Comments on the Draft York Region Official Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1	1	1.0	2	Town of Georgina	Preamble - Reference should be made to the partnership and coordinated efforts between York Region and the nine local municipalities.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
2	1	1.0	3	Town of Georgina	Preamble - The nine local municipalities should be introduced by name including a map showing their location within the Region.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
3	1	1.0	4	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro - Consider rewording to recognize that because of the rich soils agricultural has always been a central part of YR's heritage.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
4	1	1.0	5	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro - First paragraph: YR is not just greenspace. The introduction should note, urban, agriculture and greenspace.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
5	1	1.0	5	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro - Key Facts: - Add a bullet to describe the rich agricultural soils and Holland Marsh Specialty Crop Area - Add a bullet describing the amount of agricultural land in the Region	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
6	1	1.0	5	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro - Key Facts - last bullet: - YR Ag production doesn't just benefit our residents. - Should be reworded to YR's agricultural industry and agri-food businesses produce food, fiber, and fuel as well as being a local food source for our residents and recognizing that it also contributes significantly to provincial, national and international markets	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
7	1	1.2	7	City of Markham	The reference to the long title of the Growth Plan in the preamble should be changed to "A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe".	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
8	1	1.2	7	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Preamble, 2nd bullet: For further clarification, Staff questions whether this bullet should be revised to read: - an intensification target of 50% to 55% that requires that a minimum of 50% of residential development to 2041, and 55% of residential development to 2051 to occur annually within existing urban areas the built-up area	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
9	1	1.3	8	Public	Preamble - Third bullet - should there be an indication that Agriculture can also occur in the urban area?	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
10	1	1.3	8	York Region Federation of Agriculture	1.3 - #5 and last 2 bullets: - This is set out as a goal but the policies and lands YR has identified to be redesignated do not appear to reflect this goal.	Acknowledged
11	1	1.3	8	York Region Federation of Agriculture	1.3 - 2nd last bullet: - The agricultural system includes both agricultural and rural lands. - The rural policies should also reflect that agricultural needs to be recognized as a preferred and predominant activity in the rural area as well. - This should also include the premise of having policies to preserve and enhance the agricultural system as a whole.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
12	1	1.3	8	York Region Federation of Agriculture	1.3 - last bullet: - Should include wording which recognizes that the activities are and should remain mutually supportive.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
13	1	1.4	9	City of Richmond Hill	The list should also acknowledge that Centres and Corridors be recognized as places that support a substantial amount of employment uses, i.e.. population serving and office jobs.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
14	1	1.4	9	TRCA	Principle 9 - The definition of Greenland System does not include additional enhancement and restoration areas. This would make the principle of a natural heritage legacy based on "protection of a linked and enhanced" Regional Greenlands System and WRS challenging to achieve. We suggest rewording this principle to highlight the Region's Natural Systems, which include the complementary Regional Greenlands System and WRS.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
15	1	1.4	9	TRCA	Principle 10 - This principle should include both costs and benefits to ensure the contribution of natural assets are also incorporated into accounting systems	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
16	1	1.4	9	York Region Federation of Agriculture	1.4 #6: - This section should include a point which itemizes that agricultural activities have environmental benefits and would be a significant factor in the Region achieving its climate change goals. - It is also important for the Region to show its support for adaptive agricultural practices which help the Region move towards net-zero greenhouse gas emissions.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
17	1	1.4	9	York Region Federation of Agriculture	1.4 #10: - How is the protection of Agricultural land included in this approach? Consider rewording to include.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
18	1	1.4.6	9	Public	Should this statement reference agriculture? Add "agriculture" between sustainable and communities.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
19	1	1.5	10	City of Richmond Hill	There are some inconsistencies between second last paragraph on page 6 (Section 1.1) and paragraph 3 on this page (page 10) and the figure at the bottom of the page that should be rectified.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
20	2	2.1	13	City of Richmond Hill	Preamble - Paragraph 3 states "Guided by this overall planning vision..." however the preceding paragraphs do not seem to be providing a "planning vision" - consider clarifying this.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
21	2	2.1	14	City of Richmond Hill	While the November 25th version of the ROP includes changes with respect to the intensification target (50% between 2021 and 2041, and 55% between 2041 and 2051) - these changes have not been made to all sections of the ROP. Please review and update accordingly.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
22	2	2.1	13	City of Vaughan	Objective - The three pillars of "Sustainability" are economic viability, environmental protection, and social equity. - It is suggested that the word "fiscally" be removed from the Objective as it is limiting to the definition of "Sustainability"	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
23	2	2.1	13	City of Vaughan	Objective - Please revise the Objective as it is too focused on being "fiscally sustainable". Managing growth in a "fiscally sustainable manner" is not our main or only objective.□	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
24	2	2.1	13	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro - Reword to '….complete communities are realized and agricultural and natural areas are maintained.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
25	2	2.1.2 a)	13	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that this policy recognize the role of Hamlets in the Regional Structure, as follows: 2.1.2 a. Areas that provide the focus for growth and development including the urban area, towns and villages, and Regional centres and corridors, and more limited growth within the Hamlets; and...	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
26	2	2.1.2, 2.1.5 d)	13	MPLAN Inc	- How was the Greenland's system determined? And in relation to NEC lands? - Why does the current green highlight (for Greenlands) have a different shape than the green found on the Map for the 2010 Plan?□ - How have the maps been prepared? Who is providing the data? What is the data (data points) based on?	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
27	2	2.1.3	14	Township of King	2.1.3 - The organization of A-F should support a hierarchy of growth areas. - Consider reordering to the following: a. Community Areas; b. Employment Areas; c. Hamlets; d. Rural Areas; e. Agricultural Areas; f. Specialty Crop Areas	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
28	2	2.1.3	14	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Section 2.1.3: - Has the Region considered a more progressive designation of community area that more clearly sets out mixed-use expectations for employment and residential?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
29	2	2.1.3 d)	14	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Agricultural Areas does not have to be continuous to be productive and valuable. - Consider changing the wording to: Agricultural Areas provide a continuous, productive and permanent agricultural land base.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
30	2	2.1.3 e)	14	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Rural area also contains valuable agricultural resources. - Consider amending the end of the sentence to '… contain valuable natural and agricultural resources.'	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
31	2	2.1.4	14	City of Richmond Hill	Per comments regarding Map 1B - the policy indicates that this map identifies components of the urban system. However, what is shown and described are various areas that are intended to be measured to determine whether policies of the ROP are being appropriately implemented by tracking the density of development or how the area is intensifying. To minimize confusion, this policy and mapping should be clarified. (See also comment re: Policy 2.1.4 (b) and d and e)	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
32	2	2.1.4. d) & e)	14	City of Richmond Hill	Is there consideration to combine sub points d) and e) to recognize the overlap between MTSAs and Regional Centres and Corridors rather than identifying these as separate components?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
33	2	2.1.5	14	Township of King	2.1.5 - consider adding the "Holland Marsh Specialty Crop Area" to the list of provincial land use designations.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
34	2	2.1.5	14	City of Richmond Hill	This policy does not make mention of other relevant Provincial Plans that have land use planning implications for the Region, such as: Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, Parkway Belt West Plan, and it also does not make reference to the Growth Plan Natural Heritage System.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
35	2	2.1.5	14	TRCA	2.1.5 - Consider including or referencing natural heritage systems mapped by local CAs as they provide a cross-boundary systems approach at the watershed scale.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
36	2	2.1.5 a) & c)	14	City of Markham	For a) Natural Core Areas, clarify why the Oak Ridges Moraine is mentioned but not the layers in the Greenbelt outside the Oak Ridges Moraine. For c) Protected Countryside Area, lands in the Greenbelt are separate from the Oak Ridges Moraine. Oak Ridges Moraine countryside lands that are prime agricultural should be added to the list separately.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
37	2	2.1.5 c) & d)	14	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that this be revised to clarify the Provincial Plan designations, as follows: c. Protected Countryside Area and Countryside Area, made up of agricultural and natural systems identified in the Greenbelt Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan that are intended to enhance and protect the extent of agriculturally and environmentally protected lands of the Oak Ridges Moraine; and d. Urban River Valleys as identified in the Greenbelt Plan.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
38	2	2.2	15	Malone Given Parsons	Growth Management Policies: - Section 2.2 states that the Plan provides for a comprehensive approach to growth management that fully integrates infrastructure and financial planning with land use planning, while promoting the equitable distribution of costs and ensuring that the funds required to provide the necessary services for growth are provided by the proponents of growth on an equitable basis. - We support these directions in principle; however, we believe that several policies in this section provide contradictory direction. EXAMPLE: - 2.2.5 requires that Regional infrastructure required to support growth be phased based on the achievement of intensification and density targets of the Plan, among other principles. - Achieving intensification and density targets should not be related to the phasing of infrastructure, as discussed in Section 1.8 of this letter. - Infrastructure needs to be planned, financed, and constructed (in phases) in advance of planned growth in order to respond to demand for housing to ensure that there is an adequate supply available to meet the demonstrated demand. - In addition, achieving the intensification and density targets are not related to infrastructure and financial planning. This connection between infrastructure phasing and achievement of intensification targets is reiterated in Policy 2.2.6	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
39	2	2.2 & 2.3 (NEW)	15	City of Vaughan	There needs to be a policy for infill developments in "complete communities" - infill developments need to contribute to/be compatible with the existing complete community or provide an opportunity to add uses that don't currently exist in the achievement of a complete community within the existing community.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
40	2	2.2.2	16	Town of Georgina	Table 1 - It is difficult to distinguish the grey colour over the Employment forecast figures from the light blue over the Population figures. Suggest changing one of the two so that it stands out better.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
41	2	2.2.2	16	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that the policy explicitly reference 'minimum' population and employment forecasts as the basis for planning, particularly as growth within strategic growth areas may extend beyond 2051, as well as infrastructure planning and planning for employment, and planning to achieve the minimum density and intensification targets. This is consistent with the Growth Plan, see 5.2.4.2 2.2.2 That the population and employment forecasts in Table 1 be used, at a minimum, as the basis for planning of new development.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
42	2	2.2.2	16	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Table 1: - Staff are of the opinion that the growth forecasts are fairly conservative and should be increased to reflect the anticipated level of development and intensification within the Community of Stouffville. - Figure 1 - Staff recommends that the forecasted population and employment growth be updated to address the following recommendations: - The draft forecast does not take into account the Ministers Zoning Order (MZO) which was issued on November 10, 2021. Based on discussions with Regional staff, it is our understanding that these lands will be designated as Community Area to recognize the MZO. - The settlement expansion area should be expanded to include all the remaining whitebelt lands within the area bound by Highway 48, Stouffville Road, Mccowan Road, and the Town's municipal boundary. This includes all the Willowgrove lands as well as a few smaller parcels. The proposed additional settlement expansion areas are identified in Figure 1. Staff calculates the additional land area to be in the order of 33.Sha, which roughly equates to an additional 2,180 persons and jobs per hectare (assuming 65 persons and jobs per hectare). - The Town's forecasts are heavily weighted to growth beyond the 2041 planning horizon (i.e.., additional 19,200 persons from 2041 to 2051), whereas, it is anticipated that the additional population growth will occur much sooner particularly within the MZO lands and the Bethesda Road Lands, given their proximity to the existing settlement area and infrastructure. Staff recommends that the Region revisit the timing and extent of growth that is anticipated to occur prior to 2041. - Based on the above recommendations, the Town's growth forecasts in Table 1 should be revised to reflect additional growth in the order 4,175 persons and jobs to 2051. Staff would defer to the Region to identify the appropriate number of additional forecasted persons and jobs, based on their methodology and assumptions for calculating the growth forecasts. - Town staff are of the opinion that updated forecasts to include the additional settlement expansion areas as recommended above, would be appropriate.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
43	2	2.2.2	16	MPLAN Inc	Table 1 - How will Richmond Hill achieve these new forecasts since it failed to meet the old (existing) ones? - Does the Region expect housing to be built? If so, how much and where?	Acknowledged
44	2	2.2.3	16	TRCA	2.2.3 - Recommend being specific to climate mitigation and resilience which are integral to sustainability.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
45	2	2.2.3	16	MPLAN Inc	The Plan is not set up to achieve all of these objectives. There are no clear priorities set out in the Plan. - There are no evident implementation mechanisms suggested for achieving these goals, which really are just statements representing a "good planning" wish list.	Acknowledged
46	2	2.2.3	16	City of Markham	Clarify if “financial” is covered by “infrastructure planning”.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
47	2	2.2.4	16	City of Vaughan	Consider revising use of the term "agile", as it carries a lot of project management connotation. - Also consider rephrasing from "regular review" to "proactive review".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
48	2	2.2.4	16	City of Vaughan	The intent of this policy is good. Please provide clarification whether monitoring infrastructure investments is the role of the local municipality, the role of the Region, or a coordinated effort between the local municipality and the Region.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
49	2	2.2.4	16	City of Markham	Consider deleting "agile approach to growth management by ensuring" to streamline this policy.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
50	2	2.2.5	16	City of Richmond Hill	Is there, or should there be, any prioritization for the principles?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
51	2	2.2.5	16	TRCA	2.2.5 - In keeping with the Region’s Key Guiding Planning Principles, the principles on which growth-related Regional infrastructure are to be based could include the Region’s Natural Systems. Specifically, policy 2.2.5 should include alignment with the Regional Greenlands System and WRS as growth management does not operate independently from protection of the Region’s natural heritage and biodiversity, or protection, enhancement, or restoration of the quality and quantity of water within a watershed.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
52	2	2.2.5	16	Township of King	2.2.5 c) - This policy could be interpreted to support land consumptive development. - Emphasis should be placed on prioritizing investments which support vibrant, heathy, sustainable, and thriving communities, no matter their geographic size. 2.2.5 e) - Lower costs for servicing does not necessarily mean the objectives of good planning and community building will be achieved. - The entirety of policy 2.2.5 focuses too heavily on financial costs of infrastructure and not enough on planning principles. - Infrastructure investments are necessary to support smaller communities to continue to thrive and be sustainable	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
53	2	2.2.5	16	City of Vaughan	Understanding that Policy 2.2.5 pertains to Regional infrastructure, does it require thresholds for phasing (e.g. xx% build-out of intensification areas before freeing up Future Urban Areas)? - Will local municipalities need to set thresholds? Otherwise, how do we set triggers before planning is underway for FUAs? Are such thresholds not required because of Policy 2.2.12?	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
54	2	2.2.5 b) & 2.2.14	16	Town of East Gwillimbury	2.2.5 b) - states that Regional infrastructure required to support growth to 2051 be phased based on the achievement of intensification and density targets of the YROP 2.2.14 - states that development shall be prioritized in locations with existing Regional infrastructure capacity - Town staff have concern that such policies promote unequal growth within the Region and do not support the provision of more affordable housing - A firm commitment to servicing in northern York Region should be established in this section as being the key driver for meeting local municipal density and intensification targets and ensuring the development of complete and balanced communities	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
55	2	2.2.7	17	MPLAN Inc	"Region to recognize the role of partners" - Sounds good, but what does recognition entail. This does not occur in practice	Acknowledged
56	2	2.2.5 d)	16	City of Markham	Clarify if equal priority should be given to both roads and transit, or if priority should be given to transit per the phrase "prioritize existing investments that enhance the existing transportation network…".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
57	2	2.2.7 & 2.2.8	17	City of Markham	Clarify the intent of policy 2.2.7, specifically what type of coordination is needed.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
58	2	2.2.8	17	City of Richmond Hill	Recommend rewording clause d) to "protection and enhancement of the Regional Greenlands system and agricultural areas" given that other parts of the ROP references the protection and enhancement of the Regional Greenlands system. This provides consistency.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
59	2	2.2.8	17	City of Vaughan	Consider including a point under this policy regarding sustainability or the protection of the natural system.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
60	2	2.2.8	17	City of Markham	For a) clarify the intent of this policy regarding a comprehensive, integrated and collaborative planning process (i.e.., what is needed and what is it intended to achieve?). For b) clarify what the anticipated outcome/deliverable of this policy is. What changes can the local municipality expect from the Region with respect to infrastructure delivery once a municipality has provided the Region early identification of regional capital infrastructure requirements?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
61	2	2.2.8 a)	17	MPLAN Inc	"Region to work with other stakeholders to ensure a) a collaborative planning process." - I cannot think of a situation where this has occurred. More importantly, what does this mean in practice? - Does the Region include the private sector as stakeholders in the process? What is the Region proposing to do differently?	Acknowledged
62	2	2.2.8 d)	17	Public	This policy referred to agricultural areas rather than Agricultural System.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
63	2	2.2.8 d)	17	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Agricultural System would be more appropriate wording than Area now that the System has been implemented	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
64	2	2.2.10	17	MPLAN Inc	- Why would this be required for Yonge Bernard KDA? Since 2017 the Secondary Plan has confirmed no servicing constraints exist. - However, since 2020, the Region has supported a holding provision for development in the KDA dependent upon the completion of regional road network upgrades on regional streets far removed from Yonge Street and the Bernard KDA	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
65	2	2.2.11	17	City of Markham	Clarify how this policy will or should be implemented.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
66	2	2.2.12	17	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	2.2.12 states that lower tiers shall phase development in coordination with Regional Plans - Presently Vaughan has approved an Interim Servicing Strategy ahead of scheduled regional infrastructure(refer to below staff reports and below Figure). - If Council so chooses could exceptions like this be made in the future?	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
67	2	2.2.12	17	TRCA	2.2.12 - Phasing of development should also be coordinated with the Greenlands System and WRS policies contained in the ROP. We further recommend inclusion of York Region's Climate Change Action Plan as well as York Region Urban Forest Management Plan in the list of Regional Plans as references to both will strengthen opportunities for their implementation, an imperative for a resilient York Region over the long-term.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
68	2	2.2.12	17	Town of Georgina	There should be a reference in this policy about the need for the Region to constantly review, monitor and update these Plans and Strategies to reflect the current realities and changing situations of the Region and its local municipalities.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
69	2	2.2.12	17	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends that this policy be revised to recognize coordination of local municipal plans and strategies, as follows: 2.2.12 That local municipalities shall phase development in a manner that is coordinated with local municipal plans and the following Regional plans:...	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
70	2	2.2.12	17	MPLAN Inc	This kind of transportation planning policy promotes vehicular use	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
71	2	2.2.12	17	City of Markham	The word 'shall' appears to be a mandate. It is not always possible for a local municipality to phase development in accordance with this policy, specifically when development and/or growth is driven by the Province through the use of MZOs, or by other initiatives to bring innovation or world class facilities to showcase a municipality. Revise the wording of this policy to reflect this by adding ", where appropriate" after "Regional plans".	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
72	2	2.2.13	17	MPLAN Inc	- Not sure what near term development priorities means. - Typically the Region only speaks/consults with BILD and BILD does not represent most landowners.	Acknowledged
73	2	2.2.13	17	City of Markham	Clarify what "near term development priorities" means.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
74	2	2.2.14	17	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	2.2.14 indicates that development shall occur in locations with existing regional capacity. - There are two primary concerns: we have developments approved that appear stalemated and we have other MZO that have been endorsed by lower tier governments well in advance of servicing in the absence of Regional consultation or support. - What incentives/penalties will there be to deter and stop development approvals occurring ahead of infrastructure to ensure that phasing policies are effective? - Will exceptions like this be made should municipalities ask in the new Official Plan?	Acknowledged
75	2	2.2.14	17	MPLAN Inc	Does this include the Bernard Bus Terminal. Is the BBT moving? Staying? What does prioritizing development mean?	Acknowledged
76	2	2.2.15	17	MPLAN Inc	Confusing policy	Acknowledged
77	2	2.2.16	17	Malone Given Parsons	2.2.16 makes no mention of development charges and related credits for development proponents who provide funds for services. There is also no reference to the Region's ability to issue debt. Placing the burden on development proponents to fund services with no related relief does not match the direction to provide funds on an equitable basis, nor does it support the provision of affordable housing as is prioritized throughout the Draft OP. - We request that specific language be added to this section regarding Development Charges and the recovery of costs for development proponents who provide funding for necessary services.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
78	2	2.2.16	17	City of Vaughan	Policy 2.2.16 is a re-numbering of Policy 4.5.2. Has this been monitored over the past 10 years to determine that it has been effective and can be implemented?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
79	2	2.2.17	17	City of Richmond Hill	"2.2.17 To work with development proponents on alternative infrastructure initiatives to reduce financial risk to the Region." It would be helpful if the Region explained in the policy or definition what are 'alternative infrastructure initiatives'.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
80	2	2.2.17	17	City of Markham	Clarify if the intent of this policy is to reduce financial risk, or to be financially sustainable.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
81	2	2.3	18	Malone Given Parsons	Policies in section 2.3 should be revised to use language such as 'should' rather than 'shall' and should include 'where appropriate' to provide direction without being overly prescriptive.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
82	2	2.3	18	Malone Given Parsons	Section 2.3 states that "a community could be a local neighbourhood, a municipality, or a social group; it is the place where people belong and shape their identity." - This extremely broad definition means that a community is any association of people, at any scale in the Region.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
83	2	2.3	18	Malone Given Parsons	The policies of Section 2.3 describe how all communities should be planned and designed without any differentiation in this broad conceptualization of community. - Do these policies apply to local neighbourhoods, municipalities, or the Region at large? Or do they apply at all levels? - The requirements of this section need to be differentiated by the type and level of community.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
84	2	2.3	18	Malone Given Parsons	Section 2.3 introduces many new requirements and components of what comprises a complete community; if required in all instances these requirements would result in competing priorities. - We are challenged to foresee how conformity with these policies can be achieved with the lack of a clear policy hierarchy, and differentiation of which scales the Region would expect to see certain components realized. - While only illustrative, the Figure under policy 2.3.2 demonstrates very clearly that the Region's ambitions for complete communities contain a global set of components that could only all be achieved across the entire Region, not at a smaller scale.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
85	2	2.3	18	Malone Given Parsons	Section 2.3 - we are concerned with mandatory requirements being applied across all scales. - There appears to be no background work which provides an explanation to support the appropriateness of these requirements. - To maintain the structure and aspirational policy intent of this section of the Draft OP, these policies should be revised to use language such as 'should' rather than 'shall' and should include 'where appropriate' to provide direction without being overly prescriptive. - In addition, the policies of this section need to have clear outcomes and should be supported by background work.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
86	2	2.3	18	City of Vaughan	Policies for the achievement of Complete Communities should include a minimum local amenity space requirement to be provided within a walkable distance based on number of units/residents in a community.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
87	2	2.3	18	City of Vaughan	Please consider more specific policy directions/language requiring municipalities to include policies in their respective official plans for achieving Complete Communities, including the requirement for a definition of Complete Communities that is consistent with York Region's definition for complete communities (with suggested revisions).	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
88	2	2.3	18	Malone Given Parsons	The requirements of Section 2.3 need to be differentiated by the type and level of community. - Community is defined to broadly - Policies of section 2.3 describe how all communities should be planned and designed without differentiation in this broad conceptualization of community. Do these policies apply to local neighborhoods, municipalities, the Region at large or all levels?	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
89	2	2.3	18	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	The wording of these policies in section 2.3 are good, but it all depends on the execution of these concepts, something that YR Council is failing at in recent years - Suggestion to lobby the province for more supportive policy and the Feds for more financing. No guarantee the affordable housing targets would be met with existing policy structure	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
90	2	2.3 (NEW)	18	City of Vaughan	There needs to be a policy that discourages infill residential developments from replacing/displacing uses that contribute to an existing complete community (i.e.. local amenities, removal of woodlands) and impacts walkability to these destinations within the neighbourhood.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
91	2	2.3.1	18	City of Vaughan	The section number 2.3.1 is used twice - page 18 and 23. This may cause confusion if referencing either section. Other section/policy numbers are also repeated in YROP. Please review and consider re-numbering.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
92	2	2.3.1	18	City of Vaughan	City staff have been advised by Indigenous Peoples that they have an interest in Climate Change. Consider adding Indigenous Peoples to the list.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
93	2	2.3.1	18	MPLAN Inc	- How does this relate to optimizing development on a site? - In practice, the policies promote inefficient use of land, certainly in the north east quadrant of the Bernard KDA. In this area the Plan promotes unnecessary public roads, higher than necessary parking standards and unjustified buffers/setbacks from an existing man-made drainage channel block that has been in existence for many years as part of the infrastructure of the existing subdivision/neighbourhood. - The Region should provide an example of where this policy is being, or has been, implemented.	Acknowledged
94	2	2.3.1	18	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	YR Draft Climate Change Action Plan, and YR Energy Conservation and Demand Management Update should mention Material Carbon Emissions, Embodied Carbon or Global Warming Potential. York Region could require contractors to select building and insulation materials that have low MCE/Global Warming Potential	Acknowledged
95	2	2.3.1	18	City of Markham	Revise this policy to include the characteristics of a complete community (i.e.., mix of uses, amenities and services, compact, accessible, etc..) as "walkable to most local amenities" does not sufficiently describe a complete community.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
96	2	2.3.2	18	City of Richmond Hill	Policy 2.3.2 should also speak to communities being planned in a manner that is sensitive to existing context.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
97	2	2.3	19	City of Richmond Hill	The concept of "15 minute communities" is introduced with a graphic in Section 2.3 Supporting Complete Communities, but while the policies in this section speak generally to walkable and complete communities, none of the policies actually specifically reference the benchmark / concept of a 15 minute walk. The first reference is actually 60 pages later into the document, within policy 4.4.7.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
98	2	2.3	19	City of Vaughan	On Page 19, the graphic references 15-minute communities. Please clarify if it is 15 minutes by car, transit or walking. There is no reference to 15-minutes in the text. It is suggested that the definition on Page 18 be revised to: "Complete communities are designed as accessible, dense and walkable, where most amenities are within 15 minutes walking distance."	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
99	2	2.3.2	19	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Graphic after 2.3.2: Add community gardens to the Local Food Box	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
100	2	2.3.3	19	City of Vaughan	Please reference the term "wellness" in this policy.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
101	2	2.3.5	19	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends that the policy also provide for the provision of a mix of housing options and affordable housing.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
102	2	2.3.9	19	City of Richmond Hill	Our local OP policies already support this. At this point, it should be less about what municipalities should be doing, and more about encouraging private development proponents to provide access and to develop healthy and locally grown food and agricultural products.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
103	2	2.3.9	19	TRCA	2.3.9 - opportunities for urban agriculture should also be promoted	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
104	2	2.3.10	19	Malone Given Parsons	Further to the above comment^ - Policy 2.3.10 is an example where the ROP lists out mandatory requirements for complete communities. - Not all developments will be able to provide all of these components of the open space network, yet given the broad definition of community, it would seem as though almost any development would be required to provide these components. To ensure the policy is universally applicable across the Region, our suggested wording is as follows: "That communities **at the neighbourhood level should** be designed to provide an integrated open space network that contributes to a sense of place and identity, promotes physical activity and social inclusion, to include, **where possible**: a. active recreational facilities, programmed parks, **and/or** passive parks for year-round use; b. connections by sidewalk and/or trails; c. meeting places, informal gathering spaces and central squares that incorporate art **and/or** culture and heritage; d. opportunities for urban agriculture; and e. connections to the Regional Greenlands System, where appropriate."	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
105	2	2.3.10	19	City of Vaughan	Please replace "shall" with "must".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
106	2	2.3.10	19	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Tools: Add community gardens	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
107	2	2.3.10	19	Malone Given Parsons	Revise policy 2.3.10 to: 2.3.10 That communities at the neighbourhood level should be designed to provide an integrated open space network that contributes to a sense of place and identity, promotes physical activity and social inclusion, to include, where possible: a. active recreational facilities, programmed parks, and/or passive parks for year-round use; b. connections by sidewalk and/or trails; c. meeting places, informal gathering spaces and central squares that incorporate art and/or culture and heritage; d. opportunities for urban agriculture; and e. connections to the Regional Greenlands System, where appropriate."	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
108	2	2.3.10	19	Malone Given Parsons	Additional clarity from the Region in supporting explanatory work and a more clear policy hierarchy would help to improve the climate change policies.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
109	2	2.3.10 d)	19	TRCA	2.3.10 d) - It appears as if opportunities for urban agriculture will only be considered when designing communities within open spaces, however there could be opportunities to integrate in areas outside of open spaces (i.e.., residential, rooftops, balconies, etc..)	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
110	2	2.3.11	20	City of Vaughan	Please consider the following policy revisions: "That retail, commercial, office, and institutional structures shall be **integrated in a compact form in mixed-use buildings, including multi-storey buildings, where required by a municipal official plan**, and be pedestrian oriented and transit supportive, **to achieve a complete community**"	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
111	2	2.3.11	20	City of Vaughan	Please define the term "mixed-use".	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
112	2	2.3.11	20	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	2.3.11: - Transit Supportive is a defined term that speaks to mixed-use development, and high levels of density. - In our submission, such a policy reference to a defined term, which is a requirement, may have implications for standalone retail, commercial, office, or institutional uses. - We seek clarification as to how this policy is to be implemented and what threshold would be used to measure if development is transit supportive, and in particular for lands that are not proximate to transit. - We suggest revising the policy to introduce flexibility	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
113	2	2.3.13	20	City of Richmond Hill	This policy should be reframed so that the term "communities" is replaced with "development". So it reads: "That development shall be designed..."	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
114	2	2.3.13	20	Town of Georgina	What is the "highest urban design and green development standards"? Very subjective wording if there are not guidelines to adhere to. Also, requiring "high" design standards is good and well, but it could be counteractive to provision of affordable housing in some respects.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
115	2	2.3.10 e)	19	MPLAN Inc	The land to the north of the KDA, beyond its boundary - the Channel Block - is municipal stormwater infrastructure, fenced on both sides, therefore how can it be feasible or appropriate to incorporate it into an integrated open space network.	Acknowledged
116	2	2.3.13	20	City of Markham	The use of "employ" from the former policy or even "apply" is preferred instead of "shall be". Also, overall the criteria are too detailed, some with outcomes, some without. For a) and b) would this work better in preamble? For d) is "community greening" a new term? And for i) odd/inconsistent that the phrase "that support physical activity and social interactions" (i.e.. the purpose/end) is provided in this instance, but not in others above.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
117	2	2.3.13 a)	20	City of Vaughan	Please revise sub-policy (a) to the following: "provide pedestrian scale, safety, security, comfort, universal accessibility and connectivity to promote physical activity, wellness and reduce auto dependency;"	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
118	2	2.3.13 c)	20	TRCA	2.3.13 c) - We recommend this policy include a target to move communities toward net zero greenhouse gas emissions instead of just overall reduction.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
119	2	2.3.13 c)	20	City of Vaughan	Please revise sub-policy (c) to the following: "promote sustainable and attractive buildings that minimize energy use, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and incorporate renewable energy sources;"	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
120	2	2.3.13 d)	20	City of Vaughan	Please include reference to "green infrastructure" in this policy.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
121	2	2.3.13 d)	20	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add community gardens	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
122	2	2.3.13 e)	20	City of Vaughan	Please revise sub-policy (e) to the following: "provide public spaces and attractive streetscapes that encourage active transportation, and improve safety for all modes of travel;"	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
123	2	2.3.13 i)	20	City of Vaughan	Please consider the hierarchy of public spaces and relationships between these spaces in this policy.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
124	2	2.3.13 (NEW)	20	City of Vaughan	Although there are policies promoting green development in the design of new communities, there is no specific policy directing municipalities to develop green standards for private development. Staff suggest the following policy: That local municipalities develop green development standards to support sustainable growth and development.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
125	2	2.3.14	20	City of Vaughan	Please consider requiring LEED certification for all new public buildings.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
126	2	2.3.15	21	City of Vaughan	Highspeed internet shall be recognized as servicing infrastructure for businesses alongside water and power.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
127	2	2.3.15	21	City of Vaughan	There is an opportunity to include language around the shift to working from home in the future in Policy 2.3.15.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
128	2	2.3.15	21	City of Vaughan	Please consider directing this policy to the Region as well as local municipalities. These are all valuable statements (for example, with respect to arterial roads).	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
129	2	2.3.15	21	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends that consideration be given to including: 'directing intensification to appropriate locations that support the community character'.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
130	2	2.3.15	21	City of Markham	Clarify how local municipalities would demonstrate conformity with this 'shall' policy other than repeating the policy in local official plans? That is, will the Region be looking for specific mechanisms for neighbourhood retrofits such as through asset management plans or community improvement? Consider adding a text box in the margin outlining optional mechanisms to support implementation of this policy.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
131	2	2.3.15 d)	21	City of Vaughan	Please revise sub-policy (d) to the following: "promote landscaping including increasing tree canopy for shaded areas, encouraging tree planting in unencumbered soil and community greening to promote environmental sustainability;"	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
132	2	2.3.15 e)	21	City of Vaughan	Please revise policy to add sub-policy (e): "revitalizing and restoring existing buildings, including heritage resources; conserving existing cultural heritage landscapes"	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
133	2	2.3.15 g)	21	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add community gardens	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
134	2	2.3.16	21	City of Richmond Hill	Replace the term "communities" with "development". Proponents of development should be designing their site-specific developments to prioritize active transportation through this policy, not communities.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
135	2	2.3.17	21	Town of Georgina	Development is an all-encompassing term applying to minor applications such as the creation of one lot, a minor variances or a zoning by-law amendment to permit a use or reduced development standards. Requiring all development to be supported by a mobility plan is unrealistic and unnecessary. This policy requires more flexible wording for implementation. Adding wording to the effect of "where appropriate" would accomplish this.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
136	2	2.3.17	21	MPLAN Inc	- If the intent is to create 15 -minute complete communities, then this cannot occur without an express commitment to creating numerous zero car households. - The policies and zoning regulations supported by the Region to date do not allow this to occur. - Mobility plans should be prepared at the Secondary Plan level so that sites that want to develop know in advance what is expected on the mobility front.	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
137	2	2.3.18	21	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy be expanded beyond "... require the provision of facilities **to** encourage an increase in the mode share of cycling trips... ", to instead require the provision of appropriate facilities to encourage an increase in the mode share of active transportation trips, such as covered and secure storage areas, shower and change facilities, in-boulevard short-term parking, and others.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
138	2	2.3.18	21	City of Vaughan	This policy suggests the use of conditions of development approval which means it's a requirement. In this sense, the word encourage should be replaced with "shall be provided". Alternatively, the use of conditions of approval should be removed if "encourage" is the intent of this policy.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
139	2	2.3.18	21	Town of Georgina	Similar to the comment above, this is not a realistic ask for "all development". This policy requires more flexible wording for implementation. Adding wording to the effect of "where appropriate" would accomplish this.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
140	2	2.3.18	21	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that this policy clarify the type of development that should be targeted (i.e.., institutional, commercial, employment uses). - Furthermore, the policy is very prescriptive and greater flexibility is needed in determining when these facilities are required (i.e.., shall encourage).	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
141	2	2.3.18	21	MPLAN Inc	- Not sure that this thinking is relevant moving forward. - Why as a condition of development approval? If there are to be conditions for this, why not have a provision for zero car household dwelling units?	Acknowledged
142	2	2.3.19	22	City of Richmond Hill	May want to consider adding "where appropriate" language to 2.3.19 a) as maximum parking provisions are not always appropriate. We have had issues with maximum parking requirements when changes of use occurs and a creates a situation of non-compliance.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
143	2	2.3.19	22	City of Vaughan	As a part of 2.3.19, please include a policy that references on-street parking.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
144	2	2.3.19 a)	22	City of Vaughan	To emphasize the importance of limiting parking supply in order to achieve the objectives of transit-oriented development, prioritize active transportation, and address climate change, it is suggested that the policy be changed from "Reduced minimum and maximum parking requirements ... " to "Minimized parking requirements and potentially no minimum parking requirements, consistent with distance to transit and complementary uses".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
145	2	2.3.19 a)	22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	2.3.19: - The draft policy is written as a requirement, whereby a reduced parking standard is universally required across the Region. - Parking standards should reflect operational needs and specific uses (i.e.. grocery store), and ensure flexibility is maintained for landowners to provide parking that is adequate to their needs. - To reflect that there are multiple zoning by-laws and parking standards throughout the Region, some of which may already provide an appropriate parking standard, we suggest that “where appropriate” be added to the beginning of subsection a)	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
146	2	2.3.19 a)	22	MPLAN Inc	- To date there is no clear direction from the Region on how to incorporate parking management policies and standards ...that reflect the walking distance to transit... - Consistent with City of Toronto and City of Brampton, the policy should be revised to 'remove a minimum parking requirement for development on Regional Transit Corridors'.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
147	2	2.3.19 c)	22	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	2.3.19: - In our submission, this is an overly onerous standard that does not consider specific site context or operational needs. - A Regional Official Plan Amendment may be required in order for an alternative site design to be considered as it relates to the location of main building entrances. We suggest that the existing “where appropriate” be moved to the beginning of subsection c) to ensure that flexibility is maintained	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
148	2	2.3.19 d)	22	Township of King	2.3.19 d) - states "preferential locations for carpooling, car-sharing spaces and bicycle storage requirements". - Consider incorporating electric vehicle charging spaces	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
149	2	2.3.1	22	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add Agriculture to this list	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
150	2	2.3.1	22	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro: Add a paragraph that talks about Agriculture covering 43%. It needs to be recognized that Agricultural production contributes to greenhouse gas production. - By using best management practices, climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies, Agriculture can be a net carbon sink and therefore play a very significant role in Climate Change mitigation in the Region.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
151	2	2.3.1	23	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro: Add – Support strategies to reduce the Climate Change risks for Agriculture. - Support strategies for Agriculture to adopt new technologies and practices that mitigate and adapt to climate change. - Support strategies that improve carbon sequestration on Agricultural land.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
152	2	2.3.1.1	23	TRCA	2.3.1.1 - This should include a reference to infrastructure - "To support low carbon energy and infrastructure alternatives and a target progression toward net-zero emissions by 2051"	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
153	2	2.3.1.3	23	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Regarding the assessment of “the role natural systems play in mitigating and adapting to climate change” (Regional Climate Action Plan and Community Energy and Emissions Plan) - clarification is required regarding who will be making these assessments	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
154	2	2.3.1.3	23	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	The importance of York Region’s Peatlands is not addressed at all in the draft OP or the supporting documents cited in policy 2.3.1.3. - Include peatlands in features to be protected by YR Natural Heritage policies	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
155	2	2.3.1.4	23	City of Markham	Consider adding "corporate stakeholder" to this policy, or clarify if this is being addressed somewhere else outside of the ROP. A greenhouse gas emissions strategy will include partnerships with corporations.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
156	2	2.3.1.5	23	City of Vaughan	Please clarify how "Community Energy Plans" will be implemented with respect to development proposals through the planning application process.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
157	2	2.3.1.5	23	City of Markham	Amend policy 2.3.1.5 by or add a new policy to encourage area-specific community energy plans to be developed for secondary plans and major development.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
158	2	2.3.1.6	23	City of Richmond Hill	Edit lead in sentence: "To encourage and work with local municipalities, …". Given that certain financial powers are limited to the Region under a two-tier system, the Region may need/could be involved in programs related to financial incentives (e.g., Local Improvement Charge/PACE programs for building energy retrofits as per policy 2.3.1.14).	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
159	2	2.3.1.6	23	City of Vaughan	2.3.1.6 currently reads, "2.3.1.6 To encourage local municipalities, agencies, and stakeholders to integrate climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies into municipal, planning and development tools including but not limited to pilot programs, bylaws, development guidelines and incentive programs." It is recommended that the wording be change from "encourage" to "require", as climate change is a critical priority.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
160	2	2.3.1.6	23	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Infographic - Add - risks for agriculture	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
161	2	2.3.1.6	23	City of Markham	Amend policy 2.3.1.6 to add “carbon budget framework” to the list of tools.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
162	2	2.3.1.7	23	MPLAN Inc	Region does not appear to draw a link between parking requirements, the requirement for unneeded "fine grain roads", that promote the use of vehicles, and vehicle emissions etc..	Acknowledged
