



Response to Town Comments
OPA/ZBA Applications - 16-18 Mill St, Georgetown, Ontario

The table below includes responses to the Town comments received from the 2nd OPA/ZBA submission. This letter is to be read in the context of the May 2023 revised development application (3rd OPA/ZBA submission).

| <i>"Deficiencies in Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications (2nd Submission)"</i> | Response - May 31, 2023 |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Affordable Housing</u></p> <p>Please see Halton Region’s comments regarding the need to revise the Planning Justification Report to address the affordability of existing rental units and how the proposal contributes to a diverse range and mix of housing options given the loss of these units. While the development proposes to maintain 12 rental units, it isn’t clear how the existing tenants will be accommodated during and after the construction process and whether the rental costs for the new units will be comparable to the existing rental costs for the current tenants.</p> | <p>The new units will provide for a more affordable housing option when compared to the typical single detached or townhouse dwellings in the area. The existing tenants will be offered first refusal for the new units.</p> |
| <p><u>Environmental Site Assessment</u></p> <p>Please see Halton Region’s comments regarding the need to update the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to Ontario Regulation 153/04 standards and to address the closed landfill on the adjacent Town property</p> | <p>The revised Phase 1 ESA has been included in resubmission.</p> |
| <p><u>Urban Design and Landscape Review</u></p> <p>Consider introducing patios within the front yard of the ground units facing Mill Street and balconies above the first storey to enhance and animate the streetscape and provide additional outdoor amenity area in accordance with Recreation & Parks’ comments. The detailed urban design and landscape review will occur as part of the review of any future Site Plan Application submitted for the proposed development.</p> | <p>The architect has decided not to include this recommendation in their design.</p> |
| <p><u>Zoning</u></p> <p>Please see the Zoning Officer’s comments regarding the revised proposal fitting within the definition of a multiple unit building. While the provided 56 spaces would exceed the minimum requirement of 53 spaces for a 30-unit apartment building, 69 spaces are required for a 30-unit multiple unit building. As such, a provision will</p> | <p>The revised proposal now has 61 parking spaces and a special provision has been introduced in the ZBA Text which seeks to view multiple dwellings with below grade parking as requiring the same number of parking spaces as an apartment (53 required, 61 proposed). Justification for this special provision has been provided in the PJR.</p> |



| | |
|---|---|
| <p>need to be included in the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment that addresses this required zoning relief.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Change the parking rate for a multiple unit building from 2 spaces per unit plus 0.3 visitor spaces per unit to 1.6 spaces per unit plus 0.25 visitor spaces per unit; 2) Reduce the minimum parking requirement for a 30-unit multiple unit building from 69 spaces to 56 spaces; or 3) Apply the apartment dwelling parking rate of 1.5 spaces per unit plus 0.25 visitor spaces per unit. <p>Regardless of which option is chosen, justification for the proposed parking rate/requirement must be included in the “Parking Considerations” section of the submitted Traffic Impact Study as well as within the Planning Justification Report to determine whether sufficient parking is provided for the proposed development.</p> <p>The submitted Draft Zoning By-law Amendment includes a provision requiring a minimum of 12 rental units. While staff appreciates the Applicant’s commitment to maintain the existing number of rental units through the proposed development, Zoning By-laws are used to regulate land uses, buildings and structures. Town staff is currently undertaking research to determine whether Zoning By-laws may be used to regulate the tenure of residential units (e.g., rental vs. condominium) and whether this requirement would be more appropriate to be included in another planning document (such as in the Draft Official Plan Amendment). Once staff has made this determination, we will be in contact with you to provide direction.</p> | <p>The zoning by-law text was also amended to include the other recommendations which were noted in the Zoning Officer’s comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimum required front yard setback – 2.9 metres (1.5 metres to a canopy or a provision that permits canopies to encroach into a required yard) 2. Minimum required north side yard setback – 3.5 metres 3. Minimum required rear yard setback may be deleted (required is 4.5 metres for a multiple, therefore no site-specific provision required) Provisions to be added: 4. Maximum height – 14.1 metres <p>Lastly, there was originally a special provision in our ZBA Text which required that a minimum of 12 rental units be provided. However, it was later determined that the rezoning wasn't the right place to implement this since Zoning By-Laws are not intended to regulate tenure or the types of people living on a parcel of land. Discussions were held with Town of Halton Hills Staff regarding this issue and it was decided that it would be better to secure the rental replacement requirement through the site plan/plan of condominium process.</p> |
| <p>“Building Engineer Email”</p> | <p>Response – June 5, 2023</p> |
| <p>Hello John, I had a look of the drawings for 16-18 mill street and have noticed there are some issues. As this is not a site plan approval, the following comments are not meant to hold the approval for this submission, it is just to brought the client’s attention of potential issues for future SPA and building permit application.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OBC Matrix to be revised during the Site Plan Approval Stage. 2. OBC Matrix to be revised during the Site Plan Approval Stage . 3. See floor plans in the ‘Architectural Drawings’ package. |



| | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. Maged has commented on the building classification. The current building classification proposed on OBC Matrix will be revised based on Maged's comments. The sprinkler protection requirement will be determined once the building classification is determined.</p> <p>2. OBC matrix proposed sprinkler system in basement only. This is not permitted. NFPA13-2013 4.1 requires ---"A building , where protected by automatic sprinkler system installation, shall be provided with sprinklers in all areas except where specific sections of this standard permit the omission of sprinklers." Therefore, if sprinkler system is installed in the building, it should be installed to protect the entire building no matter the building is required to be sprinklered or not.</p> <p>3. There is no architectural floor plan submitted at this moments. However, from the current submitted drawings, it seems the two apartments are connected to each other from parking level and ground floor. If this is the case, they will be considered as one building. this will affect service design and hydrant location for the building.</p> <p>Cheers</p> <p>Mei Wang , P.Eng., M.Sc, Building Engineer,</p> | |
| <p>"Building Engineer Email 2"</p> | <p>Response – June 5, 2023</p> |
| <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correct OBC Data Matrix, information to reflect all Major Occupancies. Correct all items accordingly. 2. Provide Access routes, principal entrance, fire hydrant and fire department connection as per OBC2012, Division B- Part 3, Subsection 3.2.5. <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Maged Mikhail, P.Eng.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OBC Matrix to be revised during the Site Plan Approval Stage. 2. Access from Mill St. See revised site plan in "Architectural Drawings' package for fire hydrant and connection. |
| <p>"Fire Inspector Email"</p> | |
| <p>Morning John,</p> | |



| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Sorry for the delay.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Show fire route signage on site plan- Show fire hydrant location and distance to fire department connection(s)- Fire department key box to be installed at both principal entrances at least 6 weeks before occupancy- Fire safety plan shall be submitted at least 6 weeks before occupancy <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jason Blackmere</p> | <p>See revised site plan in "Architectural Drawings" package for fire hydrant and connection. Key box installation and safety plan to be dealt with prior to occupancy.</p> |
| <p>Transportation Comments</p> | <p>See transportation comments responses in the revised TIS provided by BA Group</p> |
| <p>Engineer Comments</p> | <p>See engineering comment responses provided by Egmond Associates Ltd</p> |

Should there be any questions regarding the responses provided in this document, please reach out to Jacob Dickie at (519) 719-8721.

Best Regards,

Jacob Dickie, RPP
Planner/Development Coordinator,
Urban in Mind: Urban Planning, Land Development & CPTED Consultants