



Project: 7 St. Dennis/10 Grenoble Drive
File # 22 187482 NNY 16 OZ
OPA/ZBA Resubmission 2 - Comment Response Matrix
Date: May 16, 2024

| Planning and Urban Design | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|---|------------|--|
| Item | Department | Comment # | Comment | Date | Response |
| 1 | Planning and Development | 1 | Residential Units The City's Growing Up: Planning for Children in Vertical Communities Guidelines (Growing Up Guidelines) states that a residential building should provide a minimum of 25% large units. Specifically, the guidelines state that 10% of the total residential units should be three-bedroom units and 15% should be two-bedroom units. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. A provision has been added to the by-law to reflect the Guidelines. |
| 2 | Planning and Development | 2 | The unit breakdown for the proposed residential portion of this development is as follows: [See table in comments] | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 3 | Planning and Development | 3 | The proposed unit mix supports the unit mix objectives of the Growing Up Guidelines, Official Plan housing policies, and the Growth Plan's growth management and housing policies to accommodate within new development a broad range of households, including families with children. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 4 | Planning and Development | 4 | The Growing Up Guidelines recommend for a two-bedroom unit to have an area of 90 square metres and for three-bedroom units to have an area of 106 square metres. It's encouraged for unit sizes to be increased to meet the guideline. | 2024-03-13 | The Revised Proposed Development exceeds the Growing Up Guidelines' targeted proportion of larger, multi-bedroom units within new residential development by providing 21% 2-bedroom units and 10% 3-bedroom units. The Revised Proposed Development is also designed to include 'convertible' units, which allow the possibility of merging two units to create a larger multi-bedroom unit, as shown in the typical convertible unit floorplans. Unit sizes are provided by the Guidelines to accommodate the space needs of families, based on typical programmatic requirements. In today's context, the proposed unit sizes are aligned with market conditions to ensure marketability of units, while meeting the functional requirements identified in the Guidelines for bedroom size, storage and other key needs for a variety of households. Proposed unit sizes are consistent with those of nearby approved developments. Where convertible units are combined, these units will be of significantly larger than average size. |
| 5 | Planning and Development | 5 | Connecting and Expanding the Public Realm Streets and Laneways Mid-block connections that are proposed within the site should be more prominent and look and feel like public connections. The pathway that is proposed between the new building T1 and the existing building (7 St. Dennis) was previously requested to be provided as a public street. Through the discussions with the applicant, both parties agreed that instead of a public/private street, a mid-block connection that is visible and designed to feel like a public mid-block connection will be provided. The pathway that is proposed is a hardscaped pathway similar to many proposed within the landscaped spaces of the site. More prominence should be given to this path through design and width to allow for landscaping, furniture, and pedestrian lighting. These efforts have been successful in the case of the north-south connection on the west side of the 7 St Dennis building. | 2024-03-13 | The revised submission provides a 10 metre wide easement for both the key north-south walkways. Both walkways have been located to provide a connection that is as direct and straight as possible, while avoiding existing trees and infrastructure such as vents and exit stairways. Updates to the alignment of the pathways has preserved an additional 15 existing trees overall. The western easement alongside 7 St. Dennis Drive contains a 3 metre wide paved area and ample additional room for lighting, furnishings, planted buffers where appropriate and landscaping. The eastern easement includes a 3.6 metre wide paved area, with additional space identified for furnishings, lighting and landscaping. This easement has been located to abut the eastern edge of the public park, effectively widening the publicly available space adjacent to the park. It also provides a seamless direct active transportation connection from St. Dennis Drive to Grenoble Drive, alleviating the need for additional north-south circulation within the public park. On the south end of this pathway, a temporary pathway and easement has been provided connecting the pathway directly to Grenoble Drive, until such time as a connection can be completed on the 200 Gateway Boulevard site. As demonstrated, both MUPs are now located entirely within one property. |
| 6 | Planning and Development | 6 | Outstanding comments: Increase the width of both north-south MUPs to 10m to accommodate the walkway, pedestrian-scaled lighting and other furniture. | 2024-03-13 | |
| 7 | Planning and Development | 7 | The alignment of the MUPs and other pathways within the site should take into account and prioritize the location of the existing mature trees. Where these trees are located, the pathway could meander around and should make every effort to not have a conflict with the tree. Where the risk to the health of the tree is minimized and is important for the pathway to be straight, a permit to injure the tree could be pursued instead of a permit to remove the tree to locate a landscape feature within the tree protection zone. | 2024-03-13 | |
| 8 | Planning and Development | 8 | The N-S MUP is to be proposed within one property. This will reduce the implementation complications. The MUP should not meander between two properties and should meet St Dennis Dr and Grenoble Dr at each end and be within the property line of the subject site. | 2024-03-13 | |
| 9 | Planning and Development | 9 | Driveways and Vehicular Access Outstanding comments: The Official Plan directs developments to place parking ramps within the building and consolidate and relocate them to places not visible from public streets and open spaces. Loading and underground ramps for the existing and proposed buildings should be consolidated. Remove the stand-alone ramp to underground parking and its associated driveway spaces and consolidate it with the new proposed ramps within the new building. In case this is not possible, move the temporary ramp to a location where there is less conflict with existing mature trees. | 2024-03-13 | The ramp proposed to the south of 7 St. Dennis Drive is not a temporary ramp – it will provide permanent access for 7 St. Dennis tenants to the existing below-grade parking structure. Relocating the ramp to the location identified by Staff would require significant structural impacts to the existing underground and eliminate approximately 35 existing tenant parking spaces. Instead, the location of the ramp has been revised to create a softer radius in the curve of the driveway, which allows for the net preservation of 2 additional existing trees. Parking ramps for the 10 Grenoble block have been integrated to the proposed buildings, replacing the existing ramp location with landscaped area. |
| 10 | Planning and Development | 10 | We request the applicant use the alternative driveway alignment to remove the proposed access on Grenoble Drive and to have both accesses be from the New Public Street to the east to improve safety for pedestrian and cycling along Grenoble Drive. | 2024-03-13 | The December 2023 submission revised the 10 Grenoble block to have driveway accesses to the New Public Street (part of the 25 St. Dennis Drive application) only. All curb cuts to Grenoble Drive will be removed as part of this development. |
| 11 | Planning and Development | 11 | Parking and Servicing Outstanding comments: The additional density within the site is partially justified by its adjacency to major transit infrastructure. The development should also reflect transit-supportive and transit-oriented built form and public realm by creating convenient access to transit as well as reduced dependency on vehicular trips. The footprint of underground parking should not compete with more important interests within the site such as preservation of the existing mature trees and it should be limited to occupying the same areas as the above-grade built form. Move the limit of the underground parking associated with building T1 north and preserve the 10 mature trees that are identified in the diagram below. These trees range in DBH from 32 to 90 cm. | 2024-03-13 | The proposed parking supply reflects a balance of providing sufficient parking for existing and new residents, while reflecting the transit-oriented nature of this development. Revisions have been made in resubmission #2 to preserve 15 additional existing trees through the development site. The underground parking garage and access ramps have been revised to preserve existing trees where possible. Limiting the underground parking garage to the above-grade built form in T1 would require a reduction of approximately 100 parking spaces. Given the functional requirement to maintain parking for existing tenants and future residents, this is not feasible for the project. The current parking supply represents a reduced parking rate (compared to the existing site parking rate) and is reflective of the anticipated changes in transit access coming to the Site area. |
| 12 | Planning and Development | 12 | Location and Organization Relative to Streets and Open Space Include at-grade units wherever possible but particularly along the proposed public park, and the new N-S public street. These units are important to increase the public safety and provide activation along these frontages. | 2024-03-13 | The revised submission incorporates a total of 16 at-grade townhouse units in strategic locations. The proposed townhouse units are located along the western edge of the public park and along the New Street, and they will be designed to animate the public realm and provide for activation and safety along these public spaces. Elsewhere, the building base continues to provide indoor amenity space, coordinated with adjacent exterior amenity spaces which also provide for activation of the public realm. Amenity spaces include party rooms, kids play spaces, gyms and co-working spaces which will be used by residents in the daytime and evenings, providing activation of these spaces along the interior landscaped areas of the development site. |
| 13 | Planning and Development | 13 | Outstanding comments: The applicant is encouraged to consider including service retail and non-residential uses such as community spaces within the development. | 2024-03-13 | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----|--|------------|--|
| 14 | Planning and Development | 14 | Building Massing and Design Relationship to Neighbouring Development Outstanding comments: The proposed building typology is unique and does not follow the typical tower and podium typology as defined in Tall Building Design guidelines. This typology may be appropriate considering the context of tower in the park and the lower height of the podium and generous separation distances between the towers contributes to the openness of the site and access to sunlight and sky view as well as reduced shadow impacts on the amenity areas and public realm. The small footprint of the proposed buildings also allow for increased retention of the landscaped areas. This is all acknowledged and appreciated. However, the amount of active uses within the base of the building and how it is addressing the adjacent streets and public open spaces is a concern. A purpose of the podium is to be able to define and address the street frontages. Urban design staff are not convinced that the current design and configuration achieved this objective. The base of the building should include grade-related units and have a better relationship with the streets and public open spaces. | 2024-03-13 | |
| 15 | Planning and Development | 15 | Tower floor plates exceed the minimum 750 sqm defined in the Tall Building Design guidelines. The floor plate should be reduced in areas to the maximum of 800 sqm consistent with what is approved within the context. The floor plate above 800 sqm is unacceptable. | 2024-03-13 | The revised resubmission includes tower floor plates that are now all below 800 square metres. The tower floor plates of Towers 1, 2, and 4, which were previously 810 square metres, have now been reduced to 800 square metres. Tower 3 remains 773 square metres. The towers satisfy and exceed applicable key urban design considerations related to setbacks and separation distances, and the floor plate sizes are appropriate and represent good planning and urban design. |
| 16 | Planning and Development | 16 | Building canopies and overhangs should not have a conflict with the preservation of the mature trees. Adjust the canopy to preserve Tree # 815-818. | 2024-03-13 | Existing trees 815-818 are either on or in close proximity to the proposed underground and are unable to be retained. |
| 17 | Planning and Development | 17 | The proposed public park is not comfortable for sitting all in summer from the pedestrian wind comfort level. Please provide potential mitigation measures to improve wind comfort conditions. | 2024-03-13 | The predicted wind comfort conditions within the public park are considered to be appropriate and satisfactory for the intended pedestrian uses as a public park during the summer season, particularly when the noted design and landscape considerations are taken into account. The wind conditions can be further improved with the retention of the existing conifers and the berms and mounds within the area and the implementation of thoughtful programming that responds to the wind conditions in the area. Targeted landscaping elements such as high-back bench seating may provide further screening against direct winds, and canopies above designated seating areas may provide pedestrians with further shelter from the elements. It is anticipated that these design interventions will achieve sitting conditions within sensitive regions of the proposed public park during the summer. Please see the Pedestrian Level Wind Study Addendum for more information. |
| 18 | Planning and Development | 18 | Amenity Areas The amount of amenity spaces proposed per dwelling unit does not meet the 2 sqm per dwelling unit standard. As per the Official Plan direction, developments should improve and replace the amenity spaces for the existing residents and provide new amenity space for the new and existing residents. The total amenity space per dwelling unit is proposed at 2.65% (8,072.47 / 3,040) which is significantly lower than the target of 4%. | 2024-03-13 | The revised submission provides a minimum of 1.5 square metres of indoor amenity space per unit and a minimum of 2 square metres of outdoor amenity space per unit for a total of 3.5 square metres of amenity space per unit. This is aligned with other approved developments nearby, including at 25 St. Dennis where 1.3 square metres of both indoor and outdoor amenity was approved. 1.5 square metres of indoor amenity has also been approved at 844 DOn Mills, 740-748 Sheppard Ave E, and 31 Finch Ave E. |
| 19 | Planning and Development | 19 | Landscape, Streetscape and Pedestrian Amenities Trees and Environment Tree planting should be maximized on all the unencumbered areas of the site. The landscape design should prioritize existing tree protection. In some cases, the location of the pathways within the landscape design conflicts with the location of the trees. Tree protection should be prioritized. Adjust the landscape design to preserve tree #819, 802, 801, 883, 856, 857, 858, 859, and 869. | 2024-03-13 | The landscape plan has been revised to preserve an additional 15 trees, prioritized to supporting a vibrant public realm. Where feasible, the building underground and proposed utilities have been adjusted to accommodate existing trees. Please see the Tree Preservation Plan and Arborist Report for more information. |
| 20 | Planning and Development | 20 | Toronto Green Standard The proposal is to meet the Tier 1 requirements and is encouraged to pursue higher Tier standards of the TGS. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| Parks | | | | | |
| 21 | Parks Development | N/A | Proposal for Dedication of Parkland In accordance with Section 42(3) of the Planning Act, the applicable alternative rate for on-site parkland dedication is 1 hectare per 600 residential units to a cap of 10% of the development site as the site is less than five (5) hectares, with the non-residential uses subject to a 2% parkland dedication rate. In total, the parkland dedication requirement is 1,932 m2. The Owner is required to satisfy the parkland dedication requirement through an on-site dedication. The park is to be located in the centre of the site, adjacent to the parkland proposed at 200 Gateway Boulevard (Application No. 23 118816 NNY 16 OZ), with frontage on St. Dennis Drive and comply with Policy 3.2.3.8 of the Toronto Official Plan. Drawings A-2.5 (Ground Floor) and A-2.14 (Roof Plan) of the architectural plans prepared by Architects Alliance (dated 12/12/23) demonstrates that the applicant has proposed an on-site parkland dedication of 2,793 m2, in the centre of the site with frontage on St. Dennis Drive, which is acceptable to the Parks Development Section. Drawing A-2.14 also demonstrates that a 6.84 metre setback has been proposed between the park boundary and any adjacent building face, which is acceptable. Drawing A-2.5 and the Landscape Plans indicate a 3.6 metre wide multi-use path within the eastern boundary of the proposed parkland. Any indication of the multi-use path or park programming shall be removed from all architectural, landscape, and any other plan that show these features, as the park design will be determined through a separate process. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. The total parkland dedication requirement of 1,932m2 is acceptable based on discussions with Staff to accept the excess parkland area as part of the CBC. The total parkland dedication proposed is 2,823.3m2. |
| 22 | Parks Development | 1 | Recommendations in the Final Planning Report The following recommendations will require the approval of City Council: 1. City Council approve that in accordance with Section 42 of the Planning Act as a component of the Registration of Plan of subdivision, the Owner shall convey to the City, an on-site parkland dedication, having a minimum size of 1,932 square metres, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation and the City Solicitor. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 23 | Parks Development | 2 | 2. City Council approve the acceptance of on-site parkland dedication, subject to the owner transferring the parkland to the City free and clear, above and below grade, of all easements, encumbrances, and encroachments, in an acceptable environmental condition; the owner may propose the exception of encumbrances of tiebacks, where such an encumbrance is deemed acceptable by the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation, in consultation with the City Solicitor; and such an incumbrance will be subject to the payment of compensation to the City, in an amount as determined by the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation and the Executive Director, Corporate Real Estate Management. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 24 | Parks Development | 3 | 3. City Council approve a development charge credit against the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for the design and construction by the Owner of the Above Base Park Improvements to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PFR). The development charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the Owner of designing and constructing the Above Base Park Improvements, as approved by the General Manager, PFR, and the Parks and Recreation component of development charges payable for the development in accordance with the City's Development Charges By-law, as may be amended from time to time. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 25 | Parks Development | N/A | Include the below paragraph in the "Parkland" Section in the body of the Planning Report to Council: This report seeks direction from City Council on authorizing a credit of the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges in exchange for Above Base Park Improvement to be provided by the Owner upon agreement with the City. The development charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the Owner of installing the Above Base Park Improvements, as approved by the General Manager, PFR, and the Parks and Recreation component of Development Charges payable for the development in accordance with the City's Development Charges Bylaw, as may be amended from time to time. The Owner will be required to enter into an agreement with the City to provide for the design and construction of the improvements and will be required to provide financial security to ensure completion of the works. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 26 | Parks Development | N/A | Conditions of Parkland Conveyance The detailed conditions for the parkland dedication will be captured in the registered agreement. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 27 | Parks Development | 1 | Comments from the Landscape Architecture Unit 1. Any indication of Above Base Park design should not be shown on any plans during the development approval review process | 2024-03-13 | Noted, Above Base Park design has been removed in the resubmission. |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----|--|------------|---|
| 28 | Parks Development | 2 | 2. The proposed park servicing required as a component of the base park requirements should be shown in both the landscape and civil drawing sets. Base Park Improvements can be coordinated separately from the development approval process, with the required milestones captured in the registered development agreement. Standard Parks, Forestry & Recreation water servicing details can be found here under "Water Servicing Standards for Parks". | 2024-03-13 | Services to bring the Park Block to base park is proposed, refer to Site Servicing Plan SW-S for details. |
| 29 | Parks Development | 3 | 3. All drainage from the development and areas surrounding the future park must not drain onto the park. | 2024-03-13 | No drainage from any development block will drain onto the park. Refer to Post Development SWM Drainage Plan (Minor) SWM3. |
| 30 | Parks Development | 4 | 4. All park drainage is to be contained within the park. The stormwater management report must include the parkland parcel as a separate drainage area. | 2024-03-13 | All park drainage is contained within the park, the park block is represented as it owns drainage area in the FSSR and Drainage Plans. |
