155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

A summary of response to the comments received from the first ZBA submission

2023 November

Second Zoning Submission
Rezoning Application No. 21 234538 NNY 06 OZ

Address: 155 Antibes Drive, Toronto (formerly North York), ON M2R 3G7

Applicant: Urban Strategies Inc.

Contents

1.0 Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Urban Design, Housing Policy Planning, Transportation Planning

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services

3.0 Parks, Forestry & Recreation - Urban Forestry

4.0 Parks, Forestry & Recreation - Parks Development & Planning

5.0 Environment & Energy Division

6.0 Transportation Planning (additional comments received from the first SPA submission)

7.0 Others

1.0 Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Urban Design, Policy Planning, Transportation Planning
Shelley Cham, Manager, Community Planning
Marty Rokos, Senior Planner, Community Planning
Date: August 26, 2022

	Comment	Response
Community Planning		
1	These comments are provided on a preliminary basis as the Heritage Assessment is undergoing, and the identification of any architectural or landscape features which would warrant designation under the Ontario Heritage Act remains underway. On that basis, priority should be given to discussions with Heritage Planning regarding their review and that process prior to making comprehensive resubmissions to address the comments in their entirety. Through the City Planning comments a number of global site organization questions and discussions involving both the site and the existing/proposed public realm have been identified where additional discussions should be coordinated to look at site opportunities while the Heritage assessment is ongoing prior to any significant design revisions or resubmissions being made.	Noted. This Revised Proposal made a series of improvements based on constructive feedback and collaboration with City staff, including discussions involving the revised site plan design and the heritage aspects of the existing context. Please refer to the Cover Letter and the Planning Rationale addendum for more details. Also, please see our response to comment #11 in respect to the City's heritage staff's decision regarding the Heritage Assessment.
Height & Density		
2	The proposed tall building heights of 32-storeys and 34-storeys are not appropriate in the context of the existing 16-storey building on the site, or the adjacent existing 12-storey and 13-storey buildings to the north. The proposed heights are more than double the height of the existing building on site, while building heights of 28-storeys and 30-storeys exist to the south and west of the site, the introduction of two tall buildings on the site is not consistent with the immediate context of where they are proposed to be located. There is the potential for this site to accommodate additional development, however, the form of the proposed tall buildings would represent overdevelopment of the site.	The Revised Proposal in this resubmission has made improvements to meaningfully address the City's concerns related to height and density, based on feedback received from the City staff through their written comments, a number of discussions and design workshop. Please refer to the Cover Letter and the Planning Rationale addendum enclosed in this resubmission for more details.
3	The existing building has a Floor Space Index of approximately 1.44 times the site area. The proposed development including the existing building on the net site following dedications is indicated to be 4.46 on the plans submitted. This level of intensification appears to be more than the site can accommodate from a built form and site organization perspective when reviewing the proposed tall building elements in the context of the existing building on site, and adjacent existing and proposed developments. If the built form issues created by the proposed tall buildings in particular, along with the site organization and access issues identified can be resolved, an increase in density could be supported, but at present it appears the amount of intensification being sought exceeds the site's capacity to accommodate the proposed development in an appropriate built form.	Noted. Please see our response to the comment #2 above. In our opinion, density has been deployed in a manner that optimizes the use of the currently-underutilized site and holistically achieves the Official Plan objectives and criteria for infill development in Apartment Neighbourhoods.
Development Criteria for Apartment Neighbourhoods		
4	The Official Plan provides for an intensification hierarchy with the Downtown being the most intense, followed by the Centres, designated Avenues, and then Apartment Neighbourhoods. Apartment Neighbourhoods are considered physically stable and not intended for significant growth. Compatible infill development is subject a number of policy considerations.	Please refer to the Planning Rationale addendum for our detailed response, particularly Section 6 of the addendum regarding the Planning Policy Framework updates. The Revised Proposal reflects a level of infill intensification that is consistent with what has been approved on other Apartment Neighbourhood properties around Toronto and demonstrates an appropriate balance between the provision of new housing and maintaining a generous and functional range of open spaces.
5	The proposed tall building elements are not compatible with the scale of the existing apartment building on site and those adjacent to the site. They are significantly taller than the existing building on site or adjacent to it. While the point tower form proposed may be appropriate for a single building which is taller than the existing building, the proposed two buildings result in a development which does not properly address the Official Plan development criteria.	Please refer to the Planning Rationale addendum for our detailed response, particularly Section 5.10 related to the Block Context. The proposed towers, while tall, are not overscaled in relation to the existing and planned context of the area, and are concentrated along Bathurst where numerous tall towers have been approved along the portion of Bathurst between Finch Avenue West and Steeles Avenue West.
6	The application is infill as per Policy 4.2.3 of the Official Plan, and must address the policies contained within this section, along with the development criteria for Apartment Neighbourhoods in Policy 4.2.2 to improve the existing site conditions.	Noted. In our opinion, the Revised Proposal appropriately addresses the development criteria set out in Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 of the Official Plan.
RAC Zone Uses and Opportunities		
7	The site is currently in the RAC Zone. The RAC zone permits a broader range of non-residential or home occupation opportunities in the areas designated Residential Apartment by the Official Plan. This zone provides the opportunity to animate streetscapes by the provision of purpose built retail units, or through units designed to accommodate flexibility to be used for both commercial and residential purposes. The proposed tall buildings do not take the opportunity to provide any such uses in their ground floors along Bathurst Street. Providing such uses and designs in any modified built form to address the overall built form issues identified would be beneficial to the overall development and the surrounding community.	The built form and building designs are revised for utilizing RAC permissions, including incorporation of non-residential spaces and improved landscaping design for activating streets and public realm at ground floor. Please refer to the Cover Letter and the Planning Rationale addendum for more details, in conjunction with the materials enclosed in this comprehensive resubmission.
Site Organization and Antibes Road Opportunities		
8	There are concerns with how the proposed driveway access and internal traffic flows would function as detailed further in the Urban Design comments that follow. There are opportunities to adjust the site organization of the proposed development to better enhance the prominence of the existing building, maintain some of the mature trees on site along Bathurst Street, while resolving site circulation matters.	Proposed driveway access and site circulation design have been revised to revert to a single driveway access off Antibes Drive as desired by Staff. Please refer to the Cover Letter and the Planning Rationale addendum for more details, in conjunction with the materials enclosed in this comprehensive resubmission.
9	As discussed further in the Urban Design comments that follow, Staff have been investigating the potential to close the northern leg of Antibes Drive between Bathurst Street and the main portion of Antibes Drive to facilitate an expansion of the Don Lake Gate Parkette and incorporation with an on-site parkland dedication on this site. That would offer the opportunity to provide access to this site via Antibes Drive in order to address the concerns regarding the proposed driveways to Bathurst at the east and Antibes at the south of the proposed development. We would like to schedule a meeting to discuss this and the various issues surrounding the site and development to determine if there are opportunities to explore this opportunity for reorganization to address the issues presented by the application in its current form.	In working closely with the City staff, we revised our site plan design to maintain a significant landscaped open space along Antibes Drive. The Staff has accepted this revised site plan approach.
HERITAGE PLANNING		
10	Detailed heritage comments are to be provided at a later date. As noted in the HIA submitted by ERA Architects, the existing building at 155 Antibes Drive is a representative example of a Tower-in-the-Park and a mid-century apartment building in the modernist style. The building forms part of the character and sense of place of North York.	Noted.
11	Heritage Planning is evaluating the cultural heritage value and attributes of this property to determine whether the subject property meets the Provincial criteria (O. Reg. 9/06) for determining cultural heritage significance. If deemed to be significant, Heritage Planning will seek its designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and will seek Council approval for a Heritage Easement Agreement. Heritage Planning staff are evaluating the impact of the loss of part of the "park" from this Tower-in-the-Park building, and the impact that the proposed buildings would have on the cultural heritage values and attributes of this representative example of a Miami Modernist building.	Heritage Planning staff further evaluated the existing property and determined not recommending it to be designated heritage under Part IV of the OHA, as confirmed in email dated February 14, 2023 from Michael Seaman, Program Manager, Heritage Planning.
12	Given the preceding comments, staff notes that the balance of the comments in this memo are subject to change in order to respond to any designated heritage attributes.	Noted. Please see response to comment #11 above.
URBAN DESIGN		
	Additional Information Requested	
	Provide 1:50 scale detailed colour building elevations; detailed itemized landscape cost estimate; updated TGS checklist and statistics template; updated sun/shadow study; material sample board.	Refer to updated TGS checklist and template, and sun/shadow study enclosed in this resubmission. 1:50 scale detailed colour building elevations, itemized landscape cost estimate, and material sample board will be provided in Site Plan Approval process upon further design development.
14	Include a color legend in the pedestrian wind study.	Colour legend is provided in the updated pedestrian wind study enclosed in this resubmission.

