



**Table of Contents**

**Contents**

1.0 Region of Durham - .....4  
    Regional Municipal Servicing .....4  
    Traffic Impact Study .....4  
    Waste Operations .....5  
    Works Department Traffic Operations Centre .....6  
    Peer Review of Land Use Compatibility Study – March 26, 2024.....7  
2.0 Sustainability – August 11, 2023 .....12  
3.0 Canada Post – July 31, 2023.....13  
4.0 Elexicon Energy Inc. – July 4, 2023.....14  
5.0 Metrolinx – August 28, 2023.....14  
6.0 City Engineering – November 6, 2023 .....17  
    General Comments .....17  
    Site Plan .....18  
    Site Grading Plan.....18  
    Site Servicing Plan .....18  
    Detail Plan .....18  
    Sediment Control Plan and Details .....18  
    Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report .....18  
    Conceptual Landscape Plan .....18



Traffic Impact Studies .....	18
Land Use Compatibility Study .....	18
Geotechnical Investigation .....	19
Hydrogeological Investigation .....	19
Phase One and Two Environmental Site Assessment.....	19
Stage One and Two Archaeological Assessment .....	19
Water Resources Comments .....	19
Considerations for Detailed Design .....	20
Capital Projects – General.....	21
Capital Projects – Traffic .....	21
Landscape and Parks Development.....	22
7.0 CS Viamonde – June 29, 2023 (by email).....	23
8.0 DDSB – October 5, 2023.....	23
9.0 Durham Region Transit – July 4, 2023 .....	23
10.0 Enbridge – July 11, 2023 .....	23
11.0 MTO – October 6, 2023 (by email) .....	23
12.0 Durham Regional Police – June 29, 2023 (by email).....	24
13.0 Fire Services – November 9, 2023 (by email) .....	24
14.0 City Planning – December 8, 2023 .....	24
Affordable Housing .....	24
Building Height.....	25
Shadow Impact on Parks and Outdoor Spaces .....	25



Staff’s Comments on Building Height .....	26
Traffic and Safety .....	27
Whites Road – Regional Road Works.....	29
Commercial and Office Space .....	29
Privately-Owned-Public Space (POPS) .....	30
Indoor Amenity Space.....	30
Land Use Compatibility .....	31
Draft Zoning By-law.....	31
Comments from Area Residents.....	31
Letters from Area Businesses.....	32
Comments from Planning and Development Committee .....	32
15.0 Summary of Residents Comments.....	34
Support .....	34
Objection – Traffic and Safety.....	34
Objection – Building Height .....	37
Objection – Increased Density .....	38
Objection – Commercial and Recreational Uses.....	38
Objection – Other Comments.....	39
16.0 Durham Catholic District School Board – February 20, 2024 .....	40



**1.0 Region of Durham -**

		Response From	Response
<b>Regional Municipal Servicing</b>			
1.	Municipal sanitary sewer and water supply are available to service the proposal. Our records indicate there is an existing water service connection off the 300mm watermain on Granite Ct, near the west property line. If the connection is not used, it will be the responsibility of the developer to disconnect it at the main. Our department has no further comment on servicing plan SS-1.		Noted.
<b>Traffic Impact Study</b>			
3.	Section 12. Sightline Review – The guiderail shown does not comply with current requirements. When the guiderail is rebuilt it will be higher which may affect sightlines at the proposed access. This scenario should be considered in the report.	<b>GHD</b>	The existing guide rail will be removed and replaced with a new crash attenuator system at the parapet wall. The grade of the subject site will be raised to match the grade at Granite Court which will eliminate the need for the same length of guide rail as is currently provided. The new guide rail will not impact sightlines from the site access as illustrated in Figure 16 of the revised Traffic Impact Study.
4.	Please note the that the planned MUP along Whites Road as a short term infill project (2022-2029) from Bayly to Petticoat Creek Conservation Area should have been mentioned.	<b>GHD</b>	Noted. Report has been updated to mention the MUP.
5.	The applicant will be required to dedicate a 10x10m sight triangle where Whites Road and Granite Court intersect.	<b>OSU</b>  <b>MHBC</b>	A 10mx10m sight triangle has been noted where Whites Road and Granite Court interest. Refer to drawings A-040 Site Plan and A-102 Level 1 Plans  Landscape Drawing is coordinated with the latest site plan and a 10m x 10m sight triangle has been shown. Please refer to L-1.
6.	Our department has no objection to zoning amendment application A10/23 and local official plan amendment OPA 23-004/P. As a condition of approval, the Region of Durham Works Department recommends a holding provision be implemented. Prior to lifting the holding symbol, it shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Region of Durham that there is sufficient sanitary and water supply capacity to enable the full development of the site and that a financially secured agreement has been entered into with the Region of Durham.		Noted. Refer to FSSWM Report enclosed.



Waste Operations		
7	<p>Waste Operations has reviewed the site plan for 720 Granite Court in Pickering. This submission is for a proposed a 12-storey residential condominium building, containing a total of 262 dwelling units.</p> <p>Comments provided are with respect to providing multi-residential waste and recycling service to the dwellings on the private road network. Decision to provide waste service is based on the <i>Technical and Risk Guidelines for Municipal Waste Collection Service on Private Property</i> , Schedule “P” of the Regional Waste Bylaw 46-2011 which can be found at the following link <a href="https://www.durham.ca/Modules/Bylaws/Bylaw/Details/75b823c1-da08-4fdc-99aa-514a8ca86328">https://www.durham.ca/Modules/Bylaws/Bylaw/Details/75b823c1-da08-4fdc-99aa-514a8ca86328</a>.</p> <p>Recycling to all residential homes and apartments is required in Ontario and currently in Durham Region, blue box recycling is supplied by the Region to all approved residential locations. On June 3, 2021, Ontario filed O.Reg. 391/21 under the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act that will make product producers responsible for the Blue Box program. Once transition occurs, The Regional Municipality of Durham will no longer be the service provider for the Blue Box program. The transition of responsibility of the Blue Box program to product producers in Durham Region is expected to occur in 2024. Please see O.Reg. 391/21 for full details.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
8	<p><b>Decision:</b>            A more detailed waste plan is required. The Autoturn drawing provided must show the minimum road dimensions of 6.5m, minimum turning radii of 13m, 18m straight approach for multi-residential collection areas. The Autoturn drawing should use the truck dimensions found in Schedule “P” of the Regional Waste Bylaw 46-2011. The Autoturn drawing must also show the waste room dimensions and a minimum of 7.0 metre height clearance and width for tip enabling the waste collection vehicle to safely complete the maneuver without hitting or scraping walls or roof of the building. Multi-residential developments with greater than 30 units must use compactors for all garbage and must also be clearly identified on the site plan. Buildings with chutes must identify the different waste streams that are required for the Durham Region’s multi-residential collection.</p>	<p><b>OSU</b></p> <p>A detailed waste management plan has been added to the architectural drawing package. Refer to drawing A-085 for full details pertaining to the garbage collection requirements.</p> <p><b>GHD</b></p> <p>The swept path assessment was completed based on the Region’s Waste Collection requirements.</p>



9	<p><b>Supporting Information:</b>          As per the Guidelines for Municipal Waste Collection service on Private Property found in Schedule "P" of the Regional Waste Bylaw 46-2011 roads must be 6.5m in width and a 13m turn radius provided. For multi-residential collection, overhead clearance must be met. No underground or indoor collection is provided. At the collection point, a concrete pad to accommodate the length of the collection vehicle, should be installed. The pad should have sufficient strength to handle the weight of a waste vehicle during execution of collection. All roadways must to enable the waste vehicle to move in a forward motion without reversing as per municipal waste collection guidelines. Clear access along the route must remain clear and "no parking" signs should be erected prior to start of service.</p>	<p><b>GHD</b>  <b>OSU</b></p>	<p>The swept path assessment was completed based on the Region's Waste Collection requirements.</p> <p>A detailed waste management plan has been added to the drawing package. Refer to drawing A-085.</p>
---	---	---------------------------------------	--

**Works Department Traffic Operations Centre**

The following are comments from an operational perspective regarding the Level of Service (LOS) of Whites Road South at Granite Court under existing conditions:

**Whites Rd and Granite Crt.**

	<p>The signal operates under acceptable LOS during AM and PM Peaks. It does utilize a higher cycle length so it can be coordinated with the signals to the north. This does increase delay for east/west vehicles; however, it is the best way to operate the signal within the network.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	Noted
	<p>Due to the minimum time required for pedestrian crossings, we are unable to shorten the cycle length and keep it coordinated on a half cycle strategy that would reduce side street delay.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	Noted
	<p>Activating the eastbound left advance in AM Peak under existing conditions may improve the LOS for eastbound vehicles, but there will be an increase in delay for westbound vehicles.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	Noted
	<p>With future volumes, the eastbound left advance will be active during the AM and PM peaks, which will minimize eastbound queue lengths.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	Noted
	<p>The eastbound left advance arrow is already in place and active during the PM peak.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	Noted
	<p>Based on the Synchro analysis for future conditions, the recommended eastbound</p>	<b>GHD</b>	Noted, no longer applicable. Based on the supplemental intersection assessment prepared by GHD recommending a split phase.