| 31 | Parks Development | 5 | 5. A downstream sewer capacity analysis including to the nearest trunk connection (analysis should include both storm & sanitary inputs) may be required, pending whether future public consultation determines a splash pad / water feature will be included in the park design. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 32 | Parks Development | 6 | 6. All servicing must be provided from public property (e.g. Street ROW). All wet utilities (water, storm, sanitary) should be co-located where possible. | 2024-03-13 | All park services are proposed from St. Dennis Drive (public ROW). Sanitary and water services are co-located. The storm services was relocated in an effort to preserve existing trees along St. Dennis Drive. |
| 33 | Parks Development | 7 | 7. The park block should generally be graded between 1-4% and meet the grades of the adjacent blocks. | 2024-03-13 | All park block grades are between 1-4% and match the proposed and existing grades of each adjacent block. |
| 34 | Parks Development | 8 | 8. Retaining walls and acoustic / wind panels are not permitted in the park block and should not be situated adjacent to the park block. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 35 | Parks Development | 9 | 9. Ensure parks maintenance vehicles can enter the park (minimum 3 metre clearance from streetscape elements in the ROW is required). | 2024-03-13 | Noted. Comment to be addressed through separate detailed park design process. |
| 36 | Parks Development | 10 | 10. Wind conditions in the park block shall be shown to be comfortable for sitting in the summer and standing in the winter. | 2024-03-13 | See response to comment #17. |
| 37 | Parks Development | 11 | 11. Any proposed art installation in public parkland requires the consent of LAU before the location and space requirements of the art in the park is determined. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 38 | Parks Development | 12 | 12. Where feasible, and to the satisfaction of Transportation Services, City of Toronto standard bike parking on streetscape adjacent to the park is encouraged. For information regarding the parkland improvements, the Owner should contact Erika Richmond, Senior Project Manager Landscape Architect at erika.richmond@toronto.ca. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| 39 | Parks Development | N/A | Advisory Comments <i>Community Benefits Charge</i> The Parks Development Section requests to be involved in any discussions regarding a community benefits charge and/or in-kind contribution. | 2024-03-13 | Noted, the applicant team has included Parks Development in conversations with regards to CBC. |
| 40 | Parks Development | N/A | <i>Pet Amenities</i> Given the current rise in dog-owning populations, the Owner is expected to provide onsite dog amenities with proper disposal facilities such as dog relief stations within the building premises to accommodate future residents' needs. This will also help alleviate pressure on public parkland. Comments in reference to Toronto's Pet Friendly Design Guidelines and Best Practices for New Multi-Unit Buildings will be provided by Urban Design. New outdoor Pet Relief Areas should not be located adjacent to parkland. | 2024-03-13 | Pet facilities have been provided on the ground floor of each proposed tower. In addition, a dog run has been proposed along St. Dennis Drive, separate and in addition to the proposed public park. |
| 41 | Parks Development | N/A | <i>Urban Forestry</i> Comments regarding any necessary street tree plantings and requirements under the Trees Bylaw or the Ravine and Natural feature Protection Bylaw will be provided by Urban Forestry. For information regarding parkland dedication requirements, the Owner should contact James Yun, Project Officer, Parks development at 416-392-1740 or james.yun@toronto.ca. | 2024-03-13 | Noted. |
| Transportation Planning | | | | | |
| 42 | Transportation Planning | n/a | Multi-Use Trail The Multi-Use Trail running along the proposed parkland connecting from St. Dennis Drive to Grenoble Drive should be constructed entirely on-site to avoid phasing and implementation challenges with adjacent property at 200 Gateway Boulevard. We recommend removing the east-west parallel pathway (outlined in green). The applicant at 200 Gateway Boulevard can connect into the Multi-Use Trail in the future leaving additional space for planting and landscaping along Grenoble Drive. See sketch below in red.  | 2024-03-04 | See response to comments #5-8 above. On the south end of this pathway, a temporary pathway and easement has been provided connecting the pathway directly to Grenoble Drive, until such time as a connection can be completed on the 200 Gateway Boulevard site. |
| 43 | Transportation Planning | n/a | The pedestrian connection between the existing 17-storey building at 7 St. Dennis Drive and Tower 1 should be wider and have additional prominence as it is the central unifying connection to the enhanced outdoor amenity, pedestrian connections, building entrances, and provide more direct connectivity to the future Flemingdon Park Station and should expect to support significant pedestrian and cycling desire lines. See the pedestrian connection outlined in red.  | 2024-03-04 | See response to comments 5-8 above. The proposed multi-use path / pedestrian connection through the site has been updated to be 3.6m wide (east side) and 3.0m (west side), with two 10m surface easements. |
| 44 | Transportation Planning | n/a | Travel Demand Management Based on the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Response Letter prepared by R.J. Burnside (dated December 28, 2023), a stronger TDM plan is required for this site to support the proposed development, address the site related vehicular traffic issues, and satisfy the requirements in the Toronto Green Standard. The following is a list of proposed and additional TDM measures that are considered appropriate for the subject site: Acceptable: o 8-12 Car Share Vehicles and Spaces; o 4 Bicycle repair station – please identify on site plan; | 2024-03-04 | Noted. Current proposal includes four (4) bike repair stations. These have been identified on the revised plans. |
| 45 | Transportation Planning | n/a | Needs Improvement: o Pre-loaded PRESTO Pass at the value of \$156 – Please provide for all residents for first-time purchasers and renters; o Provide real-time travel information screen; o The applicant should include additional TDM measures such as funding for new Bike Share stations and annual Bike Share memberships; and o The applicant has proposed 2 Bike Share Stations. We request this be improved substantially. We request the provision of eleven 19-space Bike Share Stations are considered appropriate for this site. One conventional Bike Share is valued at \$50,000. A total Bike Share financial contribution of \$550,000; o Coordinate with the City/Toronto Parking Authority (TPA) to secure a financial contribution for future implementation of bike-share facilities and programs in the area. o Consider providing space on-site to accommodate a future Bike Share Station o Linear (90 degree) 16.0m x 1.8m o Linear (45 degree) 22.0m x 1.4m o L-shaped 8.0m x 1.8m x 11m | 2024-03-04 | Current proposal includes 2 bikeshare stations on-site that could potentially be connected for e-bike charging. The applicant met with Transportation Planning on April 23, 2024 to discuss the City's determination of proposed bikeshare rate (1 bikeshare station per 225 residential units) and would like further information on how this was determined. The updated TIS includes a rationale explaining why the 2 proposed bike share stations is appropriate for the site. Proponent and project team will consider provision of bikeshare memberships and Presto passes for owners / occupants at time of occupancy that do not purchase vehicle parking. |
| 46 | Transportation Planning | n/a | Please remove: Most measures included in the TDM plan are Toronto Green Standard and By-Law requirements and/or do not qualify as Travel Demand Management measures. Please remove the following measures: o Land use integration; o Carpool spaces – there do not appear to be any carpool spaces proposed as part of this plan. Additionally, carpool promotional campaigns and emergency ride home must be included in TDM information package "listed as transit information package" in TIS rather than a standalone measure; and o On-site pedestrian infrastructure is a by-law requirement. | 2024-03-04 | Noted. Reference to carpool spaces in the section regarding potential mode shifts was meant to refer to car-share spaces. |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------|-----|--|------------|---|
| 47 | Transportation Planning | n/a | Underground Parking Consider limiting the underground parking footprint to minimize the impact on the presence of existing mature trees along the boulevard frontages and provide additional soil volumes for tree planting. | 2024-03-04 | The Proponent and project team have revised the underground parking footprint and the alignment of the proposed ramps to reduce impacts to existing trees where possible. |
|----|-------------------------|-----|--|------------|---|

SIPA Housing

| Item | Department | Comment # | Comment | Date | Response |
|------|------------|-----------|--|------------|---|
| 48 | Housing | 1 | Complete Application Comments 1. The Housing Issues Addendum (December 4, 2023) notes that a construction mitigation strategy and tenant communication plan will be submitted with a Site Plan Control application. | 02-13-2024 | Noted, to be prepared at SPA. |
| 49 | Housing | 2 | Comments on the Proposed Development 2. The proposed average unit sizes for two- and three-bedroom units do not address the unit size considerations of the Growing Up Guidelines. However, the revised submission includes convertible units, which would allow merging of two units to create a larger unit. Despite the convertible units, the applicant is asked to consider providing a mix of unit sizes across all unit types to balance affordability and unit functionality to meet the needs of diverse households, including families with children. | 02-13-2024 | The Revised Proposed Development exceeds the Growing Up Guidelines' targeted proportion of larger, multi-bedroom units within new residential development by providing 21% 2-bedroom units and 10% 3-bedroom units. The Revised Proposed Development is also designed to include 'convertible' units, which allow the possibility of merging two units to create a larger multi-bedroom unit, as shown in the typical convertible unit floorplans. Unit sizes are provided by the Guidelines to accommodate the space needs of families, based on typical programmatic requirements. In today's context, the proposed unit sizes are aligned with market conditions to ensure marketability of units, while meeting the functional requirements identified in the Guidelines for bedroom size, storage and other key needs for a variety of households. Proposed unit sizes are consistent with those of nearby approved developments. Where convertible units are combined, these units will be of significantly larger than average size. |
| 50 | Housing | 3 | The Housing Issues Addendum confirms that the costs of the proposed improvements to the existing buildings noted in the Housing Issues Report will not be passed through to existing tenants in the form of above-guideline rent increases. | 02-13-2024 | Noted. |
| 51 | Housing | 4 | The Housing Issues Addendum notes improvements to the existing buildings identified through tenant consultation and a site visit by City Staff as well as improvements undertaken in the last five years. The Housing Issues Addendum notes that these will be secured through one or more agreements with the City. The applicant is asked to confirm that these improvements will not be passed through to existing tenants in the form of above-guideline rent increases. | 02-13-2024 | The applicant confirms that these improvements will not be passed through to existing tenants in the form of above-guideline rent increases. |
| 52 | Housing | 5 | The revised proposal has further decreased the proposed indoor amenity space to 1.23 m2 per unit (not including the existing rental units) while the proposed outdoor amenity space meets the requirements of the Zoning By-law at 2.03 m2 per unit. The Planning Rationale Addendum (December 4, 2023) states that interior amenity spaces are provided adjacent to and opening directly onto outdoor amenity spaces. The Planning Rationale Addendum also states that the proposed interior amenity space meets the Zoning By-law for 25 St. Dennis. Given that the proposed development will significantly increase the number of households on site, the applicant is asked to identify opportunities to increase indoor amenity space to better address the needs of both existing and new residents. | 02-13-2024 | The revised submission provides a minimum of 1.5 square metres of indoor amenity space per unit and a minimum of 2 square metres of outdoor amenity space per unit for a total of 3.5 square metres of amenity space per unit. This is aligned with other approved developments nearby, including at 25 St. Dennis where 1.3 square metres of both indoor and outdoor amenity was approved. 1.5 square metres of indoor amenity has also been approved at 844 Don Mills, 740-748 Sheppard Ave E, and 31 Finch Ave E. |
| 53 | Housing | 6 | The Housing Issues Addendum confirms that no user fees or above guideline rent increases will apply to the use of the proposed exterior amenities and existing tenants will have access under the same conditions as new residents. | 02-13-2024 | Noted. |
| 54 | Housing | 7 | The revised proposal shows a decrease in the existing vehicle parking spaces from 670 spaces to 485 spaces. However, a total of 485 spaces are currently being rented by existing tenants. The applicant is asked to ensure that the total vehicle parking spaces currently being rented by existing tenants are retained. For questions or comments, please contact: Johanna Hashim, Senior Planner, SIPA at Johanna.Hashim@toronto.ca or 416-396-4288. | 02-13-2024 | Please refer to the parking phasing strategy included within the resubmission. The applicant will ensure that no tenants lose parking as a result of this development. |

Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB)

| Item | Department | Comment # | Comment | Date | Response |
|------|----------------------------------|-----------|---|------------|----------|
| 55 | TCDSB - Planning and Development | N/A | Please be advised that the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB) is in receipt of the revised zoning by-law amendment, plan of subdivision & site plan applications 22 187482 NNY 16 OZ; 22 188139 NNY 16 SB; 23 125661 NNY 16 SA dated January 11, 2024. The TCDSB previously submitted comments for these applications on September 22, 2022 & April 6, 2023. This development falls within the fixed attendance boundary of: • St John XXIII Catholic School The closest Secondary schools serving this area are: • Senator O'Connor College School • St Patrick Catholic Secondary School TCDSB projections for local area schools surrounding this development proposal remain consistent. As requested in previous comments, the TCDSB requires proof of notification signage and the attached clauses be included within any agreements of purchase and sale for the proposed plan. To obtain a clearance letter please send all inquiries to development.applications@tcdsb.org Further to the comments provided, the TCDSB reserves the right to revise status at any time without further notice. Should you require additional information regarding our comments, please contact Tomasz Oltarzewski at (416) 222-8282. Ext. 2278. | 01-16-2024 | Noted. |

Metrolinx

| Item | Department | Comment # | Comment | Date | Response |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------|--|------------|----------|
| 56 | Third Party Projects Review | N/A | Per the resubmission City Planning staff circulated January 11, 2024, Metrolinx is pleased to provide updated comments for the official plan amendment and rezoning application (the "application") for 7 St. Dennis Drive and 10 Grenoble Drive (the "development lands"), located on the east side of Don Mills Road between St. Dennis Drive and Gateway Boulevard. The development lands are located across the street from the Ontario Line elevated guideway, a new transit line in the design stage, and the future Flemingdon Park station on this line. The application proposes a mixed use infill development consisting of four residential towers ranging from 34 to 52 storeys, adding 2,197 residential units and a new public park. The existing apartment buildings on the site would be maintained. Metrolinx has no objection to the proposed development concept, in principle. Intensification along transit corridors is encouraged where it is implemented in a coordinated and orderly manner, conforming to and being consistent with provincial, regional, and local planning policies. As the development is in proximity to the Ontario Line, Metrolinx has reviewed the application and considered how the construction of the proposed development may impact implementation of the Ontario Line. Notwithstanding the incomplete detailed designs for this Priority Transit Project, reference concept design work has sufficiently advanced in this area for Metrolinx to confirm that it has no objection to the application from a subway perspective, given the alignment of the tunnel and station. Our comments and conditions for the applicant to address as part of the planning process can be found below, an updated version of our prior comments sent October 13, 2022. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. |
| 57 | Third Party Projects Review | 1 | APPLICATION COMMENTS 1. Metrolinx is in receipt of the Transportation Noise and Vibration Assessment prepared by Gradient Wind and dated March 13th, 2023. With the incorporation of the Ontario Line into the study, Metrolinx has no further comments with regards to the findings of the Assessment mentioned above. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. |
| 58 | Third Party Projects Review | 2 | 2. [Carried over from the previous comment's letter dated October 13, 2022] The Building Transit Faster Act (July 8, 2020) enables Metrolinx to design and deliver Priority Transit Projects (PTPs) faster, inclusive of the Ontario Line. Metrolinx is currently in the process of designing and procuring for the delivery of this transit project, as well as implementing new coordination measures and tools stemming from the corridor control provisions of the Building Transit Faster Act, to engage more effectively with the City of Toronto and development community at large pertaining to these PTPs. A component of these new tools is the requirement for the development proponent to apply to Metrolinx to obtain a Corridor Development Permit (CDP) where development projects fall within a transit project's corridor control lands, prior to receiving a building permit from the City of Toronto. The intent of the CDP is to protect for the design and delivery of PTPs, while concurrently working with and supporting other planned and active projects in the area. As such, there will be construction coordination required between the Ontario Line and that of the development lands, to be resolved through a CDP. Metrolinx will work with the applicant in this context to support both projects being constructed in a timely manner. More information on the CDP process can be found online. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-----|--|------------|---|
| 59 | Third Party Projects Review | 3 | 3. [Carried over from the previous comment's letter dated October 13, 2022] Upon review of the applicant's transportation impact study, Metrolinx has identified potential conflicts between construction of the transit project and the proposed development from a traffic management perspective. Given the timing of the development application, there is expected to be overlap. As the planning process advances towards the site plan application, please provide a multi-modal traffic and construction management plan at that time, detailing proposed lane closures, hauling routes, site access, and timing of construction phases. Metrolinx will provide more detailed comments upon review of the traffic and construction management plans. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. Construction Management Plans to be developed at detail design stage, prior to permit applications. These will be circulated to Metrolinx for review and coordination. |
| 60 | Third Party Projects Review | 1 | REZONING CONDITION Metrolinx is required to protect the delivery and ultimate operation of the planned Ontario Line subway. Conditions pertaining to the application aim to do so as set out below. 1. The Metrolinx Advisory Clause has been updated from the prior Metrolinx Interferences Warning Clause. The following Metrolinx Advisory Clause shall be inserted into all rental agreement(s), and/or offers of purchase and sale or lease and condominium declaration(s) for each unit of the Lands/Property: a. Please be advised that this property is located within the project study area and footprint of the Ontario Line. The proximity of the proposed development lands ("development"), to the Metrolinx Ontario Line works, may result in noise, vibration, electromagnetic interference, stray current, smoke and particular matter, transmissions (collectively referred to as "interferences") to the development. It has been advised by Metrolinx to apply reasonable attenuation/mitigation measures with respect to the level of the interferences on and in the development. b. An environmental impact assessment report has been completed to assess how existing environmental conditions may be affected and controlled as a result of the project, including but not limited to noise and vibration, traffic and transportation, and the natural environment. To learn more about potential project outcomes in relation to your property, please refer to the Ontario Line environmental impact assessment report, available online. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. |
| 61 | Third Party Projects Review | 2 | To the extent that purchasers have already entered into purchase agreements relating to units in the Development, the said purchaser(s) shall each acknowledge and agree to the Metrolinx Interferences Warning Clause in writing prior to occupancy in form agreeable to Metrolinx, acting reasonably, as an alternative to and in lieu of the inclusion of the Metrolinx Interferences Warning Clause into such purchase agreements. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. |
| 62 | Third Party Projects Review | 3 | [Carried over from the previous comment's letter dated October 13, 2022] Please note the owner shall be responsible for all costs associated with the preparation and registration of agreements/undertakings/easement/warning clauses, if any, as determined appropriate by, and to the satisfaction of, Metrolinx. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. |