1.0 Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Urban Design, Policy Planning, Transportation Planning
Shelley Cham, Manager, Community Planning
Marty Rokos, Senior Planner, Community Planning
Date: August 26, 2022

	Comment	Response
15	Review at the Design Review Panel.	In place of design review panel, we had a series of meetings and a design workshop with City staff to achieving the revised proposal in this resubmission.
16	Antibes Drive has a total of approximately 40 metre right-of-way flanking the Don Lake Gate Parkette, as there is a 20 metre right-of-way on either side of the parkette. Staff are having internal discussions on realigning Antibes Drive from Bathurst to explore potential opportunities to consolidate parkland on this site with an expanded Don Lake Gate Parkette as discussed further below.	Please see response to comment #9 above.
	Parks and Open Space	
17	Staff are having internal discussion on reconfiguring and consolidating onsite park dedication with Don Lake Parkette to create a more functional park with frontage on Bathurst Street.	Through meetings and design workshop with the City staff, the Staff has accepted the revised site plan design in this Revised Proposal, including the proposed location and the area of the parkland by the Parks staff after further discussions.
18	Staff will follow up with the applicant to schedule a discussion regarding the preceding two items if there is the potential for such changes to be made in the interests of providing options in addressing the built form and site organization issues identified.	Please see response to comment #9 and #17 above.
	Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Space (POPS)	
19	Provide additional grade-related, POPS within the development site to complement, connect, and extend the existing network of public streets, parks and open space.	870 square metres of POPS is proposed in this resubmission connecting to Bathurst Street and internal site laneway, which connects to the future proposed multi-use path to the north of the site.
20	The proposed POPS is to incorporate signage in accordance with the Council approved signage template and POPS Design Guidelines. Indicate the location and design specifications for the POPS signage on the Landscape Plan and Details.	Noted. Signage design will be incorporated as per City's POPS Design Guidelines in Site Plan Approval process.
	Views from the Public Realm	
21	Locate and design tall buildings to respect and complement the scale, character, form and setting of on-site building.	Please refer to the Cover Letter and the Planning Rationale addendum for our detailed response.
	Public Art	
22	The proposed development is of a scale and prominence to warrant participation in the Percent for Public Art Program to enhance the quality of the development and the public realm. Refer to the Percent for Public Art Program Guidelines.	Noted.
	LOCATION AND ORGANIZATION RELATIVE TO STREETS AND OPEN SPACE	
	Building Siting and Organization	
23	The tall buildings are overwhelming the existing building and site. The site is better suited to have a mix of building types; townhouses or low-rise apartment buildings on the west, midrise on the south side and possibly a tall building on the north.	A new mid-rise building is proposed to the north of the site for a mix of building types, as well as introducing step-down tower podiums for providing various different built-form elements.
	Building Address and Entrances	
24	Building B is at a corner and should be designed to have frontage on Antibes to animate and provide "eyes on the street".	Retail and indoor amenity spaces are located at grade in Building B to provide "eyes on the street" and activation towards Bathurst St and Don Lake Gate. Please refer to ground floor plan (A202.S).
25	Building A should activate and animate the north by providing grade related units facing the multiuse path to provide natural surveillance "eyes on the street". The north façade should have a front relationship to the path. A minimum setback of 7.5 metres to the path needs to be provided.	Retail is located on the north corner of Building A, and townhouses with front porches are proposed in Building C facing multi-use path to provide "eyes on the street" and an intimate neighbourhood experience in matching similar to setback relationships in the proposed developments to the north of the path. Please refer to (A202.S) for details.
	Driveways and Vehicular Access	
26	Omit the driveway from Bathurst Street. Refer to Transportation Services comments.	Noted.
27	Provide all access to the site from the main portion of Antibes Drive where the current access is located, instead of from the Bathurst Street and Antibes Drive connections as proposed. Access to be reviewed in coordination with park location discussed above.	Access has been revised to be provided from Antibes Drive.
	Parking and Servicing	
28	The loading and garbage area on the north of Building A is resulting in a blank wall adjacent the multiuse path. Reconfigure the site organization to provide an animated frontage. See item #10 above.	Please see response to comment #25 above.
29	The proposed underground garage roof structure should be at a lower elevation to allow for sufficient soil volume to support mature trees. Ensure below-grade parking structures do not limit opportunity for mature landscaping and tree growth on site by providing quality soil with appropriate volume and depth. Provide clarification on the width of the Multi-Use Path dedication as it appears to be encumbered underground on the P1 Underground Plan.	The Revised Proposal proposes a mix of intensive landscaping design above the existing garage with adequate soil depth while also considering existing structural integrity. Please refer to landscape plan (L-100) for proposed landscape design. The entirety of the proposed multi-use path is clear from the proposed extent of the underground parking.
30	Underground exhaust vents is to be located to minimize impacts on public sidewalk, outdoor amenity areas, dwelling units and neighbouring properties.	Exhaust vents have been located to minimize impacts on the public spaces. See architectural plan, (A202.S) for potential locations.
	Pedestrian and Cycling Connections	
31	Provide comfortable, safe and accessible pedestrian and cycling routes through and around the site to connect with adjacent routes, streets, parks, open space, and other priority destinations.	Refer to architectural plans (103.S and A202.S) and landscape plan (L-100) for pedestrian and cyclist-friendly connections between proposed driveway, internal site laneway (woonerf), future multi-use and public right-of-ways such as the City's sidewalk and future cycle track on Bathurst.
32	Provide for safe and appropriate pedestrian/bicycle access to the underground parking garage.	See response to comment 31 above.
	Grading Relationships	
33	The underground garage should not impede site grading and landscaping opportunities including the integration of green infrastructure.	Noted. The underground garage does not impede site grading and landscaping opportunities in this Revised Proposal.
34	Slope paved surfaces to drain into soft landscape areas to promote low-impact storm water management where possible.	Grading design has been revised carefully in conjunction with landscape design. Please refer to the updated grading plan (SG-01) and the landscape plan (L-100) for details.
	BUILDING MASSING AND DESIGN	
	Relationship to Neighbouring Development	
35	Provide a street elevation to show the relationship between the development and proposed adjacent residential development on Bathurst Street and Antibes Drive.	Please refer to perspective renderings enclosed in this resubmission for showing the relationship with adjacent developments.
36	Coordinate proposal with adjacent developments that is 5950 Bathurst Street and 25 Cedarcroft Boulevard.	Noted. We will coordinate with our neighbouring developments for design development.
	Tall Building/Mid-Rise Building/Low-Rise Building Standards	
37	Minimize the extent of the site area dedicated to servicing and vehicular access through the use of shared infrastructure, consolidate the loading areas, and efficient layout and site organization.	Servicing and vehicular access have been minimized by consolidating parking ramps and more efficient laneway design. Please refer to the Cover Letter and the Planning Rationale Addendum for detailed explanation, as well as architectural site plan (A103.S) for design.
38	Line the base buildings with active, grade-related uses to promote a safe and animated public realm.	Active grade-related uses such as retail and amenity spaces have been proposed in the ground floor.