163	2	2.3.1.9	23	City of Richmond Hill	Is there a terms of reference for "health, environmental and air quality impact study"? Are they to be provided for all development applications? Note: it is not referenced in Section 7.3.11.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
164	2	2.3.1.9	23	City of Markham	Clarify if the studies are required for local municipalities, or if they are only for the Region's evaluation.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
165	2	2.3.1.10	24	City of Richmond Hill	Is there a minimum distance from "known air emissions sources" that we should apply to determine when studies need to be requested regarding mitigation?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
166	2	2.3.1.10	24	Malone Given Parsons	2.3.1.10 - This policy does not provide specific direction as to appropriate mitigation measure, nor does it specify any other 'significant known air emissions sources', nor does it identify what it means to be near an emissions source. Without an implementation framework, these new policies will result in confusion and uncertainty for lower-tier municipal interpretation, as well as an inability for development proponents to determine that any given application conforms to the Official Plan	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
167	2	2.3.1.10	24	Malone Given Parsons	We request policy 2.3.1.10 be revised to provide more clarity and direction - Without an implementation framework, these new policies will result in confusion and uncertainty for lower-tier municipal interpretation, as well as an inability for development proponents to determine that any given application conforms to the OP	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
168	2	2.3.1.13	24	City of Vaughan	Please consider including references to Low Impact Developments, green infrastructure, and naturalized areas, including those with native grasses, that have deep root systems and protect against erosion to support this policy.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
169	2	2.3.1.13	24	City of Richmond Hill	Are there corresponding buffer policies that support this policy regarding stormwater management?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
170	2	2.3.1.13	24	TRCA	2.3.1.13 - We recommend including erosion alongside flooding as a potential risk associated with increased precipitation. There is also an opportunity to acknowledge the benefits of the natural heritage system in aiding the Region and local municipalities to adapt to climate change. Additionally, the Region’s Greening Strategy could be referenced as a comprehensive land acquisition strategy required to expand the Region’s natural system and support its goal to adapt to a changing climate.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
171	2	2.3.1.13 b)	24	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that under sub-policy (b) of 2.3.1.13 that "increased precipitation" be changed to "projected precipitation".	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
172	2	2.3.1.15	24	Town of Georgina	This policy "encourages" new development to achieve water efficiency and conservation targets that exceed the OBC; whereas, 2.3.1.16 appears to require it?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
173	2	2.3.1.16	24	City of Richmond Hill	Periodic updates to sustainable development programs should also aim to achieve: "climate equity targeting areas experiencing higher rates of energy poverty, urban canopy deficiency and limited transportation options".	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
174	2	2.3.1.16	24	City of Richmond Hill	Update text to include alternative and district energy. E.g., "That York Region and local municipalities develop, implement and periodically update sustainable development programs to achieve: d. increase in the use of alternative and renewable energy generation options and district energy systems;"	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
175	2	2.3.1.16	24	Town of Georgina	The local municipalities are required to undertake all of these programs and implement them? Are these programs for local municipal buildings and facilities? Or to be implemented by the private sector through the development process. Not clear.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
176	2	2.3.1.16	24	Public	Graphic - Chapter 2 graphic and discussion on climate change should reference the opportunity agriculture provides to mitigate the impacts of climate change.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
177	2	2.3.1.16	24	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	2.3.1.16 refers to development of "sustainable development programs". The implementation criteria for these programs must include: a. the positioning of buildings for optimum passive solar heat; b. the mandatory use of building materials that have low Material Carbon Emissions/Embodied Carbon/Global Warming Potential (see Achieving Real Net-Zero Emission Homes); c. a comprehensive list of renewable energy sources that it may be possible to incorporate into communities e.g. shared geothermal heating as well as photovoltaics; d. clarity regarding which buildings these criteria will apply to, e.g. Is that all regionally and municipally owned buildings, or just some? Will all contractors hired to build new subdivisions be required to adhere to these criteria? e. clarity regarding who will be hired to determine the implementation criteria and their application	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
178	2	2.3.1.16	24	City of Markham	Clarify why there is no longer a focus on solar energy, and why a solar design strategy is no longer needed (former policy 5.2.26).	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
179	2	2.3.1.16 h)	24	City of Vaughan	Please add "embodied carbon" to this policy.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
180	2	2.3.1.17	25	City of Markham	Clarify if this new policy is in the correct section.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
181	2	2.3.2	25	City of Vaughan	Types of dwelling units within "Multi-Residential" buildings and developments needs to be defined more clearly with respect to achieving an appropriate mix of "housing options" that considers families and various life stages, etc..	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
182	2	2.3.2	26	Town of Georgina	Affordable is mentioned several times in this subsection. Affordable is a defined term, however, there is no definition for local or regional market area. How can these policies be implemented without the accompanying definitions?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
183	2	2.3.2	25	Evans Planning	There does not appear to be any consideration given to phasing or transitioning towards this target to accommodate projects already in the development process	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
184	2	2.3.2	25	Evans Planning	Consideration should be given to requiring that incentives be provided to offset the costs of affordable units, such as the reduction/elimination of planning and permit application fees, development charges, parkland contributions, or community benefits, as well as the elimination of the need to provide parking for said units	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
185	2	2.3.2	25	Evans Planning	Concerned with the removal of the notion of 'intrinsically affordable units' from the draft YROP - Increasing the diversity and supply of a variety of housing options through the provision of apartment, townhouse, stacked townhouse, and other innovative design options is a crucial element in creating not only a complete and diverse community, but also contributes to the inherent affordability of said community by providing options for all income levels - Alternative forms of housing can be considered affordable when compared to the relatively limited supply of traditional forms of ground related housing, although may not meet the strict definition of 'affordable' as provided in the draft YROP	Acknowledged
186	2	2.3.2 (NEW)	25	MPLAN Inc	There is a reference to "housing options" on page 25. - There should be a requirement to create zero car households within a 15-minute complete community	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
187	2	2.3.2.1	26	City of Vaughan	Developing the necessary strategies and incentives to achieve these policies, yielding a greater mix of affordable housing opportunities, as implemented at the local level, remains challenging.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
188	2	2.3.2.1	26	MPLAN Inc	Please clarify the reference to "in partnership with".	Acknowledged
189	2	2.3.2.1	26	Malone Given Parsons	We would suggest that policy 2.3.2.1 be revised to also include reference to the provision of “Market Based” housing as required by the PPS 2020.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
190	2	2.3.2.1	26	City of Markham	What is meant by market housing? Should ownership housing be identified as well as purpose-built rental housing? What does “income spectrum” mean and should it be a defined term?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
191	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	The Remington Group Inc	Recommendation to include as much flexibility in how affordable housing targets are achieved as possible	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
192	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	City of Richmond Hill	It would be appreciated if wording could be added to clarify the responsibility of individual development applications in contributing to achieving these targets. (See recommendation in Staff Report SRPI.22.036)	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
193	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	City of Richmond Hill	The requirement for affordable housing should also include the requirement that these units vary in range of sizes so that they are able to accommodate families and larger households.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
194	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- While staff supports the identification of these affordable housing targets, further policy direction and implementation tools/incentives will be required to help achieve these targets, particularly for a smaller urban municipality. We understand the Region will be undertaking further work to address the provision of affordable housing. - Furthermore, the Town's ongoing Housing Strategy will assist in furthering the provision of affordable housing.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
195	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	Evans Planning	Concerns with the minimum affordable housing targets - Requiring 25% of all new units be affordable is an unrealistic target, exceeding the ultimate requirements of the Inclusionary Zoning policies for the strongest market area recently adopted by City of Toronto Council - Requiring such an onerous target may lead to the cancellation of existing or planned projects, or developers seeking other opportunities for development outside of the Region - There does not appear to be any consideration given to phasing or transitioning towards this target to accommodate projects already in the development process	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
196	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3: - Similar draft policies are provided in sections 4.4.2.9, 4.4.23 and 4.4.24. - We seek confirmation that such targets are intended to be an area wide target, and are not intended to be accommodated on a site specific basis	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
197	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	Malone Given Parsons	We request that the affordable housing targets in policies 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.2.3 be more closely tied to the Regions Housing and Homelessness Plan as required by the PPS and that these targets be defined “in addition to”, not part of the allocation of market-based housing that has been defined for these areas. - As the policies are currently written, they essentially will have the effect of removing 25 to 35% of the market-based housing supply which will only further exacerbate the affordable housing crisis that is being experienced in the Region.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
198	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	Malone Given Parsons	We suggest that the policies of the draft Official Plan be modified so that hard targets (Policies 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.2.3) for the provision of affordable housing should apply to York Region Community Housing, not to the development industry at large as there are limits to what private developers can realistically achieve -Targets that apply to all development in the Region should allow flexibility to include attainable ownership housing and be required ‘to the extent possible’ to reflect the limits of what can be provided by the market - These forms of housing should be identified in the Region’s definitions as counting towards the creation of affordable housing stock in the Region	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
199	2	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3	26	City of Markham	Draft policy 4.4.2.9 j in relation to Regional Corridors and Major Transit Station Areas refers to affordable housing targets whereas draft policies 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.2.3 state that a minimum of 35% be affordable. Regional staff should harmonize these policies so that they refer to targets. This would also align with the rental housing targets terminology used in draft policy 2.2.2.4 and Table 2. Staff support the intent of these policies to increase the supply of affordable housing, although it is not clear how the targets can be achieved. Affordable housing targets have not been met from 2018 to 2020 (2021 data is not yet available) and should be further reviewed in consultation with local municipalities. Regional programs and incentives are requested to support implementation of these targets.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
200	2	2.3.2.2, 2.3.2.3 & 2.3.2.4	26	Town of East Gwillimbury	2.3.2.2 & 2.3.2.3 - affordable housing targets of 35% in MTSA's, and 25% outside of Regional Centres and MTSA's. Town staff request for details on the strategies for implementation and monitoring between the Town and Region to ensure targets are being met collaboratively. What role will the Region play to support and incentivize this? 2.3.2.4 - EG has been assigned a target of 2,250 purpose-built rentals by 2051. Staff request further information on the role the Region will play in helping to support the achievement of this target.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
201	2	2.3.2.3	26	City of Richmond Hill	2.3.2.3 - Request to amend policy to require a minimum of 35% of residential units in **each** new development application located within a Regional Centre or MTSA to be affordable, in response to the Region’s declared affordable housing crisis and to ensure that the Region’s target is achieved through the approval of applicable applications.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
202	2	2.3.2.3	26	MPLAN Inc	Previously, the 35% figure was limited to Regional Centres and KDAs. To the extent that regional staff have sanctioned or approved any development within a Centre or KDA to date, how did they measure the 35%? - How has it been handled to date in VMC and Markham Centre?	Acknowledged
203	2	2.3.2.4	26	City of Richmond Hill	Table 2 - The targets should be noted as "minimum" in the table.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
204	2	2.3.2.4	26	City of Vaughan	Given the barriers to the financing and construction of purpose built rental buildings, achieving the targets identified in Table 2 will be challenging. Limited production of purpose- built rental units and minimal uptake of existing incentives (ex. Regional DC deferral) within the last 10 years, indicate current development trends will not meet the proposed targets. Continued work through the YRLMHWG is required to develop the strategies and incentives to increase production of purpose-built rental developments.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
205	2	2.3.2.4	26	MPLAN Inc	How did the Region arrive at this figure of a minimum 1000 new purpose built rental units be built region wide per year - NEC has proposed rental on its lands through its input to the Yonge Bernard Secondary Plan, which the Region participated in, but this was given little consideration and is being unnecessarily delayed.	Acknowledged
206	2	2.3.2.4	26	City of Markham	The Growth Plan introduced a requirement for municipalities to include rental housing targets and the draft ROP proposes purpose-built rental targets for each municipality. Markham has the highest target of all York Region local municipalities with 10,000 units by 2051. According to York Region's Regional Official Plan Update Policy Directions Report (June 10, 2021) these rental targets are proportionate to population forecasts. While there is some concern by staff whether the rental target is achievable, it is recommended that York Region provide implementation support through new programs and incentives. Further, given that the Growth Plan speaks to rental targets and not specifically purpose-built rental units, staff recommend that the target contained in the draft ROP be clarified or defined to include additional residential units ("secondary suites").	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
207	2	2.3.2.5	26	MPLAN Inc	- The City of Richmond Hill OP and the Bernard KDA Secondary Plan do not require housing options. - How is the development industry to be encouraged? There is no recognition in this Plan of methods that could be used to decrease the cost of housing, thereby leading to more affordable housing. - Since housing options are not required and the Region supported this outcome we are unclear what the Region is now requiring. Please explain?	Acknowledged
208	2	2.3.2.6	27	City of Vaughan	Please define "inclusionary Zoning".	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
209	2	2.3.2.6 a) & c)	27	Town of Georgina	As it relates to a), the qualifier "where permitted" needs to be added as the Town of Georgina does not have the authority to utilize inclusionary zoning. As it relates to c), how is this policy to be enforced outside of a specific development application which proposes to demolish an existing rental building in favour of a non-rental building? Can the municipality refuse to issues a demolition permit if the applicant meets the requirements for same? The policy has great intentions, but how does the municipality realistically apply it? Further discussion is required.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
210	2	2.3.2.6 c)	27	City of Richmond Hill	The City's Affordable Housing Strategy proposes that the threshold for lifting the prohibition on demolition of rental housing should be a vacancy rate of 3% or more over three consecutive years for greater certainty that the rental housing market is indeed meeting the needs of residents prior to permitting a demolition/conversion.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
211	2	2.3.2.6 & 2.3.2.7	27	MPLAN Inc	- The policy is poorly drafted. In 2020 the Region rejected the need for Richmond Hill's OP to provide for housing options. - Why is the Region now changing its view on this matter?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
212	2	2.3.2.7	27	City of Vaughan	A definition of affordable ownership that does not differentiate between dwelling types, significantly impacts the affordable ownership threshold calculation due to the gap between the value of single detached dwellings and condominium units. An affordable ownership threshold that is too low, often results in few/limited market units meeting the threshold. If possible, within the parameters of the Provincial definition as applied to the regional market area, consider a threshold for both high density and ground related dwelling types.	Acknowledged
213	2	2.3.3	28	City of Markham	Clarify what kind of infrastructure is being referred to in the objective.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
214	2	2.3.3.2	28	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	A goal of 1 job for every 2 residents is something the Town would like to strive to achieve. While we understand this may be a Regional target, it should also take into consideration the needs of the local municipality to foster a strong economic base. The designation of employment uses within the South Gormley lands will assist the Town in moving towards this target, however, in light of the forecasts to 2051, the Town could only achieve roughly 1 job for every 2.6 residents. This emphasizes the need for the designation and municipal servicing of additional employment lands within the Town.	Acknowledged
215	2	2.3.3.3	28	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that this policy should ensure that employment opportunities are also equitably distributed across all York Region municipalities through the appropriate designation of serviced employment lands. - Residents should not only have access to employment opportunities, but should also be able to work close to where they live to support the development of complete communities. - Staff recommends the following: 2.3.3.3 To support access to employment opportunities for all York Region residents, both across the Region and within each respective local municipality.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
216	2	2.3.3.4	29	City of Vaughan	Please consider adding "where appropriate" to the end of this policy.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
217	2	2.3.3.4	29	City of Markham	Clarify what is meant by balance, and how it will be measured.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
218	2	2.3.3.6	29	City of Vaughan	This policy was formerly policy 4.1.5. Policy 4.1.5 included important points that have not been incorporated into the policy update. Please consider the inclusion of old points from former policy 4.1.5.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
219	2	2.3.3.6	29	City of Markham	This policy seems to be the same as 2.3.3.5. Consider combining them.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
220	2	2.3.3.6 (NEW)	29	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	In staffs view, the provision of municipal infrastructure and water and wastewater services is critical in fostering economic development and higher order employment uses within our employment areas, particularly in Gormley and Vandorf, which should be addressed in this policy. The provision of municipal services to existing employment areas should be prioritized by the Region. Staff recommends inclusion of the following: f. provision of municipal water and wastewater services and supporting infrastructure;	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
221	2	2.3.3.8	29	City of Markham	This updated policy does not capture the tourism related intentions of the former policies.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
222	2	2.3.3.10	29	City of Vaughan	Policy 2.3.3.10 reads, "To encourage retrofitting, intensification and revitalization, in accordance with policy 2.3.13, when redeveloping existing retail, including major retail sites." Please consider using wording that implies that this is a 'shall' statement rather than 'encourage'.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
223	2	2.4	30	TRCA	2.4 - This section predominantly contains policies regarding the protection of heritage resources but could also include language around promoting and celebrating the cultural resources within the Region.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
224	2	2.4	30	City of Vaughan	There needs to be a data sharing agreement with the Province. Local municipal staff need to be able to review reports in order to provide meaningful engagement.	Acknowledged
225	2	2.4	30	City of Markham	From an Accessibility perspective the use of white text on coloured photographs/illustrations throughout the document is quite difficult to read. (Banner image) A photo of cemetery headstones is not the most appropriate representation of cultural heritage resources. A photo celebrating retention and incorporation of a heritage building would be more fitting.	Acknowledged
226	2	2.4 (NEW)	30	City of Markham	Recommend adding a new policy inserted or grouped where appropriate in the existing policy list: Policy 2.4.X "To encourage local municipalities to create and support municipal heritage committee as per the Ontario Heritage Act to assist local councils in identifying, evaluating, conserving, interpreting and celebrating local cultural heritage resources".	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
227	2	2.4 (NEW)	30	City of Markham	Recommend adding a new policy inserted or grouped where appropriate in the existing policy list: Policy 2.4.X To encourage York Region and local municipalities to consider fiscal tools, incentives and financial assistance programs, where appropriate, to help conserve cultural heritage resources". (this one could be combined with existing policy 2.4.9 by including community improvement plans and programs in the above policy revision)	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
228	2	2.4 (NEW)	30	City of Markham	Recommend adding a new policy inserted or grouped where appropriate in the existing policy list: Policy 2.4.X "To promote the identification of cultural heritage resources in local municipalities through a process of inventory, survey, research and evaluation, as a basis for the wise management and protection of these resources".	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
229	2	2.4 (NEW)	30	City of Markham	Recommend adding a new policy inserted or grouped where appropriate in the existing policy list: Policy 2.4.X "To support and encourage the use of secondary plans, zoning by-laws, subdivision and site plan control agreements, signage by-laws, and other municipal controls, to ensure that development that directly affects cultural heritage resources and adjacent lands, is designed, sited or regulated so as to protect and mitigate any negative visual and physical impact on the heritage attributes of the resource, including considerations such as scale, massing, height , building orientation and location relative to the resource."	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
230	2	2.4.1	30	City of Markham	The word 'conserved' needs to be highlighted as it is a defined term. The policy would read better if it incorporated part of policy 2.4.2 (which is somewhat repetitive of this policy) "…shall be conserved to foster a sense of place, support heritage character, and benefit communities".	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
231	2	2.4.2	30	City of Vaughan	Please revise "... and cultural planning..." to "...and cultural heritage planning	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
232	2	2.4.2	30	City of Markham	This policy is somewhat vague and confusing. It could be better worded to reflect the desire to see cultural heritage resources incorporated in new development. For example: "To promote the retention and incorporation of cultural heritage resources in new development through well-designed built form and appropriate cultural heritage planning."	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
233	2	2.4.3	30	City of Markham	The word "conserved" needs to be highlighted as it is a defined term.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
234	2	2.4.4	30	City of Vaughan	Please revise policy 2.4.4 to the following: To require that cultural heritage resources within secondary plan study areas be identified, and significant resources shall be conserved.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
235	2	2.4.4	30	City of Markham	The words "conserved" and "cultural heritage resources" need to be highlighted as they are defined terms.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
236	2	2.4.5	30	City of Markham	A number of words need to be highlighted as they are defined: "conserve", "built heritage resources", "cultural heritage landscapes", "heritage attributes", "protected heritage property" (also the definition of adjacent lands needs to be corrected to make reference to cultural heritage resources). This policy would be more impactful if the word "and" was added as there are two different concepts here: 1) conserving the actual heritage resource on its property and 2) ensuring adjacent development does not negatively impact the heritage resource. Suggested edit: 2.4.5 To require local municipalities to adopt official plan policies to conserve cultural heritage resources, including significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes, and to ensure that development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage properties will conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
237	2	2.4	31	TRCA	2.4 (Brief History) - This section should highlight that the Humber River is also a designated Canadian Heritage River within the Canadian Heritage River Systems and explain the significance of the Carrying Place Trail, an historic transportation route through York Region.	Acknowledged
238	2	2.4	31	York Region Federation of Agriculture	The History of the Region: Without taking anything away from the current description, include comments about the rich agricultural soils which contributed to a long history of food production which continues today.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
239	2	2.4.5 & 2.4.6	31	City of Markham	Text box between 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 - One paragraph has a repetition that should be addressed. Suggested edit: "European settlers began arriving in the late 1600s and 1700s (including French, Pennsylvania Germans, United Empire Loyalists and Quakers). In 1792, Lieutenant Governor John Graves Simcoe established the original limits of York County. The Region's early pattern of community development was influenced by the river and trail systems which followed ancient Aboriginal settlement patterns"	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
240	2	2.4.6	31	City of Markham	Clarify what the term "integrating identified cultural heritage landscapes into official plans" means. "Cultural heritage landscapes" is a defined term and should be highlighted if the policy is maintained.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
241	2	2.4.8	32	City of Vaughan	Consider replacing "are" with "shall be evaluated and conserved".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
242	2	2.4.8 & 2.4.9	32	City of Markham	The word "conserved" needs to be highlighted as it is a defined term.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
243	2	2.4.11	32	City of Vaughan	Please revise policy 2.4.11 to the following: To encourage access to core historic areas by walking, cycling and transit, and to ensure that the design of the roads, vehicular access and parking reflects and complements the historic character of the area.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
244	2	2.4.12	32	City of Vaughan	This policy appears to be out of place. Consider integrating it in a more appropriate section (i.e.. Where other policies that support fine arts and community engagement are).	No change - adequately addressed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
245	2	2.4.12	32	City of Markham	Expand the recognition and celebration to heritage site. Suggested edit: "To recognize and celebrate the rich cultural heritage of the Region's ethnic and cultural groups, as well as the commemoration and interpretation of cultural heritage resources."	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
246	2	2.4.1.1	33	City of Markham	"Development" should be highlighted as it is a defined term. Policy 'b' and 'd' appear to conflict as both deal with the treatment of Indigenous significant archaeological resources but 'b' indicates the archaeologist shall engage (when resources are to be retained on site) and 'd' indicates that the archaeologist should engage (when on-site preservation is not possible). Seems both should either be shall or should as they both deal with significant resources. It may be better to remove all of the policies regarding Indigenous engagement (b to e) and just indicate "That where Indigenous significant archaeological resources are identified, the consulting archaeologist shall follow any provincial requirements regarding the engagement of Indigenous communities." The consulting archaeologist has statutory responsibilities and should be left to fulfill these obligations.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
247	2	2.4.1.1.	33	City of Vaughan	A policy should be added regarding Stage 4 - Mitigation. Secondly, Local Municipalities should be informed when a Stage 4 is required.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
248	2	2.4.1.1 a)	33	City of Vaughan	Please add the following policy under 2.4.1.1. a: "iii) To contact and inform First Nation or Melis regarding the proposed archaeological assessments." Mississauga's of the Credit First Nation has advised the City that they would like to be engaged early on in the process.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
249	2	2.4.1.1. c)	33	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. c. from: "... during a Stage 2... " to "... during a Stage 1 or 2	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
250	2	2.4.1.1. c)	33	City of Vaughan	Suggest using stronger language such as "recommend" rather than "encourage".	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
251	2	2.4.1.1. c)	33	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. c. from: "...and in whose traditional territories... " to "... and in whose treaty rights to traditional territories...". Please note that we have been advised through our engagement with Mississauga's of the Credit First Nation that there is a difference between Treaty Rights vs. Interest Holders therefore this should be acknowledged in the preamble and subsequent policies.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
252	2	2.4.1.1 c), d) & e)	33	City of Richmond Hill	Policies 2.4.1.1(c), (d), and (e) uses "encourage" for consultation with Indigenous communities when archaeological resources are found to be Indigenous in origin. Consider using the word "shall" instead in the ROP consistent with PPS.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
253	2	2.4.1.1. d)	33	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. d. from: "... during a Stage 2 .." to "... during a Stage 1 or 2...".	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
254	2	2.4.1.1. d)	33	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. d. to address treaty rights and differentiate between treaty rights holders and interest holders	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
255	2	2.4.1.1. e)	33	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. e. to address treaty rights and differentiate between treaty rights holders and interest holders	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
256	2	2.4.1.1 f)	33	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.1. f. from: " ..a copy of the Provincial letters..." to"...a copy of reports and the Provincial letters... ".	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
257	2	2.4.1.2	34	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.2 from: "... to residents in development proposals through innovative ... " to "... to community members within project vicinity through innovative... "	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
258	2	2.4.1.6	34	City of Vaughan	Policy 2.4.1.6 states "to work in partnership with Indigenous communities, local municipalities and stakeholders to review the York Region Archaeological Management Plan on the same review schedule as this Plan to ensure that archaeological resources information is kept up-to date." Can the Region please clarify if this policy is being implemented currently?	Acknowledged
259	2	2.4.1.7	34	City of Vaughan	Please clarify the intent of this policy.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
260	2	2.4.1.7	34	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.7 from: "New development. in this plan." to "New development and site alteration applications shall be screened for archaeological potential by using York Region's Archaeological Management Plan and Archaeological Potential Mapping or equivalent local mapping."	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
261	2	2.4.1.7	34	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends revising the reference to "items" to "policies" in referring to the Official Plan.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
262	2	2.4.1.7	34	City of Markham	This policy should be amended to allow local municipalities to scope or further refine how they wish certain types of development to address the archaeological assessment requirements. The current wording would require an assessment for any project requiring approval under the Planning Act. In Markham, Site Plan Approval is used for all our heritage conservation district properties (20 square metres and larger and other small projects/alterations). This policy would trigger an archaeological assessment in every case since the Region's archaeological Management Plan (and Archaeological Potential Mapping) indicates that all heritage conservation districts possess archaeological potential. Suggested edit: 2.4.1.7 That the York Region Archaeological Management Plan and Archaeological Potential Map provide guidance on addressing the policies of this Section. New development and site alteration shall meet all items required by this Plan, and shall strive to achieve all items encouraged in this Plan, unless the requirement for archaeological assessment is further scoped in local municipal official plans to address specific types of development or specific areas such as heritage conservation districts.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
263	2	2.4.1.8	34	City of Vaughan	Please clarify if it is the role of York Region or the local municipalities to develop an Indigenous Engagement Framework in conjunction with Indigenous Peoples	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
264	2	2.4.1.8	34	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.8 to address treaty rights and differentiate between treaty rights holders and interest holders	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
265	2	2.4.1.8	34	City of Vaughan	Revise policy 2.4.1.8 from: "....an Indigenous engagement framework, which will provide..." to "....an Indigenous engagement framework or equivalent strategy, which will provide..."	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
266	2	2.4.1.8	34	City of Vaughan	Suggest adding "Treaty rights" and traditional territories. We have been advised there is a difference and should be acknowledged accordingly.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
267	2	2.4.1.8	34	City of Vaughan	In addition to creating principles, suggest adding the creation of protocols/standards.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
268	2	2.4.1.8	34	City of Vaughan	Suggest adding archaeological and cultural heritage of York Region. In the other sections archaeology is specified - this should be specified within this policy too, or changed to "Cultural Heritage Resources" as per ROP definition.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
269	2	2.5	35	City of Vaughan	Please provide clarity regarding how the regulation of managing excess soil would be implemented. Staff would like to understand how other local municipalities in the Region would implement this policy.	Acknowledged
270	2	2.4	30	City of Vaughan	Indigenous Peoples have stated that they want to be engaged earlier, in Stage 1, but the policies currently state Stage 2.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
271	2	2.5	36	Town of Georgina	Policies respecting excess soil management seem out of place in Section 2, The Foundation for Complete Communities. It could be a better fit to place somewhere in Section 3, A Sustainable Natural Environment.	Acknowledged
272	2	2.5	35	City of Markham	Objective - Conservation Authorities do not get involved in excess soil management outside of their regulated areas per O. Reg. 166/06. It is preferred that the management of excess soil outside of areas regulated by O. Reg. 166/06 be left to Project Leaders (a representative that could be a developer, Markham staff, etc..) to manage.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
273	2	2.5 & 5.5 (NEW)	35	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Add policies to sections 2.5 & 5.5 that speak to the following recommendations to reduce the impacts of soil dumping and aggregate activity: 1. Municipalities require funds to develop, monitor and enforce excess soil regulations and bylaws. The financial burden should be at the expense of the companies profiting from soil dumping, not a cost to municipal taxpayers. 2. Pits often have groundwater present in excavation sites. Placing soil into or near a water table has the potential for disastrous results for the surrounding community. Drinking water as well as farmlands and forests may be contaminated with these soils. 3. Dumping of excess soil into pits may pose new and long-lasting threats to ground and surface water. There are concerns about the cumulative impact of these contaminants as well as the long-term effects on the ecological functioning of the landscape. Evolving science may intensify these concerns. No controlled scientific testing of the impact of dumping potentially contaminated excess soils in pits and quarries has been completed by the Ministry. 4. There should be municipal oversight and approval of the importation of soil for rehabilitation through site alteration and/or commercial fill. Municipal by-laws provide for consideration of local impacts. Restore trust with the public by providing an exemption to ARA Sec 66 to allow Municipal bylaws to enforce standards on incoming fill/soil when a license is in force. 5. There should be no self-filing of site plan amendments by industry, license and approval holders. 6. Over or under 10,000 cubic meters of excess soil should require oversight by a Qualified Person. The proposed ER0- 019 itself states that “record-keeping and oversight by a Qualified Person provides reassurance that suitable quality soil is used to facilitate rehabilitation post-extraction in pits and quarries". As currently written in regulation 406/19, under 10 000 cubic meter does not require external oversight.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
274	2	2.5 (NEW)	35	City of Vaughan	Please consider adding a clause around invasive species management. The movement of construction soils accelerates the movement of invasive species (their seeds reside in soils which spread when soils are moved, and the farther soils move the farther invasive species spread). Invasive species in Toronto's ravines is a big issue and past construction projects have unknowingly accelerated the spread of new species. Maybe this isn't an issue in Vaughan yet, but if it is, maybe there should be a goal to limit soil movements from areas with levels of invasive species being present.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
275	2	2.5.1	36	City of Vaughan	Revise the language of policy 2.5.1 from "... reuse strategies as part of... " to "... reuse strategies and/or guidance document as part of... ". Please note that City staff are not proposing that local municipalities develop reuse strategies, as stated in the policy.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
276	2	2.5.1	36	City of Vaughan	York Region needs to coordinate and lead this work as the Region will have access to the entire Region's inventory of sites and Regional support would be required to coordinate with neighboring municipalities.	Acknowledged
277	2	2.5.1	36	City of Vaughan	Staff do not support this policy. York Region should develop the excess reuse strategy as this is a cross jurisdictional issue. The strategy can later be implemented by local municipalities as Engineering Standards. Staff would like to understand how other local municipalities see this regulation being implemented. Therefore, having the Region lead this initiative will assist local municipalities.	Acknowledged
278	2	2.5.1 & 2.5.2	36	City of Richmond Hill	The ROP directs the development of an excess soil reuses strategy and the incorporation of best management practices for excess soil to local municipalities. The Region may want to coordinate the development of such strategies and best management practices across all nine municipalities in order to create consistent practices across municipalities, including fines for illegal placement, amount of excess soils that can be placed or distributed, and mapping of potential areas for storage / prohibition of storage of excess soil. This policy was taken from section 3.4.2 (7) of the Greenbelt Plan. While 2.4.2 (d) of this policy notes "Fill quality received and fill placement at a site will not cause an adverse effect with regard to the current or proposed use of the property or the natural environment, and is compatible with adjacent land uses", this policy should clearly state that placement of excess soil should be located outside of the Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features, plus their associated buffers.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
279	2	2.5.2	36	City of Vaughan	Currently, the City does not regulate the management of excess soils. Please revise the language in policy 2.5.2 from "... to ensure that..." to "... to encourage that at a minimum...".	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
280	2	2.5.2	36	City of Markham	It is understood that O. Reg. 406/19 requires Project Leaders to properly manage excess soil for projects in compliance with the O. Reg. 406/19. Markham’s policies, standards, by-laws, and guidelines will include wording requiring all Project Leaders and all projects in Markham (including land development projects) to comply with O. Reg. 406/19.	Acknowledged
281	2	2.5.2 d)	36	City of Vaughan	Please revise the language in policy 2.5.2.d. from "... the natural environment, and..." to "... the natural heritage and hydrological features, and...".	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
282	2	2.5.2 e)	36	City of Vaughan	Please clarify why this policy is necessary as cultural heritage sites are protected as per the Heritage Act.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
283	2	2.5.3	36	City of Markham	Comment on 2.5.2 applies here as well. It is understood that O. Reg. 406/19 requires Project Leaders to properly manage excess soil for projects in compliance with the O. Reg. 406/19. Markham’s policies, standards, by-laws, and guidelines will include wording requiring all Project Leaders and all projects in Markham (including land development projects) to comply with O. Reg. 406/19.	Acknowledged
284	2	3.1 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	Please clarify why former policies supporting human health and wellbeing were removed, such as policies referencing climate change and light pollution.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
285	2	3.1.7 and 3.1.10 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Markham	Clarify why former ROP policies 3.1.7 and 3.1.10 were deleted.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
286	2	3.2 (2010 YROP) NEW	-	City of Vaughan	Please clarify why former policies supporting clean air have been deleted. It is suggested that they be included in the new YROP.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
287	2	3.2 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Markham	Clarify if the deleted policies in Section 3.2 of the 2010 ROP are reflected in other non-ROP policy documents.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
288	2	3.3 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	Please clarify why policies supporting human services were removed.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
289	2	3.5 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
290	2	3.5.5 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	The Secondary Plan, specifically Affordable Housing Strategy requirement may remain useful if fully connected to a broader City-wide or Regional Affordable Housing Strategy. Greater analysis with regard to implementation is required. Draft YROP 2.3.2.6 e) provides for a similar opportunity.	Acknowledged
291	2	3.5.12 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	HYI remains the primary provider/manager of affordable non-market housing in many municipalities. This policy could be retained with additional language encouraging further collaboration between HYI and Local Municipalities (secondary plan development, land identification, community benefits, etc..).	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
292	2	3.5.18 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	This policy remains relevant in a greenfield context (ex. Policy to encourage roughing-in second units). It is suggested that this policy be kept in the updated ROP.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
293	2	3.5.18 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Markham	This policy has been deleted. Is a timeframe to update The York Region Housing Needs Study included in the Housing and Homelessness Plan?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
294	2	3.5.18 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Markham	This policy has been deleted. Are policies to encourage building design that will facilitate subsequent conversion to provide additional housing units, such as secondary suites, included elsewhere in the ROP.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
295	2	3.5.24 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.	Acknowledged
296	2	4.1.1 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
297	2	4.1.7 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
298	2	4.1.15 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
299	2	4.4.5 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Markham	Does deletion of this policy mean that we have to use the ROP definition of major retail for conversion purposes?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
300	2	Section 4.5 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Markham	Clarify why several policies in Section 4.5 of the 2010 ROP on financial management were deleted.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
301	2	Section 5.2 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why this policy was removed.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
302	2	5.2.26 & 5.2.28 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that these policies remain in the updated ROP. Please clarify why these policies were removed.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
303	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	Affordable Housing Policies: The EGWLG is generally supportive of the goals and objectives identified in the Draft OP to address affordable housing needs.	Acknowledged
304	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	The EGWLG believes that a successful approach to addressing housing affordability must be realistic and implementable through partnerships between the public and private sectors. - As such, a detailed framework and realistic targets should be provided to stakeholders for comment on their feasibility and appropriateness - The Affordable Housing in York Region - 2020 Measuring and Monitoring Report that went to Committee of the Whole on June 10, 2021 concluded that the existing Region Official Plan affordability targets have not been met for the third year in a row	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
305	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	The in-force affordable housing policies reference intrinsically-affordable townhouse and apartment units, second suites, and designated land for high density residential development among other opportunities for achieving the 25% and 35% Housing Affordability Targets. - By contrast, the Draft OP provides no such guidance and appears to rely on its more generic definition of affordable housing	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
306	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	With respect to "affordable housing", the EGWLG would like to emphasize the difference between subsidized or assisted housing and affordable housing that is available on the free market, which has become referred to as attainable housing. - The latter may contain a number of building and unit types (stacked townhouses, back-to-back townhouses, secondary suites etc..) that are more affordable in the ownership housing spectrum but not commonly considered in government programming and subsidies. - These types of market- based housing options contribute to providing a range of housing options for various income levels and maintain the potential for residents of the region to attain housing ownership. - We believe the Plan can clarify that the development community's role is to produce attainable housing, whereas the role of municipalities and other agencies is to provide subsidized or assisted housing, in partnership with the development community where appropriate	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
307	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	- New communities such as the East Gwillimbury Whitebelt Lands allow for the opportunity to design innovative and modern solutions that are accessible, inclusive of additional dwelling units, appropriately zoned (for building types and parking requirements), and flexible to adapt to various housing and living space needs. - The development approvals process for these new communities should be streamlined to bring housing into the market sooner. - Providing for both assisted and attainable housing provides the best long-term strategy for ensuring there is a significant stock of affordable housing in the Region and the establishment of achievable targets. - However, without financial incentives or broadening what is considered affordable it is unlikely that these targets will be met. - This is particularly the case under current market conditions where almost no form of ownership housing can meet Provincial and Regional definitions of affordability	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
308	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	Policies of the draft ROP should be modified so that hard targets for the provision of affordable housing should apply to York Region Community Housing, not the development industry at large as there are limits to what private developers can realistically achieve.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
309	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	We request that the definition of “Affordable Housing” be revised to be consistent with the PPS 2020. - The definition of affordable housing in the draft YROP goes significantly further than the PPS in limiting what housing would qualify as affordable	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
310	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	We continue to request that a detailed framework for providing affordable housing and realistic targets be provided to stakeholders for comment on their feasibility and appropriateness.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
311	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	With respect to “affordable housing”, the difference between subsidized or assisted housing and affordable housing that is available on the free market, which has become referred to as attainable housing should be clearly defined in the YROP.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
312	2	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	We believe the Regional Official Plan should clarify the development community’s role is to produce attainable housing, whereas the role of municipalities and other agencies is to provide subsidized or assisted housing, in partnership with the development community where appropriate.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
313	2	General	-	City of Markham	Consider speaking to all the pillars of sustainability (i.e.., environmental, social and fiscal) in the objectives and policies in this chapter, which currently emphasize fiscal sustainability. The need for partnerships with various sectors (e.g., development, non-profit, agencies, etc..) should also be considered.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
314	2	NEW	-	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that strong policy requiring local municipalities to implement Green Development Standards be added to Chapter 2 of the ROP.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
315	2	NEW	-	City of Vaughan	2.3.2.4 & Table 2 - Tracking and encouraging new purpose-built rental units can be difficult without policies in the YROP that establish specific minimum requirements or incentives that can be referenced/relied upon by municipalities when evaluating development proposals.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
