

	A	B	C	D	E
1	OPA 102 - Consultations and Submissions				
2	Submissions				
3	Name	Date	Contact	Notes	Staff Responses and Recommendations
4	Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	November 15 2019	Megan Grant, Team Lead	The Ministry would like to commend the City on a draft OPA which appears to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 regarding built form and compact patterns of development intended to support current and future transit and active transportation. The PPS supports planning for complete streets and a full rang of publicly-accessible facilities, parklands and public spaces, as well as a mix of housing types, tenures and affordability.	No comment
5				No concerns have been identified regarding matters of provincial interest.	No comment
6				The Ministry notes that the introduction of policies to address specific section 37 benefits is premature until such time as section 37, as revised by Bill 108, is proclaimed and accompanying regulations are in place.	Staff will continue to monitor the proposed legislative changes and report back to Council as new information becomes available.
7				Waiting until the Community Benefits Charges regulation is in place will ensure that the City's OP policy will correctly identify the types of community benefits that will be permitted under the regulation. It will also ensure that the formula for determining the value of the community benefits that can be obtained through a Community Benefits Charge will be adhered to when the City prepares the community benefits charge strategy required by subsection 37(9) of the Planning Act, and passes a community benefits charge by-law, as required by subsection 37(2).	See above.
8				The City may wish to examine whether some of the community benefits that are proposed to be included in the Community Benefits Charges under section 37 could otherwise be obtained through site plan approval under section 41 of the Planning Act. Namely public streetscape improvements under 41(4)(2)(e), and land for public transit right of way under 41(7)(d).	See above.
9	Ashleyhelena	November 7 2019		We absolutely need dog parks or designated off leash areas for pet owners. You are all missing the big picture about dog parks. It is a safety issue for the entire community. If you do not provide areas where people can exercise their dogs, they will do it anywhere. If you cannot exercise your dog, they are harder to train and can develop behaviours. They may even be surrendered to the shelter. It would be easier to convince residents to adopt shelter animals if the City was more pet friendly.	This matter is outside the scope of the OPA.
10	AlexRanger	November 18 2019		Increased left hand turn lane from Barry Downe to LaSalle.	This matter is outside the scope of the OPA.
11	Mhoney83	December 2 2019		Better light control. A better plan to remove snow in the winter from the curbs for bus stops. The end of LaSalle needs a revamp. Fix the sidewalks and bike paths.	These matters are outside the scope of the OPA
12	Anonymous	December 2 2019		I would suggest waiting to see the actual impacts of Maley Drive to see if expectation is true or not, before making a bunch of changes to LaSalle.	No comment
13	Anonymous	December 2 2019		I like nothing about the plan. Maley Drive has not and will never result in the changes projected for LaSalle, Barry Downe Road of The Kingsway until both Phase 2 and 3 are completed.	No comment.
14	Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury	December 9 2019	Naomi Grant, Chair	Amendment text not posted on Over To You	The text of the proposed amendment was included on Over To You.
15				Overall support for Nodes and Corridors and the vision for LaSalle Boulevard. Supportive of pedestrian-friendly form, mixed use and provision of a mix of housing, etc.	No comment

	A	B	C	D	E
16				<p>Policies to permit reduced parking requirements should be much stronger. Note that provisions for bicycle parking should be included.</p>	<p>The City is currently examining its Commercial Parking Standards. The findings of that study can be incorporated in the Official Plan, where appropriate.</p> <p>The in-effect Official Plan (OP) includes policies for bicycle facilities. OPA 102 would also be subject to the in-effect policies of the OP.</p>
17				<p>OPA 102 must be integrated and consistent with community targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, create complete streets and provide sustainable transportation options, and provide housing. Coalition for a Liveable Sudbury (CLS) supports stronger policies than the ones proposed (setting requirements for key elements) and CLS would especially like to see requirements for active transportation infrastructure and transit supportive infrastructure for Regional Corridors.</p>	<p>The OP contains existing policies on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and sustainable transportation options. The ongoing Phase Two Review of the City's Official Plan will strengthen both the Complete Streets and Sustainable Transportation policies of the OP.</p>
18				<p>CLS is concerned that this OPA has been prepared in isolation from Greater Sudbury's draft Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP), and does not reference climate change. Climate change mitigation and adaptation must be a lens for all Greater Sudbury policies, plans and decisions. This OPA has the potential to assist in meeting many CEEP goals, if policies are strengthened or added to. CLS hopes that this lens is rigorously applied in developing the associated Zoning amendments and by-laws, and in developing additional OPAs.</p>	<p>Phase One of the OP Review introduced climate change considerations throughout the Official Plan.</p> <p>Once adopted by Council, staff will consider the CEEP and will propose appropriate changes to the OP, as required.</p> <p>Staff recommend no further change at this time.</p>