| 63 | Third Party Projects Review | N/A | CONCLUSION Given the above comments, the applicant should further engage Metrolinx throughout the planning process to ensure the enclosed comments are appropriately addressed. Metrolinx staff is open to meeting with the applicant outside the planning process to discuss any of the enclosed remarks if the applicant so desires. Metrolinx looks forward to continued engagement with the applicant and City staff over this proposal. Should you have any questions, please contact me at 437.297.9489 or at bishoi.shinoda@metrolinx.com. | 01-24-2024 | Noted. |

Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PFR) [URBAN FORESTRY]

| Item | Department | Comment # | Comment | Date | Response | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|----------------------------|--|-------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|-------------|--|------------|--|
| 64 | Urban Forestry | N/A | Official Plan Amendment/ Zoning By-Law Amendment/ Draft Plan of Subdivision. App No. 22 187482 NNY 16 OZ ; 22 188139 NNY 16 SB Urban Forestry – TPRR is not opposed in principle to development of this site, however at this time we object to the Zoning By-law Amendment proposal because aspects of the overall plan/concept for the site are, in Urban Forestry's opinion, inconsistent with parts of the Official Plan and with council's objectives concerning tree canopy cover, and, if approved in their current form, may prevent the pending Site Plan Control application from complying with Tier 1 of the TGS (ecology section) | 02-09-2024 | The landscape plan has been revised to preserve an additional 15 Trees, prioritized to supporting a vibrant public realm. The TGS requirements have been achieved through additional on site tree planting and retention of existing soil. Refer to revised landscape plans. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 65 | Urban Forestry | 1 | Zoning By-law Amendment Comments: 1. Opportunities for Tree Preservation: the below chart of healthy City & privately owned trees proposed for removal are not supported by Urban Forestry. Provide revised Plans and Arborist Report that allow for the preservation of these trees (some minor injury to the tree(s) may be acceptable). Revisions to the plans of most/all disciplines will be required to accommodate the preservation of the below. If the trees will be injured, the revised Arborist Report must include detailed instructions on means/methods to be used to minimize impact and a discussion of the anticipated level of encroachment and tree impact. | 02-09-2024 | Revised landscape plans and arborist report provided as part of the resubmission. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 66 | Urban Forestry | 1 | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Tree Removal Not Supported</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Reason for Removal</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Suggested Changes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">617, 618, 619, 641, 642, 643</td> <td style="text-align: center;">New driveway</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Revise driveway design to accommodate existing trees.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 645, 646</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Entrance to underground parking</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Explore options for relocating underground parking entrance.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">651, 652, 683, 684, 807, 833, 837, 838, 839, 840, 851, 856, 857, 858, 859, 869,</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Parking garage/ building overhang</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Reduce the horizontal footprint of the parking garage and/or building overhang.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">64, 65, 68, 71, 802, 818, 866, 867, 883</td> <td style="text-align: center;">New pathway</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Consider and discuss redesigning pathway to meander around existing trees.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Tree Removal Not Supported | Reason for Removal | Suggested Changes | 617, 618, 619, 641, 642, 643 | New driveway | Revise driveway design to accommodate existing trees. | 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 645, 646 | Entrance to underground parking | Explore options for relocating underground parking entrance. | 651, 652, 683, 684, 807, 833, 837, 838, 839, 840, 851, 856, 857, 858, 859, 869, | Parking garage/ building overhang | Reduce the horizontal footprint of the parking garage and/or building overhang. | 64, 65, 68, 71, 802, 818, 866, 867, 883 | New pathway | Consider and discuss redesigning pathway to meander around existing trees. | 02-09-2024 | Austrian Pine Trees North of 7 St. Dennis Dr. - 617 Fair condition and leaning, 618 Hazard condition with extreme lean, & 619 Fair condition and leaning. These trees are on existing slab and will be impacted by the existing ramp removal and slab re-waterproofing - the driveway is not able to be relocated to accommodate. Norway Maple Trees 641 & 642, and Austrian Pine Tree 643 - South of St. Dennis dr. are impacted by the location of the proposed ramp (relocation of ramp and access drive not viable). Austrian Pine Trees 638, 639, & 640 have been revised to be preserved as requested - ramp drive has been realigned to accommodate. Norway Maple Trees 641 & 642, and Austrian Pine Trees 643, 644, 645 & 646 in Good Condition - South of 7 St. Dennis dr. are impacted by the location of the proposed ramp (relocation of ramp and access drive not viable). Norway Maple Trees 683 & 684 - North of T1 have been revised to be preserved as requested - Modifications to the extent of the T1 underground are proposed to accommodate the tree preservation zone. Norway Maple Trees 651 & 652 are in conflict with the proposed T1 underground and are unable to be preserved - the T1 underground extent is not able to be shifted north. Norway Maple Tree 807 - North of T2 has been revised to be preserved as requested - Modifications to the extent of the amenity space and proposed services have been revised to accommodate the tree preservation zone. Trees 833 and 851 have been issued a tree removal permit as part of the 25 St. Dennis approvals process to facilitate the new city sidewalk and boulevard within the 20m ROW. Trees 837, 838, 839, and 840 are located between T2 & T3 in an area of proposed underground and as such are unable to be preserved. Trees 856, 857, 858, and 859 and their associated tree canopies are located South of T4 in an area in close proximity to proposed building and underground extent and as such are unable to be preserved. Norway Maple Tree 869 - South of T4 has been revised to be preserved as requested - Modifications to proposed services have been revised to accommodate the tree preservation zone. Trees 64 & 866 located on the adjacent 200 Gateway Blvd. site as well as trees 65, 68, 71, and 867 have been revised to be preserved as requested. Norway Maple Tree 883 will be preserved with minor injury. The proposed 10 Grenoble dr. MUP alignment has been relocated to the east side of the existing trees to accommodate the additional tree preservation. Austrian Pine Tree 802 located north of 19 Grenoble dr. will be preserved as requested and adjacent walkway relocated. Austrian Pine Tree 818 is in Fair condition but Poor form. The tree canopy is in conflict with the proposed Tower 2 overhang, grading, and the poor form could result in CPED sight line issues for the adjacent pedestrian connection. |
| Tree Removal Not Supported | Reason for Removal | Suggested Changes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 617, 618, 619, 641, 642, 643 | New driveway | Revise driveway design to accommodate existing trees. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 645, 646 | Entrance to underground parking | Explore options for relocating underground parking entrance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 651, 652, 683, 684, 807, 833, 837, 838, 839, 840, 851, 856, 857, 858, 859, 869, | Parking garage/ building overhang | Reduce the horizontal footprint of the parking garage and/or building overhang. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 64, 65, 68, 71, 802, 818, 866, 867, 883 | New pathway | Consider and discuss redesigning pathway to meander around existing trees. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------|------|---|------------|--|
| 67 | Urban Forestry | 2 | <p>Soil Volumes Required; The applicant has not achieved the soil volume targets required by TGS EC 1.1 and several of the proposed tree planting areas will not be counted toward satisfying this requirement due to unacceptable setbacks. A total of 6,258m³ of soil volume is required (based on the net site area of 34,419m²) and only 4,140m³ has been proposed. Applications with deficient soil volumes will not be supported by Urban Forestry. Please note that soil volume for retained trees can be used in soil volume calculations. The assumed soil depth for such soil areas shall be no more than 800mm without QL-A data demonstrating that deeper soil is available.</p> <p>a) In addition to ensuring that the application achieves the minimum amount of soil volume required by the TGS EC 1.1 (6,258m³), the applicant is also required to ensure that the proposed tree plantings are consistent with the following guidelines;</p> <p>i) A minimum tree spacing of 7.0 m on centre (or as appropriate for site conditions, a minimum of 6 m can be accepted– see soil volume area #8),</p> <p>ii) Tree species representing a diversity of large-growing shade trees,</p> <p>iii) A minimum planting size of 60 mm caliper (balled and burlapped),</p> <p>iv) A minimum of 3.0 m horizontal clearance between the tree trunk and any portion of the building, including overhead canopies/outlines, up to a minimum height of 16.0 m above the grade of the base of the tree (see soil volume areas #20, 21, 22, 31, 35, 42, 43, 45, & 47),</p> <p>v) A preferred minimum of 0.75 m clearance (0.60 m absolute minimum clearance may be acceptable) between the tree trunk and the edge of the open portion of any planter or property line,</p> <p>vi) A preferred minimum of 0.75 m horizontal clearance between the tree trunk and the extent of the available underground soil volume (on at least three sides of the tree),</p> <p>vii) A minimum of 30 m³ of soil per tree,</p> <p>viii) A soil depth between 0.80 m and 1.20m throughout each tree planting area,</p> <p>ix) Minimum tree planting area width of 2.5 m for areas on private property (see soil volume areas #11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, & 35).</p> <p>x) Soil volumes areas located within the park land dedication also cannot be counted toward satisfying soil volume requirements (see soil volume area #23).</p> | 02-09-2024 | The landscape plan has been revised to provide the following Soil Volumes and proposed trees; 53 trees for 7 St. Dennis - 2,975.1m ³ soil volume (combined existing retained and proposed) 67 trees for 10 Grenoble – 3,441.4m ³ soil volume (combined existing retained and proposed) Total soil volume: Site Area – 33,983.2m ² x 40% / 66 x 30 = 6,416.5m ³ . The revised landscape Tree Planting Plan has incorporated the dimensional requirements as requested. |
| 68 | Urban Forestry | 2 | <p>b) Where soil cells are used to achieve soil volume, include the following:</p> <p>i) Manufacturer's site-specific soil cell layout in plan and sections to scale, stamped by a licensed professional Civil Engineer and a Structural Engineer in the Province of Ontario warranting that the product as proposed satisfies all City of Toronto loading requirements.</p> <p>ii) Manufacturer's product and installation specifications.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted. No soil cells are proposed to achieve the soil volume requirements. |
| 69 | Urban Forestry | 2 | <p>c) Please provide soil specifications for tree planting areas. All components to match parameters as specified in TS 5.10 Construction Specification for Growing Medium (toronto.ca):</p> <p>i) Type III – Boulevard Mix (for trees planted in hardscaped boulevards and over underground structures).</p> <p>ii) Confirm if soil is to be retained on-site, adjusted or replaced with soil of equal or better quality.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Soil specifications will be included for private and ROW tree planting as requested. |
| 70 | Urban Forestry | N/A | <p>Draft Plan of Subdivision Comments</p> <p>Urban Forestry – Tree Protection & Plan Review does not object to the issuance of notice of decision for Draft Plan of Sub-division application and shall include the following Notice of Approval Conditions required under the City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 813 – Trees.</p> <p><u>Previously Issued Tree Removal Permit:</u></p> <p>Please note that a permit was issued in July 2021 for the removal of trees #825, 826, 827, 828, 832, 833, 834, 835, 851, 852, & 854, adjacent to the sites east property line for development at 25 St Dennis Dr (Permit #: N-7303406).</p> <p><u>New Trees:</u></p> <p>It is assumed by Urban Forestry that the eighteen new street tree plantings along the west side of the proposed public street (David Solomon Dive) will be delivered through this Subdivision Agreement. Urban Forestry anticipates that this section of the development is not currently going to be included in any surrounding Site Plan Control applications.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted. Please note that the revised landscape plan indicates 19 trees. |
| 71 | Urban Forestry | N/A | <p>Advisory Comment: Toronto Green Standards (TGS) – Version 3, tier 1</p> <p>Urban Forestry recommends that the applicant demonstrate Tier 1 compliance with the Toronto Green Standard Version 4.0. The following comments regarding compliance with TGS pertain only to at-grade tree planting and soil volumes and are to be reviewed and accessed for applicability by City Planning. The following TGS comments apply solely to MCC 813 Trees.</p> <p>EC 1.1 – Tree Planting Areas and Soil Volume: Not Met Details: Insufficient soil volume provided.</p> <p>EC 1.2 – Trees Along Street Frontages: Not Met Details: Additional information required regarding soil material quality.</p> <p>EC 1.3 – Parking Lots: Not Applicable (Met) Details: Applicable at Site Plan Control</p> <p>EC 1.4 – Watering Program: Not Applicable (Met) Details: Applicable at Site Plan Control</p> <p>EC 2.2 On-site Landscaping: Not Applicable Details: Applicable at Site Plan Control</p> | 02-09-2024 | The landscape plan has been revised to provide the following Soil Volumes and proposed trees; 53 trees for 7 St. Dennis - 2,975.1m ³ soil volume (combined existing retained and proposed) 67 trees for 10 Grenoble – 3,441.4m ³ soil volume (combined existing retained and proposed) Total soil volume: Site Area – 33,983.2m ² x 40% / 66 x 30 = 6,416.5m ³ . The revised landscape Tree Planting Plan has incorporated the dimensional requirements as requested.. |
| 72 | Urban Forestry | 1 | <p><u>Subdivision Agreement:</u></p> <p>PRE-APPROVAL CONDITION:</p> <p>1. The Owner agrees to submit a tree planting guarantee deposit to Urban Forestry in the amount of \$10,494.00 for the eighteen new trees proposed to be planted within the City road allowance.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. Please note that the revised landscape plan indicates 19 trees for a security deposit of \$11,077. |
| 73 | Urban Forestry | 18.1 | <p>SECTION 18 - TREE PRESERVATION</p> <p>18.1 The Owner agrees, prior to any site works, to submit with the first engineering submission, a Tree Preservation Plan acceptable to Parks, Forestry and Recreation in consultation with Engineering and Construction Services.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. A revised Tree Preservation Plan has been provided as requested. |
| 74 | Urban Forestry | 18.2 | <p>18.2 The Owner agrees to protect all trees until the Tree Preservation Plan has been approved by Parks, Forestry and Recreation.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 75 | Urban Forestry | 18.3 | <p>18.3 It is understood and agreed that the "Tree Preservation Plan" will:</p> <p>(a) be prepared in conjunction with the Subdivision Grading and Building Siting Control Plan, which indicates all appurtenances associated with services and utilities and show trees proposed for removal, trees to be preserved and tree protection measures including tree protection barriers which clearly illustrate tree protection zones;</p> <p>(b) be prepared by a qualified arborist or other tree professional satisfactory to Parks, Forestry and Recreation;</p> <p>(c) indicate the accurately plotted location, species, size and condition of the trees identified and shown on the approved plan; and</p> <p>(d) identify and evaluate which trees are to be preserved and the methods to be implemented to protect the trees during construction activities associated with the Subdivision, and identify and evaluate trees proposed for removal and the reason for their removal.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted. A revised Tree Preservation Plan has been provided as requested. |
| 76 | Urban Forestry | 18.4 | <p>18.4 The Owner agrees to protect all existing trees which are situated on the lands to be conveyed or dedicated to the City as road allowances or parkland and which are identified for protection in the Tree Preservation Plan approved by Parks, Forestry and Recreation. The Owner further agrees not to injure or destroy any trees which are to be preserved and to protect these trees from physical damage to trunks, limbs or roots during construction in accordance with the Tree Preservation Plan.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 77 | Urban Forestry | 18.5 | <p>18.5 During the course of developing the Subdivision, the Owner agrees to obtain any approvals or permits necessary to comply with the City's Tree By-laws, as amended from time to time.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 78 | Urban Forestry | 18.6 | <p>18.6 The Owner further agrees:</p> <p>(a) to preserve the trees identified in the Tree Preservation Plan;</p> <p>(b) to instruct a qualified arborist or other tree professional satisfactory to Parks, Forestry and Recreation to monitor tree preservation in accordance with the Tree Preservation Plan and submit monthly reports, until submission of the Site Certificate of Compliance as set out in Section 29 of this Agreement; and</p> <p>(c) to notify all builders, contractors and agents of all requirements of this clause where any part of the development will be carried out by them on behalf of the Owner.</p> | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-------|---|------------|---|
| 79 | Urban Forestry | 19.1 | SECTION 19 - STREET TREE PLANTING 19.1 Prior to Registration of the Plan of Subdivision, the Owner agrees to submit a detailed landscape plan of street tree planting indicating the location, species, size and condition of all trees proposed to be planted within the road allowance for the approval of Parks, Forestry and Recreation and Engineering and Construction Services. | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 80 | Urban Forestry | 19.2 | 19.2 Prior to Registration of the Plan of Subdivision, the Owner agrees to post a Letter of Credit in the form and from an institution, acceptable to the City Treasurer, equivalent to One Hundred and Twenty Percent (120%) of the value of the street trees and other plantings, as a Financial Security, to guarantee the planting including the maintenance of the street trees for a minimum period of two (2) years to the satisfaction of Parks, Forestry and Recreation. | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 81 | Urban Forestry | 19.3 | 19.3 The Owner agrees to plant the street trees after final grading and once sod has been laid, in accordance with the approved landscape plan. The Owner further agrees that the tree planting will be supervised by a qualified arborist or nursery person, having particular regard to planting depth and potential settlement to ensure tree survival. | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 82 | Urban Forestry | 19.4 | 19.4 Upon written request from the Owner, Parks, Forestry and Recreation agrees to inspect the newly planted trees and will advise the Owner if the trees are satisfactory. The Owner acknowledges and agrees to maintain the trees for a period of two (2) years after being advised in writing that Parks, Forestry and Recreation is satisfied with the newly planted trees. The Owner acknowledges that, should any newly planted tree require replacement during this guarantee period, the tree shall be replaced immediately and shall have an additional two (2) year maintenance period placed on this new planting. Provided the City is satisfied with the tree planting at the end of the (2) two year maintenance period, the City will assume responsibility for the maintenance of the trees and release the Letter of Credit. | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 83 | Urban Forestry | 19.5 | 19.5 The Owner agrees, prior to planting any trees, to submit a watering schedule acceptable to Parks Forestry and Recreation. The Owner further agrees to adhere to the watering schedule during the (2) two year maintenance period. | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 84 | Urban Forestry | 19.6 | 19.6 The Owner agrees that no wording will be included in any agreement of purchase and sale that states or creates an expectation that there will be a tree in front of each property. | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 85 | Urban Forestry | 19.7 | 19.7 Where tree planting is not possible, the Owner agrees to make a cash contribution to the City in lieu thereof in an amount to be determined by Parks, Forestry and Recreation. | 02-09-2024 | Noted, and agreed. |
| 86 | Urban Forestry | 1. A. | Advisory Comments: Regulated Tree Impacts and Application Requirements (subject to change) a. Where it is not possible to retain a tree that qualifies for protection under the City of Toronto's Tree By-laws, or where construction activity will encroach upon a regulated tree's minimum tree protection zone causing injury, it will be necessary for the applicant to submit an application requesting permission to injure or destroy the tree(s) in question to Urban Forestry. The Urban Forestry permit process has set time requirements, therefore an application to Urban Forestry must be submitted as soon as possible. Urban Forestry will not give Community Planning a clearance to issue the NOAC and/or Site Plan Agreement, without being in a position to make a permit issuance decision. The following summary of regulated live tree impacts is based on the arborist report by [The MBTW Group, December 8, 2023] and tree preservation plan [The MBTW Group, December 8, 2023] and adjusted to reflect the previously issued removal permit at 25 St Dennis Dr (see note above): MCC 813 article II (City street trees) Tree Removals (2): 875, 876 Tree Injuries (2): 868, 870 MCC 813 article III (private trees) Tree Removals (84): 65, 68, 71, 617, 618, 619, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 645, 646, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 680, 681, 683, 684, 801, 802, 807, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 821, 822, 823, 824, 826, 827, 828, 832, 833, 834, 835, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 867, 869, & 883. Tree Injuries (8): 624, 647, 648, 649, 689, 690, 803, & 864. Boundary/Neighbor tree Removals (3): 64, 825, 853, & 866. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. The landscape plan has been revised to preserve additional trees, prioritized to supporting a vibrant public realm. Refer to the updated Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan. |