316	3	3.0	38	City of Vaughan	Goal - It is suggested that "to citizens" be added to the end of the sentence so that the goal reads: "Sustainable Natural Environment Goal: To protect, restore, and enhance the natural environment for current and future generations so that it will sustain life, maintain health, safeguard from natural hazards and provide a high quality of life to citizens."	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
317	3	3.0	38	TRCA	Preamble - We suggest rewording the fifth paragraph of the Preamble to read as follows: "The Plan recognizes the importance of the Region's Natural Systems, which include the Regional Greenlands system and Water Resource System and how together they assist…"	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
318	3	3.0	38	TRCA	Preamble - Sustainability Benefits of the Regional Greenlands System FIGURE: - Sustainable Natural Environment Box – We suggest rewording the first item to "Provides habitat and connectivity for plants and animal species"; - Healthy Communities Box – We suggest rewording the first item to "Contributes to equitable and liveable neighbourhoods, feeling of well-being, healthy and quality of life, community identity and sense of place"; - Economic Vitality Box – We suggest rewording first item to "Encourages eco- and agri-tourism and a green economy".	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
319	3	3.0	38	MPLAN Inc	Preamble - which is operative - is generalized	Acknowledged
320	3	3.0	38	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro: There should be a recognition that Ag land is part of the natural environment and contributes to the benefits of the Greenlands System	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
321	3	3.1 (New)	39	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	The YROP must specifically refer to the LSPP as applying to the Lake Simcoe watershed, and its objectives should be reflected in the YR OP's watershed planning objectives. a. The failure to achieve watershed plan objectives should trigger a decision to both invest in remediation on an affected area or to stop new development in an area of the watershed that is heavily degraded. b. Include specific objectives about water quality, such as "reduce salt and phosphorus loads to receiving bodies of water." c. Establish timelines for achieving water quality targets and natural cover targets.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
322	3	3.1.1	39	MPLAN Inc	NEC awaits the data points that make up the Greenlands system and line work. Information has been requested from regional staff but not provided.	Acknowledged
323	3	3.1.2	39	TRCA	3.1.2 - It is unclear if Water Resource Systems is intentionally pluralized, as it is generally not elsewhere.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
324	3	3.1.2	39	MPLAN Inc	These maps are not legible, but the reader is referred to interactive maps. - Are the interactive maps proposed to be an operative part of the plan? - Who is responsible for interpreting these operative maps? - Who is supposed to "operate" them?	Acknowledged
325	3	3.1.3	39	City of Richmond Hill	It is unclear what is meant by "establish" where it reads: "... official plans shall identify and include policies to establish and protect the Regional Greenlands System and Water Resource System from development and site alteration" Do you mean "delineate" Regional Greenlands System and Water Resource Systems based on the mapping: Maps 2, 4, 7, 12A and 12B ?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
326	3	3.1.3	39	City of Vaughan	Our experience has been that policies for enhancement and linkage are not effective. Is the Region aware of any best practices or precedents that can be shared with local municipalities? Enhancement can also be interpreted to mean improvement of existing NHS areas. It should be clear if the intent is to identify enhancement areas that add to the natural heritage system.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
327	3	3.1.3	39	MPLAN Inc	This was to have been done by the public authorities in 2017, if not earlier as part of ORMCP conformity exercises. - How much of Block 32 is covered by the Regional Greenlands system? - What are the limits of the Greenland system in this area?	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
328	3	3.1.4	39	TRCA	3.1.4 - We appreciate the overall direction in this policy as it will provide opportunities to further strengthen enhancement and restoration works at the local level that are necessary for long-term resilience. We suggest adding direction for local municipalities to work with CAs to incorporate best available scientific information in further designating natural systems in official plans and secondary plans and integrated into community design. TRCA has recently updated our WRS and target NHS data sets and has been working closely with partner municipalities to share our updated mapping.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
329	3	3.1.5	39	MPLAN Inc	Does this mean that NEC has to enhance the storm channel Block 32 which is owned and supposedly maintained by the City as part of its municipal infrastructure (and is beyond the boundaries of the KDA Secondary Plan area)?	Acknowledged
330	3	3.1.6	39	City of Richmond Hill	In line with the overall goal of Section 3, and the specific objective for 3.1, this policy should include restore or enhance linkages, in addition to maintain them and their related functions.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
331	3	3.1.6	39	TRCA	3.1.6 - The policy focus on linking features in this policy could undermine the natural systems-based planning approach. We recommend adding, "To maintain linkages and related functions among **natural features and areas**, surface water features, groundwater features **and areas (including KNHFs and KHFs), and that they be restored or improved**" in keeping with the direction in 2.1.2 of the PPS.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
332	3	3.1.6	39	MPLAN Inc	Is not the function of Block 32 to provide storm water management and conveyance as part of the municipal infrastructure.	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
333	3	3.1.7	39	LSRCA	Please consider re-wording to include reference to CAs. We have mapped Natural Heritage systems which our municipal partners utilize. "To co-ordinate planning efforts with surrounding municipalities and Conservation Authorities…"	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
334	3	3.1.7	39	TRCA	3.1.7 - We appreciate the policy direction to coordinate cross-regional planning efforts in order to link natural heritage systems and corridors. Given that CAs have data and knowledge to facilitate a region-wide approach to natural systems protection and management, we suggest revising this policy to include working with CAs, alongside surrounding municipalities in coordination efforts.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
335	3	3.1.7	39	City of Vaughan	Please review and clarify if the terminology should be "features" or "systems" in this policy.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
336	3	3.1.1.1	41	City of Richmond Hill	To implement watershed policies, the ROP should provide mapping that identifies the watersheds and sub-watersheds that have a plan and any that may not, so that it is clear what to refer to when making a planning application and also to understand the scale at which these plans should be developed. It would also be helpful to recognize Conservation Authorities for their role in developing, monitoring and implementing these plans.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
337	3	3.1.1.2	41	City of Markham	For c), should infrastructure such as roads in terms of monitoring of long-term cumulative impact be mentioned? While the aim of natural heritage policies is to guide development away from the natural heritage system (NHS), new infrastructure is often allowed to cross and impact the NHS, and infrastructure 'improvements' (e.g. road widening) will also result in NHS impacts and losses.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
338	3	3.1.1.2 d)	41	City of Richmond Hill	Should the watershed planning policies also "protect, improve and restore" key hydrologic areas and their functions?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
339	3	3.1.1.2 d)	41	TRCA	3.1.1.2 d) - We recommend replacing "**improve**" with "**enhance**" to better align with provincial policy in the Growth Plan. We also suggest including "**areas**" in addition to "**features**" as provincial guidelines direct adequate protection needs as warranted for both key natural heritage features (KNHFs) and key hydrological features (KHFs) and areas, as well as their functions.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
340	3	3.1.1.2 e)	41	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	3.1.1.2 e) should be reworded to: "In light of the negative impacts of climate change on water quality and quantity, evaluate the GHG and water pollution impacts of development options and prioritize those that reduce per capita GHG emissions."	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
341	3	3.2 (NEW)	42	TRCA	3.2 Objective - The objectives for the Regional Greenlands System include identification, protection and enhancement of the system and its function. However, there are no policies that explicitly support enhancement and restoration of the system. The removal of policy 2.1.8 of the 2010 ROP leaves a gap in policy commitments related to enhancement and restoration. Similarly, the removal of policy 2.1.14 leaves a gap in policy commitments to expand the system and look for opportunities, through partnerships, to secure natural system lands in public ownership. We recommended that this policy gap be addressed to ensure that policies support the objectives of outlined in the draft ROP. Additionally, policies should be included that commit the Region to working with its partners to identify and secure lands and promote restoration and enhancement of the Regional Greenlands System.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
342	3	3.2 (NEW)	42	Public	I thought there would be policies for the local municipalities to include in their Official Plan policies on the Urban River Valley (which I believe is mentioned only once in the draft OP).	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
343	3	3.2 (NEW)	42	Weston Consulting	Section 7 of the ORMCP is foundational as it relates to 684 Henderson Drive as it allows for the development of 1 single detached dwelling on the basis that a policy test integrity test is met. Policy direction acknowledging the permissions of Section 7 of the ORMCP provides for existing lots of record is absent from the draft ROP. - It is of our opinion that the Regional Greenlands System policy framework needs to include policy direction which allows for new development and site alteration permitted by the ORMCP subject to demonstrating that all the requirements of the ORMCP are met - The ROP needs to be revised to ensure policy recognition and authorization to permit the subject property's historic zoning rights to develop 1 single detached dwelling subject to policies of the ORMCP. - We recommend the Region recognize and implement the provisions of Section 7 of the ORMCP explicitly.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
344	3	3.2.1	42	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro, graphic & 3.2.1: Add wording to recognize agricultural land as a significant contributor to the ecological services included in the graphic and an important component of the natural environment and green infrastructure in the Region	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
345	3	3.2.1	42	TRCA	3.2.1 - The Regional Greenlands System (Map 2) relies heavily on provincial policies and does not incorporate local opportunities for restoration and enhancement as identified by CAs and other partner agencies. As the Region is aware, TRCA has updated its target NHS mapping, which identifies existing natural cover (target for protection), potential natural cover (targeted for restoration) and contributing areas (targeted for enhancement through low impact development and green infrastructure). TRCA's target NHS data set can be used to help identify priority locations for restoration and enhancement, both outside and within the built environment to support ecosystem functions as well as to ensure resilience of natural systems.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
346	3	3.2.1	42	Public	Should Agricultural Lands be considered a component of the Regional Greenlands System?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
347	3	3.2.2	42	TRCA	3.2.2 - We suggest specifying that while refinements to the boundaries of the Regional Greenlands System may occur, KNHFs, KHFs and areas, and their functions, and the land necessary to maintain them will all continue to be protected within the natural system.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
348	3	3.2.2	42	MPLAN Inc	This is not correct if there is a Secondary Plan requirement that requires that these matters be resolved at the Secondary Plan level. - Through the implementation of Secondary Plans, it also appears that these studies are intended to be carried out by the private landowners as part of their development applications with no clear criteria to be followed and for other lands beyond the boundaries of the applicable applications.	Acknowledged
349	3	3.2.2, 3.4.7 & 3.4.1.5	42	Malone Given Parsons	The EGWLG is supportive of Policies 3.2.2, 3.4.7 & 3.4.1.5, which permit refinements to the boundaries of the Regional Greenlands System, Key Natural Heritage Features, Key Hydrologic Features, and Provincial boundary refinements or reclassification of wetlands without an amendment to the ROP.	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
350	3	3.2.3	43	Town of Georgina	All development and site alteration prohibited? Even a single detached dwelling? In contrast, Section 3.2.5 provides flexibility for certain situations. The language should be revised to be more flexible as opposed to a hard no, similar to the following sections respecting delineation of natural features.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
351	3	3.2.3	43	MPLAN Inc	Therefore NEC needs to know where the linework begins and ends and clearly be able to establish property boundaries related to this "System"	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
352	3	3.2.3	43	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	We support policy 3.2.3 "That development and site alteration be prohibited within the Regional Greenlands System."	Acknowledged
353	3	3.2.3 & 3.2.4	43	City of Vaughan	The requirement for scope and content of an EIS to be determined through a pre--consultation meeting is useful. Is there precedent or best practice to augment this policy to assist in determining a 'complete' application based on content and scope? Submissions in support of an application can be deemed 'complete', but still lack key details or even ignore important policy interpretation that would otherwise have to be addressed through the review process and often result in several submissions and circulations.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
354	3	3.2.4	43	MPLAN Inc	This should not be necessary, since there should be an EIS for the KDA prepared by the Regional and Local authorities in association with the TRCA. - This adds more unnecessary cost to landowner applications. - According to Regional and City OP policies for Secondary Plan preparation, the City was to have undertaken this study as part of preparing the Secondary Plan, which it failed to do.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
355	3	3.2.5 & 5.3.7	43	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends that these policies also be applied to lands within the Town by designating them as rural area to accommodate recreational and parkland uses to support the adjacent urbanizing area.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
356	3	3.2.5	43	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	We support passive uses only in YR's Greenlands System, and the agricultural uses as described in 3.2.5. - We oppose the extensive list of exceptions to S 3.2.3 found in S 3.2.5, including: stormwater ponds, active park uses like serviced golf courses and playing fields, roads, water and wastewater infrastructure, and infrastructure in the Greenlands system. This represents a list of ways to degrade the ecological value and integrity of the Greenlands System.	Acknowledged
357	3	3.2.5	43	City of Markham	Policy 3.2.5 is a notwithstanding clause to allow some uses in the Greenlands System, but subparagraph 3.2.5(d)(i) identifies "without negative impact" as the threshold. In its purist form, no negative impact would mean avoiding any impacts of the Greenlands System with alternative infrastructure location and/or design. Recognizing that the Draft ROP is using the same language as the PPS (Policy 2.1.5), clarify if the intent of subparagraph (d)(i) is to allow for compensation and net ecological gain.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
358	3	3.2.5.c)	43	City of Richmond Hill	Suggestion that the use of "non-motorized trails" within the definition of "Passive Recreational Uses" may be incongruent with emerging consideration and regulation of the full spectrum of micro mobility devices at local levels. Some motorized uses are likely to be permitted on these trail systems (e.g., e-bikes).	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
359	3	3.2.5 c)	43	TRCA	3.2.5 c) - We suggest that, "no negative impact on the form and function of key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features and areas" be included. Further, it should be explicitly stated that stormwater management infrastructure will avoid KNHFs and KHFs and areas.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
360	3	3.2.5 c)	43	City of Vaughan	Remove community garden reference, as this would be quite onerous for City staff and non--profit organizations developing urban agriculture in the City. Community gardens are not designed where there are natural features. There are criteria for the selection of a site. Having to hire a consultant to conduct an EIS would be onerous and discourage public agencies. Please provide clarification as to why this reference is included. It is staffs understanding that there are many issues with private landowners encroaching onto natural heritage lands to extend their private vegetable gardens.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
361	3	3.2.5 c)	43	York Region Federation of Agriculture	An environmental impact study would be cost prohibitive for community gardens which are generally non-profit	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
362	3	3.2.5 c) & d)	43	City of Richmond Hill	Stormwater management facilities are infrastructure, and should be treated as such, recommend moving stormwater management systems/facilities from subclause (c) to subclause (d) (with new infrastructure), that way it is also subject to subclause (i) no other reasonable alternative exists and if an approved EIS demonstrates that it can be constructed without negative impacts ..." Subclause (c) would pertain only to passive recreation.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
363	3	3.2.5 c) & d)	43	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	3.4.1.2 speaks to permitting development and site alteration within 120 metres of wetlands, in their vegetation protection zone. - As noted elsewhere, we do not like 3.2.5 c & d, which permit the building of infrastructure in natural features in YR Greenlands. - Here the same policy is used to develop in the vegetation protection zone of wetlands. - This is not a good way to achieve the wetlands objective above (Point 3 in this section)	Acknowledged
364	3	3.2.5 e)	43	City of Richmond Hill	What is a "linear valley"? Are these hazard lands?	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
365	3	3.2.5 e)	43	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add Urban Agriculture to the permitted uses	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
366	3	3.2.5 e)	43	Malone Given Parsons	We request that the term "linear valleys" be substituted by "linear river valleys" in policy 3.2.5 e) for consistency	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
367	3	3.2.5 e)	43	Malone Given Parsons	Policy 3.2.5.e should reference the list of permitted uses under the suggested refinement to Policy 5.3.7 as follows: e. permitted uses as identified in policy 5.3.7 for rural lands within the linear river valleys, such as recreational and parkland uses which may include serviced playing field and golf courses. The location, range, and types of parkland and recreational uses permitted will be determined by the local municipality through its official plan and/or secondary plans	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
368	3	3.2.5 & 3.2.6 (NEW)	43	City of Vaughan	Please consider adding a 'shall' policy that provides habitat compensation for instances when Regional infrastructure impacts the natural heritage system, particularly when the loss of key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features cannot be avoided.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
369	3	3.2.6	43	TRCA	3.2.6 - Where negative impacts are expected within KNHFs and KHFs, requirement for ecosystem compensation should be part of the approval process, especially in the case of infrastructure projects. TRCA's Guideline for Determining Ecosystem Compensation may be of particular interest and may inform additional policies or references.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
370	3	3.2.6	43	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Policy 3.2.6 permits activities that we do not think should be permitted. However, if it remains, it should be amended as follows: That infrastructure planning, design and construction be sensitive to the features and functions of the Regional Greenlands System and include context sensitive design and innovative technologies to minimize impacts and enhance the system. Infrastructure within the system MUST avoid key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features and shall be subject to the policies of applicable Provincial plans, including providing passive recreational amenities and environmental restoration where appropriate.	Acknowledged
371	3	3.2.7	43	City of Richmond Hill	Suggest including wording that would allow land trusts and conservation authorities to perform land severances for the purpose of land acquisition and protecting lands in perpetuity. This was brought up at the York Region Land Securement Working group by several organizations, and would be in alignment with the York Region Greening Strategy.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
372	3	3.2.7 (NEW)	43	City of Markham	Consider adding an 'encourage' policy that lands in the Greenlands System be conveyed into public ownership to ensure long-term protection in accordance with PPS Policy 2.1.1.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
373	3	3.3	44	TRCA	Section 3.3 - It appears that new policies are introduced to conform to applicable source protection plans (SPPs) established under the Clean Water Act, 2006 (CWA). We recommend denoting why these policies were incorporated into the ROP (i.e.., as per the implementation requirements of the CWA and associated SPPs) and specifying that they must be read in conjunction with the applicable SPPs, which should be named.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
374	3	3.3	45	City of Markham	Add hydrogeologic function to the "Objective" statement to cover water cycle/interaction with the groundwater source (hydrologic function only covers surface water). This should apply to all of the "hydrologic" wordings within this section if the policies are intended to include groundwater source.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
375	3	3.3.1, 3.3.2 & 3.3.3	45	MPLAN Inc	The Region wants all these studies for protection but City was to have done them for Bernard KDA. - These studies should have been carried out as a foundation for an opportunities and constraints analysis forming the basis for the Secondary Plan which then would have properly addressed larger KDA development issues such as impact of a high watertable on underground parking. - This also could have addressed maximizing development potential on sites adjacent to, or affected by such features and outlining appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that the implementation of the intensification policies for the KDA could be carried out in support of the higher level and other regional policies for this area.	Acknowledged
376	3	3.3.2	45	TRCA	3.3.2 - We suggest adding Ecologically Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas to the list of key hydrological areas, as shown on Map 12B.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
377	3	3.3.4	45	City of Markham	Should this policy reference the policies of the Source Protection Plan (i.e.., all municipal policies and plans per the Source Protection Plan)?	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
378	3	3.3.5	45	City of Richmond Hill	Please clarify that this policy regarding comprehensive master environmental servicing plans can apply on a city-wide basis in addition to Secondary Plan areas.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
379	3	3.3.5	45	TRCA	3.3.5 - We suggest adding subwatershed plans, or equivalent, to the list of required technical studies to better align with provincial guidelines.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
380	3	3.3.5	45	MPLAN Inc	This was never carried out for the Bernard KDA and should have been prepared by the City in association with the Region and TRCA	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
381	3	3.3.5	45	City of Markham	Since ESGRAs and Significant Surface Water Contribution Areas were not assessed during the Secondary Plans and MESPs for the current FUA in the northwest part of Markham, do the best practices need to be revisited with attention to parameters such as (1) infiltration targets and (2) improved retention and cooling of rainwater and subsequent release into receiving streams?	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
382	3	3.3.5 & 3.3.7	45	City of Markham	A text box may be warranted here to identify the types of parameters that describe the "hydrologic functions" (policy 3.3.5) and the "characteristics and functions" (policy 3.3.7), such as such as infiltration rates, streamflow within natural ranges of variability, baseflow, wetland hydroperiod, etc..	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
383	3	3.3.6	45	City of Richmond Hill	This water budget policy should indicate the outcome it is seeking - e.g. no negative impact (?)	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
384	3	3.3.6	45	TRCA	3.3.6 - We suggest noting that a water budget and water conservation must also account for any required infrastructure, or upgrades to existing infrastructure, required to facilitate major development.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
385	3	3.3.6	45	MPLAN Inc	What does the Region or City MESP say about servicing through NEC lands? It is not clear that this matter has been addressed.	Acknowledged
386	3	3.3.6	45	City of Markham	Clarify if the Oak Ridges Moraine policies should be referenced here as well.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
387	3	3.3.8 - 3.3.11	45	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that Source Protection Plan polices be moved to Chapter 6. The SPP policies should be grouped together.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
388	3	3.3.8	45	TRCA	3.3.8 - We note that this policy aims to help implement the requirements of Part 1 of the REC-1 policy in the CTC SPP. However, we recommend including "development and site alteration", in keeping with CTC SPP language.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
389	3	3.3.8	45	TRCA	3.3.8 - Consider adding or revising policy to reflect the CTC SPP requirements specific to Part 2 of the REC-1 policy, including reference to the "downgradient line", which should be identified on Map 12A to distinguish REC-1 policy exclusions. At a minimum, we recommend noting that the policy requirements applicable to recharge management areas are in accordance with the applicable source protection plans established under the Clean Water Act, 2006.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
390	3	3.3.8	45	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	3.3.8 should be re-drafted as follows: That in recharge management areas (as shown on Map 12A) development will maintain pre-development recharge rates.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
391	3	3.3.9	46	City of Richmond Hill	This policy should indicate the outcome it is seeking - to what level must these Best Management Practices aspire?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
392	3	3.3.9	46	Public	3.3.9 - is there a legislative reason for this to be so weak? Is this just the Clean Water Act?	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
393	3	3.3.9	46	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Revise policy 3.3.9 to require, not encourage, best practices when development involving salt and other contaminants occurs in significant groundwater recharge areas, highly vulnerable aquifers, and significant surface water contribution areas.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
394	3	3.3.9	46	City of Markham	Clarify if this should reference the Source Protection Plan (SPP) for consistency. According to the SPP, developments involving (a) and/or (b) type of development applications require proponents to prepare and submit a contamination/spill management report to the water resources section at the Region of York for review and approval.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
395	3	3.3.9 & 3.3.10	46	LSRCA	Although it appears that both these policies attempt to address the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan policy (LUP-12) that deals with the WHPA-Q2 area, it does not capture the full extent of the policy and may lead to local official plans being just as vague. LUP-12 requires that for major development (excluding single family dwellings and farm accessory buildings) a hydrogeological assessment and water balance is required and any infiltration loss is mitigated by low impact development measures. Where this loss cannot be mitigated offsite recharge compensation can be considered within the same WHPA-Q2 area.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
396	3	3.3.10	46	LSRCA	It appears that the term "recharge management area" is referring to the WHPA-Q2. This should be defined. In addition, it is not clear what is meant by "Infiltration Management Plan"? This is not a widely used term that is known. If referring to the WHPA-Q2 policies, this should be changed to "Hydrogeological Study and Water Balance".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
397	3	3.3.10	46	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	To avoid confusion, perhaps it should be noted in 3.3.10 "That major development may be permitted within key hydrologic areas of the Protected Countryside…" that in the Lake Simcoe watershed, it is the LSPP which must be followed, and refer to those sections of the LSPP. It is stronger than the Greenbelt Plan on development within key hydrologic areas.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
398	3	3.3.10 & 3.3.11	46	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	These policies specifically reference the Protected Countryside area in relation to requirements for major development. Further clarification is required as to whether they are also intended to apply to the Countryside Area of the ORMCP.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
399	3	3.3.11	46	City of Vaughan	A challenge for staff is confirming that a proposed building is required for "agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses or on-farm diversified uses". Is the Region aware of any tests to assist in the confirmation of the permitted uses? There have been examples in Vaughan of buildings claiming to be used for agriculture and then are used for a non-permitted use once built.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
400	3	3.3.11	46	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that the agriculture policies be moved to Chapter 5.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
401	3	3.3.1.2	47	City of Vaughan	Please clarify why this policy only pertains to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, since it is applicable city-wide.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
402	3	3.3.1.2	47	City of Markham	Revise this policy to reference the policies in the Source Water Protection Plan which directs the review and approval of ministerial and chemical or salt storage sites to the Region's Water Resources Department for review and approval.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
403	3	3.3.1.4	47	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that the Aquifer Vulnerability policies be reviewed in the context of ORCMP and Source Protection Plan. Coordination is needed on this matter. It is suggested that a technical document or handout be prepared for municipal staff.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
404	3	3.4	48	Township of King	There are formatting errors throughout Section 3.4. - There are two policies labelled 3.4.1, two policies labelled 3.4.2, two policies labelled 3.4.3, etc.. - Same issue in Section 2.3, there are two policies numbered 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, etc.. - Same issue in 4.4. There's two 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.4 and in 6.4 as well.	Acknowledged
405	3	3.4	48	Public	I thought there would be policies for the local municipalities (where appropriate) to include policies in their Official Plan on protecting and possibly expanding the Urban Forest where they exist as part of the local municipality expanding green areas and climate change plan.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
406	3	3.4.1	48	TRCA	3.4.1 - Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) are not included in the list of KNHFs and KHFs. Further, we note that ESAs have been removed from the 2010 ROP and Section 3.4 policies in the draft ROP now exclude any reference to ESAs established at the local level by municipalities and/or CAs. In many cases, ESAs are candidate Life Science Areas and Earth Science Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest and have significant ecological value. We advise that ESAs should be acknowledged and afforded protection in the updated ROP.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
407	3	3.4.4	50	TRCA	3.4.4 - We suggest revising this to better align with provincial guidelines, i.e.., "key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features and areas that are important to maintain their long-term functions…".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
408	3	3.4.5	50	Township of King	3.4.5 - This policy seems to suggest that ag, ag-related and on-farm diversified uses may be permitted within the feature or the MVPZ and should be revised to clarify. - Section 22(6) of the ORMCP is clear that agricultural uses other than uses associated with on-farm buildings and structures (i.e... growing of crops) can occur within the area of influence and minimum vegetative protective zone, but not in the feature itself. - Farm buildings outside the MVPZ do not require an Natural Heritage Evaluation.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
409	3	3.4.5	50	City of Vaughan	Similar to the comment for Policy 3.3.11, better tests are needed to verify an agricultural use.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
410	3	3.4.5 a)	50	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that under sub-policy (a) of 3.4.5, to add Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE) or equivalent technical study after EIS. Please note that if lands are in Provincial Plan areas, then an NHE is needed. There are different standards that need to be included in the review.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
411	3	3.4.6	50	TRCA	3.4.6 – As written, this policy could be interpreted as prohibiting an application from being submitted. We suggest revising the text to read "development **and** or site alteration within fish habitat and habitat of endangered and threatened species is not permitted except in accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements".	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
412	3	3.4.9	50	City of Richmond Hill	This policy (and others) appear to make reference to an Environmental Impact Study (EIS), in replacement for a Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE) which is the current terminology used in the City's Official Plan. Is there a difference between an EIS and NHE, or are they interchangeable? We note that Policy 6.4.8 of the draft ROP references a Natural Heritage Evaluation, but it is not defined.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
413	3	3.4.9	50	City of Vaughan	The policy language that the content and scope of an EIS be identified at the PAC can assist with the determination of a complete application. It is suggested that this policy be strengthened to reference that the decision about a complete application can have reference to the scope of work and not just a submission document (i.e.. relate to the quality and content of the submission).	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
414	3	3.4.10	50	City of Richmond Hill	This policy exempts proponents of buildings or structures related to agriculture from preparing an Environmental Impact Study (EIS), however, won't they need to prepare an EIS to identify the feature and its boundary to then create a 30m buffer? As such, perhaps the policy can indicate that they are exempt from having to identify impacts of proposed development on the feature.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
415	3	3.4.10	50	Township of King	3.4.10 - Should clarify that it is also notwithstanding policy 3.4.5 as well, specifically 3.4.5 c)	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
416	3	3.4.10	50	City of Vaughan	Please consider moving this policy to Chapter 5.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
417	3	3.4.10	50	City of Vaughan	The term "minimum vegetation protection zone" has not been used in the ROP prior to this policy. Please check other policies to remain consistent with the terminology.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
418	3	3.4.10	50	Township of King	3.4.1.2 - consider adding reference to "in accordance with policy 3.4.10" as it permits agricultural buildings within the vegetation protection zone without an environmental impact study	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
419	3	3.4.12	50	City of Richmond Hill	Trails should avoid Key Natural Heritage Features (KNHF) and Key Hydrologic Features (KHF). The Natural Heritage Reference Manual suggests trails (suitably designed) can be within buffers; however, the purpose and intent of the buffer (i.e.., to protect the KNHF/KHF) should not be undermined by the provision of the trail. Regarding the need for an EIS, it should also demonstrate that the construction/development of a trail will not result in a negative impacts, not just the future uses of the trail.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
420	3	3.4.13	51	TRCA	3.4.13 - Table 3 - To highlight the important diversity and connectivity of natural features and adjacent lands, as well as the long-term ecological functions and biodiversity of natural heritage systems as a whole, we suggest the VPZ Table direct that in instances where features (or hazards) overlap, the VPZ/buffer and AOI/adjacent lands would extend from the furthest extent.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
421	3	3.4.13	52	TRCA	3.4.13 - Table 3 - We suggest removing the term "**evaluated**" or using the term "**locally significant**" wetland instead and recommend defining "Provincial Plan area" as this may not be a commonly understood term.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
422	3	3.4.13	51	Township of King	Table 3 - Blanks in table are confusing and should be identified as NA if they are not applicable.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
423	3	3.4.13	51	City of Vaughan	Table 3 - This table provides visual clarity on the VPZs which is great. However, for significant valley lands, permanent and intermittent streams and seepage areas/springs, the minimum would still be 10 meters. There may be instances where this can be interpreted to be below the 10 meters. Please provide clarification.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
424	3	3.4.13	51	City of Vaughan	Table 3 - Please consider replacing the term "buffer" unless it is used by other local municipalities. We should all be consistent.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
425	3	3.4.13	51	Town of Georgina	Table 3 - Where/what Plan do the second and third last columns related to VPZ for Regional Greenlands System and Urban Areas, Towns and Villages, come from? The LSPP requires a 30m VPZ adjacent to Lake Simcoe "where feasible" in Settlement Areas. Section 3.4.17(d) acknowledges this. This chart should be revised to include the words "where feasible".	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
426	3	3.4.14	54	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends that consideration be given to more clearly articulating this policy (i.e.., is located both within and outside a Provincial Plan area).	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
427	3	3.4.14	54	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Policy 3.4.14 should not allow an EIS to be used to request a reduced buffer on a protected feature.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
428	3	3.4.18	54	City of Vaughan	Please clarify why this policy only pertains to lands on the Oak Ridges Moraine.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
429	3	3.4	55	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	We support the objective: To ensure enhancement and no net loss of wetland function or area in the Region. (pg. 55)	Acknowledged
430	3	3.4.1	55	City of Richmond Hill	Recommend making the goal: "no loss of wetland". The current wording: "no net loss" is in conflict with provincial policy that requires protection of significant wetlands and all wetlands within the provincial natural heritage systems.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
431	3	3.4.1	55	TRCA	3.4.1 - OBJECTIVE - This objective would benefit from inclusion of protection of provincially significant wetlands, as well as within identified wetlands within the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan Area, and the Natural Heritage Systems of the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan. As currently drafted, it could be interpreted that a no net loss approach is the intent for all wetlands. This would open the door to removal and compensation for protected wetlands.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
432	3	3.4.1.3	56	TRCA	3.4.1.3 - There remains a policy gap in determining when an unevaluated wetland should be evaluated for significance per provincial protocols. We suggest revising this policy as follows: "That applications for development and site alteration within 120 metres of wetlands not evaluated per the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System, or wetlands not shown on Map 4 of this Plan, shall be accompanied by an **evaluation** that determines their **significance, as applicable and in accordance with the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System. Through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study, wetlands that are not evaluated as being provincially significant should be assessed to determine their functions, importance, and means of protection**."	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
433	3	3.4.1.3	56	TRCA	3.4.1.3 – In addition to the comment above, we recommend expanding this policy (or include a new policy) documenting expectations around compensation when applicable wetlands are to be removed through the planning approval process. The need for compensation is clearly outlined in section 3.4.2 (Woodlands) and we suggest similar policy direction for wetlands be incorporated. We would be happy to assist in developing such a wetland compensation policy.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
434	3	3.4.2.1 & 3.4.2.2	56	TRCA	3.4.2.1 & 3.4.2.2 – We suggest specifying a timeline for meeting both targets (25% and 40%) to increase woodland canopy cover.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
435	3	3.4.2.1 & 3.2.2.2	56	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	For YR to be in sync with best practices and with achieving positive environmental outcomes, the woodland canopy cover target should be 30 - 40%, not 25% as described in 3.4.2.1. The canopy cover target, set at 40% in 3.4.2.2 should be slightly higher.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
436	3	3.4.2.3	57	Township of King	3.4.2.3 - should this policy not refer to policy 3.4.5 as a whole instead of specifically 3.4.5 a)?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
437	3	3.4.2.3	57	City of Markham	Clarify what is intended by this policy. Is it to recognize instances where infrastructure may need to cross a significant woodland? This policy may not be needed unless it is to strengthen the policy intent to protect significant woodlands.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
438	3	3.4.2.4	57	City of Vaughan	Please consider adding, "and local municipalities" to the end of the policy.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
439	3	3.4.2.5	57	Town of Georgina	Does this require the local municipality to develop its own Forest Management Plan or to contribute toward the Region's Plan as it relates to Georgina? Unclear.	Acknowledged
440	3	3.4.2.5	57	York Region Federation of Agriculture	If this is truly an Urban Forest Management Plan, then this policy should be to establish or re-establish local woodlands within urban areas, in addition to protecting those which may still, at this point, be in existence.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
441	3	3.4.2.6	57	City of Richmond Hill	This policy does not provide reference to the criteria for woodlands located on the Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM) or Greenbelt. As it is a carry forward from the current ROP, the additional sub-policies (e) to (g) which address significance for woodlands on the ORM, in the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System (NHS) and in the Lake Simcoe watershed outside of the Greenbelt NHS, ORM and settlement areas.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
442	3	3.4.2.6	57	City of Vaughan	Please consider setting more inclusive thresholds for significance in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP). The threshold of 4 hectares for significant woodlands in the Countryside Designation means that woodlands will be lost in the ORMCP, as has already occurred even though the City of Vaughan has only 11-12% woodland cover. It is to be noted that the ORMCP Technical Paper for significant woodlands does not appear to provide the opportunity for more inclusive thresholds of significance.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
443	3	3.4.2.6	57	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add - contributes to the woodland cover and/or canopy cover targets	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
444	3	3.4.2.6 & 3.4.2.7	57	Public	Policies 3.4.2.6 & 3.4.2.7 - is this taken from MNRs guidance on identifying significant woodlands? If not, why make this so complicated? Why have a policy that allows woodlands to be not considered significant? Aurora residents trying to save the Hendeson Forest had a terrible time with this.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
445	3	3.4.2.7	58	City of Vaughan	It is recommended that the tests be made harder for this policy, or that the policy be deleted and focus on restoring woodlands that meet a certain size threshold, but may be of a lower quality due to invasive species or other matters. In some instances, larger woodlands are being described by consultants working for applicants as degraded or not meeting tests of a woodland.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
446	3	3.4.2.7	58	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	The handling of significant woodlands in S 3.4.2.6 and 3.4.2.7 is complex. - If the protection of forests is important to YR, just cut red tape and protect the environment by sticking to the size criteria as outlined in S 3.4.2.6 c & d: c. is south of the Oak Ridges Moraine and is 4 hectares or larger in size; d. is north of the Oak Ridges Moraine and is 10 hectares or larger in size.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
447	3	3.4.2.7	58	York Region Federation of Agriculture	These policies would work against protection of or establishment of woodlands within an urban area - if they don't have rare species etc.. They should be protecting "regular" woodland in urban areas to be in keeping with their woodland and canopy cover objectives.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
448	3	3.4.2.7	58	Malone Given Parsons	We suggest that Policy 3.4.2.7 reconsider to what extent the mapping of the Regional Greenlands System as illustrated on Map 2 applies when considering a features significance - This is important if the basis used for defining the Regional Greenlands System hasn't been ground truthed through appropriate studies	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
449	3	3.4.2.7 & 3.4.2.8	58	City of Markham	Amend policies 3.4.2.7 and 3.4.2.8 to ensure principles of no net loss of land area to the designated natural heritage system and overall net ecological gain (e.g. restoration planting in parts of the existing natural heritage system).	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
450	3	3.4.2.8	58	Public	3.4.2.8 is not ecologically helpful as woodland protection. Are there details regarding what is considered "net gain" in woodland area? Are we to read it would be acceptable to remove 2 hectares of mature forest and replace it with 2.1 hectares that has been re-planted with trees?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
451	3	3.4.2.8	58	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	S 3.4.2.8, is not as ecologically helpful as woodland protection. The policies will predominantly allow for developer arguments to remove woodlands. - Are there details regarding what is considered “net gain” in woodland area? Are we to read that it would be acceptable to remove 2 hectares of mature forest and replace it with 2.1 hectares that has been re-planted with trees?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
452	3	3.4.2.8 (NEW)	58	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that a policy be added, encouraging municipalities to develop their own woodland compensation plan using York Region's principles.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
453	3	3.4.3 (NEW)	59	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	The Region may wish to include a policy to address major development within a landform conservation area in accordance with S. 30{8) of the ORMCP.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
454	3	3.4.3.2	59	City of Vaughan	Suggest being more specific and identifying when a "Landform Conservation Plan" is required. Can the Region please provide an example of this study.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
455	3	3.5	60	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	We are pleased to see policies protecting natural hazards (S 3.5) and to minimize impacts on such. Again, were these policies to be followed, the Bradford Bypass would not be supported by Council.	Acknowledged
456	3	3.5.5	60	TRCA	For policy 3.5.5, we recommend adding the word “provisions” in addition to policies and mapping to indicate that zoning by-law mapping schedules should contain corresponding text to restrict or prohibit uses in hazards.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
457	3	3.5.5 b)	60	City of Markham	For b), wording such as “recognize” or “support” would be more appropriate than “identify”.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
458	3	3.5.6	61	TRCA	We appreciate this section’s image of an unconfined system from the provincial natural hazards guide. You may also want to include an image from the same technical guide for a confined system (erosion hazard), as that conveys the image of the valley systems within the Region.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
459	3	3.5.7 (NEW)	61	City of Vaughan	Please consider rewording this policy. While conservation authorities have a mandate related to the management of floodplain areas, isn't it Vaughan that it responsible for setting and updating Special Policy Areas rather than the CAs? In other words, please consider providing an additional policy with the intent that, "It is the policy of Council to support local municipalities in the setting and updating of Special Policy Areas... "	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
460	3	NEW	-	City of Richmond Hill	We request that the following policy (2.2.29) from the 2010 ROP not be deleted as Technical papers associated with the ORMCP, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and the Greenbelt Plan are being used and referenced. Please re-state the policy to read: "That the technical papers associated with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and the Greenbelt Plan be consulted to provide clarification in implementing the policies related to key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features within the Provincial Plans."	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
461	3	NEW	-	City of Richmond Hill	Policy 2.3.31 from the 2010 ROP should not be deleted: "To work with the conservation authorities and local municipalities to identify remediation and mitigation opportunities for hazardous lands and hazardous sites." It is important that the commitment to partnerships in this regard is formalized in this regard as the CAs and municipalities have different roles and tools that can be used for the protection and enhancement of these areas.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
462	3	NEW	-	TRCA	Policies 2.1.24 & 2.1.25 from the 2010 ROP are not included in the draft ROP. TRCA recommends including a policy promoting the development and advancement of studies and the collection of data to inform the Regional Greenlands System health. We further encourage that emphasis be placed on partnerships with relevant agencies and engaging stewardship and citizen science groups.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
463	3	NEW	-	TRCA	A policy should be added for prohibiting certain uses in hazardous lands and sites in accordance with 3.1.5 of the PPS.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
464	3	NEW	-	TRCA	We recommend that a policy be added for directing local municipalities to update their official plans and zoning by-laws for managing natural hazard risk (including for Special Policy Areas) to ensure updated and consistent frameworks are in place based on current technical information.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
465	3	NEW	-	City of Markham	Consider including policies that provide direction for ecological offsetting.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
466	4	4.1.1	64	City of Markham	This policy speaks to the primary location for growth and development within the Region and makes reference to Community Area and Map 1B. Map 1B identifies new Community Area in the north east area of Markham. However, the Region's Water and Wastewater Master Plan does not identify any regional infrastructure to support growth in this new Community Area. It appears that there is a misalignment between this Plan and the Water and Wastewater Master Plan Update.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
467	4	4.1.1 c)	64	City of Richmond Hill	It would be helpful to clarify that the "overlay" reference to Map 1B is a means to measure where targets are set - these are 'monitoring' areas - more so than land use. Map 1B also is important with respect to phasing of development - it ties in with policy 4.2.2.4 which requires a population of 1.5 million before a secondary plan related to new community areas can be approved.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
468	4	4.1.2	64	City of Vaughan	The role of MTSAs in the hierarchy proposed in the first bullet of the policy should be examined further. There is considerable overlap between MTSAs and other SGAs in the policy. A concern is that they will ultimately evolve into an overlapping continuum. Municipalities build communities based on logical planning units potentially composed of some or all of these elements. Local municipalities will benefit from flexibility to provide an appropriate naming protocol.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