19				<p>Greater Sudbury's draft Official Plan has an intensification target of 20%. Greater Sudbury's CEEP's Compact, Complete Communities actions requires 80% of new development to be in urban centres (nodes), or adjacent to existing or new transit services (corridors), starting in 2025. In addition, average home size will decrease 20%, and the share of new homes that are single-family will drop sharply to 10% by 2050.</p> <p>Although the new Regional Centre, Regional Corridor, and Secondary Community Node areas in the Lasalle corridor OPA allow and assist meeting these goals, they in no way ensure that these goals will be met. To meet these goals, the Official Plan must not only encourage intensification in desired areas, it must require that intensification happen in these areas, and not be permitted in others. Currently, high density can happen anywhere in Living Area 1. Gentle density should be allowed in all living areas, but high density should only be permitted in nodes and along corridors served by frequent transit.</p>	<p>Staff is in support of appropriate intensification and densification. The purpose of the proposed OPA is to encourage increased densities along corridors and to introduce a policy framework that would help increase densities in line with the Province's Transit Supportive Guidelines. This is consistent with the efforts around the City's new Affordable Housing CIP, and the recently-adopted Development Charges By-law, both of which seek to facilitate more development along the City's Corridors.</p> <p>Staff suggests that it may be premature at this time to restrict High Density development to these new land use designations. The City could consider additional policy changes once the complete system of nodes and corridors is in place in the OP.</p>
20				<p>Similarly, transit supportive density should be required (not simply encouraged) in nodes and corridors. Greater Sudbury's modest growth rate means that we cannot afford to misdirect growth if we wish to meet intensification goals and reach transit supportive density.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

	A	B	C	D	E
21				<p>The timeline of the nodes and corridors strategy is mismatched with the timeline for CEEP Compact, Complete Communities actions. Change must happen at a much faster pace. All OPAs should be developed and approved through a CEEP lens. This is also true of associated rezoning and other planning tools. For example, parking standards are a powerful tool for shifting travel patterns and should be implemented in a manner consistent with meeting CEEP goals.</p>	<p>Staff is presenting a Report on Commercial Parking Standards in early 2020 with recommendations related to the City's parking standards and parking strategies. Staff is seeking direction to initiate appropriate changes to the City's Zoning By-law.</p> <p>Once adopted by Council, staff will consider the CEEP and will propose appropriate changes to the OP, as required.</p>
22				<p>Regional corridors and nodes are home to large commercial areas with large flat roof and parking areas. These large areas have potential for green infrastructure, on-site stormwater management, and green energy production. Requiring green roofs, permeable parking surfaces, and green energy production on commercial roofs and parking areas are all planning tools that could be applied to regional corridors and nodes to meet CEEP goals. Similarly, requirements for bike parking, and EV charging stations and parking should be included.</p>	<p>Section 12.5 of the City's OP outlines Energy Efficiency Programs. Section 14.9 of the OP outlines Urban Design Guidelines for Energy Efficiency and Climate Change Resiliency. The OP currently encourages the development of green buildings, alternative heating and cooling methods, and eco-sensitive design in the Downtown Core. Green infrastructure is encouraged in Parks and Open Space.</p>
23				<p>Regional Centres, Regional Corridors, and Secondary Community Node, and other identified Nodes (such as Town Centres) are where the most development is hoped to occur. Therefore, it is especially important that policies for these areas support CEEP goals, most especially for Compact, Complete Communities, Efficient Buildings, and Low Carbon Transportation. Note that the urban forest also has an important role to play in climate mitigation and adaptation. This is something that should inform landscaping requirements, as well as other policies (e.g. support for or requirements for green roofs).</p>	<p>See above.</p>
24				<p>The proposed road design in the Lasalle Corridor Study fails in one of its basic aims: to provide safe and comfortable infrastructure for walking and biking for all users, including the most vulnerable (the elderly, children, and people with disabilities). The vision is for Lasalle to be the 'gold standard' for a complete street, but the proposed design does not meet even the minimum requirements for a true complete street, or the Transportation Master Plan street design standards for arterials (sidewalks and dedicated cycling facilities on both sides of the street). Lasalle is a main travel corridor, an arterial road, and has many key destinations. Dedicated infrastructure for both pedestrians and cyclists is a must.</p>	<p>This matter is outside the scope of the OPA.</p>
25				<p>We would like to see language in the definition of Regional Corridors that ensure dedicated and separated pedestrian and cycling infrastructure is provided in both directions, including safe crossings.</p> <p>Transit infrastructure such as bus bays, dedicated bus lanes, and advanced greens for transit, should also be supported. Regional Corridors are main travel corridors, and they must function well as main travel corridors for all modes of travel. Regional Centre and Secondary Community Node designations should also specifically reference cycling infrastructure (wherever 'pedestrian-friendly' design is referenced).</p>	<p>Staff recommends that "cycling-friendly" be added to the OPA 102 (See comments from Ward 8 CAN)</p>

	A	B	C	D	E
26				Lasalle was identified as part of a minimum grid of cycling routes by the Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel. Completing a safe, connected and convenient network of cycling routes in a timely manner is a basic requirement to significantly increase the number of residents travelling by bike. Similarly, walkability and transit supportive measures are also needed to shift travel patterns to sustainable transportation. Note that here have been many collisions involving pedestrians along Lasalle, and improvements for pedestrian safety should be a priority.	This matter is outside the scope of the OPA.
