

Promenade Centre Secondary Plan – Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting)
Summary of Public Meeting Comment and Response

Theme	Response	VOP 2010 Policy Reference	Promenade Centre Secondary Plan Reference
Land Use			
Mall Use	Comment Extensive comments were received at Public Meeting emphasizing the importance of retaining the existing Promenade Mall. Multiple stakeholders referenced the value of Promenade Mall as a community asset that should be protected in the long term. Specific concern was raised regarding the High-Rise Mixed-Use designation shown on Schedules C and D of the draft Secondary Plan, which provided for residential development on this site. The Council Extract from Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting) recommended the use of an alternate designation and reallocation of the residential density to the surrounding areas. Response In response to the comments received at Public Meeting, the revised draft Promenade Centre Secondary Plan introduces a new dedicated land use designation for the Promenade Mall to ensure this use remains in the long term. The Community Commercial Mixed-Use designation explicitly recognizes the current Promenade Mall as a permitted use, while restricting any potential residential development. An exemption is included in this designation to recognize the approved Phase 1 of the Promenade Limited Partnership mixed-use development proposal. A limited density transfer policy is included in the Community Commercial Mixed-Use designation to provide for a residential development on the existing anchor grocery store as shown on Schedule D, while protecting the primary Mall structure. See Density response below for more information on the density transfer process.	VOP 2010 2.2.5, 9.2.2.8	Part A Section 1.0 Part B Sections 2.1a, 2.1b, 3.1.1.ii, 3.6, 9.1.d Schedule C, D

Community Centre	Comment It was requested at the Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting) that consideration be given to the inclusion of a community centre in the Promenade Mall, to strengthen the community function of this use and service the estimated population for the Plan area. Response The draft Secondary Plan reflects the concentration of a number of existing community facilities and public uses in the Community Hub Precinct, as shown on Schedule B. While the majority of community facilities will continue to be located in this Precinct, the Plan provides permissions for different public uses, including community facilities such as community centres, in a variety of mixed-use designations across the Plan. The review of the Active Together Master Plan (ATMP) will identify the need for any additional recreation space in the Secondary Plan area, based on the estimated population and required servicing levels.	VOP 2010 7.2.2.	Part B Sections 2.1.b.iii, 3.2, 3.3, 3.6, 3.7, 7.0 Schedule B
Parks Plan	Comment While the draft Secondary Plan had identified a number of potential locations for Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) throughout the Plan area, it was requested that the location of POPS on Schedules C and D be deleted. Suggested policy language was provided to introduce greater flexibility in modifying the size and location of POPS without amendment to the Secondary Plan. Response POPS have been removed from Schedules C and D. The exact location and size of POPS will be determined through the development review process. POPS policies have been consolidated in Section 6.0.	VOP 2010 7.3.2., 7.3.3.	Part B Sections 6.3, 6.4

	Comment Concern was raised regarding the method of calculation and total area of required parkland dedication in the draft Secondary Plan. Additional concern was raised regarding policies that provide for the potential of additional parkland provision. Response Total parkland (existing and proposed) is 5.98 hectares. The parkland area allows for the provision of outdoor recreational facilities based on the needs of the anticipated local population within the boundaries of the Secondary Plan to meet current levels of service as guided by the ATMP provision standards. The parks policies conform to the existing policies in VOP 2010, section 7.3, such as minimum size, programmable configuration, park type, and minimum public street frontage. Therefore, no change has been made to the proposed parkland dedication as part of the draft Secondary Plan.	VOP 2010 7.3.3.	Part B Sections 3.9, 6.1 Schedule C
	Comment The parks plan for the draft Secondary Plan has been established to ensure equal access to public parkland throughout the Plan area. Comments were received requesting a shift in the proposed parks plan shown on Schedule C, including increasing the size and extent of the park fronting Bathurst Street and a corresponding removal of the park shown in the development block south of the Transit Terminal site. Response The distribution of parkland within the Secondary Plan allows for equal physical access to public parkland within the boundaries of the Secondary Plan consistent with the distribution of densities. This approach is consistent with the policies of the VOP 2010, specifically section 7.3.1.2. and the recommendations of the ATMP. The parks plan remains as presented at the Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting).	VOP 2010 7.3.3.	Part B Sections 3.9, 6.1 Schedule C