**Whites Rd and Bayly St.**

It is not advised to build a west leg access for the following reasons:

	<p>The introduction of west leg access will increase delay at the intersection.</p>		
--	---	--	--



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The east leg would need to be converted to a shared through/right or shared through/left. Making the existing right turn lane a shared through/right would reduce the capacity of that lane significantly. We would not be able to maintain the right turn arrow overlap with the southbound left advance phase. Given the high volume of the westbound right turn movement, it is not advisable to do this. Alternatively making the left a shared through/left would not be ideal but would operationally work better given the EB/WB volumes.</li> </ul>	GHD	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The addition of the west leg would lead to increased delay and queuing for southbound traffic. The AM southbound left queue would extend beyond the intersection to the north, blocking the 401 ramps. Southbound queues spill back through the 401 ramps during the PM peak period today, which would be made significantly worse should a west leg be introduced at this intersection.</li> </ul>	GHD	Noted
	The introduction of a west leg access would reduce southbound through capacity because of southbound right turning movements in the curb lane and introduce additional conflict movements at the intersection where collisions are notably high already, approximately 60 collisions in 10 years.	GHD	Noted
<b>Peer Review of Land Use Compatibility Study – March 26, 2024</b>			
2	Peer Review Comments – Air Quality Assessment		
2.1	<p><u>Site and Development Description</u>          EXP agrees that the study adequately describes the zone names but recommends that the verbiage be expanded to include specific zones, e.g. residential single, prestige employment, low density) and that the map provided in Figure A.1 be updated with a legend for clarity. EXP could not confirm the discrepancy of C1 on zoning map in Figure A.1 which is noted as LN on the web-based maps provided by the city.</p> <p>No description or assessment of Site meteorology was provided. It is common practice to include a summary wind speed and direction for consideration in the evaluation of potential impact of industrial facilities upwind of the proposed development. EXP recommends meteorological data and assessment be included in the additional detailed studies recommended.</p>	GHD	<p>The text in Section 2 of the Study has been updated to indicate the more specific zoning designations for surrounding lands as requested.</p> <p>The updated Study only includes the current enforceable zoning, and the applicable drawings are included in Appendix A.</p> <p>Figure A.1 has been replaced with zoning maps taken directly from the City of Pickering’s website to reflect the current enforceable zoning (including all amendments).</p> <p>GHD included Site meteorology in Section 2 based off the nearest weather station data, and, additionally, included the observed meteorology during the site visits.</p>



2.2	<u>Land Use Compatibility Assessment</u>		
2.2.1	<p><u>Section 3.1 – 3.3</u>          A search of the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Access Environment on-line approvals database identified an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) at 575 Granite (no. 3790-A5UU6U, ECA-Air, 2016), 580 Granite Court (no. 7738-8ZFRVQ, ECA0Air, 2012) and 1851 Sandstone Manor (no. 7756-6H6QKL, ECA-Air, 2005). EXP Recommends that operations at 575 and 580 Granite Court be reviewed and included in the assessment. EXP notes the ECA for 1851 is for a standby diesel generator and is not likely an issues. The approval number provided in Table 3.2 for Ellis Packaging, 550 Granite Court shown as 6804-8A2QK which has been revoked and or replaced. The current ECA is 3029-8ZDQTH. EXP recommends the table be updated.</p> <p>EXP Agrees with the recommendation “The following facilities are located within the respective potential AOI per Guideline D-6, and that <i>“further evaluation or justification could be provided to determine if there are any potential compatibility concerns:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Trim Stamping Inc.</i></li> <li>• <i>Web Offset Publications Limited</i></li> <li>• <i>Peg Perego Canada</i></li> <li>• <i>Lenbrook Industries Limited</i></li> <li>• <i>Ellis Packaging</i></li> <li>• <i>Waterbridge”</i></li> </ul> <p>Specifically, and as noted elsewhere in the report, a detailed assessment should be conducted for Web Offset Publication Limited and Ellis Packaging. EXP recommends such assessments be conducted. For clarity the map should be updated to specify the location of Ellis Packaging.</p> <p>It is further noted that since the site visit was conducted in 2002 and change in occupancy or presence of new developments such as 145 Sandstone may have occurred, that confirmation through satellite and or web base review would provide more confidence in findings.</p>	GHD	<p>GHD has updated the ECA/EASR appendix to include all relevant ECAs/EASRs.</p> <p>GHD is of the opinion that detailed assessment of Ellis Packaging is not required due to the site observations during both site visits conducted by GHD. Noise was observed to be quiet in the direction of the Development and, as such, is not a significant source of noise impacts to the Development.</p> <p>Web Offset Publications is no longer in business and is no longer included in the assessment. The thermal oxidizer that was previously on site has also been removed.</p> <p>Other tenants have since taken occupancy of the building and are included in the assessment. The potential for air quality impacts is negligible as none of the facilities have tall stacks. As such, the height of the Development will not be a factor as the facilities are required to comply with air quality limits at their property line.</p> <p>The map has been updated to include Ellis Packaging</p> <p>The initial site visit was conducted in 2022. GHD has conducted an additional site visit on May 1, 2024 and confirmed the vacancy of 1851 Sandstone Manor. All D-6 screening has been reviewed and updated since the last study revision.</p>
2.2.2	<u>Section 3.4 Review of Complaint History</u>	GHD	GHD has since conducted an additional site visit on May 1, 2024, which included an odour survey of the indicated facilities with potential for





	<p>Section 3.4 Review of Complaints related to dust or odour which is reassuring; however, no odour survey was conducted at the proposed development or at facilities identified with a potential for odour; and no comments or odour observations during site visit were provided. While an odour survey is not a specific requirement for MECP Guideline it is commonly conducted in air quality land use compatibility assessments and specifically included in the Terms of Reference of other municipalities (i.e. City of Toronto). EXP recommends an odour survey be conducted or rationale provided if one is not needed; or recommendations on feasible mitigation measures with respect to odour be provided.</p>		<p>odorous impacts. The updated Study concludes, based on the odour survey, that odour is not a compatibility concern for the Development.</p>
2.2.3	<p><u>Section 3.5 Guidelines D-6 Assessment Conclusions</u>          The expected D-6 classifications within the adjacent zone noted in Section 3.5.1 Potential Future Industrial Developments provided are reasonable. It is also recognized that future industrial developments would require an ECA that considers the receptors at the proposed development. However, a review should be included with respect to any pending applications with the MECP for amendments or new activities within 1 km of the proposed development. EXP recommends a search of the Access Environment on-line database to confirm the status of pending applications and impact if any be provided.</p> <p>No assessment is provided regarding compatibility with current development proposals with the City of Pickering. EXP recommends that a review of Current Development Proposals within 1 km of the proposed development be included for completeness.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	<p>GHD conducted an updated review of Access Environment which removed some outdated ECAs/EASRs.</p> <p>GHD has included a review of the current development applications from the City of Pickering's website. 603-643, 645 and 699 Kingston Road, 755 Oklahoma Drive were reviewed to further evaluate potential for future developments in the area. GHD found that there were no developments planned within the Class II AOI. Also, all other developments outside the Class III RMSD and within the Class III AOI were Class II or lower (603-643, 645 and 699 Kingston Road, and 755 Oklahoma Drive).</p>
2.2.4	<p><u>4.1 Industrial Impacts</u>          In Section 4.1 the assessment concluded that further air quality assessment could be completed to confirm assumptions based on the lack of complaints. Given that the proposed development will include elevated receptors which could not be captured in a history of complaints nor in the ECA assessment of operations, EXP recommends that further air quality assessment be conducted for Web Offset Publications Limited and Trim Stamping Inc.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	<p>Web Offset Publications is no longer in business, and the thermal oxidizer for the facility has been removed.</p> <p>None of the remaining facilities have tall stacks and, as they are required to comply with concentration limits at their property lines, air quality impacts to the Development are not anticipated. Further detailed air quality assessment is not warranted.</p>
2.2.5	<p><u>4.2 Transportation Impacts</u>          Section 4.21 and 4.22 recognize the risk of transportation related air pollution (TRAP) and EXP agrees that there is risk to exposure to TRAP. While it is stated that TRAP policies are not in place at Pickering or Durham, it is considered a potential adverse effect that should be addressed at the proposed development. The proposed mitigation measures do not include</p>	<b>GHD</b>	<p>The updated Study includes discussion of TRAP mitigation. The outdoor amenity spaces are set back as far as possible from Whites Road, which is the closest significant source of TRAP emissions, and acoustic barriers are included between the outdoor amenities and the TRAP sources. The</p>



	measures for outdoor spaces. For example, selecting outdoor amenities away from roadways, placing outdoor amenities in locations with physical barriers from a TRAP source, and scheduling fresh air intake of HVAC units to avoid peak traffic volumes during rush hours. EXP recommends additional measures or details on the measures be provided. In addition, it is not clear why the recommendation to install carbon and/or dust filters is not carbon and dust filters and should be revised as such unless a rationale otherwise can be provided.		updated Study also recommends scheduling fresh air intake of HVAC units to avoid rush hours.
2.2.6	<u>4.3 Summary of Air Quality, Odour, and Dust Conclusions</u> GHD's conclusion that the facilities surrounding the Site serve as insignificant sources of dust, and odour emissions based on the lack of complaints is not valid for elevated receptors in the proposed development. EXP agrees with GHD's recommendations that further air quality assessment be completed to confirm this. GHD suggests that the mitigation measures with respect to TRAP detailed in section 4.2 are sufficient. EXP also recommends that additional measures be considered.	<b>GHD</b>	Please refer to GHD's response to 2.2.4. Additionally, the site visit GHD conducted on May 1, 2024, found that the odour emissions generated from the potentially odorous facilities were imperceptible at setback distances comparable to the nearest sensitive location of the Development. This provides further justification that these facilities are not a concern for odour impacts at the Development.
3	<u>Recommendations Air Quality, Odour, and Dust</u> EXP is in general agreement with the approach and conclusion that the proposed Development is feasible provided that the above recommendations are addressed and that the findings of the recommended additional assessment does not identify any air quality issues or land use conflicts. EXP recommends that the study be updated as noted in the above sections.	<b>GHD</b>	GHD has updated the study to include greater detail and supporting evidence to substantiate the Development's compliance and that no further assessment is necessary.
4	Peer Review Comments – Noise and Vibration Assessment		
4.1	<u>Sound and Vibration Criteria</u> Specific sound level limits for ventilation for road and rail traffic noise respectively are missing in Section 5.1.2. EXP however agrees with the recommendation for central air conditioning.  The paper written by VenDeldene al which is quoted in Section 5.1.3.2 for typical hourly traffic distribution should be provided in the list of reference in Section 8. In addition, the percentages for minimum hourly daytime vehicles of AADT for Whites Road and Bayly Street based on the traffic distribution in the paper by VenDelden et al are significantly higher than the percentages for other roads and Highway 401 in Table 5.4. It is possible that the hourly traffic distribution in the paper by VanDelden et al is not representative for the project area.	<b>GHD</b>	The text in Section 5.1.2 of the updated Study clarifies the thresholds for which central air conditioning is mandatory.  GHD reviewed the calculations of minimum hourly road traffic and corrected issues with some of the values for local / Regional roads in the updated Study. The traffic distribution in the paper by VanDelden et al provides a reasonable estimate of the road volumes on busier local roads during the quietest day and night hours. Nevertheless, GHD applied the distribution percentages from Granite Court to Whites Road and Bayly Street to estimate the minimum hour counts.