27				The CEEP goals are for 35% active mobility and 25% transit modal share by 2050. These goals must be integrated into the nodes and corridor strategy. As nodes and corridor policies and projects move ahead, they must always support walking, biking and transit as safe and convenient modes of travel.	Once adopted by Council, staff will consider the CEEP and will propose appropriate changes to the OP, as required.
28				Greater Sudbury will develop a Climate Adaptation Strategy in 2020. Flooding is a common problem along certain areas of the Lasalle corridor, and is only expected to become a greater challenge. Policies to address and prevent flooding, protect water quality, and increase climate resilience should be part of the Lasalle Corridor strategy, and included in the definitions and associated zoning rules for all Regional Corridors and Nodes. Our Regional Corridors should not only be complete streets and public spaces, but also green streets (providing shade and green stormwater management). Note that the Lasalle corridor is in the Junction Creek watershed, and planning policies and associated requirements should be protective of the health of Junction Creek.	The current OP contains policies regarding flooding, protecting water quality, and climate change resiliency.
29	Ward 8 CAN	December 9 2019	Rachelle Niemela, Chair	Ward 8 Community Action Network (CAN) supports the direction that proposes refining the policy structure and hierarchy of the corridors in Greater Sudbury	No comment
30				There is no mention of Climate Change, or the use of a Climate Change lense applied to the proposed OPA changes.	Phase One of the OP Review introduced climate change considerations throughout the Official Plan.
31				Will there be opportunities to further refine the OPA once the CEEP and mitigation plans have been completed, and goals and strategies have been approved by Council?	Once adopted by Council, staff will consider the CEEP and will propose appropriate changes to the OP, as required.
32				In order to meet the proposed goals in the CEEP, we must be more aggressive in how we encourage and discourage growth and activities in key areas of the city. High density growth needs to be mandated in corridors like Lasalle, which is designated as a major transit spine. We look forward to seeing the following addressed and clarified: green infrastructure and zero carbon buildings; stormwater management; parking requirements; transit; a Complete Street approach which targets safety and comfort - including dedicated, separated pedestrian and cycling infrastructure on both sides of the street, safe crossings and other changes that prioritize our most vulnerable road users; flooding mitigation; streetscaping and public art; connections with neighbourhoods and local trails and paths; urban trees and greenspace.	See above comments. The OP contains policies regarding flooding, climate change, stormwater management, green infrastructure, etc. OPA 102 would also be subject to the in-effect policies of the OP.
33				CAN requests adding "bikeable" in preamble to Section 4.2.2 of the OP.	This proposed change is recommended
34				CAN agrees with adding "Residential" to Regional Centres	No comment

	A	B	C	D	E
35				Why are public City Parks not permitted in Regional Centres?	OPA 102 proposes to include "open spaces that are either parks and/or plazas accessible to the public" to encourage private land owners to develop these private open spaces in their developments. Public parks are permitted in all zones, per section 4.40 of the City's Zoning By-law.
36				Add "and cycling-friendly" after "pedestrian-friendly" in new policy 3 of section 4.2.2	This proposed change is recommended.