1.0 Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Urban Design, Policy Planning, Transportation Planning
Shelley Cham, Manager, Community Planning
Marty Rokos, Senior Planner, Community Planning
Date: August 26, 2022

	Comment	Response
39	The shadow studies are difficult to decipher. Tweak the color and line weight of the property line and tone down other components to ease drawing legibility.	Colours have been updated in the updated Shadow Study as per the City's Terms of Reference.
40	Maintain 25 metre tower separation distance between Tower B and the existing building. Also confirm the total separation distance between the proposed buildings and the existing building to the north.	Shape and orientation of Tower B are revised to provide +/- 22 metre tower separation to the existing building from level 7 to 116 in a corner-to-corner relationship without facing directly. Please refer to detailed response in the Planning Rationale addendum and architectural site plan (A103.S).
41	Provide appropriate transition in scale to the adjacent existing and proposed developments, and open space.	Appropriate transition in scale has been considered in this Revised Proposal. Please refer to the Planning Rationale addendum for details.
42	The proposed townhouses should have a front relationship with Antibes on the south and the park or multi use trail on the north to animate the public realm.	Townhouses are provided in the midrise building facing multi-use trail to the north. Retail and amenity spaces are provided in the tower bases towards Bathurst St and Don Lake Gate for animating the public realm.
43	Provide wind mitigation at Building A and B's amenity on level 8 as recommended by the wind study.	The revised built forms and proposed wind mitigations helped improving the wind conditions on the rooftop amenity spaces on level 5. Please refer to updated pedestrian-level wind study.
	Planning for Pets	
44	The proposed pet amenity is appreciated. Refer to Pet Friendly Guidelines to further fine tune the location and other components.	Noted. Further design details for the pet amenity area will be explored in Site Plan Approval.
45	Provide a hose-bib connection for regular cleaning of the space. Good drainage to mitigate waste and odour build up. The drainage should connect to the sanitary system.	Hose-bib connections will be considered as necessary in detailed design development during Site Plan Approval.
46	Incorporate pet accessories such play elements, waste baggie dispensers and garbage.	Pet accessory details will be explored in Site Plan Approval.
47	Screen from other amenity spaces to avoid conflicts between users, and to mitigate impacts from odours, mess, and noise.	Screens and other privacy mitigation design will be explored further in Site Plan Approval.
	Materials and Articulation	
48	1:50 scale detailed colour building elevations are to be provided. A material sample board is requested for review and approval.	1:50 coloured building elevations and a material sample will be provided during Site Plan Approval.
	Drawings - Perspectives, Elevations and Sections	
49	Provide detailed sections, elevations and or perspectives of a. the shared outdoor amenity area at grade. b. drop off areas c. see additional locations on the markup	Please refer to the architectural drawings and the landscape plan (L-100) for details on the outdoor amenity areas at grade, drop-off areas and additional locations.
50	Provide detailed sections capturing the site grading relationships. Please note the above sections should capture the plant material, retaining walls and all landscape elements.	Please refer to the architectural building sections (A451.S - A453.S) and soil volume sections (L500) for the site grading relationships. Specific landscaping details will be provided in Site Plan Approval.
	LANDSCAPE, STREETSCAPE AND PEDESTRIAN AMENITIES	
	Indigenous History and Cultural and Natural Heritage	
51	Explore opportunity to integrate/showcase/make visible and or celebrate Indigenous history and or culture.	We're open to exploring this opportunity in Site Plan Approval.
	Landscape Plans and Details	
52	A detailed itemized landscape cost estimate is to be provided for review and approval. Once the cost estimate is deemed to be acceptable, a Letter of Credit is required to secure and guarantee the landscape work identified.	A detailed itemized landscape cost estimate will be provided in Site Plan Approval.
53	Landscaping on the site should provide appropriate front yard transition between the sidewalk on Bathurst, Antibes Drive and the future Multiuse Pathway to promote year-round interest, biodiversity and pedestrian comfort.	Please refer to the landscape plan (L-100) for front yard transitions and landscaping relationship to the public realm.
54	Select plant material and planting design suitable for site conditions and acceptable to other city agencies; promotes year-round interest, pedestrian comfort, biodiversity, resilience.	Plant material and design details will be explored in Site Plan Approval.
55	Provide irrigation and or hose bib for the green roof. Indicate on the plan	Irrigation and/or hose bibs will be considered in Site Plan Approval after further design development.
	Trees and Environment	
56	Adjust the extent of the underground garage on the east to preserve the large Silver Maples along Bathurst to the extent possible.	The possibility of preserving the existing Silver Maples along Bathurst was explored in detail with various consultants, but it proved to be very challenging to making this Revised Proposal work. In place, the revised landscaping design proposes a series of new large canopy trees more fitting to the site in conjunction with the proposed retail spaces and the POPS area to enliven the public realm and enhance the boulevard experience. Please see perspective renderings for POPS / Bathurst views.
	Streetscape Improvements	
57	Refer to the Streetscape Manual for requirements regarding improvements to the streetscape adjacent to the site.	Noted. Streetscape Manual was reviewed, and further streetscape design details will be explored in Site Plan Approval.
	Lighting	
58	Provide a lighting plan.	Lighting Plan will be provided in Site Plan Approval.
59	Provide pedestrian-scale lighting that is evenly spaced, continuous and directed onto sidewalks, pathways, entrances, outdoor waiting areas and public spaces.	Pedestrian-scale lighting will be explored in conjunction with existing street lights in Site Plan Approval.
60	All exterior lighting fixtures on the building façade should be shown on the elevations.	Architectural lighting fixtures will be explored in Site Plan Approval.
61	All lighting standards should be Dark Sky Compliant.	All lighting standards will be Dark Sky compliant.
	Utilities	
62	Provide coloured composite utility plans and cross section capturing the horizontal and vertical relationship of the utilities.	Please refer to the updated Public Utilities Plan (PU-01) for utility plans and sections.
63	All utilities (light standards, hydrants, overhead wires, vents, transformers, hydro vaults, cable boxes, meters, grates, etc.) are to be indicated on appropriate plans and elevations.	Please see response to comment #62 above.
64	Trees, plantings and other landscape features are to be coordinated with existing and proposed utilities.	Landscaping design has been coordinated with existing and proposed utilities.
65	Utilities and service connections are to be located away from public streets, walkways, corners, entrances and/or integrated within building massing and landscape design.	Lateral servicing connections have been located in consideration of public spaces and engineering requirements.

1.0 Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Urban Design, Policy Planning, Transportation Planning
Shelley Cham, Manager, Community Planning
Marty Rokos, Senior Planner, Community Planning
Date: August 26, 2022