	Comment At the Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting) it was stated that within high-density developments, less parkland is often provided in favour of cash-in-lieu, and it was recommended that any cash-in-lieu for the proposed developments be invested in the Plan area, such as in Pierre Elliott Trudeau Park and the woodlot. Response A robust parks plan is being provided as part of the draft Secondary Plan which includes the even distribution of proposed and existing parkland. The City's intent is to secure this parkland in order to meet the recreation needs of the estimated population in accordance with the ATMP. While the ATMP provides a target of 2 ha/1000 residents, it envisioned that not all parkland can be satisfied within the developable lands of the Secondary Plan, and therefore the cash-in-lieu generated through development will facilitate the acquisition of additional parkland city-wide to meet the ATMP target. Furthermore, per recent recommendations of the Parkland Dedications Study completed and presented to Council in February 2022, consideration #38 suggests that the City establish a special bank account for the receipt of all cash-in-lieu of land contributions accrued through the parkland dedication/cash-in-lieu of parkland process. Staff are supportive of these considerations and they align with Council direction to consider a geographic area where cash-in-lieu of parkland is to be used. Staff will work to develop a cash-in-lieu of parkland expenditure policy in consultation with internal stakeholder departments.	VOP 2010 7.3.3.2., 7.3.3.3.	Part B Sections 6.3, 11.1.2
Natural Areas	Comment A woodlot is currently located in the southwest corner of the Plan area. Suggestions were raised at the Committee of the Whole (Public Meeting) regarding the restoration and potential enhancement of the woodlot, including the development of a formalized trail system.	VOP 2010 3.0, 7.3.1.3.c., 9.2.2.16.c.	Part B Sections 3.11, 4.3.b.

	Response The woodlot is designated 'Natural Area' on Schedule C of the draft Secondary Plan, which is intended to protect this use in accordance with Policy 3.0 of VOP 2010 (Natural Environment). It is currently under City ownership. Segments of the Shared Use Path network are identified to be developed in the woodlot in order to provide access to this feature and connections to the broader Plan area. Further studies will be required to identify feasible trail connections within the woodlot that balances between controlled access, trail type, and the protection and potential enhancement of existing natural features. Future development will be identified through separate capital works and be subject to identifying suitable funding sources. Part of the identified trail system in the Secondary Plan bordering the eastern limit of the woodlot has been included in the Bathurst Clarke Library parking and entrance renovations works to be tendered in 2023. This segment (approx. 160m) will connect Promenade Circle to Clarke Avenue.		
Density			
Population and Density	Comment Multiple comments were received raising concern over the proposed population densities in the draft Secondary Plan. In light of recent development activity in the vicinity of the Plan area, the proposed densities contained in the draft Secondary Plan area were considered too high. Conversely, comments were also received requesting that a higher minimum density than 200 people and jobs per hectare (as identified in Appendix 2 of the draft YROP for the Disera-Promenade BRT Station MTSA) be considered for the Secondary Plan area and identified in the Plan as a target rather than a maximum. Response The estimated population and job totals (15,500 people, 2,300 jobs) provided for in the draft Secondary Plan meet the minimum 200 people and jobs per hectare density target as identified in the draft YROP for the Disera-Promenade BRT Station MTSA. The estimated population and employment density for the Secondary Plan also reflects the position of		Part A Section 5.0 Part B Section 3.1.3, 3.2.4 Schedule D

	Promenade Centre as a Primary Centre as shown on Schedule 1 Urban Structure of the VOP 2010. Population and employment estimates completed as part of the background to the Study also support the proposed densities in the draft Secondary Plan.			
	Comment Comments were received raising concern regarding the calculation and reporting of densities in the Secondary Plan. Response The draft Secondary Plan has been revised to provide additional information regarding the estimated number of residential units, people and jobs anticipated to be present in the Plan area to ultimate build out. Building heights and densities identified on individual development blocks on Schedule D have been developed through a density analysis consistent with the definition of Floor Space Index (FSI) in the VOP 2010, which nets out public uses from the calculation of lot area.	VOP 10.2.2.2. Floor Space Index	Part A 5.0 Policy Context Schedule D	
Site-Specific Height and Density	Comment Concern was raised over the proposed heights and densities on the Promenade Limited Partnership (PLP) lands as set out on Schedule D, it was requested that the maximum heights and FSI be increased at key locations across the Plan area, and a more flexible approach to building heights be included in the Secondary Plan policies and on Schedule D. Response In response to concerns related to Promenade Mall and the recommendation of Committee of the Whole, the heights and densities originally identified on specific development blocks have been revised. Residential densities originally allocated to the Mall site have been transferred to the parcels in the immediate surrounding area. Building heights and densities limits have been established in the Secondary Plan as shown on Schedule D. These limits are included to	VOP 2010 2.2.5 Primary Centres	Part B Sections 3.2, 3.3, Schedule D	