37				Why is the City proposing to continue to allow light industrial uses in Regional Centres? This is contrary to the advice in the LaSalle Boulevard Corridor Plan and Strategy.	Per the current OP, light industrial uses in Regional Centres are uses conducted entirely indoors provided that appropriate landscaping and buffering can be established to shield any adjacent sensitive uses. Staff maintains that these uses are compatible with the overall vision of Regional Centres in the Official Plan, and Strategic Core Areas in the Growth Plan for Northern Ontario.
38				Include "and cycling infrastructure" after "pedestrian walkways" in renumbered policy 5 d) of Section 4.2.2.	This proposed change is recommended
39				Why is the City proposing to remove renumbered policy 6 of Section 4.2.2?	The intent of policy 6 is captured in policy 2. Both policies supported active transportation and transit.
40				Add cycling in the preamble to Section 4.2.3 - Secondary Community Uses and to Regional Centres.	This proposed change is recommended.
41				Regional Centres should be modified to explicitly state that they will be transit hubs that connect transit corridors.	This matter is being referred to Phase Two of the Official Plan Review.
42				The differences that are identified between Regional Centres and Secondary Community Nodes are that Regional Centres allow recreational and entertainment activities which are not permitted in Secondary Community Nodes; and Secondary Community Nodes permit parks which are not permitted in Regional Centres. Both allow residential, retail, office, service, institutional, and other community-oriented activities. It is unclear to the CAN why these differences exist.	Staff recommends that "Recreational" and "Entertainment" uses be harmonized throughout the designations.
43				There is no policy in the Regional Centres section to encourage Mixed Use Buildings (compared to Secondary Community Nodes). The wording "should be" implies that it is not mandated; perhaps we should be using stronger language to mandate what kind of built forms will be permitted in each area.	The preamble to section 4.2.2. encourages "mixed use districts". A change to OPA 102 is recommended in order to recognize the desire for mixed use buildings.
44				Policy 2 in the Secondary Community Node, as compared to its companion Policy 2 in Regional Centres, has the following differences: Additional “be the focal point for expression of community heritage and character;” Additional “provide residential development primarily in the form of medium and high density buildings, and discouraging single-detached dwellings;” Not included “include, where appropriate, open spaces that are either parks and/or plazas accessible to the public;” CAN agrees that community heritage and character should be preserved and encouraged, and also that densification should be encouraged (eg discouraging single-detached dwellings). CAN would suggest that this section would also benefit from encouraging privately-held open spaces, in particular in mall-type areas eg Montrose Mall.	As mentioned above, the City's Zoning By-law permits Public Parks in all zones. In order to harmonize this section of the Secondary Community Node with the Regional Centres, staff recommends adding the private park provision to the OPA.
45				It is unclear why the City may require a traffic impact study to support the reduction in parking in Secondary Community Nodes and Regional Corridors, but not in Regional Centres.	The traffic impact study is a requirement under the renumbering of policy 2 to new policy 5 in Section 4.2.2. Regional Centres.
46				CAN recommends including "cycling-friendly" in Policy 5 of Section 4.2.3 - Secondary Community Nodes.	This change is recommended

	A	B	C	D	E
47				CAN is in agreement with the intent of the Regional Corridors (new Section 4.2.4), and the preamble that describes a vibrant environment for these areas. As with the Secondary Community Nodes, CAN is suggesting explicitly including cycling in the preamble.	This change is recommended
48				The differences that are identified between Secondary Community Nodes and Regional Corridors are that Regional Corridors permit medium-density residential and open spaces. We are unsure of the definition of open spaces and why they are specifically identified in this section and in none of the other sections.	See comment above regarding private and public parks.
49				The differences that are identified between Regional Centres are that Regional Centres allow recreational and entertainment activities which are not permitted in Regional Corridors; and that Regional Corridors, like Secondary Community Nodes, permit parks which are not permitted in Regional Centres.	The City's Green Space Advisory Panel Report (2010) outlined a comprehensive strategy to guide park acquisition, development and management. This advice was incorporated into Phase One of the Official Plan Review (See Section 7.0 of the OP).
50				Regional Corridors also specify the uses are “at transit supportive densities in compact, pedestrian-friendly built forms”. We would suggest that if this phrase is used here, it should be used for all three designations, and that the words “cycling-friendly” be added into the phrase.	The notion of transit supportive densities is included in all three designations. Staff recommend adding "compact" and "cycling-friendly" in the Secondary Community Node section.