469	4	4.1.2	64	City of Richmond Hill	The last sentence states: "The intent of Map 1B is provide further policy direction for where higher levels of intensification are to be promoted and how the Urban System is to be phased and developed in the long term." In this sentence, insert the word "to" between "provide" and "further", and suggest that you change the word "promoted" to "directed". The policies of the ROP are necessary to provide direction for intensification for local municipalities and for proponents of development.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
470	4	4.1.2	64	City of Vaughan	There is potentially a conflict between Maps 1A and 1B. If so, which prevails?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
471	4	4.1.3	65	City of Markham	The following revision is suggested to streamline the intensification hierarchy given that MTSAs are located throughout the urban system and located in Regional Centres and Corridors as well as Local Centres and Corridors (the Milliken and Mount Joy MTSAs are two good examples of this): i. Regional Centres; ii. Subway Station Major Transit Station Areas; iii. Other Major Transit Station Areas iv. Regional Corridors outside of major transit station areas; and v. Local centres and corridors outside of major transit station areas. Preamble or sidebar text could also be used to clarify the intent of distinguishing subway MTSAs from other MTSAs in the intensification hierarchy.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
472	4	4.1.3 b)	65	City of Vaughan	Please consider making reference to 'local municipal official plans' in this policy.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
473	4	4.1.4	65	Richmond Hill Residents (17 Submissions)	The land owned by Baif Developments at the southeast corner of Bloomington and Yonge Street and have made a site specific request for Yonge Street to permit higher density along the Yonge Street Corridor. -Densities and building heights along the Yonge Street Corridor within the Oak Ridges Moraine should protect environmentally sensitive areas from further development. It should be consistent with current policy (2010 Richmond Hill Official Plan) that densities and heights be limited to 4 - 5 storeys and allow special exemptions permitting up to 6 storeys, similar to the Oak Ridges Retirement Home. Protecting the environment should be a top priority in York Region planning. More than ever, we need to preserve our greenspaces, wetlands, and environmentally sensitive areas, not pave them over.	Acknowledged
474	4	4.2	66	Town of Georgina	Preamble - Not all Community Areas in the Region are alike. Some are urban in nature while some are more rural. The preamble should reflect the diversity of the Region's Community Areas and acknowledge that not all will be developed consistently.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
475	4	4.2.1	66	City of Vaughan	Please clarify how this policy will be measured and implemented. It will be important to ensure that all the supporting elements identified in 4.2.1 are planned for and tracked to ensure that they are appropriate to the mix of housing types they are supporting.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
476	4	4.2.1	66	City of Vaughan	Please clarify what will constitute a majority and how it will be determined. Consider removing the reference to "majority of" in this policy.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
477	4	4.2.2	66	City of Vaughan	The Land Needs Assessment report identified a lack of housing options for families, and that this trend is contributing to slower growth in York Region. Will there be any advancement of policies that encourage or mandate larger unit sizes to attract families? This would be helpful in SGAs, where significant growth is planned and there is not much range or mix of housing types.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
478	4	4.2.2	66	City of Vaughan	Please consider removing 'zoning by-laws' as a requirement in this policy. This policy is more suited to be implemented at a local municipal official plan level. It might be better as a broader statement in the Implementation section of the ROP.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
479	4	4.2.3	66	HBR Planning Centre	The wording of "if necessary, in greenfield areas" implies that these lands are to be developed only after all other lands have been redeveloped or intensified, but as mentioned before some of these greenfield lands are already developed and are built upon. - In addition, the Designated Greenfield areas are part of the "Community Area" designation where residential development is to be directed to accommodate existing and future populations. - We do not feel that Policy 4.2.3 above is reflective of this premise, and should be revised accordingly.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
480	4	4.2.3	66	City of Vaughan	Please clarify why the supply of designated land is now 15 years in the ROP and why the 5 year supply of units with servicing capacity is now 5 years.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
481	4	4.2.3 a)	66	City of Markham	Consider removing "if necessary" from this policy as the need has already been determined through the LNA.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
482	4	4.2.4	67	City of Vaughan	Please clarify what is considered as "compatible employment uses".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
483	4	4.2.4	67	City of Vaughan	Only residentially supporting and compatible employment uses should be provided for in the Community Area. This policy should be reviewed to ensure that it does not open the door to non-residential supporting and incompatible uses. Office buildings may be permitted in areas where the SGAs overlay a Community Area.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
484	4	4.2.4	67	City of Vaughan	Please define the word "balanced" and provide clarity as to how "balance" is measured.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
485	4	4.2.4	67	City of Markham	Clarify what is considered an appropriate "balance" of residential and compatible employment uses? Does it relate to the activity rate that is in the plan, or is it up to the local municipality to decide what the balance is?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
486	4	4.2.5	67	City of Vaughan	This policy should clarify that live-work (within residential units, home offices) do not make up for or substitute employment uses nor would it contribute to employment targets.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
487	4	4.2.6	67	City of Vaughan	Please consider adding policy language that requires reference and compliance to D-Series Guidelines.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
488	4	4.2.6	67	Malone Given Parsons	We suggest this policy be revised to provide for more direction with regards to land use and design that provides an appropriate transition in uses between sensitive land uses and employment area.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
489	4	4.2.6	67	City of Markham	Revise this policy to clarify that major retail uses should not be permitted in employment areas.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
490	4	4.2.6 (NEW)	67	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	We recommend that additional policy language be inserted after Section 4.2.6 (i.e.. a new section 4.2.7) to read: "That major facilities and sensitive land uses be planned and developed to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, address the land use compatibility requirements of the PPS for the introduction of sensitive land uses near major facilities. This includes determining the need for the sensitive land use in that municipality and the assessment of alternative locations within the municipality to determine that there are no reasonable alternative locations for the use in the municipality. The sensitive land use will minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks guidelines."	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
491	4	4.2.7	67	City of Vaughan	Table 4 - Please clarify "People and Jobs per hectare" in Table 4.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
492	4	4.2.7	67	City of Vaughan	Table 4 - Assuming that the density targets expressed in the policy are in people and jobs per hectare, what are the implications for Blocks 27 and 41 in Vaughan? This is likely not a concern for Block 27, however, Block 41 has specific Council direction for a reduced density target. Please provide further clarification.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
493	4	4.2.7	67	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	What was the final recommendation from York Region Council and how is it calculated to be reflective of the different DGA targets of lower municipalities? - Why does King City have a DGA target if no lands are being approved for urban boundary expansion, is it for already approved yet to be developed land if so why is it only 30? Same questions for Newmarket except DGA is 40? Do they have DGA that do not yet have approved secondary plans? - How does the new DGA target compare under the new methodology to the previously approved DGA density target of 70 ppl & jobs/Ha is it lower or higher?	Acknowledged
494	4	4.2.7	67	HBR Planning Centre	How are municipalities to achieve these Greenfield targets, if the built up areas are to be intensified and redeveloped first, before Greenfield areas are developed.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
495	4	4.2.8	67	Malone Given Parsons	We are requesting that draft policy 4.2.8 be revised as follows: 4.2.8 That secondary plans within the designated greenfield area with complete applications filed prior to the adoption of this Plan are not required to conform to this Plan. Where existing secondary plans are being revisited, opportunities to reflect policies 4.2.1.4, 4.2.1.5, 4.2.1.12 of this Plan should be considered. - We are concerned that the draft transition policy does not recognize secondary plans deemed complete under the current YROP - Under the draft ROP, the Angus Glen Block is no longer a New Community Area - We recommend 4.2.8 be clarified to ensure current applications are not subject to any new policies for New Community Areas - The exclusion of this clarification will risk unraveling a significant amount of effort placed into the secondary plan application which will further delay the development of these lands which are intended for 2031 build-out	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
496	4	4.2.1	68	Malone Given Parsons	New Community Areas Policies: - We believe that the current policies in this section of the Draft OP are generally unclear and overly burdensome, factors that will result in the delay of housing delivery. - These policies need to have demonstrable outcomes that will result in communities that align with the Official Plan's vision.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
497	4	4.2.1.1	68	City of Markham	Policy 5.2.15 in the 2010 ROP, which provides direction to re-examine the people and jobs per hectare in designated greenfield area secondary plan areas that are not completely built, is preferred to the new policy proposed here.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
498	4	4.2.1.2	69	City of Markham	Policy 5.2.16 in the 2010 ROP, which provides direction for secondary and subdivision plans within the designated greenfield area that are not approved, is preferred to the new policy proposed here. Clarify what is considered a "timely manner" for completing secondary plans.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
499	4	4.2.1.3	69	City of Vaughan	Please clarify who would prepare the subwatershed plan or equivalent comprehensive planning study and what would be considered an acceptable equivalent comprehensive planning study.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
500	4	4.2.1.3	69	City of Markham	Consider revising the policy to clarify that a subwatershed plan or equivalent is needed to inform the preparation of secondary plans for new community areas. Suggested edit: "Secondary Plans for new community areas shall be...".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
501	4	4.2.1.4	69	City of Vaughan	Consider clarifying that local municipalities will define the community core areas referred to in 4.2.1.4.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
502	4	4.2.1.4	69	City of Vaughan	Although a distinctive core is desired, it is also desirable for the entire New Community Area to be "vibrant, mixed use and walkable" and include the qualities listed in 4.2.1.4 a) - g).	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
503	4	4.2.1.4	69	City of Vaughan	It is vital to have a core that accommodates higher order services. This should be established through retail studies undertaken through the secondary planning process.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
504	4	4.2.1.4	69	City of Markham	Consider adding a network of open space and parks, enhanced tree canopy/preservation opportunities, and integration of heritage resources to the list of community core areas.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
505	4	4.2.1.5	69	City of Vaughan	Please clarify the intent of this policy. Fundamentally, in community areas, the number of jobs is generated by the projected population, (e.g. retail, services, schools). Please clarify if the intent is to draw employment uses from "Employment Areas" or to catch overlapping uses coming out of other structural elements.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
506	4	4.2.1.5	69	City of Markham	Clarify the benefit of requiring local municipalities to set residents to job ratio targets for each new community area.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
507	4	4.2.1.6	69	City of Markham	Policy 2.3.1.5 only requires local municipalities to develop municipal-wide community energy plans. This does not limit local municipalities from including requirements for community energy plans for secondary plans and major developments in their official plans, but this could be challenged by stakeholders as going beyond the Region's official Plan. - Refer to report for recommendation - new policy, or revise a policy to encourage area-specific community energy plans to be developed for secondary plans and major development	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
508	4	4.2.1.6	69	City of Vaughan	This is a good policy to support the integration of energy into land use planning. However, the Region should set minimum requirements for local municipal community energy plans. Municipal-wide energy plans tend not to have specific targets and it is difficult to translate from the MEPs to specific developments. For example, if MEPs include recommendations to build better than the OBC for new construction, then it will simply be interpreted as guidance and not applicable OP policy.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
509	4	4.2.1.7	69	City of Markham	There appears to be a copy and paste error in Policies 4.2.1.7 b. and c. (the entirety of b is restated in c). C used to speak to strategies to "minimize stormwater volume and contaminant loads" which are important and may have unintentionally been deleted. Consider deleting "management needs and areas and" in 4.2.17 d to clarify and streamline the policy.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
510	4	4.2.1.7	69	LSRCA	Please include blue roofs in this section	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
511	4	4.2.1.8	70	City of Vaughan	Please consider redefining "active transportation" to distinguish between bike paths and walking paths. Shared use active transportation paths are not effective.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
512	4	4.2.1.8 b)	70	City of Richmond Hill	Add active transportation to: b. a transit plan is completed in consultation with York Region Transit, which identifies transit routes and corridors, co-ordinates transit with land use patterns and active transportation; and ensures the ability to integrate transit into the community;	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
513	4	4.2.1.8 g)	70	City of Richmond Hill	This policy speaks to a 'reduced' parking standard, however it does not indicate from what it is reduced. It should be clarified.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
514	4	4.2.1.9	70	City of Markham	Clarify the intent of this policy as there are no major transit station areas or new rapid transit corridors identified in the new community areas.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
515	4	4.2.1.9	70	City of Richmond Hill	This policy makes reference to "future transit corridors", however it is unclear what corridors are being referred to, either in this ROP, provincial Plan or other legislation. We note that Map 10 does not explicitly illustrate any "future" transit corridors.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
516	4	4.2.1.10	70	City of Markham	Clarify the intent of this policy as there are no major transit station areas identified in the new community areas.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
517	4	4.2.1.12	70	City of Vaughan	Please provide clarification on the policy - How can you have a minimum density of 65 residents and jobs per ha and 18 residential units per ha? Do they have to achieve both? How many residents are in a unit?	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
518	4	4.2.1.12	70	City of Markham	New community areas would also be considered designated greenfield areas (DGA). The target of 65 people and jobs per hectare in this policy seems to conflict with Policy 4.2.7 that assigns a minimum DGA target of 70 people and jobs per hectare in Markham. In addition it is unclear what the end of the sentence is trying to achieve (i.e.., "and 18 residential units per hectare") as the beginning of the policy speaks to both residents and jobs.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
519	4	4.2.2	71	Malone Given Parsons	The phasing of new community areas in the Plan should be based only on the requirement that sufficient infrastructure and servicing capacity is available prior to development. - Tying the planning of new community areas to the achievement of discrete targets at a Regional scale will result in a significant delay in the provision of housing. - To meet housing demand, it is essential that all areas within the Region be allowed to advance as they are able (once they can be serviced.) Example - Given that Table 1 does not project a population until 2031-2041, policy 4.2.2.4 c) alone will halt the planning of new community areas for a decade, and create unnecessary supply constraints and unrealistic growth rates in the latter portion of the planning period - We request that the phasing policies be revised to require only the availability of infrastructure prior to permitting growth in new community areas which is the primary concern of the Region.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
520	4	4.2.2	71	Malone Given Parsons	The policies for new communities should require that lower- tier municipalities establish appropriate phasing policies when considering approval of new secondary plans.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
521	4	4.2.2	71	MPLAN Inc	A further reference to options, yet this was specifically rejected by Regional Staff in the 2020 OLT hearing for Bernard KDA.	Acknowledged
522	4	4.2.2	71	Malone Given Parsons	We request that the phasing policies be revised to require only the availability of infrastructure prior to permitting growth in new community areas which is the primary concern of the Region.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
523	4	4.2.2	71	Malone Given Parsons	The policies for new communities should require that lower-tier municipalities establish appropriate phasing policies when considering approval of new secondary plans.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
524	4	4.2.2	71	City of Markham	Where do Community Structure Plans and Community Design Plans fit in? Should they be mentioned in this section?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
525	4	4.2.2.1	71	City of Vaughan	Please clarify the need for the explicit reference of "entire New Community Areas".	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
526	4	4.2.2.1	71	City of Vaughan	Please clarify if this policy allows a local municipality to specify a subwatershed study supported by an MESP as the comprehensive plan.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
527	4	4.2.2.2	72	City of Markham	Clarify if d) "a maximum number of concession blocks being permitted to develop at any one time", applies locally or region-wide.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
528	4	4.2.2.2	72	SGL Planning & Design Inc.	We recommend that policy 4.2.2.2 be revised to: - Add to end of c) "that does not leapfrog over other undeveloped areas in the Designated Greenfield Area"; - Delete d) and replace with "multiple phases may be developed concurrently to provide for a competitive housing environment provided the provision of infrastructure to multiple phases is financially viable for the Region and the initial component of each phase is large enough to provide for complete communities"; - Reverse the order of points d) and e); - Add two additional sub policies: i) progression of each phase of development shall consider how infrastructure can be provided in a financially sustainable manner including consideration of front ending works by proponents; and i) priority is given to areas that can help facilitate major transit stations and /or rapid transit corridors.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
529	4	4.2.2.2	72	City of Vaughan	Please clarify the meaning of an "alternative study" in this policy. In particular: "That local municipal concept plans or alternative comprehensive studies for each new community area shall form the basis for more detailed secondary plans at the block level." This makes sense if you substitute "block plan" for "secondary plan". This would reflect our current system. New Communities require secondary plans. By mentioning a secondary plan in this policy indicates that the Region intends it to be a statutory OP amendment to a secondary plan that has already been prepared. The Block Plan would not constitute an OPA. It ultimately may be better if the work identified in this section combine all these elements into a combined Secondary Plan/Block Plan exercise. The local municipalities should have this option. This is worth discussing with the local municipalities as a means of speeding up the process.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
530	4	4.2.2.2 d)	72	Town of East Gwillimbury	4.2.2.2 d) - Town staff have concern with this policy, which states that a maximum number of concession blocks be permitted to develop at any one time - East Gwillimbury Whitebelt lands/new community areas are made up of partially developed concession blocks and limiting development in this capacity would impede logical and orderly development for the communities of Holland Landing, Sharon, Queensville and Green Lane	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
531	4	4.2.2.4	72	SGL Planning Inc	Since the Region is relying on the full development of the Secondary Plan areas to accommodate population growth to 2031, and knowing that the full amount of this population will likely not able to be accommodated during that time period, we request that the Region revise its draft phasing policies for expansion lands to permit Secondary Planning to begin now so that lands are available to be developed to meet required housing needs before 2031. - Policy 4.2.2.4 h) i. should be deleted	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
532	4	4.2.2.4	72	SGL Planning & Design Inc.	We recommend that policy 4.2.2.4 be revised to refine the introductory statement and delete b, c and h and replace with a new h as follows: 4.2.2.4 "That the approval of development within secondary plans for new community areas shall be contingent on the following"..." b) DELETE c) DELETE h) DELETE & REPLACE with: a phasing plan that: a) identifies the required infrastructure and required public service facilities for each phase; b) requires the necessary internal and external infrastructure to be provided concurrently or in advance of development within the phase; c) requires each phase should be large enough to provide for or contribute to a complete community that includes public service facilities necessary to serve the phase (i.e.., parks, schools, emergency services etc..); d) Identifies how the required public serviced facilities will be provided in the early phases of development in each phase where such facilities are required in tandem with residential development; e) identifies how transit service can be provided in the initial development of the phase; f) provides for an appropriate balance of jobs generally in accordance with policy 4.2.1.5; and g) contains a mix and range of housing types, sizes, tenures and affordable options that include but are not limited to medium and/or high density development along corridors with accessibility to transit.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
533	4	4.2.2.4	72	City of Richmond Hill	Please clarify what is meant by "early stage" in the text at the bottom of page 72 with respect to service delivery in new communities.	Acknowledged
534	4	4.2.2.4	72	Town of East Gwillimbury	Town staff believe that phasing policies at the YROP level for new community areas should only be tied to the availability of infrastructure and servicing. - 4.2.2.4 - policies unduly restrict the planning for new community areas by preventing the secondary planning of new community areas until the Region maintains 50% intensification over the last 5 years and meets a min population of 1.5M people - This will prohibit the Town from being able to develop comprehensive secondary and block plans for new community areas ahead of further development pressure and market demand - Phasing for new community areas should be based on the requirement that sufficient infrastructure and servicing capacity is available prior to development proceeding	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
535	4	4.2.2.4	72	City of Vaughan	It is difficult to see how this policy works, it needs to be reconsidered. (i.e.. Secondary Plan approval should be contingent on provision of local infrastructure, and availability of local municipal services). The Region should make a schematic and work flow diagram to show how the Region's proposed system works.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
536	4	4.2.2.4	72	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Town staff supports appropriate phasing of development within new community areas, notwithstanding, the requirement for the Region achieving a minimum population of 1.5 million people (b) and that 75% of the preceding phase of development to be registered prior to approval of a subsequent phase (h.i.) is overly restrictive and greater flexibility should be provided, as determined through the secondary plan process to recognize the local circumstances and context, and the need to meet minimum thresholds related to accommodating sufficient housing supply in registered plans. The phasing of development should not be directly tied to achieving an overall minimum Region wide population in instances where the local municipality may have insufficient housing options available to meet their needs and growth forecasts. - Staff recommends that the minimum thresholds in policies 4.2.2.4 (b) and (h.1.) be removed in favour of identifying appropriate phasing policies through the secondary planning process, to address local municipal needs.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
537	4	4.2.2.4	72	City of Markham	For b) what time period would this be calculated over, and what if the local municipality is achieving their intensification rate? We suggest linking this to Table 1. For c) assuming the 1.5 million is based on growth post 2031, should the availability of draft approved or serviced lots also be considered as a threshold? We suggest linking this to Table 6. For h) clarify what the "subsequent phase/preceding phase" means and how it is to be applied when considering a new secondary plan. As it is written now, it appears difficult to implement, especially with criteria i. We suggest removing sub-criteria i under h). - Refer to staff report for further detail and recommendations.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
538	4	4.3.3	73	Township of King	4.3.3 - Consider rewording policy to the following: "That employment areas, as shown on Map 1A, shall be designated in local official plans for employment uses for clusters of business and economic activities **which may include ~~including~~**, but not limited to, manufacturing, warehousing, industrial, offices and associated retain and ancillary facilities, **subject to local official plan policies**." - This would allow for flexibility in permitted uses subject to the local context	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
539	4	4.3.4 (NEW)	74	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	We recommend that additional policy language be inserted following 4.3.4 to read: "That employment areas and major facilities be protected from the encroachment of sensitive uses to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of major facilities as required by the PPS and in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks guidelines."	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
540	4	4.3.8	74	City of Richmond Hill	Please clarify what would be considered to be a "complementary employment use".	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
541	4	4.3.10	74	City of Markham	Why is it just these areas? Do they have a different priority for protection?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
542	4	4.3.12	74	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff understands that core employment areas and supporting employment areas are to be delineated in the local official plans, and that only the conversion of those employment areas identified on Map 1A could be considered through a Regional municipal comprehensive review. Staff questions whether further guidance should be provided with respect to other employment areas that are not identified on Map 1A (in addition to 4.3.18 and 4.3.19). Additional policy direction could be considered regarding the removal of other employment lands not identified on Map 1A in order to strengthen their protection at the local level.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
543	4	4.3.12	74	KLM Planning Partners Inc	Distinction between Core Employment Areas and Supporting Employment Areas is not clear in terms of identifying where noxious uses and traditional and land-extensive employment uses can go - see policy 4.3.1.12 - We recommend that the Region's employment area framework generally reflect that of the West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plan, in which employment land use designations are categorized as either "General" or "Prestige"	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
544	4	4.3.12	74	City of Vaughan	Consider reframing this policy to simply require local municipalities to create hierarchies of employment uses.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
545	4	4.3.12	74	KLM Planning Partners Inc	Distinction between Core Employment Areas and Supporting Employment Areas is not clear in terms of identifying where noxious uses and traditional and land-extensive employment uses can go - see policy 4.3.1.12 - We recommend that the Region's employment area framework generally reflect that of the West Vaughan Employment Area Secondary Plan, in which employment land use designations are categorized as either "General" or "Prestige"	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
546	4	4.3.14	75	City of Richmond Hill	e) stipulates that other uses in employment areas where individuals reside on a temporary or permanent basis are not permitted in employment areas. Interpretation of this policy could suggest that hotels are included in this, despite hotels being commonplace in many employment areas across York Region. It is unclear whether this is in fact a policy direction the Region is introducing (i.e.., limiting hotels within employment areas). If that is not the case, then it suggested that the words "not including hotels or equivalent" be included in the policy.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
547	4	4.3.14	75	City of Vaughan	This policy may contradict the encouragement of developing mixed-use areas. With work from home/15min city concepts, more and more people will live, work, play in the same zone.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
548	4	4.3.14, 4.3.15 & 4.3.16	75	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff is generally supportive of the restriction of sensitive land uses within employment areas. Staff is concerned as to how this policy may affect existing uses and current ongoing applications by restricting current development permissions, and would strongly recommend that some transitional policies be included. -Staff recommends that a notwithstanding policy be included, that these policies would not come into effect until such time as the local municipality has updated its Official Plan to conform to the ROP. Alternatively, the policies could be reworded to 'require that local municipalities through their official plan conformity exercise shall not permit those types of sensitive land uses within employment areas'.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
549	4	4.3.15	75	City of Richmond Hill	Please clarify what is an "accessory institutional use" in the context of this policy.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
550	4	4.3.15	75	City of Markham	Major retail is not permitted in Markham's core employment areas (i.e.., 'Business Park Employment, and 'General Employment' designations). Suggest moving a) to policy 4.3.14 to not permit major retail in all employment areas. Core employment areas also do not permit retail uses that are not accessory. Suggest moving 4.3.14 d (boarding schools) and e (other uses where individuals reside on a temporary or permanent basis) to this policy.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
551	4	4.3.15 & 4.3.17	75	City of Vaughan	Growth Plan policy 2.2.5.7.b should be left at the discretion of the Region, in consultation with local municipalities. Major retail in the supporting employment area would constitute a conversion and affect the Region's employment mapping. It may also create a variety of standards, whereas a regional approach would provide consistency. Alternatively, the ROP could potentially provide guidelines for local municipal policies. Lastly, the municipalities are doing their own retail studies, which should identify the City's retail needs.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
552	4	4.3.17	75	City of Vaughan	It is important to consider that major retail nodes may be less and less important as main streets revive.	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
553	4	4.3.21	75	Malone Given Parsons	Table 5 - Employment Area Policies: - As the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe does not specify a minimum density target for employment lands, there is no overarching Provincial density requirement that must be met. - As such, the Draft OP should use the absolute minimum density necessary to meet the employment growth forecasts to ensure flexibility to accommodate all future businesses. - Using a minimum density will ensure flexibility for a range of employment uses - Unnecessarily increasing the minimum densities for employment areas will limit the possibilities for lower-density employment uses that are critical to the Region's successful growth, which would undermine Policy 4.3.7's direction to protect certain employment areas for manufacturing, warehousing and logistics	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
554	4	4.3.21	75	Town of East Gwillimbury	Table 5 - Since there is no provincial density requirement that must be met for employment lands, the YROP has the potential to assign the absolute minimum employment density required to meet forecasts so that there is greater flexibility for employment uses and emerging economic trends. - This can be considered as part of the YROP and would be supported by Town staff as minimums that can be exceed to still ensure an appropriate ratio of employment to population	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
555	4	4.3.21	75	City of Vaughan	Table 5 - Please clarify "Jobs per hectare" in Table 5.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
556	4	4.3.21	75	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	The Highway 404 North Employment Zone, which includes Gormley, has a proposed density target of 55 jobs per hectare. It is staff's understanding that the density target is intended to apply across the entire employment zone and not on a parcel by parcel basis. Notwithstanding, the proposed density target would not be achievable on the basis of private water and wastewater servicing. As such, staff supports the provision of municipal services to lands within Gormley to accommodate more intensive and higher order employment development, to assist in achieving the overall density target.	Acknowledged
557	4	4.3.22	76	City of Vaughan	New employment areas should require a secondary plan, not Alternative/Equivalent Comprehensive Studies. Please consider revising this policy.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
558	4	4.3.22	76	City of Vaughan	Please provide clarification regarding whether the Secondary Plan is a further Official Plan Amendment or through a Block Plan.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
559	4	4.3.24	76	City of Vaughan	Strategic growth areas, e.g. Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC), is often taken out of or not included as a part of designated employment areas. While in the Secondary plan level we designate certain land for employment uses, Cities are often facing market challenges for employment uses. It would be helpful if the Region could strengthen policy language to bolster secondary plan requirements for employment uses since they do not fall within the employment area and are not required to contribute to the minimum density targets.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
560	4	4.3.25	76	City of Markham	Clarify what "a mix of amenities" of amenities is referred to here.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
561	4	4.3.26	76	City of Markham	Consider expanding the list of criteria for flexible and adaptable employment areas to include: - redevelopment and intensification; and - climate adaptation measures, including green infrastructure, and climate mitigation actions including renewable energy and alternative energy systems.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
562	4	4.4	77	City of Richmond Hill	This section makes reference to "strategic growth areas" (SGA) as they are listed in Policy 4.1.3 (a). However, the definition for Strategic Growth Area provided in Section 7 is much broader than what is provided in the list in policy 4.1.3 (a). As such, either the definition for SGA should change, or this term should not be used in relation to many of the policies in Section 4.4.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
563	4	4.4	77	City of Markham	The first and second paragraphs of the preamble differentiate subway stations from other MTSAs when describing the intensification hierarchy. Any revisions to the hierarchy in Section 4.1.3 should be reflected here and in the graphic on the next page. With regard to "the missing middle" see also comments to Section 4.4.16 below. The objective under the preamble contains a spelling typo (i.e.., "signification" should be "significant"). Also, should "cities" be "communities"?	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
564	4	4.4 (NEW)	77	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New policy suggestion in section 4.4: “That employment growth is an important component of intensification, and that employment/non-sensitive land uses are encouraged within strategic growth areas.”	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
565	4	4.4 (NEW)	77	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New policy suggestion in section 4.4: “Due to the importance of employment uses within the Region of York, intensification of sensitive land uses can only occur where it has been demonstrated that the long-term protection of employment uses in proximity to the strategic growth area has been demonstrated and that there are no adverse effects on the proposed sensitive land use or impacts on the employment use.”	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
566	4	4.4.1	77	MPLAN Inc	The requirement to utilize land efficiently is not something that has occurred to date, based on my experience in York Region. - There are no clearly established criteria to be applied to applications to provide for maximizing development potential and utilizing land efficiently.	Acknowledged
567	4	4.4.2	77	Public	I understand that many of the Town/Cities in York Region supported a higher level of intensification (equivalent to 55% of projected growth) for future development in existing urban areas and transit hubs than what was actually adopted in the Region's Plan (50%). Why is this? I see no rational for the Region's decision in the Plan. The Plan does include bumping the target from 50% to 55% in the latter years of the plan, but why was 55% not used throughout the full timeframe of the Plan, particularly in the light of the Towns/Cities support for the more aggressive target? This decision seems to undermine some of the stated goals of the Plan (i.e.. preservation of agricultural lands, managing environmental impacts of urban sprawl, etc..)	Acknowledged
568	4	4.4.2	77	MPLAN Inc	Has this occurred to date?	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
569	4	4.4.2	77	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	What analysis was done of MTSA to ensure that the areas will be able to accommodate the proposed density? Here are some examples of concern: - MTSA 59 contains 2 community parks - MTSA 57 is located within a PSEZ - MTSA 54 contains a community centre - Will MTSAs in PSEZ's allow for mixed use developments, employment & residential, to achieve the density targets or are they limited to employment only?	Acknowledged
570	4	4.4.3	78	City of Vaughan	Strategic Growth Areas is a broad category. There are urban centres and some MTSAs that fit this definition, while other MTSAs do not. Please consider that this may more appropriately address Centres.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
571	4	4.4.4	78	City of Richmond Hill	The scale of development needs to be in accordance with local context and in a form that will meet or exceed the minimum density target, as opposed to "reflecting the intensification hierarchy" which only speaks to where the majority of development is expected to be directed in accordance with policy 4.1.3.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
572	4	4.4.4	78	City of Vaughan	MTSAs and other Provincial designations do not necessarily need to be an explicit part of the hierarchy, as such, please consider revising. One approach is to make the categories of the hierarchy more distinct.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
573	4	4.4.4	78	City of Vaughan	We understand that the Region is designating all MTSAs as Protected MTSAs. Should all MTSA references be prefaced with and distinguished as "Protected"?	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
574	6	6.5.6	131	City of Richmond Hill	What is intended by the policy? Typically, after development the developer is no longer responsible for the property. Is the policy suggesting that the proponent be responsible in perpetuity or is it intended that the stormwater management works be designed to municipal standards that take into consideration long-term maintenance and cost effectiveness?	Acknowledged
575	4	4.4.5	78	City of Vaughan	Please clarify the meaning of a 'comprehensive plan', as referred to in 4.4.5.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
576	6	6.5.6	131	City of Vaughan	Please consider revising this policy from, "to ensure that they function as designed.", to, "to ensure that they function in accordance with the levels of service defined within municipal asset management plans."	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
577	4	4.4.6	78	City of Vaughan	Please consider referencing the term "hierarchy" to be clearer about what this context means.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
578	4	4.4.6	78	City of Vaughan	Please clarify the intent of this policy.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
579	4	4.4.7	78	MPLAN Inc	Why the reference to a 15-minute walk? - If this is a clear direction and intent of the Region, these areas should be identified at the local level in Secondary Plans, and implementation policies should be in place to support the intent.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
580	4	4.4.8	78	City of Richmond Hill	This policy should clarify that larger family type units are encouraged within multi-unit buildings.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
581	4	4.4.8	78	City of Vaughan	Further emphasis and clarity with respect to variety of dwelling unit sizes should be considered, i.e.. minimum percentage of unit types and respective minimum sizes.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
582	4	4.4.8	78	City of Markham	The inclusion of "larger family type units" is helpful. Stronger policy text could be that local municipalities shall identify mechanisms to require larger family type units in local official plans.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
583	4	4.4.9	78	City of Markham	Clarify what is considered a "significant" amount of mixed-uses.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
584	4	4.4.9, 4.4.10 & 4.4.11	78	MPLAN Inc	As noted above, this has not occurred to date concerning the Yonge Bernard KDA and most of Richmond Hill along the Yonge Corridor.	Acknowledged
585	4	4.4.10	78	City of Vaughan	Please define the term "comprehensive planning study". Please consider replacing this term if it cannot be defined.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
586	4	4.4.11	79	City of Markham	For c), clarify the time period (i.e.., should this be to build out or to meet the 2051 forecast?) Also, the corresponding section in the 2010 ROP provided direction to "identify and map", but "map" appears to have been removed. Should it be added for clarity? For d), clarify what is intended by this policy. Should this only be applied to MTSAs?	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
587	4	4.4.11	79	City of Vaughan	Generally, dense areas cannot have suburban amenities. Please reconsider how the tools match the intent of the policy.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
588	4	4.4.11 a) & 4.4.12	79	City of Vaughan	In Vaughan and especially within the VMC, meeting and exceeding intensification targets isn't an issue. The problem at hand is over-exceeding and having sufficient infrastructure to support overdevelopment. Policy 4.4.12 speaks to local municipalities identifying maximums. Consider connecting this policy with 4.4.11 a.	Acknowledged
589	4	4.4.11 d)	79	City of Vaughan	The term "gentle density" is subjective. Please consider using another term.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
590	4	4.4.12	79	City of Richmond Hill	The reference to hierarchy is not correct, as there is considerable variation in terms of potential buildout of the areas within the individual tiers of the hierarchy, even among the four Urban Growth Centres, let alone the 78 MTSAs. It may be more appropriate to state that density and height targets shall be established to implement the Regional minimum targets and also in accordance with local context and available or planned infrastructure to support growth and development.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
591	4	4.4.12	79	MPLAN Inc	So the locals are to now set targets?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
592	4	4.4.15	79	City of Richmond Hill	Note that Map 10 does not identify "future rapid transit corridors." Also, the policy directs to plan for "higher density" development, but does not say higher than what. Perhaps this could be reworded to direct planning for future development that is commensurate with the planned transit for the area?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
593	4	4.4.16	79	City of Richmond Hill	The term "missing middle" is used in this policy. In the Richmond Hill Key Directions Report we consider triplex, quadraplex, townhouses and walk-up apartment buildings to be "missing middle." However, these building types are listed in the ROP's definition of low-density. The definition of "missing middle" is quite vague - but seems to allude to mid-rise multi-unit development. As such, it may be more easily understood if the policies simply referred to the term "mid-rise development", rather than "missing middle."	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
594	4	4.4.16	79	City of Vaughan	The term "missing middle" is vague - does this only include medium density development? What about more intense forms of low rise development?	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
595	4	4.4.16	79	City of Vaughan	Please clarify how the Region would be able to assist local municipalities to enforce requiring missing middles to be incorporated into development.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
596	4	4.4.16	79	City of Vaughan	Clarification is needed for this policy on how it could be implemented. Is the intent of this policy to require all levels of Council to work with lower tier municipalities to ensure that policies in local documents consider gentle intensification and a mix of housing options?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
597	4	4.4.16	79	City of Vaughan	Consider revising the policy to avoid using the term "missing middle".	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
598	4	4.4.16	79	City of Markham	Should the official plan not focus on land uses as "missing middle" does not appear to be defined and it could speak to finding appropriate locations to support medium density midrise development? The housing section already speaks to an appropriate mix and range of housing types and could be combined in that section as well.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
599	4	4.4.17	79	City of Vaughan	Planners cannot give a professional opinion on gentle density. Consider using terminology such as "compatibility".	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
600	4	4.4.17	79	City of Markham	Suggest deleting reference to "gentle density" as it will be used to support NIMBYism.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
601	4	4.4.18	80	City of Vaughan	Please clarify the meaning of "cyclist-friendly". Please consider strengthening and clarifying, indicating how we can better promote dedicated cycling infrastructure.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
602	4	4.4.19	80	City of Vaughan	Urban design is typically the responsibility of local municipalities. Please clarify the intent of this policy.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
603	4	4.4.19	80	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- While staff generally supports this policy, there may be instances in strategic growth areas where limited parking could be accommodated between the main building and the major street within strategic growth areas and depending on the planned character of the street. The policy is overly restrictive for an upper-tier official plan and such urban design and built form matters should be addressed at a local level. Furthermore, strategic growth areas may also include brownfield sites or greyfields, and such detailed matters should be assessed on a site by site basis. - Staff recommends that the last sentence be revised as follows: "Surface parking between the main building entrance and the major street shall be discouraged to be permitted."	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
604	4	4.4.19	80	MPLAN Inc	This policy should be deleted since it refers only to public streets and omits reference to private streets. - Site design should not be left to be determined by the local municipality.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
605	4	4.4.19	80	City of Markham	Consider replacing both instances of "shall" with “encourage” in this policy.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
606	4	4.4.20	80	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	Suggested policy edit to 4.4.20: "That a wide range of residential, commercial and institutional uses, including retail uses, offices, mixed-use and human services be provided in strategic growth areas. The introduction of sensitive land uses within a strategic growth area in proximity to major facilities can only occur where the sensitive land use has met the land use compatibility requirements of the Provincially Policy Statement, including demonstrating the need for the proposed use and that there are no reasonable alternative locations for the sensitive land use in the municipality. This is to ensure the long-term protection of employment uses in the Region."	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
607	4	4.4.26 f)	80	City of Vaughan	This is a good policy. Please ensure this policy is also applied to regional roads.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
608	4	4.4.22	80	City of Richmond Hill	This policy maybe directing major office too far afield when it suggests that it be directed to (non-MTSA) Local Centres and Corridors.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
609	4	4.4.22	80	City of Markham	Should the statement about the preferred location of major office uses in SGA's also be included in Section 4.3?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
610	4	4.4.23	80	MPLAN Inc	Please explain why such a requirement should be set out in "equivalent comprehensive planning studies". What does this mean?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
611	4	4.4.23 & 4.4.2.9 j)	80	City of Richmond Hill	These two policies should specify that a proportion of the affordable units should be 3-bedroom or larger units in order to accommodate larger households. The current draft policies are too generic when referring to "a range of compact housing forms and tenures".	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
612	4	4.4.23 and 4.4.24	80	City of Markham	The same comments to Policies 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.2.3 apply here as well. It is questioned whether a minimum of 35% of new housing units in Regional Centres and MTSAs is achievable and implementable.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
613	4	4.4.24	80	MPLAN Inc	To-date this has not occurred. It is odd to have a requirement for 35% but then ask the local municipality to prepare an implementation plan. - Is this an additional plan to the plan the Region will prepare?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
614	4	4.4.25	80	City of Markham	Should "rental" be replaced with "affordable housing" as per Section 28 of the Planning Act?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
615	4	4.4.26	80	City of Richmond Hill	Similar to Policy 4.2.1.6, there needs to be a similar policy requiring secondary plans and planning applications in strategic growth areas to demonstrate how development conforms to local municipal community energy plans as well as the Region's Energy Conservation and Demand Management Plan. By doing so we create opportunities to incorporate renewable/ alternative/ district energy/ local generation systems where they are most feasible (i.e.., Regional Centres, many MTSAs and even within some employment areas).	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
616	4	4.4.26	80	City of Markham	The text box at the bottom of this page states that "For the purposes of this Plan, strategic growth areas consist of Regional Centres, subway station Major Transit Station Areas, Regional Corridors, and local Centres and Corridors". Clarify why are non-subway MTSAs left out.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
617	4	4.4.29	81	Township of King	4.4 - consider outlining what is included in a strategic growth area at the beginning of 4.4 instead of later in the Section.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
618	4	4.4.26 l)	81	City of Richmond Hill	This policy speaks to public benefits through both private and public development and may be better presented through two separate policies.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
619	4	4.4.26 s) (NEW)	81	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New sub policy to policy 4.4.26: "s. That sensitive land uses are only permitted when it has been demonstrated that the long-term protection of employment uses/major facilities within or in vicinity of the strategic growth area have been demonstrated, including the land use compatibility requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement. Specifically, the local municipality must demonstrate that there is a need and that there is no reasonable alternative location for the sensitive land use to be located in the municipality"	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
