

# 1 Rosetta Street and 6 & 8 Saint Michael's Street, Halton Hills – Second Submission Response Matrix

File No: D09OPA22.003 & D14ZBA22.006  
Submitted by: 1 Rosetta Street Inc.  
Agent: Arcadis  
Date: June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023

**The submission response matrix addresses the following commenting letters and emails received for the first submission made on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2022 and deemed complete on July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022:**

Planning and Development Review (Letter from John McMulkin) .....	2
Urban Design Peer Review – Letter from Brook McIlroy .....	15
Zoning Review – Rachel Purdy .....	27
Accessibility Review – John McMulkin .....	28
Building Review – John McMulkin .....	28
Development Engineering Review – Reece D’Souza .....	28
Functional Servicing Report – Reece D’Souza .....	30
Noise Report Review – Reece D’Souza .....	31
Transportation – Ivan Drewnitski .....	31
Recreation and Parks – Kevin Okimi .....	35
Heritage Review – Laura Loney .....	37
Fire Services – Jason Blackmere .....	37
Metrolinx – Derek Brunelle .....	38
AECOM – Mohammed Mirza .....	40
CN Railway – John McMulkin .....	43
CN Railway – WSP .....	43
CN Peer Review – Jade Acoustics .....	45
Region of Halton – Amanda McNeish .....	49
Halton Hills School Board .....	54
Halton Hills Catholic School Board .....	55
Enbridge .....	56
Halton Hills Hydro .....	57

Public Comments .....57

**The following agencies have no comments with this submission:**

- Legal, as per letter from John McMulkin dated December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2022
- Halton Regional Police, as per letter from John McMulkin dated December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2022

#	Planning and Development Review (Letter from John McMulkin)	Consultant Response
<b>Statutory Public Meeting</b>		
1	Staff is targeting the February 13, 2023, Council meeting for the Statutory Public Meeting. It is recommended that the Applicant’s Planner also make a brief presentation (no more than 10 minutes in length) following Town Planning staff’s presentation and that a qualified individual from each of the consulting disciplines be in attendance to respond to questions and concerns raised by the public.	A Statutory Public Meeting was held on February 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2023. The agent, owners, traffic, and engineering consultant were in attendance to answer questions. Some of the concerns that were brought up including; height, density, infrastructure phasing, and sun/shadow impacts.
<b>Site Plan</b>		
2	Remove the sidewalk south of the southern property line given this property is owned by Metrolinx and not the Town.	Sidewalks are currently proposed for Caroline, Rosetta and St. Michaels Street. The sidewalk at the southern property limit has been removed, however pedestrian access is now proposed on to the Metrolinx land from the underground parking area. The access will be used for residents of the building only and is not intended for public use. Further discussion with Metrolinx and their consultants will determine the criteria for the proposed pedestrian connection and its incorporation into their future plan. Further consultation with Metrolinx is anticipated through this resubmission.

3	Given the proposed GO Station improvements, the design of the southern portion of the site shall be coordinated with Metrolinx to ensure there are no conflicts between the designs of the projects.	Communication with Metrolinx has taken place; however no plans have been shared with the LEV Team. No conflicts are anticipated, and further consultation will be conducted through this resubmission.
<b>Planning Justification Report – General</b>		
4	Replace the rendering on the first page with the updated Building Rendering.	The image has been updated on the Planning Justification Addendum Report.
5	Multiple references are made throughout the Planning Justification Report that assume affordability given the unit count and types. With no real policy commitment (e.g., development agreement or developer commitment to rental units or affordable pricing) this would all be considered speculative given the state of the current housing market. This should be acknowledged somewhere in the Planning Justification Report.	Noted. The dwelling units proposed are considered as a more affordable housing option than single detached housing options.
6	Consideration should be given to providing office and commercial uses to serve residents within the development, residents in the neighbourhood, and commuters, provide employment opportunities, and meet the employment targets outlined within the Growth Plan, Regional Official Plan, and Town Official Plan.	Commercial or office uses are not proposed for this development. Arcadis is of the opinion that there are still ample opportunities for future development to provide commercial and office uses once the residential population in the neighbourhood is in a place to support these uses. However, we propose that commercial and retail uses continue to be permitted in the site-specific by-law, which will in turn permit the consideration for potential retail or commercial space at the future site plan approval process when the residential population is viable to support these uses.
7	The Town completed an update to the Intensification Opportunities Study in 2020. This includes an updated intensification inventory for the GO Station/Mill Street Corridor Area (2016-2041). This update contemplates a longer-term planning horizon and includes more detailed work on unit counts in the HDRMUA II designated areas, which should be noted in this report.	Noted.

8	<p>Based on the Site Plan drawing it appears Buildings 1 &amp; 2 will be one large footprint. Consideration needs to be given for a pedestrian “through-way” through this footprint to provide a connection for foot traffic from the north side of the site towards the GO Station. If a direct pedestrian connection through the crash wall is not possible due to design requirements, provide confirmation from Metrolinx, CN Railway and/or their peer review consultant (AECOM).</p>	<p>A pedestrian access from the resident’s parking area within the podium of Building 1 and 2 has been proposed. As noted above, further consultation with Metrolinx is anticipated through this resubmission to ensure that the pedestrian connection meets with the required safety standards and the future redevelopment of River Drive.</p>
<p><b>Planning Justification Report – Section 4</b></p>		
9	<p>Section 4 states that the development proposal will be constructed in phases, with the two twelve-storey buildings intended to be constructed within Phases 1 &amp; 2, while the eight-storey building will be constructed in Phase 3. Section 8.2.1 states that the reason for this is that initial conversations with Town and Regional staff indicated that there are not enough SDEs for the entire development at once, therefore the proposed ZBLA includes a Holding Provision on the subject lands so that the proposal may commence once the subject lands have received necessary servicing allocations. How will Buildings 1 &amp; 2 be constructed in separate phases (Phases 1 &amp; 2) given they are proposed to be connected? Is the base/podium and Building 1 proposed to be constructed first, followed by Building 2 (storeys 2 to 12) once further servicing allocation has been granted to the development? Please provide further detail regarding the proposed timing of construction.</p>	<p>The Phasing Strategy has been provided as part of this submission. Please refer to Section 3 of the Planning Justification Addendum Report (“PJAR”) for a detailed explanation.</p> <p>Although the footprint of Building 1 and 2 has the appearance of one building on a Site Plan, the buildings are in fact separated by a shared lobby and corridor. The south façade of the building has been further articulated using a green wall, which visually separates Building 1 to Building 2. As shown on the proposed floor plan, the shared lobby and corridor marks the location of where the phasing line has been established between these two buildings.</p> <p>Construction timing will be contingent of servicing allocation, but it’s the applicant desire to implement the required site plan in phases to expedite the planning approvals once allocation is granted.</p>
10	<p>Replace Figure 4.1 with an updated Site Plan submitted as part of the 2nd submission.</p>	<p>The revised site plan dated June 2023 and prepared by ICON Architects has been included as Figure 3-1 of the PJAR.</p>

11	Replace Figures 4.2 to 4.5 with the updated Building Renderings.	The revised building renderings dated June 2023 and prepared by ICON Architects has been included as Figures 3-2 to 3-5 of the PJAR.
12	Replace Figure 4.6 with an updated Conceptual Landscape Plan submitted as part of the 2nd submission	The revised Landscape Plan and Rooftop plans dated May 2023 and prepared by MEP Landscape Architects has been included as part of the submission package.
13	Section 4.3 – Parking: change reference to Table 4-3 to Table 4-4.	The parking table can be found as Table 3-4 of the PJAR.
14	Table 4-4 – Parking Composition of Proposed Development: recalculate and reconfirm the number of parking spaces. The table indicates that there are 64 visitor parking spaces, 329 resident spaces in Underground Level 1 and 292 resident parking spaces in Underground Level 2; however, 329 + 292 does not add up to 643 resident spaces (it adds up to 621 resident spaces) and 64 + 329 + 292 does not add up to 707 total spaces (it adds up to 685 total spaces). 685 spaces appear to be the parking demand based on the ITE Parking Generation Manual.	Noted. An Updated Parking Table is provided in Table 3-4 of the PJAR.
<b>Planning Justification Report – Section 5</b>		
15	Section 5 should be revised to clarify that the current proposal seeking Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment approval is for a total of 640 units (not 483 units) and that the proposal discussed at the September 3, 2020, pre-consultation meeting contemplated a total of 442 units.	The proposed development is now proposing 637 units. The site statistics are included in Table 3-1 of the PJAR.
16	Please add a sentence acknowledging that a separate pre-consultation meeting will be needed for review of the Site Plan and Draft Plan of Condominium applications.	Noted.
<b>Planning Justification Report – Section 8.0</b>		
17	Ensure all referenced policies are italicized for consistency purposes.	Noted.
<i>8.1 Planning Act</i>		
18	As suggested in the Planning Comment, Figure 4-5 does not display a cross section of the proposed development along Caroline Street showing how the prescribed	Figure 4-4 provides a cross-section of the proposed development along Caroline Street.

	angular plane guidelines have been applied. Insert a new figure depicting this and update the reference to the figure.	
<i>8.2 Provincial Policy Statement</i>		
19	Policy 1.1.1(b) references accommodating “affordable” and market-based range and mix of residential uses. Subsequent Planning Comment does not reference affordable in response. Recent housing market trends have shown smaller unit types are becoming less and less affordable. Clearer commitment to affordability would help better align with this PPS section. Consider for instance the inclusion of some bachelor units, which would presumably be the lowest cost unit type available to such a development.	Noted. References to affordable housing is removed.
20	Policy 1.1.1(f) Planning Comment states that the proposed development, consisting of a variety of unit sizes will aid in achieving the “noise” of an age friendly community, as it caters to a diverse population and allows older persons to age in their community. Should a different word be used here? If not, please clarify the intent of the word “noise” in relation to this statement.	This is a typo. The word ‘noise’ should be notion.
21	Policy 1.1.3.2 Planning Comment here could better outline why a “mixed-use” building is not being considered as part of the development given the Secondary Plan designation permits office and a full range of commercial uses and the surrounding land use on the north side of the tracks (within the MTSA) is primarily residential.	As stated previously, commercial or office uses are not proposed for this development. Arcadis is of the opinion that there are still ample opportunities for future development to provide commercial and office uses once the residential population in the neighbourhood is in a place to support these uses. However, we propose that commercial and retail uses continue to be permitted in the site-specific by-law, which will in turn permit the consideration for potential retail or commercial space at the future site plan approval process when the residential population is viable to support these uses.
22	Policy 1.1.3.3 Planning Comment stating that housing will become more affordable as a result of “diminishing transportation barriers” should be removed. This ties housing	Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR)

	being affordable to reduced transportation costs, which is not the intent of the referenced PPS policy.	and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
23	Policy 1.1.3.5 Planning Comment should be revised to state that the development would increase the overall density (people/jobs per ha) of the MTSA.	Noted. The response to the Town's comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
24	Policy 1.6.8.3 Change Planning Comment from "St. Micheal Street, Drive and Rosetta Street" to "St. Michaels Street and River Drive".	Noted. The response to the Town's comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
25	Policy 1.8.1 Planning Comment refers to the area being designated a Strategic Growth Area. This should be referred to as a Major Transit Station Area given the PPS does not reference Strategic Growth Areas.	Noted. The response to the Town's comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
26	Provincial Policy Statement Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove reference to "Strategic Growth Area" from the second bullet point (as what was recommended on Page 42).</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town's comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
27	Provincial Policy Statement Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove "Protected" from "Protected MTSA" in the second bullet point. This status has yet to be achieved, as the MTSA was only recently delineated and approved through the Halton Regional Official Plan Review process. The Georgetown GO MTSA cannot be classified as a PMTSA until it has been assigned a Regionally approved density target.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town's comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
28	Provincial Policy Statement Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarify in the fourth bullet point that this privately operated park is to be available for public use (as suggested on Page 40).</li> </ul>	The privately operated park ("POPs") will be accessible to the community and will operate as a privately owned publicly accessible space ("POPS"), which means that the open space will be privately owned and operated but will be available for the public and surrounding area to use.