	Comment	Response
	TORONTO GREEN STANDARD	
66	The proposal is to meet the Tier 1 requirements and is to strive to achieve Tier 2.	This Revised Proposal will pursue TGS version 4, tier 1 and/or higher as possible.
67	Update the TGS Checklist and Statistics template.	TGS version 4 checklist and Statistics template have been updated.
68	Tier 1 Requirements: d. AQ 3.1 Covered outdoor waiting areas e. AQ 3.4 Pedestrian-scale lighting f. EC 1.4 Provide watering program for trees g. EC 3.1 Landscape includes 50% native plants h. EC 3.2 No invasive species planted i. EC 4.1 85% of all exterior glazing within the required is treated to reduce bird collisions j. EC 4.2 Glazing 4m above rooftop vegetation is treated to reduce bird collisions k. EC 4.3 Maximum porosity of ventilation grates is 20mm x 20mm l. EC 5.1 Dark sky compliant fixtures	All of TGS version 4, at least tier 1 requirements will be fully satisfied in Site Plan Approval. Please refer to the updated TGS version 4 checklist for references.
POLICY PLANNING		
	Environmental Planning	
69	Environmental Planning advises the applicant that the site plan application for this site will fall under TGS V4 or subsequent versions depending on the date of submission. The applicant is strongly encouraged to plan for the requirements at the time of site plan application and for the purposes of the OZ application may submit TGS V4 documentation available on the TGS webpage.	Noted. First Site Plan application was deemed complete as of April 27, 2023, and this development will pursue TGS version 4, tier 1 or higher. TGS version 4 checklist is included in this resubmission.
70	Consistent with the Official Plan and Council's goal of achieving net zero emissions for new buildings by 2028 or sooner, we encourage the applicant to pursue a stronger focus on environmental sustainability in this application, including targeting performance measures that meet higher tiers of the TGS and the TGS DC refund incentive program.	Noted.
71	Operational emissions and energy performance should be considered early in the design process and inform building orientation, massing and building envelope design strategies.	Noted.
72	Consider opportunities in design to reduce embodied emissions in materials, such as reduction in below grade parking structures.	Noted.
	Housing	
	Official Plan Policy 3.2.1.5	
73	The Toronto Official Plan outlines City Council's policies and objectives for land use planning and development. Section 3.2.1 of the Official Plain contains policies pertaining to the provision, maintenance, and replacement of rental housing.	Noted.
74	Policy 3.2.1.5 states that new development on sites containing six or more rental units, where existing rental units will be kept in the new development, will secure the rental tenure of the existing rental units and should secure needed improvements and renovations to extend the life of the building(s) that are to remain and to improve amenities, without pass-through of costs to tenants.	Noted.
75	The Housing Issues Report submitted with the application confirms that all of the existing occupied rental units at 155 Antibes Drive have affordable or mid-range rents. Consequently, Policy 3.2.1.5 applies to this application and the Owners will be required to secure the rental tenure of all 259 existing rental units for a period of at least 20 years. In terms of rental housing improvements, the Housing Issues Report indicates the owner is committed to providing the following: a. Private open space and landscaped amenity areas (currently consisting of a children's play area, two pet relief areas, and an outdoor gathering space); b. A reconfigured and updated amenity space within the existing building (details on design and programming are to be determined at a later date); c. An upgraded and expanded lobby area; and d. New secure storage lockers.	Noted. Rental tenure for the existing 259 units in the existing building will be maintained for a period of at least 20 years. In conjunction with feedback received from tenant survey summarized in the updated Housing Issues Report, these items are proposed in the Revised Proposal.
76	As the application progresses, the applicant is asked to:	
e	Submit detailed rent rolls for the 259 existing rental units;	Rent roll will be provided separately from the submission in the future.
f	Coordinate with Housing Policy staff to administer a tenant survey for the purposes of identifying needed improvements to the existing buildings and amenities; and	Please refer to the summary of the Tenant survey in the Housing Issues report, which was coordinated with Housing Planner, Keir Matthews-Hunter.
g	Develop and implement a construction mitigation strategy and tenant communication plan to mitigate the adverse impacts of construction of existing tenants.	Construction mitigation strategy and tenant communication plan will be developed in Site Plan Approval after design development.
77	The rental tenure of, and improvements to, the existing rental building, as well as the construction mitigation strategy and tenant communication plan, will need to be secured through one or more agreements with the City, to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner.	Noted.
	Open Door Affordable Housing Program	
78	Affordable housing is a strategic priority for the City of Toronto. Section 3.2.1 of the City's Official Plan states that a full range of housing, including affordable rental housing, will be provided and maintained to meet the needs of current and future residents. There is a significant public interest in including affordable housing within the proposed development. We encourage the applicant to consider the City's Open Door Affordable Housing program, which provides incentives for the creation of new affordable housing beyond those required by the Official Plan.	Noted.
	Unit Size Mix and Growing Up Guidelines	
79	The Council-adopted Growing Up: Planning for Children in New Vertical Communities urban design guidelines provide guidance on the proportion and size of larger units recommended in new multi-residential developments.	Various proportion and size of units are proposed to meet diverse needs of different households and also make it more market-affordable. Please refer to the updated Housing Issues Report for detailed response.
80	Guideline 2.1 of the Growing Up guidelines states that a building should provide a minimum of 25% large units (10% of the units should be 3-bedroom units and 15% of the units should be 2-bedroom units).	The Revised Proposal proposes 34% of 2-bedroom and 10% of 3-bedroom unit types.
81	Guideline 3.0 states that the ideal unit size for large units, based on the sum of the unit elements, is 90 square metres for 2-bedroom units and 106 square metres for 3-bedroom units, with ranges of 87-90 square metres and 100-106 square metres representing a diversity of sizes for such bedroom types while maintaining the integrity of common spaces to ensure their functionality.	Noted.
82	The provision of 248 (32.4%) of the net new dwelling units as 2-bedroom units and 100 (13.1%) of the net new dwelling units as 3-bedroom units satisfies the unit mix objectives of Guideline 2.1 of the Growing Up Guidelines. However, only 55 2-bedroom units (7.2% of all new residential units) approximate or are larger than 87 square metres in size (80 square metres or larger), and only 45 3-bedroom units (5.9% of all new residential units) approximate or are larger than 100 square metres in size (93 square metres or larger), which does not adequately support the unit size objectives of Guideline 3.0.	While the some of proposed unit sizes are smaller than the guideline unit size for 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units, it is anticipated that the units will be designed with open concept layouts to maximize efficient use of space. Also, a variety of unit sizes are proposed to make it more market- affordable to various households with different needs.

1.0 Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Urban Design, Policy Planning, Transportation Planning
Shelley Cham, Manager, Community Planning
Marty Rokos, Senior Planner, Community Planning
Date: August 26, 2022