620	4	4.4.26 t) (NEW)	81	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New sub policy to policy 4.4.26: "t. the strategic placement of non-sensitive land uses as an appropriate buffer to employment uses within or in proximity of the strategic growth area"	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
621	4	4.4.27	81	City of Vaughan	This policy is logical. However, we should ensure that this policy is not used to accelerate urban area expansion by claiming that there are delays in build-out in intensification areas.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
622	4	4.4.27	81	City of Vaughan	These areas need to be prioritized and the current proposed policy would seem to complicate and delay their delivery. "The approval of the Secondary Plan be "contingent on" the availability of infrastructure and other services" does not seem desirable as it will become a mechanism that will further delay our process. Please consider revising this policy.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
623	4	4.4.27	81	City of Vaughan	Infrastructure needs are determined through a Secondary Plan. It is the policy of a Secondary Plan and the Phasing Plan that the delivery of services be provided. It may be more efficient to make approval of development contingent on the confirmation of the availability of infrastructure (e.g. planned and funded by way of DCs). Please consider revising.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
624	4	4.4.27	81	City of Vaughan	The Infrastructure and phasing are what provide for delivery of those services. York Region Master Plans should be identifying these deficiencies.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
625	4	4.4.27	81	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- While staff supports the orderly phasing and timing of growth in relation to the provision of infrastructure, staff is concerned that such a policy as currently worded may unduly restrict the timing of growth in certain secondary plan or strategic growth areas in other municipalities which could negatively impact their ability to achieve the growth forecasts and address local municipal infrastructure needs to accommodate planned growth. Priority should be given to servicing strategic growth and intensification areas, including lands identified for urban development through a Minister's Zoning Order. - Staff recommends that the Region consider alternative means of funding the development of new infrastructure which should consider the use of front- ending agreements with landowners to expedite the provision of housing supply within the Region.	Acknowledged
626	4	4.4.27	81	City of Markham	What is the intent of this policy? Do we not want approval of intensification in secondary plan areas?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
627	4	4.4.28	81	MPLAN Inc	Asking the local municipality to consider something does not address the housing crisis and lack of supply in the Region. - As of right zoning should have been put in place years ago. Most zoning bylaws are outdated even the Bernard KDA zoning bylaw. - Streamlining approvals should occur but does not occur at the local or regional level for reasons discussed. - The plan should include creation of zero car households.	Acknowledged
628	4	4.4.29	81	City of Vaughan	This policy could be problematic if local municipalities were shifting density permissions within a Secondary Plan area. Densities and associated developments need to be reviewed in context of the area, not in isolation. It is recommended that this policy be deleted or revised to allow the decision to be on the local municipality, depending on the circumstances and without the need for an MCR.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
629	4	4.4.29	81	City of Vaughan	This could be used as a means to limit the mix of housing. It makes it implies that every site in an SGA must meet the minimum target, when the target is actually applied across the SGA/MTSA, rather than a site by site basis. Please consider revising.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
630	4	4.4.1	82	City of Richmond Hill	Preamble - In the preamble to this policy section it states that second to Regional Centres and Subway Station MTSAs, all of the other MTSAs will have higher density and scale than Local Centres. However, the MTSAs vary across the City and Region. In Richmond Hill we have MTSAs that are UGC and KDAs as well as one that is partly located in a hamlet. Some of these MTSAs may have higher density than a local centre and some will not. The language in this section needs to be mindful of the extreme variation among these MTSAs. Accordingly, the intensification hierarchy needs to recognize the local context in terms of expectations for density of development over the long-term, from one growth area to the other. Furthermore, it would be helpful to indicate that this hierarchy is about prioritizing where growth should go, thereby indicating that priority of growth goes to the build out of those areas at the top of the hierarchy, which also helps to inform when and where Regional infrastructure planning over the 2051 planning horizon. To that end, there are several policy tweaks that should occur. Starting with this policy. It should read as: "That growth and development be directed to in accordance with the Regional intensification hierarchy outlined in policy 4.1.3...."	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
631	4	4.4.1	82	TRCA	4.4.1 - To improve the effectiveness of this policy, infrastructure must be considered in a state of good repair and directly linked to municipal asset management strategies. Further, opportunities to upgrade or alter existing infrastructure to provide green and blue options (e.g., urban street canopy, low impact development or “LIDs”), must be integrated into intensification options. The local municipalities are encouraged to do this through secondary planning options, or through site planning as appropriate. We recommend setting specific targets over time.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
632	4	4.4.1	82	City of Markham	Should the reference to subway stations in the third preamble paragraph be "Together with the areas surrounding subway stations"?	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
633	4	4.4.1.4	83	City of Vaughan	It would be difficult to mandate public facilitates within Regional Centres and along corridors. For example, Vaughan City Hall and Vaughan's new hospital are both located outside of the VMC and not along Highway 7. We cannot change the location of these facilities without a huge financial burden and local Council would need to make the decision on this. In addition, certain EMS services like hospitals are provided by the province, who are not required to go through planning processes. In this regard, it would be difficult to meet/ enforce this policy. The policy language needs to be softened to consider existing conditions or use language such as "highly encourage".	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
634	4	4.4.1.4	83	City of Markham	Consider replacing the phrase "shall be" with "should be".	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
635	4	4.4.1.5	83	City of Richmond Hill	Suggest restructuring the policy to encourage/direct these uses to locate in the Regional Centres, and then advocate for subsidies to encourage their location. Or alternatively, major office and institutional uses could be explicitly noted in Policy 4.4.1.6.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
636	4	4.4.1.6	83	City of Markham	For g) Question whether the long-term resident to employee target ratio of 1:1 for Regional Centres is realistic.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
637	4	4.4.2	84	City of Richmond Hill	Preamble - 5th Paragraph, where it states: "Each MTSA is unique with its own growth potential and will be planned based on local context and conditions to support and enhance the Regional intensification hierarchy." In addition to this being stated in the preamble, this should be its own policy in Section 4.4.2 to give it more weight. It is important that Council, local municipalities and proponents of development understand that each MTSA is unique, and will not be planned homogenously. This means that density will vary across each, and the MTSA designation does not and should not signify density is the only important factor when planning for MTSA's.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
638	4	4.4.1.6 i) (NEW)	83	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New sub policy to policy 4.4.1.6: "i. address the land use compatibility requirements in the Provincial Policy Statement"	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
639	4	4.4.2.1 c)	85	City of Richmond Hill	Does the Region expect that the whole of the MTSAs will be in the Regional Corridor designation of the lower-tier municipal Official Plans? This is not what was proposed when we worked to delineate them, as some included Neighbourhood areas that could support medium density development, such as townhouses.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
640	4	4.4.2.1 d) (NEW)	85	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New sub policy to policy 4.4.2.1: "d) land use compatibility with employment uses in proximity to the MTSA is also a consideration for boundary adjustments for MTSAs as currently delineated on Appendix 2."	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
641	4	4.4.2.2	85	MPLAN Inc	They should also allow for the creation of zero car households	Acknowledged
642	4	4.4.2.6	85	City of Vaughan	Please add "range of unit sizes and housing and tenure options".	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
643	4	4.4.2.6 (NEW)	85	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	Add a new section after 4.4.2.6 … (i.e. new 4.4.2.7): "That the introduction or intensification of sensitive land uses only occur where the long-term protection of employment facilities has been addressed per the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement."	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
644	4	4.4.2.7	85	Evans Planning	Suggestion that the provisions of policy 4.4.2.7, which state that a new MTSA area will only be approved through a Regional MCR, should be revised. - Specific to the subject property, the potential for a new GO Station north of Major Mackenzie Drive has been discussed on numerous occasions, and has been a consideration in both the prior approvals for our clients development applications, and as part of the ongoing Mount Joy Markham Road Corridor Secondary Plan Update - Delaying the establishment and delineation f new MTSA's until an MCR will delay the development process for these areas, which could have long term impacts on affordability, services, and traffic - We suggest an alternative protocol be established to ensure that new MTSAs are identified and delineated immediately upon being established	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
645	4	4.4.2.7	85	City of Markham	The Region should consider a scoped MCR to identify additional protected MTSAs in Markham should the Province agree to additional GO Stations at Denison Street and Major Mackenzie Drive East currently being explored through the Milliken and Markham Road - Mount Joy Secondary Plan Studies.	Acknowledged
646	4	4.4.23	80	City of Markham	Please refer to concerns raised above on policies 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.2.3.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
647	4	4.4.24	80	City of Markham	Please refer to concerns raised above on policies 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.2.3.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
648	4	4.4.2.8	86	City of Richmond Hill	Consider qualifying that the delineation of MTSAs as required in this policy is for monitoring purposes (since these areas could have more than one land use designation).	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
649	4	4.4.2.9	86	City of Vaughan	Please clarify if the "official plan and other implementation documents" referred to in policy 4.4.2.9 includes secondary plans or alternative development studies.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
650	4	4.4.2.9	86	City of Vaughan	Please consider revising the terminology in this policy as it appears to be inconsistent with other terminology used throughout the ROP.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
651	4	4.4.2.9	86	MPLAN Inc	Just how has the Region and local municipality implemented this type of policy to date? - As an example, the Yonge Bernard KDA zoning bylaw should be evaluated to see if it has appropriate zoning to implement the policies - which it does not. There is no provision for car share, carpooling etc.. and or zero car households.	Acknowledged
652	4	4.4.2.9	86	Malone Given Parsons	Remove maximum height and density policy requirements for MTSAs in policy 4.4.2.9 - 4.4.2.9 requires local municipalities identify max height and density policies within MTSAs. Enforcing this is more restrictive than the growth plan requirements, which only require a minimum density target. - It also results in additional growth pressures being distributed away from strategic growth areas	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
653	4	4.4.2.9	86	City of Markham	For j) please see comments to policies 2.3.2.2. and 2.3.2.3 which would apply here as well.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
654	4	4.4.2.9 d)	86	City of Vaughan	Please consider splitting this into two separate sub-policies (i.e.. one on mixed-use pedestrian environments and one on retaining employment).	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
655	4	4.4.2.9 f)	86	City of Vaughan	Consider adding at the end "and integrated into development in a manner consistent with the prevailing urban design criteria."	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
656	4	4.4.2.9 & 4.4.29	86	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	4.4.2.9: - Policy 4.4.29 contains similar policy related strategic growth areas. - Firstly, we seek clarification that such a policy will not preclude what could be considered interim development. - We are of the view that redevelopment of this expansive area will require several decades to come to fruition. A number of factors would suggest that development will be long term. - In the interim, it is imperative that the existing functions of the lands be supported, including by allowing for interim development type uses (i.e.., expansions to existing uses, new infill buildings, etc..). - We suggest that Policies 4.4.2.9 and 4.4.29 should add a subsection that would require municipalities to consider and plan for uses that could be considered as interim use	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
657	4	4.4.2.9 l) (NEW)	86	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New sub policy to policy 4.4.2.9: "l) Policies that prohibit the establishment of land uses and built forms that would adversely affect employment uses in proximity to the MTSA."	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
658	4	4.4.2.9 m) (NEW)	86	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	New sub policy to policy 4.4.2.9: "m) that the municipality will address the land use compatibility requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement including the demonstration of needs and alternatives when designating lands for a sensitive land use in proximity to major facilities."	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
659	4	4.4.2.10	86	City of Richmond Hill	This policy speaks to MTSAs that are not yet "Protected", however, there are no policies that speak to the balance of the MTSAs being "protected", nor is there any indication of what is meant by that "label." It is acknowledged that the definition of MTSA states that most are "protected", but it does not make reference to the Planning Act and it gives no indication of what is meant by stating it is 'protected.'	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
660	4	4.4.2.10	86	City of Vaughan	Please consider referring to the MTSAs in this policy as "future MTSAs" to provide clarity.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
661	4	4.4.2.10	86	City of Markham	For a) all MTSAs in Markham, including the subway stations on the Yonge North Subway Extension, should be identified as protected Major Transit Station Areas to enable the implementation of inclusionary zoning. This policy also appears to be inconsistent with draft policy 4.4.2.4 which refers to the "protected major transit stations areas identified on Map 1B", however Map 1B does not differentiate between protected and not protected MTSAs. Map 1B should be revised to indicate all MTSAs in York Region are protected MTSAs.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
662	4	4.4.3.5	88	City of Vaughan	Please consider revising this policy with an alternative term for the "missing middle".	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
663	4	4.5 (NEW)	89	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends that a new notwithstanding policy with respect to future growth and development within the Community of Ballantrae may be warranted pending the timing of the resolution of Official Plan Amendment 136 by the Ontario Land Tribunal, and the most appropriate water and wastewater solution to accommodate growth within the existing settlement area. In staff's view, the communal servicing policies as currently provided in the Draft ROP, are overly restrictive, and if not revised could limit the use of communal water and wastewater servicing systems. Refer to staff comments on S. 6.4.8.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
664	4	4.5.2	89	Township of King	4.5.2 - consider rewording policy to the following: ""That the local community plans for Towns and Villages may also include rural and agricultural designations within their boundaries. Any redesignation of agricultural and rural uses within the local community plan boundary to urban uses **shall only be considered at the time of the local municipality's conformity exercise with this Plan, and at the sole request of the local municipality**." ~~requires an expansion to the urban boundary through a Regional municipal comprehensive review~~"" - This policy revision would allow the appropriate local planning to occur, subsequent to the ongoing MCR and that any revisions to the Urban Area of Nobleton be at the sole request of the Township during the conformity exercise.	Acknowledged
665	4	4.5.5	90	Township of King	4.5.5 - Are these policies intended to apply to employment areas within Towns and Villages? Please clarify.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
666	4	4.6 (NEW)	91	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Should include similar policy to 4.2.1.16 to make it clear to allow and protect agricultural uses until urban development	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
667	4	4.6 (NEW)	91	Weston Consulting	Request for a new policy "4.6.5" be added to the draft ROP that direct Future Urban Areas be given priority at the time of the next Municipal Comprehensive Review to be added to the Urban Boundary of the ROP.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
668	4	4.6.1	91	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Should be that municipalities may identify future urban areas but that they cannot redesignate them until they area brought into the urban boundary through a regional MCR, i.e.. prime ag would be left as prime ag	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
669	4	4.6.3	91	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	The future urban area includes lands referred to as the whitebelt areas which are anticipated to accommodate growth beyond 2051. In staff's view, directing future expansions of the urban area to lands only identified as future urban area on Map 1B is overly restrictive and not consistent with provincial policy. Greater flexibility is required when contemplating future urban expansions that are appropriate to the community structure and local municipal needs. Furthermore, Provincial Plans allow the Region to contemplate settlement area expansions within the Greenbelt Plan Area and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Area subject to meeting the required criteria. - Staff recommends the policy be modified, to the effect of: 4.6.3 That expansions of the Urban Area, shall only be initiated by the Region, in consultation with local municipalities, as part of a Regional municipal comprehensive review in conformity with policies 2.2.8.2 and 2.2.8.3 of A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and shall generally be directed to lands identified as future urban area on Map 1B, or other areas in accordance with provincial policy.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
670	4	4.6.4	91	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Any expansions of the urban area of any size should not be permitted in advance of an MCR	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
671	4	4.3.1 (2010 YROP)	-	City of Markham	This policy states that the employment forecasts in Table 1 of this Plan be used as the basis for planning, etc.. Clarify why Table 1 is not referenced as the basis for planning for employment in the draft ROP.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
672	4	General	-	City of Richmond Hill	Some policies in the ROP talk about "best efforts" while others speak to "encourage"; and even further, some speak to "best efforts to encourage" (Policy 4.5.4(e)). Please clarify how will lower-tier municipalities implement these standards.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
673	4	General	-	City of Vaughan	Please ensure that community policies make room for employment areas that are not captured in the Regional Official Plan (i.e.. converted areas that local municipalities may want to keep as employment areas).	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
674	4	General	-	City of Vaughan	Please consider the opportunity to identify main streets as employment areas within this section of the ROP. We have faced challenges in the past to get resources for main streets because they lacked such designation.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
675	4	5.2.39 (2010 YROP) (NEW)	-	City of Markham	Clarify why this policy is being deleted as it provides for Regional support to local municipalities with information, resources and training to implement sustainable building policies. Also, a similar policy should be considered to support climate change policy implementation?	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
676	4	NEW	-	Town of East Gwillimbury	Town staff support that infrastructure and servicing be available prior to development proceeding and believe that having that policy alone in the YROP is sufficient to then allow the local municipality to be able to dictate and manage the detailed phasing and growth of new community areas	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
677	4	NEW	-	TRCA	Policies within Chapter 4 related to Future Urban Areas and Intensification exclude reference to protection of, and integration with, the Regional Greenlands System. We suggest including a policy outlining how the Regional Greenland System will be managed in the urban environment, to address the removal of policy 5.6.14 from the 2010 ROP.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
678	4	NEW	-	City of Vaughan	4.4.11 e) - Recognizing that affordable housing is governed at the upper tier level, through development applications, we have not seen any active approaches from the Regional level to require affordable housing through S.37 contributions. Please consider adding some policy language to require affordable housing through the review of development applications at the Region level, including criteria which affordable housing would be required, ownership models, etc..	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
679	5	5.0	93	York Region Federation of Agriculture	We would concur with this statement, however, supporting a vibrant agricultural community requires stronger protections to ensure that the amount of viable agriculture land is not reduced. - It would appear that the Region's proposed land use designations and policy framework continues to have the effect of reducing agricultural lands and the viability of the agricultural system. - The Region should be looking at its overall policies to ensure that stronger protections are in place for all agriculture lands and activities.	Acknowledged
680	5	5.0	93	York Region Federation of Agriculture	It appears that they are including all 3 designations in this calculation. In that case, using the word "protected" would only be applicable to the lands designated Agricultural and Holland Marsh Specialty Crop Areas. - The policies for lands designated Rural provide for many other uses and some without even the requirement for an agricultural impact assessment. - Rural permits agriculture but does not protect for it. - The level of protection is questionable at best.	Acknowledged
681	5	5.1	93	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add wording to the effect – Agriculture in York Region is more than locally produced and sold food products. It is also an integral part of the larger food system within the GTA, across the Province and internationally.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
682	5	5.1	94	York Region Federation of Agriculture	The location of the entire value chain including Urban Areas should be described even if the portions with the urban are not identified on the map.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
683	5	5.1	94	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro: - This supports what YRFA has been saying about the protecting ag lands in the greenbelt fingers - ag co-existing along growing communities. - There should be more policies developed from the Edge Planning Background report to speak to the urban/agriculture interface to ensure mitigation actions are put into place and recognize that they can effectively co-exist.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
684	5	5.1	95	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Objective - Policy 2.1.3 (Regional Structure) identifies the Regional Structure on Map 1A which includes the Hamlet designation, which recognizes smaller communities in the rural area where growth potential is limited. Notwithstanding, the Hamlet policies are included under Section 5 of the ROP, and it is staff's understanding that Hamlets are intended to comprise part of the 'Agricultural System'. In staff's view this raises confusion when interpreting Map 1 since the Hamlets are not identified, whereas they are currently identified on Map 1 in the current ROP. - Staff recommends that Hamlets continue to be identified on Map 1 consistent with all the settlement areas in the Region, and the associated policies be included in Section 4 of the ROP. In staff's view this would provide greater clarity and better assist in interpreting the Regional Structure and settlement hierarchy within the Region, and the role of Hamlets in accommodating more limited growth. - Furthermore, the policies of Section 5.1 should emphasize the importance of Hamlets and how they support the Agricultural System. Staff recommends that this be recognized in the Objective, which may be revised to the effect of: Objective: To protect the Agricultural System by supporting a productive and sustainable agricultural and rural land base and agri-food network, and the continued viability of Hamlets that support the agricultural system.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
685	5	5.1	94	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add Input Suppliers to the wording in the value chain list	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
686	5	5.1	94	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Reword - The York Farm Fresh map can be used to find local farm fresh products found on farms and farmers markets within York Region.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
687	5	5.1	94	York Region Federation of Agriculture	- Change first bullet to Sustains farms. - Remove 'and healthier' from the fourth bullet. - Remove the last bullet about food contamination	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
688	5	5.1.1	95	Township of King	5.1.1 - Should hamlets and mineral aggregate resource areas be included in this list as they are located within Chapter 5 (5.4 & 5.5). - Consider using numbering/roman numerals instead of bullets for lists	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
689	5	5.1.3	95	City of Vaughan	In Vaughan there are prime agricultural areas (as per the OMAFRA mapping) outside of the Greenbelt and ORMCP areas. Are there policies that support these areas, or are they all being identified as urban expansion areas? Please clarify.	Acknowledged
690	5	5.1.6	95	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that "and promote Environmental Farm Plans" be added to this policy.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
691	5	5.1.7	95	City of Vaughan	Suggest specifying what the permitted non-agricultural uses are.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
692	5	5.1.8	95	City of Vaughan	Is the Region reviewing Agricultural Impact Assessments? Through the current process, City staff have not been relying on Regional staff for agricultural review of AIAs. Please provide clarification so we can update processes. Also, the policy should also include municipalities as approval authority.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
693	5	5.1.8	95	Town of Georgina	The way the first part of the policy is worded, it gives the impression that residential uses are not permitted (i.e.. "excluded") in the Agricultural System? Conversely, does Policy 5.1.7 not permit residential uses? Confusing. Could benefit from rewording to make the intent more clear.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
694	5	5.1.8	95	Township of King	5.1.8 - Recommend restructuring 5.1.8 so that the requirement for an agricultural assessment is ahead of "if within the agricultural area designation", OR restructure to read as different requirements within the Agricultural Area designation vs. the Future Urban Area. - Also, are there any parameters for how to demonstrate compatibility for 5.1.8(d)?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
695	5	5.1.8	95	City of Vaughan	Please clarify if this policy only pertains to Regional projects.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
696	5	5.1.8	95	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Policy revision: 5.1.8 b.ii Alternative locations have been evaluated, and there are no reasonable alternative locations that avoid Prime Agricultural Areas; and there are no reasonable alternative locations in Prime Agricultural Areas with lower priority agricultural lands' c. An agricultural impact assessment be prepared to the satisfaction of the Region in accordance with Provincial and municipal guidelines by addressing the following elements: i. Adverse impacts on agricultural operations shall be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, shall be minimized and mitigated. Where mitigation is required, the mitigation measures should be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed; ii. Proposed use is appropriate in size….	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
697	5	5.1.9	96	City of Vaughan	Please considering adding "at a minimum" after "addressing the following elements".	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
698	5	5.1.9 b)	96	City of Vaughan	Please add "and policies" to the end of sub-policy (b) of policy 5.1.9.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
699	5	5.1.9 e)	96	Township of King	5.1.9 e) - should be separated into 2 bullet points; one for the Minimum Distance Separation Formulae, and one to require an Agricultural Impact Assessment	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
700	5	5.1.9 e)	96	City of Vaughan	Sub-policy (e) (iii) only focuses on Regional Greenlands System, however, there may be natural heritage features outside the Regional Greenlands System. Please consider including these in the policy to ensure that they are protected.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
701	5	5.1.9 e)	96	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Policy revision: e.and an agricultural impact assessment be prepared to the satisfaction of the Region in accordance with Provincial and municipal guidelines by addressing the following elements: i.Adverse impacts on agricultural operations shall be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, shall be minimized and mitigated. Where mitigation is required, the mitigation measures should be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed; ii.Proposed use is appropriate in size….	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
702	5	5.1.9 (NEW)	96	City of Vaughan	5.1.9 f) Please consider adding a sub-policy (f) to address Agricultural Impact Assessment requirements.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
703	5	5.1.12	96	City of Vaughan	Please confirm that the term Agricultural "System" should be used instead of "Area".	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
704	5	5.1.16	97	City of Vaughan	Please consider identifying the requirements for Source Protection Plans in this policy.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
705	5	5.1.20	97	City of Vaughan	Staff is supportive of this policy. It is suggested that "at a minimum" be added to the policy before the list of sub-policies.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
706	5	5.1.20 & 5.1.21	97	TRCA	5.1.20 and 5.1.21 – We suggest developing policies, strategies and programs that include urban agriculture and use more enabling language directing local municipalities to develop policies for urban agriculture to tie into PPS policies aimed at “preparing for the impacts of a changing climate”. For example, section 1.4, which speaks to creating “more opportunities to develop urban agriculture within the region.”	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
707	5	5.1.21	97	York Region Federation of Agriculture	h. change value-added operations to agriculture-related uses. - Add - identify and facilitate infrastructure development needed to support and enhance the Agricultural System	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
708	5	5.2	98	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Considerations for additional Objectives or policies: Objectives: -To protect the Prime Agricultural Area for long-term use for agriculture and maintain a continuous agricultural land base, minimizing fragmentation. -To protect agricultural uses in the Prime Agricultural Area from incompatible activities and land uses that would limit agricultural productivity or efficiency. -To provide flexibility to enable agricultural innovation and the adoption of new farming practices and to accommodate the development of agriculture-related uses and on–farm diversified uses in the Prime Agricultural Area. -To support and enhance the Agricultural System by addressing the impacts of development on the System through the planning process and by planning for local food and near-urban agriculture.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
709	5	5.2.2	98	Township of King	5.2.2 - Consider providing a provision that makes it clear that the policies of Section 3 also apply	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
710	5	5.2.5	99	City of Vaughan	Staff is supportive of this policy; however Vaughan does not have requirements at this time. The permitted uses guidelines identify criteria for the development of the farm dwellings. Please consider these as a reference.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
711	5	5.2.6	99	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that this policy be revised to also reference the Provincial Policy Statement in considering lot creation within the Agricultural Area outside of the Greenbelt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. - Staff recommends that additional policy guidance be provided to clarify what constitutes an 'existing residence that is surplus to a farming operation as a result of a farm consolidation' to ensure greater consistency across the Region when applying this policy (i.e.., criteria for what constitutes an 'existing residence' and a 'farm consolidation').	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
712	5	5.2.6 f)	99	City of Vaughan	Please clarify if 5.2.6 sub-policy (f) applies to farm help dwellings.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
713	5	5.2.7	99	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends that this policy be deleted as it is more restrictive than provincial policy. The Provincial Policy Statement provides for lot creation in prime agricultural areas for agriculture-related uses, provided that any new lot will be limited to a minimum size needed to accommodate the use and appropriate sewage and water services (S. 2.3.4.1 b).	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
714	5	5.3	100	Public	Rural Area Objective - why is the objective scoped to protect existing agricultural uses?	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
715	5	5.3	100	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Objective: Remove existing	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
716	5	5.3 (NEW)	100	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add a policy to that all non-agriculture uses adjacent to an agriculture require an agricultural impact assessment be prepared to the satisfaction of the Region in accordance with Provincial and municipal guidelines by addressing the following elements: i. Adverse impacts on agricultural operations shall be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, shall be minimized and mitigated. Where mitigation is required, the mitigation measures should be incorporated as part of the non- agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed;	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
717	5	5.3.1	100	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Add – to protect agricultural land in the Rural Area as an integral component of the Agricultural System	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
718	5	5.3.1 & 5.3.2	100	City of Vaughan	Map 1A identifies rural areas designation for lands within the Greenbelt Plan and ORMCP. These lands are within the urban settlement area and are primarily natural heritage lands. Please provide rationale for redesignating the lands outside of the linear valleys of the Greenbelt Plan Area i.e.. Kortright and ORM countryside.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
719	5	5.3.1 & 5.3.2	100	City of Vaughan	The preamble states "The Rural Area contains areas of environmental significance, including large portions of Natural Core Area and Natural Linkage Area of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.". Please clarify why only portions of the lands in eastern Vaughan (ORMCP) have been included, not others. This same comment applies to the lands in eastern Vaughan in the Green Belt as well.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
720	5	5.3.2 a)	100	City of Vaughan	This policy is overly permissive, particularly if the Region is contemplating expanding the Rural Area designation. The uses in sub-policy (a) may not be appropriate if we are acknowledging the NHS overlay of the Greenbelt Plan.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
721	5	5.3.2 c)	100	City of Richmond Hill	Hhaving unserviced parks and major recreational uses both permitted in the same sub-policy seems contradictory. There are many more caveats with respect to major recreation, it should be listed on its own with recognition of subject to meeting other policy requirements.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
722	5	5.3.2 c)	100	Township of King	5.3.2 c) - Clarity as to whether this refers to the Protected Countryside Designation of the Greenbelt Plan, or the Countryside designation of the ORMCP as the ORMCP does not have a Protected Countryside designation.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
723	5	5.3.2 c)	100	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Small-scale commercial, industrial and institutional uses are a permitted use within the Rural Area. Staff recommends that further policy guidance be provided as to what constitutes a small-scale commercial, industrial and institutional use to assist in implementing this policy and ensuring consistency across the Region. The ORMCP (S. 40) provides some general guidance as to what constitutes a small-scale commercial, industrial and institutional use. - The policy refers to the "Protected Countryside Designation of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan". This should be revised to the "Countryside Area Designation" as there is no Protected Countryside in the ORMCP. - Further clarification should be provided that home businesses, home industries and bed and breakfast establishments, are permitted accessory uses within the home, or accessory building where permitted. Alternatively, these uses could be defined as per Provincial policy.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
724	5	5.3.2 & 5.3.4 g)	100	Township of King	5.3.4 g) appears to contradict 5.3.2 a), which only permits recreational and tourist uses outside of the Regional Greenlands System.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
725	5	5.3.5	101	Township of King	5.3.5 - This policy refers back to policy 5.2.6 and may need to reference 5.2.5.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
726	5	5.3.5	101	City of Richmond Hill	Why is the rural lot creation policy defaulting to consent permissions for lands within the Prime Agricultural Area?	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
727	5	5.3.7	101	City of Markham	Consider amending policy 5.3.7 to replace the opening text, “That rural lands”, with a notwithstanding provision such as, “Notwithstanding the Rural Area designation in this Plan …”. Similarly, replace the text, “shall be identified in local official plans and protected for …”, with “these lands shall be designated in local official plans to protect for …”.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
728	5	5.3.7 & 5.3.8	101	Malone Given Parsons	Request for draft policies regarding permitted uses for rural lands within linear river valleys be clarified by combining policy 5.3.7 & 5.3.8 as follows: "5.3.7 That rural lands within the linear river valleys of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside shown on 1C, that are surrounded by the urbanizing Designated Greenfield Areas of Vaughan and Markham, per Map 1B, shall be identified in local official plans. Notwithstanding policy 5.3.2, permitted uses within the rural lands within the linear river valleys are limited to the following: a. Passive recreation; b. Environmental management, restoration, and enhancement; and c. Compatible urban agricultural uses; d. Recreational and parklands in accordance with the Greenbelt Plan and local municipal secondary plans on the basis of appropriate technical studies and natural systems planning."	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
729	5	5.4	102	Humphries Planning Group Inc	Request to discuss hamlet policies.	Acknowledged
730	5	5.4.3	102	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- The policy speaks to 'limit future growth to minor infilling in Hamlets'. While this may be appropriate for some Hamlets, the character of each Hamlet and development opportunities within the settlement area vary substantially, particularly in the case of Vandorf and Gormley, which are a focus of employment growth within the Town, and comprise larger vacant development parcels which are designated for growth. - Staff recommends the policy be revised to the effect of: 5.4.3 That local official plans shall provide policies that limit future growth to minor infilling in Hamlets, and through the development of vacant and underutilized lots, ...	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
731	5	5.4.3, 5.4.4 & 5.4.6	102	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Greater flexibility should be provided for new development on communal systems within Hamlets to provide greater flexibility and accommodate appropriate servicing solutions within Hamlets. - The requirement for servicing only by individual private on-site water and wastewater systems is overly restrictive, in light of the recent changes to the Provincial Policy Statement, as per S. 1.6.6.3: "Where municipal sewage services and municipal water services are not available, planned or feasible, private communal sewage services and private communal water services are the preferred form of servicing for multi- unit/lot development to support protection of the environment and minimize potential risks to human health and safety." The use of individual on-site sewage services and individual on-site water services may be considered in instances where municipal sewage services and municipal water services or private communal sewage services and private communal water services are not available, planned or feasible (S. 1.6.6.4). - Furthermore, in staffs view, the servicing limitation is contrary to Regional Council endorsed policy directions with respect to employment development (Regional Official Plan Update Policy Directions Report, March 2021) that directs: "Permitting private communal systems for employment developments on an interim basis until full municipal serving is available". - Furthermore, these policies appear contrary to Policy 6.4.6, which may permit employment uses on private communal systems, subject to certain criteria. To ensure consistency with provincial policy, staff recommends that the reference to "by individual private on- site water and wastewater systems" be deleted and replaced with "in accordance with provincial policy."	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
732	5	5.4.4	102	TRCA	5.4.4 - This policy should be revised to discourage development within KNHFs and KHFs. At minimum, it should be demonstrated through appropriate studies that there will be no negative impacts to the features or their functions. We recommend revising the text to: "That small-scale structures for recreational uses (such as boardwalks, footbridges, fences, **and** docks **may be** permitted within key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features **so long as they** meet the provisions of the Regional Greenlands System in Chapter 3 **and it can be demonstrated that there will be no** negative impacts on these features through an appropriate study."	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
733	5	5.4.6	102	City of Richmond Hill	Suggest inserting the words "subject to applicable Provincial Plans" before the words "local official plan consent policies" because the Gormley Hamlet in Richmond Hill is also subject to the policies of the ORMCP and the applicable lot creation policies set out in that Plan.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
734	5	5.4.6	102	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- In addition to consents, development within Vandorf, Gormley and Bloomington, has, and will continue to occur through Draft Plans of Subdivision, which should also be contemplated and recognized in the ROP. - Staff recommends that the policy be revised as follows: 5.4.6 That ~~consents lot creation may be permitted in Hamlets, subject to local official plan consent policies...~~	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
735	5	5.4.7	102	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- It is uncertain as to how this policy is intended to be implemented or assessed and why it only addresses an increase in the number of residents. - Furthermore, policy 5.4.3 directs limited growth within Hamlets, and the rural nature of the Town's Hamlets vary between Hamlets. In staff's view, Hamlets can still retain a rural character while accommodating more limited growth. Staff recommends that this policy be deleted.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
736	5	5.4.8	102	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff supports maintaining this policy as it recognizes the additional growth planned to occur in Vandorf in accordance with the Town's Secondary Plan and an appropriate servicing solution.	Acknowledged
737	5	5.5.1	103	City of Vaughan	York Region staff provided us a link to the Provincial mapping, and the mapping does now show any active mineral aggregate sites in Vaughan.	Acknowledged
738	5	5.5.7 & 5.5.20	104	City of Richmond Hill	Policies 5.5.7 and 5.5.20 seem to be saying the same thing - do they apply to different areas within the Provincial plans?	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
739	5	5.5.9 & 5.5.10	104	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff is concerned that these policies may pose an implementation issue as the approvals are provided by the Province.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
740	5	5.5.11	104	City of Richmond Hill	Why is a zoning by-law amendment required for portable asphalt plants in Policy 5.5.11? And what does this policy have to do with petroleum (as it references Policy 5.5.21)?	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
741	5	5.5.14 & 5.5.15	104	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	These policies suggest that aggregate resource areas be utilized as transfer sites. Staff's recommendation is that this type of use does not allow accumulation of recycled material on the site. Any net accumulation of recycled aggregates on a site on an annual basis should be considered as dumped/waste material.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
742	5	5.5.15	105	City of Richmond Hill	How is this policy intended to be implemented? While it may direct public (municipal) developments, how would the policy be implemented for private ones in terms of recovering and recycling manufactured materials?	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
743	5	5.5.16	105	Township of King	5.5.16 - what rehabilitation measures are proposed/considered to be in conformity with the ROP?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
744	5	5.5.16	105	York Region Federation of Agriculture	All rehab should be to a state that the lands can be used for agricultural purposes	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
745	5	5.5.18	105	City of Richmond Hill	The ROP defers to provincial plans for details regarding proper extraction and rehabilitation of sites of mineral aggregate operations and wayside pits. This is not a user-friendly way to provide directions for land use. The ROP should give details on the policies of the provincial plans.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
746	5	NEW	-	City of Markham	Consider adding a new policy to confirm that infrastructure across the green fingers meets the intent of policy 4.2.1 in the Greenbelt Plan.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
747	6	6.0	107	City of Richmond Hill	Preamble - Move away from "alternative" or "other" language when describing low-carbon mobility options, as it situates them subconsciously within the dominant car-centric transportation paradigm. Consider "more sustainable" (also used on page 112) or "low carbon" in this case, as the previous sentence references climate change. Possible use of "sustainable modes" as this document outlines at the bottom of page 109. We suggest that the Region review this and make changes where applicable, throughout the document.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
748	6	6.0	107	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro: - Add – the protection of Prime Agriculture Areas and Holland Marsh Specialty Crop Area. - Add a requirement for an Agricultural Impact Assessment.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
749	6	6.1.1	109	City of Richmond Hill	"…addressing impacts of a changing climate…" this phrasing makes it sound like transportation is primarily focused on climate adaptation. Could the sentence also make it clear that transportation is key to climate mitigation?	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
750	6	6.1.1 (NEW)	109	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is only briefly mentioned in the draft ROP (part of 6.1.1.1). It warrants a policy of its own. - Modeling by York Region using its Activity Based Model shows that work-from-home and peak-shaving have a huge effect on road demand.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
751	6	6.1.1.1	109	City of Richmond Hill	The Region may want to use the term "sustainable mobility measures" in order to capture micro mobility in this policy. Also, shouldn't the Region's Transportation Master Plan be mentioned here? And also an acknowledgement of the Region's role as the transit authority?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
752	6	6.1.1.1	109	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	This policy could be interpreted to require an assessment and implementation of TOM with any development application, which may be excessive for minor development applications, including but not limited to consent and minor site plan applications. Staff recommends, that the policy be revised to include reference to 'major' development applications, or 'where identified by the local municipality'.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
753	6	6.1.1.2	109	City of Markham	It is unclear what parking monitoring will consist of. Typically parking standards are under the local municipalities' jurisdiction.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
754	6	6.1.1.3	109	City of Richmond Hill	Please elaborate how the proponent would fulfill this policy; the current wording is too broad. Also, consider adding the words: "to the satisfaction of the Region" at the end of this policy.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
755	6	6.1.1.3	109	Town of Georgina	Similar comment as noted above for Policy 2.3.17 and 2.3.18. Development is an all-encompassing term. It would be unrealistic to require a proponent to demonstrate how a proposed severance for one lot, or a minor variance application, supports a transit system for all users. Needs flexibility for minor applications or add in the term "where appropriate".	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
756	6	6.1.1.6	109	MPLAN Inc	A key driver to achieving the non-auto mode split will be the creation zero car households.	Acknowledged
757	6	6.1.2.3	110	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	While water re-use has to be part of our water and wastewater systems moving forward, there are some notes of caution about the overall objective in S 6.1.2.3 - This policy appears to address the issue of communal systems: 6.4.7 - Go further in 6.1.2.1 by committing to full cost pricing of water and wastewater services.	Acknowledged
758	6	6.1.2.4	110	TRCA	Consider adding to Policy 6.1.2.4 to ensure that plans for servicing incorporate conservation strategies and the protection of the natural environment including key natural heritage and key hydrologic features, subject to other policies of this Plan.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
759	6	6.1.2.4	110	York Region Federation of Agriculture	- Add – the protection of Prime Agriculture Areas and Holland Marsh Specialty Crop Area. - Add a requirement for an Agricultural Impact Assessment	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
760	6	6.1.2.4 (NEW)	110	City of Vaughan	6.1.2 - Please clarify/add policies to describe the Region's preferences regarding wastewater servicing. Please consider adding policies such as: "It is the policy of Council...To first pursue wastewater contribution reductions through Inflow and Infiltration reduction and the promotion of efficient plumbing fixtures to minimize the amount of Regional wastewater servicing infrastructure that is required" and then, "It is the policy of Council...To ensure that wastewater servicing capacity is forecasted and corresponding infrastructure upgrades are constructed to ensure that Regional wastewater servicing capacity does not become the limiting factor for population growth in member municipalities"	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
761	6	6.2	111	City of Markham	As noted in the comments to Chapter 2, consider speaking to all the pillars of sustainability (i.e.., environmental, social and fiscal) in the objectives and policies, which currently emphasize fiscal sustainability.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
762	6	6.2.2	111	TRCA	6.2.2 – We suggest the Region consider introducing stormwater fees as other GTA municipalities have done (e.g., Mississauga), to address inequities and to promote funding of retrofit opportunities.	Acknowledged - Beyond Regional planning jurisdiction
763	6	6.2.3	111	City of Richmond Hill	What does Policy 6.2.3(d) mean? Are there specific policies that this is referencing? Request to make the language more clear and simple.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