8.3 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe		
29	<p>Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2020</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change the title of this section from “Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2020” to “Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019”</li> </ul>	Noted. This policy section is not included in the Planning Justification Addendum Report.
30	<p>Policy 2.2.1.4(b) and (c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Similar to PPS references, Planning Comment assumes affordability with no policy commitment.</li> <li>- In addition, explore and consider the inclusion of affordable housing units within the development given the property will be located within a Protected Major Transit Station Area.</li> </ul>	References to affordable housing is removed.
31	<p>Policy 2.2.1.2(c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Insert “(Major Transit Station Area)” beside “Strategic Growth Area” in Planning Comment as the property is also located within a Major Transit Station Area, which is far more relevant to the nature of the proposed development given its proximity to the GO Station.</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
32	<p>Policy 2.2.1.4(e)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change “two” to “three” in the Planning Comment.</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
33	<p>Policy 2.2.2.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Insert “(Major Transit Station Area)” beside “Strategic Growth Area” in Planning Comment.</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning Comment states that the built form will be compatible with the surrounding low-density neighbourhood by integrating a 45-degree angular plane towards the single detached dwellings. Additional compatibility factors should be listed that would help justify such a large development in an established low-density neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	Noted. Please refer to Section 4.1 of the Planning Justification Addendum Report.
35	<p>Policy 2.2.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove Policies 2.2.4.2 and 2.2.4.3 and the reference to the minimum 150 residents and jobs density target in the Planning Comment as the</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR)



	<p>Georgetown GO Station Major Transit Station Area is not located on a Priority Transit Corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove “protected” from “protected Major Transit Station Area” in Planning Comment.</li> </ul>	<p>and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
<p><i>8.4 Region of Halton Official Plan</i></p>		
36	<p>Figure 8-3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add column headings for Table 2a.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
37	<p>Figure 8-4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove “Protected” from “Protected Major Transit Station Area” in Planning Comment.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
38	<p>Figure 8-6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace Figure 8-6 with the updated Map 1h.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
39	<p>Figure 8-7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace Figure 8-7 with the updated Map 6g.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
40	<p>Figure 8-8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace Figure 8-8 with the updated Map 3.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
41	<p>Regional Official Plan Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove “protected” from “protected Major Transit Station Area” in the third bullet point.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
<p><i>8.5 Town of Halton Hills Official Plan</i></p>		

42	<p>Figure 8-9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change “Figure 8-13” to “Figure 8-9” in the Planning Comment.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.</p>
43	<p>Policy A2.3.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning Comment references urban design and maintaining character with surrounding low density by applying a 45-degree angular plane. Similar to other references made in this report to this feature, it is unclear how this helps maintain the existing character, given the plane does not start until 6-7 storeys high for the buildings. The impact of the height and massing of the proposed buildings would not be mitigated by an angular plane alone. In general, this report needs to better reference the UDGs and provide more detail on how building design will attempt to mitigate impacts on the existing neighbourhood character.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Discussion on compatibility is provided in Section 4.1 of PJAR.</p>
44	<p>Policy A2.7.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As noted, consider incorporating office and commercial uses within the buildings to promote the establishment of more live-work relationships that reduce commuting in accordance with this policy.</li> </ul>	<p>As stated previously, commercial or office uses are not proposed for this development. Arcadis is of the opinion that there are still ample opportunities for future development to provide commercial and office uses once the residential population in the neighbourhood is in a place to support these uses. However, we propose that commercial and retail uses continue to be permitted in the site-specific by-law, which will in turn permit the consideration for potential retail or commercial space at the future site plan approval process when the residential population is viable to support these uses.</p>
45	<p>Policy D1.4.3(d) was omitted. This policy needs to be included along with commentary regarding how the intent of this policy is being maintained.</p> <p>Policy D1.4.3(f) was omitted. This policy needs to be included along with commentary regarding how the intent of this policy is being maintained.</p>	<p>Noted. These policies and planning commentary is included in Section 6 of the PJAR.</p>
46	<p>Section D5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change “Figure 8-14” to “Figure 8-10” in the Planning Comment.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The response to the Town’s comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR)</p>

		and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
47	<p>Policy H3.3.7(b)(i)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning Comment suggests extension of St. Michaels Street isn't necessary for the development. Clarification is needed here as it was generally understood this would be part of the development to assist with traffic outflow.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	Further clarification is provided in Section 6 of the PJAR.
48	<p>Policy H3.5(b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change "Figure 8-17" to "Figure 8-13" in the Planning Comment.</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town's comments has been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As noted, Figure 4-5 does not display a cross section of the proposed development along Caroline Street showing how the prescribed angular plane guidelines have been applied, as suggested in the Planning Comment. Insert a new figure depicting this and update the reference to the figure.</li> </ul>	Figure 4-4 provides a cross-section of the proposed development along Caroline Street.
50	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Planning Comment states that the Urban Design Brief will further outline how the proposed development adheres to the angular plane and Urban Design Guidelines, which will be submitted during the Site Plan stage. While this is accurate, urban design (including the impacts of building orientation, massing, and height) will be heavily scrutinized through the OPA/ZBA process, which will be public. While the Site Plan Approval process would finalize the site design, the policy being referenced here includes items (density, height, and traffic) that are typically evaluated through the OPA/ZBA process. Please revise the Planning Comment accordingly.</li> </ul>	Noted. Discussion on compatibility is provided in Section 4.1 of PJAR.
<b>8.6 Town of Halton Hills Zoning By-law 2010-0050</b>		
51	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change "Figure 8-18" to "Figure 8-14" in the second paragraph.</li> </ul>	Noted. The response to the Town's comments have been incorporated into an Addendum Report (PJAR) and the figures have been updated in the PJAR as required.
<b>Planning Justification Report - Section 9</b>		

52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarify that the proposed modifications are written in red.</li> </ul>	Noted. This statement has been included in Section 4 of the Planning Justification Addendum Report.
53	<p>Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change Maximum Number of Dwelling Units to “640” and remove “units per hectare of a lot area” in Proposed Modifications column.</li> <li>• Change “Minimum Required Interior Side Yard (River Street)” to “Minimum Required Interior Side Yard (Southern Lot Line)”.</li> <li>• Change Minimum Required Exterior Side Yard to “5.9 metres” in the Proposed Modifications column and change text to red.</li> <li>• Change Maximum Height to be consistent with the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.</li> <li>• Change Minimum Width of Drive Aisle Providing Access to a Parking Space within a Parking Area to 6.0 metres in Proposed Modifications column and change text to red.</li> <li>•</li> <li>• Change Minimum Width of Drive Aisle Providing Access to a Parking Space within a Parking Area to 6.0 metres in Proposed Modifications column and change text to red.</li> <li>• Add a section for Minimum Drive Aisle Width along with commentary.</li> </ul>	The proposed ZBLA has been updated to include these changes.
54	Change “Building A” to “Building 1”.	The proposed ZBLA has been updated to include these changes.
55	Change “River Drive” to “the southern lot line”.	The proposed ZBLA has been updated to include these changes.
56	Change maximum height to be consistent with the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.	The proposed ZBLA has been updated to include these changes.

57	Change “River Drive” to “the lands to the south”.	The proposed ZBLA has been updated to include these changes.
<b>Planning Justification Report – Section 10</b>		
58	<p>Change “14 calendar days” to “20 calendar days” to be consistent with the notification requirements for the Statutory Public Meeting under “Section 2 – Community Meeting”.</p> <p>A preliminary Public Information Session should be held early in 2023 after the Statutory Public Meeting with the intent of presenting the site plan, renderings and community vision, with an opportunity to allow residents to voice concerns and ask questions. Depending on the results of the first session, a follow-up Public Open House may be required to provide a project update showing how questions and concerns voiced in the PIS were considered.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A Public Information Session is scheduled for June 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2023. Notice will be sent out 20 calendar days before the meeting.</p>
59	This project (if approved) would be the largest infill development the neighbourhood has ever seen, and an extended public process is warranted. The Town will expect the other subconsultants (e.g., architecture, engineering, traffic, heritage) to attend the community meetings to answer questions from the public in addition to the Owners and IBI Group staff.	Noted.
<b>Planning Justification Report – Section 11</b>		
60	Remove reference to the 150 residential and jobs per hectare target. As noted, it is not applicable to the subject lands.	Noted.
<b>Urban Design Guidelines</b>		
1	General	Recommended punctuation and word additions have been integrated within the updated Urban Design Guidelines, prepared in June 2023.
2	Section 2.8.1 – Noise, Vibration and Safety Mitigation Measures of the Urban Design Guidelines for the “GO” Station District states that “the noise wall should have a unique design character” and that “a low maintenance planting material (such as fescues and wildflowers) should be planted to the rail side to contribute to the ambience of the GO Station”. In addition, it states that “tree planting in these areas should be generous,	The proposal strives to find a balance between provincial policy within the PPS, the Growth Plan, urban intensification policies within the GO Station Secondary Plan, coordination with Metrolinx and urban design within an existing built context,

	<p>providing high level screening” and that “shrubs should be planted according to their size to create masses and continuous planting beds on 50% of the land surface of the buffers”. More guidance is needed to demonstrate how the proposed “landscaping screens” and/or “green walls” meet these guidelines (e.g., types, amounts and locations of plant material, etc.).</p>	<p>however, in the absence of any plans provided by Metrolinx for the Georgetown GO Station, we cannot comment on the future ambience of the GO Station.</p> <p>The Urban Design Guidelines in Appendix 4 – Section 2.1.8 of the Official Plan relates to an urban context where new development is separated from the GO Station via a landscaped berm and noise wall. The Guidelines directed design considerations intended to enhance the landscape berm to visually soften a noise wall as seen from the residential (north) side of the fence.</p> <p>However, to provide a more efficient use of land in an area identified as a MTSA and for intensification, an alternative condition is proposed using a vegetated crash wall at the southern property limit. The proposal to use a parking podium in the setback area and to support a crash wall is noted to be acceptable to Metrolinx.</p> <p>The proposed buildings have been site to appropriately address safety and mitigate environment impact from the GO Rail Line, particularly noise impacts. The proposed green wall on the crash wall aims to achieve an environmental buffer to the GO Station as intended in the Guidelines. Further coordination with Metrolinx will be required for the redevelopment of River Drive.</p>
2	<p>Add a heading and guidelines for the design and development of the parkette.</p>	<p>This has been included within the updated Urban Design Guidelines, prepared in June 2023. Please refer to MEP’s Design as proposed guidelines.</p>

3	Add a Cultural Heritage heading and guidelines for heritage commemoration	This has been included within the updated Urban Design Guidelines, prepared in June 2023.
4	Consider adding a Public Art heading or Public Art guidelines under the Cultural Heritage heading.	This has been included as a general guideline under the landscape section of the Urban Design Guidelines, prepared in June 2023

**Draft Official Plan Amendment**

1	The calculation of Floor Space Index (FSI) of 3.4 appears to be based on including the two (2) levels of underground parking, which is not meant to be included in the calculation. Recalculate and reconfirm the FSI based on excluding the underground parking	Noted. The FSI calculated has been confirmed within the Town’s Zoning Department and an updated FSI of 3.16 is now shown on the proposed development concept and within the Draft Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.
2	Add “and the urban design guidelines for the Georgetown GO Station Area Secondary Plan” to the end of Policy iii. under “b) New Development and Redevelopment Policies”	Noted. This is included within the Draft Official Plan Amendment.

#	Urban Design Peer Review – Letter from Brook McIlroy	Consultant Response
---	--	---------------------

1	a) South Requirements for a solid crash wall adjacent to the south (River Drive) and southwest (St. Michaels Street) property lines limits options for facing and engaging the street, however the south and southwest facades have been designed to incorporate a rhythm of solid pilasters framing a series of green wall elements. Designing the watering and maintenance systems for the green wall features will be important to maintain the vegetation’s aesthetic quality over time.	Noted.  The Landscape Planting Plan dated May 2023, prepared by MEP includes the design and specification of proposed vertical green wall planting that complies with Metrolinx design standards for planting adjacent to Crash Walls.
2	b) Southwest Similar to the south interface, the railway crash wall that extends through the majority of the southwest frontage will consist of a rhythm of solid pilasters with green wall elements between. The ground floor façade steps back north of the crash wall to a glazed façade set into a brick structural grid, enclosing	Noted.  A Landscape Plan prepared by MEP, dated May 2023 has been submitted. Trees and planting have been introduced in the southwest including drought-resistant native species and rain garden.

	<p>the indoor amenity exercise room and children’s play area. The wider setback contains green space and tree plantings, as well as a shallow patio space adjacent to the façade. The glazed façade will help to visually connect indoor program with the adjacent public realm, and although exterior doors are not shown on the ground floor plan, it is recommended that access and seating be provided to the west patio space to activate the frontage further with passive activity. A detailed landscape plan has not been received for review; however it is recommended that the deep setback along the west and north property line at the northwest edge of the site be designed to contain trees, low level plantings, and opportunities for on-site stormwater infiltration, including swales and rain gardens featuring drought resistant native species.</p>	
<p>3</p>	<p>c) Northwest</p> <p>As noted above, the deeper setback at the northwest corner of the site provides opportunities for enhanced landscape features, including trees, low-level plantings, and swales and rain gardens for onsite stormwater infiltration.</p> <p>The Caroline Street frontage includes a plaza framed by green areas and tree plantings. A pergola structure with seating separates the plaza from a children’s playground and splash pad. Vehicle access from Caroline Street is provided by way of a 6.7-metre-wide driveway illustrated with interlocking paving. The interface at the north side of building 3 features green space, tree planting, and walkways on both the public and private side of the landscaped area. The north façade of building 3 features extensive glazing at the ground floor, visually connecting the building lobby and entrances with the adjacent public realm. The setback of the ground floor provides weather-protected walkways along the facades, leading to entrances at both the west and east side of building 3. Care should be taken to ensure that minimum 1.8-metre-wide pedestrian clearway within a minimum general 2.1-metre-wide pedestrian path of travel is maintained adjacent to any obstructions, including short-term bicycle parking. This may require expansion of sidewalks beyond the extents of the building overhang at key locations. Please indicate pedestrian pathway width dimensions on the site plan to confirm that minimum widths of 2.1</p>	<p>2.1 metre wide sidewalk on Rosetta, Caroline and St. Michaels Streets, will be constructed within an updated Right of Way which will bound the subject lands. The identification of pedestrian pathways of travel are provided in the Pedestrian Connectivity Plan, prepared by ICON Architects</p>