	<p>The height of POR for west façade and north façade for calculating the background sound level is 15 m above grade in Table 5.5. There are condo suites from the ground floor to the top floor. As stated in Section 5.1.3.2, the lowest background sound levels generally occur at the ground floor level. Explanation should be provided how the worst case scenario at 15 m above grade is determined.</p>		<p>A 3D comparison figure has been included in the updated Study to show the predicted stationary and background sound levels throughout the worst-case façades during nighttime for clarity.</p>
<p>4.2</p>	<p><u>Transportation Noise Impact Assessment</u>        It is stated in Section 5.2.2.1 that traffic volume data for Whites Road were obtained from the Durham open data website in the form of 2017 AADT. The traffic data including the corresponding segment of Whites Road should be provided in Appendix C, The Region's preference for Arterial Roads is that they use AADT data from the Planning Department. This data can be obtained by emailing <a href="mailto:noiserequests@durham.ca">noiserequests@durham.ca</a>. In addition, EXP has found discrepancy between the traffic data in the Durham open data website and the calculated future AADT for Whites Road in Table 5.7.</p> <p>VIA Rail data in Table 5.8 were obtained from a train schedule. However, not all routes that pass the project site have been included. In addition, the volume of passenger train provided in the CN Rail train data in Appendix C was excluded in Table 5.8. Passenger trains in CN Rail train data instead of number of trains in VIA train schedule should be used for noise calculation with 2.5% annual growth.</p> <p>There are errors for GO Rail data in Table 5.8. The table of future night-time trains with 1 locomotive should be 26. The number of future daytime trains with 2 locomotives should be 77.</p> <p>A breakdown of road traffic sound level and rail traffic should level should be provided in Table 5.9 in order to determine the noise control measures.        The Amenity Terrace on level 9, as shown in architectural drawings dated May 17, 2023, should be included as a noise receptor if it is considered a designated outdoor living area.</p> <p>The façades that require STC-43 glazing or STC-37 glazing should be described in the main text of the report under Section 5.24.1 or stated in Table 5.11.</p>	<p><b>GHD</b></p>	<p>GHD had contacted both Durham Region and the City of Pickering, and neither were able to provide data for Whites Road. Correspondence is included in Appendix C for reference. The typo in the Whites Road future AADT has been corrected in the updated Study.</p> <p>GHD updated the analysis such that passenger trains (VIA Rail) in the CN rail data were used as requested. The typos in Table 5.8 have also been corrected.</p> <p>Table 5.9 has been updated to indicate road and rail traffic levels separately and cumulatively. The current design referenced in the updated Study does not include an outdoor amenity space on Level 9.</p> <p>The minimum STC ratings for each facade are now indicated in Section 5.2.4.1 and in Table 5.10.</p>



	The recommended acoustic barrier shown in Figure 5.3 should be updated with the latest site plan. The outdoor amenity area at grade in the architectural drawing dated May 17, 2023 is not in rectangular shape as shown in drawings in Appendix A.		
4.3	<u>Noise Impact from the Development</u> The roof plan in the architectural drawings dated May 17, 2023 indicates that an emergency generator will be housed in the mechanical penthouse. If the emergency generator is installed indoor, an enclosure is not needed. Instead, a muffler for the generator combustion exhaust and silencers for cooling air openings should be recommended in Section 5.4.1.	GHD	The on-site noise control general guidance in the updated Study has been revised accordingly.
4.4	<u>Rail Vibration Impact Assessment</u> The location of vibration measurement for train pass-by should be provided in terms of perpendicular distance from the railway tracks or railway right-of-way in Section 5.5.1. In addition, verifying whether the measurement location represents the closest point of underground parking structure from the railway track can be determined whether it is the worst-case location.  The vibration measurements do not include any freight trains. Freight trains typically produce the highest vibration level among passenger trains and GO trains. However, if the vibration measurement location represents the worst-case location, freight train may not be a concern given the measured vibration levels are low for GO train and VIA trains.	GHD	Rail vibration monitoring in the context of this study is required to determine the perceptibility of vibration at the nearest sensitive point on a structure. Placing the vibration monitoring equipment at the limits of the underground parking will not accurately reflect the worst-case location for perceptibility in the sensitive spaces, and thus, the original location was maintained in the updated study.  GHD is of the opinion that, despite the absence of freight data, the vibration measurements provide an accurate indication that rail vibration is not a concern given the low levels experienced for the train movements captured.
4.5	<u>Noise and Vibration Conclusions and Recommendations</u> EXP agrees with the methodology and findings in the noise and vibration assessment in general. However, EXP recommends using the correct road traffic and train volume data. In addition, EXP recommends the noise control recommendations for road and train traffic noise to be updated with the calculation results.	GHD	GHD has updated all results and recommendations based on the correct road and rail data.

**2.0 Sustainability – August 11, 2023**

		Response From	Response
1.	We have no objection to the proposed applications and are pleased to see the applicant's integration of the ISDS metrics through the development proposal. Based on the information provided, the applicant has committed to pursuing ISDS Tier 1 and, in some instances, will		Noted



	aspire to achieve Tier 2 (voluntary) sustainable site and building design targets. This sustainable commitment aligns with the City's sustainability goals and objectives.		
2.	Staff encourage the applicant to consider the inclusion/integration of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ISDS Energy and Resilience Principle:</b> ER2 (Building Resilience) Performance Measure Tier 2 (Optional), which emphasizes emergency preparedness. For high-rise residential buildings greater than 12 storeys, provide a 72-hour minimum backup power system, preferably using a non-fossil fuel source, to ensure power is provided to the refuge area and to the ground floor or the first two floors as applicable to the building use, to supply power to building security systems, domestic water pumps, sump pumps, at least one elevator, boilers and hot water pumps to enable access and egress and essential building functions during a prolonged power outage.</li> </ul>		This measure will be considered at the site plan control stage.

**3.0 Canada Post – July 31, 2023**

		Response From	Response
1.	Canada Post has reviewed the proposal for the above noted Development Application and has determined that the completed project falls within our centralized mail multi-unit policy for the for a 12-storey residential condominium building.		Noted.
2.	The owner/developer of any commercial buildings will fall under Canada Post's multi-unit policy. The owner/developer will be required to provide the centralized mail facility (Lock Box Assembly) at their own expense (less than 100 units will require a front loading LBA and more than 100 units will require a rear loading LBA which will require a mail room) will be in effect for all buildings and complexes with a common lobby, common indoor or sheltered space. Section B of the Canada Post Delivery Standards manual provide full details regarding specifications.	<b>OSU</b>	A mail room has been indicated on the architectural drawings. Detailed design of this area, in compliance with Canada Post's multi-unit policy will be detailed during Site Plan Approval submission.
3.	The complete guide to Canada Post's Delivery Standards can be found at: <a href="https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf">https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf</a>		Noted.



**4.0 Elexicon Energy Inc. – July 4, 2023**

		Response From	Response
1.	Elexicon Energy Inc. has no objection to the proposed Site Plan Application to permit the development of a 12-storey residential condominium building, containing a total of 262 dwelling units on subject land.		Noted.
2.	The applicant or its authorized representative shall consult with Elexicon Energy Inc. concerning the availability of supply voltage, service location, metering, costs and any other details. These requirements are separate from and in addition to those of the ESA. Elexicon Energy Inc. will confirm the characteristics of the available electrical supply and will designate the location of the supply point to the applicant. Elexicon Energy Inc. will also identify the costs that the applicant will be responsible for.		An agent of the Owner shall contact Elexicon during the detailed design stage of development
3.	The applicant or its authorized representative shall apply for new or upgraded electric services and temporary power service in writing. The applicant is required to provide Elexicon Energy Inc. with sufficient lead-time in order to ensure: a) The timely provision of supply to new and upgraded premises; and/or b) The availability of adequate capacity for additional loads to be connected in the existing premises		An agent of the Owner shall contact Elexicon during the detailed design stage of development
4.	Please ensure that Elexicon’s approved standards and clearances are followed, for all structures, equipment, and people.		Noted.

**5.0 Metrolinx – August 28, 2023**

		Response From	Response
1	As per Metrolinx’s Adjacent Development guidelines for GO rail corridors, sensitive uses (such as residential) require both a 30-meter setback from the mutual property line and the nearest sensitive use, along with a safety barrier. Metrolinx is in receipt of the architectural drawings and the derailment protection report which shows that a 30M setback and a natural berm is provided as a rail safety barrier which will be reviewed and commented upon by our technical advisor AECOM.		Noted.



2	Please note that the safety barrier shall not impact the existing drainage pattern onto Metrolinx property. No additional drainage shall be directed towards Metrolinx lands.	<b>MAENG</b>	Acknowledged
3	Metrolinx is in receipt of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by Mason song Associates Engineering Ltd. Dated May 2023. I note that, storm drainage will be collected on-site and discharged into the existing 450 CMP located on the southwest of the site off Granite Court. Prior to site plan approval, the final Site Grading and Drainage Plan and the Functional Servicing Report shall be submitted for review and to the satisfaction of Metrolinx and our technical advisor (AECOM). I note that this plan is currently being reviewed by AECOM and additional comments will be forthcoming. Any proposed alterations to the existing drainage pattern affecting Metrolinx property must receive prior concurrence from Metrolinx.	<b>MAENG</b>	Acknowledged
4	Metrolinx is in receipt of the Noise and Vibration (Land Use Compatibility) Study conducted by GHD dated April 27, 2023. I note that table 5.8 of the report indicates the rail traffic data obtained from Metrolinx, however I note that the night and day train count as well as the train speed shown on the table is incorrect. Submit a revised report correctly incorporating Metrolinx rail data as appended in the report. Prior to site plan approval, the proponent shall submit a final noise study for review and to the satisfaction of Metrolinx.		Refer to updated Land Use Compatibility Study enclosed.
5	I am in receipt of the Landscape Plan prepared by MHBC Planning and dated March 2023. Please include a 3.5 metre vegetation setback, to be measured from the Metrolinx property line on the drawings, as this setback has been established in association with Metrolinx's GO Expansion Program. Limited types of vegetation are allowed within this section such as low rise shrubs and/or decorative grasses.	<b>MHBC</b>	A 3.5m vegetation setback from the Metrolinx property has been added and will be confirmed and considered low-rise shrubs/ or decorative grasses vegetation at SPA submission. Please refer to L-1.
6	Metrolinx notes the Derailment Protection Report includes a statement about the installation of a 2.43-meter-high security fence along the entire property line. However, the high security fence shall be included within the final landscape/site plan, subject to Metrolinx review and approval.	<b>MHBC</b>  <b>OSU</b>	A 2.43 m high security has been added along the property line. Please refer to L-1.  Noted
7	Prior to Site Plan Approval Owner shall enter into an Adjacent Development Agreement with Metrolinx stipulating how applicable concerns will be addressed. The agreement will include an environmental easement for operational emissions.		Acknowledged.
8	Please note that any construction activity (shoring, tie-backs, crane swing) within or immediately adjacent to (within 30 ft) Metrolinx's rail corridor must be coordinated with our		Acknowledged.