764	6	6.2.3	111	Town of Georgina	Staff support this policy.	Acknowledged
765	6	6.2.3	111	City of Markham	For c), clarify how often monitoring and adjusting the timing of infrastructure delivery would be undertaken. For d) clarify how this will be implemented so that the Region can deliver infrastructure in alignment with growth. Also, consider updating the policy to include and address MZOs.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
766	6	6.2.4	111	City of Markham	Clarify how frequently the review and coordination of the delivery of Regional services with local municipalities will take place, in what format, etc.. Also, clarify how the Region's infrastructure program would be adjusted to reflect the outcome of the review.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
767	6	6.3 (NEW)	112	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	We recommend the following policy language be inserted within section 4.2 – Community Areas and/or 6.3 – Goods Movement: "To require local municipalities to plan for and develop employment and non-sensitive land uses near and adjacent to major goods movement facilities and corridors that are major facilities to serve as a transitional buffer with sensitive uses to ensure land use compatibility."	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
768	6	6.3.1 (NEW)	112	City of Vaughan	6.3.1 - It is suggested that a new policy be added to 6.3.1 - "to work with local municipalities to determine the operation and maintenance responsibilities for the Regional Cycling Network and other cycling facilities within the Regional right-of-way."	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
769	6	6.3.1 (NEW)	112	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- The Town's current Leisure and Community Services Master Plan recommends that opportunities to create linkages with the wider trail network (i.e.., within the Rouge National Urban Park network, neighbouring municipalities) be explored as a means to support a more active and engaged community, increase tourism potential, and enhance municipal partnerships. On February 16, 2022 Council passed a motion to direct staff to undertake discussions with Parks Canada, York Region, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and other stakeholders to explore the feasibility of creating linkages and expanding the Town's trail system with a focus on connectivity. The Town is in the process of updating the current Leisure and Community Services Master Plan. - Staff recommends that a policy be included in the ROP which expressly supports the establishment of linkages and trail network within and connecting to the Rouge National Park by supporting discussions with key stakeholders.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
770	6	6.3.1.4	112	City of Vaughan	This policy should also require cycling facilities in addition to sidewalks, streetlighting and street furniture.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
771	6	6.3.1.5	112	MPLAN Inc	The Bernard bus terminal is adjacent to the site. Is it staying or moving?	Acknowledged
772	6	6.3.1.10	113	Town of Georgina	It is the Town's understanding that part of the Lake to Lake Trail, as per Map 9A, is located on local Town roads (i.e.. Lake Drive South, Lake Drive North). What are the impacts on the Town's local road system as a result of a Regional Trail? What is required of the Town for this portion of the trail? Why is a Regional cycling trail not located entirely on the Regional roads system? Further discussion with the Town is required.	Acknowledged
773	6	6.3.1.6	113	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy be made more general beyond "including pedestrian and cycling connections" to pedestrian and cycling supportive infrastructure. If this is appropriate, additional infrastructure listed could also include: dedicated short and long- term bicycle parking, shower and change facilities, bicycle wash stations, etc..	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
774	6	6.3.2	115	TRCA	6.3.2 - We recommend the Region commit continuing to integrate transit infrastructure into regional road projects, whereby a road widening will accommodate future busways, which in turn can be converted to Light Rapid Transit routes if and when travel demand requires the transition. By building the footprint for such expansions, impacts on the environment are reduced as further encroachments may not be needed.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
775	6	6.3.2 (NEW)	114	City of Markham	Consider adding new policies in this section that speak to integrating: - mobility-as-a-service (e.g., ride-share and ride-hailing) at rapid transit stations; and - Regional and local active transportation networks to connect to all transit stops including rapid transit stations and regular bus stops.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
776	6	6.3.2.3	115	MPLAN Inc	Does the transit network contemplate a break in the BRT line north of the existing station box at Yonge Bernard. Regional Staff claim they can cause a break in the BRT whenever they decide.	Acknowledged
777	6	6.3.2.4 d)	115	City of Vaughan	Please consider also including MTSAs.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
778	6	6.3.2.5	115	City of Richmond Hill	How would this preferential treatment of transit align with accommodation of cyclists and micro mobility users? Suggestion to acknowledge this within policy.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
779	6	6.3.2.6 c)	115	TRCA	6.3.2.6 c) - – We recommend including wayfinding to the list of measures to be provided.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
780	6	6.3.2.7	116	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that this policy should read "To require local municipalities to, subject to available funding:". Implementation should be premised on the availability of financial resources rather than a mandatory requirement from the Region.	Acknowledged
781	6	6.3.3	117	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Intro: Add farm equipment	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
782	6	6.3.3.3	118	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Support for policy 6.3.3.3 - Arterial Road Widening - We note that there are fewer planned widenings (to 6 lanes) than in the 2016 ROP. This is a positive step forward, as wider roads induce more car travel, have negative impacts to communities and environment, and are costly.	Acknowledged
783	6	6.3.3.4	118	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that the cross-section image be updated with in-boulevard cycling facilities, or otherwise removed to not indicate a preferred type of cycling facilities on rapid transit corridors.	Acknowledged
784	6	6.3.3.4	118	City of Richmond Hill	The typical rapid transit corridor cross-section should also include in-boulevard bike lane options.	Acknowledged
785	6	6.3.3.4	118	City of Markham	Consider revising the figure under this policy to include an in-boulevard rather than on-road cycling facility.	Acknowledged
786	6	6.3.3.5	118	City of Richmond Hill	Policy 6.3.3.5 speaks to 6-lane Regional streets, however Map 11 provides streets with varying widths; is there a way that these can be reconciled?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
787	6	6.3.3.5	118	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Policy 6.3.3.5 requires HOV lanes and cycling facilities on 6-lane roads based on established thresholds. It is important that these thresholds are not onerous, as 6 lanes of general purpose travel is not what our communities want	Acknowledged
788	6	6.3.3.11	119	City of Markham	Clarify if the change to a 41 m right-of-way will result in inconsistencies with development applications where 43 m was required for the right-of-way.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
789	6	6.3.3.16	119	City of Vaughan	Please note that Vaughan Council does not currently support implementation of the GTA West Corridor and therefore Council is unlikely to support official plan policies that provide corridor protection for this Corridor.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
790	6	6.3.3.16	119	City of Markham	It seems the reference should be to Map 11 rather than Map 10. Also, the policy makes reference to interchanges and ramp extensions which should also be shown on Map 11.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
791	6	6.3.3 (NEW)	120	City of Vaughan	6.3.3 - Suggest a new policy similar to policies 6.3.3.22 and 6.3.3.25, which states that the Region will identify funding partners for, and subject to identification of secured funding, will implement the Langstaff Road extension between Creditstone Road and Keele Street over the CN MacMillan Yard.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
792	6	6.3.3.17 & 6.3.3.20	120	City of Vaughan	In principle, staff support these policies to provide finer grid street networks through the local municipality's collector and local street system. However, continuous networks are not always implementable in areas with significant natural heritage resources, heritage areas, etc.. without substantial financial investment. Therefore, implementation should be premised on the availability of financial resources rather than a mandatory requirement from the Region.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
793	6	6.3.3.20 & 6.3.3.23	120	MPLAN Inc	This policy is a nonstarter for the NEC site and many other sites. - Traditional public roads waste land in intensification areas and support increased vehicular use, not the opposite.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
794	6	6.3.3.21	120	City of Vaughan	Please note that Vaughan Council does not currently support implementation of the GTA West Corridor and therefore Council is unlikely to support official plan policies that provide corridor protection for this Corridor.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
795	6	6.3.3.27	120	City of Richmond Hill	Ppolicy 6.3.3.27 seems to conflict with policies in Section 3 which requires "no alternative test" for infrastructure; should reconcile these policies as it relates to Key Natural Heritage Features and Key Hydrologic Features.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
796	6	6.3.4 (NEW)	121	City of Vaughan	6.3.4 - It is suggested that a new policy be inserted that says, "to work with local municipalities to identify existing areas adjacent to Regional roads with land uses which are sensitive to noise, vibration and safety issues, and discourage heavy truck traffic from using these segments of Regional roads."	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
797	6	6.3.4.2	121	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	Revise policy 6.3.4.2 removing reference to "Intermodal Yards". - We recommend that clarity be added to this policy to ensure that new developments are required to meet the PPS requirements for land use compatibility and an OPA would be required to locate sensitive land uses near a Major Facility	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
798	6	6.3.4.2 (NEW)	121	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	We recommend an additional policy below 6.3.4.2 (i.e.. a new 6.3.4.3) as follows: "To avoid the location of sensitive land uses in proximity to major facilities (i.e.. freight rail yards), that new or expanded sensitive land uses be prohibited within 300 m of major facilities. If a sensitive land use is proposed a local Official Plan Amendment will be required to address the following: a. Require that the planning and development of sensitive land uses near or adjacent to major facilities be done in accordance with the PPS and provincial guidelines, standards and procedures, including assessing the need and alternative locations for the proposed sensitive land use, b. Ensure that noise, odour, vibration, safety issues and other land use compatibility matters are addressed for development adjacent to rail facilities and corridors, and; c. Ensure the long-term operation of the facility."	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
799	6	6.3.5	123	Public	Consider whether sensitive land uses should be permitted on lands within the proposed Pickering Airport's approach areas in Markham and Whitchurch-Stouffville.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
800	6	6.3.5	123	Public	The policies of Section 6.3.5 - Airports, effectively protect for a future airport in Pickering, Ontario	Acknowledged
801	6	6.3.5	122	Region of Durham	Federal Airport Lands: - Draft ROP policies recognize that it is important to ensure that new development or changes to existing development of not conflict with the operations of the proposed Pickering Airport (6.3.5) - Draft Airport policies ensure that development of residential or other sensitive land uses will occur in accordance with any Provincial Federal requirements to protect the Pickering Airport (6.3.5.6) - Support: The draft policies align with Durham Region's current policy framework related to the Federal Airport Lands in Pickering	Acknowledged
802	6	6.3.5.5	123	City of Richmond Hill	Please clarify this policy further. The terms "vicinity" is too general. Does this mean 150m, 250m, 500 metres within the "vicinity" of the airport? or would 5km away still be considered "vicinity". If you were to apply Airport Zoning Regulations, the "Outer Surface Area" alone extends several kilometers out from airport approach surfaces, hence this policy needs to be revised to be more specific.	Acknowledged
803	6	6.3.5.6	123	City of Richmond Hill	Why is policy 6.3.5.6 only limited to the Pickering Airport? The Provincial Policy Statement about airports also speaks to Noise Exposure Forecast / Noise Exposure Projection contours; why are those policies not addressed in the ROP?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
804	6	6.3.5.7	123	City of Markham	While staff generally support the intent of the employment mapping and site specific policy for the Toronto Buttonville Airport lands, there is concern that the policy may not conform to the Growth Plan as it could be interpreted as permitting an employment conversion outside of an MCR. City staff also recommend minor revisions to the draft ROP policy 6.3.5.7 as shown in **bold**: "That the Toronto Buttonville Airport lands are designated for business park use in the City of Markham Official Plan, including permission to operate an airport. When airport operations at the Buttonville Airport cease, the significant majority of the subject lands shall be retained for business park use, and the balance for a mix of urban uses. The City of Markham, in consultation with the Region, will determine ~~**the details of the final extent of employment designation** for future use of these lands through an implementing secondary plan process. ensuring that the significant majority of the lands are retained for business park use.~~	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
805	6	6.4	124	D.J.K. Land Use Planning	Suggestion to add a modified policy exception to Section 6.4 Water and Waste Water Servicing, of the draft ROP to allow a municipal water and/or sanitary sewer connection outside of urban service boundaries.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
806	6	6.4	124	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Stop advocating for the UYSS and discharging to Lake Simcoe using unproven offsets.	Acknowledged
807	6	6.4	124	City of Markham	The Region should consider the lowest total life cycle costs to both the Region and Local Municipalities, and ultimately York Region's residents when following Region's policy.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
808	6	6.4.3	124	City of Markham	Clarify how this policy applies to plans of subdivision, site plans, etc.., associated with MZO applications. Markham has a number of MZOs where plans of subdivision and site plan applications will be submitted for locations where there are no regional water and wastewater services in place, and the Region's Water and Wastewater Master Plan update has not shown any planned regional infrastructure to 'ensure that water and waste water services will be available prior to occupancy'.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
809	6	6.4.5	125	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that this policy is also applicable to the Community of Stouffville which has full municipal services and yet is identified as a "Town and Village". As per previous comments, staff recommends that the Community of Stouffville be identified as an Urban Area given the significant growth allocated and planned to 2051. - Furthermore, staff recommends that the policy be revised to include "To provide full municipal water and wastewater servicing in a timely manner to accommodate growth...", particularly in instances where planning and development approvals are in place.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
810	6	6.4.7	125	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	6.4.7 If one of the communal systems now permitted by the province fails, or if the owner, strata or condominium corporation becomes insolvent, the system becomes a liability for municipalities. - We urge York Region to get ahead of this by proposing even more specific Official Plan language that would ensure that resources must be available for maintenance and repair, and that adequate funds are collected by the Region to prepare for this burden should it become necessary. - This provincial policy change has massive potential pitfalls, especially for small municipalities hungry for development, and lacking in staff capacity	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
811	6	6.4.8	125	City of Markham	Clarify if the "employment uses" referred to in this policy are the same uses permitted in both core and supporting employment areas as proposed in chapter 4. For b), suggest this should also specify to the satisfaction of local municipalities since the intent is to connect to municipal services as part of the municipal system.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
812	6	6.4.8	125	City of Richmond Hill	Does this policy need to clarify that the "employment uses" that are referred here need to be occurring within the settlement area?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
813	6	6.4.8	125	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Further to our comments on Section 5.4 (Hamlets), in staff's view the private communal water and servicing policies are too restrictive, and not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. Staff strongly disagrees with these proposed servicing requirements, as it will greatly impede the Town's ability to consider more appropriate forms of communal servicing, within our existing settlement areas that do not provide for full municipal services, as directed by the PPS. Staff recommends that greater flexibility be provided to consider opportunities for the use of private communal water and servicing policies within the Town's Hamlets and Ballantrae (Town and Village). - Staff recommends that the ROP should align and be consistent with the policies of the PPS which provide that - see PPS 1.6.6.1 & 1.6.6.3 - As such, staff recommends that this policy be revised to read: 6.4.8 That multi-unit/lot development employment uses may be permitted on an interim basis to use private communal water and sewage services, where full municipal services are not available, planned or feasible, planned, subject to the following:..."	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
814	6	6.4.20	126	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff recommends this policy be revised as follows: 6.4.20 To require local municipalities to implement mandatory connection to municipal wastewater systems, where they exist and based on available capacity, in vulnerable areas of a Wellhead Protection Area and/or Intake Protection Zone where individual on-site sewage systems have been identified as a significant drinking water threat.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
815	6	6.4.10	125	City of Markham	Clarification is needed on the intent of this policy. This policy has been modified from the 2010 Regional Official Plan from requiring local official plans to identify regional wastewater treatment plants and appropriate buffer areas according to Provincial guidelines, to requiring local official plans to also identify regional wells, water treatment plants, and private communal water and sewage systems, which may not be feasible.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
816	6	6.4.23	126	City of Vaughan	This is a good policy. However, this policy could be strengthened by revising the language slightly. For example, "That water and wastewater systems be sized to consider potential expansion of the service area, intensification, and increased servicing allocation from what is described in York Region Official Plans, York Region Master Plans, local municipal official plans and Provincial Plans".	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
817	6	6.4.1	127	City of Markham	Remove the word “from contamination” in the objective statement since “water quality” covers all types of contamination. The current objective does not provide water quantity protection because of the use of the wording “from contamination”.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
818	6	6.5	130	City of Markham	(Preamble, second paragraph) The projected impacts of climate change also include the increased frequency of storms. Add the word "frequency" to the second sentence in the second paragraph. At the end of the second paragraph, add "prevent future or downstream flooding" since stormwater management is more about managing the increase in stormwater (from development, climate change, etc..) at the source to prevent downstream flooding, erosion, etc.. (Preamble, third paragraph) Without proper treatment, stormwater can only be used/re-used for non- potable purposes. (Objective) Consider adding meeting the latest relevant SWM guidelines to the objective.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
819	6	6.5	130	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	We are pleased to see what appears to be full cost recovery for the full lifecycle and maintenance of stormwater systems in S 6.5.6. - It is appropriate to note in S 6.5 that the Lake Simcoe watershed has specific development and stormwater management guidelines.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
820	6	6.5.1	130	TRCA	6.5.1 [Updated, former policy 2.3.40] To support and work in partnership with local municipalities, the Province, conservation authorities and other agencies in the implementation of stormwater management initiatives, so that new stormwater management facilities be designed to reduce the risk of contaminating drinking water and that the stormwater drainage should not reduce downstream water quality, including total suspended solids, oils, total phosphorus and temperature.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
821	6	6.5.1	130	City of Markham	Consider revising this policy to speak to flooding, specifically downstream flood protection, as it currently focuses on water quality.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
822	6	6.5.2	130	City of Markham	Revise this policy to speak to the use of quantity and quality controls when designing stormwater management facilities. The current policy only suggests quality control requirements (e.g., “reduce risk of contamination”).	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
823	6	6.5.3	131	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Stormwater management infrastructure should be required to locate within urban area that it is servicing. - If adjacent to an agriculture use then such infrastructure should be subject to an Agriculture Impact Assessment	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
824	6	6.5.4 & 6.5.5	131	City of Richmond Hill	It seems that these policies should be rolled into the other Master Environmental Servicing Plan policies of the ROP to minimize repetition and avoid loss of information.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
825	6	6.5.4 & 6.5.5	131	MPLAN Inc	The Region has not insisted that this work be done by the City of RH, as part of the Yonge Bernard KDA.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
826	6	6.5.5 & 6.5.7	131	TRCA	6.5.5 & 6.5.7 - We suggest including that the recommendations from watershed and subwatershed plans should also be considered.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
827	6	6.5.7	131	City of Vaughan	With the recent changes to the Conservation Authorities Act, a municipality doesn't have to use/work with a CA to develop master plans. A city could simply choose to hire a consultant to do this work instead. A CA does not have approval authority on master plans. In such processes they are a stakeholder no different than any other party. CA's hold power mostly only in the permitting part of the process, and even then only with their regulated boundaries. It is suggested that the wording of this policy be revised: "and the conservation authorities' be replaced with "and the conservation authorities, in accordance with the Conservation Authority Act, ... ".	No change - adequately addressed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
828	6	6.5.9	131	Malone Given Parsons	We request that the OP encourage combined stormwater and park facilities and recommend that lower-tier municipalities provide parkland credit for usable parklands above stormwater tanks - Given the MTSA density targets proposed, and prioritization of parks and open space, large suburban parks and SWM ponds should be combined to provide efficient use of lands - Facilities should be supported at the regional level as they are an innovative approach to implementing multiple Regional Priorities	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
829	6	6.7.2	134	TRCA	6.7.2 - Please note that the "GTA West" project is now officially referred to by the Province as “Highway 413”. The text of the ROP should reflect this recent change.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
830	6	6.7.7	134	City of Markham	Clarify the intent of this policy, and consider replacing "require" with “encourage”. Also, clarify what "open access conduit" refers to.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
831	6	6.7.10	135	City of Richmond Hill	In addition to design, it might be prudent to consider the phasing and expansion of on-site renewable/alternative energy infrastructure and future connections to coincide with the phasing of development blocks and other servicing infrastructure.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
832	6	6.7.11	135	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Should require an Agriculture Impact Assessment if adjacent to an agriculture use.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
833	6	6.7.11	135	City of Markham	Is the intent of the text, “Local municipalities shall specify in detail where renewable energy projects will be permitted.”, to provide the detail for permissions for renewable energy projects in updating of zoning by-laws? Are other planning instruments contemplated by the Region?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
834	6	6.8 (NEW)	135	MHBC (TransCanada Pipeline)	Add a new subsection titled "6.8 Pipeline Infrastructure" with the following policies: 6.8.1 TransCanada Pipelines Limited (“TCPL”) operates high pressure natural gas pipelines within its rights-of-way crossing the Region as well as an industrial compressor station and is identified on Map 1, Regional Structure and Map 1B, Urban Overlays. 6.8.2 As major utility corridors and a major facility, the rights-of-way and compressor station shall be protected for current and projected needs. 6.8.3 Development resulting in increased population density in proximity to TCPL’s rights-of-way and compressor station may result in TCPL being required to replace its pipeline(s). Early consultation with TCPL or its designated representative, for any development proposals within 200 metres of its pipelines and within 750 metres of TCPL’s compressor station should be undertaken to ensure TCPL can assess potential impacts and provide recommendations to avoid adverse impacts to its facilities. 6.8.4 TCPL is federally regulated through the Canadian Energy Regulator Act and its associated Regulations. The Act defines a Prescribed Area of 30 metres on either side of the pipeline and requires authorization for ground disturbances and crossings within this Prescribed Area. TCPL will incorporate setback requirements identified in codes and standards as part of its authorization through written consent. TCPL should be consulted early in the land use, subdivision and development process to confirm all requirements. 6.8.5 Notwithstanding Section 6.7.6, throughout any built up areas, the TCPL’s right-of-way should be limited to municipal open space uses.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
835	6	7.2.16 (2010 YROP) NEW	-	City of Markham	Clarify why this policy was not carried forward in the draft ROP. It is recommended that it be included.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
836	6	7.2.58 (2010 YROP) NEW	-	City of Markham	Clarify why this policy was not carried forward in the draft ROP. It is recommended that it be included.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
837	6	General	-	TRCA	TRCA recommends adding policies that promote mitigation measures to reduce both regional and local road impacts on wildlife through various measures (e.g. Eco passages, fencing, road closures, speed limits, signage, etc..).	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
838	6	General	-	TRCA	Consider a reference to natural hazards, avoidance and mitigation of risk.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
839	6	General	-	City of Richmond Hill	We suggest to embed micro mobility more prominently and define it within this policy. Micro mobility is referenced within this document, and it should be recognized alongside other low-carbon modes. The City's draft TMP Update mobility hierarchy recognizes Micro mobility as electrified versions of active transportation modes, such as e-scooters, e-bikes, and cargo e-bikes.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
840	6	General	-	Malone Given Parsons	We ask that the Official Plan include text to provide guidance on how planned development can proceed if Metrolinx does not commit to doing new studies for the Bolton Line; especially if there are other viable station sites available at the intersection(s) identified by the Region's Transit Map.	Acknowledged
841	6	General	-	City of Markham	Please refer to comments on the York Region Transportation Master Plan update provided to Markham’s Development Services Committee on February 15, 2022.	Acknowledged
842	6	NEW	-	City of Vaughan	6.4.1 - It is suggested that a new subsection, 6.5 Source Protection, be created. Please consider combining the Source Protection policies in Chapter 2 into the new subsection as well.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
843	6	NEW	-	TRCA	Chapter 6 - We appreciate recognition that long-term plans for servicing should incorporate conservation strategies and the protection of the natural environment. We recommend enhancing this vision by including policies that promote avoidance and mitigation of key natural heritage and key hydrologic features as well as protection of the Regional Greenlands System, particularly as it relates to region-led infrastructure projects. Policies that commit the Region to incorporate LID measures, green infrastructure, road ecology, and compensation for impact that cannot be avoided would strengthen the Region’s commitment to protecting the natural environment through design, implementation, and operation of its servicing infrastructure. In addition, we recommend including a policy highlighting that watershed planning should inform water and wastewater infrastructure master planning.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
844	6	NEW	-	TRCA	Chapter 6 - Preamble - This section should include policies that advocate for a comprehensive wayfinding and trailhead program, integrating trails, trailheads and community/cultural amenities. Further, the trail/trailhead program should be inter-regional, where feasible. We also recommend that active transportation be intrinsically linked to the development and expansion of public transportation infrastructure, including the widening of culverts and bridges and accommodation of safe passage to improve non-auto reliant modes of access to transit hubs. TRCA has engaged York Region on the implementation of the TRCA Trail Strategy and would be pleased to continue this collaboration as it relates to the refinement of trail policies for the ROP.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
845	6	NEW	-	Township of King	6.4.11 - Consider adding a policy that a local municipality can request the Region to review the feasibility of expanding municipal water and wastewater treatment services when 75% (or some appropriate portion) of capacity has been allocated.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
846	7	7.1	138	City of Markham	Review policies to ensure that the draft ROP is consistent with section 2.6.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement as it pertains to indigenous engagement.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
847	7	7.1	138	City of Vaughan	The Region has not addressed Mississauga's of the Credit First Nation's request to include specific language into the ROP. Please advise if this is being considered, as staff would like to understand how to address in our Official Plan update. Direction would be appreciated.	Acknowledged
848	7	7.1	138	City of Vaughan	Please revise the preamble as it should differentiate between Treaty Rights holders vs. Interest holders.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
849	7	7.1	138	City of Vaughan	Please clarify if the Region has considered leading the coordination of Indigenous Communities engagement for the lower tier municipalities.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
850	7	7.1 (NEW)	138	City of Vaughan	7.1 - It is suggested that a new policy be added to encourage local municipalities to develop in partnership with their Treaty Rights Holders, a Memorandum of Understanding and/or Friendship Agreement for future relationship building and partnerships between both parties. This would account for the following: economic development, cultural heritage, environment, archaeological and history.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
851	7	7.1.1	138	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that the term "Indigenous Peoples" vs. "Indigenous Communities" be reviewed by the Region as there have been some recent legal decisions that may have identified Peoples as the preferred term.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
852	7	7.1.4 & 7.1.5	138	City of Vaughan	York Region should take the leadership role on engagement to ensure that lower tier municipalities are consistent with their consulting protocols.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
853	7	7.1.9	138	City of Vaughan	The policy as written has no basis for engagement with stakeholders, public or Indigenous Communities. It is suggested that the policy be revised to the following: "To advocate to senior levels of government for funding partnerships for economic development, environmental sustainability and cultural heritage matters with our Indigenous Communities."	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
854	7	7.2	139	City of Richmond Hill	Figure - This figure provides a partial list of targets to monitor - what about the modal split, affordable housing, intensification, and greenhouse gas reduction emissions? Consider adding population too in support of the phasing policies related to complete communities.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
855	7	7.2.1	139	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Support for policy 7.2.1 - this should be presented to Council in the 3rd year of each Council term, and development approvals that will further exacerbate any of the following indicators must be reconsidered. This set of indicators should include: - Chloride contamination of rivers - Hectares of wetland loss / gain, # offsets used - Hectares of woodland loss / gain, # offsets used - Phosphorus loading in Lake Simcoe - Stormwater pond / system performance - Flooding / water levels in YR rivers at peak, at low flow - Monitoring of ground water for contamination	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
856	7	7.2.2	139	City of Vaughan	Please clarify who will be responsible for the monitoring, and how densities will be allocated.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
857	7	7.2.6	139	MPLAN Inc	Data is currently not available. The Region has not provided it and Richmond Hill require an FOI request to obtain data. The data, if provided, may then be arbitrarily redacted.	Acknowledged
858	7	7.3.1	140	MPLAN Inc	There is no timeline for the carrying out of this conformity exercise to be completed.	Acknowledged
859	7	7.3.10 d) & e)	141	City of Vaughan	Reference is made that there is a requirement of at least 1 pre-application meeting (PAC). Please clarify if this would be the PAC of the local municipality, or of York Region.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
860	7	7.3.7	141	City of Richmond Hill	Although (d) provides flexibility to include other matters specified under the Planning Act, it should reflect the most recent update which is supported by further policy direction under the Provincial Policy Statement and Growth Plan on climate resiliency. Suggested edit to include: "sustainable buildings (or development) designed to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions and adapt to changing climate".	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
861	7	7.3.8	141	City of Richmond Hill	Included in the list of matters that are not eligible to be exempt from Regional approval should be: -Request for employment conversion (should a lower-tier municipality permit it) -Application seeking to permit higher or lower density than what is permitted in an MTSA (should a lower-tier municipality permit it) -Approval of new or changes to Special Policy Areas -Official plan amendments that are pursuant to Section 26 of the Planning Act Also, what is considered to be "major secondary plan"?	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
862	7	7.3.8	141	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- This policy identifies the types of local official plan amendment applications that would be exempt from Regional approval. Staff requests clarification on the following: - For employment areas that are not mapped on Map 1, but only designated in the local official plan, would the conversion of these employment areas be exempt from Regional approval? It is staff's understanding, as per policy 4.3.20 that only the conversion of lands within employment areas identified in Map IA to non-- employment uses shall be considered through a municipal comprehensive review.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
863	7	7.3.8	141	MPLAN Inc	Regional Staff as opposed to Regional Council have exempted many secondary plans from Regional Council approval. This may well explain why the Region is in a housing crisis.	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
864	7	7.3.11	142	City of Richmond Hill	The requirement for an Affordable Housing Contribution Plan needs clarification as to what that is and should only apply to applications where housing is proposed. The requirement for an Archeological assessment should only apply where archeological artifacts are likely to be found (i.e.., in accordance with the Region's and/or local Archeological master plans). Agricultural Impact Assessments should be required with a certain/defined distance of an agricultural area. Several policies of the ROP call for Master Environmental Servicing Study, yet it is not provided in the table - should it be?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
865	7	7.3.11	142	City of Richmond Hill	Consider adding to Table 7: -Stormwater management plan -Excess soil management plan (where major site alteration/excavation is proposed) -Site-specific wildland fire assessment where applicable -Reference (or at least a placeholder) to demonstrating conformity/implementation of the future Community Energy & Emissions Plan. -Source water impact assessment and mitigation plan for development within Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas, particularly if there is storage & handling of organic solvent and Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL)	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
866	7	7.3.11	142	Malone Given Parsons	Table 7 requires a Transportation Mobility Plan only for Regional Official Plan Amendments, yet the definition says that a mobility plan is required to support all development applications in York Region that have potential impacts on Regional and local transportation systems. - It is likely that ALL development will have an impact on the Regional or local transportation system, however, not all developments will have a significant impact. - We request clarification that only major development (those outside of Province Plans that are larger than 50,000 sq. m.) will require a mobility plan.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
867	7	7.3.11	142	Township of King	Table 7 - Should the requirement for an Affordable Housing Contribution Plan be limited to ROPA applications that propose residential development? - Not sure of its applicability if the ROPA is in relation to agricultural or other policies of the ROP. **Planning Studies:** Affordable Housing Contribution Plan **Circumstance:** All Regional Official Plan Amendment Applications.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
868	7	7.3.11	142	City of Vaughan	Applicants may request a terms of reference for certain required planning studies i.e.. Affordable Housing Contribution Plan. Can the Region make this available?	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
869	7	7.3.11	142	MPLAN Inc	List of studies will only further delay housing starts.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
870	7	7.3.11	142	Malone Given Parsons	We request additional policy direction in the Draft YROP to specify the circumstances in which specific studies are absolutely required, with an emphasis on requiring studies only where necessary - More specificity is required in terms of which appropriate technical studies are required in different development contexts and scales.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
871	7	7.3.11	142	Malone Given Parsons	We request clarification that only major development (those outside of Province Plans that are larger than 50,000 sq. m.) will require a mobility plan.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
872	7	7.3.13	142	MPLAN Inc	This will only delay development and increase cost. Many studies should have been undertaken by the public authority at the Secondary Plan level. - It is not clear how an individual applicant could implement this requirement through a development application to ensure a "complete application" could be filed.	Acknowledged
873	7	7.3.14	143	City of Vaughan	Please see policy: "That if approval of a draft plan of subdivision lapses, opportunities for achieving the growth management targets of this Plan shall be considered as part of the development review process." This statement is unclear. Please clarify if York Region is stating that they can pull their approvals if a subdivision lapses. Vaughan provides for an opportunity to extend approvals subject to the comments from internal and external agencies.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
874	7	7.4.3	144	MPLAN Inc	This work should have been done years ago by the local municipality and TRCA.	Acknowledged
875	7	7.4.3 b)	144	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff questions whether "Towns and Villages" should also be included in this policy to indicate that the boundaries are also fixed where clearly defined by the specified features.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
876	7	7.4.4 & 7.4.6	144	City of Vaughan	7.4.4 states that where a term is defined in the ORMCP, those definitions shall prevail over those contained in the Plan, however, this same statement is not identified for the Greenbelt Plan. Please revise 7.4.6 to be consistent.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
877	7	7.4.5	144	City of Richmond Hill	What is the difference between policies a) and b)?	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
878	7	7.4.5	144	City of Markham	Note that lands below the 245 m contour are only subject to the Greenbelt Plan under certain circumstances as per section 2.1 of the Greenbelt Plan (i.e.., in the countryside/settlement designation and does not connect to the Greenbelt). Markham approved OPA 27 that confirmed lands in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Area that are below the 245 m contour line are not subject to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan or the Greenbelt Plan.	Acknowledged
879	7	7.4.7	144	City of Richmond Hill	Please note that the only maps that identify the Parkway Belt West Plan are those in Appendix 2, and these maps do not include an "underlying land use designation."	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
880	7	7.4.14	145	City of Vaughan	This clause should also apply to the existing uses and residential dwellings on existing lots of record in the ORMCP.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
881	7	7.3.18 (2010 YROP) (NEW)	-	City of Markham	Clarify why this policy was not carried forward in the draft ROP. It is recommended that it be included.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
882	7	7.3.22 (2010 YROP) (NEW)	-	City of Markham	Clarify why this policy was not carried forward in the draft ROP, particularly if policy 7.3.23 in the 2010 Regional Official Plan is being deleted. It is recommended that it be included.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
883	7	7.3.27, 7.3.28, 7.3.30, 7.3.31, 7.3.32 (2010 YROP) (NEW)	-	City of Markham	Clarify why this policy was not carried forward in the draft ROP. It is recommended that it be included.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
884	7	General	-	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Other recommendations: - The Region should not issue approvals for land owners with existing non-compliance by-law or building permit issues. - Financial transparency must support and drive decisions at the regional level. - All land use decisions in which Council supports decisions against the recommendations of staff, existing policies and the approved Official Plan and/or Secondary Plans be documented and transparently reported to Council annually and made publicly available.	Acknowledged
885	General	-	-	MHBC Planning	Request to reconsider the position put forward in Proposed 2051 Forecast and Land Needs Assessment staff report (March 2021).	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
886	General	-		Public	Comment on the shortage of available land supply and other factors contributing to high housing costs.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
887	General	-	-	LSRCA	It is unclear why policies regarding the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan have been deleted from the new OP.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
888	General	-	-	LSRCA	Please include a policy to prevent development occurring in areas of unstable soils due to geotechnical or other concerns.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
889	General	-	-	LSRCA	Please consider including a policy regarding ecological offsetting as per the LSRCA Ecological offsetting policy. Contact m.bessey@lsrca.on.ca for recommended wording for consistency with LSRCA member municipalities	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
890	General	-	-	LSRCA	As per the LSPP peat extraction should be prohibited. Please consider including a policy to this effect.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
891	General	-	-	LSRCA	Please consider including a policy in support of the LSPP Phosphorus Offsetting Policy requiring a zero export of phosphorus from a new major development site. Please contact M.bessey@lsrca.on.ca for recommended wording for consistency with LSRCA member municipalities	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
892	General	-	-	TRCA	There should be a policy that requires new or upgraded active transportation systems be undertaken in an environmentally responsible way to avoid sensitive ecological or hydrological areas. Also, there should be a policy to avoid the use of chemical means of winter de-icing for maintenance of trails within ravines or close to sensitive features, such as wetlands.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
893	General	-	-	Public	Question on higher density request along Yonge Street between Industrial Parkway and 19th Avenue.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
894	General	-	-	Public	Meeting request to discuss draft ROP comments on 3 focus areas: - Phasing of new communities - Housing - Transportation ***See meeting outcome for notes****	Acknowledged
895	General	-	-	TRCA	TRCA commends the Region for bringing the natural environment and climate change further to the forefront of the Region's draft ROP and emphasizing watershed planning to inform growth. TRCA appreciates the policies set out in Chapter 3 as they provide a comprehensive approach to a sustainable natural environment. TRCA also appreciate that policies from the Natural Hazards section of the 2010 ROP were carried over into the draft ROP.	Acknowledged
896	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	We are concerned that prescriptive policies with unclear implementation outcomes will present significant challenges to realizing the goals of the Plan. The development community needs to understand what is required when designing buildings and communities, be assured that the requirements are achievable and reasonable, and clearly understand the specific outcomes that achieve the goals of the Region. For those policies where universal application throughout the Region is not possible, or where specific outcomes are unclear - we recommend that policy framing of "hard" requirements currently using the words 'shall' or 'must' be softened to 'should' or 'may'.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
897	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	We request that the final Plan Schedules reflect Regional Council's decisions for growth. - In the case of East Gwillimbury, this would include at least 70% of the Whitebelt within the urban area.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
898	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Climate Change Policies: - The EGWLG supports the Region's direction to include policies regarding planning for and mitigating climate change and appreciate the policies in the Draft OP are informed by the York Region Climate Action Plan. - To be realized, the policies must be realistic and implementable through clear requirements. We do not believe the policies in the draft OP currently provide clear requirements, which will result in delays and uncertainty during the local implementation and development processes. - We are also concerned with how these policies will work with other policies of the Plan. All policies must be read together, yet some of the climate change policies are in direct conflict with the priorities of other policies of the Draft OP. The policies should be amended to specify which take priority and make clear the specific outcomes that are sought to be achieved.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
899	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Additional clarity from the Region in supporting explanatory work and a more clear policy hierarchy would help to improve the climate change policies.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
900	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Active Transportation Policies: - The EGWLG supports the inclusion of robust active transportation policies, yet the Draft OP policies lack clear expectations and requirements and there is no differentiation between what applies at the Regional level, the local level, the subdivision level, or the small-scale development level. - Example - Policy 2.3.17 - What constitutes an acceptable Mobility Plan ?	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
901	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Study Requirements: - We believe that additional policy direction should be provided in the Draft OP to specify the circumstances in which specific studies will be required, with an emphasis on requiring studies only where necessary -Generally requiring all studies for all development applications will result in wasted time and energy. - More specificity is required in terms of which appropriate technical studies are required in different development contexts and scales.	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
902	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Request for the release of the Final Official Plan be supported by a comment-response matrix for all comments received throughout the MCR process (including those from this group).	Acknowledged
903	General	-	-	Town of East Gwillimbury	Town of East Gwillimbury staff express support for: - Forecasted population and jobs by 2051 - Minimum DGA density target of 55 persons and jobs per hectare - Residential intensification target of 700 unit to 2051 - Purpose-built rental target of 2,250 units to 2051 - Regional Greenlands and Water Resource Systems alignment with the Town's local NHS and policies - Future Urban Area designation and associated policies - 2 defined MTSAs in East Gwillimbury and the related policies and densities for these areas	Acknowledged
904	General	-	-	Town of East Gwillimbury	The draft ROP implements a more rigid policy framework by using language such as 'must' or 'shall'. - Town staff believe there is merit in the ROP retaining an aspirational and softer policy stance through the use of language such as 'should' or 'may' throughout the document to enable each lower tier municipality the flexibility to respond to YROP policies in manners that fit their communities best.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
905	General	-	-	Town of East Gwillimbury	Request for a comment-response matrix to track decision making and updates	Acknowledged
906	General	-	-	Township of King	Township of King staff express general support for: - Population and Employment Forecasts in King - Villages being designated Local Centres and Corridors - Draft ROP Growth forecasts and density targets - Employment area designations for lands in Schomberg, Nobleton, and King City - Majority of draft ROP policies	Acknowledged
907	General	-	-	City of Vaughan	The text should be interactive, where terms or Maps are different colour & in italics, the reader should be able to click on them to take them to the definition or the map. The table of contents should also be interactive considering that the document is all electronic.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
908	General	-	-	Town of Georgina	References to "Towns and Villages" is not consistent throughout. Sometimes it is "Town and Villages", sometimes it is "towns and villages", others it is "Towns and Villages".	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
909	General	-	-	Public (17 submissions)	Support for the Regional Corridor to be continuous along Yonge Street	Acknowledged
910	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	We recommend that policy framing of "hard requirements currently using the words "shall" or "must" be softened to "should" or "may"	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
911	General	-	-	Public	- Reposition (philosophically and structurally) the Plan policies to emphasize the importance of the natural environment and resources - That is, to tell the story that the Region's living and working areas, including all the things we need to live and to make an economy, depend on a healthy ecosystem, resources (e.g., water, air, crops, etc.. - In this way, it is suggested that the lan's Section 3 - Sustainable Natural Environment, comes first - as the context within which growth and other functions happen, as opposed to the other way around - As such, it's a combination of policy reordering and perhaps some additional text to explain this approach	Acknowledged
912	General	-	-	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	- We note that there are occurrences of unclear policy numbering and there may be repeat section numbering. - For example, Section 2.3.1 “Sustainable and Resilient Communities” follows after a prior Policy 2.3.1, as does Section 2.3.2, 2.3.3, and others.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
913	General	-	-	Region of Durham	Support for policies related to the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, Natural Heritage and Agricultural Systems, Adjacent Communities, and Transportation/Transit Network. Policies align with Durham Region's policy framework.	Acknowledged