| 87 | Urban Forestry | 1. B. | The applicant must obtain a permit from Urban Forestry prior to the start of any site works which may impact regulated trees. This may include early works such as demolition. Submit a TPRR application form and associated application fees to Urban Forestry –Tree Protection & Plan Review Office North York (tpprnorth@toronto.ca) to obtain a tree permit to remove/injure the subject trees. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 88 | Urban Forestry | 1. C. | Submitting an application does not guarantee that a permit will be issued. In accordance with MCC 813, Urban Forestry is required to post a Public Notice for a minimum of 14 days and to consult with the Ward Councillor with regards to the proposed removal of a healthy City or private tree and with regards to the proposed Landscape/Compensation Plan. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 89 | Urban Forestry | 1. D. | A permit is not required to remove a fully dead or terminally diseased tree on private property, but rather an exception from Urban Forestry must be obtained. Make all requests for a tree exception separately to Urban Forestry –Tree Protection & Plan Review Office North York (tpprnorth@toronto.ca) to obtain a Confirmation of Exception prior to completing the dead/diseased tree removal activities. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 90 | Urban Forestry | 1. E. | If the applicant wishes to request the removal and replacement of a dead City tree by City forces, they may call 311 to initiate this work, however timeframes for when removal may occur will not be guaranteed. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 91 | Urban Forestry | 1. F. | Where a live City owned tree is approved for removal, Urban Forestry will require payment of a non-refundable Tree Loss Payment as compensation to the City for the loss of the tree's appraised amenity value. The amount will be determined upon review of the application to injure or remove trees to Urban Forestry. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 92 | Urban Forestry | 1. G. | Authorisation for tree removal or pruning of any City owned street tree or park tree must be done by a qualified arborist that has provided a completed 'Agreement for Contractors to Perform Arboricultural Services on City Owned Street Trees' form to Urban Forestry. Forms can be found on the City's website: How to Apply for a Tree or Ravine Permit – City of Toronto | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 93 | Urban Forestry | 1. H. | Private property boundary or neighbor trees may be impacted by the proposal. It is important to emphasize that the possible issuance of a permit to injure/remove boundary/neighbor tree, will not supersede or expunge any civil or common law property rights. A tree permit is merely an acknowledgement that the proposed injury/removal, if carried out in accordance with the terms and conditions of the permit, will not constitute a violation of the tree By-law. A permit does not determine ownership or authorize the applicant to encroach or enter upon another's private property or to injure/remove a tree owned by another without their consent. It is the applicant's responsibility to resolve any ownership issues or other property disputes with any potential co-owners of a boundary or neighbour tree. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 94 | Urban Forestry | 2. A. | Advisory Comments: By-law Tree Compensation Summary (subject to change) a. As a requirement listed in the applicable tree by-law(s), compensation via tree planting, or cash-in-lieu payment is required for the removal for any tree regulated by MCC 813. The following is a summary of compensation required and proposed (and adjusted to reflect the previously issued removal permit at 25 St Dennis Dr): MCC 813 article II (City street trees): 2 trees required; 18 trees proposed. MCC 813 article III (Private trees): 259 trees required; 120 trees proposed. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 95 | Urban Forestry | 2. B. | Payment in lieu of by-law required planting will be accepted for the shortfall between the number of trees required and the number of satisfactory trees proposed. The cash-in-lieu payment amount is calculated based on \$583.00 per tree but may be subject to change. Any payment or deposit requirements will be specified in the Notice of Approval Conditions. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|------|---|------------|--|
| 96 | Urban Forestry | 2. C | For proposed planting on City lands, Urban Forestry will require a security in the amount of \$583.00 per tree to ensure satisfactory planting and maintenance of the tree. Security values may be subject to change. The General Manager of Parks, Forestry & Recreation may hold the security for the duration of the guarantee period. The deposit may be drawn upon by the City to cover any costs incurred while ensuring that the tree is planted in accordance with approved plans and kept in a healthy and vigorous state during the two-year guarantee period. Any payment or deposit requirements will be specified in the Notice of Approval Conditions. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 97 | Urban Forestry | 3. A | Advisory Comments: Tree Protection a. Prior to any demolition, construction, or grading activities taking place, tree protection barriers/hoarding shall be installed in the locations indicated on the approved plans and to the satisfaction of Urban Forestry – TPR. Once the tree protection barriers have been installed and any other tree protection measures undertaken, the applicant/owner shall notify Urban Forestry to arrange for an inspection of the site and approval of aforementioned tree protection requirements. The owner must not proceed with any demolition, construction, or grading activities until Urban Forestry approval and permit (s) have been obtained. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 98 | Urban Forestry | 3. B | All regulated trees on or adjacent to the subject lands must be protected in accordance with MCC 813 and the Tree Protection Policy and Specifications for Construction Near Trees (toronto.ca). | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 99 | Urban Forestry | 3. C | Where a City tree is to be retained on the site through appropriate protection measures, Urban Forestry may require a refundable Tree Guarantee Deposit. Any payment or deposit requirements will be specified in the Notice of Approval Conditions. If necessary, this deposit will be drawn upon to cover any cost incurred by the City if the City tree requires maintenance or removal and replacement as a result of construction activities associated with this project. Provided the tree protection is maintained as specified in an approved Tree Preservation Plan, and in accordance with the Tree Protection Policy and Specifications for Construction Near Trees (toronto.ca). The deposit may be released at the completion of construction. If it is discovered that during construction there has been unauthorized encroachment within a TPZ, or if a tree was not protected in accordance with the above noted documents, the deposit will be retained for an extended period. Should the tree's condition decline as a result of construction and/or encroachment the deposit may not be refunded. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 100 | Urban Forestry | | For any City tree to be retained, regardless of the tree being alive or dead, the applicant is required to preserve existing soil volume(s) and any associated underground infrastructure (e.g. soil cells or similar) from all construction activity throughout the entire project so that a new tree may thrive in that location. For the purposes of this requirement, the applicant may refer to Tree Protection Policy and specifications for Construction Near Trees (toronto.ca) and apply all relevant guidelines, including, but not limited to, Prohibited Activities listed on page 8, to the existing soil and associated infrastructure. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 101 | Urban Forestry | 4 | 4. Advisory Comment: Payments to Urban Forestry: a. All deposits and payments must be submitted to the attention of David Bostock, Supervisor of Urban Forestry and payable to Treasurer, City of Toronto. Acceptable methods of payment are in the form of a letter of credit, certified cheque, bank draft, money order, or by credit card or debit card at public facing UF service counters between 8:30 am and 3:00 pm, Monday – Friday (excluding holidays). | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| 102 | Urban Forestry | N/A | Please contact Derek Morrow, Urban Forestry Planner by email at derek.morrow@toronto.ca if you require additional information. | 02-09-2024 | Noted. |
| Enbridge | | | | | |
| 103 | Enbridge | N/A | Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. | 15-Jan-24 | Noted. |
| Toronto Hydro | | | | | |
| 104 | Toronto Hydro | N/A | A locate must be completed in the field to identify Toronto Hydro infrastructure if needed. Any proposed UG structures must maintain 300mm vertical & 600mm horizontal clearance Edge to edge from all Toronto Hydro's Underground plant 600mm from Hydro pole Any proposed trees must maintain min. 1000mm horizontal clearance from Hydro plant. Hydro plant should not be undermined. Please contact our COS Dept. @ 416-542-2533 for disconnect. Equipment removal before any construction For pole relocation please e-mail to utility.relocations@torontohydro.com. Any cost of pole relocation will be the responsibility of developer. Shorings, Tiebacks, Piling within 1000mm or Blasting within 500mm is deemed a conflict that requires a professional Engineering report to resolve. | 15-Jan-24 | Noted. |
| Engineering and Construction Services (ECS) | | | | | |
| 105 | Transportation Services | 1 | PART I: ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT COMMENTS A. REVISIONS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR PLANS, STUDIES, AND DRAWINGS The Owner is required to amend the Studies and/or Drawings to address the following comments and submit/resubmit for review and acceptance by the Executive Director of Engineering & Construction Services, prior to approval of the Official Plan/Zoning By-law Amendment application. Architectural Plans, Revision No. 3 dated December 4, 2023, prepared by Architects- Alliance; Landscape Plans, Revision No. 3 dated December 7, 2023, prepared by the mbwt group; Urban Transportation Considerations, dated December 4, 2023, prepared by BA Group; | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 106 | Transportation Services | a | a) Zoning approval be granted subject to implementing a Holding designation, in order to satisfy all outstanding matters regarding the traffic impacts of the proposal, as further discussed in Section E. | 22-Apr-24 | To be discussed with City staff further. |
| 107 | Transportation Services | b | b) Submit a comprehensive phasing plan delineating the site's development stages, specifying timelines for each phase and the projected completion time for the New Public Street. Furthermore, please include thorough information/documentation regarding the management of parking and loading activities throughout the construction period. | 22-Apr-24 | At our April 23rd meeting with City staff, Transportation Services staff advised that they will confirm / review existing agreements with the adjacent 25 St. Dennis application regarding the conveyance of the new public north-south street. The east boulevard and full pavement width is currently under construction as part of the 25 St. Dennis application. Our understanding is that the New Public Street will be conveyed to the City after this construction is complete. The subject Site is responsible for the design and construction of the west boulevard of the new public street. Our understanding is that the boulevard is to be provided as a road widening of the new public street. |
| 108 | Transportation Services | c | Include a notation on the Site Plan stating that "The 2.76m wide strip of land along the Don Mills Road frontage of this property will be conveyed to the City in an unencumbered manner for a nominal sum, to the satisfaction of the City." | 22-Apr-24 | Note has been added to the Site Plan. |
| 109 | Transportation Services | d | a) Include a notation on the Site Plan stating that "The 1.44m wide strip of land along the St Dennis Drive frontage of this property will be conveyed to the City in an unencumbered manner for a nominal sum, to the satisfaction of the City." | 22-Apr-24 | Note has been added to the Site Plan. |
| 110 | Transportation Services | e | a) Include a notation on the Site Plan stating that "The 5.0m corner rounding at the northeast corner of the site (southwest corner of St. Dennis Drive and New Public Street intersection) must be conveyed to the City for a nominal sum and at no cost to the municipality." | 22-Apr-24 | Note has been added to the Site Plan. |
| 111 | Transportation Services | f | a) Include a notation on the Site Plan stating that "The 5.0m corner rounding at the southeast corner of the site (northwest corner of Grenoble Drive and New Public Street intersection) must be conveyed to the City for a nominal sum and at no cost to the municipality." | 22-Apr-24 | Note has been added to the Site Plan. |
| 112 | Transportation Services | g | g)The site frontages on St Dennis Drive, Grenoble Drive, and Don Mills Road are designated as a "Bike trail/Multi-use trail". The applicant is required to address the following comments from the cycling group regarding the design of the cycle track: •Both St. Dennis Drive and Grenoble Drive site frontages currently have existing buffered bicycle lanes. Please upgrade these existing bicycle lanes to cycle tracks in accordance with Chapter 2.7 of the Toronto On-Street Bikeway Design Guide and widen the cycle tracks to meet the default widths and separation types outlined in Chapter 3 of the Toronto On-Street Bikeway Design Guide. •The infrastructure improvement requirement for the Don Mills Rd site frontage will be provided at a later date. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. The functional design of the upgraded bicycle facilities on the St. Dennis, Grenoble, and Don Mills development frontages will be completed as part of the Site Plan process, in coordination with City Transportation Services and Cycling staff. |
| 113 | Transportation Services | h | h)The Site, Ground Floor, and Landscape Plans require revision to clearly indicate the location and dimensions of the proposed 19 pick-up/drop-off parking spaces. Additionally, these spaces must be clearly labelled on the Site signage plan and appropriate signage must be provided for them. | 22-Apr-24 | Please refer to the updated architectural plans. The 19 pick-up / drop-off areas and lay-by short-term parking spaces have been labeled on all relevant plans. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---|--|-----------|--|
| 114 | Transportation Services | I | a) The legend of the Parking Plans must be revised to incorporate the explicitly labelled typical dimensions for accessible parking and parking spaces as outlined in By-law 579-2017 and By-law 569-2013. Furthermore, the Parking Plans must also include the additional typical dimensions for accessible parking spaces and parking spaces adjacent to obstructions, such as walls and pillars that extend beyond 1.0m from the front or rear of the parking space, with an additional clearance of 0.3m on each side of the obstruction. Please be advised non-standard parking spaces will not be accepted. | 22-Apr-24 | Please refer to the updated architectural plans. The legend for dimensions of all parking spaces has been updated to confirm that parking spaces conform to the City of Toronto's Zoning By-law 569-2013 dimensional requirements. |
| 115 | Transportation Services | J | a) Transportation Services cannot accept compact cars spaces as legal parking and the proposed small-car spaces cannot be counted towards the parking provision and legal parking spaces. Please ensure to include the appropriate provision in all offers of purchases and sale agreements specifying that these designated small car parking spaces, are intended for the use of compact/small vehicles. In addition, a notation in this regard must be included in the site plan. In addition, appropriate on-site signage plan must be provided for the proposed small-car parking spaces. | 22-Apr-24 | The site-specific zoning by-law will specify that all existing tenant parking spaces at 7 St. Dennis and at 10 Grenoble will be considered legal. The site-specific by-law will also include a provision allowing for a small number of parking spaces to be obstructed or "small car" spaces (maximum 15%). Although every effort has been made to minimize the number of parking spaces that may be obstructed or "small car" spaces at this ZBA level of detail, it is reasonable to expect that as the design progresses through the Site Plan approvals process and construction, a small number of the proposed parking spaces may be required to be obstructed due to structural and servicing constraints. BA Group will provide justification regarding dimensions along with vehicle manoeuvring diagrams, if small car spaces are required, at the Site Plan Approval stage. |
| 116 | Transportation Services | K | a) The Parking Plans must be revised to explicitly label all parking spaces, distinguishing between those allocated for residential and visitor use. | 22-Apr-24 | The parking plans distinguish between residential and visitor use. |
| 117 | Transportation Services | L | a) Please provide loading in accordance with the minimums outlined in Zoning By-law No. 569-2013, as shown in Condition B (3). | 22-Apr-24 | Noted, please refer to Section 8.0 of the transportation update letter. |
| 118 | Transportation Services | M | a) Please provide appropriate documentation to justify how the loading activity will be managed with only 1 Type G loading space for the existing east building and Towers 2, 3, and 4 – See Section E. | 22-Apr-24 | BA Group has reviewed the proposed plans with the City reviewer from Solid Waste Management Services. Ms. Qureshi has confirmed that the City Solid Waste services can accept a split staging area for the Site, with a portion of the required bin staging area provided in another building in Phase 2 or on a level of the underground parking garage. This will require for building management staff to be available during City collection to ensure that bins are being moved from the primary bin staging area (in front of the Type G space) and the secondary bin staging area(s) to ensure that City collection can be completed in a timely manner. In the current proposal, a total of 126sq.m. of bin staging is provided adjacent to the Type G loading space and an additional 96sq.m. bin staging is provided in a secure room on the P1 parking level. Bins will be moved between the staging areas via the parking ramp in Tower T3. The Applicant and project team have confirmed that it is not feasible to relocate the chutes and waste storage room for the existing 10 Grenoble to the P1 parking level. The existing exterior waste storage area is proposed to be enclosed (see landscape plans) and bins will be moved to the primary bin staging area for City collection days. |
| 119 | Transportation Services | N | a) Please ensure that all proposed Type C loading spaces and loading spaces for the existing west building are integral into the building. Note that layby loadings are not acceptable. | 22-Apr-24 | At the April 23rd meeting with City staff, Transportation Services staff confirm that external Type C spaces are acceptable for residential moving and delivery activities, with appropriate access to the proposed moving rooms. Staff also confirmed that the external Type C spaces can be provided within a lay-by area but must be clearly designated / signed as being a loading space. The Type C spaces will not be counted as part of the short-term parking spaces for passenger vehicle pick-up / drop-off activity. |
| 120 | Transportation Services | O | a) The Underground Parking Plans must be revised to explicitly label the dimensions of turnaround spaces for dead-end drive aisles and include vehicle manoeuvring diagrams for parking spaces near the turnaround area. | 22-Apr-24 | The parking plans have been revised to explicitly label the dimensions of turnaround spaces where required adjacent to proposed overhead doors and at dead-end drive aisles. The current proposal and design of the parking levels will continue to be refined throughout the Site Plan process. At SPA, vehicle manoeuvring diagrams can be provided. |
| 121 | Transportation Services | P | a) The Site, Ground Floor, and Landscape Plans must be revised to show the location of the existing utility structures within the site frontages. | 22-Apr-24 | The existing utility structures within the site frontages have been indicated as requested. |
| 122 | Transportation Services | Q | a) The Site, Ground Floor, Underground Parking and Landscape Plans must be revised to clearly label all internal private drive aisles with a width of 6.0m. The proposed driveway aisle of 5.28m wide in P2 level of Phase 3 is not acceptable. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted, the drive aisles have been updated to all be 6.0m wide. |
| 123 | Transportation Services | R | f) Revise the Site, Ground Floor and Landscape Plans to show the provision of minimum 2.1m wide linear paths of concrete public sidewalks along all development site frontages, which: i. Must be clear of any encumbrances such as utility poles, fire hydrants, bike rings, street furniture, specialized paving areas, landscaping, etc.; ii. Must have appropriate transition areas beyond the site frontages connecting to the existing sidewalks at a 5:1 ratio; iii. Must be continuous through the driveway; iv. Must be offset by 0.3m from the property line; v. Must be offset by 0.5m from permanent structures such as hydro poles, fire hydrants, etc.; and vi. Must be aligned and connected with the existing/new adjacent sidewalks and maintain a linear course. | 22-Apr-24 | 2.1m wide linear paths of concrete public sidewalks are provided along St. Dennis, New Street, and Don Mills. The existing sidewalk along Grenoble will remain as 1.5m, given the presence of existing street trees and the right-of-way width. |