	Comment	Response
83	The applicant is asked to slightly reduce the number of 1-bedroom units within the proposed development to provide at least 15% of the total proposed residential units as 2-bedroom units with an area of 87 square metres or larger, and 10% of the proposed residential units as 3-bedroom units with an area of 100 square metres or larger. Such revisions would permit the applicant to better accommodate a broad range of households, including families with children, within the proposed development.	The opportunity to reduce the number of 1-bedroom units for potential unit size increase in some of 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units will be considered in Site Plan Approval after further design development, pending future tenure and market conditions of the development.
84	For questions or comments, please contact: Keir Matthews-Hunter, Planner, SIPA (Housing) at Keir.Matthews-Hunter@toronto.ca, 416-392-5092	Noted.
	Community Services and Facilities	
	Policy Context	
85	Community services and facilities (CSF) contribute to the social, economic and cultural development of the city and are vital in supporting liveable communities. CS&F are publicly accessible, non-profit facilities and places where City Divisions, agencies and boards, and school boards deliver programs and services. This includes child care centres, libraries, recreation facilities, schools and community space for human services. CS&F support a strong network of programs and services that are essential to building community capacity as well as the fostering of complete communities.	Noted.
86	The Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS) uses the term public service facilities and identifies that such facilities will be coordinated and integrated with land use planning so that they are financially viable and available to meet current and projected needs. The PPS supports the optimization and adaptive re-use of existing facilities.	Noted.
87	The Growth Plan (2020) reinforces the PPS and further identifies that public service facilities form part of the achievement of complete communities and improve social equity and overall quality of life. The Growth Plan calls for facilities to be co-located where possible with preference given to locations in or near strategic growth areas easily accessible by active transportation and transit.	Noted.
88	The City's Official Plan Policy 2.3.1.7 identifies that community and neighbourhood amenities will be enhanced where needed by improving and expanding facilities, creating new facilities and adapting existing services to changes in the needs of the neighbourhood. Section 3.2.2 of the Official Plan calls for adequate and equitable access to community services and local institutions, and sets out a policy framework that, among other things, encourages the inclusion of community service facilities as part of private development.	Noted.
	Community Services and Facilities Comments	
89	The applicant's submission includes a CS&F Study, which provides a brief description of the proposed development, a demographic profile of the Study Area, a high-level inventory of services and facilities located within the Study Area and final conclusions. The inventory includes schools, community recreation centres, libraries, child care centres and human service organizations.	Noted.
h	a) Demographic Profile	
	This subject site is located within the Westminster-Branson Neighbourhood. The following are key demographic characteristics of the neighbourhood: i. Between 2011 and 2016, the Study Area experienced population increase of 3.3%, while the population of the City of Toronto increased 4.5%. ii. The age distribution in the Study Area is generally similar to the rest of the city, with slightly greater proportion of seniors (65+) and fewer working age (25-64) individuals. iii. The neighbourhood has a greater proportion of larger households (3+ persons) compared to the rest of the City. iv. A greater proportion (76%) of individuals in the Study Area live in apartments that are greater than five storeys than in the city as a whole (44.3%). v. There is a higher proportion of renter households in the neighbourhood (60%) when compared with the city-wide proportion (47.2%). vi. The Study Area has a greater proportion of lower-income households and a lower proportion of higher-income households than in the city overall. vii. Median household income in the Study Area ($54,101) is lower than the city overall ($65,829)	Noted.
i	i. Development Activity	
i	According to the applicant's submission, as of August 2021, there were eleven active developments and four recently approved developments in the Study Area. Including the proposed development, they represent 3,558 new residential units which are estimated to result in 6,729 new residents. In addition, the proposed development's 765 residential units are anticipated to generate a population of 1,399 new residents.	Noted.
j. c)	j. c) Sector Inventory	
i	The Study Area includes the lands bounded by Steeles Ave. W. to the north; York Cemetery to the south; Cactus Ave./Granbrook St./Senlac Rd. to the east; and Don River West branch to the west.	Noted.
	Child Care	
90	The applicant's submission identifies eight licensed childcare facilities currently operating within the Study Area offering approximately 524 spaces, with approximately 33 vacancies. The applicant's submission also notes that a new child care facility is planned 1.3 km from the Subject Site.	Noted.
91	The applicant estimates that the proposed development will result in a population increase of approximately 1,399 persons. Based on 2021 Census data for the neighbourhood, children 0-4 form approximately 4.2% of the area's population, resulting in approximately 59 0-4 year old residents from the proposed development. Based on this estimate, the proposed development would result in 29 childcare spaces to be accommodated in order to achieve the Licenced Child Care Growth Strategy vision.	Noted.
92	The Council approved Licensed Child Care Growth Strategy has a vision to serve 50% of children aged 0 to 4 years by 2026. New development presents opportunity to increase the capacity of the licensed child care spaces in recognition that there is an overall system shortage of spaces and capital funding. Children's Services neighbourhood priority mapping for early years child care spaces, December 2021, identifies the Westminster-Branson neighbourhood as an area of medium need with 30-39% of children aged 0-4 served by licensed child care.	Noted.
	Libraries	
93	The Centennial TPL neighbourhood branch is located approximately 1km from the Subject Site. The Council-approved Toronto Public Libraries Facilities Master Plan (FMP), January 2019 identifies and prioritizes investments in Library facilities over the short, medium, and long-term. The Plan establishes a Prioritization Framework for investment to support evidence-based decision-making that considers operational factors and investment requirements to achieve a balance between maintenance and growth-related capital projects. The FMP identified the Centennial branch as a Horizon A funded capital project. This branch is planned to be rebuilt and increase in size from 6,869 square feet to 15,000 square feet.	Noted.
94	TPL was circulated on this application and may provide further comments on specific improvements that this application may contribute towards.	Noted.
	Community Recreation	
95	The Council approved Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan 2019-2038 (FMP) aims to ensure that the provision of city-run recreation facilities is maintained and consistent across the City, and provides provision strategies for a whole host of different types of facilities. The Implementation Strategy for the Parks and Recreation FMP 2019 - 2038 was adopted by City Council on October 29, 2019. It prioritizes and provides timelines for recommended facility projects across the city.	Noted.

1.0 Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Urban Design, Policy Planning, Transportation Planning
Shelley Cham, Manager, Community Planning
Marty Rokos, Senior Planner, Community Planning
Date: August 26, 2022

	Comment	Response
96	There are two City-owned community recreation centres within the Study Area of the proposed development. They include Antibes Community Centre and the Herbert H. Carnegie Centennial Centre. No major capital projects are identified for these facilities in the Parks and Recreation FMP. The FMP identifies a number of other priorities Within Ward 6, including new Artificial Ice Rinks, Splash Pads, and Skate Parks.	Noted.
	Schools	
97	School sites and facilities play an important role as learning institutions and also as integral community resources providing space, play spaces and green and open spaces that support the community. Each school board undertakes ongoing evaluation and monitoring to inform program and accommodation planning.	Noted.
98	The applicant's submission indicates that the subject site is within the local catchment area of 3 TDSB schools: Rockford Public School (JK-Gr. 6), Fisherville Senior Public School (Gr 7-9), and Northview Heights Secondary School (Gr. 9-12). TDSB enrolment figures indicate that all of these schools are currently operating within available capacity. The TDSB estimates that 47 elementary students and 25 secondary students will be generated by the proposal.	Noted.
99	The submission indicates that the subject site is served by five TCDSB schools, including 1 elementary and 4 secondary schools. The TCDSB has indicated that 14 elementary students and 12 secondary students will be generated by the proposal. The elementary school is currently operating at 99% capacity and 1 of the 4 secondary schools are operating over 100% capacity.	Noted.
100	Both boards utilize several methods to manage enrolment throughout their system. These include boundary realignments, portable classrooms, interior retrofits, additions, school consolidations and new schools.	Noted.
101	Both boards have been circulated on this application and may provide additional comments related to capacity.	Noted.
	Community Space/Human Service Agencies	
102	Human Services refers to non-profit community based organizations that deliver a wide-range of programs and services across the city. They can include: youth, family and homelessness services; employment education and immigrant services; health medical and disability services; and seniors services.	Noted.
103	The applicant's submission has identified 14 human service agencies operating in the Study Area, with 10 of these agencies located within the Bathurst-Finch Hub, which offer settlement, employment and legal services, family support, health care, and community development services.	Noted.
104	The City plays an important role in the delivery of CS&F by supporting the human service sector through community grants, contracting agencies for the provision of specific programs and services through fee for service, and providing Community Space Tenancy (CST) space opportunities. City Council adopted a Community Space Tenancy (CST) policy that provides a framework for leasing City space to the non-profit community-based sector led by SDFA.	Noted.
	CS&F Recommendations	
105	The CS&F assessment demonstrates that the site is generally well served by community services and facilities. However, there is an identified need for additional childcare and recreational amenities within the neighbourhood and Ward 6. Based on the foregoing, the following in-kind community benefits recommendations are suggested for consideration as part of the evaluation of the subject application:	The opportunity for either in-kind or financial contribution
a	Provision of an on-site child-care facility in accordance with Children's Services Child Care Development Guidelines on the ground and/or second floor within the proposed development. There is an identified need for additional non-profit licensed child care facilities in the Westminster-Branson neighbourhood, and the potential for such a facility on-site should be explored, given the scale and configuration of the proposed development. The City's standard for a non-profit licensed child care centres accommodate 62 children with approximately 10,000 square feet (929 square metres) of indoor space and a minimum of 3,000 square feet (279 square metres) of dedicated outdoor space; and/or	
b	Securing financial contributions towards the provision of needed recreation facilities in Ward 6, including new Artificial Ice Rinks, Splash Pads, and Skate Parks as identified in the Parks, Forestry and Recreation Facilities Master Plan.	
106	If you have any questions regarding these comments or require more detailed information, please do not hesitate to contact: Dan Godin, Senior Planner, SIPA (Community Services and Facilities) 416-392-0421 dan.godin@toronto.ca	Noted.
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING		
107	The 8.4 metre identified as Multi-use Trail to be dedicated to the City, is acceptable. The multi-use trail width minimum requirement, based on the City's MUT guidelines would be 7.6 metre, which includes the trail, signage, and clearances (but does not include landscaping). Therefore, assuming this 8.4 metre dedication from the 155 Antibes site, plus the additional 3 metres secured from the 5950 Bathurst site, provides adequate space for the MUT and landscaping.	Proposed land conveyance for multi-use path has been revised to 4.6m along the proposed Parkland and 6.1m along the development property to accommodate and exceed 7.6 metre width. Please refer to architectural plans (1/A100.S, A103.S and A202.S) for proposed land conveyance location, area and width for future multi-use path.
108	It is our understanding that Transportation Services has agreed to the dedication of the multi-use trail part to them in principle, as well as the maintenance of the trail and associated elements.	Noted.
109	The proposed driveway access on Bathurst Street is strongly discouraged. According to the City's Road Classification System, Bathurst Street is a major arterial road, and new accesses are to be very limited. It is not evident why this application requires a new driveway access from Bathurst, which will be upgraded with cycling facilities in the future so access conflicts should be limited as much as possible.	The revised proposal no longer proposes a new driveway access from Bathurst Street.
110	Please provide the proposed parking supply broken down into unit type. The implementing zoning by-law must address a parking rate on a unit basis.	Refer to Section 1.3.2 in the TIS addendum for the proposed parking supply breakdown by unit type.
111	The TDM plan will require further commitments in order to meet the requirements of the Toronto Green Standard. There are various items listed that are not likely to attain the claimed trip reduction in Table 14 of the TIS. Remove 'Unbundled Parking' – this is a double count of a reduced parking supply. Remove 'Smart Commute' - they do not work with residential projects and the claimed reduction is too substantial. Remove 'bicycle lanes on Bathurst Street' – this is not being proposed by the applicant.	Refer to detailed response to the comment and Table 9 in the TIS addendum for the proposed TDM measures.
112	PRESTO pre-loaded cards are an acceptable TDM measure if the value can be increased to the typical request of $156 per card per unit, which is the value of a TTC monthly pass.	In place of PRESTO, Bikeshare stations and other supporting infrastructure for multi-modal transportations are proposed. Refer to detailed response in the TIS addendum.
113	The applicant is requested to review additional TDM measures, such as publicly accessible carshare vehicles on site, and a contribution to the expansion of the City's bikeshare system.	5 car-share spaces and Bikeshare stations are proposed.
114	Some of the short-term bicycle parking should be located to the exterior of the building, in highly visible locations near main entrances.	Refer to architectural plan (A103.S and A202.S) and landscape plan (L-100) for short-term bicycle parking proposed outside in highly visible locations near main entrances and public realm.
115	The TTC has included a request for larger bus platforms on Antibes. Further discussion with the TTC is recommended to review the need for a larger platform on Antibes in consideration of the volume/usage of that bus stop, in order to prevent tree removal and to maximize the urban tree canopy.	Two bus stop platforms are proposed on Antibes Drive and Bathurst Street as per the comments provided by TTC.
116	Confirm that 20% of vehicle parking spaces will be equipped with electric vehicle charging equipment, and identify this in the site plan.	Refer to architectural plans (A151.S - A153.S) for proposed parking spaces with EV charging stations, which meet or exceed 20% of the proposed vehicle parking spaces.