	<p>metres have been achieved throughout the site, with clearways no less than 1.8 metres wide adjacent to site furnishings.</p> <p>It is noted that public realm components (i.e. public sidewalks) have been noted to be constructed “by others” in the proposed site plan. Given the importance of maintaining pedestrian connectivity and safety around the site, although agreements may not be in place until the Site Plan Control phase of approvals, commitments should be secured from the applicant at the ZBA/OPA stage to establish the timing and process for design and construction of public realm features. This will ensure the costs of improvements as well as continuity in design and construction between the proposed development and adjacent public realm is achieved. It is recommended that the site plan landscape design drawings include public realm elements between the property line and the edge of street curb along all frontages, and that the “by others” notes are removed from the drawings.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>d) Northeast</p> <p>The Northeast interface features a combination of common indoor amenity space (party room and exercise room) and private amenity patio space. Both facades are set back from the street edge by approximately 6 metres with landscaping and tree planting in the boulevard. Given the wide boulevard width along the northeast interface with Rosetta St., opportunities for on-site stormwater infiltration including swales and rain gardens should be explored.</p> <p>It is important that the residential frontage character along Rosetta St. be continued through the private residential patio frontages, increasing physical connections between the street and adjacent groundlevel units. This can be accomplished by treating each ground-level patio space as an exterior townhouse-style entrance, complete with a front door and walkway access.</p> <p>A secondary 1.8-metre-wide sidewalk could be located adjacent to the building’s east wall, continuing past the private patios. At each patio, an entrance opening or gate could provide access to the patio and unit’s exterior entrance, establishing an active frontage. This will encourage pedestrian presence, personal interactions, and casual</p>	<p>The ground floor units of Building 3 facing Caroline and Rosetta Streets have been redesigned to resemble maisonettes or townhouse facades with entrances onto the public sidewalks.</p>

	<p>surveillance of the adjacent street, increasing safety and opportunities for community-building along Rosetta Street. A similar approach is recommended for private ground-level patios along the west side of building 3, facing into the central roundabout and courtyard to increase pedestrian presence and connection with the interior laneway network as an active residential ‘street’ within the development.</p>	
5	<p>e) East The east interface’s ground floor facade includes the wrapping of the crash wall and green wall elements from the south facade, and a blank wall enclosing the interior parking area ramp. The setback includes tree plantings and landscaped space. Due to the lack of glazing along this façade, opportunities for enlivening the façade with human scaled materials, vegetation, and other means will help to enhance the pedestrian experience along the eastern edge of the site.</p>	<p>Noted. The green wall system has been extended to cover the blank wall enclosing the interior parking area ramp on Building 1.</p>
6	<p>a) Building Length In most urban conditions, limiting building length to 60 to 75 metres helps to achieve adequate site permeability, reduce shadowing on adjacent sensitive properties, and provide variety in the streetscape.</p> <p>The proposed building 3 limits length to 74.1 metres, within the acceptable range for a mid-rise building in this location. In the proposed development, massing and articulation is used to attempt to separate the south building into two distinct masses referred to as buildings 1 and 2. The site plan illustrates a narrow corridor connection between the two elements and the Planning Justification Report explains that the two buildings will be connected by a two-storey centralized lobby area, sharing a main entrance to both buildings. However, floor plans indicate that residential units will be located within a 12-storey tall connector element, minimizing the articulation and visual separation between massing elements and effectively creating one single very long building.</p> <p>In an ideal scenario, the two 12-storey elements would be separated physically above the base building, providing intermittent sun access on lands to the north and visual relief along the façade. Should this scenario not be possible, given the proposed building’s adjacency to the rail corridor, location at the south side of the lot, and the</p>	<p>Please refer to the proposed renderings which display the proposed glazing and materials to reduce the visual impact of the proposed buildings, prepared by ICON Architects.</p>

	<p>overall lot depth, it may be possible to maintain a physical connection between the building masses, however significant articulation and sculpting would be needed to reduce the visual impact of the scale of the building from the public realm on River Drive and from the south. It is recommended that the connection between building masses, if deemed necessary, be narrowed to the dimensions illustrated in the site plan drawing and designed as a narrow fully glazed corridor connection that provides both visual relief and sun access through to the centre of the site. In addition, it is recommended that an additional recess be created at the southwest corner of the building to provide a visual break. This recess can be created in place of the southern portion of the solarium of unit Type Q, providing a visual break and shadow line at the corner of the building, further articulating the façade and minimizing its perceived length from both St. Michaels Street and River Drive.</p>	
7	<p>b) Building Height</p> <p>The appropriateness of the proposed building heights of 8 and 12 storeys can be evaluated based on a combination of angular plane analysis and shadow study to determine the expected visual and shadowing impact of the proposed building on neighbouring private lots and on the public realm. The taller 12-storey building elements have been located at the south edge of the site, with stepping occurring toward the north. The 8-storey building has been located in a northwest-southeast orientation along the northeast portion of the site. Building 3 is located in the closest proximity to existing low-rise residential neighbours.</p> <p>The Town's Official Plan anticipates buildings up to 8 storeys in height in this area designated for high density development. The analysis of setbacks, stepbacks, and shadow impacts below will inform the discussion of whether an increase from 8 storeys in height to 12 storeys in height will significantly negatively impact the neighbouring low-rise residential neighbours and adjacent public realm, or whether the site can support the proposed building heights and sufficiently mitigate undesirable impacts.</p>	<p>The discussion of compatibility in relation to height is provided in Section 4.1 of the PJAR.</p>
8	<p>c) Setbacks &amp; Building Separations</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>The proposed buildings have been located at various setbacks, responding to adjacent uses. Along the east-west portion of River Drive adjacent to the railway lands, setbacks to the crash wall are appropriately minimal.</p> <p>Setbacks along St. Michaels Street increase from approx. 4 metres at the south to 11 metres at the northwest. This coincides with the termination of the crash wall and closer proximity to dwellings along Caroline Street. The increased setback at the northwest corner maintains larger landscaped areas as visual buffers from low-rise residential lots and allows adequate building separations to any future development that may occur on the adjacent surface parking lot to the west.</p> <p>Setbacks at the northwest wrap the Caroline Street corner at a setback of 5.6 metres to the colonnade structure and 7.9 metres to the building wall. The setback of building 2 together with upper storey setbacks (discussed in 2(d) below) create a transition in height perpendicular to Caroline Street.</p> <p>Building 3 is located at a setback 6.3 metres to the colonnade structure and 8.8 metres to the building wall from the Caroline Street property line. The setback allows the inclusion of landscaped area, tree planting, a covered pedestrian walkway, and bicycle parking to be located within the site. Between Buildings 2 and 3, common outdoor amenity spaces reach toward the street and provide a mix of hard and soft landscaping, as well as tree planting, vehicle access, pick-up/drop-off, and some surface visitor parking.</p> <p>Along the Rosetta Street frontage, building 3 is located at a setback of 5.9 metres. Private patios are located beyond the setback at the southeastern portion of the building, further increasing the effective ground-level setback. Landscaping and tree planting is proposed in the private portion of the boulevard, and opportunities for pedestrian walkways, suite access, and stormwater management features could be explored within the wide setback area as discussed in 1(d) above.</p> <p>Buildings 1 and 3 have been located at a separation distance of 16.6 metres. This is an acceptable separation distance between two mid-rise elements and should sufficiently preserve privacy and access to sunlight for residents.</p>	
--	--

	<p>Along the eastern north-south portion of River Drive, Building 1 has been located at a setback of 3.9 metres to the outer structure and 5.6 to 6.1 metres to the building wall. The setback provides opportunities for landscaping and tree planting. These elements will be important as the façade encloses parking and vehicle ramp functions and does not contain glazing or active frontages.</p> <p>Overall, the setbacks and separation distances proposed provide adequate depths and space for landscape elements including soil volumes for large-growing shade trees. The landscape areas and tree plantings will help to buffer the transition to the taller building elements and provide pedestrian amenity along the fronting streetscapes.</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p><b>Step-backs</b></p> <p>The proposed development has employed a series of step-backs at upper levels, consistent with the parameters for angular planes established in the accompanying Urban Design Guidelines. In order to preserve a degree of sunlight access, sky views, and privacy, the 45-degree angular plane is applied at each exterior property line at a height equal to 80% of the width of the adjacent right-of-way. The frontages along River Drive facing the railway and the eastern frontage facing the existing industrial property are proposed to be exempted from the 45-degree angular plane requirement as no sensitive uses exist in proximity to the subject site at this frontage. The angular plane approach proposed is consistent with best practices for the design of mid-rise buildings in urban environments and has been employed consistently in the proposed development as described below. Further façade articulation, including recessing portions of facades, glazing vertical elements, recessing balconies, and providing additional step-backs should be considered to articulate façades, create visual permeability, and reduce the visual impact of the overall mass and upper storeys, particularly along the wide expanse of buildings 1 and 2.</p> <p>Along the western portion of Caroline Street, the northern portion of building 2 steps back at levels 8, 9, 10, and 12, locating all building walls and structure below the angular plane. Minor encroachments into the angular plane occur with guardrails on the 12th level and parapets at the roof level. These are</p>	<p>Noted. A future Urban Design Brief will demonstrate how the proposed development adheres to the proposed Urban Design Guidelines.</p>

	<p>considered acceptable as the overall integrity of the angular plane is maintained. Along the eastern portion of Caroline Street, the northern portion of building 3 steps back at the 8th and mechanical penthouse levels, locating all building elements below the angular plane. Combined with the setbacks described in 2(c) above, the proposed massing mitigates overlook concerns and preserves access to sky views from low-rise residential properties along Caroline Street.</p> <p>Along Rosetta Street, building 3 steps back at the 7th, 8th, and mechanical penthouse levels. All elements at levels 7 and 8 are located below the angular plane. Minor encroachments occur at the egress stair at the mechanical penthouse and at the mechanical penthouse roof. These encroachments are acceptable as the overall integrity of the angular plane is maintained. Combined with the setbacks described in 2(c) above, the proposed massing mitigates overlook concerns and preserves access to sky views from low-rise residential properties along Rosetta Street.</p> <p>Along the south and southwest frontages in proximity to the railway corridor, a large step-back occurs at the 2nd level above the ground-level parking area and enclosing crash wall. The large step-back will help to mitigate the perceived building height from the public realm.</p>	
10	<p>The shadow studies provided illustrate the expected shadow impacts of the proposed development on public realm components and adjacent private properties. The tallest building elements have been located toward the south portion of the site with buildings oriented with their long axes perpendicular to the Caroline Street to the north. This site organization produces narrower shadows that move quickly across neighbouring properties and the public realm. Building 3, at 8 storeys, is located with its long axis along Rosetta Street, where neighbouring properties and the public realm are expected to receive wide shadows throughout the evening hours.</p> <p>March and September (equinox) test times show shadows cast from buildings 2 and 3 moving quickly across properties on the north side of Caroline Street, leaving the public right-of-way by 1:18pm. Shadows from building 3 move into the Rosetta Street right-</p>	Noted.

	<p>of-way in the afternoon and shadow lowrise residential neighbours across Rosetta Street from 4:18pm into the evening. The effects are typical of an 8-storey mid-rise building and upper building step-backs have mitigated the extent of the shadowing to a minor degree. The eastern portion of building 1 creates minor additional shadowing on the property at 2 Rosetta Street.</p> <p>June test dates show that the majority of shadowing is contained within the subject property between 10:18am and 2:18pm with minor shadowing extending into the adjacent rights-of-way and neighbouring existing industrial site to the east in the afternoon and evening.</p> <p>December test dates show shadowing on neighbouring rights-of-way and low-rise residential properties to varying degrees throughout the day. The most impacted properties are those located along the northeast side of Rosetta Street, where shadows are produced primarily by the 8-storey tall building 3, with the east portion of building 1 producing shadows affecting these properties earlier in the day than those cast by building 3.</p> <p>Generally, the shape, depth, and duration of shadows in the supplied shadow studies show that the location and orientation of the 12-storey building 1 and 2 elements along the southern portion of the site create shadow patterns and effects that are similar to those created by the 8-storey building 3, which is located in closer proximity to the low-rise residential neighbour lots. The site layout and building orientations mitigate the negative effects of increased shadowing resulting from the taller 12-storey building elements.</p>	
11	<p>a) Common Outdoor Amenity Space and Landscaped Open Space                  A series of outdoor common amenity areas have been provided both at grade and on the rooftop. Ground-level spaces include soft and hard landscaped areas within the setbacks from the street, a plaza facing Caroline Street, a playground and splash pad in the courtyard, a park area adjacent to the playground, and various common patio spaces. Rooftop spaces include an amenity area and swimming pool on the 2nd level rooftop of building 1 &amp; 2 and a 9th level rooftop terrace and swimming pool on building</p>	<p>This is provided within the Architectural Package, dated May 2023 prepared by ICON Architects.</p>

	<p>3. A full summary of common outdoor amenity spaces has not been provided, however the proportion of the site's open area dedicated to useable, programmable outdoor common amenity uses in a variety of forms appears appropriate for the size of the site. Surface vehicle circulation and parking has been minimized to dedicate space to amenity space for residents, guests, and visitors. The proposed site plan provides 33.6% of the site as landscaped open space. This falls just short of achieving the best-practice threshold of 35% to 40% open space. The inclusion of unique programming within the landscaped areas, including a children's playground, plaza, seating, and splash pad, presents a positive addition to the site and can be considered an acceptable trade-off in place of additional open space. As a result, the 33.6% landscape area as proposed is an acceptable balance of built form and useable landscaped open space, and provides a number of options for outdoor activities for residents.</p> <p>A tabulation of all common indoor and outdoor amenity spaces by program as well as a total area for each category will be useful in evaluating the overall amenity area offering in proportion to the number of units and density of building on the site, as compared to best practices.</p>	
12	<p>b) Common Indoor Amenity Space</p> <p>Common indoor amenity spaces include an exercise room, kids' play area, and party room in building 2, a lounge in building 1, and an exercise room, kids' play area, and party room in building 3. All common indoor amenity spaces are located at-grade and are easily identified and accessible. Locating indoor common amenity spaces at grade along the building's exterior allows additional glazing and visual connections with the street, increasing the number of active frontages as well as liveliness and safety in the streetscape.</p> <p>A tabulation of all common indoor and outdoor amenity spaces by program as well as a total area for each category will be useful in evaluating the overall amenity area offering in proportion to the number of units and density of building on the site, as compared to best practices.</p>	