914	General	-	-	Public	- There is opportunity to strengthen the organization of the plan for a triple bottom line focused on sustainability. This would bring clarity to the overarching priorities. - The Venn diagram on page 6 sets the tone, but the order of sections later in the plan, did not flow in a way the priorities were illustrated earlier. - Suggested order: 1.0 - Introduction and purpose of the plan 2.0 - A Sustainable Natural Environment 3.0 - Supporting the Agricultural System 4.0 - A Foundation for Complete Communities 5.0 - An Urbanizing Region 6.0 - Servicing for Communities - This has to be carried through the whole document so some re-ordering of sub-sections and bullets would be required as well	Acknowledged
915	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	The policies are confusing, in part because they are layered with prescriptive requirements, which in turn refer to numerous maps/schedules and overlays for which there is no clear or understandable map schedule that can be easily interpreted.	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
916	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	There are numerous requirements for development (meaning landowners) to undertake further and more detailed studies, despite clearly established existing ROP Official Plan policies that outline the requirements for the preperation of such studies by the responsible public agencies, as input to and providing the basis for such secondary plans and comprehensive zoning by-law (which have not yet been completed)	No change – local flexibility to scope studies
917	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	It would appear that the operative parts of the Plan are to be implemented in 'digital format' as well. However, the data sources for the map schedules and overlays produced and available on-line from York Region, have obvious errors, certainly as related to the Greenlands system adjacent to the NEC lands (by way of example).	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
918	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	The Region has received data sets including ARC files created by 3rd parties and has accepted them as true and accurate when they are not based on any identifiable or sufficient studies. - Because there are no sufficient studies, the policy requirements proposed are for the individual landowners, proposing development, to prepare more detailed studies based on terms of reference from the public authority(s) when these studies ought to have been prepared by the local municipality or the TRCA as part of a creating the map or schedule in the first instance or as part of a mandated Secondary Plan process.	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
919	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	Regional Staff continue to promote policies that do not support transit, nor a shift in the transit modal split. - For example, Regional Staff continue to support a fine grain grid of public streets as opposed to supporting private streets with public access. - Traditional public streets do not work in intensification areas and support the continued use of private vehicles. - There is a need to promote stratification of title as a means to make efficient use of land and support innovative planning.	Acknowledged
920	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	Regional Staff continue to promote high and inconsistent minimum parking standards for apartment dwelling units. - They do this by declaring that parking is not a regional concern, but only a local issue. Since 2010, parking rates in intensification corridors were to be based on proximity to transit, and one would think, increasing the transit modal split. - In practice, the Region (actually it is Regional Staff) leaves parking rates to the local municipality to determine. This practice has resulted in numerous and continuing long standing disagreements with Staff at the Region and local Planning and Transportation Staff. - The result, unfortunately, has been that very little new high- density housing has been constructed along the Yonge Street corridor because of longstanding disagreements on parking rates and parking strategy along the intensification corridors.	Acknowledged
921	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	- The 2010 Regional Official Plan required local municipalities to designate Key Development areas through Secondary Plans and implementing zoning bylaws. - There is not one Secondary Plan approved, together with an implementing zoning bylaw, for lands within the Yonge Corridor through the City of Richmond Hill. It is therefore unclear how the Region's Chief Planner could conclude that the Region has met its Planning Act supply requirements.	Acknowledged
922	General	-	-	MPLAN Inc	The detailed Secondary Plan level technical studies that ought to have been prepared by the local municipalities and public authorities since 2010, in consultation with the Region and stakeholders, along the Yonge Street and other corridors, has simply not been done at all, or if done, only carried out as a desk top study. - If the Provincial and Regional goal is to now start to plan for complete communities (more specifically, the 15-minute complete community), then the proposed policy framework does not provide for that to occur, in any type of timely fashion, if at all.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
923	General	-	-	1334618 Ontario Inc	While we recognize that the planning horizon of the Plan is to the year 2051, it is important to recognize in the Plan that all Urban Areas should have the same opportunities for development, and that the development community be involved with the installation of infrastructure to permit development. - For example, the latest additions to the Urban Areas should not be required to wait until 2041 before they can develop, if the infrastructure for development can be supplied to those areas. - The Official Plan needs to incorporate guidelines/objective to streamline the development process - The Official Plan refers to a general objective of co-ordination, but in our opinion, it is not enough. While we recognize the objectives to improve communities, every one of those objectives adds another layer to the approval process and we only foresee an even lengthier approval time.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
924	General	-	-	1334618 Ontario Inc	Infrastructure funding and timing and the processing of development applications is a major problem in York Region.	Acknowledged
925	General	-	-	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Employment Conversion Requests: - There are several employment conversion requests to community areas endorsed that staff advised against, yet these areas are now shown as community areas - Specifically requests: RH1, RH10, V3, V4, V5, V6, V7, V11, V13, V15, V18, V22, V24, V25, V26 and V30 adopted by York Region Council on October 15, 2020 - Many of these requests are located within PSEZ's - are residential uses prohibited in these areas? What about MTSAs located within PSEZs?	Acknowledged
926	General	-	-	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Concerned that future employment conversion requests will be made to convert lands, in Vaughan 2 large PSEZ's, to residential - If the West Vaughan Employment Density was higher how would this influence the urban boundary expansion?	Acknowledged
927	General	-	-	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Significant mega-warehouse expansion has occurred in Vaughan. - Have staff given any consideration to policy directions for warehouses to mitigate the negative social and environmental impacts that accompany this type of land especially when concentrated?	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
928	General	-	-	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Map 7 shows the Bradford Bypass going through a highly vulnerable aquifer. With Council's support of the Bypass, this is yet another example where YR Council does not support the policies the Region sets.	Acknowledged
929	General	-	-	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Putting the Bradford Bypass highway across a highly vulnerable aquifer while claiming to avoid chemical contamination of such is absolute doublespeak. T - There is no way that specific goods would be restricted on said highway. The 1997 - 2002 EA concluded that there would be severe groundwater and stormwater impacts from the Bradford Bypass. - No mitigation measures have been proposed in the intervening twenty years. Re. 3.3.1.6 To consider restrictions on the haulage of chemicals and volatile materials in Wellhead Protection Areas, shown on Map 6, and Areas of High Aquifer Vulnerability, shown on Map 7.	Acknowledged

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
930	General	-	-	Public	When making planning decisions, the environment has to be the top priority. I agree with many of its worthy objectives of the Draft ROP to plan for a healthy sustainable environment and healthy, vital, and complete walkable communities for people. 1. The Environment- Climate change is accelerating, & exacerbating other problems. All planning decisions have to include preservation, restoration, and renaturalization of the environment. 2. Physical and Mental Health- depend on the human built environment and a clean, safe environment. Studies show that tree-lined streets result in happier residents. Greenery also reduces violence and crime. COVID has shown how important accessible natural features are to physical and mental health. As stated in the draft OP, communities have to be complete offering all the needs of daily life. They have to be safe, comfortable and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists, and provide safe, convenient affordable public transit. Pedestrians add to the vitality of a neighbourhood and community. 3. Food Security – climate change with its extremes of drought and flooding destroy crops. Regenerative farming helps to reduce these extremes. Hedge rows and woodlots also moderate extremes in temperature and rainfall. We have to protect the foodlands we currently have. 4. Supply chain disruption – can be caused by severe weather, pandemics and war. Food, energy, and essential products require local production. 5. Future pandemics-Sars 1, was the Act 1, Sars 2 (COVID) is the 2nd act, with more to come. They increased movement of goods and people globally connects us and increases our vulnerability to new disease. Climate change is also introducing new diseases from warmer climates to humans and other animals and plants. 6. Canada's Involvement in future wars- food and water and problems often trigger civil war and invasions.	Acknowledged
931	General	-	-	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Edge Planning Background report: How has the Region incorporated the recommendations/principles of the York Region Edge Planning Policy Background Report?	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
932	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	We request the Region review the policy numbering approach to increase clarity and eliminate all instances where policies are numbered the same.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
933	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	- Concerned with how these policies will work with other policies in the plan - Policies should be amended to specify which take priority and make clear the specific outcomes that are sought to be achieved - Additional clarity from the Region in supporting explanatory work and a clearer policy hierarchy would help to improve the climate change policies.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
934	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Draft ROP comments, same content as previous MGP submissions.	Acknowledged
935	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Draft ROP comments, same content as previous MGP submissions.	Acknowledged
936	General	-	-	Malone Given Parsons	Draft ROP comments, same content as previous MGP submissions.	Acknowledged
937	General	-	-	MHBC Planning	Home Depot's priority is to preserve their existing development permissions on all 9 sites within York Region, including the ability to expand their existing stores and operations. - On this basis, it is requested that future draft ROP policies clearly reflect these existing permissions, and do not preclude the potential future expansion of all existing Home Depot stores within York Region - 2 Home Depot stores are identified as "Employment Area" in the draft ROP - 55 Cityview Blvd., and 10885 Leslie Street	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
938	General	-	-	MHBC Planning	There should be a mechanism in the future Draft OPA policies that allow for partial redevelopment of Home Depot's sites on an interim basis, without the need for the full redevelopment infrastructure being put in place that is associated with the Region's long-term vision. - For example, if it has been determined that the current Home Depot sites are "over-parked", these lands may be better utilized for "out-parcel or pad developments" within the parking areas. This type of intensification redevelopment has been undertaken at various Home Depot sites throughout the GTA.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
939	General	2.2.13, 2.2.14 & 2.2.26 (2010 YROP)	-	Evans Planning	- We note that within the draft ROP certain policies have been removed that were in the 2010 YROP. Specifically 2.2.13, 2.2.14 and 2.2.26 - There do not appear to be any policies included within the draft ROP that address the matter contained within the removed policies of sections 2.2.13, 2.2.14, and 2.2.26 - We note that policy 3.2.2 states the limits of the Regional Greenlands system may be refined through an approval technical study, however this section is silent with respect to the required buffer from the limits of the system. It is unclear from the draft ROP if buffers constitute the Regional Greenlands system - We request clarification of how the removal of these policies may impact the assessment of development applications on the Oak Ridges Morain, particularly given the framework established within Section 21(1), 21(2), 21(3) and 21(4) of the ORMCP - We suggested these deleted policies should be included in any future draft of the ROP in order to provide certainty and clarity	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
940	General	Land Acknowledgement	ii.	City of Vaughan	Was the Indigenous Land Acknowledgment prepared in collaboration with the First Nations Peoples?	Acknowledged
941	Definitions	Adjacent Lands	147	City of Markham	Re-insert the reference to cultural heritage resources in this definition. The current definition only refers to natural heritage features and other adjacencies. Recommended edit: "Those lands contiguous to existing or planned corridors and transportation facilities where development would have a negative impact on the corridor or facility. Those lands contiguous to a specific natural heritage feature or key hydrologic feature where it is likely that development or site alteration can reasonably be expected to have a negative impact on the feature. Those lands contiguous to lands on the surface of known petroleum resources, mineral deposits, or deposits of mineral aggregate resources where it is likely that development would constrain future access to the resources. Lands contiguous to cultural heritage resources. The extent of the adjacent lands may be recommended by the Province or based on municipal approaches which achieve the same objective. Generally, adjacent lands are considered to be within 120m from any part of the feature."	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
942	Definitions	Affordable	147	City of Richmond Hill	To ensure that appropriate affordable housing is provided, and to meet objective of providing affordable housing to larger households, the definition of "affordable" should be expanded to capture core housing need (e.g., housing that is "suitable" and "in good repair.")	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
943	Definitions	Affordable	147	Township of King	Affordable - Definition of affordable does not align with the definition in the Growth Plan. - Portions of the definition from the Growth Plan have been excluded. - Consideration should be given to aligning the definition with the definition of 'affordable' in the growth plan for consistency and to provide more flexibility in the parameters for affordability	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
944	Definitions	Affordable	147	City of Markham	Consider revising the definition to provide flexibility for local municipalities to use average local market rents by adding “or the local market area” after “regional market area” in the second sentence. Refer to the staff report for further discussion.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
945	Definitions	Agricultural Area	147	City of Richmond Hill	In the definition of Agriculture, the term "prime" should be explained because this term is referenced throughout the ROP, including within the definition of "rural area". Alternatively, the term "prime agricultural area" may be added as a new definition in the ROP. (Prime are areas where Canada Land Inventory class 1-3 agricultural lands predominate)	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
946	Definitions	Agriculture Area	148	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Use the provincial term and definition to avoid confusion. "Prime Agricultural Area: An area where prime agricultural lands predominate. This includes areas of prime agricultural lands and associated Canada Land Inventory Class 4 through 7 lands, and additional areas where there is a local concentration of farms which exhibit characteristics of ongoing agriculture. Prime agricultural areas are to be identified by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs using guidelines developed by the Province, as amended from time to time."	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
947	Definitions	Agriculture Impact Assessment	147	York Region Federation of Agriculture	We concur with the definition, however, when an AIA is required there should be policies added throughout the document which state that these are prepared in accordance with provincial and municipal guidelines and to ensure that the mitigation measures implemented.	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
948	Definitions	Agriculture Uses	148	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Use the Provincial Definition which includes biomass: "The growing of crops including nursery, biomass, and horticulture crops; raising of livestock; raising of other animals for food, fur or fibre, including poultry and fish; aquaculture; apiaries; agro-forestry; maple syrup production; and associated on-farm buildings and structures, including but not limited to livestock facilities, manure storage, value-retaining facilities, and accommodation for full-time farm labour where the size and nature of the operation requires additional employment."	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
949	Definitions	Agriculture-Related Uses	148	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Use the Provincial definition which no longer includes ‘small in scale’. "Those farm-related commercial and farm- related industrial uses that are directly related to the farm operations in the area, support agriculture, benefit from being in close proximity to the farm operations, and provide products and/or services to farm operations as a primary activity"	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
950	Definitions	Built-Up Area	149	City of Richmond Hill	The definition for Built-Up Area could be clearer.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
951	Definitions	Community Area	150	City of Richmond Hill	The Community Area definition does not correspond with Map 1A, given that the definition seems to say that these areas include employment areas. Consider refining the definition to coincide with Map 1A.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
952	Definitions	Community Hub	150	City of Richmond Hill	Why is "or accessed through a digital service" in the definition - how would this be addressed via land use planning?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
953	Definitions	Complete Community	150	TRCA	We note that the definition of complete communities aligns with the Province’s definition but omits the environmental components highlighted in the figure shown on page 19. We recommend amending its definition to include reference to the environmental components in the figure (i.e.., Greenspace and Climate Change), as well as protection of the Regional Greenlands System and WRS, as these are critical to providing ecosystem services that are foundational to complete communities	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
954	Definitions	Complete Community	150	City of Vaughan	Complete Community - Please revise definition to the following: "Places such as mixed-use neighborhoods or other areas within cities, towns, and settlement areas that offer and support opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to conveniently access most of the necessities for daily living **within 15 minutes walking distance or without relying on vehicles**, including an appropriate mix of jobs, local stores, and services, a full range of housing, transportation options and public service facilities. Complete communities are age friendly, **walkable** and may take different shapes and forms appropriate to their contexts."	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
955	Definitions	Complete Community	150	City of Vaughan	Definition of "Complete Community" - delete "such as mixed-use neighborhoods or other areas" - implies complete communities are limited to mixed-use neighbourhoods and "other areas" is not defined.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
956	Definitions	Complete Community	150	City of Vaughan	"(Local) Amenities" needs to be defined in the context of achieving a Complete Community in terms of uses and location.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
957	Definitions	Conserved	150	City of Markham	This definition should include the word "conserve" as having the same meaning.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
958	Definitions	Core Employment Areas	151	City of Richmond Hill	Item (ii) of the definition for Core Employment states: "Adjacent to, or in proximity to,..." Shouldn't it be referring to where there is planned or existing employment uses that are not compatible with non-employment uses?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
959	Definitions	Core Employment Areas	151	City of Richmond Hill	Item (iii) "Not appropriate for more flexible employment uses" is rather vague. Not sure exactly what this is supposed to mean.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
960	Definitions	Cultural and Regenerating Woodland	151	City of Markham	The definition of "cultural and regenerating woodland" could include many fragmented woodlands. Most small and fragmented woodlands are likely not able to be maintained by self-seeding or the soil seed bank and will require management. Recommended edit: "For the purpose of policy 3.4.2.7, woodlands where the ecological functions of the site are substantially compromised as a result of prior land use activity and would be difficult to restore and/or manage as a native woodland in an urban setting. An environmental impact study should assess these ecological functions with consideration of the following: • the woodland is regenerating, typically with a dominant proportion of woody species being invasive and non-native (e.g., Norway Maple, Manitoba Maple, Siberian Elm, Scots Pine, European Buckthorn, White Mulberry, Tree-of-heaven, Apple, White Poplar, etc..) • the area was not treed approximately 20 to 25 years ago as determined through air photo interpretation or other suitable technique • soils may be degraded, for example, soil may be compacted, the topsoil removed, or there may be substantial erosion from over-use and/or the woodland may be regenerating on fill • there is limited ability to maintain or restore self-sustaining ecological functions typical of native woodlands Woodlands (including plantations) established and/or managed for the purpose of restoring a native tree community are excluded from cultural and regenerating woodlands (e.g. naturalization or restoration projects)."	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
961	Definitions	Designated Greenfield Area	151	City of Richmond Hill	There is an italicized term ("designated area') in the definition of Designated Greenfield Area that is not defined. The definition of DGA makes reference to the Provincial Built Boundary paper which is helpful, but the Region's definition must also account for new DGA that has come on stream since 2006 via ROPAs 1, 2, and 3, as well as through the proposed ROP.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
962	Definitions	Gentle Density	154	City of Richmond Hill	The definition for Gentle Density is very vague. For the Region's consideration, in the City's Key Directions Report, we define it as follows: "forms of development that can be accommodated through new lot creation within an existing community and/or when "missing middle" housing is introduced to an area where single and/or semi-detached housing is prevalent, in a manner that is contextually appropriate and desirable. Gentle density can also introduce non-residential development into a predominantly residential area through the provision of modest neighbourhood-serving commercial, cultural, institutional, and recreational uses. Further to that, "missing middle" is defined as: "modest multi-unit housing in forms such as duplex, triplex, walk-up apartments and live-work units." Also, the term "single family" is generally an antiquated planning term as it speaks to kinship vis-a-vis land use. Suggest it be replaced with "single-detached" dwelling.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
963	Definitions	Housing Options	156	MPLAN Inc	There is a need to permit and promote the creation of zero car households as part of this mix.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
964	Definitions	Major Development	157	Malone Given Parsons	Major Development - The draft OP should define major development in the Region as "the construction of a building or buildings with a ground floor area of 50,000 square metres or more", appropriately deferring to Provincial Plans for applicable definitions within those plan areas. - The current definition states that major development consists of the creation of 4 or more lots, construction of a building/buildings of 500 m2 or more, and the establishment of a major recreational use. - This definition was taken from the Oak Ridges Morain Conservation Plan and the Greenbelt Plan. - The draft OP however applies this definition Region-wide, and we believe it inadvertently requires ALL development beyond the size of a large home to be subject to extensive and often area-wide study requirements. - A change in the definition will generally require studies for development that is truly on major scale, except where a different definition applies with a Provincial Plan area	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
965	Definitions	Major Development	157	Malone Given Parsons	We request the Plan define major development in the Region as the construction of a building or buildings with a ground floor area of 50,000 square metres or more, appropriately deferring to Provincial plans for applicable definitions within those plan areas.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
966	Definitions	Major Goods Movement Facilities and Corridors	158	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	Revise definition for Major Goods Movement Facilities and Corridors. - We suggest that a distinction be made between major facilities and goods movement corridors so that the PPS policy test can be applied appropriately. - The PPS provides separate definitions of major facilities and major goods movement facilities and corridors. In our policy suggestions, we have noted major facilities as they are a distinct land use with distinct land use planning implications.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
967	Definitions	Major Office	158	City of Markham	Consider revising the definition for major office in the draft ROP to align with the definition in the Growth Plan, 2019. The higher minimum area for freestanding office buildings in the draft ROP definition may be challenging to implement at the local level.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
968	Definitions	New Community Areas	160	City of Vaughan	New Community Areas are defined, however, they are lands that have been added to the Urban Area through a Regional MCR beyond those designated as Urban Area at the date of approval of this Plan. The maps are very small and a comparison from the old to the new MCR would be required.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
969	Definitions	Rural Area	161	York Region Federation of Agriculture	The Region has used the Province's "Rural Land" definition but has entitled it "Rural Area". This may cause some confusion when referencing Provincial and Regional policy documents. Was there a specific reason for this approach? - To help clarify, here are the Provincial definitions for Rural Area and Rural Lands: Rural Areas: means a system of lands within municipalities that may include rural settlement areas, rural lands, prime agricultural areas, natural heritage features and areas, and resource areas. Rural Lands: means lands which are located outside settlement areas and which are outside prime agriculture areas.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
970	Definitions	Secondary Plan	162	City of Richmond Hill	For clarity, it would be helpful to define "secondary plan" as per the Planning Act: 17 (2.1.2) For the purpose of subsection (2.1.1), a secondary plan is a part of an official plan, added by way of an amendment, that contains policies and land use designations that apply to multiple contiguous parcels of land, but not an entire municipality, and that provides more detailed land use policy direction in respect of those parcels than was provided before the amendment. 2017, c. 23, Sched. 3, s. 8 (1).	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
971	Definitions	Specialty Crop Areas	163	York Region Federation of Agriculture	b. The Provincial definition no longer includes 'and of capital investment in related facilities and services to produce, store, or process specialty crops;	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
972	Definitions	Strategic Growth Area	164	City of Richmond Hill	The definition of "Strategic Growth Area" is much broader than what is listed in the policy for intensification hierarchy. Please reconcile the definition with the policy. The policy definition is more appropriate given the way the term is used in the policies of the ROP.	Policy deleted - addressed through other content in the Plan
973	Definitions	Subwatershed	164	City of Richmond Hill	This term would be more easily understood if the Region identified the watersheds and subwatershed on a map. Also, would it be appropriate to recognize the Conservation Authorities as the author of these plans?	Acknowledged
974	Definitions	Supporting Employment Area	164	City of Richmond Hill	In the definition of "Supporting Employment Area", why is "knowledge based uses" singled out in item (b)? Shouldn't it say "office uses"?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
975	Definitions	Sustainable Mobility Measures	164	City of Markham	Recommended removing "during rush hours" from definition.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
976	Definitions	Transit-Supportive	165	City of Richmond Hill	The definition for "Transit-Supportive" states: Transit-supportive development will be consistent with Ontario's Transit Supportive Guidelines. This reads like a policy. What is intended by making that statement in the definition?	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
977	Definitions	Watershed Planning	166	City of Richmond Hill	The definition of "watershed planning" seems very close to that of "subwatershed plan." It would seem that watershed planning is the act of preparing a watershed plan. Consider creating a definition for a watershed plan and ensure there is clarity in terms of what it is in relation to a subwatershed plan. It seems that the sub-watershed plan may take the high-level information from a watershed plan and provide much greater detail for a smaller area. But, as it is now, there is not a lot of clarity on this.	Acknowledged - Draft ROP consistent with Provincial Plan language
978	Definitions	Woodland	167	City of Vaughan	It is recommended that the reference to stem density for the definition of woodlands be deleted. Please refer to the PPS, ORMCP Technical Paper series and Ecological Land Classification for guidance on how to define woodlands so that the definition is not used to remove woodlands. We need to recognize that most remaining woodlands are fragmented and impacted by invasives and edge effects. Hence, the focus should be on restoration.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
979	Definitions	Woodland	167	City of Markham	Revise the definition of woodlands to align with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 definition that includes consideration of stem densities (similar to that of the Guelph Official Plan).	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
980	Definitions	NEW	146	City of Vaughan	2.3.14 uses the term "**Accessible**". Please define the term "accessible" in the ROP.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
981	Definitions	NEW	146	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Transportation Demand Management needs to be a defined term in the Definitions. - The definition needs to include school travel, to ensure that programming is covered	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
982	Definitions	NEW	146	City of Richmond Hill	The term "accessory" is referenced throughout the policies of the ROP, but a corresponding definition does not appear to be included in the definitions section. A definition should be provided.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
983	Definitions	NEW	146	City of Richmond Hill	Consider providing clarifying definitions for climate terminology used in the policies (e.g., mitigation, adaptation, and resiliency) - similar to how the Provincial Policy Statement defines its policy reference to "impacts of a changing climate". It will help set the tone and provide consistency for the local municipal official plans as they too incorporate climate change into their policies.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
984	Definitions	NEW	146	City of Richmond Hill	Medium density is not defined, but is referenced in the definition of "missing middle". It might be more helpful if the Region simply stated in its policies what it is looking for along Regional Roads. For instance, in policy 4.4.16, it would be more clear to simply state that local municipalities identify locations along Regional arterial roads and other main streets where townhouse development can be accommodated.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
985	Definitions	NEW	146	TRCA	2.1.3 d) - It is unclear if urban agriculture could be considered as within an agricultural area or an agricultural use, especially without a definition. Urban agriculture is not always a continuous land use, but it could be interpreted as “a concentration of farms that exhibit characteristics of ongoing agriculture”. We recommend including a definition of urban agriculture, or incorporating it into another definition, as appropriate. Section 6.6 of TRCA’s LCP includes a description for sustainable near-urban agriculture, which could be of assistance should a definition of urban agriculture be incorporated.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
986	Definitions	NEW	146	Malone Given Parsons	In general, medium and high-density housing forms, as well as secondary suites associated with lower- density housing forms, are the most market-attainable affordable homes in the housing spectrum. - These forms of housing should be identified in the Region's definitions as counting towards the creation of affordable housing stock in the Region and providing a full mix and range of housing over the next 30 years	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
987	Definitions	NEW	146	City of Vaughan	2.4.10 - Please define "Core Historic Areas" in the ROP.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan
988	Definitions	NEW	146	City of Vaughan	4.3.10 - Please define "Megazones" instead of creating a text insert. This appears to form part of Policy 4.3.10.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
989	Definitions	NEW	146	City of Vaughan	5.1.20 - Please provide a definition for 'urban agriculture'. Has vertical farming been considered? City of Vaughan has a definition that can be used. Clarification is needed if Vertical Farming is included in the definition of urban agriculture.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
990	Definitions	NEW	146	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Numerous policies speak to the provision of human services. While the term is generally described in the Official Plan as: "Human services such as healthcare, education, community and social services, have a significant impact on the quality of life for residents and workers", staff recommends that consideration be given to including it as a defined term for greater clarity and interpretation.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
991	Definitions	NEW	146	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Urban Agriculture: Add an Urban Agriculture definition. 2 examples: From Peel - The growing of crops, including nursery, biomass, and horticultural crops, within an urban or rural settlement area. It includes urban farms, community gardens, rooftop gardens and gardens on private lots and may include supporting structures such as hoop-houses, raised beds, and cold-frames to improve production. Urban agriculture may include aquaculture and the raising of livestock or insects. From Vaughan - The growing or raising of food products produced through agricultural activity within or on the fringe of an Urban Area.	Request Supported - Definition created/updated
992	Maps	Map 1	169	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends that the Community of Stouffville be designated an Urban Area on Map 1 as it is the primary focus of growth in the Town and provides for more intensive development on full municipal services in addition to accommodating a built-up area, various strategic growth areas and two MTSAs. It is uncertain as to why the designation differs from other fully serviced "Settlement Areas" within the ORMCP. Staff requests clarification on the criteria that distinguishes an Urban Area from a Town and Village. - Furthermore, the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville is forecasted to have a greater population than the Town of Aurora by 2051. In staff's view an Urban Area designation would be most appropriate to plan for growth over the planning horizon and recognize the community as the primary area to direct growth within the Town. - Furthermore, staff believes it is important to differentiate the Community of Stouffville from Ballantrae (which is also designated a Town and Village) in the Region's settlement hierarchy, since Ballantrae does not provide for full municipal services, does not have a delineated built-up area, and is not anticipated to accommodate substantial growth within the Town, given the current servicing limitations.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
993	Maps	Map 1	169	Public	Map 1 - It would be beneficial if on the Regional Structure Map the name of the Town and Villages were identified by their names, rather than solely by the colour used on the map legend	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
994	Maps	Map 1	169	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	We oppose, in the strongest terms, any recommendations to revise the Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine Acts in order to allow York Region to build on these currently protected lands.	Acknowledged
995	Maps	Map 1	169	York Region Federation of Agriculture	The Greenlands System is an overlay and should be displayed as an overlay on the map instead of a solid colour that blocks out a significant portion of the Agricultural System. - Using the solid colour misrepresents the significant size of the agricultural system and diminishes its value. - This could also result in mis-interpretations relating to appropriate land use.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
996	Maps	Map 1	169	Public	Please remove any ambiguity on the consistent classification of Major Mackenzie Drive and conform its existing classification as a regional transit Corridor. - Request that you present Major Mackenzie Drive West as a regional corridor without ambiguity	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
997	Maps	Map 1, Map 1A	169	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff requests clarification as to why 'Hamlets' are not proposed to be identified on Map 1 (Regional Structure) as they are in the current York Region Official Plan (Map 1). It is staff's understanding that Hamlets are intended to comprise part of the 'Agricultural System', however, this may raise confusion as they are defined settlement areas but are not mapped as part of the Regional Structure on Map 1, notwithstanding that they are designated on Map IA. It is noted that while Map IA identifies the Hamlets, the interactive on- line mapping has not been updated to identify them. - Staff recommends that the Hamlet areas continue to be identified on Map 1, as they are settlement areas and will continue to be a focus of more limited growth within the Town, and form an integral part of the Region's settlement area hierarchy. Hamlets should be clearly identified on all Maps where the Towns and Villages and Urban Area are shown. - Furthermore, Hamlets appear to be shown as overlay (hatched area) on Map IA which raises some confusion as Hamlets have a specific land use designation on Map IA. Staff recommends that Hamlets be identified in a similar manner as the Towns and Villages (solid colour).	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
998	Maps	Map 1, Map 1A	169	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff supports the identification of the Gormley Secondary Plan Area and the South Gormley Employment Expansion Area as an Urban Area on Map 1. Consistent with the Employment Area designation for the South Gormley Employment Expansion Area on Map 1A, staff recommends that the Gormley Secondary Plan Area also be designated primarily as an Employment Area on Map 1A, recognizing that it will form a contiguous extension of the North Markham Employment Area. The identification of Gormley as an Employment Area will recognize this area as a focus of employment growth, benefited by proximity the Highway 404 Corridor, and assist in protecting these lands for employment uses. - Furthermore, staff supports the future northerly extension of full municipal services to Gormley from the North Markham Employment Area and through the South Gormley Employment Expansion Area. Not only is this required to address existing public safety concerns, but also support more intensive employment growth in Gormley.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
999	Maps	Map 1, Map 1A, Map 1B	169	Public	The protection of the Pickering Airport identified through policies in Section 6.3.5 does not carry-over into the land use designations shown in specific draft Schedules - Map 1, Map 1A and Map 1B. Suggestion to either: 1. To Maps 1, 1A & 1B - Add an overlay reflective of the approach surfaces of a future Pickering airport as they extend into York Region. Delineation of those surfaces would be based on published Transport Canada information. 2. Add a new map specifically showing the approach surfaces of a future Pickering airport as they impact development in York Region.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1000	Maps	Map 1, Map 1A, Map 1B	169	City of Markham	Section 4.6 : Remove the identification of Future Urban Area from the draft ROP, as this contradicts the underlying designation of agricultural area as shown in Map 1A. - Refer to staff report for recommendation: The Future Urban Area lands identified in Markham in Map 1B of the draft ROP be removed and maintained as agricultural system in Map 1, as these lands are not needed to accommodate growth to 2051;	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
1001	Maps	Map 1, Map 1A, Map 1C	169	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- The settlement area boundaries have been generally updated as provided by the Town, with the exception of the following recommended revisions: • The southwest corner of Highway 48 and Stouffville Road (Community of Stouffville) should be revised to reflect what is currently shown in the Region's current Official Plan, which provides for a larger settlement area. - Based on previous discussions with the Region, these lands are located within the Region's settlement area. The landowner has submitted a local OPA to align the settlement area boundary with the Region's Official Plan and designate these lands as Mixed Use. Based on previous correspondence with the Region, it is staff's understanding that this mapping will be revised, to align with the interactive mapping that was updated to correct this boundary discrepancy. - The settlement area boundaries within the western and northern portions of Musselman Lake as shown on Map IA, IC, and 2, should be updated to align with the settlement area boundaries as delineated in the Town's Official Plan and OPA 136, for consistency and alignment with the ORMCP designations.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1002	Maps	Map 1, Map 1A, Map 1C	169	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff has recommended some changes to the Town's proposed settlement expansion areas as outlined in our Policy Comments on S. 2.2.2 below and illustrated on Figure 1. - Staff recommends that the approved ORCA Equity MZO lands, and the remainder of the Whitebelt Areas bound by Highway 48, Stouffville Road, Mccowan Road, and the Town's municipal boundary be included in the Urban Area (Map 1) and designated Community Area (Map 1A), to recognize the most recent Ministerial approvals and to assist in comprehensively plan for this contiguous future development area, and consistent with the Town's ongoing Highway 48 Land Use Study.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1003	Maps	Map 1, Map 1B	169	MHBC (TransCanada Pipeline)	We request Map 1 and Map 1B show the TransCanada Pipeline Limited (TCPL) rights-of-way and facility as infrastructure. - We can provide GIS shape files of the pipeline ROW to the Region for mapping - a confidentiality agreement would be required prior to releasing the files	Addressed in part – policy changes recommended
1004	Maps	Map 1, Map 2	169	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- While the Regional Greenlands System shown on Maps 1 and 2 within the Community of Stouffville have been updated, there are still some discrepancies from the mapping that was provided to the Region. There are some smaller features that have been included and staff recommends they be removed from the Regional Greenlands System. - Notwithstanding, as per policy 3.1.4 it is staff's understanding that within the Urban Area and Towns and Villages, the Regional Greenlands System and Water Resource System shall be designated more specifically in local official plans and secondary plans. - The mapping for the 'Regional Greenlands System' should be consistent across all the Maps.	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
1005	Maps	Map 1, Map 2, Map 5	169	Malone Given Parsons	We request that the Region remove the woodlands identified on Map 5 from the Regional Greenlands System on Map 1 and Map 2. - The inclusion of ALL potential features within the Regional Greenlands System identified on Map 1 and Map 2 removes the applicability for any refinements to features, or removals of portions of woodlands that area currently permitted by the in-force YROP. - Woodlands identified on Map 5 are now included in the Regional Greenlands System mapped on Map 1 and Map 2	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
1006	Maps	Map 1A	170	York Region Federation of Agriculture	Request to maintain the Prime Agricultural designation of several blocks of lands within the Greenbelt Fingers or hire a consultant to complete a Land Base Refinement Analysis.	Acknowledged
1007	Maps	Map 1A	170	City of Richmond Hill	Only one of the areas designated as Office in the North Leslie Secondary Plan is shown as Employment, the lands adjacent to the 404 that are mid-block should also be identified as Employment on Map 1A.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1008	Maps	Map 1A	170	Malone Given Parsons	Inquiry regarding site at NW corner of 16th Ave and Woodbine Ave. MGP submitted an employment conversion request for the property, but want to make sure draft ROP mapping is showing the lands correctly per Council decision.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1009	Maps	Map 1A	170	City of Vaughan	5.4.2 - Please remove the Purpleville Hamlet (heritage properties) in the City of Vaughan from Map 1A. The heritage properties are no longer in the landscape as there was a fire. These were delisted in Spring 2020. The cemetery is the only remanent feature left.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1010	Maps	Map 1A	170	City of Vaughan	5.4.2 - The Teston Hamlet located at the northeast corner of Teston Road and Jane Street has been identified as a cultural heritage landscape through the Block 27 Secondary Plan. Please refer to Block 27 Secondary Plan for more information. Please update Map 1A to designate the Teston Hamlet.	No change – further determination/flexibility to be addressed in a Local Official Plan

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1011	Maps	Map 1A	170	Town of Georgina	Council Resolution - That the Region be requested to re-examine: a) The appropriateness of the Agricultural Land Use Designation on the south side of Baseline Road between Warden Avenue and McCowan Road for the reasons expressed in Report No. DS-2022-0027, with the objective of designating these lands as Rural Area. b) The timing of the next expansions of the Keswick Water Resource Recovery Facility and the Sutton Water Resource Recovery Facility to ensure that these critical facilities are properly aligned with the population and employment targets in the proposed York Region Official Plan	Addressed in part – mapping changes recommended
1012	Maps	Map 1A	170	Councillor Jackson	1. Along roads, rail lines, at highway interchanges etc.., adjacent to employment areas, there are narrow strips community land which may cause false expectations or at very least confusion. I think it is because 'community' is the default and employment are polygons. The issue is most prominent and problematic along Highways	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
1013	Maps	Map 1A	170	Councillor Jackson	2. The Provincial 'On Route' stations are noted as community land. I suspect this is the same cause as point 1 but it does have to be corrected since the province could eventually sell these lands (assuming they're provincial)	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
1014	Maps	Map 1A	170	IBI Group	Letter of support concerning the draft ROP policies and mapping for 0 Pine Valley Road (east of Mill Road, north/south of the King and Vaughan municipal boundary) - Supportive of the southern portion of the site being brought within the Urban Area, as well as the draft designations that apply to the site throughout Section 4.2 of the draft ROP. - Supportive of retaining the existing permissions on the northern portions of the subject site, respective of the existing policy framework	Acknowledged
1015	Maps	Map 1A	170	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	Map 1A: We note that the pullback track associated with MacMillan Yard north of Rutherford Road is not designated as Employment Area on draft Map 1A – Land Use Designations. - We recommend that these land uses be designated as Employment Area recognizing their importance to the operations of MacMillan Yard and to further strengthen protection from encroachment of sensitive land uses.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1016	Maps	Map 1A	170	York Region Federation of Agriculture	It would appear that the hamlet of Vandorf mapping has been extended north of Aurora Road into the Greenbelt Protected Countryside. - This would suggest that the urban/hamlet boundary of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside has been amended - Is the Region proposing this expansion through its MCR process and, if so, what justification is this based on?	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
1017	Maps	Map 1A	170	Malone Given Parsons	Request confirmation from the Region of our interpretation that in accordance with Draft "Map 1A Land Use Designations", the Portage Lands are now within the "Community Area" designation of the Draft YROP and no longer designated as "Employment Area".	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
1018	Maps	Map 1A	170	City of Markham	Revise Map 1A to: - Remove lands from the Employment Area designation to reflect Regional Council's decision regarding employment conversion request M3;	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1019	Maps	Map 1A	170	City of Markham	Map 1A to: - Include lands from deferred employment conversion requests M4 and M7 in the Employment Area designation;	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
1020	Maps	Map 1A	170	City of Markham	Revise Map 1A to: - Remove lands from the Community Area designation in two areas as shown in Figure 3 to the staff report; and	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1021	Maps	Map 1A	170	City of Markham	Revise Map 1A to: - Amend the Markham Centre employment area mapping west of Warden Avenue in the draft ROP to reflect the in-effect employment designations of Official Plan Amendment (OPA) 21 to the 1987 Markham Official Plan. See figure 4.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1022	Maps	Map 1A, Map 1B	170	City of Vaughan	Block 47 is not correctly identified in the updated mapping. - It is currently shown as 'Designated Greenfield Area' but Vaughan Official Plan 2010 designates it as a 'Community Area'. - Please update the map schedules accordingly.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
1023	Maps	Map 1A, Map 1B	170	Weston Consulting	Letter of support for the proposed land use designations of 11650 & 11700 Keele Street identified in Map 1A and Map 1B. - Given the approval in principle from the OLT and the in-process Site Development applications, the development of the subject lands in accordance with approvals will not be impacted by the adoption of the new ROP	Acknowledged
1024	Maps	Map 1B	171	City of Richmond Hill	As per comments regarding the use of the term "overlay" in Section 2.0, the Region should consider calling this something like the "Urban System Target Areas" or "Urban System Monitoring" and use this for monitoring purposes.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
1025	Maps	Map 1B	171	City of Richmond Hill	Policy 4.4.2.4 refers to protected MTSAs in Map 1B, but the map itself doesn't identify the MTSAs as "protected". To provide clarity, please indicate "Protected MTSAs" in addition to "MTSAs" on the legend of the map, as we understand that there are also MTSAs that are not protected.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1026	Maps	Map 1B	171	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff recommends, that for consistency, the Designated Greenfield Area boundary on Map 1B should be updated to align with the extent of the updated Community of Stouffville settlement area boundary on Map 1 and Map IA. - The discrepancies appear to be related to the refinements to the settlement area boundary within the northeast corner of the Community of Stouffville (Bethesda Road and Tenth Line) and within the Gateway Area (lands west of Highway 48 and Stouffville Road). In these instances, the Designated Greenfield Area should align with the settlement area boundary, for lands not within the delineated built-up area, and consistent with the Growth Plan definition of Designated Greenfield Areas.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1027	Maps	Map 1B	171	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	We strongly encourage the Region to reconsider the extent of new community areas approved in principle by Council in late 2021. The target population of York Region had to be increased in order to accommodate these sprawling plans into greenfield areas, which indicates that these lands are not needed to meet the minimum population for York Region to 2051 required by the province. Given that prior population targets have not been met, this is irresponsible and unrealistic planning. - South Gormley Employment Expansion Area and Bethesda Lands north of the community of Stouffville	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1028	Maps	Map 1B	171	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	We recommend identifying major goods movement facilities and corridors on a schedule of the York Region Official Plan, such as on draft Map 1B – Urban System Overlays. - Identifying their boundaries and areas of influence (1 km) will reduce the uncertainty for planning and developing sensitive land uses, and it will help to identify and avoid land use conflicts for those areas that are already designated for intensification and growth.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