| 124 | Transportation Services | S | a) Include a notation on the Site Plan stating that "The new reconstructed sidewalks along the development site frontages will be built to the satisfaction of the City and at no cost to the municipality"; | 22-Apr-24 | Notation has been added to the Site Plan. |
| 125 | Transportation Services | T | a) Label all existing utilities and permanent structures in the Site Plan as further discussed in Section E. In addition, all street furniture, hydro poles, and planters should have a minimum setback of 0.5m measured from the curb and from the edge of the new 2.1m wide sidewalk; | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. The existing utility structures within the site frontages have been indicated including minimum setbacks annotated as requested. |
| 126 | Transportation Services | U | a) Please provide tactile walking surface indicators (TWSIs) at all public road crossings adjacent to the development lands; and | 22-Apr-24 | Tactile warning indicators have been provided as requested. |
| 127 | Transportation Services | | a) Demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Toronto Green Standard (TGS) Version 4.0, as further discussed in Section E. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. Please refer to the transportation update letter prepared by BA Group and included with this submission. |
| 128 | Solid Waste Services | | General Comments a) Revised drawings must provide an accurate scale. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 129 | Solid Waste Services | | Multi-Residential Component – Existing Building (Phase 1) a) If the existing building requires additional waste storage space beyond what is currently available inside the building, then the dedicated additional waste storage area must be shown on the drawings and properly labeled. | 22-Apr-24 | The required waste storage for the existing buildings is noted on the architectural and landscape plans. |
| 130 | Solid Waste Services | | Multi-Residential Component – Phase 1 (T1) a) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space that is 13 metres in length, 4 metres in width, has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres. b) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space will be at least 70 square metres, is level (+/-2%), and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. c) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 194 square metres. d) Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage area of minimum floor area of at least 10 square metres. | 22-Apr-24 | a) Annotations added b) Annotations added c) Annotations added d) Annotations added |
| 131 | Solid Waste Services | | Multi-Residential Component – Existing Building (Phase 2) a) Revised drawing must annotate if the existing building will be sharing the loading with the proposed loading in T3 or if they will use the existing loading for waste collection. Currently the notation is provided for loading in Tower 3 to be shared with the existing building, staging area must be large enough to house the bins. Revised drawings must provide an accurate scale. b) Revised drawings must clearly indicate the collection point for Tower 2 and Tower 4. If collection point is the same for existing building plus T2, T3 and T4, then staging pad must be 206.2 square metres to accommodate all buildings. This must be shown on the drawings and properly labeled. Currently notation is only provided for Tower 3 loading space to be shared with existing building. | 22-Apr-24 | a) Notation has been added to drawings to clarify Type G loading bay to be shared with T2 + T4 b) Bin staging pad has been increased to 126 sm at grade, with additional 96 sm staging area provided at P1 adjacent to T4 waste storage room |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------|---|
| 132 | Solid Waste Services | | <p>Multi-Residential Component – Phase 2 (T3)</p> <p>a) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space that is 13 metres in length, 4 metres in width, has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres.</p> <p>b) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space is level (+/-2%) and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. If collection point in this tower is shared with the existing building plus T2 and T4, then staging pad must be 206.2 square metres to accommodate all buildings. This must be shown on the drawings and properly labeled. Currently notation is only provided for Tower 3 loading space to be shared with existing building.</p> <p>c) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 146.68 square metres.</p> <p>d) Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage area of minimum floor area of at least 10 square metres.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>a) Notation has been added to drawings to clarify Type G loading bay to be shared with T2 + T4</p> <p>b) Bin staging pad has been increased to 126 sm at grade, with additional 96 sm staging area provided at P1 adjacent to T4 waste storage room</p> <p>c) T3 garbage storage room revised to 154 sm</p> <p>d) T3 10 sm bulk waste room provided at grade in T3</p> |
| 133 | Solid Waste Services | | <p>Multi-Residential Component – Phase 2 (T4)</p> <p>a) Revised drawings must clearly indicate the collection point for Tower 4.</p> <p>b) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 172.16 square metres.</p> <p>c) Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage area of minimum floor area of at least 10 square metres.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>a) Annotations added to T3 Type G loading bay to include collection for T2 + T4 + 10 Grenoble (existing building)</p> <p>b) T4 garbage storage room revised to 176 sm on P1</p> <p>c) T4 10 sm bulk waste room provided at grade in T4</p> |
| 134 | Solid Waste Services | | <p>Multi-Residential Component – Phase 3 (T2)</p> <p>a) Revised drawings must clearly indicate the collection point for Tower 2.</p> <p>b) Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 179.44 square metres.</p> <p>c) Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage area of minimum floor area of at least 10 square metres.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>a) Annotations added to T3 Type G loading bay to include collection for T2 + T4 + 10 Grenoble (existing building)</p> <p>b) T2 garbage storage room revised to 189 sm on P1</p> <p>c) T2 10 sm bulk waste room provided at grade in T2</p> |
| 135 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Engineering and Construction Services Comments</p> <p>a) Update the architectural drawings as required to address comments on the FSR. The architect must coordinate with the owner, civil consultant and other consultants to make the necessary site plan / built form changes as required to provide sufficient provision to be able to meet City by-laws and policies including having adequate space to house proposed storm tanks, storm and sanitary control manholes, groundwater access points, water meters and backflow preventers, detector assemblies, etc. all within the private property per applicable City standards, policies and by-laws. The limits and footprint of these areas must be confirmed at the rezoning stage since additional space may be required.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Updated General Servicing Plan (SP-1) has been provided to the architect for coordination. |
| 136 | Engineering and Construction Services | | b) Update the drawings to address comments on all other documents including the Draft Plan of Subdivision and ensure all plans match. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted, drawings have been updated. The Draft Plan of Subdivision application has been withdrawn as of April 25, 2024. |
| 137 | Engineering and Construction Services | | c) Statistics, Drawing A-1.7: Please provide a floor-by-floor GFA breakdown for all existing buildings to verify the values used in the FUS fire flow calculations. | 22-Apr-24 | Floor-by-floor GFA breakdown for all buildings are included within the statistics. |
| 138 | Engineering and Construction Services | | d) On all drawing title blocks, include the City ZBA and SUB file numbers. | 22-Apr-24 | ZBA file numbers have been added. The Draft Plan of Subdivision application has been withdrawn as of April 25, 2024. |
| 139 | Engineering and Construction Services | | e) Repeat Comment: Clearly indicate all existing and proposed property lines on the Site Plan drawing for lands to be conveyed / dedicated to the City including road widening, corner rounding, public parkland dedication and proposed public roads. Add the property line type to the legend for clarity. Additionally, please add a note to indicate these areas as "land to be conveyed to the City, in an unencumbered manner for a nominal sum, to the satisfaction of the City". | 22-Apr-24 | Annotations have been added to the Site Plan. |
| 140 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>2. Hydrogeological Review Report, dated July 12, 2022, prepared by Grounded Engineering; Hydrological Review Summary Form, signed and stamped by Matthew Bielaski, P.Eng., dated February 8, 2023, prepared by Grounded Engineering; Foundation Drainage Summary Form Technical Brief, signed by Matthew Bielaski, P.Eng., dated February 8, 2023, prepared by Grounded Engineering; Foundation Drainage Summary Form, signed by Matthew Bielaski, P.Eng., dated February 8, 2023, prepared by Grounded Engineering;</p> <p>a) Repeat Comment: The Hydrogeological Review Report and Hydrological Review Summary Form indicate that ground water level monitoring is ongoing. Please provide the full 3 month monitoring records in the next submission and update the dewatering calculations as required.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Acknowledged. The Hydrogeological Review Report has been updated with the full 3 months of groundwater monitoring. |
| 141 | Engineering and Construction Services | | b) Further to the above comment, please submit a Final Hydrogeological Investigation which meets the City's Terms of Reference for Hydrogeological Investigations. | 22-Apr-24 | Acknowledged. |
| 142 | Engineering and Construction Services | | c) Please include the City's ZBA & SUB file number on the report cover page. | 22-Apr-24 | Acknowledged. The Hydrogeological Review Report cover has been updated to include the ZBA file number. |
| 143 | Engineering and Construction Services | | d) The report is stamped February 8, 2023, but the report is dated July 12, 2022. Please clarify and ensure consistency between report date and the professional seal. | 22-Apr-24 | Acknowledged. The Hydrogeological Review Report date has been updated. |
| 144 | Engineering and Construction Services | | e) Hydrological Review Summary Form: When inputting short-term dewatering flows, please revise to include the design rainfall event. | 22-Apr-24 | Acknowledged. The design rainfall event has been included on the Hydrogeological Review Summary Form. |
| 145 | Engineering and Construction Services | | f) Ensure the Hydrological Review Summary Form is updated and to match the Final Hydrogeological Investigation (which meets the City's Terms of reference) and ensure it's coordinated with the Servicing Report Groundwater Summary Form. Please ensure the 2 forms are coordinated between the consultants completing the forms (owner information, etc.) and the forms are completely filled out (only the last column is to be completed by the City), and they are stamped, signed and dated. | 22-Apr-24 | Acknowledged. |
| 146 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>3. Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report, dated February 13, 2024, prepared by Counterpoint Engineering; General Comments</p> <p>a) Please include the City's ZBA and SUB file numbers on the title/cover page.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the City's ZBA file number will be included on the title/cover page. The SUB application has been recinded. |
| 147 | Engineering and Construction Services | | a) Section 1.1 Background: The report shall clearly identify all lands to be conveyed to the City including road widening, corner rounding's, public roads, etc., as well as land to be dedicated to the City as public parkland. The FSR shall clearly identify the existing subject property area and the area of the private lands after all appropriate land conveyances and dedications to the City under proposed conditions clearly stating all areas, which should match the Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the report will include language identifying all lands to be conveyed to the City and a table showing the subject property areas in the existing and proposed condition in coordination with the Site Plan. |
| 148 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Section 4.0 Groundwater Management</p> <p>c) Update this section as required to match the final Hydrogeological Investigation.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, Section 4.0 - Groundwater Management will be updated to match the final Hydrogeological investigation. |
| 149 | Engineering and Construction Services | | d) Short-Term Discharge (Construction Dewatering): The applicant must confirm and clearly document in the FSR whether or not groundwater will be discharged to the municipal sewer system in the short-term (during construction), which sewer(s) groundwater will be discharged to including which street and confirm there is capacity in the municipal system if discharge is proposed. The applicant will not be permitted to change their proposal once zoning has been approved. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the report will be updated to clearly state that short-term groundwater will be discharged to City's sanitary sewer. The discharge point will be identified and the municipal sewer capacity will be confirmed. |
| 150 | Engineering and Construction Services | | a) Repeat Comment: Clarify, document and show the proposed discharge locations for short term (construction) dewatering. If the existing sanitary laterals (which are to remain) are to be used, the FSR should include capacity calculations to prove that the existing laterals can handle the increase in flow. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the discharge locations will be clearly identified in the Site Servicing Plan (SW-SP) and will be discharged through proposed sanitary laterals. |
| 151 | Engineering and Construction Services | | a) As the applicant is aware, the Foundation Drainage Policy and Guidelines do not permit long-term discharge to the City sewer system. If the proposed buildings will be designed completely water-tight below grade (no long-term groundwater discharge to the municipal system), the FSR must be updated to clearly state this and the applicant shall provide three (3) certification letters (Owner, Mechanical Engineer, Structural Engineer) to the attention of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director, Engineering and Construction Services and copy GM of Toronto Water. Refer to the letter templates attached. | 22-Apr-24 | No long-term groundwater is proposed. Upon resubmission of the FSSR, three (3) certification letters will be provided to clearly state that the proposed underground structure will be fully water-tight. |
| 152 | Engineering and Construction Services | | g) Further to the above comment, this section and the General Servicing Plan indicate groundwater sampling points, which indicates the applicant is planning to discharge groundwater in the long-term. As noted above, this is not permitted under the policy. If groundwater is proposed to be discharged to a municipal sewer in the long-term, the applicant must apply for and obtain an exemption as outlined in the Foundation Drainage Policy and the sewer capacity analysis must be updated to suit. Accordingly, the zoning application cannot be approved until the groundwater management strategy has been confirmed. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the groundwater sampling ports will have been removed from the General Servicing Plan (SP-1). No long-term groundwater discharge is proposed for this development. |
| 153 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Section 2.0 Stormwater Management</p> <p>h) Section 2.1 Existing Conditions: This section states "there may be external drainage entering the subject site from the south." Given that the consultant engineer is also completing the design for the south site (200 Gateway Boulevard), confirm if there will be any external drainage. Based on the last submitted SWM report for the south site, it appears there will be an area of uncontrolled drainage (north east corner of the adjacent site) that would drain to this site. Please account for external drainage and revise the calculations and figures accordingly</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, uncontrolled drainage from property to the south (200 Gateway Boulevard) will be shown on the updated Pre & Post Drainage Plans and considered in the revised SWM calculations. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------|--|
| 154 | Engineering and Construction Services | | a) Section 2.2 Stormwater Management Criteria: Refer to comments below on Blocks 1 & 3 SWM approach. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 155 | Engineering and Construction Services | | j) Table 2: Allowable Release Rate: i. Add another column for the Design Runoff Coefficient "C", which must not exceed 0.50 per section 2.2.3.7 a) of the City's WWFM Guidelines. This affects the calculations for Blocks 1 and 3. ii. Block 1: Remove catchment 101B from the calculation as it does not drain to the storm sewer on St. Dennis Drive. Please refer to section 2.2.3.7 a) of the City's WWFM Guidelines for more information. | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 156 | Engineering and Construction Services | | k) Section 2.5 Proposed Stormwater Management: i. Revise this section including Table 4 and the appendices to use the correct allowable release rates as noted above. ii. Catchment 304A: The catchment appears to have its own orifice control but appears to drain to catchment 304B. Please clarify in the report how this will be achieved as only 1 storm connection is shown on Grenoble Drive. iii. Area 306 (Park Block 6): The public park block must comply with the WWFM Guidelines including water quality, quantity and water balance. The detailed design shall be completed at SPA however the report at zoning must quantify the expected storage volume required and outline a rough strategy. Be advised that PF&R typically prefer underground storage tanks to maximize the usage of the park. Please update the report accordingly. iv. Repeat Comment: The report does not propose any SWM controls to blocks 1 and 3, however it appears based on the Site Plan that site alterations are proposed to these areas. Please review Table 7 in the WWFMG. v. Further to the above comment, as discussed in the meeting with the applicant on September 11, 2023, in lieu of the applicant providing separate storm quantity controls for Blocks 1 & 3, the applicant may wish to overcontrol Blocks 2, 4 & 5 to ensure the allowable release to each storm outlet is less than the allowable release rate. Currently, Blocks 1 and 3 within Table 4 specify the proposed 2-year peak flows, which is not acceptable. As the applicant is aware, the WWFM Guidelines require design for the 100-year storm event. Prior to the next submission, the applicant is encouraged to reach out to the ECS Case Manager to discuss their SWM approach. vi. Section 2.5.2 Stormwater Quality Controls: This section states: "The 5mm water retention provided will capture an average of 50% of annual rainfall, therefore removing this volume out of the runoff discharged, and providing 50% TSS average removal". This is not an acceptable approach to achieving the water quality targets for the site. Please revise the report to clarify how water quality targets are expected to be achieved including for Blocks 1 & 3. Detailed design can be completed at SPA. vii. Section 2.5.3 Water Balance: This section states "Blocks 2, 4 and 5 will have a stormwater recycling facility in the underground parking level within the stormwater quantity control tank." It is unclear what this is or what the strategy will be to meet the water balance targets, or how the targets for Blocks 1 & 3 will be achieved. Water balance targets must be met through a combination of initial abstraction, green/LID infrastructure and water harvesting and reuse. Detailed design can be completed at SPA. | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 157 | Engineering and Construction Services | | l) Appendix B: i. Revise to address all comments in this memo. ii. Repeat Comment: The City requires the use of orifice tubes, with a minimum size of 100mmØ and a discharge coefficient Cd= 0.82 for the purpose of quantity control. In cases where the allowable release rate is very small and due to the head acting on the orifice, and an orifice tube would not provide sufficient stormwater control, the City will allow the use of orifice plates, with a minimum size of 75mmØ and a discharge coefficient of Cd= 0.63 for the purpose of quantity control. iii. Further to the above comment, Area 302 and 304A reference orifice plates but use cd values of 0.81 which is for tubes. If orifice tubes aren't feasible, orifice plates with cd values of 0.63 shall be used. Please revise. iv. Further to the above, Area 304B and 305 reference vortex valves but use cd values of 0.81 which is for orifice tubes. If both orifice tubes and plates aren't feasible, vortex valves can be used with the head-flow discharge following the manufacturers design (not a cd value for an orifice tube). v. Area 304B: Storage volume methodology is incorrect. As commented above, it appears Area 304A drains to 304B and both drain through the same service connection. Assuming Area 304A drains to the storm tank in Area 304B, the peak flow from Area 304A must be added into the design of Area 304B as a constant flow, which will increase the required storage volume. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the SWM calculations will be updated to reflect the appropriate discharge coefficient (Cd) to each orifice control proposed. |
| 158 | Engineering and Construction Services | | Section 3.0 Sanitary Servicing m) Update this section as required to address comments on the sanitary capacity analysis as noted below. St Dennis and Grenoble Sanitary Capacity Analysis, prepared by Civica, Version 3, dated November 22, 2023 | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 159 | Engineering and Construction Services | | a) Table 1-1: 200 Gateway Blvd: Based on the latest FSR, total population is noted to be 1,579 people. 7, 11 Rochefort Dr: Based on the latest FSR, total residential population is noted to be 2,664 people. Please also include the following 3 development applications which appear to be excluded: 48 Grenoble Dr, 1185 Eglinton Ave E & 2 Sonic Way, 805 Don Mills Rd. Please update Figure 1-1 and all other parts of the report accordingly. Please update the table accordingly. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the updated population for 7, 11 Rochefort Dr will have been used in the sanitary model. Additionally, sanitary discharge for 48 Grenoble Dr., 1185 Eglinton Ave & 2 Sonic Way and 805 Don Mills Rd would also have been included. The model outputs will be updated accordingly. |