<p>13</p>	<p>a) Pedestrian Access and accessibility                  Pedestrian circulation includes sidewalks provided along all street frontages. It is recommended that all public and private pedestrian sidewalks and walkways provided be a minimum of 2.1 metres in width for accessibility and pedestrian volumes. Please indicate pedestrian pathway width dimensions on the site plan to confirm that minimum widths of 2.1 metres have been achieved throughout the site, with clearways no less than 1.8 metres wide adjacent to any site furnishings.</p> <p>The site is generally permeable along all edges with the exception of the railway-facing crash wall interfaces. Interior site pedestrian circulation includes a series of walkways leading between pedestrian entrances, outdoor amenity spaces, seating, and landscaped areas. Marked pedestrian crossings have been located at each crossing point, and all loading areas have been located within the building envelope, minimizing conflict zones. Building entrances appear to be located at-grade without stairs or ramps, providing good accessibility for those with mobility challenges or using mobility devices. Vehicle pick-up and drop-off locations are located directly adjacent to main building entrances, and amenity areas appear to be accessible from ground level sidewalks and interior elevator cores. The use of unit paving throughout vehicle surfaces at the interior of the site will add to the pedestrian-friendly design of the site, using visual and tactile means to slow vehicle traffic and encourage safe sharing of the site for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles.</p>	<p>2.1 metre wide sidewalk on Rosetta, Caroline and St. Michaels Streets, will be constructed within an updated Right of Way which will bound the subject lands. The identification of pedestrian pathways of travel are provided in the Pedestrian Connectivity Plan, prepared by ICON Architects</p>
	<p>b) Vehicle Access &amp; Parking                  The overall site organization restricts vehicle movements to two laneway entrances with a central roundabout. The laneway provides access to three loading areas, all located within the building envelope. One parking entrance at building 1 provides access to interior surface and underground parking spaces with the majority of visitor spaces provided at the ground level adjacent to the crash wall. 14 visitor parking spaces including four barrier-free spaces are provided as exterior surface parking. The overall vehicle circulation approach appears to balance ease of access with minimization of impermeable surfaces dedicated to vehicle purposes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>c) Bicycle Access &amp; Parking                  Bicycle access and bicycle parking will be increasingly important in future years as Georgetown continues to grow. The site's proximity to multiple parks, shopping areas, and the GO rail station will fuel demand for bicycle infrastructure on-site. Requested reductions in vehicle parking can be justified by significant increases in easily accessible long- and short-term bicycle parking on-site.</p>	<p>702 Bicycle Spaces are provided throughout the proposed development.</p>

	<p>Exterior short-term bicycle parking spaces for visitors are provided throughout the site at-grade. They are located in proximity to site and building entrances. It is recommended that weather protection in the form of roof structures, canopies, and overhangs be provided to protect short-term bicycle parking from weather wherever feasible. A table providing a total count of exterior short-term bicycle parking spaces should be provided to determine the ratio of provided parking in relation to the number of residential units provided on-site, and should aim to provide a 0.1 space per unit ratio, or 64 spaces total (for 640 units).</p> <p>Long-term secure bicycle parking spaces for residents are provided within interior bike rooms at grade in buildings 1 (158 spaces), 2 (94 spaces), and 3 (52 spaces). Additional long-term bicycle parking space are also provided in the lowest parking level (102 spaces). This provides a total of 406 spaces. Due to the proximity to the rail station and reduced vehicle parking ratio, it is recommended that indoor secure bicycle parking spaces be provided at a ratio of 1 space per unit, or 640 spaces total (for 640 units). Furthermore, it is recommended that any spaces provided within parking areas be located as close as possible to grade, either within the enclosed ground level parking area or on the first parking level below grade.</p>	
15	<p><b>Building Façade Design &amp; Materials</b></p> <p>Although the building façade design and materials will be reviewed and evaluated more fully at the Site Plan Control stage, it is important that a development in this location adjacent to an established neighbourhood near the centre of Georgetown exhibit high quality urban design with materials that are harmonious, materially authentic, robust, and age well over time. Generally, stucco and EIFS facades should be avoided in favour of rain screen systems that quickly shed water and maintain their appearance in all seasons and over many years. A combination of brick and stone facades as depicted in the preliminary elevations is appropriate, and care should be taken to ensure that a consistency in rhythm and materials balances vertical and horizontal elements throughout the façades.</p> <p>The elevations presented for buildings 1 and 2 present a consistent, harmonious composition along the south façade that becomes inconsistent and overly complicated along the north elevation where frieze and planter elements are distinctive in material from the adjacent stone grid. Although the necessity of enclosing the solarium spaces along the south façade of buildings 1 and 2 demands a specific façade approach, the success of the tripartite expression and consistency of</p>	Noted.

	<p>the façade elements could be brought to all facades on buildings 1, 2, and 3, including those with exposed balconies. The use of lighter-toned materials including vision glazing and glazed spandrels above the base building, in combination with façade articulation and step-backs help to mitigate the visual impact of the upper storeys. The use of masonry, stone, ceramic, and other solid modular cladding materials at the base building helps to maintain the prominence and human scale of the building base. Combined with a lower ratio of openings to solid surface, the base building becomes the visual focus and gives less prominence to the upper building components. The inclusion of planter boxes in the façade is a positive addition that will enliven the development with greenery. Harmonizing the planter box material with the surrounding façade grid would provide consistency and simplify the façade expression in a number of locations. The proposed regular grid of dark brick along the base buildings establishes a human-scaled primary façade element. The dimension of the brick grid should be increased through the integration of planters and cornices to further establish a strong, consistent base building. The brick material should be carried through to the south façade’s crash wall pilasters on building 1 in a consistent material language of solids and voids along the public realm-facing elements of the development.</p> <p>Lastly, blank wall areas on the south and west elevations of building 3 and the east elevation of building 1 should be designed with a material palette that creates interest along these facades and gives a sense of scale to any larger blank areas.</p>	
<b>#</b>	<b>Zoning Review – Rachel Purdy</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	The Comprehensive Zoning By-law does not contain an FSI provision, therefore provision ii is not required.	Noted. The ZBLA has been updated.
2	Setbacks to “River Drive” should not be indicated as River Drive, as these setbacks are to the south interior side lot line, which is the property owned by Metrolinx.	Noted. The ZBLA has been updated.
3	By-law to indicate maximum number of units instead of units per hectare	Noted. The ZBLA has been updated
4	Two separate and different height provisions have been indicated in the site-specific by-law (provisions iii and xii). Ensure the information is coordinated.	Noted. The ZBLA has been updated
5	It is recommended that a massing schedule is proposed, and referenced in the site-specific by-law, instead of the current proposed provisions, to more clearly demonstrate the setbacks, massing and stepping of the buildings – currently the 2.3m setback only applies to a corner of Building 1, while the setback to Building 3 is greater.	Noted. The ZBLA has been updated to include a Massing Schedule as Schedule 3.

	A massing schedule can clearly indicate the varying setbacks to the same road for different buildings and at different storeys.	
6	Railway setback provision is in Section 4.34 of Zoning By-law 2010-0050. This provision should be reworded in conjunction with comments from CN or Metrolinx; the Zoning By-law provision should either not apply, or be to a property line, not the active lay-by lane, as this is not a defined term in the by-law.	Noted. The ZBLA has been updated to note that this section does not apply.
7	By-law could include a provision and definition for Auto-Share Parking Space.	Two Car share spaces are provided, over and above the required parking spaces.
<b>#</b>	<b>Accessibility Review – John McMulkin</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	Provide an additional two (2) barrier-free parking spaces	This have been included within the Architectural Set, prepared by ICON Architects, and identified on the parking stats.
<b>#</b>	<b>Building Review – John McMulkin</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	Provide Ontario Building Code Data Matrix for review.	This has been included within the submission package.
2	Indicate the principal entrance, distance to fire hydrant, and fire department connection on the Site Plan as per OBC 2012, Division B-Part 3, Subsection 3.2.5.	The distance to the fire hydrant and fire department connections have been included on the Site Plan, prepared by ICON Architects.
3	Provide separate services for each individual building.	There is one lateral for each service for the site – each building will have its own service which will run in the parking garage as the garage will be shared by all three condo buildings.
4	Provide fire department connection locations for each individual building.	This has been included on the Site Plan and Ground Floor Plan, prepared by ICON Architects.
5	Provide hydrant locations. Hydrants shall be within 45m distance to closest hydrant.	This has been included on the Site Plan and Ground Floor Plan, prepared by ICON Architects.
6	Is the roof drain flow-control type? Provide roof drain flow rate information.	Please refer to the FSR, prepared by Arcadis dated June 2023.
<b>#</b>	<b>Development Engineering Review – Reece D’Souza</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>

1	In the SWM Report and on the drawings provide further details on how Quality Control (80% TSS removal) & Quantity Control requirements shall be achieved to satisfy Stormwater Management Requirements	A Jellyfish Filtration Unit has been incorporated into the stormwater management design. Sizing and details pertaining to the unit can be found in Appendix D of the FSR, prepared by Arcadis dated June 2023.
2	How do permeable pavers function on a site with two levels of underground parking? Further information must be provided.	Permeable pavers have been removed.
3	Regarding Quantity control, the existing conditions of the site split drain; one-part drains to River Drive via Rosetta, the other part drains south towards Metrolinx lands and is picked up by storm infrastructure internal to Metrolinx, which has a separate outlet to John St. The applicant will have to determine how the rooftop drains of the existing structure (i.e., dye test) and show where each downspout is located. The applicant will have to control stormwater on-site to the pre-development flow rates if the sole post-development outlet drains towards River Drive via Rosetta. See attached Pre-Development Catchment Check PDF.	A dye test investigation has been completed on the existing building. The quantity control calculations have been updated to properly reflect the allowable release rates to each sewer based on existing conditions. No increase in flow is proposed to any of the surrounding sewers.
4	According to the Water Balance report, there is a positive increase of 772m <sup>3</sup> /year of additional run-off. While it's understood that a two-level underground parking garage prevents infiltration, an effort should be made to reduce the impact of increased flows to the Town's system and the outlet into the Credit River.	Best efforts have been made to reduce the impact of the site on the Town's system and outlet to the Credit River.
5	The parking foundation may be impacted by the water table. The water table is at 253.5 masl (Phase 2 ESA) and the underground level 2 is 253.70 masl; the potential impact of groundwater discharge due to an undetermined shallow ground water flow pattern must be quantified as the foundation drains could result in continuous flow rates into the Town's system and will need to be accounted for within the Quantity Control measures	At the time for this report, no Hydrogeological Report was available to quantify the potential for groundwater seepage into the proposed building. The quality and quantity of any groundwater seepage will be outlined during the Site Plan Application stage. It is assumed that any groundwater will be directed to the proposed stormwater management tank and treated if applicable.
6	Show the borehole & MW locations on the Grading, Servicing and Architectural Site Plans.	The applicable engineering drawings, prepared by Arcadis have been revised accordingly.
7	Submit a copy of the Phase 3 ESA to demonstrate the solution to handling the contamination on site	A QP Letter from Terraprobe is provided in this submission that describes timing and next steps for environmental works
8	As mentioned in the DRC notes, The Town will be looking for St. Michaels Street to be extended to John Street. There may also be an opportunity to close a portion of St. Michaels Street from Caroline St to River Drive (Metrolinx lands); because of this the	Several discussions have occurred with Town Staff regarding the extension of St. Michael's Street to John Street and the closing of St. Michaels Street from Caroline Street to River Drive. Transportation

	Town has currently withheld taking a road widening on St. Michaels Street (20m). Further discussions need to be held between the Town and the Developer on this topic.	Engineering advised that they were of the opinion that St. Michaels Street would need to be closed from Caroline Street to River Drive, while being extended to John Street to accommodate the proposed vehicular traffic at the owner’s cost. However, as indicated in the PJAR, these are possible modifications and potential connections that can be explored. As such, the closure of River Drive or St. Michaels Street has not been made official. Therefore, we propose that the consideration for St. Michaels Street extension or any cul-de-sac design should be revisited when the decision on these roads have been made.  2.1-metre-wide sidewalk on Rosetta, Caroline and St. Michaels Streets, will be constructed within an updated Right of Way which will bound the subject lands. The identification of pedestrian pathways of travel are provided in the Pedestrian Connectivity Plan, prepared by ICON Architects
9	The Developer shall be responsible for restoration improvements that need to be completed to Caroline St & Rosetta St as part of this project. Improvements include but are not limited to the installation of curb, resurfacing, and sidewalk	Restoration improvements are provided on the Conceptual Site Plan, prepared by ICON Architects and the Landscape Plan, prepared by MEP.
10	The Salt Management plan should be updated to reflect any changes made to the design of the site through application review	The Salt Management Plan has been updated and included with this submission.
11	Provide a draft condo plan to aid with review of the OPA & ZBA application	A Draft Condo will be apart of the future submission once the Site Plan has been completed.
12	A daylight triangle will be required at the corner of Rosetta St and River Drive (Metrolinx lands) and/or the realignment of the sidewalk & road to avoid encroachment onto the private lands. Further discussion with Town staff is required.	The sidewalk has been removed from the Metrolinx lands. A daylighting triangle has been provided at the corner of Rosetta Street and River Drive.
13	Engineering staff shall review the draft OPA & ZBA within the next submission as the requested changes will impact the context of the documents.	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>Functional Servicing Report – Reece D’Souza</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>