	provide greater clarity regarding overall development capacity and to assist in the evaluation of Development Applications. This approach is consistent with policy 10.1.1.3 of VOP 2010 regarding the development of secondary plans.		
	Comment Comments were received requesting that the Secondary Plan include a policy which allows for the transfer of heights and densities between development parcels through the development approval process without requiring an Official Plan Amendment. Response The Community Commercial Mixed-Use designation contains a limited density transfer policy allowing the transfer of unused residential density from other areas of the Plan to the hatched area identified on Schedule D, representing the anchor grocery store located on the northern part of the Promenade Mall. An applicant initiated Official Plan Amendment is not required to complete the density transfer process.		Part B Section 3.3.6
Built Form			
Residential Floor Plates & Setbacks	Comment The draft Secondary Plan provides specific thresholds related to built form, including the size of residential floor plates and minimum setback standards. It was requested that these thresholds be removed or that greater flexibility provided in the policies. Response Revisions to the Community Design section of the draft Secondary Plan have been made which provide alternative thresholds and more flexible wording concerning minimum numerical requirements.	VOP 2010 9.2.3.6 d.	Part B Section 4.2.c.
Gateways	Comment Gateways function as key entrance points into the Secondary Plan area.		Part B

	Comments were received requesting that all gateway locations and points of intersection with Promenade Circle be considered for additional height and density, offering opportunities for architectural expression and design features. Response Gateway locations can be emphasized through architectural expression, landscaping and signage and do not require, as they were not originally intended for, additional height or density to emphasize their importance. Therefore, no additional wording has been added to the draft Secondary Plan.		Section 4.5
Parking	Comment Concern was raised that the draft Secondary Plan policies preclude surface parking where it would be necessary and supportive of retail uses, and request that the policies be amended to allow for limited amounts of surface parking within the High-Rise Mixed-Use designation to support retail and commercial uses. Response The draft Secondary Plans provides a policy framework to minimize the amount of surface parking in the Plan area and identifies specific instances in which surface parking may be provided. There is no revision to the draft Secondary Plan on this matter.	VOP 2010 4.3.2.2., 4.3.2.4., 4.3.2.7., 9.1.2.9. d-f.	Part B Sections 4.4.a, 5.5.a.i
Transportation			
Public vs Private Streets	Comment Concern was raised regarding a number of the streets proposed to be public streets as part of the draft Secondary Plan, and it was requested that the Plan policies and Schedule E be amended to identify the interior Local Streets, as well as the north-south street proposed on the Torgan lands, as private streets.		Part B Section 5.2 b. Schedules E and F

	Response Within the broader context of an approach to policy changes intended to retain the Promenade Mall, modifications to the multi – modal network, as identified on Schedules E and F, and implementation framework include revisions to the: • north-south local street on the west side of the Mall from a local public street to a publicly accessible private linkage to address concerns including on existing Mall operations and additional policy setting out a framework for the continued protection and not precluding the implementation and establishment of public local street right-of-way; • east-west local street (short segment) to a Shared Use Path Network, allowing for a larger block size in addressing concerns with respect to developable area and siting of a park in the northwest quadrant of the plan; and, • revision to the local east-west street on the east side of the Mall (short segment) to a publicly accessible private linkage, allowing for a larger block size in addressing concerns with respect to developable area. No modification is proposed to the local public street in the northeast quadrant of the Secondary Plan connecting to Centre Street		
Rights-of-Way	Comment Rights-of-ways of 26 metres for Collector Streets, 22 metres for Local Streets (with parking on one side) and 7.5 or 10 metres for Shared Use Paths have been provided as part of the draft Secondary Plan. It was requested that the Plan policies be amended to provide reduced right-of-way widths for these street typologies.		Part B Section 5.2 b Schedules D, E Appendix Figure A

	Response The draft Secondary Plan revises collector streets minimum right-of-way from 26m to 24.5m at typical mid block section. It is noted that this is the minimum right-of-way for the typical mid block section and will vary for collector streets segments for north, south, west and east Promenade Circle on approaches to and at intersections per policy 5.2.b.ii.		
	Comment Comments were received requesting that the draft Secondary Plan policies be amended to provide flexibility with respect to the cross-section elements required within private Local Streets. Response The Secondary Plan does not contain any policies with respect to cross-section elements for private streets, nor figures in Appendix A. Secondary Plan sets out policy for public local streets.		Part B Policy 5.2.b.iii b, 5.2.b.iii.c, 5.2.b.iv.b Appendix A Figures 2 and 3
Long-Term Future Connection	Comment A Long-Term Future Connection is identified on Schedules C, D and E to provide and not preclude for a connection in this location in the event that the Promenade Mall redevelops in the future. It was requested that the Plan policies be amended to clarify that the Long-Term Future Road Connection would only occur in the event of a very long term redevelopment of the Mall. Response Policy 5.2.f.iii in the Transportation and Mobility section has been modified with the intent of further clarifying and consistent with policy 11.4.7. Development shall protect for and not preclude the long term future connection as identified on Schedule E, such that it can be implemented if and when Promenade Mall is redeveloped, consistent with the policies of this Plan.		Part B Section 5.2.f.ii, 5.2.f.iii, 11.4.7 Schedules C, D, E