| 160 | Engineering and Construction Services | | a) Advisory: Prior to each formal resubmission, it is the applicant's responsibility to consult the City's development applications website (AIC) and ensure all development applications in the sewershed are included and the correct and most up to date information is utilized in the analysis including populations, ICI areas, peak groundwater, etc. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 161 | Engineering and Construction Services | | p) All groundwater discharge flows from development sites must be input as base flows in the model as they must be modeled as constants. Please clearly document. | 22-Apr-24 | No long-term groundwater is proposed for this development. The short-term dewatering rate is less than the post-development sanitary discharge rate, as such the sanitary discharge rate governs. |
| 162 | Engineering and Construction Services | | q) Figures 1-1 & 1-2: The analysis must go to the trunk sewer connection point. The last collector sewer which connects to the trunk is a 13m, 750mm pipe (asset ID SL4179178) with the upstream manhole being asset ID MH5512534171. Please revise the figures and all other parts of the report accordingly. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the additional sewer legs to the trunk sewer will be included in the capacity analysis. |
| 163 | Engineering and Construction Services | | r) Repeat Comment: Section 5.0 Conclusions: Include the following statements explicitly in the report: • Flow rates from all development since the model was prepared, including new builds, sites where zoning has been completed and where applications are currently in progress. • Best efforts have been made to include all flows from Private Water discharge agreements in the sewer shed. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the noted statements will be included in the report. |
| 164 | Engineering and Construction Services | | s) Advisory: The City reserves the right to provide additional comments until the sanitary sewer capacity analysis is updated to meet City requirements. | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 165 | Engineering and Construction Services | | t) Section 5.1 Existing Water Servicing: It must be confirmed and documented in the report that the existing water service laterals planned for reuse are equipped with the necessary water meters and backflow preventers in the buildings as per City standards including Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 851. If modifications or additional mechanical equipment is required to bring the site up to code, the FSR must clearly document what is required. Detailed design can be done at SPA. | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, a section speaking to whether the existing water services, to remain, are equipped with the necessary water meters and backflow prevention will be included. |
| 166 | Engineering and Construction Services | | u) Include the following statements in the revised report: "Where there is a risk of contamination at a property, such as non-potable water, wastewater, or any other liquid, chemical or substance entering the waterworks that may affect the quality of the water supply, the owner of the property will install a backflow prevention device." "Backflow prevention devices will be selected, supplied, installed and tested at the owner's expense in accordance with Water Supply Bylaw, Chapter 851 of the Toronto Municipal Code, Ontario Building Code, CSA B64 and NFPA 13/14 standards and specifications." | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the noted statements will be included in the report. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------|--|
| 167 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>v) Section 5.2 Proposed Water Servicing Strategy:</p> <p>i. Block 2: Given that T2 is >84m, OBC Section 3.2.9.7 applies, which states the building shall be served by not less than two sources of water supply from a public water system. As outlined in the City's Design Criteria, "The City requires that if two separate watermain are available to service the development, then the applicant must connect to each watermain." As a new watermain is proposed for David Salomon Dr., T2 shall connect to this watermain.</p> <p>ii. Block 4: The report indicates that Block 4 will have 2 connections to Grenoble Dr., which doesn't match the Servicing Plan showing 4 connections. Additionally, similar to Block 2 comments, given that T3 & T4 are >84m, a connection to the new watermain on David Salomon Dr. is required. Note that fire services can be shared between towers if they share a common underground garage and there will be only 1 fire pump for both towers. The civil engineer shall confirm with the fire pump engineer and if there will be only 1 fire pump for T3 & T4, only 1 fire connection to Grenoble Dr. and 1 fire connection to David Salomon Dr. would be required for Block 4.</p> <p>iii. Block 1: Document location of the existing water service connections.</p> <p>iv. Block 3: Document location of the existing water service connections. Also, based on the Servicing Plan, the existing connection appears to traverse through the 200 Gateway Boulevard property, which is not permitted. Please indicate in the FSR and Servicing Plan that this service is required to be relocated to be solely located within Block 3.</p> <p>v. Table 8: Include totals for daily water demand, max day and peak hour demands to clarify the total site domestic demands for the overall development.</p> <p>vi. Total Required Water Flow: The report must clearly demonstrate that the minimum required fire flows can be met for this development. The analysis must be based on the worst-case scenario of (peak hour domestic demand for the entire site) and (max day domestic demand for the entire site including existing buildings to remain + FUS fire flow for the worst-case building). Please document and confirm.</p> <p>vii. Further to the above comment, each municipal watermain system must be evaluated (based on the specific hydrant flow test) in reference to the specific building requiring fire protection and shall be based on FUS for the building + max day domestic demand for the entire site.</p> <p>viii. Page 21 states "The calculated flow on St. Dennis at 140 kPa (20psi) of the municipal watermain system was calculated to be 300.70 L/s." Based on the hydrant flow test completed by Lozzi Aqua Check on June 8, 2022, City Staff disagree with this statement. Based on a static pressure of 86 psi with a flow of 1,297 USGPM, the maximum flow available at 20 psi would be 227 L/s.</p> <p>ix. Update this section as required to address Appendix D comments.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 168 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>w) Appendix D:</p> <p>i. Water Demands by Block and Building: In the Summary of Demands table, include totals for daily water demand, max day and peak hour demands to clarify the total site domestic demands for the overall development.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 169 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>a) Please be advised that the City has endorsed FUS 2020 with minor amendments. Please clarify if this version will be used or the 1999 version will be used. If the 2020 will be used, all calculations and analysis must be updated to reference and follow the 2020 version.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 170 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>a) Repeat Comment: The utilized Gross Floor Areas in the Fire Flow FUS calculations have not been substantiated. Please provide a breakdown of GFA calculations for each building to illustrate how effective area "A" was determined for each building.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | The architectural plans provide a floor-by-floor breakdown of the proposed GFA. Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the Fire Flow FUS calculations will be updated to reflect the provided GFA breakdown. |
| 171 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>a) Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 (all proposed & existing buildings): If the construction type will be 1.0 or greater, under FUS 2020, the total GFA for the entire building being analysed must be to be included for "A". If construction type will be less than 1.0, a short form calculation for "A" can be used however a certification letter from the Architect is required and FUS calculations must be completed per FUS 2020.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 172 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>d) FUS fire flow calculations which use a 'C' value of 0.8 to calculate the fire demand is only applicable for "Noncombustible Construction (Type II)" as per FUS 2020: "A building is considered to be of Noncombustible construction (Type II) when all structural elements, walls, arches, floors, and roofs are constructed with a minimum 1-hour fire resistance rating and are constructed with noncombustible materials." FUS fire flow calculations which use a 'C' value of 0.6 to calculate the fire demand is only applicable for "Fire Resistive Construction (Type I)" as per FUS 2020: "A building is considered to be of Fire-resistive construction (Type I) when all structural elements, walls, arches, floors, and roofs are constructed with a minimum 2-hour fire resistance rating, and all materials used in the construction of the structural elements, walls, arches, floors, and roofs are constructed with noncombustible materials." Accordingly, where the engineer uses a 'C' value less than 1.0, a certification letter signed, sealed and dated from the Architect is required for buildings using this C value. The letter needs to clearly state the type of material to construct the specific building and that the material is of Type I or II as per the FUS 2020 Guidelines. The letter must clearly reference all specific buildings within the site that are applicable under this construction type and clearly state if the vertical openings and exterior vertical communications are properly protected or unprotected in accordance with the National Building Code. Please ensure the letter references the specific City ZBA file number and the full municipal civic address of the subject site. Please append the letter to the FSR.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 173 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>e) If the FUS fire flow calculations use the short form calculation to calculate an effective area via the single largest Floor Area plus 25% of each of the two immediately adjoining floors, the above noted certification letter from the Architect must also clearly specify that as per the FUS 2020 Guidelines, "all vertical openings and exterior vertical communications are properly protected in accordance with the National Building Code". The letter must also clearly reference all specific buildings within the site that are applicable under this construction type. Please ensure the letter references the specific City ZBA file number and the full municipal civic address of the subject site. Please append the letter to the FSR.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 174 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>a) Letter dated November 27, 2023, prepared by Architects-Alliance: The civil engineer shall work with the Architect to revise this letter to match the FUS fire flow design and assumptions as noted above.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 175 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>g) The FUS fire flow calculations use a 50% reduction for an Automatic Sprinkler Protection for all existing and proposed buildings. Provide a letter from the Mechanical Engineering Consultant confirming all existing and proposed building has/is being designed with a fully automatic and fully supervised sprinkler system as per FUS 2020 Guidelines and the reduction applied is appropriate, to validate your assumptions in fire requirement (FUS) calculations. The certification letter will be required to be appended to the FSR. See below letter requirements:</p> <p>i. In order for the engineer to get credit for a 50% reduction in their fire flow calculations, the letter must confirm that the sprinkler system for the building in question will be, per FUS 2020 Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Automatic sprinkler protection designed and installed in accordance with NFPA 13; • Water supply is standard for both the system and Fire Department hose lines; and • Fully supervised system. <p>The above items must be satisfied for 100% of the building. Where only part of a building is protected by Automatic Sprinkler Protection, credit should be interpolated by determining the percentage of the Total Floor Area being protected by the automatic sprinkler system. Please refer to FUS 2020 Guidelines for further information.</p> <p>ii. The letter must include the full site civic address and the City zoning application number.</p> <p>iii. The letter must be signed, sealed and dated by a qualified Ontario licensed Mechanical Engineer, P.Eng.</p> <p>iv. The letter must be addressed to:</p> <p>Attention: Executive Director, Engineering and Construction Services c/o Manager, Development Engineering North York Civic Centre, 4th Floor 5100 Yonge St. Toronto, Ontario, M2N 5V7</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 176 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>h) Letter dated November 7, 2023, prepared by Smith + Anderson: The civil engineer shall work with the Mechanical Engineer to revise this letter to match the FUS fire flow design and assumptions as noted above and ensure the letter references all existing and proposed buildings.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 177 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>i) Repeat Comment: The separation charges used in the FUS calculations for all buildings shall represent the ultimate scenarios. Please provide a separation distance figure for all buildings and ensure the information matches the Site Plan.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Will be addressed upon resubmission of the FSSR. |
| 178 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>B. (PRELIMINARY) OFFICIAL PLAN & ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT CONDITIONS</p> <p>The Owner is required, as condition of approval of the Official Plan/Zoning By-Law Amendment Application to:</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------|---|
| 179 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Transportation Services Conditions:</p> <p>1. Provide parking in accordance with the following minimum requirements: Visitor Residential Use Resident Spaces:0.31 spaces per unit; Visitor Spaces:2.0 + 0.01 spaces per unit;</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>The site specific zoning by-law is proposed to follow the City's amended Zoning By-law 569-2013. It will therefore include the maximum parking permissions for residential parking (parking Zone A) but at this time, it will not specify a minimum resident parking requirement. For visitor parking, a minimum of 2 parking spaces plus 0.01 parking spaces per dwelling unit is provided for in the draft by-law.</p> <p>The applicant team / BA Group understand that the City's amended by-law is meant to permit resident parking supplies to be reflective of anticipated demand for new buildings. For the subject site, the demand for tenant parking is less than the existing tenant parking supply and the demand is expected to continue to decrease between now and the final phase of construction (Phase 3) given the overall changes to the area transportation context with the forthcoming Eglinton Crosstown LRT and Ontario Line service / stations near the Site. The current proposal includes a modest reduction in the overall tenant parking supply that is required to allow for the construction of the proposed residential buildings and to replace existing surface parking with enhanced landscaping on the Don Mills Frontage.</p> <p>This reduction in the supply will occur in stages over the construction of the residential buildings, with the existing surface parking at 7 St. Dennis maintained until the tenant parking demand can be accommodated within the 446 parking spaces retained in the existing underground parking garages.</p> <p>The applicant team will provide additional information regarding the proposed construction phasing and the plans for ensuring that existing tenants continue to have access to parking.</p> |
| 180 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>2. The on-site parking is subject to the following maximum requirements: Residential Condominium Use Bachelor (Up to 45 m2):0.3 space per unit; 1-Bedroom Units:0.5 space per unit; 2-Bedroom Units:0.8 space per unit; 3+ Bedroom Units:1.0 spaces per unit; Visitor Spaces:1.0 space per unit up to 5 units, 0.1 spaces per unit thereafter.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted, no relief is required in the zoning by-law. |
| 181 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>3. Provide loading in accordance with the following minimum requirements: Phase 1 Existing West Building 1 Type G space; Tower 1: 1 Type G space and 1 Type C; Phase 2 & 3 Existing East Building: 1 Type G space; Tower 2, 3 & 4: 1 Type G space and 1 Type C; Provide dedicated loading spaces for the existing building if the existing building and the new proposed buildings are not connected at the underground level.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City staff at the April 23rd meeting, the Applicant and project team have reviewed the feasibility of relocating the existing chutes and waste storage rooms for 7 St. Dennis and 10 Grenoble to the P1 parking level and it is not feasible. The existing waste storage areas are proposed to be upgraded with enclosures to improve at-grade conditions.</p> <p>Collection for 7 St. Dennis will be maintained at the existing loading space on the west side of the building, where City collection is currently being done for the building. Providing a new Type G loading space at the existing 7 St. Dennis building would impact the proposed landscaping and at-grade facilities. The Applicant will continue to coordinate with City staff through the Site Plan process.</p> <p>Collection for 10 Grenoble will be accommodated at the shared Type G loading space proposed in Tower T3, with bins moved to the primary bin staging area for the City collection days. This movement would have to occur at-grade but can be scheduled for off-peak hours to minimize potential conflicts with tenant and resident activities at-grade. Alternatively, City solid waste can advise if they would prefer collection to occur from the driveway (as per existing conditions) to minimize the distance that bins are required to be moved. The proposed Type C loading space provided in front of 10 Grenoble could, in that case, be used as a bin transfer zone to move bins to / from the proposed waste storage enclosure to the City's collection vehicle.</p> <p>Loading facilities for the proposed residential towers (T1, T2, T3, and T4) are provided in accordance with the City's zoning by-law, with consolidation of loading supply between the existing and proposed buildings in Phase 1 and in Phases 2 and 3.</p> <p>For Phase 1, 1 Type G space is proposed within an enclosed loading facility in Tower T1 and it is proposed to maintain the existing Type C-equivalent space on the west side of the existing 7 St. Dennis building. This meets the functional requirements of the existing and proposed buildings for Solid Waste collections and residential moving / deliveries activities.</p> <p>For Phases 2 and 3, 1 Type G space is proposed within an enclosed loading facility in Tower T3 with a primary and secondary bin staging areas that meet the overall staging requirement for 10 Grenoble and Towers T2, T3, and T4. 3 Type C loading spaces are also proposed in lay-by areas (with appropriate signage) with direct connections to the moving rooms / elevators in 10 Grenoble and Towers T2 and T4. This meets the functional requirements of the existing and proposed buildings for Solid Waste collections and residential moving / deliveries activities.</p> |
| 182 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>4. Comply with the following parking space dimensional requirements: (i) The minimum dimensions of a parking space shall be: • Length 5.6 metres • Height 2.0 metres • Width 2.6 metres (ii) The minimum dimensions of an accessible parking space shall be: • Length 5.6 metres • Height 2.0 metres • Width 3.4 metres • With a 1.5m wide shared access aisle • The minimum required width of a parking space shall be increased by 0.3 metres for each side of the parking space which is obstructed; • The side of a parking space shall be considered to be obstructed when any part of a fixed object such as, but not limited to, a wall, column, bollard, fence or pipe is situated within 0.3 metres of the side of the parking space, measured at right angles, and more than 1.0 metres from the front or rear of the parking space; • Compact car spaces are not acceptable as legal parking and the proposed small-car spaces cannot be counted towards the parking provision and legal parking spaces.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>Please refer to the updated architectural plans. The legend for dimensions of all parking spaces has been updated to confirm that parking spaces conform to the City of Toronto's Zoning By-law 569-2013 dimensional requirements.</p> <p>The site-specific zoning by-law will specify that all existing tenant parking spaces at 7 St. Dennis and at 10 Grenoble will be considered legal.</p> <p>The site-specific by-law will also include a provision allowing for a small number of parking spaces to be obstructed or "small car" spaces at a rate of maximum 15%. Such approach has been accepted by the City in a number of recently approved by-laws. Dimensions of accessible parking spaces is provided in the draft by-law because such regulation in 569-2013 is still under appeal. Although every effort has been made to minimize the number of parking spaces that may be obstructed or "small car" spaces at this ZBA level of detail, it is reasonable to expect that as the design progresses through the Site Plan approvals process and construction, a small number of the proposed parking spaces may be required to be obstructed due to structural and servicing constraints.</p> <p>BA Group will provide justification regarding dimensions along with vehicle manoeuvring diagrams, if small car spaces are required, at the Site Plan Approval stage.</p> |