1	Development Review Memo contains additional comments about Stormwater Management. At SPA Stage, provide a separate SWM Report document from the FSR.	Noted.
2	What is the proposal to achieve 80% TSS Removal?	A media filtration unit has been sized to remove 80% of total suspended soils.
<b>#</b>	<b>Noise Report Review – Reece D’Souza</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	How was 2.95 metres determined? The analysis and all future reference identifies that it reduces the sound levels to an acceptable range, but does not specify why or how 2.95 metres was reached. Provide further explanation.	The height of the barrier was included in the analysis of predicted sound levels.
2	In the design plans, are the solariums considered to be the ‘ENBs’? Please clarify on the plans and in the discussion.	Appendix D contained within the Noise and Vibration Study, dated May 2023 prepared by SLR provides more details on the ENBs.
3	Noise Wall for OLA 1 – please label clearly	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>Transportation – Ivan Drewnitski</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	There are errors or omissions in the description of existing conditions in the Traffic Impact Study. A site visit must be conducted to document existing conditions and to assist the consultant when making assumptions and completing analysis. The corrections are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Please update the text in Site Description, as the development consists of one eight storey and two interconnected twelve storey residential buildings.</li> <li>b. Please note that the Caroline Street driveway is west of Rosetta Street not River Dr.</li> </ul>	Please refer to the TIA Cover Letter, prepared by Paradigm dated June 2022.
2	In the analysis of the base year conditions, the consultant had found that the westbound approach is experiencing a critical movement, as identified through the Halton Region’s TIS Guidelines. A specific concern with the calibration that was undertaken is that there are apparent errors or inconsistencies in the initial analysis of some study area intersections, and these errors affect the results of the analysis and undermine the validity of the calibration adjustments. The errors and inconsistencies include the use of a peak hour factor (PHF) by individual intersection approach rather than one for the whole intersection, potential errors in inputting signal timings, and omitting existing conditions that are present in the field. The Town also requires that consultants conduct field observations, which can be helpful to understand and explain the results of their initial analyses and could provide the basis for calibration	

	adjustments if any are necessary. This is a requirement of the Region's Traffic Impact Study Guidelines.
3	Regarding the appended Synchro reports, Synchro – Lanes, Volumes Timing Report must also be provided for signalized intersections.
4	Figure 3.1 (Site Concept Plan) is illegible. Note that study reports and submissions to the Town should conform to the AODA standards.
5	Furthermore, it appears that the Figure 3.1: Site Concept Plan does not match the latest Drawing Package that was included as part of the submission. Please update the figure to match the latest Site Plan.
6	It is noted that that the peak hour trip generation estimates are based on the 11th Edition of Institution of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. Table 5-1 provides peak hour trip generation estimates for the proposed development. Although the difference in the resultant weekday peak hour trips is not significant, the calculated trip ends used to determine the trip generation estimates are inaccurate. Table 3.1: Site Trip Generation shall be revised to reflect correct trip generation estimates; the consultant shall use the greater result of either the fitted curve or average rate.
7	Please provide rationale for the trips entering/exiting off Caroline Street; based on the site plan layout, all visitor parking is situated on the ground floor. With the configuration of the garage access all trips are destined to come out/in from Rosetta Street due to the close proximity of the underground garage parking.
8	Section 3.5 – Site Circulation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Update all AutoTURN to include the safety enhancements at the site access and Rosetta Street.</li> <li>b. Illustrate a garbage truck making a full exit off of Caroline down to Rosetta to River.</li> <li>c. AT4 – Please try to illustrate the southeast loading spot, with the HSU utilizing the hammerhead not the live roundabout lane.</li> <li>d. Swept Path Analysis must be illustrated for the underground parking.</li> </ul>
9	Section 3.6 – Traffic Signage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A note should be incorporated with reference made to the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) for the type, design, location, and installation of signs and pavement markings.</li> <li>b. A traffic signage and pavement marking legend should be included to show a visual blown-up spec of all signs and pavement markings.</li> <li>c. An Ra-1 stop sign must be shown for the access off Caroline Street.</li> <li>d. Signage for PUDO bays is recommended.</li> </ul>



	<p>e. Provide a convex mirror at the following highlighted locations below:</p> <p>f. A significant emphasis must be placed on pedestrian circulation and safety. Traffic calming features such as raised crossings/intersections and textured crosswalks should be explored and incorporated into the design. Crosswalks shall be additionally provided at the red marked-up areas below:</p>	
10	<p>There are significant safety concerns with the expected high pedestrian volumes internally within the road network (mix of garbage pick up, loading vehicles, visitors, and tenants). At Site Plan stage, the TIS must be updated to include a site plan review to identify the potential of safety or operational internal issues associated with the following: vehicle-pedestrian conflicts, heavy truck movement conflicts, and on-site active transportation. Significant consideration of speed humps, raised crossings/intersections, textured crosswalks, etc. should be explored and incorporated into the design due to the POP.</p>	
11	<p>Due to the expected development application to be filed in 2023 within the study area, please update the background traffic to include the following development:</p> <p>a. 130 Mountainview Road North – The proposal contemplates the construction of four 16-storey apartment buildings and two blocks of townhouse units, all to be accessed via a shared internal road. The development would contain a total of 1092 units. Main access will be off River Drive.</p>	
12	<p>For the full development, the consultant has identified a parking supply of 707 spaces (1.10 spaces per unit), which would be 413 or approximately 37% less than the requirements under the Town’s Zoning By-law. The consultant has undertaken a comprehensive assessment of parking requirements to support such a reduction. Further to the parking supply, the subject site has locational challenges for non-auto travel modes for day-to-day living, such as relatively being car dependent (as rated through walkscore.com, a well-known resource used by Transportation Professionals GTA wide), with long walking distances to groceries, shopping, errands, schools and entertainment and no local transit service available. Therefore, if the proposed on-site parking supply is insufficient, there is a potential risk of spillover parking onto the local road network and the Metrolinx parking lot.</p>	
13	<p>TTS reflects distribution patterns for where surveyors (residents) will be travelling to/from work. School buses mode share wouldn’t be used by residents to support a need to not require a vehicle; as such, the AT and transit-oriented combined trips account for approximately 6% for Halton Hills and 8% for Kitchener Line.</p>	
14	<p>Section 6.4 reviews traffic zones surrounding GO Transit stations along the Kitchener Line; this assumption is not reflective of Halton Hills as Kitchener, Guelph and Brampton have a well-established transit system, which supports non-auto travel</p>	

	<p>modes within their respective municipality to travel for groceries, shopping, etc. As such, this methodology is not justifiable to the Town and does not effectively demonstrate that this supports the proposed parking supply.</p>	
15	<p>It's understood that the Parking Justification section utilizes other municipalities. It is important to understand that these municipalities surveyed all have operating municipal transit systems that would effectively support providing lower parking demand. Subsequently, this is inapplicable within the Town of Halton Hills, as there is no established municipal transit system available presently. Therefore, surveys of comparable local conditions should always be considered as the best practice to estimate parking demand and account for local factors. Please provide reasoning and justification as to how these rates compare to a municipality such as the Town of Halton Hills with no local transit operating. Detailed abstracts should be provided to illustrate the surrounding network as it relates to the active transportation network, surrounding study area amenities, transit system, etc. for each proxy site.</p>	
16	<p>Reviewing a well-known transportation manual such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) is strongly encouraged and supported by the Town for both trip generation and parking generation. However, it is important to understand that the sites surveyed within ITE Parking Generation are well established urban/suburban areas (majority in the United States) with some having a remarkable multi-modal transportation network (cycling, walking, transit, LRT, etc.) that would evidently not require a vehicle as everything from work and shopping to visiting a doctor can be done through the municipal services provided.</p>	
17	<p>Provide rationale (understanding from COVID limitation for new data) for using such outdated surveys from February 2015; new tenants with different travel modes may be present at these apartments and the parking demand could drastically be different.</p>	
18	<p>Based on the information provided above, Transportation staff cannot support a parking ratio of 1.1 and the proposed information provided in the Parking Justification Study.</p>	
19	<p>There are safety concerns with a reverse curve movement due to the proximity of the access to Rosetta Street/River Drive intersection; please include a safety mitigation measure to help detour this.</p>	
20	<p>Bicycle parking supply shall be provided in the project statistics in drawing A101.</p>	
21	<p>Pedestrians tend to always take the shortest and quickest routes and the designs should reflect that. Convenient and safe connections from the building entrances to the municipal active transportation network are to be made. Conflict points should be</p>	

	limited as much as possible and the pedestrian routes should be as direct / convenient as possible.	
22	Confirm clear throat lengths at both site accesses.	
23	The Owner shall make a cash contribution prior to the lifting of the Holding Provision which shall be allocated and expended by the Town as the Owner's portion for the costs of intersection improvements at Mountainview Road North and River Drive associated with the estimated increased traffic generated from the proposed development. The amount of such cash contribution is to include but not be limited to installing left turn/right turn lanes and modifications to the existing traffic control signals. Please update the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment accordingly as part of the 2nd Submission.	
24	Further discussions need to be held for the Saint Michaels Street extension to John Street and the closure of Saint Michaels Street from Caroline Street to River Drive.	
25	Please submit a revised Transportation Impact Study with the aforementioned changes in both PDF and hardcopy format.	Noted.
26	Please send all electronic Synchro files with any resulting aforementioned changes. Synchro files will need review to ensure the analysis is properly modelled to the Town's standard.	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>Recreation and Parks – Kevin Okimi</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	We have reviewed the Official Plan and Rezoning Application for the above noted property. While we are generally supportive of the proposal, we note the following comments:	
2	There is limited parkland in the area and increased density will put pressure on existing and planned parks near the neighbourhood.	Noted. The proposed development will include a privately operated park ("POPs"), which will be accessible to the community and will operate as a privately owned publicly accessible space ("POPS"), which means that the open space will be privately owned and operated but will be available for the public and surrounding area to use.
3	We acknowledge that outdoor amenity and landscape spaces are shown on the plans provided. Through the site plan process, outdoor amenity space and landscape areas will be reviewed in detail.	Noted.

4	Urban Design Review of landscape elements (in addition to building massing/elements) will be required through the site plan process, pending approval of the Official Plan and Zoning Amendments.	Noted.
5	The proposal shows a “park” over top of the underground parking garage including playground and splash pad. The applicant is advised that the Town has no formal policies or provisions in the Official Plan or Parkland Dedication bylaw that provide any type of credit for strata-parks. Further medium and high density developments are required to provide outdoor amenity space (private) to serve the residents of the development, which is to be provided within the development site, and is independent of any public parkland proposal. Any request for parkland dedication credit for any strata park will be subject to special approval from Council, including potential agreements to address the provisions for perpetual maintenance, use, operations, replacement, and management of the space.	Based on discussions with Staff on May 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2023, there was an agreement in principle that the POPs Park could be open to the public and counted towards public dedication. It will not be fenced in and located with frontage onto Caroline Street, creating a neighbourhood park for the surrounding area to utilize. A POPs Agreement will be shared with Planning and Recreation/ Parks Staff for further discussion once the resubmission materials have been reviewed.
6	We also note the following conditions will be secured through the Site Plan Approval process:	Noted.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prior to the issuance of Site Plan Approval, landscape standards and related securities as contained in the Site Plan Application Guide will be secured to the satisfaction of the Recreation and Parks Department. If minimum standards can not be met, enhanced landscape treatments may be required (masonry features, enhanced fencing, etc.). Some of the landscape widths adjacent to neighbouring properties do not appear to meet the minimum standards. Any 0 Lot line setbacks will have facades addressed through the Urban Design Review.</li> </ol>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. A Tree Preservation Plan will need to be prepared to address any tree removals proposed as part of the redevelopment. It should be prepared by an arborist or other qualified professional, and must address compensation for trees to be removed. Landscaping required as part of the site plan design requirements are not considered compensation. If compensation plantings can not be accommodated on site, the Town will consider off site locations at nearby/adjacent open space areas or may consider a payment in lieu of compensation plantings. application.</li> </ol>	Noted. Refer to Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan prepared by The Urban Arborist Inc.
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Prior to the issuance of Site Plan Approval Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland shall be paid per the Official Plan, By-law 2022-0043 and the Planning Act to the satisfaction of the Recreation and Parks Department. Please note that there is currently a cap of \$13,200 per medium or high density residential unit or 20% of the land value whichever is greater (September 2022 rates) for the GO Station Secondary Plan area as approved by Council. The rates/cap are</li> </ol>	