	Technical Advisor (AECOM). Permits and flagging may be required depending on the nature of the proposed work.		
9	In addition to the technical review, it should be noted that various Metrolinx permits/approvals/agreements with associated fees may be required for implementation/construction. For example, this includes, but not limited to, private property when works are proposed within 30ft of an active rail. As such, these permits/approvals/agreements with their required fees and processing timelines in advance of proposed work, should be factored into your construction cost and schedule accordingly. More detail can be provided as the application and details progress		Acknowledged.
10	If entry into rail corridor either airspace or subterranean is determined to be unavoidable, the proponent must enter into a crane swing and/or tieback agreement with Metrolinx. Our Technical Advisor will need to review your construction methodology plan (once available) to determine if such agreements are needed. Further, please note that appropriate permits will be required for any works occurring within or immediately adjacent to the rail corridor (to be administered through AECOM).		Acknowledged.
11	Prior to site plan approval, Metrolinx shall have confirmation that the following Warning Clause will be inserted in all development agreements, offers to purchase and agreements of Purchase and Sale or Lease of each dwelling unit within 300 metres of the railway right-of-way. <i>Warning:</i> <i>“Metrolinx and its assigns and successors in interest has or have a right-of-way within 300 metres from the land the subject hereof. There may be alterations to or expansions of the rail facilities on such right-of-way in the future including the possibility that Metrolinx or any railway entering into an agreement with Metrolinx to use the right-of-way or their assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand their operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwelling(s). Metrolinx will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under the aforesaid right-of-way.”</i>		Acknowledged.
12	The Owner shall be responsible for all costs for the preparation and registration of agreements/undertakings/easements/warning clauses as determined appropriate by		Acknowledged.





	Metrolinx, to the satisfaction of Metrolinx. They shall also consider the timelines required to advance such agreements and reviews in their schedule accordingly.		
--	--	--	--

**6.0 City Engineering – November 6, 2023**

		Response From	Response
<b>General Comments</b>			
1	As per the Development Services User Fee Schedule, please provide payment in the amount of \$7,800.00 for the review of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSSR).		Payment will be provided.
2	Confirm all proposed construction works, including restoration requirements, within the Whites Road right-of-way are to the satisfaction of the Region of Durham.	<b>MAENG</b>	Construction and restoration notes are indicted on plans SS-1 & GR-1.
3	Long-term permanent discharge of foundation drainage containing groundwater shall not be permitted to discharge to the storm sewer system. The proponent, in consultation with their engineers, shall construct and maintain a completely water-tight below grade structure which is resistant to hydrostatic pressure.	<b>MAENG</b>	The long-term groundwater flow rate is very low (0.026 L/s) and below the EASR limit of 50,000 L/s; therefore, the long-term groundwater is proposed to discharge into the sanitary sewer. A discharge permit from the Region will be required.
4	Short-term groundwater discharge, as part of the ESC works, exceeds the limits for storm sewer discharge as per Groundwater Quality Assessment which is not acceptable. The proponent shall explore temporary dewatering to manufactured dewatering tanks operated by a certified company.	<b>MAENG</b>	The selection and design of the temporary dewatering system will be prepared by a dewatering contractor. At the time of construction and prior to the discharge of groundwater, the dewatering contractor will need to ensure all appropriate approvals are met.
5	A transition from the proposed sidewalk on Whites Road to connect to the existing sidewalk will be required with the detailed design.	<b>MAENG</b> <b>OSU</b>	See Grading Plan (GR-1) for the proposed sidewalk transition to the existing on White's Road Refer to response below.
6	Show the removal of existing sidewalk, guard rail and their limits on the plan. Proof that confirms shortening the guardrail will not cause any safety concerns for vehicular traffic will be required for review.	<b>GHD</b>	The removal of the existing guide rail has been shown on the site plan and will be replaced with a new crash attenuator system at the parapet wall. The grade of the subject site will be raised to match the grade at Granite Court which will eliminate the need for the same length of guide rail as is currently provided. The sightline assessment completed in Figure 16 of the revised Traffic Impact Study confirms that the new guide rail will not impact sightlines from the site access.



7	A 1.8 metre wide concrete sidewalk adjacent to the site on the north side of Granite Court up to the bridge will be required to be installed with this development.	OSU	In response to the comment requesting a 1.8m wide sidewalk along Granite Court and Whites Road, these have been updated on the latest drawings. Refer to architectural drawings A-040 and A-102. The transition along Granite Road to the existing sidewalk has also been modified as per City comments to make it more gradual.
8	A 1.8 metre wide concrete sidewalk adjacent to the site on the west side of Whites Road up to the existing sidewalk at Whites Road and Bayly Street intersection will be required to be installed with this development. Show how the proposed sidewalk will tie into the existing sidewalk on Whites Road.	OSU	
<b>Site Plan</b>			
9	We have reviewed the plan and have no comments		Acknowledged.
<b>Site Grading Plan</b>			
10	We have reviewed the plan and have no comments		Acknowledged.
<b>Site Servicing Plan</b>			
11	We have reviewed the plan and have no comments		Acknowledged.
<b>Detail Plan</b>			
12	We have reviewed the plan and have no comments		Acknowledged.
<b>Sediment Control Plan and Details</b>			
13	We have reviewed the plan and have no comments		Acknowledged.
<b>Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report</b>			
14	The report is to be sealed and signed as per PEO guidelines.	MAENG	Report is sealed and signed
15	Ensure the current owner's contact information is provided in the report.	MAENG	Acknowledged.
<b>Conceptual Landscape Plan</b>			
16	We have reviewed the Conceptual Landscape Plans and have no comments. Refer to Landscape & Parks Development Comments below for additional comments.		Acknowledged.
<b>Traffic Impact Studies</b>			
17	We have reviewed the Traffic Impact Study and have no comments. Refer to Traffic Comments below for additional comments.		Acknowledged.
<b>Land Use Compatibility Study</b>			
18	As per the recommendation of the report, this study is preliminary and subject to change depending on actual window-to-floor area ratios and should be updated at the detailed design stage. Ensure all requirements are implemented at the detailed design/site plan application.		Noted.



<b>Geotechnical Investigation</b>			
19	The report is to be sealed and signed as per PEO guidelines.		Refer to sealed report enclosed.
<b>Hydrogeological Investigation</b>			
20	Hydrogeological Investigation is to include a section on long term ground settlement.		Refer to updated Hydrogeological Assessment and Review of Potential Ground Settlement letter enclosed.
<b>Phase One and Two Environmental Site Assessment</b>			
21	We have reviewed the Phase One and Phase Two Environmental Site Assessments and have no comments.		Acknowledged.
<b>Stage One and Two Archaeological Assessment</b>			
22	We have reviewed the Stage One and Stage Two Archaeological Assessments and have no comments.		Acknowledged.
<b>Water Resources Comments</b>			
1	The quantity control criteria tributary to the south has not been sufficiently addressed. The allowable flows from the post-development "Controlled Area" catchment have been underestimated. The allowable flows shall be based on the 0.8036 ha "South" pre-development catchment area at a 2-year return period. Revise the design accordingly.	<b>MAENG</b>	Quantity control revised to the 2-yr pre development
2	The storage volume required for the "Controlled Area" has been underestimated. Firstly, update the allowable release rate as per the comment above and secondly, apply a runoff coefficient adjustment factor of 1.25 for the 100-year event in accordance with Section 6.3.2 of City's SWM Design Guidelines. Revise the design accordingly.	<b>MAENG</b>	Runoff coefficient updated with factor of 1.25
3	The proposed storm service connection shall be revised to 2% min. slope and diameter reduced to match the allowable release rate. Oversized service connections are not permitted; revise the design accordingly.	<b>MAENG</b>	Revised to 2% min. slope and sized to meet the allowable release rate
4	It is unclear how the allowable flows are met as there is no orifice control proposed which is not acceptable. It is not sufficient to simply propose a pumping system rated/limited to the allowable flowrate designed by the mechanical engineer. Provide an orifice control upstream of the control manhole.	<b>MAENG</b>	Control MH1 to MH2 (200mm diameter storm sewer @ 1.75%) is sized to match the allowable release rate of 43.3 L/s.
5	Provide a detailed breakdown of the composite imperviousness and/or runoff coefficient for the "Controlled Area" and "Uncontrolled Area #1" post-development catchments.	<b>MAENG</b>	See updated Figure 03
6	The runoff coefficient for the "Uncontrolled Area #1" has been underestimated and must be revised based on impervious and semi-pervious surfaces.	<b>MAENG</b>	See updated Figure 03



7	The quantity control criteria tributary to the north has not been sufficiently addressed. Analyze the post- to pre-development flows discharging to the north by comparing the flows from “Uncontrolled Area #1” to the 0.3373ha “North” pre-development catchment. Post-development flows must not exceed pre-development levels.	<b>MAENG</b>	See Section 6.2 of the FSR for analyze of pre and post from the north area
8	The quality control not been addressed as OGS units shall only be credited for up to 50% TSS removal. Furthermore, quality control must be provided for “Uncontrolled Area #1” and the proponent is encouraged to use surface type LID features such as a bioswale prior to discharging north and west to the Metrolinx lands.	<b>MAENG</b>	A combination of OGS and infiltration are implemented to meet the 80% TSS removal rates
9	Include the ISO14034 ETV certification for the proposed OGS or filter unit.	<b>MAENG</b>	Attached in Appendix C
10	Update the OGS sizing calculation to use the ETV particle size distribution.	<b>MAENG</b>	See OGS sizing report in Appendix C
11	The erosion control criteria has not been sufficiently addressed as 5mm from every storm event is not being retained onsite with the proposed irrigation system. The proponent shall explore infiltration type LID features, in addition to the irrigation system, as it is feasible to implement an infiltration trench or similar measure in the southwest portion of the site.	<b>MAENG</b>	The 5mm water balance target is achieved with a combination of water re-use and the proposed infiltration trench.
12	The grading at the northwest limit and corner of the site, adjacent to the proposed berm, proposes significant grade raises and filling of the existing ditch, where the Whites Road CBs outlet, which is not acceptable. Clarify grading in the area and provide cross-sections for reference. Sloping to match into existing grades must also be shown.	<b>MAENG</b>	See the updated Grading Plan
13	The existing Granite Court DCB, on the north side, must be replaced with DCBMH structure to accommodate site’s storm service connection.	<b>MAENG</b>	See the updated Grading Plan
14	Provide a detailed cross-section from the Granite Court outfall up to and including the underground storage tanks.	<b>MAENG</b>	See Detail Plan
<b>Considerations for Detailed Design</b>			
15	Comment responses must be provided to the following comments at the first detailed design submission in support of Site Plan Approval.	<b>MAENG</b>	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
16	Confirm that there is sufficient inlet capacity to capture the 100-year flows on-site, assuming 50% blockage of all inlets. Please provide applicable details/calculations.	<b>MAENG</b>	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
17	Delineate the maximum ponding areas, associated with the 100-year capture, on the Site Grading Plan.	<b>MAENG</b>	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
18	Provide specifications/details for all inlets on the plans.	<b>MAENG</b>	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA



19	Dimension the underground storage tanks in plan and section view in order to confirm actual provided storage volumes. Furthermore, 100-year HWLs and pump details must be shown on the drawings.	MAENG	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
20	Grades along the proposed berm must be shown on the Grading Plan.	MAENG	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
21	Based on the allowable release rate, the proposed storm sewers downstream of the storage tank are oversized which is not acceptable. Review and revise.	MAENG	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
22	LIDs shall be designed in accordance with the LID SWM Planning and Design Guide (CVC/TRCA, 2010).	MAENG	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
23	Provide the following notes on the Site Servicing Plan: a. This plan has been approved for the installation of a (insert oil-grit separator/filtration treatment unit manufacturer name and model number) stormwater treatment unit as per the Engineer of Record's design. The oil grit separator/filtration treatment unit specified by the Engineer of Record in the stormwater management report and on the approved site plan drawings cannot be substituted for a different model. b. The Owner shall provide the City of Pickering certification of the (insert oil-grit separator/filtration treatment unit manufacturer name and model number) from the manufacturer upon installation. c. The manufacturer shall provide an operation and maintenance manual to the Owner and to City of Pickering. The Owner is to maintain the unit as per the manual and shall provide the City of Pickering with annual cleaning certificates.	MAENG	Acknowledged, will be provided at SPA
<b>Capital Projects – General</b>			
1	The proposed sidewalk transition along the east side of Granite Court into the bridge is too tight. Revise the location of the sidewalk transition to somewhere approximately 14m from the southwest site corner on Granite Road.	OSU	The transition along Granite Road to the existing sidewalk has also been modified as per City comments to make it more gradual.
<b>Capital Projects – Traffic</b>			
2	Confirm if a dedicated right turn lane is required on Granite Court for the proposed development.	GHD	Based on the projected site generated traffic volumes, a dedicated right-turn lane has not been recommended on Granite Court to accommodate the proposed development.
3	Traffic Report Section 3.2 – As per the Region of Durham Cycling Plan 2021, an in boulevard multi-use-path will be constructed in the future. Update the report as required.	GHD	Noted. Report has been updated to mention the MUP.



4	Traffic Report Table 5 – The table shows some of the existing 95th% queues are less than the future total traffic queues. Confirm if the existing SBL 95th% queue is 90 m while SBL queue for 2027 and 2032 is 20 m.	GHD	The signal timings were optimized to mitigate delays, resulting in the reduction in the southbound left-turn movement identified by City staff. It should be noted that this analysis has been superseded by the proposed signal changes to the Whites Road and Granite Court intersection which introduces a split signal phase and dual eastbound left turn lanes from Granite Court to Whites Road to improve overall intersection capacity and reduce queueing and delays on the eastbound approach on Granite Court.
5	A proposed pavement markings and signage plan is required at the site plan stage.	GHD	A pavement marking and signage plan will be prepared at the site plan stage.
<b>Landscape and Parks Development</b>			
1	The Arborist Report indicates all existing (11) trees to be removed, however, it notes that only 4 trees will be required for compensation. Compensation shall be provided at the rates indicated in the City’s Tree Removal Compensation Policy. The Arborist Report also provides instructions for tree protection measures and the concept landscape plans indicate tree protection fencing around several trees. Please confirm what the intent for the tree preservation/protection are for this application.	MHBC	The landscape plan has been coordinated with the latest Arborist materials.
2	The proposed design and function of the Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS), whose main feature is outdoor seating/dining, does not seem feasible at this location, considering that it is located on a busy street corner and outside of private residential units. If the ground floor units facing this space were commercial use that included eating establishments, this treatment may be more feasible. Although the decorative unit paving, raised planters and trees that are proposed at the south side of the building are nice landscape/architectural features as a corner treatment, we question its functionality as POPS without associated uses to attract people to gather in this space. Granite Court is the gateway into an industrial area and there is a significant amount of truck traffic during regular business hours, making this location less desirable to sit and gather. Perhaps some of this table seating could be located in the private amenity space north of the building.	MHBC	The proposed POPS space has been removed and replaced with more passive landscaping.



**7.0 CS Viamonde – June 29, 2023 (by email)**

		Response From	Response
1	No comment on this application		Acknowledged

**8.0 DDSB – October 5, 2023**

		Response From	Response
1	Staff have reviewed the above referenced application and under the mandate of the Durham District School Board, staff have no objection. Based on the proposed unit breakdown submitted, the anticipated elementary student yield from the development is expected to be between approximately 53 students. Students generated from this development should attend existing neighbourhood schools.		Acknowledged

**9.0 Durham Region Transit – July 4, 2023**

		Response From	Response
1	The above noted applications were reviewed from a transit perspective, and Durham Region Transit has no comments.		Acknowledged

**10.0 Enbridge – July 11, 2023**

		Response From	Response
1	Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions.		Acknowledged

**11.0 MTO – October 6, 2023 (by email)**

		Response From	Response
1	The MTO has no concerns in principle with the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By Lay Amendment. Site specific review/comments will be done at the pre-consultation/site plan application stages.		Acknowledged



**12.0 Durham Regional Police – June 29, 2023 (by email)**

		Response From	Response
1	Fortunately, in this case, I can say that construction in the outlined area ( please confirm if you can this is the correct location on the attached .jpg file ) will pose no immediate obstruction issue for the Region’s NextGen radio system and associated microwave links.		Noted.
2	In addition to the microwave path obstruction noted above INTERNAL in-building radio coverage for First Responders MAY be an issue in the future if larger buildings are constructed in the outlined area. Larger and newly constructed buildings will have to be tested for in-building coverage once the buildings are completed.		Noted.

**13.0 Fire Services – November 9, 2023 (by email)**

		Response From	Response
1	We request that they re-design the fire route. Currently it is located on Whites rd, which puts fire fighters in danger as they are responding to a fire from a live lane of traffic on a busy road. They should look at an internal fire route that complies with the Ontario Building Code that is not dead ended so that it provides access/exit for multiple fire and other emergency vehicles.	OSU	A fire route has been added internally to the site as an alternate to the fire route on Whites Road. Refer to drawing A-040 which outlines the fire route dimensions and proximity to the relocated Fire Department Connection. A new fire hydrant is being proposed internal to the site so that it is within 45m of the Fire Department Connection.
2	the fire department connection is required to be within 45m of a fire hydrant	OSU MAENG	A fire hydrant is provided within 45m of the Siamese connection

**14.0 City Planning – December 8, 2023**

		Response From	Response
<b>Affordable Housing</b>			
1	... The provision of affordable housing within the City is a key Council priority. At the Statutory Public meeting, members of the Planning & Development Committee expressed concerns related to this matter and requested that the applicant explore opportunities to provide affordable units within the development. To have regard for Official Plan Policy 6.4, and to address the concerns raised by the Planning & Development Committee, staff request the applicant strongly explore opportunities to provide affordable housing units within the development.	GG	The proposed apartment dwellings provide much needed variety to the existing housing options within the community, and will also provide additional supply to a constrained area. This dwelling type can be considered more attainable and intrinsically affordable than other forms of ground related housing.





<b>Building Height</b>		
2	<p>During the processing of this application, and at the open house and statutory public meetings, area residents have consistently expressed concerns with the proposed building height. Their key concerns include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the potential overlook issues and shadowing issues that may occur as a result of the height of the proposed building;</li> <li>• the proposed building will stand out visually in a neighbourhood that is composed primarily of detached and semi-detached dwellings; and</li> <li>• the height and massing of the proposed building are not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSU/GG</b></p> <p>In light of concerns from the area residents, the building height has been reduced to 10 storeys along Whites Road and 7 storeys along Granite Court to help minimize any potential concerns of the overlook and shadowing. Additional renderings have been prepared to clarify the view of the proposed development from surrounding neighbourhood rear yards.</p> <p>The shadow study has been updated to reflect the new building heights and demonstrates the further reduction of the already minimal impact that the proposed development would have on existing low-rise dwellings.</p> <p>It is notable that the City Official Plan would otherwise permit a variety of built forms within the applicable land use designation on the property. No amendments are sought with respect to the height provisions of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Additionally, the reduced height is well below a 45-degree angular Plane, a generally accepted urban design standard for transition between areas of differing intensity. Combined with the intervening roadways, it is our belief that the proposed height is appropriate, and that perceived privacy and overlook issues have been mitigated.</p> <p>Refer also to the Urban Design Brief Addendum prepared by MHBC.</p>
<b>Shadow Impact on Parks and Outdoor Spaces</b>		
3	<p>New development should be designed, located, and massed in such a way that it limits any shadowing on the public realm, parks, and public spaces, to achieve adequate sunlight and comfort in the public realm through all four seasons.</p> <p>On the subject lands and within the surrounding area, the following existing and proposed outdoor spaces may be affected by shadowing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• public sidewalks, particularly along Whites Road, Granite Court, and Oklahoma Drive;</li> </ul>	<p><b>OSU</b></p> <p>The proposed development does not cast shadows along the public sidewalks on Granite Court as they are all south of the proposed building. Shadows along Whites Road do not occur until late afternoon during the studied times. Minimal shadows occur on the public sidewalks along Oklahoma Drive towards the end of the studied days.</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• outdoor amenity space that serves Fairport Beach Public School, at the corner of Eyer Drive and Oklahoma Drive;</li> <li>• Bidwell Tot Lot, located north of Fairport Beach Public School, off of Eyer Drive;</li> <li>• private outdoor amenity space located on the 8th floor of the proposed building; and</li> <li>• outdoor amenity spaces located on the subject property at-grade, including private amenity space to the north of the proposed building, privately-owned-public-space (POPS) to the south of the building, and an open field located to the west of the building.</li> </ul>		<p>The shadow study has been updated to include Fairport Beach Public School and the Bidwell Tot Lot to ensure they are included in the shadow study impact assessment. The proposed development does not contribute to any shadow impact on these two areas.</p> <p>The private outdoor amenity space on the 8th floor roof has been removed as a result of wind concerns. The city comment pertaining to the shadows in this area are no longer relevant.</p> <p>The orientation of the proposed development has minimal impact on the private amenities located on the North end of the property as well as the open field West of the building. Further, the POPS space to the South of the building has been removed and no amenity space is provided in that location. Refer to the updated shadow studies included in the resubmission package.</p> <p>Refer also to the Urban Design Brief Addendum prepared by MHBC.</p>
<p><b>Staff's Comments on Building Height</b></p>			
<p>4</p>	<p>Staff appreciate that, through the design of the proposed building, the applicant has had regard for potential shadowing impacts on adjacent properties and public spaces. That said, the West Shore neighbourhood, and more specifically the immediately surrounding built form, is made up of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings that do not exceed 2-storeys in height. A 12-storey building is a significant deviation from the existing built form within the neighbourhood. It is therefore important that the building is designed to ensure an appropriate transition is provided between the existing low-density built form and the proposed mid-rise building. Staff require the applicant to consider reducing the height of the proposed building from 12-storeys, which will further reduce any shadowing or overlook impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood</p>	<p><b>OSU/GG</b></p>	<p>In light of concerns from the area residents, and based on consultation with Planning Staff, the building height has been reduced to 10 storeys along Whites Road and 7 storeys along Granite Court to help minimize any potential concerns of the overlook and shadowing.</p> <p>The proposed development provides a step back after the first 4 storeys to create a distinct podium and to mitigate the perception of the overall building height at the pedestrian level.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>Additionally, the City of Toronto has developed Performance Standards For Mid-Rise Buildings, to address the position, scale, and massing of proposed development in relation to the surrounding neighbourhood and streetscape. Staff encourage the applicant to</p>		<p>The surrounding sidewalks all achieve a minimum of 5 hours of consecutive sunlight from March to September. Please see the updated shadow studies.</p>