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
PART I - REZONING APPLICATION COMMENTS		
A. REVISIONS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT		
	The owner is required to amend and/or provide drawings, studies, reports to address the following comments and resubmit for the review and acceptance by the Chief Engineer & Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services prior to the Enactment of Zoning By-law Amendment.1	Noted.
1.1	**1.1 Transportation Services**	
a	Provide an updated Transportation Impact Study Addendum to address the comments outlined in Traffic Assessment, Part II, Section E of this memo.	Find the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) addendum letter prepared by RJ Burnside, enclosed in this resubmission.
b	Delineate and identify on all drawings the following lands as being conveyed to City for a nominal sum and free of any obstructions: - A 6.0m corner rounding is required at the southeast corner of the site adjacent to the intersection of Bathurst Street and Antibes Drive.	Refer to architectural Site Plan (A103.S) and Landscape Plan (L-100) for 6.0m corner rounding at southeast corner of the site adjacent to Bathurst St and Don Lake Gate.
c	Include a notation on the Site Plan and Landscape Plan stating that "The 6.0m corner rounding at the southeast corner of the site will be conveyed to the City in an unencumbered manner for a nominal sum, to the satisfaction of the City.".	Refer to architectural Site Plan (A103.S) and Landscape Plan (L-100) for the requested notation.
d	Remove all obstructions, at, above, or below grade within the public streets and corner roundings.	No obstructions are proposed within public streets and corner roundings at, above or below grade.
e	Please provide parking spaces in accordance with the rates specified in Condition No. B2, or alternatively submit acceptable documentation which justifies a reduced parking supply that is appropriate for the area and site context.	Please see the updated vehicular parking analysis in Section 1.3.2 in TIS addendum, which confirms the proposed parking supply will either meet and exceed ZBL requirements and / or future parking demand.
f	Please provide sightline analyses for all driveway accesses.	Refer to Attachment 6 in the TIS addendum for sightline analysis.
g	Revise the Site Plans and Landscape Plans to show the provision of minimum 2.1m wide linear paths of concrete public sidewalks along all development site frontages, which: i. Must be clear of any encumbrances such as utility poles, fire hydrants, bike rings, street furniture, specialized paving areas, landscaping, etc.; ii. Must be entirely within the public right-of-way; iii. Must be continuous through the driveway; iv. Must be offset 0.3m from the property line; and v. Must be aligned with the existing adjacent sidewalks and maintain a linear course.	Refer to architectural Site Plan (A103.S) and Landscape Plan (L-100) for 2.1m wide public sidewalks along the development site. Refer to detailed response provided in the TIS addendum.
h	Include a notation on the site plans and landscape plans stating that "The new reconstructed sidewalks along the development site frontages will be built to the satisfaction of the City and at no cost to the municipality".	Refer to architectural Site Plan (A103.S) and Landscape Plan (L-100) for the requested notation.
i	The corner radii at the intersection of Bathurst Street and Don Lake Gate must be designed as per the City's Curb Radii Guidelines. Single-unit truck, city solid waste collection vehicle, and passenger vehicle turning templates will be required to confirm the road design.	It is not proposed to modify the geometrics at the intersection of Bathurst Street and Don Lake Gate.
j	The applicant must submit acceptable functional plans (including pavement markings and signage plans), along with the required civil works related to the curb radii modifications on Bathurst Street and Don Lake Gate.	It is not proposed to modify the geometrics at the intersection of Bathurst Street and Don Lake Gate.
k	Please provide a conceptual ultimate functional plan for the future Multi-Use Trail as per City's Multi-Use Trail Design Guidelines. The plan must include the intersection of this multi-Use Trail at the existing public roads.	Refer to Landscape Plan (L-100) for the conceptual trail design as per City's Multi-Use Trail Design Guidelines, including a potential design for intersection. It is understood the detailed design and construction of the trail will be completed by the City.
l	The applicant must submit a cost estimate for the new Multi-Use Trail, to the satisfaction of Transportation Services.	Please see response to comment (k) above.
m	Please illustrate on the site and landscape plans the tactile walking surface indicator (TWSI) at the northwest corner of Bathurst Street and Don Lake Gate and the northeast corner of Antibes Drive and Don Lake Gate.	Refer to architectural Site Plan (A103.S) and Landscape Plan (L-100) for TWSI shown at the requested corners.
n	Provide accessible parking spaces in accordance with By-law 569-2013.	Refer to Section 1.3.2 in the TIS addendum, which confirms the proposed accessible parking supply will meet the zoning by-law requirements.
o	Demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Toronto Green Standard (TGS) Version 3.0, as further discussed in Part II, Section E of this memo.	The project will comply to requirements for TGS version 4.0, tier 1.
p	Please label the dimension of all parking spaces. Clearly identify the distance of the parking spaces from walls and obstructions. The minimum dimensions of a parking space are 2.6m wide by 5.6m long by 2.0m high. The width must be increased by 0.3m for each side of the parking space that is obstructed more than 1.0m from the front or back of a parking space.	Refer to architectural parking plans (A151.S - A153.S) for typical parking space dimensions.
1.2	**Solid Waste Services**	
	Multi-Residential Component – Building E (Existing Building)	
a	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a collection vehicle movement diagram that has a length of 12 metres and a width of 2.4 metres with a minimum inside/outside turning radii of 9.5 metres and 14 metres respectively, when entering, exiting, travelling throughout the site and entering/exiting the type G loading space. The diagram must also indicate the ability of the collection vehicle to enter and exit the site in a forward motion with no more than a three-point turn.	Refer to Attachment 4 in the TIS addendum for updated vehicle maneuvering analysis in compliance to the comment's requirements.
	Multi-Residential Component – Building A	
a	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 113.14 square metres	Refer to architectural plan (A202.S) for 118.7 square metres of garbage room for Building A.
b	Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will have maximum gradient of 8%, have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum width of 4.5 metres throughout and be 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress.	Refer to architectural plan (A202.S) for the clearance required for the collection vehicle in Building A.
c	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a collection vehicle movement diagram that has a length of 12 metres and a width of 2.4 metres with a minimum inside/outside turning radii of 9.5 metres and 14 metres respectively, when entering, exiting, travelling throughout the site and entering/exiting the type G loading space. The diagram must also indicate the ability of the collection vehicle to enter and exit the site in a forward motion with no more than a three-point turn.	Refer to Attachment 4 in the TIS addendum for updated vehicle maneuvering analysis in compliance to the comment's requirements.
	Multi-Residential Component – Building B	
a	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space will be at least 35.2 square metres.	Refer to architectural plan (A202.S) for 30 square metres of staging pad in front of the Type G loading space, as required to meet requirement for the residential unit count proposed in Building B.
b	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 103.52 square metres	Refer to architectural plan (A202.S) for 123.8 square metres of garbage room in Building B.