	subject to change on an annual basis (could be updated in future years). This application is considered a high density residential.	
<b>#</b>	<b>Heritage Review – Laura Loney</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	A general comment is that copy-editing is needed throughout the Heritage Impact Assessment.	Communication with Town Heritage Staff confirm that these updates can be addressed at the Site Plan Stage.
2	Further comments and discussion should be provided in the HIA on the impacts of the contrast in scale, massing and height relative to the adjacent heritage properties. As written, it is identified that they are in contrast but not the actual impacts of that contrast in terms of compatibility, legibility, subordination, etc. Providing renderings showing the relationship would support this analysis.	
3	It should be noted that the demolition has not been “approved” by the Heritage Committee – this should be updated to reflect the Committee’s wording in the recommendation that they do not object in principle and that removal from the Heritage Register to permit demolition still requires Council approval.	
4	The Commemoration and Interpretation Plan details, including production and installation timelines, materials, and final copy, should be finalized and approved to the satisfaction of the Senior Heritage Planner prior to final site plan approval. Staff will review the Commemoration and Interpretation Plan as presented at the September meeting of Heritage Halton Hills and provide additional feedback, following which the existing Commemoration and Interpretation .	
5	Staff concur that design detailing at the lower levels of the proposed infill should respond to and complement the existing residential housing stock in the immediate area including the property at 11 Caroline Street. It is recommended that the HIA be updated to demonstrate how the design of the first few storeys will respond to and complement the residential housing stock as part of the site plan application.	
6	Replace City of Halton Hills with “Town” as required.	
7	The HIA should be updated to note that the Municipality does not determine whether or not an archaeological assessment is required, and that Halton Region makes this determination.	
<b>#</b>	<b>Fire Services – Jason Blackmere</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	Provide a fire truck turning assessment as per the following and add fire route signage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a clear width not less than 6 m, unless it can be shown that lesser widths are satisfactory,</li> </ul>	Please refer to updated Conceptual Site Plan, dated May 2023 prepared by ICON Architects.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a centerline radius not less than 12 m,</li> <li>• an overhead clearance not less than 5 m,</li> <li>• have a change of gradient not more than 1 in 12.5 over a minimum distance of 15 m,</li> <li>• be designed to support the expected loads imposed by firefighting equipment and be surfaced with concrete, asphalt or other material designed to permit accessibility under all climatic conditions and designed to support a load of not less than 25,000 lbs. (11,363 kg) per axle.,</li> <li>• have turnaround facilities for any dead-end portion of the access route more than 90 m long,</li> <li>• be connected with a public thoroughfare, and</li> <li>• show the required fire route signage on site plan.</li> </ul>	
2	Submit a fire safety plan for review at least four weeks before occupancy	Noted.
3	Fire hydrant location with distance from fire department connection	Please refer to updated Conceptual Site Plan and Ground Floor Plans, dated May 2023 prepared by ICON Architects.
4	Fire department key box to be installed before occupancy.	Noted.
5	Show all fire department connections (3 buildings indicated on site plan). Building 01 fire department connection to be moved along the fire route	The fire department connection's locations have been provided at the entrance of each building. Please refer to updated Conceptual Site Plan and Ground Floor Plans, dated May 2023 prepared by ICON Architects.
<b>#</b>	<b>Metrolinx – Derek Brunelle</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The subject property is located adjacent to CN's Halton Subdivision, which carries Kitchener GO train service.</li> <li>• Metrolinx notes that a Noise and Vibration Impact Study has been submitted. The proponent may obtain Metrolinx's most up to date rail forecast by submitting a request to <a href="mailto:raildatarequests@metrolinx.com">raildatarequests@metrolinx.com</a>.</li> <li>• From Metrolinx Stations Planning: Provide a more direct pedestrian and cyclist connection to the intersection between St Michaels Street and River Drive, for access to Georgetown GO (pedestrian tunnel).</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proponents Noise and Vibration Consultant, SLR has requested the rail forecast.</p> <p>A pedestrian access from the resident's parking area within the podium of Building 1 and 2 has been</p>

		proposed. As noted above, further consultation with Metrolinx is anticipated through this resubmission to ensure that the pedestrian connection meets with the required safety standards and the future redevelopment of River Drive.
2	<p>The Proponent shall provide confirmation to Metrolinx, that following warning clause will be inserted into all Development Agreements, Offers to Purchase, and Agreements of Purchase and Sale or Lease of each unit within 300 metres of the Railway Corridor</p> <p>Warning: Metrolinx and its assigns and successors in interest operate commuter transit service within 300 metres from the land which is the subject hereof. In addition to the current use of these lands, there may be alterations to or expansions of the rail and other facilities on such lands in the future including the possibility that Metrolinx or any railway entering into an agreement with Metrolinx or any railway assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand their operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwellings. Metrolinx will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under these lands.</p>	Noted.
3	<p>This application is subject to peer review by Metrolinx’s consultant AECOM. AECOM will provide the applicant with a Letter of Effort (LOE), indicating review fees that the applicant will be responsible for paying. The applicant has been informed of this review. Specific comments from AECOM to the applicant are forthcoming.</p>	Peer Review fee has been paid and the response to AECOM’s comments are provided below.
4	<p>The Owner will be required to enter into the following agreements with Metrolinx:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adjacent Development Agreement</li> <li>- Tie-back Agreement</li> <li>- Crane Swing Agreement</li> </ul> <p>Templates of these agreements will be sent to the Owner directly. The Owner shall grant Metrolinx an environmental easement for operational emissions, which is to be registered on title for all uses within 300 metres of the rail right-of-way. We have included a copy of the form of easement for the Proponent’s information. The Proponent may contact <a href="mailto:derek.brunelle@metrolinx.com">derek.brunelle@metrolinx.com</a></p>	Noted.

#	AECOM – Mohammed Mirza	Consultant Response
1	<p>Setbacks (p.2 and S6-01): Setbacks should be measured from the Metrolinx property line and crash wall design should be based on distance from centerline of the closest existing track or future track at 4m from the property line, whichever is closer. The proponent shall add Metrolinx property line to the section view S6-01 and clarify distance from centerline of track to the face of the crash wall and either the 30m setback from the property line or the setback to the closest sensitive or high occupancy use;</p> <p>S6-01 still doesn't show the Mx property line and S1-01 shows "property limit of Metrolinx Lay-by" which doesn't make sense and it goes through the middle of River Drive</p> <p>Metrolinx has confirmed that setbacks to sensitive uses shall be measured from the Metrolinx property line on the north side of the access road; setbacks may be measured as a combination of vertical (from the groundline at the property line) and horizontal. Please add these dimensions to the drawings; Crash wall as designed for the closest CL of track as the existing track is acceptable.</p>	<p>These measurements have been added. Please refer to updated Conceptual Site Plan and Ground Floor Plans, dated May 2023 prepared by ICON Architects.</p>
2	<p>Design approach and impact load calculations are accepted if confirmation of distances to the face of the wall is received. Reinforcement is also acceptable but note that this is not per AECOM recommendation but should be for a reasonable capacity and serviceability per the designer's judgment;</p> <p>Letter still reads reinforcement is "per AECOM recommendations." AECOM Guidelines do specify minimum dimensions noted but do not recommend reinforcement. Designer is to provide adequate reinforcement for reasonable capacity and serviceability of the wall.</p> <p>Comment closed;</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
3	<p>Proponent to clarify what this is for as it is unclear;</p>	<p>This is resolved through the resubmission of the Crash Wall Design, prepared by Stephenson Engineering.</p>
4	<p>Proponent to add the track location, alignment and the Metrolinx property line to the site layout;</p>	<p>This is resolved.</p>



	Track alignment is here. See comment 3 for property line questions.	
5	Proponent to top of rail elevation for clarity on the height of the crash wall; Top of rail shown but may be a typo - perhaps it should be 258580?	Please refer to Section B within the Architectural Plans, dated May 2023 prepared by ICON Architects.
6	Provide current architectural drawings. The set we have is dated June 10, 2020 and is inconsistent with drawing S1-01 in the crash wall package. In particular, we are looking for details on use of space in areas inside 30m horizontal setback from the rail corridor property line;	Please refer to the Architectural Plans, dated May 2023 prepared by ICON Architects.
7	On the provided Site Plan and Cross-section (i.e. Dwg #S1-01 & #S6-01), please address the following: a. Indicate Railway Mileage and Subdivision (i.e. Mile 23.50 Halton subdivision) b. Clearly mark and label Metrolinx property line; c. Clarify and label to what limit the 30m setback line is marked on the cross-section; d. On the Cross-section, please confirm all the spaces (i.e. whether High occupancy or Low occupancy) between the marked 30m setback line and the proposed Crash wall;  We are checking internally with Metrolinx to confirm which property line shall be considered to measure the setbacks, once we get the response we will relay it to the proponent;  Metrolinx (Derek Brunelle): I reviewed the file again and have determined that there are no concerns with the setback being measured from the MX property line. For the purposes of rail safety, we will measure from the layover track;	Noted.
8	The Professional Engineer's stamp on page #3 of 4 is missing the date, please revise;	Please refer to the Crash Wall Design, prepared by Stephenson Engineering.
9	Be advised, as per Metrolinx requirements, the proposed Crash wall will need to consider anti-graffiti treatment. Please incorporate this requirement;	Noted. This is resolved through the resubmission of the Crash Wall Design, prepared by Stephenson Engineering.
10	The designer must consider the underground utilities (existing or proposed) to be far enough from the crash wall foundations, so that in case of a derailment impact, the foundation does not have potential to damage the underground utilities (i.e.	Noted.

	watermain, gas, etc.) leading to severe consequences. As such, separations requirements shall be met as per applicable standards. This comment was provided as a means of cautioning the proponent;	
11	Please confirm that all drainage from the subject adjacent development will be directed away from the Metrolinx drainage ditches and Right-of-Way. The project and its construction should have no adverse effects on the existing and future Metrolinx drainage facilities / ditches / grading; a. Please advise if drainage of water against the proposed crash wall has been addressed and what provisions are being made, if any;	Please refer to the Grading Plan, dated June 2023, prepared by Arcadis, which confirms that subject lands will be graded in a way that no water will drain against the proposed crash wall.
12	Be advised, the design of crash wall footing shall comply with the recommendations from the associated Geotechnical Report; a. Be advised, the Geotechnical Report was not provided by the proponent and reviewed by AECOM Geotechnical Engineer.	A Geotechnical Report, dated October 202 prepared by Terraprobe is provided.
13	Be advised, any proposed vegetation along the crash wall shall consider the following Metrolinx requirements: a. It must not impact the foundations of the crash wall; b. Tall growing vegetation (like trees) are not allowed within 3.5 m from the property line. Some low-lying vegetation, such as decorative grasses or shrubs, may be accommodated.	The Landscape Planting Plan L-1.1, prepared by MEP, dated May 2023 includes the design and specification of proposed vertical green wall planting that complies with Metrolinx design standards for planting adjacent to Crash Walls.
14	Please note, once the conceptual design and detailed design phases are completed and approved, the proponent and their contractor will need to go through the construction work plan review phase to obtain a Metrolinx Work Permit for all construction works taking place adjacent to the railway corridor (i.e., construction of the retaining wall on Go Station property side, shoring system, etc.). Requirements for the construction work plan review phase will be provided at the time of design approval.	Noted
15	Based on the site location, communication and coordination with Metrolinx Station Operations is critical. At the moment they don't have any comments but with future resubmissions, there may be some;	Noted
16	Please note, all applicable agreements with Metrolinx shall be coordinated with Metrolinx for the proposed adjacent development;	Noted
17	Since this is a Conceptual Design review, the scope of this review is limited to the following: a. Review of Rail Safety Study for the proposed Adjacent Development Rail Safety Mitigation package; b. Review Structural design and calculations of Adjacent Development Safety Barrier (i.e., Crash Wall);	The Rail Safety Study has been reviewed by AECOM. Please refer to the FSR/SWM prepared by Arcadis, dated June 2023.

	<p>c. Review Stormwater Management Report for surface and underground water;</p> <p>We have only received the Design of Crash Wall report and assumed that this is submitted as to fulfill the requirement of item #b from above. The remaining items #a and #c are still pending;</p>	
18	<p>Please note that, this review has not been performed to check compliance of the proposed work with Metrolinx Electrification requirements. Any comments regarding Metrolinx Electrification requirements shall be provided by Metrolinx Electrification Group. We have reached out to Metrolinx to get feedback from Electrification group (if any);</p> <p>Metrolinx (Derek Brunelle): No internal comments on this matter. Comment closed;</p>	Noted.
19	<p>Review was for structural and rail safety considerations only. Review for drainage, noise and vibration shall be done by subject area experts.</p>	Noted.
20	<p>Following points are acceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• design track speeds of 50mph</li> <li>• use of parking podium in setback area and to support crash wall with inclusion of isolation joint to inhibit load transfer to sensitive use supporting elements</li> <li>• depth of crash wall shown</li> <li>• 450mm crash wall thickness</li> <li>• crash wall alignment with returns</li> </ul>	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>CN Railway – John McMulkin</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	<p>The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report is satisfactory for CN since the project will use the municipality’s storm drain.</p>	Noted.
2	<p>Regarding the Environmental Noise and Vibration Study, the Applicant is to provide CN with a CadnaA acoustic model and associated bitmaps for the project.</p>	The Acoustic Model has been provided directly to Jade Acoustics.
3	<p>The Crash Wall Design is to be peer reviewed by AECOM. A copy of the Crash Wall Design approved by AECOM shall then be submitted to CN for review.</p>	Please refer to the Crash Wall Design, prepared by Stephenson Engineering.
<b>#</b>	<b>CN Railway – WSP</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	<p>Safety setback of principal buildings from the railway rights-of-way to be a minimum of 30 metres in conjunction with a safety berm. The safety berm shall be adjoining</p>	The Crash Wall Design has been peer-reviewed by AECOM, as indicated in the comments above.

	<p>and parallel to the railway rights-of-way with returns at the ends, 2.5 meters above grade at the property line, with side slopes not steeper than 2.5 to 1.</p> <p>(If the proposed development cannot respect the minimum recommended setback, a crash wall must be proposed taking into consideration the attached crash wall design standards developed by AECOM. Please note CN requires for all crash wall design and report to be peer reviewed and approved by AECOM before being submitted for evaluation by CN.)</p>	
2	The Owner shall install and maintain a chain link fence of minimum 1.83 meter height along the mutual property line	Correspondence with Metrolinx has confirmed that a chain link fence is not required as the property line is under 1 metre away from the crash-wall.
3	The Owner shall engage a consultant to undertake an analysis of noise. Subject to the review of the noise report, the Railway may consider other measures recommended by an approved Noise Consultant	Please refer to the Noise Report, prepared by SLR, dated May 2023.
4	Ground-borne vibration transmission to be evaluated in a report through site testing to determine if dwellings within 75 meters of the railway rights-of-way will be impacted by vibration conditions in excess of 0.14 mm/sec RMS between 4 Hz and 200 Hz. The monitoring system should be capable of measuring frequencies between 4 Hz and 200 Hz, ±3 dB with an RMS averaging time constant of 1 second. If in excess, isolation measures will be required to ensure living areas do not exceed 0.14 mm/sec RMS on and above the first floor of the dwelling.	Noted.
5	<p>The following clause should be inserted in all development agreements, offers to purchase, and agreements of Purchase and Sale or Lease of each dwelling unit within 300m of the railway right-of-way:</p> <p>“Warning: Canadian National Railway Company or its assigns or successors in interest has or have a rights-of-way within 300 metres from the land the subject hereof. There may be alterations to or expansions of the railway facilities on such rights-of-way in the future including the possibility that the railway or its assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand its operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwelling(s). CNR will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under the aforesaid rights-of-way.”</p>	Noted.
6	The storm water management facility must be designed to direct away all runoff waters away from CN right of way including ditches, culverts and tracks.	Please refer to the FSR/SWM Report, dated June 2023, prepared by Arcadis.