	<p>consider these performance standards for the design of the proposed building, which include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• providing step backs on buildings taller than 23 metres, to mitigate the perception of height at the pedestrian level and to create buildings that are of a comfortable scale for pedestrians;</li> <li>• ensuring that the building envelope allows for at least 5 hours of consecutive sunlight onto surrounding sidewalks, from March to September;</li> <li>• ensuring buildings provide the highest level of urban design treatment to create beautiful, safe, and accessible pedestrian environments, and great places to shop, work, and live;</li> <li>• ensuring balconies on street-facing façades do not negatively impact the public realm, and are contained within all angular planes; and</li> <li>• ensuring that mechanical penthouses do not penetrate any angular planes.</li> </ul>		<p>The pedestrian level of the building is well articulated with appropriate massing and materials that are compatible with pedestrian interaction. Brick, metal and glass are used to tie the materials into the neighbouring context. Entrances to suites on the ground level face the streets with connecting pathways to the public street, providing active uses at the street level. Landscaping, pedestrian paths are all integrated to reinforce the public/private interface of the building at the ground level.</p> <p>Commercial uses can be found on the ground floor, which further reinforces the City’s goal for creating places where people can shop, work, and live.</p> <p>All balconies located in the first 4 stories have been inset which provides an active façade while not causing problems of overlook and privacy concerns. All projecting balconies above are within the angular plane.</p> <p>The mechanical penthouse does not penetrate the angular planes. It is also architecturally integrated into the building massing.</p> <p>Additional renderings have been prepared to clarify the view of the proposed development from surrounding neighbourhood rear yards on drawing A-037.</p> <p>Refer also to the Urban Design Brief Addendum prepared by MHBC.</p>
6			
	<p>To address concerns related to overlook, staff request the applicant to provide renderings of the proposed building, from the perspective of a pedestrian standing on the south side of Granite Court and the east side of Whites Road, as well as from the perspective of a pedestrian standing in the rear yard of a residential lot located along Gallant Court, Abingdon Court, and Hampton Court (<b>see examples in Letter</b>).</p>		
<b>Traffic and Safety</b>			
7	<p>During the processing of this application, and at the open house and statutory public meetings, area residents, businesses, and members of the Planning &amp; Development Committee expressed concerns with the existing traffic in the area, and the increased traffic that will result from this proposed development. Their key concerns related to existing and future traffic include, but are not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) concerned about increased traffic on neighbouring streets, Highway 401 ramps, and public parks, in a neighbourhood that is already congested during rush hour and summer months;</li> </ol>	GHD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The traffic impact study confirmed that the proposed development will generate a manageable amount of traffic, with 76 new two-way trips during the weekday a.m. peak hour and 91 trips during the p.m. peak hour. The study concluded that under existing, future background, and future total conditions, all intersections, including those providing access to Highway 401, will operate within acceptable capacity.</li> </ol>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) concerned about the lack of proposed road improvements for Whites Road and Granite Court to accommodate increased traffic, such as road widenings and additional traffic lanes;</li> <li>c) concerned about the number of large trucks that travel along Whites Road and Granite Court, to access Highway 401, and how the proposed development may impact this;</li> <li>d) concerned about the ability of residents to exit the West Shore and Rosebank neighbourhoods during an emergency, or the ability for emergency services to access these neighbourhoods, considering that there are only two existing roads that provide access to and from the neighbourhoods;</li> <li>e) concerned for the number of children who use the signalized intersections to walk to and from school, and how additional traffic on the road will be dangerous for pedestrians; and</li> <li>f) concerned with the safety of the proposed vehicular access from Granite Court, as this road is already congested and is frequently travelled on by large trucks.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b) According to the traffic impact study, the capacity analysis at key intersections, including Whites Road and Granite Court/Oklahoma Drive, show that all intersections will operate within capacity through 2037, even with background growth and site-generated traffic. No additional road widenings or traffic lane additions were recommended to accommodate traffic from the development, only changes to the signal timing plan for the intersection of Whites Road and Granite Court.</li> <li>c) The study acknowledges the presence of large trucks on these roads, however, the traffic analysis shows that all study intersections, including those frequently used by trucks, will operate within capacity even with the additional traffic from the proposed development.</li> <li>d) The assessment and review of emergency access for residents of West Shore and Roseback neighbourhoods is outside of the scope of this Traffic Study. However, traffic operations, even with the new development, will remain manageable during peak periods. As a result, emergency access should not be significantly impacted. For more specific concerns related to emergency planning, the City's Community Emergency Management Plans should be consulted.</li> <li>e) The report highlights existing pedestrian infrastructure, including sidewalks and signalized pedestrian crossings at key intersections. Signalized crossings at Whites Road and Bayly Street, and at Whites Road and Granite Court/Oklahoma Drive, ensure safe pedestrian access. The site access from Granite Court has been assessed and meets the city's requirements for sightlines, design and capacity. Despite existing traffic volumes and truck traffic, the traffic study shows that the access proposed site access will operate safely and with manageable delays.</li> <li>f) The study includes a detailed sightline and turning movement analysis for the proposed driveway onto Granite Court. It concludes</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---



			that the design meets the city's requirements for safe vehicle access, even considering the existing truck traffic on Granite Court.
8	Please note, to appropriately address concerns related to traffic and safety, City Development staff have requested that both the Regional Works Department and the City's Engineering Department further assess the submitted Traffic Impact Study, and determine if road improvements to the existing road network (including traffic calming measures, improvements to signal timings, potential taper lanes, etc.) are required, to alleviate congestion and address the concerns expressed by area residents and businesses.		Noted.
<b>Whites Road – Regional Road Works</b>			
9	<p>The property is subject to an "(H)" Holding Symbol, which was enacted in 2004, as a result of the previously approved Zoning By-law Amendment (A 06/03(R)). A major issue that was identified during the review of that application was the existing traffic congestion on Whites Road and related intersections. As such, a hold was placed on the property, which prohibited any development on the site from occurring, until certain road improvements were initiated by the Region of Durham, to reduce existing congestion, and accommodate new traffic generated by the proposed development.</p> <p>The "(H)" Holding Symbol requires the following conditions to be satisfied by the Owner before the holding symbol can be lifted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide proof to the City that the road works for Whites Road and Granite Court that abut the subject property, including road widening and reconstruction, have been initiated by the Region of Durham; and</li> <li>• enter into an appropriate agreement with the City, and receive site plan approval, to address matters such as site function (access/egress, traffic aisles, parking locations), site improvements (landscaping, paved surfaces, road improvements), and building placement.</li> <li>• In accordance with the condition of the "(H)" Holding Symbol, please provide documentation to the City that the road works that abut the subject property have been completed by the Region.</li> </ul>		<p>It is anticipated that the 'H' provision will be addressed through processing of Zoning By-law Amendment. It is noted that a full TIS has been provided including review of traffic operations along Whites Road. To date, no requests for widening along Whites Road have been received from the Region. On this basis, the need for a further 'H' provision may be limited.</p> <p>The need for Site Plan Control approval is acknowledged.</p>
<b>Commercial and Office Space</b>			
10	The "Mixed Use Areas" designation within the Pickering Official Plan is intended to	<b>OSU/GG</b>	A retail space has been added at grade along Whites Road. It is proposed that this space be eligible to convert to a residential unit should a tenant not



	<p>accommodate the widest variety of uses in the City. In establishing performance standards for “Mixed Use Areas”, particular regard shall be had for encouraging development in an integrated manner, for a wide variety of uses and purposes. Further, the “Local Nodes” designation permits residential uses, retailing of goods and services that serve the needs of the surrounding neighbourhood, offices, restaurants, community, cultural and recreational uses, community gardens, and farmers’ markets.          Staff encourage the applicant to explore opportunities to provide a greater mix of uses within the proposed development. Uses that may serve the needs of the surrounding neighbourhood, such as a daycare or cafe, are encouraged.</p>		<p>be found within a reasonable timeframe, subject to commercially reasonable efforts to lease or sell the space.</p>
<p><b>Privately-Owned-Public Space (POPS)</b></p>			
11	<p>As noted in the comments received from Landscape &amp; Parks Development, the location of the proposed POPS may not be feasible, considering that Granite Court is a gateway into an industrial area and that there is a high volume of large trucks travelling through the Whites Road and Granite Court intersection. Staff request the applicant relocate the proposed POPS, or consider allocating this outdoor space to provide more amenities on the north side of the building. That said, staff request that enhanced landscaping be provided at the corner and along the street edges, to provide privacy and a buffer for the residential units on the ground floor.</p>	<p><b>OSU</b>  <b>MHBC</b></p>	<p>The proposed POPS has been removed from the design. A revised landscape plan and enlarged private patios have been incorporated into the corner of Whites Road and Granite Court in its place to keep sightlines clear for turning trucks. Refer to the landscape drawings along with drawing A-040 and A-102.  The proposed POPS has been removed from the design. A revised landscape plan and enlarged private patios have been incorporated into the corner of Whites Road and Granite Court in its place to keep sightlines clear for turning trucks.  Refer also to the Urban Design Brief Addendum prepared by MHBC.</p>
<p><b>Indoor Amenity Space</b></p>			
12	<p>Within the proposed development, the applicant is proposing to provide 1,009 square metres of private outdoor amenity space (at a ratio of 3.85 square metres per dwelling unit), and 499 square metres of indoor amenity space (at a ratio of 1.9 square metres per unit).  Staff appreciate the amount of outdoor amenity space proposed within the development, and are satisfied that this will sufficiently serve the needs of future residents. Staff request the applicant increase the amount of indoor amenity space within the building, to comply with the City’s standards (minimum 2.0 square metres of indoor amenity space per dwelling</p>	<p><b>OSU</b></p>	<p>We have added indoor amenity area on level 2 which allows the development to achieve the minimum 2.0m<sup>2</sup>/unit in compliance with the City’s standards. Refer to our statistics chart on drawing A-020 for the full breakdown of indoor and outdoor amenity areas.</p>