| 183 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>5. Include the following definitions in the Site Specific By-law for this project: Type 'G' Loading Space means a loading space that is a minimum of 4.0 metres wide, 13.0 metres long and has a minimum vertical clearance of 6.1 metres. Type 'C' Loading Space means a loading space that is a minimum of 3.5 metres wide, 6.0 metres long and has a minimum vertical clearance of 3.0 metres.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. It is intended that the minimum required dimensions of the loading spaces will comply with 569-2013. |
| 184 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>6. Provide accessible parking in accordance with the following minimum requirements: 5 accessible spaces plus 1 space for every 50 parking spaces in excess of 100 parking spaces are required to be dedicated as accessible spaces.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Accessible parking spaces will be provided according to the City's Zoning By-law 569-2013, as amended by 89-2022. The accessible parking requirement is calculated based on the "Effective Parking Requirement" for the development program. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------|--|
| 185 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Engineering and Construction Services Conditions:</p> <p>1. Submit to the Chief Engineer & Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services for review and acceptance, prior to approval of the rezoning application, a Functional Servicing Report to determine the storm water runoff, sanitary flow and water supply demand resulting from this development and whether there is adequate capacity in the existing municipal infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development;</p> <p>2. Make satisfactory arrangements with Engineering and Construction Services and enter into the appropriate agreement with the City for the design and construction of any improvements to the municipal infrastructure, should it be determined that upgrades are required to the infrastructure to support this development, according to the accepted Functional Servicing Report accepted by the Chief Engineer & Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services;</p> <p>3. No person shall use any land or erect or use any building or structure unless municipal services are provided to the lot line and the following provisions are complied with. Prior to the earlier of the issuance of the first Building Permit for the Development, or portion thereof, the Owner shall:</p> <p>a) At their sole cost, design and construct to City standards, in accordance with the Subdivision Agreement and the City approved design, the proposed north-south public road (6.0m west boulevard of David Salomon Drive), including all related municipal infrastructure, all to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner, Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services and the City Solicitor; and</p> <p>b) Ensure all municipal services, service connections and service tie-in's to existing municipal services as outlined in the City accepted Functional Servicing Report have been installed and are operational for the proposed north-south public road (6.0m west boulevard of David Salomon Drive), to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services and the General Manager, Toronto Water; and</p> <p>4. Provide space within the development for installation of maintenance access holes and sampling ports on the private side, as close to the property line as possible, for both the storm and sanitary service connections, in accordance with the Sewers By-law Chapter 681.10.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 186 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>PART II: DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION COMMENTS</p> <p>Although this submission is only for the OPA/ZBA application, the following comments have been provided for the SUB application, which have yet to be addressed. The applicant is required to provide updated documents and submit for review and approval an updated subdivision application, which must be submitted in conjunction with the OPA/ZBA application. These comments are subject to change based on submissions for subsequent planning approval applications. They are provided for the owner's information only</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. As agreed upon, the applicant will withdraw the Plan of Subdivision application in favor of a 'Master Site Plan' approach. As such comments will be addressed in a future Site Plan Application. |
| 187 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>b) The FSR must indicate the required lands to be conveyed to the City for the municipal right-of-way for the proposed north-south public road to comply with the City's Development Infrastructure Policy & Standards (DIPS): https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/building-construction/infrastructure-city-construction/construction-standards-permits/standards-for-designing-and-constructing-city-infrastructure/development-infrastructure-policy-standards-dips/.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, the lands to be conveyed to the City for the proposed north-south public road will be noted. However, City staff have acknowledged that the boulevard section to be delivered will not comply with the City's Development Infrastructure Policy & Standards (DIPS) as it will include a new 300mm watermain within the west boulevard, as per the City's request. |
| 188 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>c) Municipal Right-of-Way: A separate section in the FSR is to be added and shall include a discussion on the required municipal services along the proposed public right-of-way corridor to be able to adequately service all adjacent properties as well as future development along this right-of-way corridor to facilitate future servicing connections. As the adjacent development at 25 St. Dennis has prepared a design for the travelled portion of the road and the east boulevard, the applicant must complete the design for the west boulevard. The FSR shall confirm the alignment, depth, size and capacity of the proposed municipal watermain and other required utilities and trees in accordance with City of Toronto standards and policies including DIPS.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Upon resubmission of the FSSR, a separate section will be added to discuss the required municipal services along the proposed public right-of-way in coordination to the design provided for 25 St. Dennis Dr. A hydraulic watermain model has been provided to City staff to assess the capacity of the proposed watermain. |
| 189 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>a) The City requires that the municipal infrastructure for the public road be located entirely within the proposed public road per DIPS and the applicant must confirm if any modifications to existing municipal infrastructure will be required to facilitate the proposed public road.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | The proposed 300mm watermain is located entirely within the public right-of-way. City staff have acknowledged that the proposed location will not conform to DIPS. |
| 190 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>e) A new watermain (minimum 300mm) will be required on David Salomon Drive to provide water servicing and adequate hydrant coverage and spacing. The proposed watermain should connect to the existing watermain on St Dennis Drive and Grenoble Drive. The engineer shall follow the City's Development Infrastructure Policy & Standards (DIPS) when designing the ROW infrastructure.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | A new 300mm watermain is proposed within the west boulevard of David Salomon Drive connecting the existing watermain in St. Dennis Dr. and Grenoble Dr. City staff have acknowledged that the watermain location will not conform to DIPS. |
| 191 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>PART III: SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION COMMENTS</p> <p>Although this submission is only for the OPA/ZBA application, the following comments are preliminary, repeated and advisory Site Plan comments, which are being provided to the applicant as an advisory to help facilitate and expedite future resubmissions for Site Plan Approval. To help expedite review, it is recommended that the applicant address as many of these comments during SUB/ZBA as possible. Also note that these SPA comments are not an exhaustive list and further comments will be forthcoming once a formal Site Plan Application resubmission is made. These comments are subject to change based on submissions for subsequent planning approval applications. They are provided for the owner's information only.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. Comments made regarding a future Site Plan Application will be addressed at a future SPA application. The purpose of this submission is to address ZBA/OPA related comments. |
| 192 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>D. ADVISORY OF OTHER CITY APPROVALS & REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The owner is advised that the following approvals and/or permits are required for this development:</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. The applicant acknowledges the need for the listed considerations and permits; this will be dealt with at future stages of the development |
| 193 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>E. BACKGROUND</p> <p>TRANSPORTATION SERVICES</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>The comments and conditions in this report generally pertain to the re-zoning aspects of the proposal. This development will be subject to a future Site Plan Control application, and additional comments pertaining to parking, access, loading and site circulation will be provided at that time.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 194 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT</p> <p>A Transportation Impact Study (TIS) report, dated December 4, 2023, by BA Group, was submitted in support of the proposed development. The report estimates that in the near-term (2028 Horizon) phase 1 of the proposed development will generate approximately 95 and 105 new two-way trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hour periods, respectively. The report estimates that in the long-term (2033 Horizon) phases 2 and 3 of the proposed development will generate approximately 310 and 315 new two-way trips during the weekday morning and afternoon peak hour periods, respectively.</p> <p>The estimated vehicular site trips were generated by the consultant based on the following methodologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential trip generation rates were established based on a review of several similar sites including 325 Bogert Avenue, 160, 170, 180, 200 Chlkfarm Drive, 60-61 Henintzman Street, 1375 Dupony Street, 151 & 181 Village Green Street, 522 St. Clair Avenue West, 1638 Bloor Street, 224 King Street, 60 John Street, 295 Adelaide Street West, 111 St. Clair Avenue, 736 Spadina Avenue, 1 Bedford Road, Heron's Hill Condos, 25 Town Centre Crt and 190 Borough Drive. <p>Additional information regarding the projected vehicular site trips is provided in Table 1. (See table in the original ECS Memo)</p> <p>The consultant concludes that the proposed development will have a minor impact on the overall operation of the other network signalized and unsignalized intersections. Despite this conclusion, revisions are required to the Transportation Study report in order to address the following issues:</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------|--|
| 195 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>1. Horizon Year and Development Phasing Two horizon years (2028 and 2033) were selected by the consultant for future traffic analyses. Given the scope and size of the proposed development, it is unlikely that it will be built entirely within the assessed time frame. Therefore, additional information is required to justify the selected horizon year. Provide a phasing plan for the build-out of the site including the timeline for each phase and the completion schedule for the the new proposed north-south public road. Additionally, revise the traffic capacity analyses based on the approved phasing plan and provide different scenarios for each significant phase of development.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services Staff at the April 23rd meeting, the 2028 Horizon year includes only Phase 1 of the project which includes the completion of Tower T1 only. The traffic analysis assumes that the Eglinton Crosstown LRT (and associated construction on Eglinton Avenue East) will be completed for the 2028 Horizon year. City confirmed that this timeline is reasonable for the purposes of traffic analysis.</p> <p>BA Group also clarified that the 2033 Horizon Year was 10 years from the December 2023 application, and considers the full build-out of Phase 2 and Phase 3 (Towers T2, T3, and T4). The traffic analysis assumes that the Ontario Line will be constructed and operational for the 2033 Horizon year, consistent with communications from the City and Province regarding construction timelines. City confirmed that this timeline is reasonable for the purposes of traffic analysis. The Applicant will provide additional information regarding the planned phasing for the construction of Phases 2 and 3 as part of the Site Plan process.</p> <p>City also acknowledged that new public street is currently under construction as part of the 25 St. Dennis application. City to review agreements regarding the conveyance of street from 25 St. Dennis site.</p> |
| 196 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>2. Trip Generation It is imperative that the trips generated by the existing site not be removed from the analysis (Future total conditions), as these trips are already accounted for in the existing condition, and the existing building will be retained. The trip generation methodology must solely be based on the proposed number of new units. Therefore, please revise the trip generation to estimate trips based only on the number of the new units proposed. Additionally, please conduct a thorough review and update of the traffic operation performance analysis to align with the revised trip generation methodology.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services Staff at the April 23rd meeting, and outlined in the July 2022 transportation study, the Site area is undergoing a significant change due to the introduction of two significant transit lines with stations within 500m of the Site. This will impact the trip characteristics of the existing buildings as well as the proposed buildings. The existing trips for 7 St. Dennis and 10 Grenoble driveways were therefore removed from the Future Total Traffic Volumes, allowing the future anticipated mode splits to be applied to the entire Site.</p> <p>It is important to note that this was only done for the existing Site trips and was not applied to other developments in the site area. The Future Background condition (with the background developments currently approved or under review by the City) has maintained the existing site trips.</p> <p>City staff confirmed this is acceptable for the traffic analysis for the 2028 and 2033 Horizon years.</p> |
| 197 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>3. Data Inputs The peak hour factor and lost time adjustment that have been inputted in the traffic analyses do not comply with the values typically accepted by the City. All data in the traffic analyses must comply with the most recent version of the City of Toronto Synchro Guidelines. Deviation from these values can be considered subject to the submission of acceptable documentation which justifies alternate values.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services staff at the April 23rd meeting, the City of Toronto Synchro Guidelines allow for modifications to the data inputs where appropriate.</p> <p>As detailed in the July 2022 and December 2023 reports, the City of Toronto Guidelines for using Synchro 11 specifies that default peak hour factors should be used except where site-specific values can be calculated from existing traffic count information. Values included in the traffic analysis were computed from available traffic count information (using revised traffic counts for the December 2023 submission). These values were adopted in the analysis at all intersections, as is permitted by the City's guidelines.</p> <p>The City of Toronto Guidelines for using Synchro 11 specify a base lost time adjustment factor of -1.0 seconds (i.e. a total lost time per phase equal to the amber plus all-red time minus 1 second). This default value was adopted in the analysis in most cases. Congestion at some intersections under existing conditions necessitated additional studies of left-turning sneakers during the intergreen phase, in order to calibrate lost time adjustments to reflect observed intersection capacity. This information was included with the previous submissions and is considered appropriate by the City's guidelines.</p> |
| 198 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>4. Analysis parameters Section 9.3 of the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) report dated December 4, 2023, highlighted that lane configurations at intersections along Don Mills Road and Eglinton Avenue East were initially established based on existing conditions. However, future analysis scenarios modified the lane configurations along Eglinton Avenue East to match the post-construction conditions outlined in the City of Toronto's Eglinton Connects planning study. To support the proposed adjustment in lane configurations, provide the completion schedule for the lane reconfiguration along Don Mills Road and Eglinton Avenue East.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services staff at the April 23rd meeting, the design and construction schedule of the Eglinton Crosstown LRT is the responsibility of Crosslinx. Although the anticipated opening date has not been made public, it is our understanding that the ultimate lane configurations for Eglinton Avenue East and Don Mills Road at the intersection are now in place. City staff confirmed it is reasonable to assume that the ultimate lane configuration will be in place for the 2028 and 2033 Horizon years.</p> |
| 199 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>5. Signal Timing Plan Optimization The consultant has proposed signal timing optimization at the study intersections to address capacity constraints identified during the existing condition and background development. However, additional capacity analyses are required for the Existing, Future Background, and Future Total conditions based on the existing signal timing plans. This analysis will provide valuable insights into the potential impacts of the proposed development. The capacity analysis result based on the existing signal timing plans must be summarized in separate tables, which should include information on the level-of-service, v/c ratio, delay, 50th and 95th percentile queues, and available storage areas for all intersections and each movement. It's important to note that this information must not include any applicable taper areas.</p> <p>Additionally, if optimization is deemed necessary, it should be applied only to address the conditions of the Future Total traffic scenario. A summary of the changes to the signal timing plans at the signalized study area intersections must be provided in separate tables. A review of these optimizations will be undertaken by Traffic Signal group. If deemed acceptable, a request will be made to the applicant to implement these changes, including any associate infrastructure, at their cost.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services staff at the April 23rd meeting, the December 2023 study included a modification at the Don Mills / Eglinton intersection for the Future Background and Future Total (both Horizon Years) conditions. This extended the cycle from the existing 128-second cycle to a 144-second cycle to match the cycle lengths at other intersections along Don Mills Road, to accommodate the Future Background Traffic Volumes (i.e., not related to the proposed development works).</p> <p>City staff confirmed that this may be considered by the City in the future background, in response to traffic conditions. Despite this, City has requested that the traffic analysis be provided for the Future Background and Future Total conditions with and without the cycle length adjustment.</p> <p>As per the December 2023 submission, the traffic analysis reporting will include summary tables for each signalized intersection summarizing the movements, v/c and LOS for the existing, future background, and future total conditions. A separate Queuing Summary tables for each signalized intersection will once again be provided, including the available storage lengths, 50th and 95th percentiles in future background and future total for both horizon years.</p> |
| 200 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>6. Pick-Up/Drop-Off Activity The consultant provides an assessment of the projected pick-up/drop-off demand for the proposed development. However, further information is required. Please provide the occupancy rate of the building during the time of the survey and detailed survey data in the appendix of the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) report. Additionally, further justification is required regarding the assumed average 10-minute pick-up/drop-off activity duration. In addition, the Site, Ground Floor and Landscape Plans must be revised to clearly label the location and dimensions of the proposed 19 pick-up/drop-off parking spaces.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services staff at the April 23rd meeting, all proxy buildings have been occupied for more than 5 years (33 & 44 Dunfield since 2019, 7 St. Dennis and 10 Grenoble since early 1980s). City staff confirmed that it is reasonable to assume that all buildings are fully occupied. WJ Property Management has confirmed that the existing buildings on Site have 2 units total available as of April 2024 (0.4% availability) and have been fully occupied for several years.</p> <p>As further explained in the meeting, the anticipated duration of vehicles using the at-grade pick-up / drop-off facilities is based on the observed occupancy in the proxy site surveys. The pick-up / drop-off facilities will be clearly signed as being a passenger loading zone only, with a 15-minute maximum time limit, as is consistent with sites throughout the City. This will be enforced by building management to ensure that vehicles are not parked for extended periods of time; visitors needing to park for longer than 15 minutes will need to make use of the available visitor parking. City staff confirmed that this is reasonable for the traffic analysis.</p> <p>The plans have been revised to clearly identify the 19 pick-up / drop-off facilities, as well as the external Type C spaces (which are not counted as passenger pick-up / drop-off spaces).</p> |