7	The Owner shall through restrictive covenants to be registered on title and all agreements of purchase and sale or lease provide notice to the public that the safety berm, fencing and vibration isolation measures implemented are not to be tampered with or altered and further that the Owner shall have sole responsibility for and shall maintain these measures to the satisfaction of CN.	This will be reviewed.
8	The Owner shall enter into an Agreement with CN stipulating how CN's concerns will be resolved and will pay CN's reasonable costs in preparing and negotiating the agreement.	This will be discussed at a later stage.
9	The Owner shall be required to grant CN an environmental easement for operational noise and vibration emissions, registered against the subject property in favour of CN	Noted.
10	CN anticipates the opportunity to review a detailed site plan, a N&V study, crash wall design plan and report approved by AECOM and a storm water management report taking into consideration CN development guidelines.	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>CN Peer Review – Jade Acoustics</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	It is acknowledged that the noise study indicates the MOE requirement for brick veneer or masonry equivalent construction as it relates to dwellings within 100 m of the railway line. The report does not mention that CN generally requires that the first row of dwellings be constructed of brick veneer or masonry equivalent construction regardless of the predicted sound level. For completeness, it is requested that these requirements are included in the updated noise study This requirement is to apply to all south, east and west facing facades of the first row of buildings. It is also applicable I Noise Buffer (ENB) exterior walls (i.e. outermost facades of the building), which should be constructed of brick veneer or masonry equivalent construction. If spandrel panel wall sections (or similar construction) are proposed, they should be backed with a masonry component such as block. The exterior wall requirements as currently noted in the report are not sufficient and need to be addressed in the updated noise report.	Please refer to the Comment Response Letter, dated May 2023, prepared by SLR.
2	Further to point 1., above, Table 5 of the report mentions criteria related to exterior wall construction and indicates "Brick Veneer or Acoustic Equivalent Required". This is not the wording used in the applicable guidelines and should be revised to indicate Brick Veneer or Masonry Equivalent Required.	

3	The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) and Railway Association of Canada (RAC) "Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations" were correctly referenced in the report with respect to vibration criteria. However, the text of the report should also acknowledge the noise criteria sections of the respective guidelines as they are followed by CN rail and Metrolinx.	
4	It is acknowledged that the common outdoor amenity areas have been assessed and that a 2.95 m high barrier is being proposed as part of the building design. For Table 9 and general completeness, a footnote should be added to indicate the predicted sound level includes the 2.95 m high barrier (in terms of the applicable receptors).	
5	Table 10 includes facade requirements due to transportation noise. There are aspects in terms of exterior wall construction that are to be revised as per point 1., above. Also, to be incorporated into this table or provided in a separate table, the building component requirements (exterior wall and window requirements) for the ENBs, with consideration of point 1., noted above.	
6	In Section 2.6.1, it is acknowledged that the ventilation requirements are provided due to transportation noise sources. As it is understood that the intention for this development is to receive the Class 4 designation, it is recommended that this section mentions this intention and that all dwellings (units) are expected to be provided with central air conditioning regardless of the transportation analysis conclusions in this section.	
7	The report does not address the need for the safety berm typically required adjacent to a principal main line. Also, the text of the report should clearly mention that the closest building structure does not comply with the minimum 30 m setback from the CN right-of-way (ROW). In general, the proponent and CN will need to determine the acceptability of this reduced setback and applicable safety requirements for this project.	
8	Section 4.5.1.2 provides justification as to why this development should be considered for a Class 4 designation. To clarify here and further to the statement on the first page of this peer review, the discussions in this section are beyond the scope of this CN peer review as only transportation noise source impacts (the through rail traffic) are being considered and are not relevant to the Class designation of the subject site.	

9	Section 4.6 mentions where warning clauses are to be applied. This section should also mention that warning clauses should be included in condominium documents (if the buildings are to be condominium buildings).	
10	It is acknowledged that a mitigation summary table is included in the Appendix of the noise report (Table D1 ). The table should include (or a separate all encompassing mitigation table provided) the building component requirements (as it relates to walls, windows and the requirement of ENBs). The request here is for a comprehensive table that summarizes all acoustical mitigation requirements for the project in a single Table.	
11	Section 7.4 of the noise report includes a bullet list of conclusions for the development. The last bullet point indicates that a re-assessment of noise control measures (transportation and stationary noise) should be completed once the Heritage Road Layover is confirmed to proceed This statement is general in nature and is acceptable to include in the noise report The statement should also indicate that any such subsequent review will be completed as an Updated Environmental Noise and Vibration Study and subject to peer review by CN.	
12	As mitigation measures are required, it is recommended that NPC-300 warning clause Type 8 is applied to this development	
13	Appendix B includes rail traffic data received January 24, 2019, that is related to 18 to 24 Elizabeth Street, in Brampton It appears this correspondence was included in error and should be deleted from the updated noise report.	
1	It is acknowledged that vibration measurements were completed (involving thirty (30) train passbys) There are various uncertainties with how the vibration measurements were completed. Clarification of the vibration monitor setup is to be included in the updated noise and vibration report. At this time, it is unclear if the vibration monitoring setup was within an existing building or adjacent to the building (among certain possible setups).	

2	<p>The noise and vibration report does not include any of the raw vibration measurement data. Instead, only corrected/adjusted data is shown (as per SLR, based on calculated coupling loss/attenuation that would be associated with the proposed building structure) Table 11, 'Measured Rail Vibration Levels" is a misleading title since the reported values in this table are corrected/adjusted values. To avoid confusion, the title should be revised, or a footnote added to the table.</p>	
3	<p>Further to point 2., above, the raw measured vibration levels should be included in the noise and vibration report Also, The calculations used to correct/adjust the raw vibration levels should be documented in the noise and vibration report for review and comment</p>	
4	<p>Figure 6 in the report shows the vibration monitor location. Further to the points above, It is unclear if this location was inside at building or beside a building. The distance from the railway right-of-way to the vibration location should be included on the Figure, along with clarification as to the specific vibration monitoring setup.</p>	
5	<p>Considering the vibration measurement location and the presence of existing buildings, the vibration measurements would have been influenced by the presence of the existing buildings. To note here, vibration measurements are to be completed at this location again when the demolition of existing buildings is completed.</p>	
6	<p>The determination of the required mitigation measures should be based on the measured data not the corrected data</p>	
7	<p>The proposed building is within 30 m of the CN right-of-way. The report mentions the closest building foundation is approximately 35 m to the track centreline. This distance should be provided on Figure 6, along with the distance between the CN right-of-way and closest building structure. The distance to closest residential dwellings should be noted in the Report. CN rail is to comment on any safety requirements, such as the potential for a crash wall (if needed).</p>	
8	<p>At this time, there are various clarifications needed to the vibration work before a conclusion can be made that no vibration mitigation is applicable to this development</p>	



	We find that the noise and vibration report has generally been prepared with the appropriate guidelines considered. We do not anticipate that any of the comments in this peer review will alter the feasibility of the development; however, with consideration, of the number of items to address and the unknowns associated with final mitigation measures, the peer review comments should be addressed in an updated noise report. A subsequent CN peer review is to be completed when the updated noise report is available	
<b>#</b>	<b>Region of Halton – Amanda McNeish</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	Certain matters of provincial interest that are more technical in nature are explored in further detail in the comments below. Regional staff require additional information as outlined below prior to being able to confirm the proposed development will be consistent with the policy direction of the PPS and in conformity with the Growth Plan.	Noted.
2	In terms of the Urban Area and Strategic Growth Area policies of the ROP, Regional staff are satisfied that the proposal conforms to the ROP as it relates to the principle of intensification; the Town will need to be satisfied that the proposed increase in intensity meets its specific local goals and objectives related to growth areas, including integration and scale of intensification.	Noted.
3	Halton Region will rely on Metrolinx staff for review of the above noted items as well as the proposed ZBA, and in particular, confirmation that the proposed Special Railway Right-of-way Setback provision is acceptable. It is Regional staff's understanding that Metrolinx has identified the need for more direct pedestrian and cyclist connection, the need for specific warning clauses, various agreements, and also require a peer review of the application.  Regional staff require confirmation from the Town of Halton Hills and Metrolinx that the compatibility matters above have been addressed to their satisfaction, and kindly request to be forwarded a copy of any updated comments from Metrolinx subsequent to the completion of the peer review.	Noted.
4	Regional staff also require the author of each of the ESAs to extend third party reliance to Halton Region. Halton Region requests that the attached reliance letter template be utilized by the Qualified Person (QP) when issuing their letter.	Reliance Letters are provided with the submission package.
5	Regional staff agree with the QP that a mandatory Ministry of the Environment Conservation and Parks (MECP) acknowledged Record of Site Condition (RSC) is required due to a change to a more sensitive use on 1 Rosetta Street. Staff also agree with the QP that not all of the Areas of Potential Environmental Concern (APECs) were investigated and additional contamination delineation and a Remedial Action Plan is	A QP Letter is provided with the submission package.

	required prior to the filing of an RSC. In addition, staff note that the Phase Two ESA does not contain a Phase Two Conceptual Site Model which is a requirement in accordance with O.Reg. 153/04.	
6	<p>Regional staff request an opinion letter written by the QP, to the satisfaction of Halton Region, identifying any risks associated with the remaining APECs not investigated during the Phase 2 ESA. The letter should confirm whether or not the subject lands can be brought to a condition suitable for its proposed use, following the additional APEC investigation and subsequent Site Remediation/ Risk Assessment.</p> <p>Ultimately, a MECP acknowledged RSC for the subject lands will be required to be submitted to the Region. This submission must include all environmental documentation (e.g., updated ESAs) used for filing the RSC, and letters of reliance from the author extending third party reliance to the Region of Halton for each of the ESAs. Regional staff may be amenable to addressing the RSC through a Holding Provision, subject to the opinion letter addressing Regional concerns in a satisfactory manner. This will be confirmed at a later date.</p>	
7	<p>It is further noted that the Phase 1 and 2 ESAs only appear to address the lands municipally known as 1 Rosetta Street, whereas the proposed development includes two additional properties (i.e., 6 and 8 Saint Michaels Street). An evaluation of 6 and 8 Saint Michaels Street is also required, which should be addressed through the submission of an executed ESSQ. Subsequent to further review, Regional staff may determine that additional environmental documentation is required (e.g., Ph 1 and/or 2 ESA, completed to O.Reg. 153/04 standards, and accompanied by a letter of third party reliance, etc.).</p> <p>Until the QP opinion letter and ESSQ are received and evaluated, Regional staff cannot support the application from a contaminated sites perspective.</p>	A completed QP Opinion Letter and ESSQ is provided within the submission package.
8	The proponent is cautioned that during development activities, should archaeological materials be found on the property, the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture should be notified immediately (416-212-8886 or archaeology@ontario.ca). In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, the proponent should immediately contact the appropriate authorities (police or coroner) and all soil disturbance must stop to allow the authorities to investigate and the Registrar of Cemeteries to be consulted.	Noted.
9	The subject lands are located within the jurisdiction of the CTC Source Protection Plan (SPP). The CTC SPP can be accessed online at: <a href="http://www.ctcswp.ca/ctc-">http://www.ctcswp.ca/ctc-</a>	Noted.