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
c	Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will have maximum gradient of 8%, have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum width of 4.5 metres throughout and be 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress.	Refer to architectural plan (A202.S) for the clearance required for the collection vehicle in Building B.
d	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a collection vehicle movement diagram that has a length of 12 metres and a width of 2.4 metres with a minimum inside/outside turning radii of 9.5 metres and 14 metres respectively, when entering, exiting, travelling throughout the site and entering/exiting the type G loading space. The diagram must also indicate the ability of the collection vehicle to enter and exit the site in a forward motion with no more than a three-point turn.	Refer to Attachment 4 in the TIS addendum for updated vehicle maneuvering analysis in compliance to the comment's requirements.
	Multi-Residential Component – Building C & D	
a	Revised drawings must indicate that the staging pad in building A, B or E accounts for the extra units from building C & D in order to sufficiently to account for the extra waste.	Previously proposed townhouses (Building C & D) are removed. A new mid-rise Building C is proposed, which is provided with its own garbage room in the basement.
b	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 25 square metres.	Refer to architectural plan (A153.S) for 82.9 square metres of garbage room in Building C.
c	Revised drawings must ensure that the travel distance from their unit door to the chute is less than 100 meters.	N/A
1.3	**Engineering and Construction Services**	
a	The Architectural Site Statistics Plan shall clearly indicate the total property area under existing conditions, provide a breakdown of all areas being conveyed to the City including road widening, corner rounding's, etc., as well.	Refer to architectural master key plan (1/A100.S) for the proposed land conveyance areas.
b	Clearly indicate all existing and proposed property lines on the Site Plan drawing for lands to be conveyed / dedicated to the City including road widening, corner rounding, public parkland dedication and multi-use trail. Additionally, please indicate all these areas as "land to be conveyed to the City, in an unencumbered manner for a nominal sum, to the satisfaction of the City"	Refer to architectural master key plan (1/A100.S) for the proposed land conveyance areas. Refer to architectural Site Plan (A202.S) for the requested notation.
c	Update the Architectural Drawings as required to address comments on the FSR. The Architect must coordinate with the owner, civil consultant and other consultants to make the necessary site plan / built form changes as required to provide sufficient provision to be able to meet City by-laws and policies including having adequate space to house proposed storm tanks, storm and sanitary control manholes, groundwater access points, water meters and backflow preventers, detector assemblies, etc. all within the private property per applicable City standards, policies and by-laws. The limits and footprint of these areas must be confirmed at the rezoning stage since additional space may be required which could utilize parking spaces thus affecting the parking count for the site.	Noted.
2	**Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, 155 Antibes Drive, Toronto, ON, dated August 31, 2021, prepared by Lithos Group Inc.; Servicing Report Groundwater Summary Form, signed and stamped by Nick Moutzouris, P.Eng., dated August 31, 2021, prepared by Lithos Group Inc.;**	From hereafter, Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report will be referred to as (**FSR**)
	General Comments	
2.1	Please include the City's ZBA file number on the title page. .	Title page has been updated to include the City's ZBA file number.
2.2	Revise the executive summary to address all comments in this memo	The executive summary of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated accordingly.
2.3	Please document in the report the total site area under existing conditions and the total site area after land conveyances to the City.	Refer to architectural site key plan (1/S100.S) and Sections 2.0 and 3.0 in FSR for site statistics of existing site area and net site area, which excludes proposed land conveyances.
2.4	Section 3.0 Site Proposal: Clearly identify the lands (including approximate area) to be conveyed to the City including the corning rounding and the multi-use trail. Note that the public park will be under PF&R ownership while the multi-use trail will be under Transportation Services ownership.	Noted. See response to comment 2.3 above.
2.5	Confirm whether the proposed development will be under a single ownership (standard condominium corporation, a co-operative or a single rental property owner) or is a common element condominium. Confirm and clearly state the ownership type for the proposed development in the FSR by including the following statement: "*Per the information provided to Staff by the applicant, Staff have reviewed this application on the understanding it will comprise of a single parcel of land, under one ownership, under a single standard condominium corporation (applicant to confirm ownership structure for the development), upon completion. If any party, including the applicant or any subsequent owner, submits an application for severance, part-lot control, subdivision, condominium approval or any other form of land division for this development not in accordance with this assumption, different servicing connections, including all associated stormwater management facilities and any necessary revised plans and studies, may be required by the City at the sole cost to that applicant. Also be advised that should any party, including the applicant or any subsequent owner, apply for more than one condominium corporation encompassing any or all of this development or make an application that results in a land division, Staff may require legal assurances, including but not limited to easements, with respect to the approved services. Such assurances will be determined at the time of application for condominium approval.*"	The tenure and the ownership(s) for the proposed developments will be determined in a later submission (site plan approval) stage. At this time, each development is anticipated to have its own separate ownership, and separate servicing connections have been proposed for each development. Please refer to Section 3.0 in FSR, as well as details in the Proposed Servicing Figures (Fig3-1 and Fig3-2) in Appendix F.
	Section 4.1 Terms of Reference: Please reference the City's Sewer Capacity Assessment Guidelines (July 2021).	Refer to updated Section 4.1 in FSR for having referenced the City's Sewer Capacity Assessment Guidelines (July 2021).
2.7	As part of the ZBA application, it must be confirmed that the park can be serviced for storm, sanitary and water servicing based on the depth and location of municipal services and factoring in crossings with other sewers and utilities. The typical servicing requirements from Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PF&R) division for public parkland includes: - Storm servicing (control manhole will be required just inside property line) - Sanitary servicing (control manhole will be required just inside property line) - Water servicing (minimum 50mm domestic water service, shut-off valves, water meter and backflow preventers in chambers, etc. will be required just inside property line) - Electrical Service Connection (minimum 100 Amp service with electrical panel in a lockable cabinet just inside property line) The engineer is to contact PF&R to confirm the exact needs of PFR to ensure the required services are provided and that the sizes of the proposed services will provide adequate capacity for the parks intended use. Written confirmation from PF&R for the required services for the public park is to be appended to the FSR.\	Noted. We have received comments from PF&R and we have updated our civil engineering drawings accordingly. Should there will be no further comments from PR&R, we will provide you with the approval document.
2.8	Section 9.0 and Appendix F: Please update to address all comments in this memo.	Refer to Section 10.0 and Appendix F of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report having addressed all comments in this memo.
	Storm Servicing and Stormwater Management Comments	
2.9	2.9 Section 5.1 Existing Conditions:	