| 201 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>7. Collision and Safety Analysis A safety evaluation must be undertaken for each intersection and major accesses within the study area to identify locations where traffic safety should be given extra consideration. The analysis should include recent collision history (5 years) and mitigation measures should be recommended where required.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with Transportation Services staff at the April 23rd meeting, the Applicant and project team will undertake safety evaluations, where required, at the Site Plan stage for each Phase of development. City staff confirmed that they will provide additional direction at Site Plan regarding the intersections that require this additional analysis.</p> |
| 202 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>8. On-Site Signage and Wayfinding The retained transportation consultant must submit an acceptable on-site signage and wayfinding plan to help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and regulate the parking, loading, and pick-up/drop-off activity that is intended to be accommodated by the site.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>Noted. The transportation regulatory pavement marking and signage plans will be prepared for City review at the Site Plan stage for each Phase of development. The plans will include (but are not limited to) all required pavement markings, signage, convex mirrors, and truck warning systems.</p> |
| 203 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>9. Digital Synchro File In order to fully assess the traffic impacts, digital Synchro and SimTraffic files must be provided. Additional comments pertaining to the Synchro/SimTraffic analysis may be provided upon further review.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services staff at the April 23rd meeting, the digital Synchro files will be provided with the submission (as they were for the December 2023 submission) for City review. Additional opportunities for revising the traffic analysis are possible during the Site Plan stage for each Phase of the development.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------|--|
| 204 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>10. Holding By-law A Holding By-law is implemented that may be lifted for each phase of development subject to the submission of an acceptable Transportation Impact Study (including parking and loading study) which evaluates any changes in existing conditions as well as the impacts of the subject development phased, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Transportation Services.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>As discussed with City Transportation Services staff at the April 23rd meeting, we believe that a Holding provision is not required for the subject Site. The traffic analysis has undergone thorough reviews by City Transportation Services staff and the revised studies have met all City requirements. The December 2023 and forthcoming submission have used revised turning movement counts for the intersections in the study area to reflect the current traffic conditions. Following our discussions of the comments received for the December 2023 submission, it is clear that the City is in general agreement with the methodology and conclusions of the traffic analysis completed by BA Group for the subject Site.</p> <p>The items that City Transportation Services staff have indicated require additional coordination (i.e., signage plans, parking space dimensions, safety evaluations, parking supply for existing tenants through construction) can be appropriately addressed at the Site Plan stage for each Phase of development, without the need for a Holding provision in the site specific by-law. We therefore respectfully ask that the City reconsider this requirement.</p> |
| 205 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Prior to accepting the traffic impacts of the proposal, the TIS from BA Group must be revised to address the above-noted issues. The proponent is advised that additional comments may be provided with respect to the traffic impacts of the proposal once a revised Transportation study is submitted for review and approval.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>Please refer to the transportation update letter prepared by BA Group and included with this submission. Comments provided by City Transportation Services staff have been addressed as per our April 23rd meeting, with additional information provided where requested.</p> |
| 206 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>ROADWAYS In accordance with the City's Official Plan requirements, the following conveyances are required from the property, which must be free and clear of all encumbrances and obstructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.76m widening is required along the Don Mills Road frontage of this property to satisfy the requirement of a 36m wide right-of-way; • 1.44m widening is required along the St Dennis Drive frontage of this property to satisfy the requirement of a 23m wide right-of-way. St Dennis Drive has an approximate width of 20.12m; • 5.0m corner rounding is required at the northeast corner of the site adjacent to the intersection of St. Dennis Drive/New Public Street; and • 5.0m corner rounding is required at the southeast corner of the site adjacent to the intersection of Grenoble Drive/New Public Street. <p>The applicant will be required to submit to the Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services, for review and acceptance, prior to depositing in the appropriate Land Registry Office, a Draft Reference Plan of Survey, in metric units and integrated with the Ontario Co-ordinate System, showing the coordinate values at the main corners of the development lands, and delineating thereon, by separate PARTS, the lands to be conveyed to the City as part of the 2.76m road allowance widening along the Don Mills Road frontage of the site, the 1.44m road allowance widening along the St Dennis Drive frontage of the site, the 5.0m corner rounding at the northeast corner of the site (southwest corner of St. Dennis Drive and New Public Street intersection), the 5.0m corner rounding at the southeast corner of the site (northwest corner of Grenoble Drive and New Public Street intersection), the remainder of the site, and any appurtenant rights-of-way.</p> <p>The site frontages on St Dennis Drive, Grenoble Drive and Don Mills Road are designated as a "Bike trail/Multi-use trail". The applicant is required to address the following comments from the cycling group regarding the design of cycle track:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both St. Dennis Drive and Grenoble Drive site frontages currently have existing buffered bicycle lanes. Please upgrade these existing bicycle lanes to cycle tracks in accordance with Chapter 2.7 of the Toronto On-Street Bikeway Design Guide and widen the cycle tracks to meet the default widths and separation types outlined in Chapter 3 of the Toronto On-Street Bikeway Design Guide • The infrastructure improvement requirement for the Don Mills Rd site frontage will be provided at a later date. | 22-Apr-24 | <p>Noted, the requested conveyances are proposed. The applicant to review the design of the cycle track along St. Dennis Drive and Grenoble Drive at detailed design.</p> |
| 207 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>SIDEWALK / BOULEVARD / STREETSCAPING The applicant must restore those sections of municipal boulevard where they propose to close existing driveway(s), replacing the access point(s) with appropriate landscaping and continuous poured raised concrete curb.</p> <p>The applicant must ensure that any streetscape designs proposed within municipal right-of-way comply with the requirements of this Division. We emphasize that anything other than municipal sidewalks, street trees, and sod are encroachments that the property owner must recognise in either a site plan or encroachment agreement that is registered on title to the property. The property owner is responsible for designing, constructing, and maintaining these encroachments.</p> <p>New 2.1m wide clear linear paths of concrete public sidewalks are required along all development site frontages. Appropriate transition areas must also be provided beyond the site frontages which connect the new sidewalks to the existing sidewalks at a 5:1 ratio. The required 2.1m wide public sidewalks must be clear widths and shall not include the street curb, specialized paving areas, planting areas, furniture zones, marketing areas, etc. The sidewalk must be offset 0.3m from the property line and must be offset by 0.5m from permanent structures such as hydro poles, fire hydrants, street light and etc. The Site, Ground Floor and Landscape Plans must be revised to demonstrate compliance to the above noted requirements.</p> <p>The Site Plan must be revised to include a notation stating that, "The reconstructed sidewalks along the development site frontages will be built to the satisfaction of the City and at no cost to the municipality."</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>Noted. Please refer to the landscape plans included in the current submission.</p> |
| 208 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>DRIVEWAY ACCESS / SITE CIRCULATION Access to the site is proposed via the following private and public connections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access for Phase 1 will be provided via the site driveway from St. Dennis Drive on the north side of the Site; and • Vehicular access for Phases 2 and 3 will be provided via the proposed two-site driveways connecting the new north-south municipal street to the east of the Site. <p>Please provide the completion schedule timeline for the proposed new north-south public road and be advised that the interim design for the proposed driveways onto the new north-south public road is not acceptable.</p> <p>The Site, Ground Floor, Underground Parking and Landscape Plans must be revised to clearly label all internal private drive aisles with a width of 6.0m. As mentioned, this development will require a Site Plan Application. More comments pertaining to the design of the proposed site access will be given at that time.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>At our April 23rd meeting with City staff, Transportation Services staff advised that they will confirm / review existing agreements with the adjacent 25 St. Dennis application regarding the conveyance of the new public north-south street. The east boulevard and full pavement width is currently under construction as part of the 25 St. Dennis application. Our understanding is that the New Public Street will be conveyed to the City after this construction is complete.</p> <p>The subject Site is responsible for the design and construction of the west boulevard of the new public street. Our understanding is that the boulevard is to be provided as a road widening of the new public street.</p> <p>Please refer to updated architectural plans; aisle widths have been confirmed to be a minimum of 6.0m.</p> <p>As the general arrangement of the proposed accesses has been approved-in-principle by City staff in comments and in our discussions, additional comments regarding the accesses can be appropriately addressed at the Site Plan stage for each phase of the development.</p> |
| 209 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>PARKING The parking space requirements for the project are governed by the applicable parking provisions contained in the Zoning By-law 569-2013. However, Zoning By-law 89-2022 was recently developed in order to update the parking requirements for developments. The parking provisions contained in this by-law have been accepted by staff on recent development projects, where appropriate, as the associated parking standards are based on more recent information. As a result, Transportation Services can support parking being provided for this project in accordance with Zoning By-law No. 89-2022. The site can be considered located in Parking Zone A (PZA) of the City Zone under By-law 89-2022 due to its proximity to the future Flemingdon Park subway station, as part of the Ontario Line, that will be built at the intersection of Don Mills Road/Gateway Boulevard. A summary of the parking space requirements for the proposed residential units is provided in Table 2. SEE COMPLETE COMMENTS FOR TABLE</p> | 22-Apr-24 | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|--|---|-----------|--|
| 210 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Based on By-law 89-2022 under in Parking Zone A (PZA), a minimum of 28 visitor parking spaces are required for the proposed development. The maximum permitted parking supply is 1,645 spaces consisting of 1,433 resident spaces and 256 non-resident spaces.</p> <p>According to the site statistics, Tower 1 proposes a total of 297 new parking spaces, including 288 residential and 9 visitor parking spaces, with effective resident and non-residential parking rates of 0.41 and 0.013 spaces per unit, respectively. Tower 2, 3 & 4 propose a total of 520 new parking spaces, including 496 residential and 24 visitor parking spaces, with effective resident and non-residential parking rates of 0.28 and 0.013 spaces per unit, respectively. These spaces are provided in a three-level underground parking garage. The minimum parking space requirement has been satisfied.</p> <p>However, the Parking Plans must be revised to explicitly label all parking spaces, distinguishing between those allocated for residential and visitor use.</p> <p>Transportation Services cannot accept compact cars spaces as legal parking and the proposed small-car spaces cannot be counted towards the parking provision and legal parking spaces. Please ensure to include the appropriate provision in all offers of purchases and sale agreements specifying that these designated small car parking spaces, are intended for the use of compact/small vehicles. In addition, a notation in this regard must be included in the site plan. In addition, appropriate on-site signage plan must be provided for the proposed small-car parking spaces.</p> <p>Based on By-law 89-2022 effective parking spaces must be used to determine the required amount of accessible parking spaces. A summary of the effective parking spaces for the project is provided in Table 3. SEE COMPLETE COMMENTS FOR TABLE</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted, please refer to updated architectural plans and the transportation update letter included in this submission. |
| 211 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>Based on By-law 89-2022, a minimum of 5 accessible parking spaces plus 1 accessible parking space for every 50 parking spaces in excess of 100 parking spaces are required. A summary of the accessible parking space requirements for the site in accordance with Zoning By-law 569-2103 is provided in Table 4. SEE COMPLETE COMMENTS FOR TABLE</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Accessible parking spaces will be provided according to the City's Zoning By-law 569-2013, as amended by 89-2022. The accessible parking requirement is calculated based on the "Effective Parking Requirement" for the development program. |
| 212 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>According to By-law 89-2022, Tower 1 requires 13 accessible parking spaces, and Towers 2, 3, and 4 collectively require 28 accessible parking spaces. As per the site statistics, Tower 1 provides a total of 13 accessible parking spaces, while Towers 2, 3, and 4 provide the required 28 accessible parking spaces. The proposed accessible parking supply meets the By-law 89-2022 requirements. This is acceptable.</p> <p>In addition, the legend of the Parking Plans must be revised to incorporate the explicitly labelled typical dimensions for accessible parking and parking spaces as outlined in By-law 579-2017 and By-law 569-2013. Furthermore, the Parking Plans must also include the additional typical dimensions for accessible parking spaces and parking spaces adjacent to obstructions, such as walls and pillars that extend beyond 1.0m from the front or rear of the parking space, with an additional clearance of 0.3m on each side of the obstruction. Please be advised non-standard parking spaces will not be accepted.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Detailed parking plans have been provided per project phase showing typical, accessible, and obstructed parking space dimensions. |
| 213 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>LOADING Loading space requirements are governed by North York By-law 7625 and Zoning By-law 569-2013. However, we require that the project complies with the loading space requirements of Zoning By-law 569-2013 since they are based on more recent information.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Please refer to response to comment in previous section. |
| 214 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>The minimum number of loading spaces required for this development under Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 is 3 Type G loading spaces and 2 Type C loading space with the following dimensions:</p> <p>Type 'G' i. Minimum length of 13.0 meters; ii. Minimum width of 4.0 meters; and iii. Minimum vertical clearance of 6.1 meters.</p> <p>Type 'C' i. Minimum length of 6.0 meters; ii. Minimum width of 3.5 meters; and iii. Minimum vertical clearance of 3.0 meters.</p> <p>The site plan proposes a total of 6 loading spaces, comprising 2 Type 'G' loading spaces and 4 Type 'C' loading spaces located at grade, which does not meet the minimum By-law requirements. Please be advised that all the proposed Type 'C' loading spaces are situated at layby lanes of on-site circulation drive aisles, which are not acceptable. It is imperative that all the proposed loading spaces are internalized within the building. We require that the loading supply for the project be provided in accordance with the rates stipulated in Zoning By-law No. 569-2013 unless acceptable documentation is submitted that justifies otherwise.</p> <p>Please provide appropriate documentation to justify how the loading activity will be managed with only 1 Type G loading space for the existing east building and Towers 2, 3, and 4. In principle, a shared loading space for the existing east building and Towers 2, 3, and 4 is acceptable if the underground level is connected. However, we require clarification regarding the nature of the connection between the existing east building and Towers 2, 3, and 4—whether it will be potential or permanent. If the connection is intended to be potential, it is imperative that a dedicated loading space be provided for the existing east building, considering that the underground parking level is not connected. As mentioned, this proposal will be subject to further comments as part of a future Site Plan application. More detailed comments will be provided at that time with regard to the design and configuration of the proposed loading space.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Please refer to response to comment in previous section. |
| 215 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>TORONTO GREEN STANDARDS The Toronto Green Standard (TGS) Version 4.0 applies to the site given that the application for the development proposal was received by the City after May 1, 2022. Tier 1 of the TGS is mandatory, while Tier 2 is voluntary.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Noted. |
| 216 | Engineering and Construction Services | | <p>TGS Version 4.0 Tier 1 requirements: AQ 1.1 – Single-Occupant Auto Vehicle Trips AQ 1.1 of the TGS requires single-occupancy auto vehicle trips that will be generated by the proposed development to be reduced by 25 percent through a variety of multimodal infrastructure strategies and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. TDM measures including cycling, walking, transit and car-share incentives are proposed. The transportation consultant quantified the reduction in auto trips for each TDM measure by referencing the Victoria Transport Policy Institute Online TDM Encyclopedia. However, please include specific excerpts from the Victoria Transport Policy Institute Online TDM Encyclopedia in the appendix of the Urban Transportation Considerations report, which are referenced to support the estimated reduction in single-occupancy auto-vehicle trips for each proposed TDM measure on the subject site. This requirement has not been satisfied. The retained transportation consultant is required to submit acceptable documentation which: 1. Individually quantifies how much each measure is expected to reduce single-occupancy auto-vehicle trips using appropriate and reasonable data/methodologies.</p> <p>AQ 1.2 LEV and Sustainable Mobility Spaces AQ 1.2 of the TGS requires all parking spaces to be equipped with an energized outlet. The requirements for AQ 1.2 may be implemented using any of the following strategies: dedicated electrical outlet, receptacle or EVSE supplied by a separate branch circuit or using Electric Vehicle Energy Management Systems (EVEMS) load sharing technologies, which allow multiple vehicles to charge on the same circuit reducing both power requirements and installation costs. This requirement has not been satisfied.</p> <p>AQ 2.1 - Bicycle Parking Rates The site falls within Bicycle Zone 1, as defined in Zoning By-law 569-2013. As a result, the TGS requires bicycle parking spaces to be provided in accordance with Table 6. SEE FULL COMMENTS FOR TABLE</p> <p>The site statistics indicate the provision of 630 long-term and 70 short-term bicycle parking spaces for Tower 1, and the provision of 1,601 long-term and 179 short-term bicycle parking spaces for Towers 2, 3, and 4. The proposed bicycle parking supply meets the requirements of Zoning By-law 569-2013/TGS Tier 1 for Bicycle Zone 1.</p> <p>AQ 3.2 – Sidewalk Space Provide a context-sensitive pedestrian clearway that is a minimum of 2.1m wide, to safely and comfortably accommodate the pedestrian flow.</p> | 22-Apr-24 | Please refer to the transportation update letter prepared by BA Group and included with this submission. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|-----------|--|
| 217 | Engineering and Construction Services | <p>SOLID WASTE MANANGMENT MULTI-RESIDENTIAL COMPONENT</p> <p>Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code.</p> <p>In addition to the conditions listed above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage) can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Design Code - Ontario Building Code b) Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements c) Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds | 22-Apr-24 | Please refer to the transportation update letter prepared by BA Group and included with this submission. |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|-----------|--|