	<p>source-protection-plan/. The property is located in a Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA-E and WHPA-Q1/Q2), and within an Issue Contributing Area for chloride.</p> <p>It is noted that a Risk Management Plan (RMP) was previously established for the subject lands. Based on the current proposal, the previously issued Section 59(2)(b) Notice (dated July 31, 2019) continues to meet the requirements set out in Section 59 under the Clean Water Act, 2006. However, prior to the issuance of site alteration / building permits, the existing RMP will need to be reviewed/amended to ensure that the appropriate risk management measures are utilized to address final construction plans and proposed uses. The review/update to the RMP will be tied as a condition of site plan approval.</p>	
10	<p>It is the Region’s understanding that a WBA, dated May 7, 2021 and prepared by Terraprobe was submitted for review. The review of the WBA is deferred to the Town. Town staff should be satisfied the WBA meets the objectives stated under policy REC-1, while still considering the protection of groundwater quality from road salt impacts.</p> <p>Halton Region requests that the applicant provide additional information confirming planned dewatering for both during and post-construction, as well as discharge locations. Dewatering within the WHPA-Q is a potential concern for the Region’s municipal groundwater supply wells. Furthermore, please be advised Halton Region does not support dewatering discharge to the Region’s sanitary sewer system.</p>	<p>Please refer to the updated FSR/SWM Report, dated June 2023, prepared by Arcadis.</p>
11	<p>There is a 150mm diameter section and a 300mm diameter section of watermain that loops around the perimeter of the property along Rosetta Street, Caroline Street and Saint Michaels Street.</p> <p>The property already appears to be serviced via a lead connection to the 300mm diameter section of watermain.</p> <p>There is a 200mm diameter sanitary sewer main adjacent to the property along Saint Michaels Street.</p> <p>There is a 300mm diameter sanitary sewer main adjacent to the property along Caroline Street.</p> <p>There is a 250mm diameter sanitary sewer main adjacent to the property along Rosetta Street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

12	<p>No wastewater service laterals or water service connections are to cross existing or proposed property lines. Furthermore, any system upgrades or extensions to water or wastewater services that will be required to service the proposed development will be at the expense of the Owner and will require a full Engineering Review Submission, execution of a Servicing Agreement with the Region of Halton, MECP approvals and a Services Permit.</p> <p>The applicant shall comply with the Region's current construction and design standards as stated in the Region's Development Engineering Review Manual, Region of Halton Design Criteria, Contract Specifications and Standard Drawings, Sewer Discharge By-Law 02-03, Multi-unit Servicing Policy as set out in Report PPW01-96 and By-Law 71-19 Respecting the Prevention of Backflow Into the Water System.</p>	Noted.
13	<p>A revised FSR is required to be submitted to the Region for review and approval to address the key matters below:</p> <p>Watermain Analysis:</p> <p>The hydrant flow test results utilized as part of this FSR analysis were obtained by a Hydrant Flow test conducted on Monday December 14th, 2020 by Aquacom Contracting. An updated/more recent hydrant test will be required and the following information should be submitted to the Region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Expected static pressures;</li> <li>b) Required fire flows;</li> <li>c) Expected fire flows; and a</li> <li>d) Fire Flow Certification Letter that is signed and stamped by a professional engineer that states the theoretical flow rate is at a pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (PSI).</li> </ul>	An Updated FSR/ SWM Report, dated June 2023, prepared by Arcadis is included within the submission.
	<p>Wastewater Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sanitary sewer design sheets are required to determine if any downstream capacity constraints exist. It is necessary for the Region to analyze the minimum velocity on actual flows; actual peak velocity calculated for each pipe to ensure adequate flushing velocities; and the maximum velocity with the pipe flowing full in the segment of pipes in the analysis. This has not been provided in the current FSR.</li> <li>b) Please provide an isolated internal Sanitary Area Drainage Plan of the development site. This has not been provided in the current FSR.</li> </ul> <p>Regional staff note the current unit count as follows: Residential (1 Bedroom) – 490 units</p>	

	<p>Residential (2+ Bedrooms) – 150 units Total unit count of 640</p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>Based the above, the proposed development will require three hundred and sixty-seven (367) Single Detached Equivalents (SDEs) of water allocation. The development will receive two (2) SDEs of water allocation as a credit for the current usage respectively. Therefore, the applicant will be required to obtain a total of three hundred and sixty-five (365) SDEs of water allocation for the residential development. The water allocation is subject to change as the number of units and type of usage is altered by the proponent.</p> <p>Should allocation not be granted by the Town as part of the decision on the subject applications, a Holding Provision will be required that shall not be lifted until such time as allocation is provided to the satisfaction of Halton Region.</p> <p>The Owner should be aware that there may not be sufficient water or wastewater plant capacity, storage or pumping facilities and associated infrastructure to accommodate this development and that additional capacity may not become available within the term of site plan approval and that granting of site plan approval does not imply a guarantee by the Region to service this development within the term of site plan approval.</p> <p>A Water Usage and Sanitary Discharge Report may be required to be submitted to the Region of Halton for review and approval, should there be changes to the development proposal.</p> <p>Additional specific servicing requirements, such as the need for Regional Services Permits, will be detailed and tied to any future Site Plan application.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>The residential portion of waste (i.e., recycling, organics and garbage) may be eligible for Region waste collection, provided the requirements of the guidelines are met and the Waste Management Plan demonstrates that waste will be managed, stored and collected in a manner that is safe, functional and accessible.</p> <p>Through Regional staff’s review of the first submission, a number of waste management related concerns have been identified.</p> <p>Regional staff have raised concerns with the current layout of the proposed loading areas due to its very close proximity to pedestrian traffic and amenities (e.g., splash pad and playground). Regional staff recommend consolidating all waste loading areas into one and having access to this loading area outside of heavily pedestrian accessed areas. A safe, functional and accessible solution for Regional collection is</p>	<p>Auto-Turn Analysis has been provided to demonstrate that a safe, functional and accessible solution for Regional Collection is provided.</p>

	<p>required. A revised Waste Management Plan/Vehicle Traffic Plan is required which clearly addresses the below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clearly details how residential waste will be managed, stored and collected.</li> <li>2. A review of alternative configurations to address pedestrian safety.</li> <li>3. Meets minimum requirements as outlined in the Development Design Guidelines for Source Separation of Solid Waste.</li> <li>4. The turning radius is currently indicated as 7-12 m in the TIS. Please confirm the minimum 13m turning radius has been met.</li> <li>5. Ensure the turning radius is clearly labelled on the plan showing a minimum 13 m turning radius from center line.</li> <li>6. Please show and label both the length of the head-on approach (a minimum of 18 m is required) and the length the truck will be required to reverse.</li> <li>7. Please show and clearly label the Vertical Clearance Loading areas.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Vertical clearance required in the collection loading area is a minimum of 7.5m. The drawing indicates a type G loading area with a 6.1 m height clearance. This does not meet Regional guidelines.</li> </ol> </li> <li>8. With respect to loading, the plans indicate where the collection point will be located which appears to be internal to the structures. Type G loading areas are shown. The Region requires 6 m in width within the loading area with a 7.5 m height clearance. The garage door height must be 5 m. Please confirm dimensions and ensure all dimensions are clearly labeled.</li> </ol>	
<b>#</b>	<b>Halton Hills School Board</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	<p>Any students generated from this development application are currently within the Glen Williams PS, George Kennedy PS, Centennial PS and Georgetown District HS catchment areas. According to the Board’s projections, many of the existing schools in the vicinity are projected to be at or under building capacity.</p>	Noted.
2	<p>For your convenience, below are our standard conditions of development that may be applied to the development proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The owner agrees to place the following notification in all offers of purchase and sale for all lots/units and in the Town’s condominium agreement, to be registered on title:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Prospective purchasers are advised that schools on sites designated for the Halton District School Board in the community are not guaranteed. Attendance at schools in the area yet to be constructed is also not</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Noted.

	<p>guaranteed. Pupils may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or be directed to schools outside of the area.</p> <p>b. Prospective purchasers are advised that school busses will not enter cul-de-sacs and pick up points will be generally located on through streets convenient to the Halton Student Transportation Services. Additional pick up points will not be located within the subdivision until major construction activity has been completed.</p>	
3	That in cases where offers of purchase and sale have already been executed, the owner sends a letter to all purchasers which include the above statement.	Noted.
4	That the developer agrees that, should the development be phased, a copy of the phasing plan must be submitted prior to final approval to the Halton District School Board. The phasing plan will indicate the sequence of development, the land area, the number of lots and blocks and units for each phase.	Noted.
5	That the Owner shall supply, erect and maintain signs at all major entrances into the new development advising prospective purchasers that pupils may be directed to schools outside of the area. The Owner will make these signs to the specifications of the Halton District School Board and erect them prior to the issuance of building permits.	Noted.
6	That a copy of the approved sidewalk plan, prepared to the satisfaction of the Town of Halton Hills be submitted to the Halton District School Board.	2.1 metres sidewalks along Rosetta and Caroline Streets are shown on the Conceptual Site Plan, dated May 2023, prepared by ICON Architects.
7	In addition, the following note should be included in the conditions: Educational Development Charges are payable in accordance with the applicable Education Development Charge By-law and are required at the issuance of a building permit. Any building permits which are additional to the maximum unit yield which is specified by the Subdivision Agreement are subject to Education Development Charges prior to the issuance of a building permit, at the rate in effect at the date of issuance.	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>Halton Hills Catholic School Board</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	Elementary students generated from this proposal would be accommodated at Holy Cross Catholic Elementary School located at 222 Maple Avenue, Georgetown. Secondary school students would be directed to Christ the King Catholic Secondary School located at 161 Guelph Street, Georgetown.	Noted.
2	Should the development proceed with the approval of the Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment, we require that the following conditions be placed in	Noted.

	any subsequent agreements (e.g. Condominium, Site Plan). The conditions are to be fulfilled prior to final approval:	
3	The owner agrees to place the following notification in all offers of purchase and sale for all lots/units and in the Town’s subsequent agreements, to be registered on title: a. Prospective purchasers are advised that Catholic school accommodation may not be available for students residing in this area, and that you are notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bused to existing facilities outside the area. b. Prospective purchasers are advised that the HCDSB will designate pick up points for the children to meet the bus on roads presently in existence or other pick up areas convenient to the Board, and that you are notified that school busses will not enter cul-de-sacs and private roads.	Noted.
4	In cases where offers of purchase and sale have already been executed, the owner is to send a letter to all purchasers which include the above statements.	Noted.
5	That the owner agrees in subsequent agreements to the satisfaction of the HCDSB, to erect and maintain signs at all major entrances into the new development advising prospective purchasers that if a permanent school is not available alternative accommodation and/or busing will be provided. The owner will make these signs to the specifications of the HCDSB and erect them prior to final approval.	Noted.
6	That the developer agrees that should the development be phased, a copy of the phasing plan must be submitted prior to final approval to the HCDSB. The phasing plan will indicate the sequence of development, the land area, the number of lots and blocks and units for each phase.	Noted.
7	It should be noted that Education Development Charges are payable in accordance with the applicable Education Development Charge By-law and are required at the issuance of a building permit. Any building permits that are additional to the maximum approved unit count will be subject to Education Development Charges prior to the issuance of a building permit, at the rate in effect at the date of issuance.	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>Enbridge</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	The existing gas services will need to be abandoned prior to redevelopment. A short main extension may be required for the new gas service. A capacity review will need to be conducted once the loads of the new development are known. Are the preliminary gas loads known? Please have the developer reach out to me regarding the requirements for this project. For location of the gas services please reach out to Ontario One Call for locates.	Noted.



	The builder will need to submit a service application through Get Connected - Residential/Commercial Builders & HVACs   Enbridge Gas	
<b>#</b>	<b>Halton Hills Hydro</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	Halton Hills Hydro must be contacted for an Electrical Service Layout if a new service or upgrade to an existing service is required; or metering changes. Location and method of servicing is at the sole discretion of Halton Hills Hydro. Please note that any costs due to changes required of Halton Hills Hydro's distribution system (i.e. extending 3- phase line, moving poles or other equipment to accommodate lane ways, driveways and parking lots, etc.) will be borne by the applicant.	Noted.
<b>#</b>	<b>Public Comments</b>	<b>Consultant Response</b>
1	<p>As a local resident on the same level of the proposed building, I have observed aircraft flying 'low' over our properties, and some of these flights have been mentioned on various Facebook pages associated with the town about the height and noise from some aircraft.</p> <p>We are located approximately 840 feet above sea level, Pearson being some 560 feet above sea level on the same land. We are what is described as on the final leg of arrivals into Pearson when the runway 05 is used and sometimes 06L or 06R is in operation. As can be seen from the attached screen shots, the planes altitude is based on the arrival height of the destination airport, most aircraft come over the house at about 2500 sometimes 3000ft but when our height is subtracted from the altitude the arriving aircraft are lower to us.</p> <p>I notice that the overall height of the proposed buildings are not included in any of the publicity material but a height of number of stories, but I would assume the overall height is going to be close to 160 feet when completed and higher is any communication masts are installed on top of it, being probably the highest building in Georgetown, its height would be attractive to any would be communication operator to mount some beacons on it. Considering we are already sitting on a 840 foot hill, adding a building of some 160 plus feet will produce an overall height of some 1000 feet. This would in effect be eating into that altitude height that aircraft have as they come over the area, meaning if the mentioned rooftop gardens/ spaces are to be used, planes will be passing over about 1500 foot above these spaces.</p>	The proposed heights are provided in the Massing Schedule of the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.

	<p>We are also on a direct route into the helipad at our local hospital, which Ornge on a regular basis of at least once a week for patient transfer and the chosen route for their arrival is over less densely populated areas coming in to land, using the direction of John Street as their final approach, as can be seen on one of the attached, there is a helicopter (not Ornge) flying directly over the proposed site at a height of 1485 feet, this would mean he was less than 500 feet above the site, which is not only noisy but very close to the building and I am sure is considered dangerous.</p> <p>I would like to see a full report in time from NavCan, detailing the adverse effects of the proposed buildings and if any new NOTAMS are to be issued about its location on the approach into Pearson and the hospital.</p> <p>I look forward to next set of documents supplied by the developer and where they are in relation to getting final approval from the town planners and Council members.</p>	
2	<p>My concern is the amount of rain that runs off the roofs of the present buildings and floods our properties.</p> <p>Georgetown South will have an influx of approximately (3000)? new homes built on our precious farmland. How is our GO trains north and south parking lots going to accommodate all of the vehicles who will need transit to the big cities?</p> <p>Where are the vehicles from the 640 condo units going to park? The Go train North parking space has parking all day and the parking lot will not have enough space. Do the neighbours have to accommodate all of the new traffic to appease the Developer?</p>	<p>Please refer to the FSR/SWM dated June 2023, prepared by Arcadis.</p> <p>Metrolinx has not provided the proponent with any plans for the Georgetown GO Station.</p> <p>Please refer to the TIS, dated May 2023, prepared by Paradigm.</p>
3	<p>I'm totally against this many condos going in . It will increase traffic tremendously. We will be blocked of sun shine also I'm understanding we will have a play ground splash park right in front of our house which takes away privacy.</p> <p>The demolition of the building will be very scary and unhealthy for all as there is asbestos led paint we will be over run with rats as we have been in past when Reno's were going on.</p>	<p>Please refer to the TIS, dated May 2023, prepared by Paradigm.</p> <p>Please refer to the provided ESAs on contamination.</p>