

Summary of Area Municipal Comments and Policy Response

Comments	How addressed in ROPA 43
Aurora	
• All local secondary plans should not be required to meet the 2.5 FSI density target • Density targets should only apply to Key Development Areas – not the entire Regional Corridor • Areas within historic downtown cores and the residential neighbourhoods abutting them may achieve modest intensification but should not be subject to the 2.5 FSI density target	• Importance of retaining and enhancing historical character emphasized (see Policy 5.4.4.q and paragraphs four, six and seven of Section 5.5 introductory text) • No requirement for historical mainstreets to be designated as a Key Development Areas (see Policy 5.5.4)
East Gwillimbury	
• Extend Yonge Street Regional Corridor north from the Newmarket municipal boundary to Morning Sideroad	• Yonge Street Regional Corridor extended to Green Lane (see Policy 5.5.1 and 5.5.3, and Figure 1) • Future consideration for further Regional Corridor extensions (see Policy 5.5.2)
Georgina	
• Clarification required on Key Development Areas and relationship with “inter-modal nodes” • What is meant by a “fine grain” network of streets?	• General intent of Key Development Areas clarified (see paragraph five of Section 5.2 introductory text and paragraph two of Section 5.5 introductory text) • Key Development Area criteria broadened to include inter-modal nodes (see Policy 5.5.4.d) • Definition of “Fine Grain Grid Network of Streets” added to Definition Section
King	
• No formal comments received	

Comments	How addressed in ROPA 43
Markham	
- Place more emphasis on Region's desired urban structure - Add clarity to the role of local municipalities in identifying Key Development Areas - Confirm that 2.5 FSI is a long-term target - Recognize that achieving a compact urban form, consistent with the 2.5 FSI target, will occur incrementally over time - Make changes to Chapter 6 – Regional Infrastructure to ensure consistency between transit-supportive land use and urban design policies with infrastructure and transit policies	- Further explanation added to introductory text of Section 5.2 (see paragraph five) - Clarification made to Key Development Area policies (see Policy 5.5.4 and 5.5.5) 2.5 FSI described as a long-term target (see Policy 5.5.6) - Recognize that infill and intensification will occur incrementally over time (see Policy 5.3.5 and 5.5.12.1) - New introductory text added to Sections 6.1 and 6.2 to recognize completion of Transportation Master Plan and the planning of rapid transit services
Newmarket	
Infrastructure capacity and growth must be better co-ordinated to support further infill and intensification (e.g. traffic congestion is a problem)	- Region to support Newmarket in preparation of secondary plan for Newmarket Regional Centre (see Policy 5.3.10) - New policy added to ensure the co-ordination of development and infrastructure in Regional Centres (see Policy 5.3.9c)
Richmond Hill	
- Infill and intensification cannot be achieved everywhere along the Yonge Street Regional Corridor – development must be focused in specific areas - Confirm that 2.5 FSI is a long-term target - Address transition/compatibility between established areas and new, more intensive development - Employment areas along Regional Corridors should be protected	- Local municipalities to direct most intensive infill and intensification to Key Development Areas, defined by them (see Policy 5.5.4 and 5.5.5) 2.5 FSI described as a long-term target (see Policy 5.5.6) - Recognize that not all Regional Corridors, and segments of those corridors, are the same (paragraph six of Section 5.5 introductory text) - Secondary plan criteria added to address compatibility of new development (see Policy 5.3.11.n) - Employment areas should be planned comprehensively. Applications for non-employment uses in these areas will be subject to a comprehensive study (see Policy 5.5.9)

Comments	How addressed in ROPA 43
Vaughan	
• Ensure that Local Centres recognize both urban and rural conditions • Urban design criteria should be most prescriptive at the local level – Regional criteria should be general • References to “transit-oriented” should be replaced with “transit-supportive” • Policies should promote and explain the importance of achieving a “fine-grain” network of streets • Infrastructure must be co-ordinated with the build-out of the Regional Centres	• Policies differentiate between Local Centres in urban areas (see Policy 5.4.1) and those in Towns and Villages (see Policy 5.4.2 and 5.4.5) • Regional urban design criteria is based on broad, high-level principles (see Policy 5.2.7.q and 5.3.9.b) • “Transit-supportive” is referenced throughout • “Fine-grain grid network of streets” added to the Definition Section, and included in the urban design criteria for Regional Centres (see Policy 5.3.9.b.i) • New policy added to ensure the co-ordination of development and infrastructure in Regional Centres (see Policy 5.3.9c)
Whitchurch-Stouffville	
• No formal comments received	