51				<p>Policy 4 in Section 4.2.4 Regional Corridor, as compared to its companion Policy 4 in Secondary Community Nodes, has the following differences: Does not include being a focal point for community heritage and character; Residential development emphasis is on medium density buildings and not high density, and does not discourage single-detached dwellings; Functions as a transit spine; Speaks to small lot rezoning and land assembly; Does not encourage alternative active transportation options.</p> <p>Some of these corridors may not be long in length, and therefore be very bikeable between community nodes. The CAN's recommendation is to encourage alternative active transportation options in the same language as Secondary Community Nodes: “provide mobility choices and associated facilities to encourage alternative active transportation options.”</p>	<p>The thrust of the OPA is to focus high density development in nodes (proximity to commercial, services, etc) and medium density along corridors. This allows for transition in densities between zones.</p> <p>The OP contains policy regarding active transportation. Transportation is also a key focus of Phase Two of the Official Plan Review.</p>
52				Cycling should specifically be mentioned in the second paragraph of the preamble in Section 4.3 - Mixed Use Commercial	This change is recommended
53				The difference between Mixed Use Commercial and the two new designations is that it uses the language “commercial” which is not found in the other designations. The other designations permit “retail, office, service”. Are these the same or different? Is it the intent that light commercial is eliminated here, while it is not in Regional Centres?	Staff recommends revising the amendment so that it is closer to the current in-effect text of the OP.
54				Mixed Use Commercial does not contain any language that prioritizes pedestrian, cycling, and transit. This should be added to this designation.	The language is included in the existing preamble to the Mixed Use Commercial Designation. Staff recommends adding "cycling and" prior to "pedestrian environment" in the second paragraph of the said preamble.

	A	B	C	D	E
55				<p>The CAN very much agrees with the content and intent of the new policy 3 in Section 11.4 - Parking. Should item a. read “...maximum parking standards within or in the Regional Centre ...”?</p> <p>The CAN also suggests that bicycle parking be included as a direction in the Parking section, perhaps in a change in Policy 1:</p> <p>“New developments generally must provide an adequate supply of vehicle and bicycle parking to meet anticipated demands.”</p>	<p>A change to "within" is recommended in Section 11.4.</p> <p>No change is recommended to policy 1 at this time.</p>
56				<p>Attachment C – Regional Centre North Side of Lasalle across from the New Sudbury and Superstore Malls to Regional Centre – no concerns save for the impact on the Junction Creek Trail, the impact of lack of cycling infrastructure on Paquette, and how we integrate both sides of Lasalle with its current configuration of 4 lanes and priority on car movement into a vibrant, cohesive community.</p>	<p>Lane configuration is outside the scope of OPA102.</p>
57				<p>Attachment D – Secondary Community Node Lasalle/Notre Dame intersection – no concerns save for the required redesign of this intersection to provide safe pedestrian and cycling movement from the Paris/Notre Dame Bikeway to what we’d like to call the Lasalle Bikeway, and as for all of the Lasalle, the current pedestrian and cycling unfriendliness of the whole corridor which does not make it very liveable or vibrant. The whole of Lasalle needs to be revitalized so people will want to walk, bike, and live on it.</p>	<p>The design of the LaSalle / Notre Dame intersection is outside the scope of OPA 102.</p>
58				<p>Attachment D – Secondary Community Node Montrose Mall area – how will the south side designation impact the significant wetlands and where do they border or intersect? Same comments re corridor revitalization.</p>	<p>The OP contains policies regarding wetland protection. See Section 8.0</p>
59				<p>Attachment E – Regional Corridor Lasalle west from Starlight to the Data Center – what would be the impact should Felix Ricard ever close? Same comments re corridor revitalization.</p>	<p>The OP contains policies regarding surplus institutional buildings. See policy 3 of Section 4.4.</p>
60				<p>Attachment E – Regional Corridor west from Secondary Community Node Montrose Mall to Regional Centre – no concerns. Same comments re corridor revitalization.</p>	<p>No comment</p>
61				<p>Attachment F – Regional Corridor east from Regional Centre to Falconbridge Road – concerns: impact on Junction Creek Trail and green space east of the creek on the south side, and around the creek on the north side. Same comments re corridor revitalization, only more important. This area has very little housing directly on Lasalle in the area from Rosemarie to Falconbridge, there is no sense of community there, traffic speeds regularly. What would be impact if Jean-Ethier Blais were ever to close? What is the impact of having a primary school on a 4-lane arterial road with the speeds and volume of traffic and lack of safe active transportation (until the Lasalle Bikeway is built)?</p>	<p>See comment above regarding surplus institutional buildings.</p>