	unit, as required by the City Centre Zoning By-law and the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law), to ensure sufficient indoor amenity space is provided for future residents, especially during the winter months.		
<b>Land Use Compatibility</b>			
13	As the applicant is aware, the Region is requesting the submitted Land Use Compatibility Study be peer reviewed. The Region has provided a Terms of Reference to the applicant, for their review and approval. City staff will conclude our position on the Land Use Compatibility Study once a full peer review of the study has been completed.		Noted.
<b>Draft Zoning By-law</b>			
14	In the submitted Draft Zoning By-law, the applicant is proposing a minimum drive aisle width of 6.0 metres. It is staff's understanding that, to safely accommodate fire vehicles, the City's minimum requirement for a drive aisle is 6.5 metres, for two-way traffic. Please consult with the City's Engineering Services and Fire Services Departments about this matter.	<b>OSU</b>	The only area on the development that requires a reduced drive aisle width is the 6m ramp from Grade to P1 and then P1 to P2 levels so that it fits within the building structural spacing. We have worked with the traffic consultant to incorporate other safety features on this ramp, such as rounding/widening the corners, to allow for additional space for two vehicles to pass each other. All fire routes within the development are 6.5m wide or greater. Further to this, as per section 3.2.5.6.(1)(a) in the Ontario Building Code, the fire department access route should have a clear width not less than 6m.
15	In the Draft Zoning By-law, the applicant is proposing the following provision: i. The vertical clearance of a parking space may be obstructed by such facilities intended to be used for a suspended or wall mounted bicycle parking space for the exclusive use of the owner or user of the parking space. To help staff's understanding of this provision, please provide a diagram showing a suspended or wall mounted bicycle parking space.	<b>GG</b>	This is included as a means to expand the provision of bicycle parking on site by making more efficient use of the vertical area of a parking stall. The provision of such spaces will be examined closer during the detailed site plan stage. At this point, no such spaces are reflected on the plans, nor included in the calculation of the proposed supply of bicycle parking.
16	Staff are satisfied that the proposed parking rates for residential and visitor spaces will sufficiently serve the needs of future residents. Staff request the applicant include a minimum bicycle parking requirement for the proposed development that is in line with the minimum standards in the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.	<b>GG</b>	Refer to updated draft Zoning By-law. Noted. The proposed development meets the minimum bicycle parking requirements in the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law.
<b>Comments from Area Residents</b>			
17	During the processing of this application, and at the open house and public meetings, the City received several comments and concerns from area residents (see Attachment #1,		Refer to responses under heading 15



	Summary of Comments Received from Area Residents). With your second submission, please provide a fulsome response to each comment and concern raised by the public.		
<b>Letters from Area Businesses</b>			
18	<p>During the processing of this application, the City received letters from four area businesses, located in the Whites Road Prestige Business Park, to the west of the subject lands. Some of the major concerns raised by these businesses include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) concerns about increased traffic as a result of the proposed development, and how this may affect the daily operations and movement of employees, goods, and services to these businesses;</li> <li>b) concerns that the large trucks that travel through the Whites Road and Granite Court intersection to access these businesses will be unable to make safe turning movements due to increased traffic at the intersection; and</li> <li>c) concerns that increased traffic in the area will result in delays and associated fines and fees for these businesses.</li> </ul> <p>The letters are attached to this document for your review and fulsome response.</p> <p>Please note, staff from the City’s Economic Development Department will be reaching out to these businesses, to facilitate meetings between City staff and the businesses, to further discuss their comments and concerns.</p>	<b>GHD</b>	<p>The Owner’s representatives have met with concerned businesses to advise them of the proposed improvements to the intersection of Granite/Whites. These will address the perceived traffic issues.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this approach, the TIS continues to conclude that the intersection is operating at an acceptable level of service.</p>
<b>Comments from Planning and Development Committee</b>			
19	<p>We need a greater understanding of the impacts the proposed development may have on the industrial business park to the west. Developments such as this one should not hinder opportunities for important businesses within the City.</p>	<b>GG</b>	<p>The subject site is located within the <i>Mixed Use Areas</i> designation, which permits residential uses. Accordingly, it is reasonable to conclude that the potential for redevelopment including a residential component in the context of the adjacent employment area was considered by Staff and Council during the preparation of the Official Plan.</p> <p>A compatibility study has been prepared which assesses the proposed development from the perspective of air quality, noise, and vibration. No impacts have been identified.</p>





			<p>Similarly, the traffic impact study demonstrates all area roadways and intersections will continue to operate with acceptable levels of service in post-development conditions.</p> <p>On the basis of these expert reports, the existing permissions of the Official Plan, and considering that the subject site is effectively separated from the employment area by a rail corridor, it is not expected that the proposed residential uses, even with increased density, would have a negative impact on the ability of existing industrial/commercial uses to continue to operate or expand.</p>
20	Has the applicant prepared a lighting plan for the proposed development?	<b>GG</b>	This will be provided during the site plan control stage of development.
21	Will the proposed bicycle parking spaces be for sale, or are they considered an amenity of the building? What is the difference between the visitor and resident bicycle parking spaces?	<b>GG</b>	Typically, bicycle parking spaces are a common element of a building. Visitor parking spaces are generally 'short-term' and located at grade to avoid the need for a visitor to have to access the underground parking area.
22	When was the last time the applicant met with the community to discuss their concerns with the proposed development? Are there opportunities moving forward for the applicant to continue to meet with the community to discuss the proposal?	<b>GG</b>	<p>A community meeting and a statutory Council Public Meeting have been held. The requirements of the Planning Act have been satisfied. The proposed built form has been revised in response to comments received at these meetings.</p> <p>Residents are able to provide comments through Staff at any point during the development review process, and will have further opportunity to speak before Council when a recommendation report is considered.</p> <p>Additional meetings can be scheduled at the request of the Local Ward Councillor.</p>
23	There are no affordable housing units proposed within the development. Until we prioritize affordable housing, the matter can always be brushed aside. The applicant should focus on and prioritize affordable housing units for this development.	<b>GG</b>	The proposed apartment dwellings provide much needed variety to the existing housing options within the community, and will also provide additional supply to a constrained area. This dwelling type can be considered more attainable and intrinsically affordable than other forms of ground related housing.



24	Has the applicant spoken to any of our Emergency Services staff, to understand how the development and increased traffic may impact the movement of their vehicles within the neighbourhood?	GG	A traffic impact study has been provided, and updated in response to comments. All application materials have been circulated to the Fire Department and Police Services for comment.
----	--	----	---

15.0

Summary of Residents Comments

		Response From	Response
<b>Support</b>			
1	stated that a commercial use would not be viable in this location, as many of the smaller commercial plazas in the neighbourhood struggle at times, despite the population of the neighbourhood;		Acknowledged.
2	stated that the proposed development is more desirable than an empty field;		Acknowledged.
3	supports the proposal to provide a variation of housing type and tenure, especially in a neighbourhood that is made up predominantly of single-detached dwellings;		Acknowledged.
4	supports the proposed vehicle access onto Granite Court, as it avoids creating additional traffic on Whites Road; and		Acknowledged.
5	stated that a proposal to construct a grocery store at the property would create far more traffic than the proposal to construct a residential building.		Acknowledged.
<b>Objection – Traffic and Safety</b>			
6	concerned about increased traffic on neighbouring streets, Highway 401 ramps, and public parks, in a neighbourhood that is already congested during rush hour and summer months;	GHD	The traffic study evaluated the signalized intersections and found that both will operate within capacity even with the additional traffic from the proposed development. The delays and queuing for both intersections remains at acceptable levels confirming that congestion and vehicle queuing will not be significantly worsened by the proposed development.
7	concerned about the proximity of traffic lights at the intersections of Whites Road and Granite Court, and Whites Road and Bayly Street, as it regularly causes backups during rush hour, which will be further exacerbated by increased traffic as a result of the proposed development;	GHD	The traffic study evaluated the signalized intersections and found that both will operate within capacity even with the additional traffic from the proposed development. The delays and queuing for both intersections remains at acceptable levels confirming that congestion and vehicle queuing will not be significantly worsened by the proposed development.
8	stated that when there is an accident on Highway 401, many vehicles travel through the neighbourhood to avoid traffic on the highway, which creates a lot of traffic congestion on the	GHD	While the study does not directly address accident spillover from Highway 401 during infrequent events, it concludes that the local network, including



	neighbourhood streets, which would be further exacerbated by traffic from the proposed development;		Whites Road and Granite Court, can accommodate the additional traffic generated by the proposed development without significant impacts to the study intersections under typical conditions.
9	concerned about the lack of proposed road improvements for Whites Road and Granite Court to accommodate increased traffic, such as road widenings and additional traffic lanes;	<b>GHD</b>	No planned widenings are identified in the City Official Plan. Notwithstanding, the City has requested a conveyance at the corner of the site at the intersection of Whites/Granite in order to regularize the geometry of the existing right-of-way. This has been reflected on the plans. The traffic study concludes that no road widenings or additional traffic lanes are necessary as the intersections and streets are projected to operate within acceptable limits including traffic generated by the proposed development.
10	questioned if the submitted traffic impact study analyzed safety for pedestrians, specifically related to sight lines at signalized intersections;	<b>GHD</b>	The traffic study includes a sightline review of the proposed site access on Granite Court, which confirms that the proposed access points and intersections provide sufficient sight distances, ensuring the safety of pedestrians and vehicles. Pedestrian sightline at signalized intersections was not considered in the traffic study as the proposed development does not recommended changes to the existing geometry of the intersections which have been designed to regional standards. Therefore, pedestrian sightlines are not impacted by the subject site.
11	concerned for the number of children who use the signalized intersections to walk to and from school, and how additional traffic on the road will be dangerous for pedestrians;	<b>GHD</b>	Pedestrian safety, including for children, was a priority when developing the Site Plan. Signalized crossings are provided at key intersections to provide safe crossing of the roads, and the proposed development will extend the pedestrian sidewalk along the frontage of Granite Court to improve safety.
12	questioned when the submitted traffic impact study was completed, and if there was a significant difference in the data collected pre- and post-COVID;	<b>GHD</b>	The traffic data used in the analysis was collected in November 2022 and was approved by City and Region staff for use in the study. GHD collected another set of volumes in September 2023 which confirmed the volumes from 2022 where consistent with post COVID conditions.
13	concerned about the number of large trucks that travel along Whites Road and Granite Court, to access Highway 401, and how this may be impacted by the proposed development;	<b>GHD</b>	The study recognizes that Whites Road and Granite Court are used by trucks accessing Highway 401. The analysis shows that despite truck traffic, the intersections will continue to operate within capacity, and the addition of development-related traffic will not significantly impact truck movements.