1029	Maps	Map 1B	171	HBR Planning Centre	Map 1B - Urban System Overlays: - Map indicates that the majority of lands outside of the built-up area are designated as Greenfield Areas with some Future Urban Areas identified - Map seems outdated in that many of the Greenfield development areas identified, particularly in Newmarket and East Gwillimbury are already designated for development and in many instances are already built upon and therefore do not accurately reflect "greenfield" development, but rather existing development - We feel this map should be revised to reflect the current situation	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1030	Maps	Map 1B	171	City of Markham	Per Recommendation 3 of the Supplementary Report with City of Markham Comments on York Region's Growth Forecast and Land Needs Assessment to 2051, which was endorsed by DSC on October 18, 2021, that any whitebelt lands in Markham that are not needed to accommodate 2051 growth not be designated as "Future Urban Area", but rather maintain a non-urban (agriculture or similar) designation in the Regional Official Plan and Markham Official Plan. https://pub-markham.escribemeetings.com/Meeting.aspx?Id=400c0427-8552-498a-8ef9-2356564b39ed&Agenda=PostMinutes&lang=English&Item=6&Tab=attachments	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
1031	Maps	Map 1B	171	City of Markham	This policy refers to the "protected major transit stations areas identified on Map 1B", however Map 1B does not differentiate between protected and not protected MTSAs. Map 1B should be revised to indicate all MTSAs in York Region are protected MTSAs.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1032	Maps	Map 1B	171	City of Markham	The proposed definition and identification of "Future Urban Area" in the draft ROP seems to contradict protection of agricultural systems, where it is proposed to be the underlay designation for Future Urban Area. It is recommended that that the "Future Urban Area" overlay identified in Map 1B the draft ROP within the City of Markham be removed.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1033	Maps	Map 1B	171	City of Markham	Map 1B shows the area bounded by Elgin Mills Road East, Kennedy Road, Markham's northern boundary, and Highway 48 as New Community Area, which are lands to be added to the current urban area through the MCR process. However, the Region's Water and Wastewater Master Plan does not show any planned regional infrastructure to service this New Community Area. The ROP and the Water and Wastewater Master Plan do not align and should be reviewed. Revise Map 1B to: - Include text or revise the text in the legend to indicate that all Major Transit Station Areas (MTSAs) in Markham are protected MTSAs to facilitate implementation of inclusionary zoning.	Addressed in part – mapping changes recommended
1034	Maps	Map 1B	171	City of Markham	Revise Map 1B to: - Remove the Future Urban Area overlay.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
1035	Maps	Map 1C	172	City of Richmond Hill	The Parkway Belt West Plan (PBWP) could be identified on this map as well. This is necessary since the ROP defers to the policies of the PBWP. Furthermore, it is noted that the Greenbelt Urban River Valleys are identified on this map, but there is no policy provided in relation to them. Perhaps the Region could consider indicating that when it comes to enhancement areas for the Greenlands System, public acquisition of these lands could be prioritized?	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1036	Maps	Map 1C	172	Town of East Gwillimbury	Map 1C - minor mapping correction required on Map 1C where the Provincial NHS is mistakenly shown outside the Greenbelt are, with portions of the Town's Central Growth Area.	Addressed in part – mapping changes recommended
1037	Maps	Map 1C	172	City of Vaughan	5.3.7 & 5.3.8 - It is understood that the intent to limit the uses in the proposed Rural Area in the Greenbelt 'fingers', however, there is concern that the Rural designation will result in ongoing challenges of permitted uses. It is suggested that a 'Natural Areas' designation be added that allows for passive recreational uses, such as trails and community gardens. Alternatively, the Region could permit local municipalities to apply a more restrictive land use designation, such as Natural Areas, in order to ensure conformity with the more restrictive uses.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1038	Maps	Map 1C	172	City of Vaughan	Please add Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) Settlement Areas to the list in the legend and identify in Map 1C. It is assumed that the white 'shading' in the map represents the Settlement Area in the ORMCP.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1039	Maps	Map 1C	172	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- While staff understands that the these designations have been based on the Provincial mapping, staff recommends that refinements to Map IC are warranted and appropriate to more accurately reflect the extent and more detailed delineation of the settlement area boundaries as shown on Maps 1 and IA for consistency, and to avoid any confusion. The discrepancies relate primarily to the refinements to the settlement area boundaries within the northeast corner of the Community of Stouffville (Bethesda Road and Tenth Line) and within the Gateway Area (lands west of Highway 48 and Stouffville Road). - Furthermore, staff recommends that the South Gormley Employment Area Expansion and the Bethesda Road Community Area Expansion also be identified on Map 1C, consistent with Map 1 - Map 1B to provide greater clarity.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
1040	Maps	Map 1C	172	Public	The general public appears to suffer at the expense of a big land developer. - This is yet another reason why the 'Countryside' designation requires lifting. - Development rights along the west side of Leslie street were expanded by the province during imposition of Moraine legislation while and the east side of Leslie Street, which includes the Soccia (12411 Leslie) and Jackson lands abutting the GO Station were sterilized. - It should also recognized the City of Richmond Hill participated in theses land swap negotiations (Commissioner of Planning, Janet Babcock) and together with the Region of York were subsequent signatories to development approvals resulting from this private - provincial land swap. - And as such they have duties to resolve the inappropriate negative economic impacts imposed on other private land holdings abutting the MTSA with the continued assignment of the 'Countryside' land use designation.	Acknowledged
1041	Maps	Map 2	173	TRCA	TRCA's target NHS mapping is currently undergoing revisions as part of engagement process, which is anticipated to be completed in Q2 2022.	Acknowledged
1042	Maps	Map 2	173	City of Vaughan	It is suggested that the legend be renamed from "local municipal Greenland's system" to "local natural heritage system". Please note that Vaughan does not use 'Greenland's system' as a term in the Vaughan Official Plan.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1043	Maps	Map 2	173	Public	Map 2 - It would be beneficial if on this map the name of the Towns and Villages were identified by their names.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1044	Maps	Map 2	173	MPLAN Inc	3.2.1 - Region to confirm that Regional Greenlands system is located within Block 32 owned by the City. - Are the boundaries of the Regional Greenlands system consistent with the similar "natural" designations in the provincial, local and TRCA planning documents. - There must be a reasonable level of consistency among these documents (re mapping and policy) in order for a landowner to determine the impact on their properties.	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
1045	Maps	Map 3	174	City of Markham	Clarify if candidate ANSIs are intended to be shown on this map. The Robinson Swamp PSW is a candidate ANSI (Life Science).	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1046	Maps	Map 3	174	City of Richmond Hill	Because the policies related to life science areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSI) are dependent on whether or not the ANSI is in the provincial Natural Heritage System (NHS), it would be helpful to also include the NHS overlay on this map.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1047	Maps	Map 4	175	City of Vaughan	Please consider changing the title of the map to "Water Resources System", as per the policies.	Acknowledged – addressed through other content in the Plan
1048	Maps	Map 4	175	City of Vaughan	Please change the blue layer to "Provincially Significant Wetlands". Please clarify by Provincial Plan Area Wetlands are identified.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1049	Maps	Map 4	175	City of Markham	Review seepage areas and springs, specifically on lands within the York Downs Golf Course, Robinson Glen block and Angus Glen block (outside of the NHS), with Markham staff. There are concerns that some of the lands shown as seepage areas and springs on this map have already been confirmed as developable land through environmental impact studies and master environmental servicing plans (i.e., the studies did not identify any seepage areas and springs). Key hydrologic features such as seeps and springs are protected under the Growth Plan, and any mapping with seeps and springs in developed areas should only be shown where there is a high level of confidence.	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
1050	Maps	Map 6, Map 7, Map 12A	177	City of Vaughan	Please consider grouping together all maps that are environmentally related as it would be more reader-friendly.	Acknowledged
1051	Maps	Map 9A	180	TRCA	3.2.8 - We note that construction of the Nashville Conservation Reserve trail is near completion. We invite the Region to include it on Map 9A.	Acknowledged
1052	Maps	Map 9A	180	Region of Durham	Map 9A - Recreational Trail Network: - The existing Oak Ridges Moraine Trail near the York-Durham boundary, which is shown on York Region trails mapping and TRCA Trail Strategy (2019) to run west of York Durham Line along Hillsdale Drive (and its road allowance to York Durham Line), is not identified as part of the Existing Region-Wide Trail Network on the map schedule. - Please add this connection or clarify if it has been relocated based on more up-to-date information, in the response to our comments. - The Durham Transportation Master Plan (TMP) shows the Oak Ridges Moraine Trail as part of the existing Regional Trail Network, but it does not appear to connect on the York Region side at the same location. - A similar comment was also made with respect to the York TMP Update in November 2021.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1053	Maps	Map 9A	180	Region of Durham	Map 9A - Recreational Trail Network: - The Proposed Region-Wide Trail Network shown within the 407 ETR right-of-way is not mirrored on the Durham Region side. - Although this trail is shown in the TRCA Trail Strategy (2019), it is unlikely that a trail along the Highway 407 right-of-way will be implemented as the right-of-way is protected for the future 407 Transitway (and now identified as part of the Regional Cross rail in the GGH Transportation Plan released by MTO on March 11th). - As such, we would recommend that this future trail connection be removed from the plan.	Acknowledged
1054	Maps	Map 9A	180	Region of Durham	Map 9A - Recreational Trail Network: - There is no trail connection identified for the Pefferlaw area along Lake Simcoe, which should be added. - The Region of Durham has added a future trail connection to the Regional Trail Network going to York Region along Lake Simcoe, along Thorah Park Boulevard to Bolster Lane. - A similar comment was also made with respect to the York TMP Update in November 2021.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1055	Maps	Map 9A	180	City of Richmond Hill	The Recreational Trail Network should remove the proposed segment of the Lake to Lake Cycling Route and Walking Trail on the east Rouge tributary south of 19th Avenue, spanning from 19th Avenue to Leslie Street. The proposed segment on the west Rouge tributary should be maintained.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1056	Maps	Map 9B	181	Region of Durham	Map 9B - Regional Cycling Network: - There are no sections of York Durham Line, Steeles Avenue or Ravenshoe Road identified as part of the Shared Cycling Network or Proposed Cycling Facilities. - Please confirm whether this is a mapping error (i.e.., the regional boundary symbol is on top of the cycling designations) or intentional. - Note that the Durham Regional Cycling Plan, which was updated in October 2021, shows York Durham Line from Bloomington Road/Regional Highway 47 to Regional Road 39.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1057	Maps	Map 9B	181	Region of Durham	Map 9B - Regional Cycling Network: - Certain proposed east/west cycling routes do not connect with Durham Region's proposed routes from the York Region side (e.g., 16th Avenue) or vice versa (Highway 7, 16th Avenue, Major Mackenzie Drive), unless there is planned cycling on this section of York Durham Line (under York Region's jurisdiction and, as such, not identified in the Durham Regional Cycling Plan update).	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1058	Maps	Map 10	182	City of Vaughan	Please confirm whether commuter parking lot identified at Islington and Rutherford is correct.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1059	Maps	Map 10	182	WSP Canada Inc	Confirm Map 10 shows latest preferred alignment of the proposed freeway part of the GTA West Corridor.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
1060	Maps	Map 10	182	City of Richmond Hill	Given recent provincial announcement and the updated Environmental Project Report Addendum for the Yonge North Subway Extension, there should be two subway stations shown for lands within Richmond Hill Centre (i.e.. move the "station for further study" symbol). Bathurst Street, from Highway 7 to Major Mackenize - what is the status of this corridor, given that it was a Special Study Area in the current Regional Official Plan?	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1061	Maps	Map 10	182	City of Richmond Hill	It is recommended that the proposed GO Station at Bayview and 19th Avenue be removed and replaced by a proposed GO Station at Elgin Mills and Newkirk to better service residents and business along the Yonge Corridor, the Yonge and Bernard Key Development Area, and the Newkirk Business Park. (See Recommendation in Staff Report SRPI.22.036.)	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1062	Maps	Map 10	182	City of Vaughan	As discussed with York Regional staff, we request stronger policy language on the Regional intensification hierarchy, particularly as it relates to the proposed BRT on Major Mackenzie Drive West, west of highway 400. We are happy to have further discussions and provide suggested policy language for incorporation in the updated draft YROP.	Request Supported - Sidebar and/or preamble created/updated
1063	Maps	Map 10	182	Malone Given Parsons	We ask that the CP Railway Line be labeled as "Rush Hour Only Go Rail Service, Subject to Further Study" or as "Potential Commuter Rail Line" on Map 10 - Map 10 identifies the CP Line as "Rush Hour Only GO Rail Service" and does not identify it as being a potential or future service line	Acknowledged - Beyond Regional planning jurisdiction
1064	Maps	Map 10	182	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Map 10 - Rapid Transit Network: 1. Is there an existing provincial transit way along the proposed highway 413 route? There are two purple dotted lines and one solid purple line. 2. Why are Kirby Station and Mulock Go Stations shown the same as other GO Stations that have no approved Metrolinx Business Cases? Should they not be treated differently and prioritized since they are further ahead in the planning process?	Addressed in part – mapping changes recommended
1065	Maps	Map 10	182	Malone Given Parsons	Provide clarity as to the "Active Commuter Lot" symbol on 5000 Highway 7, Markham (Markville Mall) - Subject site has an active commuter parking lot shown on Map 10 - It is unclear what this symbol means and if there are any obligations relating to these symbols	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1066	Maps	Map 10	182	City of Markham	Revise this map to include a GO Rail Station subject to further study at Denison Street. Refer also to comments on the York Region Transportation Master Plan Update provided to Markham's Development Services Committee on February 15, 2022.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1067	Maps	Map 11	183	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	Map 11: - Remove Langstaff Road crossing of MacMillan Yard from draft YROP and TMP update - Map 11 shows a new road link connecting Langstaff Road from Creditstone Road to Keele Street across the active operational area of MacMillan Yard (also shown on Map 4 of TMP) - CN Rail has significant concerns regarding this potential link and page 41 if the draft TMP states that no local funding is available, or anticipated to be made available for the links construction. As a result, this suggests that the link is not absolutely needs for future growth in the Region and should be removed.	No change - request requires additional assessment and should be addressed through next MCR
1068	Maps	Map 11	183	City of Vaughan	It is unclear what process the Region has undertaken to determine "Other arterial street widths" and by extension, which of these roads will be considered for transfer to the Region subject to the Policies of Regional Council. We will note that Kirby Road between Bathurst Street (in the future) and Highway 27, as well as Pine Valley Drive between Teston Road and King-Vaughan Road may be candidates for transfer to the Region.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1069	Maps	Map 11	183	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	Map 11 - Street Network - Map 11 identifies the ultimate Right of Way for Regional Roads. - As it relates to two Choice Sites, the Right of Way width is proposed to be increased from the current Official Plan. - This includes a 4m increase along Dalton Road (from 26m to 30m) and a 6m increase along Black River Road (from 30m to 36m) in proximity to 20895 Dalton Road, as well as a 6m increase along Green Lane (from 35m to 41m) in proximity to 18120 Yonge Street. - These are substantial increases, and we seek clarification as to the basis and need for the increased road widths;	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1070	Maps	Map 11	183	Region of Durham	Map 11 - Street Network: - The Potential Freeway symbol, which is included on Map 10: Rapid Transit Network, should also be shown on this map. - A user of the Official Plan would look for potential freeways on this map before they would consider looking for them on the Rapid Transit Network map.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1071	Maps	Map 11	183	Region of Durham	Map 11 - Street Network: - The Regional Planned Street Widths for roads along the York- Durham boundary (and other boundaries with York Region) under York Region's jurisdiction should be shown on the map, as they are hidden under the boundary symbol. - Along the York-Durham boundary, this would include York Durham Line south of Bloomington Road/Regional Highway 47 and Ravenshoe Road	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1072	Maps	Map 11	183	Rescue Lake Simcoe Coalition	Map 11 - Street Network: - Please clarify the difference between the solid line versus the dashed line. Is the solid line the current width or is it indicating that roads are planned to be widened with the planning period?	Acknowledged
1073	Maps	Map 11	183	City of Markham	Remove the Donald Cousens Parkway extension from this map as it was removed in the Transportation Master Plan Update.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1074	Maps	Map 12A	184	TRCA	Identify the "downgradient line" in Map 12A to distinguish REC-1 policy exclusions	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1075	Maps	Map 12A	184	City of Vaughan	Please add the downgradient line to the map.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1076	Maps	Map 12B	185	TRCA	TRCA staff recently updated a method for significant surface water contribution areas within their WSR data set which is not reflected in the Region's mapping. Data set shared with staff November 2021. The updated layer captures additional areas within urban boundaries due to their importance for maintaining hydrological function.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1077	Maps	Map 12B	185	City of Vaughan	Please confirm that that the ESGRA policies are part of the water resources system mapping, if so, it is suggested that they be grouped together with Map 4.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content
1078	Maps	Map 12B	185	City of Markham	Confirm which policies apply to this map. There is some concern with this mapping as it appears to extend significantly into Markham Centre and other developed communities (e.g., Greensborough and Wismer Commons).	Acknowledged
1079	Maps	Maps 1-18	-	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- Staff supports the proposed South Gormley Employment Expansion Area and Bethesda Road Lands Community Expansion Area as shown on Maps 1-18 in accordance with the Regional Council direction of November 25, 2021, and Council's direction for Regional Staff to seek an amendment from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing under the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Act. - Furthermore, Staff recommends that the hatched overlay identified as "Area within ORMCP conditional upon amendments to Ontario Regulation 140/02*" be revised to exclude the lands that are designated as Natural Linkage Area under the ORMCP or comprise part of the Natural Heritage System within the Protected Countryside Area of the Greenbelt Plan. In staff's view, it was the intent to only expand the settlement areas into lands comprising the Countryside Area designation of the ORMCP, consistent with the provincial direction under the ORMCP (Implementation - Settlement Area Expansions). - Staff also recommends, that should the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing not comment on the proposed expansion, nor amend Ontario Regulation 140/02, prior to the commenting deadline, that the proposed ORMCP settlement area expansions be carried forward in the ROP presented to Regional Council for adoption, and subsequently forwarded to the Minister for final review and approval.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1080	Maps	General	-	Public	Questions, clarifications and suggestions for mapping, including highlighting points of interest, showing MZO 's, highway mapping, and a separate map for institutions (hospitals, community centres, libraries), among other items.	No change – Map based on best available information at Regional scale/ROP policies allows for more detailed refinement through local plans and studies
1081	Maps	General	-	MPLAN Inc	Impact of ROP policies on a subject property.	Acknowledged
1082	Maps	General	-	GTA Strategies	Inquiry regarding the MCR process and site designations for 5616 Major Mackenzie Drive East in Markham as part of consultants due diligence on the site for a client.	Acknowledged
1083	Maps	General	-	City of Vaughan	Is there any parcel fabric mapping that could help identify different designations? i.e.. Appendix 1 Employment Area Zone and Density Map - The southwest corner of Highway 7 & Keele is identified as both Urban Area and Employment Area Zone. The owner could pick up additional land and claim that it is all Urban Area. Parcel mapping would help identify where the Urban Area ends and Employment Area Zone begins.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1084	Maps	General	-	Councillor Jackson	3. The northern end of the existing Highway 427 is identified as under construction, a dashed line, it should be a solid line.	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
1085	Maps	General	-	Councillor Jackson	4.Councillor Jackson suggested adding a disclaimer, which I think is a good idea, along the lines of 'these maps may contain minor errors or omissions based on the data used…'	Request Supported – policy changes recommended
1086	Maps	General	-	Public	Bethesda + Leslie lands: - It is not appropriate to assign 1393 Bethesda Side Road low to medium density given proposed ramps to Highway 404, widening of Leslie Street and Bethesda, and distance to MTSA 48 - Suggestion for higher density designations to this area	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1087	Maps	General	-	Public	Mapping as provided by the Region as proposed for its Draft Official Plan, continues to be a problem, most particularly in electronic versions because these images pixelate and distort graphics.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1088	Maps	General	-	Public	Concern remains the lack of support to accommodate corrections to Oak Ridges Moraine mapping by Regional and City Planners. - Clearly, from evidence already given at the Ontario Municipal Board by urban planner Michael Manett (see attached), the large developer within the West Gormley Secondary Plan has clawed-back provincial lands and altered the linework assigned as the boundary for development. - In addition to Mr. Manett's hand drawn map, municipal mapping reflect this same 'correction'.	Acknowledged
1089	Maps	NEW	-	Malone Given Parsons	We recommend a key map that encompasses the entire Region or smaller parts to illustrate the MSTA together in a combined map	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1090	Maps	NEW	-	City of Richmond Hill	As noted in previous comments, mapping that shows watersheds and subwatershed either on their own or integrated with existing maps would help to implement policies of the ROP.	Addressed in part – mapping changes recommended
1091	Maps	NEW	-	City of Richmond Hill	With intensification, greenfield development and employment area conversions, it is important to understand the extent of airport protection areas with respect to noise and flightpaths. It would be very beneficial to include current Noise Exposure Forecast / Noise Exposure Projection contours as well as the regulated area for building height in relation to the Pearson, Buttonville and future Pickering airports.	Acknowledged - Beyond Regional planning jurisdiction
1092	Maps	NEW	-	City of Vaughan	4.2.7 - Local municipalities shall plan to meet or exceed the designated greenfield area minimum however, there is no map associated with the location of the designated greenfield area. Designated greenfield areas are defined as outside of the built-up area in the 2006 Growth Plan. Mapping should be provided to provide clarity and ensure that the local municipality is accurately providing the density target.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1093	Figures	Figure 1	186	City of Richmond Hill	Figure 1 identifies the Landform Conservation Area with terms from the ORMCP technical papers - Complex Landform (ORM Category 1) and Moderately Complex Landform (ORM Category 2). However, these terms are not used within the ROP - not specifically within Section 3.4.3, nor defined in the definitions.	No change - adequately addressed with existing content
1094	Figures	Figure 1	186	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Staff questions whether this Figure should constitute a Map to the Official Plan (as opposed to a Figure), given the policy significance of landform conservation areas within the ORMCP.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1095	Figures	NEW	186	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	Recommendation that a new Figure be included to identify Strategic Employment Lands, as shown on Attachment 1 (Figure 1), which include the: • North Gormley Strategic Employment Lands; • Vandorf Strategic Employment Lands; and • Davis Drive Strategic Employment Lands. - The current ROP identifies strategic employment areas on Figure 2 in the ROP, which has not been carried forward in the new draft ROP. In staff's view there is a significant opportunity for the Region to identify future strategic employment lands beyond the 2051 planning horizon in the ROP (without designating them) to ensure that these lands are protected and planned for future employment uses. - Staff requests that the Region identify Strategic Employment Lands in the ROP, particularly along the Highway 404 Corridor in the Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville, consistent with York Region Council and Town Councils directions and the Region's Report on Potential For Employment Lands Along 400 Series Highways, October 8, 2020. - Consistent with Regional Council and Town Councils support of the Proposed Provincially Significant Employment Zones (PSEZs) within the Town, Figure 2 identifies the lands that should be identified as Strategic Employment Lands within the Town. Staff would be pleased to work with the Region in drafting some appropriate policies and mapping. In staff's view, the ROP should provide more strategic direction for accommodating future growth and development, particularly for the protection and planning of future employment lands, and also provide policy direction to inform future reviews of the Provincial Plans. - In staff's view, there is a significant opportunity to accommodate more intensive employment growth within the existing Community of Vandorf, which is currently designated a Hamlet in the draft ROP, and subject to an appropriate servicing solution in accordance with the approved Secondary Plan.	No change – would conflict with Provincial conformity
1096	Appendices	Appendix 1	188	Humphries Planning Group Inc	- Appendix 1 establishes a density target for the Highway 400 North Employment Zone as 55 jobs per hectare - With the restructuring of traditional industrial and manufacturing employment, in favor of warehousing, distribution centres, transportation terminals and other uses of logistics nature paired with Block 35's strategic location and access to the Highway 400 corridor, it is likely that Block will develop as a continuation of existing trends. - Distribution facilities can produce densities as low as 5-10 jobs per hectare as compared to densities of 290 jobs per hectare in employment areas with large concentrations of professional services employment located in office and multi-unit industrial buildings Request for clarity as to how the Region intends on implementing the employment density target.	No change – policy or mapping achieves a balanced approach addressing a range of interests
1097	Appendices	Appendix 1	188	Town of East Gwillimbury	Appendix 1 - Mount Albert should be added to the "Schomberg, Nobleton, Holland Landing, Pefferlaw" employment area zone in the legend. Mount Albert employment area is color-coded for employment in the YROP Appendix Map, but should be appropriately referenced within the Employment Area Zone table listings as well.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1098	Appendices	Appendix 1	188	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	- As per our Policy Comments below on S. 4.3.21, the Highway 404 North Employment Zone, which includes Gormley, has a proposed density target of 55 jobs per hectare. It is staff's understanding that the density target is intended to apply across the entire employment zone and not on a parcel by parcel basis. - Notwithstanding, the proposed density target would not be achievable on the basis of private water and wastewater servicing. As such, staff supports the provision of municipal services to lands within Gormley to accommodate more intensive and higher order employment development, to assist in achieving the overall density target.	No change - density target is consistent with Council direction
1099	Appendices	Appendix 1	188	KLM Planning Partners Inc	We recommend that the Region should reduce the proposed density target of 30 jobs/hectare for the West Vaughan Employment Zone to better align with current potential employment densities realized in West Vaughan - Consider 25 jobs/hectare	No change - density target is consistent with Council direction
1100	Appendices	Appendix 2	190	City of Vaughan	The number of the corresponding "Adjacent Major Transit Station Area" needs to be labeled on the MTSA maps. It is difficult to find the corresponding Adjacent MTSA since the maps are not in order.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1101	Appendices	Appendix 2	190	City of Vaughan	A map showing each local municipality with the MTSAs would be helpful along with their number. The list and MTSA number is not visual or user-friendly.	Acknowledged – to be addressed through implementation and/or implementation plans
1102	Appendices	Appendix 2	190	City of Vaughan	What is the base to use in calculating people and jobs per ha? The MTSA mapping shows density targets, however, it does not state whether those are minimums of maximums. Please identify on the mapping.	No change - adequately addresssed with existing content

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1103	Appendices	Appendix 2	190	WSP Canda Inc (CN Rail)	Review and reconsider the locations of several planned MTSAs in proximity to CN Rail facilities - Several MTSAs would create conflict with the MacMillan Yard. These include: • MTSA 57 – Creditstone BRT Station • MTSA 61 – Keele BRT Station • MTSA 73 – Langstaff BRT Station • MTSA 76 – Pennsylvania BRT Station • MTSA 77 – Springside BRT Station • MTSA 78 – Vaughan Mills BRT Station - Preference is that these MTSA are removed as the existing employment policy framework can appropriately address future non-sensitive land use growth in these areas - Alternatively, we request the boundaries of these MTSAs be shaped such that the MTSA does not encroach on the 300m setback from the MacMillan yard	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1104	Appendices	Appendix 2	190	Public	- A positive appearance in the Region's proposed Draft Official Plan 2051 is the rationalization of density / job targets around existing provincial GO Stations in the form of assigned MTSAs. This has been needed for some time.	Acknowledged
1105	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 1	192	Weston Consulting	MTSA 1 - Aurora GO Station: - It is our opinion that the Aurora GO Station MTSA can provide an appropriate context to support the minimum density target of 150 people and jobs per hectare, which is currently proposed - It is also our opinion the area can support a higher minimum density target should the Region find it appropriate - An increased minimum density target would promote and support greater levels of intensification within the Aurora Promenade and MTSA	No change - density target is consistent with Council direction
1106	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 8	193	Malone Given Parsons	Expand MTSA 8 - Chalmers BRT Station to incorporate lands within an 800m radius, including low density residential areas - The MTSA delineation is inconsistent with the PPS and does not conform to the Growth Plan as it: 1) does not maximize the # of potential transit users within walking distance of the MTSA; and 2) does not optimize intensification opportunities in close proximity to a rapid transit corridor/station that leverages infrastructure investments - Exclusion of low-density and existing neighborhoods from the MTSA lowers the density surrounding a major transit area, which is contrary to the direction of the PPS, Growth Plan and good planning principles for directing growth - Based on the proposed figure, it is clear the area is well below the expect 500 to 800m radius or 10-minute walking distance as prescribed in the growth plan	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1107	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 8	193	Malone Given Parsons	Consider increasing the density target of MTSA 8 from 200 to 250 people and jobs per hectare - Other MTSA's along these same routes have a density target of 250 and a similar policy/transit context (MTSA 24 & 26). - Based on these comparable MTSAs, we request an increase to MTSA 8	No change - density target is consistent with Council direction
1108	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 13, MTSA 14, MTSA 20	195	City of Markham	Delete MTSA 14 - Langstaff-Longbridge Subway Station given that a subway station is no longer contemplated on Yonge Street south of Highway 7 on the Yonge North Subway Extension. Also, revise the delineations of MTSA 13 - Langstaff GO Station and MTSA 20 - Royal Orchard Subway Station to incorporate lands from the former Langstaff-Longbridge Subway Station as shown in Figure 1.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended
1109	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 16	195	Malone Given Parsons	Expand MTSA 16 - McCowan BRT Station to incorporate lands within an 800m radius, including general employment lands. - The MTSA boundary is smaller than the City's Markville Secondary Plan boundary and Intensification Area boundary. Notably, the existing low-density employment uses east of McCowan Road have been excluded from the MTSA - Concerns that MTSA 16 does not maximize the size of the area and the exclusion of general employment areas erroneously lowers the density surrounding the MTSA	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1110	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 16	195	Malone Given Parsons	Consider increasing the density target of MTSA 16 from 200 to 250 people and jobs per hectare - A higher density target would be more appropriate for this MTSA given its proximity to 2 distinct forms of rapid transit. Other MTSAs (17, 24, 25) have a density target of 250 and are located on the same transportation routes	No change - density target is consistent with Council direction
1111	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 46	203	Malone Given Parsons	Request to expand MTSA 46 - Crosby BRT Station to incorporate lands within an 800m radius, including low-density neighborhoods. Policy 4.4.2.9 is unnecessarily more restrictive than the Growth Plan requirements, but also results in additional growth pressures being distributed away from strategic growth areas.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1112	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 48	203	Public	MTSA 48: has a density target of 50 people and jobs per hectare - I do not disagree with this target, but I do disagree with the area of coverage for the MTSA. It is completely misdirected on 3 fronts: 1) the MTSA has subsumed all of the Hamlet of Gormley, which also carries a heritage designation. This is a conflict of existing assets and future resources. The existing built fabric of the Hamlet needs to remain undisturbed without execution of density / job targets during the time frame of the 2051 ROP 2) I am aware there is a substantive 25-acre land parcel (Doner lands, 12119 Leslie Street) inside the Gormley Hamlet. It would be appropriate to direct and approve new development here, well within the 300-metre distance from the GO Station, in order to protect the existing built fabric of the Hamlet, while at the same time accommodating logical intensification around a transportation hub. 3) As shown on page 203 of the Draft ROP, there is a glaring revelation in the absence of supportive development immediately abutting the Gormley GO Station. This flies in the face of first and best urban planning principles in Canada, and requires change. Currently these abutting supporting lands are designated Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM) 'Countryside'. The Region should be proactive in requesting the province amend this land use designation as it is an economic impediment to the success of achieving a complete community. To further punctuate this, is the premature assignment of 50 jobs / Ha to Long Body Homes, located on the east side of Leslie Street adjacent to the GO Station.	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1113	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 71	209	Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville	The Lincolnville GO MTSA should be renamed "Old Elm GO" as per the Provincial announcement on Sept 29, 2021 which renamed the GO Station.	Request Supported – mapping changes recommended

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1114	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 71	209	Malone Given Parsons	Request to refine the boundaries of MTSA 71 - Linconville GO Station as per criteria below: - Western Boundary: 2.1 ha adjacent to the railway line contain environmental lands, SWM facility, and other non-developable uses. Since they cannot be developed, the should be excluded from the MTSA - Eastern Boundary: re-align to focus density closer to the new Lincolnville GO Station, specifically with some form of mid-rise apartments along tenth line - The modification results in a net reduction of 4.7 ha to the MTSA area. - The Lincolnville lands are large agricultural, undeveloped parcels of land unlike other MTSA's in the Region. The eastern boundary is currently based on the alignment of the proposed collector road in the draft Secondary Plan - Engineering work has been completed and identified a more appropriate alignment to the east that will avoid the need for deep sewers and extensive infilling to accommodate servicing of the lands - Since the location of the proposed collector road has not been finalized, we are requesting a consistent 164m setback from the 10th Line ROW up to the north end where it will align with the collector road just south of Bethesda Road (SEE Comment Letter for map of suggested new boundary limits)	No change – policy or mapping is consistent with Council direction
1115	Appendices	Appendix 2 - MTSA 74	210	Zelinka Priamo Ltd.	4.4.2.10: - Policy 4.4.2.10 notes that a number of stations are not protected MTSAs, and require further approvals for locations and boundaries. - This includes MTSA 74 "Major Mackenzie BRT Station", which is currently delineated to include 2911 Major Mackenzie Drive. We note support for the MTSA delineation to include the Choice Lands, but seek clarification as to why the current MCR process is not sufficient to delineate the boundaries for this station. - In total, 78 MTSAs are being considered and the boundaries of 17 of those stations are not delineated as part of this MCR. In addition, we and seek clarification as to timing and next steps for MTSA 74;	Acknowledged
1116	2	2.3.12	20	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	2.3.12 - Add "**d. designed in a compact form integrated within multi-storey, mixed use buildings, where appropriate**". - This addition would encourage urban format schools as may be appropriate Regional Centres or MTSA areas where the highest levels of intensification are envisaged.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1117	2	2.3.13 i.	20	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	2.3.13 i. - Add next sentence "**These spaces and/or facilities should take the form of publicly owned land, stratified public ownership, or with right of use established by means of public easements (i.e. Privately Owned Publicly-accessible Space) as appropriate**". - This addition would encourage municipalities to use a broad range of tools and solutions to secure public open space and facilities, particularly in urbanized settings such as Regional Centres or MTSA's.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1118	2	2.3.2	25	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	Section 2.3.2 policies: - The goal of affordable housing for everyone is common to all of us – within and beyond the land development and building industry. It is our opinion that this goal can not be met by focussing only on the price of a new residential unit as set by building industry for its introductory sale into the market. - We believe that the matter of housing affordability requires a broad and all-encompasing approach - considerations such as the price of the subsequent sale once the 1st purchaser sells the unit, household income rates, measurements and flucuations, increased costs of development and other development considertations - We urge the Region to ensure it focusses on all aspects of potential solutions to the goal of affordable housing and not only on housing purchase price considerations	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1119	2	2.3.2.3	26	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	2.3.2.3 - This policy has significant implications, at the Regional, Municipal, and private levels. The word "minimum" should be replaced by "**targeted**" to allow for flexibility for municipalities given strategy details require further development at the municipal level.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1120	2	2.3.2.6	27	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	2.3.2.6 - Significant impediments exist and require all levels of government to cooperate to ensure that implementation of additional dwelling unit permissions is possible and practical. - Matters such as additional parkland dedication, additional development charges, additional parking, additional zoning restrictions, etc., are all critical and must be comprehensively addressed by the region and the local municipalities if these policies are to succeed in delivering additional units.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1121	3	3.4.2	49	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Section 3.4 Table - Section 3.4 Table, page 49, identifies what are considered "Key Natural Heritage Features". One of these, "Significant Wildlife Habitat", is noted to include "habitat of special concern species", which deviates from Provincial Policy. That policy is intended to protect significant habitat, not any habitat, which may for example be artificial and inconsequential (such as a roadside). This is an important point, as many special concern species are widespread and common. - We recommend that the notation within the Table be revised as follows: "including **significant** habitat of special concern species".	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1122	3	3.4.13	51	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Table 3 - Minimum Buffer/Vegetation Protection Zone of the Draft OP specifies minimum buffers to features for Settlement Areas within the area subject to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (the "ORMCP") of 30 metres, whereas s. 21.4 of the ORMCP allows considerable flexibility to determine appropriate buffers. The Draft OP goes much further than the ORMCP. - We recommend that the Draft OP be revised to conform with the ORMCP per the above.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1123	3	3.4.13	51	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Table 3 - For "Other Evaluated Wetlands" (i.e. non-Provincially Significant Wetlands) that are retained, a minimum buffer of 15 metres is required, whereas the Toronto Region Conservation Authority requires a minimum buffer of 10 metres - We recommend that the Draft OP be revised to identify that for "Other Evaluated Wetlands", minimum buffers will be "**As determined by an Environmental Impact Study**", rather than a pre-established minimum.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1124	3	3.4.2.6 a)	57	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	Policy 3.4.2.6 (a. ii.) is unclear with respect to whether the exception cited for Butternut trees extends to other species for which an Endangered Species Act permit may be issued. The specificity of this exception is likely to be an issue for small, wooded patches with bats, where a permit (or future exemption) could be granted, but the 0.5 hectare woodlot would still be deemed to be significant. - We recommend that policy 3.4.2.6 a. ii. be revised by removing the reference to Butternut trees, and replacing with a general phrase such as, "**except where permitted by a process under the Endangered Species Act**."	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1125	4	4.2.2.1	71	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	4.2.2.1 - This requirement must be carefully implemented so that it is kept at a high and broad level to ensure that the City is not burdened with a very large, diverse, lengthy and difficult to complete study required to cover such a large geographic area.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending

ID	Chapter	Policy/Section Number	ROP Page #	Comment Source	Comment	Response
1126	4	4.2.2.2 d)	72	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	4.2.2.2 d) - One must be cautious to not allow this policy to preclude development in any or all concession blocks if development is stalled for some reason in another concession block. - Logical and progressive phasing does not have to restrict development in one concession block in order to complete development in another. - The logical extension of infrastructure and the planned development of a concession block should be the goal. Interdependence with the timing of a different concession block is not required and in fact could be detrimental to the delivery of housing in the entire area.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1127	4	4.2.2.4	72	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	4.2.2.4 - We urge the Region to not create conditions upon approval of secondary plans, but rather create conditions or criteria upon the occurrence of development itself. - The secondary plan approval process is already a long and difficult one. - Approval of a secondary plan should not await the items listed in this proposed policy, but rather it should provide the framework for development to take place with the appropriate criteria to be met in subsequent development approvals. - We suggest that this policy be revised to provide criteria which may be applied to the approval of development, not to the approval of secondary plans	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1128	4	4.2.2.4 b)	72	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	4.2.2.4 b) - this policy would restrict development in one area of the City of Markham and for one new community IF development in another area of the City in a different community did not occur for whatever reason. - This linkage is not appropriate as it would stop development in one area if another area is subject to any sory of delay causing issues to matter like servicing, soils, construction, groundwater, market conditions etc. - This policy will negatively impact housing supply in Markham - we urge the removal of this creiteria	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1129	4	4.2.2.4 c)	72	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	4.2.2.4 c) - this policy would also restrict development on certain communities and housing forms in an artificial manner and should be removed	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1130	4	4.2.2.4 h)	72	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	4.2.2.4 h) i. - reconsider this policy. Delays or difficulties in developing one particular area should not cause a delay in development of other communities. - Policies such as these serve to further exacerbate housing shortages and constrain the market such that demand exceeds supply causing delays in housing delivery and potential increases in housing prices.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1131	4	4.4.19	80	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	4.4.19 - Suggesting "all new buildings" be replaced by "**new developments**" as current wording could suggest internal buildings in larger multi building developments will not conform.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1132	4	4.4.23	80	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	4.4.23 - The word "minimum" should be replaced by "**targeted**" to allow for flexibility for municipalities given strategy details require further development at the municipal level.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1133	4	4.4.24	80	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	4.4.24 - The word "minimum" should be replaced by "**targeted**" to allow for flexibility for municipalities given strategy details require further development at the municipal level.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1134	4	4.4.26	80	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	4.4.26 - While it is agreed minimum heights and densities are critical in Regional Centres and MTSA's for the purpose of compliance with Provincial policy, the word "maximum" as it relates to heights and densities should be removed to ensure that appropriate opportunities for growth are not limited by general Official Plan policies. - Where appropriate, maximum heights and densities may be identified through the rezoning process following a qualitative review of the subject site and surrounding context	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1135	4	4.4.2.9	86	KLM Planning Partners Inc.	4.4.2.9 - The word "maximum" as it relates to heights and densities should be removed, and the word "minimum" should be replaced by "**targeted**".	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1136	5	5.1.7	95	MHBC Planning	Based on policy 5.1.7, it is our interpretation of the draft Official Plan Policies, that a Regional Official Plan Amendment is not required for new mineral aggregate operations. We would appreciate if staff could confirm this interpretation.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1137	5	5.5	103	MHBC Planning	We suggest revising the following sentence in the intro of Section 5.5 to: "~~The majority of~~ **Within York Region** These resources **may be also be** subject to the applicable provisions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, **Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, Greenbelt Plan, and Growth Plan**."	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1138	5	5.5.7	104	MHBC Planning	The Region's policies cannot be more restrictive than provincial policy relative to mineral aggregate operations. We suggest that this policy be deleted as it is not consistent with the Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan, or Oak Ridges Morain Conservation Plan. This is explicitly outlined in the Greenbelt Act (Section 6(2)(e)) and the Greenbelt Plan (Section 5.3).	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1139	5	5.5.17	105	MHBC Planning	To be consistent the terminology through the draft Official Plan, and for clarity, we suggest that the word "**Prime**" be added before the term Agricultural Areas.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1140	5	5.5.20	105	MHBC Planning	This policy needs to be consistent with the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan policies which permit expansions to mineral aggregate extraction in key natural heritage features. - In addition, this policy could be reworded to make it clear that this policy does not apply to components of the Regional Greenlands System that are located outside of a Provincial Plan Natural Heritage System (i.e. local natural heritage systems).	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1141	7	7.3.15	143	Gatzios Planning + Development Consultants Inc.	7.3.15 - Once a plan of subdivision is registered and developed and housing is built it would be extremely odd and unfair to the lot owners / residents for this to occur, and it is unclear why this policy has been included in this draft of the Plan. - Many plans of subdivision which have been registered (and built) more than 8 years ago may not meet the policies of this pending new Plan, however, to suggest that the Region is going to identify whole existing communities full of developed lots or even existing residents and deem their subdivision lots to not be a registered plan of subdivision is not logical. - Perhaps this proposed policy was not worded as intended and therefore its language should be revisited.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending
1142	Maps	Map 1	169	Public	Support for designating Beacon Hall Golf Course Lands as Greenlands. Suggestionfor a walking or bike path across the south and east boundary of the property, separated by a fence for safety, connecting Yonge Street to the newly built bike and cycling path on Bayview that runs from Bloomington to Vandorf.	Later Submission - Assessment Pending