	Comment Comments were received requesting that the draft Secondary Plan be amended to allow flexibility in establishing minimum and maximum parking requirements, the potential for shared parking, and reduced parking standards for residential visitors, retail, personal service and office uses, similar to those used in the VMC. Response Policy 5.5.b.ii in the draft Secondary Plan wording has been modified to clarify that the minimum and maximum automobile parking requirements in the City-Wide Zoning By-law at rates set for the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre shall apply for residential-and also apply for personal service and office uses. Policy 5.5.b.iii in the draft Secondary Plan sets out and provides framework that - if through the <i>development</i> approval process relief from either the minimum or maximum parking rates including through consideration under shared arrangements are sought, the proposed rates and supply must be justified by a parking study. The draft Secondary Plan has been modified to more explicitly also include under shared parking arrangements.	VOP 2010 4.3.2.2.	Part B Section 5.5.b ii, 5.5.b.iii
Shared Use Paths	Comment Suggestions were provided that the Shared Use Path policies in the draft Secondary Plan and corresponding Figures 4 and 5 allow flexibility to permit vehicular movements and allow for flexibility in the removal, relocation and width of Shared Use Paths through the development application process, or that Figures 4 and 5 be deleted. Specifically, comments request that the west leg of the Shared Use Path proposed on the Torgan lands be identified as a Private Local Linkage on Schedule E, and do not preclude vehicles. Response Policy 5.2.e ii has been modified to more clearly include consideration of provision for vehicular access as part of local network and servicing ill be		Part B Section 5.2.e. Schedule E Figures 4, 5

	determined by the City through the <i>development</i> process working with the landowners.		
	Comment Concern was raised that the draft Secondary Plan does not provide an explanation of how the Shared Use Paths and trails are to be secured through the development parcels in a strata condition. Response The draft Secondary Plan had been modified policy 11.4.5 intended to address comment The City may, at its discretion, require an easement to secure public access to the Shared Use Path Network as identified on Schedule E, as a condition of approval(s) to be registered on title. The easement is to set out matters including owner sole responsibility and obligation but not limited to a maintenance program, state of good repair and reconstruction by the owner and/or condominium board at their expense.		Part B Section 11.4.5
Active Transportation	Comment The draft Secondary Plan proposes cycle tracks on all Collector and Local Streets in the Plan area. It was requested that the Plan policies be amended to clarify that cycle tracks be provided on all public Collector Streets, with flexibility to configure cycling facilities on private Local Streets. Response The active transportation network in the draft Secondary Plan is planned to provide a connected and fine grid network and intended to allow active transportation options to have the same or shorter travel times than automobiles, while being safe and comfortable in supporting the evolution of the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan. Cycle tracks on collector and local streets in the Promenade Secondary Plan area form part of the broader area cycling network including existing Clark Ave and planned New Westminster Ave. There is no revision for the requirement for cycle tracks on local streets.		Part B Section 5.4.b.i, 5.7 Schedule E Figures 1-3

	Comment Concerns were raised over crossing of the existing roads to get to the Mall, particularly from the existing peripheral residential buildings. It was requested that the Plan more clearly show how this access will take place, how safe crossing will be provided, and how the Plan area will be made more pedestrian-friendly so that people feel comfortable walking. Response The draft Secondary Plan, formed by two equally important components, the street network and shared use path network provide a connected multi-modal network that prioritizes sustainable modes including walking. It is noted that the draft Secondary plan includes several new traffic control signals on existing boundary streets some of which are for pedestrian crossings.	VOP 2010 4.2.1.2., 4.2.2.17., 4.2.3., 4.3.1.	Part B Sections 2.1.b.ii, 5.2., 5.3.a, 5.4
Phasing	Comment Comments were received requesting that Schedule F be deleted, instead allowing the detailed phasing of the Street Network implementation to be determined through the development applications. Response Schedule F and policies 11.4.3 and 11.4.4 set out a policy framework for the implementation a public street network in step with development of blocks, the timing of which is in association with phasing of development through the planning application process. Apart from the addition of policy 11.4.4 and modifications to Schedule F there are no other modifications to the Secondary Plan.		Part B Sections 11.4.3., 11.4.4 and Schedule F