14	concerned about the ability of residents to exit the West Shore and Rosebank neighbourhoods during an emergency, or the ability for emergency services to access these neighbourhoods, considering that there are only two existing roads that provide access to and from the neighbourhoods;	GHD	Although not specifically addressed, the traffic study concludes that the proposed development will not cause significant congestion at the study intersection, implying that emergency access would not be impeded during an emergency call. Furthermore, the City's Community Emergency Management Plan provides a structured management process for key City staff and external officials, who make up the Municipal Emergency Control Group (MECG). It outlines how the MECG, the Emergency Operations Centre, and the Emergency Site Management Team will operate during community emergencies or major crises, ensuring effective response.
15	concerned with the data provided in the submitted traffic study, as it is not an accurate reflection of the traffic conditions in the neighbourhood;	GHD	As previously noted, the traffic data used in the analysis was collected in November 2022 and was approved by City and Region staff for use in the study. GHD collected another set of volumes in September 2023 which confirmed the volumes from 2022 where consistent with post COVID conditions.
16	concerned with the safety of the proposed vehicular access from Granite Court, as this road is already congested and is frequently travelled on by large trucks;	GHD	The study includes a detailed sightline and turning movement analysis for the proposed driveway onto Granite Court. It concludes that the design meets the city's requirements for safe vehicle access, even considering the existing truck traffic on Granite Court.
17	concerned with the current speed limit of 40 kilometres/hour on Granite Court, as many vehicles travel above the posted speed limit;	GHD	The study uses a design speed of 50 km/h for safety assessments, which is higher than the posted speed limit, ensuring that the proposed access is safe even if some vehicles exceed the speed limit.
18	concerned that the City will install a three-way stop along Granite Court, at the proposed vehicular access for the site, which will create additional congestion along Granite Court;	GHD	The traffic study concluded that the proposed site access will operate with acceptable conditions with stop control only on the site access. No stop control along Granite Court has been recommended.
19	questioned if future proposed developments within the surrounding area have been considered in the drafting of the submitted traffic impact study;	GHD	The traffic study considered all future developments in the area identified by City staff, including three background developments. The analysis used future traffic volumes that consider these developments and concluded that the intersections will continue to operate within capacity.
20	concerned about the location of the proposed private outdoor amenity space in proximity to Whites Road, which may be unsafe for children;	GHD	The proposed POPS area has been removed from the proposal. The traffic study does not address the placement of amenity spaces, but City planning staff would ensure the amenity spaces are safe for residents, particularly children, in line with city regulations for proximity to roads.



21	concerned about the number of large construction vehicles that would be travelling to and from the site during construction, and how this would affect traffic and safety;	GHD	The traffic study does not directly address construction traffic, but standard practice during construction would involve the preparation of traffic management plans to minimize disruption on the adjacent road. The City and Region will require these plans as part of the construction permit process.
22	concerned that the submitted traffic study does not take into account the impacts of other proposed development within the surrounding area, particularly the proposed development at Kingston Road and Rougemount Drive; and	GHD	The traffic study considered all future developments in the area identified by City staff, including some along Kingston Road. The analysis used future traffic volumes that consider these developments and concluded that the intersections will continue to operate within capacity.
23	questioned if there is an evacuation plan in place for the West Shore and Rosebank neighbourhoods, if an evacuation is necessary for the nuclear station.	GHD	The traffic study does not address evacuation plans, but the City's Community Emergency Management Plan provides a structured management process for key City staff and external officials, who make up the Municipal Emergency Control Group (MECG). It outlines how the MECG, the Emergency Operations Centre, and the Emergency Site Management Team will operate during community emergencies or major crises, ensuring effective response. This public concern can be addressed at a municipal level and is beyond the scope of the traffic study.
<b>Objection – Building Height</b>			
24	concerned about the height of the proposed building, as it will stand out visually in a neighbourhood that is composed primarily of detached and semi-detached dwellings;	OSU/GG	The property is identified within the Mixed Use designation of the Official Plan which permits higher density built form, and does not limit building heights. Notwithstanding this, the overall building height has been reduced to 10 storeys along Whites Road and 7 storeys along Granite Court. The reduced building height results in full compliance with a 45-degree angular plane projected from the opposite property lines on both streets, which a generally accepted urban design standard to determine transition between areas of different intensity. In this respect, it is our belief that the proposed height is appropriate, and that an acceptable means of transition has been provided.  The subject site is not identified within, or proximate to, the City natural heritage system, thus impacts to protected bird species are not anticipated.
25	requested that the proposed building be reduced in height, as no other buildings in the neighbourhood are as tall;		
26	concerned that the height and massing of the proposed building is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood;		
27	stated that many native bird species live within the neighbourhood, and are concerned that the height of the building will impact the flight path of migratory birds; and		
28	concerned with the lack of privacy and potential overlook issues that may result due to the height of the proposed building.		



			<p>Bird Friendly design measures will be implemented at detailed design stage of development to minimize potential for bird strikes.</p> <p>Updated renderings have been provided demonstrating the views into the site that could be expected should the development proceed. Considering the width of the intervening roadway network, it is our opinion that there will be no negative impact on area residents due to overlook.</p> <p>Refer also to the Urban Design Brief Addendum prepared by MHBC.</p>
<b>Objection – Increased Density</b>			
29	questioned what the justification is for increasing the maximum permitted density, considering the site is not located within the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Plan area;	<b>GG</b>	The rationale for the proposed increased density has been summarized in the planning justification report, which is available for public review.
30	questioned if the proposed increase in density will result in an improvement to existing infrastructure, such as sidewalk and road improvements, specifically along the southern portion of Whites Road;	<b>GG</b>	Additional road widening is being conveyed to the City to regularize the geometry of the intersection of Granite/Whites. New sidewalks would be constructed along the frontage of the subject property. Further, the reconfiguration of the northbound left turn lanes at Granite Court have been proposed to alleviate the perceived concern related to traffic queues.
31	stated that townhomes would be a more appropriate development for the neighbourhood, and would be more in keeping with the character and built form of the neighbourhood; and	<b>GG</b>	Noted.
32	concerned with the proposed increase in density, considering the small size of the lot.	<b>GG</b>	It is our opinion that the proposed development is appropriately scaled for the size of the lot, and note that the building only covers 23% of the lot area, which is comparable to the coverage of an average detached dwelling, and compliant with the Zoning of the property which permits commercial uses to cover up to 25% of the site area.
<b>Objection – Commercial and Recreational Uses</b>			
33	stated that there is an opportunity for the City to invest in the subject property, to provide facilities or amenities that serve existing residents and support local businesses, such as a grocery store, restaurants, family-friendly establishments, entertainment, community centre, etc.;	<b>GG</b>	These comments are noted. A retail space has been added to the proposed development along the frontage of Whites Road to contribute to the provision of non-residential uses within walking distance of the local community.



34	suggested that the subject property be used to provide commercial and/or recreational uses within the neighbourhood, such as a coffee shop, ball-hockey court, outdoor skating rink, splash pad, manicured pollinator garden, farmers market, etc.; and		The site has been previously approved to permit commercial uses, however considering the concerns raised with respect to traffic it is noted that the trip generation of a residential building is approximately half of that of the grocery store during the a.m. peak hour and 6.5 times <b>less</b> than that of the grocery store during the p.m. peak hour that is presently permitted on the subject property (2,300 square metres).
35	concerned that there are very few grocery stores located south of Highway 401 within the City and suggested that commercial/retail space be provided within the ground floor of the proposed building.		
<b>Objection – Other Comments</b>			
36	concerned that the proposed development will negatively impact the property values of surrounding homes	<b>GG</b>	This is not a planning matter and is outside of the scope of consideration of the pending applications.
37	questioned how the development may impact flooding on Highway 401, during rain and other climate events;	<b>GG</b>	A stormwater management plan has been prepared and circulated to the City, Region, Rail Authority, and MTO for review. No concerns have been raised by MTO. All stormwater must be controlled on site through redevelopment.
38	questioned what the cost of each unit is expected to be;	<b>GG</b>	Unknown at this time.
39	concerned about noise pollution as a result of the proposed development;	<b>GG</b>	This matter has been assessed through the Noise Study provided as part of the submission package, and updated in response to comments.
40	questioned why the previous development applications for this property were withdrawn, and what changed between the previous proposals and now;	<b>GG</b>	As noted at the Council Public Meeting, a great deal has changed since the prior consideration of applications for this property in 2004 from a planning policy perspective, including (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple updates/revisions to the Provincial Policy Statement, and release of a new Provincial Planning Statement to take effect on October 20, 2024;</li> <li>• The introduction of, and subsequent revisions to, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe between 2006 and 2020. Notably, the Growth Plan is to be rescinded and replaced by the new Provincial Planning Statement on October 20, 2024;</li> <li>• Revisions to the Durham Region Official Plan, most recently in May 2023</li> <li>• Revisions to the Pickering Official Plan</li> </ul>



41	concerned with pressure that new development would have on existing infrastructure, especially considering the number of power outages that happen in the neighbourhood;	GG	Ellexicon has reviewed the proposal and indicated no objections to approval. They will be contacted during the site plan control stage of development to advance the detailed design.
42	concerned that the traffic derailment report only considers protection for being hit by a train, but does not consider other emergencies, such as a train catching on fire;	GG	The Rail Safety study has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the rail corridor operator.
43	concerned with light pollution that may be caused by the proposed building;	GG	A lighting plan will be provided at the site plan control stage to demonstrate appropriate lighting standards are met at the property lines of the property.
44	stated that no benefits to the community are proposed as a part of this development;	GG	The proposed building will be subject to the City's CBC charge. Further, the provision of apartment dwellings benefits the community by expanding options and diversity of housing in a form that can be considered more affordable than ground related housing.
45	questioned when all of the studies and reports submitted by the applicant were completed;	GG	All reports are dated, and have been updated in response to comments as necessary.
46	questioned what sustainable features are being proposed as part of the development; and	GG	A sustainability report has been provided.
47	questioned if a construction management plan has been submitted for the proposed development.	GG	This is typically prepared at the site plan control or building permit stage.

**16.0 Durham Catholic District School Board – February 20, 2024**

		Response From	Response
1	The Board has no objections to the plan's proposal to develop a 12-storey residential condominium building, containing a total of 262 dwelling units.		Acknowledged.
2	Students from this development will attend Father Fenelon Catholic Elementary School located at 795 Eyer Drive and St. Mary Catholic Secondary School located at 1918 Whites Road in the City of Pickering		Acknowledged.