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
2.9.1	Section 2.2.3.7 a) of the WWFMG's requires applicants to calculate the allowable release rate to the municipal sewer from the development site under pre-development conditions. Please calculate and document the allowable release rate to each storm sewer outlet (i.e. the two 525 storm laterals, storm sewer on Bathurst Street, the storm sewer in the City easement, etc.). The entire subject site (less corner roundings) must be delineated with catchment areas based on the actual existing storm drainage conditions to clarify what areas and flows from the site drain to each storm outlet. Please revise this section and the figures in the appendix accordingly.	According to the detailed Site Investigation conducted by our inspection team in February 2023, found in Appendix B of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, the existing storm drainage pattern of the property has been identified. Section 5.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to include the existing catchment areas and the allowable release rates towards each storm outlet. Please refer to Appendix C of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, for details.
2.9.2	Further to the above comment, the applicant is advised that the municipal storm sewer within the City easement does not converge with the municipal storm sewer on Antibes Drive, rather both systems have independent and separate storm outfalls to the Don River W Branch located west of Torresdale Ave. The applicant appears to be proposing storm service connections to Bathurst Street however as documented in the report, the majority of storm drainage from the subject appears to outlet to the storm sewer within the city easement or the Antibes Drive storm sewer. Therefore, the applicant is proposing to change minor storm drainage patterns as these proposed storm connections are introducing storm flows to a municipal storm sewer from an area which it currently does not accept them. Therefore, a storm sewer capacity analysis from this upstream connection point to the outfall of the municipal storm sewer system is required as part of the ZBA application to confirm that the municipal storm sewer system has sufficient capacity for the proposed flows and to verify the proposed development is serviceable for storm and if any external sewer upgrades are required to support this proposed development. Please note that this area is located within Chronic Basement Flooding Area 28, and the EA is complete, therefore the above requirements must be prepared using InfoWorks software. A copy of the storm sewer system model can be obtained through a request to the Development Engineering case manager. The applicant is responsible for reviewing and updating the model to reflect the most current conditions. Alternatively, the applicant can revise Qallowable for the private site as outlined in the previous comment.	A storm external capacity analysis, up to the outfall located at Don River West Branch, located west of Torresdale Avenue, has been prepared. Please refer to Section 5.3 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as to the Downstream Storm Capacity Analysis Report (submitted separately), for details.
2.9.3	Further to the above comments, clearly identify and document the following allowable storm release rates based on actual existing storm drainage conditions: Qallow for public park, Qallow for multi-use trail, Qallow(s) for private site.	According to the detailed Site Investigation conducted by our inspection team in February 2023, found in Appendix B of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, the existing storm drainage pattern of the property has been identified. Section 5.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to include the existing catchment areas and the allowable release rates towards each storm outlet. Please refer to Appendix C of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, for details.
2.9.4	Land dedication to the City such as corner rounding's and road widenings are to be excluded from the SWM/SAN calculations however the public parkland dedication and multi-use trail conveyance to the City must be separately delineated and accounted for. Please revise the report including pre and post figures & calculations to suit.	Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to include separate calculations/figures for the proposed development, the public parkland dedication and the multi-use trail.
2.1	Section 5.2 Stormwater Management:	
2.10.1	The report must clearly confirm and state that minor and major drainage patterns under proposed conditions will generally match existing conditions. The grading design of the development will be required to facilitate major overland flow drainage in a way that generally mimics existing conditions. Otherwise, a major system (overland flow) analysis in accordance with Section 2.2.3.8 of the Wet Weather Flow Management Guidelines will be required to support this development.	Section 5.2.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been prepared, to clearly identify both minor and major drainage patterns and state that they generally match the existing conditions.
2.10.2	Major Overland Flow: The revised SWM Report must include a detailed discussion for all the storm outlets, mitigative measures in the event of complete system failure for the minor (piped) flow, where and how major overland flow will occur for the entire site and confirm that the buildings on site and the adjacent properties will not be flooded. Add a separate section in the report to describe the major overland flow route(s) for the site and emergency overland flow routes for storm events beyond the 100-year storm or in case of blockage or failure of the proposed drainage system per City Terms of Reference for SWM reports.	Section 5.2.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been prepared, to clearly identify the major drainage pattern and the emergency flow route.
2.10.3	It is unclear why the green roof area of Building A has been separately delineated. The subject site must be delineated based on the area proposed to drain to each storm lateral for the site and uncontrolled flow. If buildings A and B will each have their own storm lateral, each building is required to be separately delineated and shall have its own SWM system. Additionally, the public park and the multi-use trail each require their own storm service connection and SWM system.	Separate storm lateral connections have been proposed for existing and proposed buildings, public parkland dedication and multi-use trail dedication areas. Buildings A, B and C will be serviced by one (1) storm lateral connection. Please refer to Sections 5.2 and 5.4.1, as well as Appendices C and F (Proposed Servicing Figures, Fig3-1 and Fig3-2) of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, for details.
2.10.4	Parkland Dedication (A3 Post Drainage Area): It is unclear why an area of 0.110 ha has been delineated. The public park area per the Architectural Plans will be 797.4 m2 (0.08 ha) as indicated on the predevelopment drainage area figure. Additionally, a runoff coefficient of C=0.5 should be assumed for the park under proposed conditions since the program for the park is currently unknown. Please revise.	Section 5.0 and Appendix C of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been updated, according to the latest architectural site statistics and incorporating the runoff coefficient of C=0.5 for the parkland dedication area.
2.10.5	As part of the ZBA application, it must be confirmed how the stormwater management requirements (quantity control, quality control and water balance) for the public park and multi-use trail is intended to be handled. Please note that separate SWM controls will be required. Alternatively, the subject site may over control peak flows to compensate for the public park and multi-use trail draining uncontrolled (for quantity control). Regardless, the public park and multi-use trail is required to be self contained for drainage (cannot drain to the subject site or vice versa) and both parcels of land require a separate storm control manhole and storm service connection. Please review and revise accordingly.	Section 5.2 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated to incorporate a separate stormwater management approach for the development, the public parkland dedication and the multi-use trail. Please refer to Appendix C, for details. In addition, the Proposed Servicing Figures (Fig3-1 and Fig3-2), found in Appendix F, have been updated to illustrate separate storm lateral connections for the development, the public parkland dedication and the multi-use trail.
2.11	Section 5.3 Proposed Storm Connections	
2.11.1	The report must document which existing storm service laterals for the site are to remain and which ones are to be decommissioned. There appears to be two (2) existing 525mm storm connections to Antibes Drive from the site. Please clarify.	Section 5.4.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to identify the existing storm connections to remain/be decommissioned.
2.11.2	The existing storm connection into the exiting municipal easement is required to be decommissioned. It is recommended to relocate Ex STM MH #2 (per the OnSite Locates Plan) just outside of the multi-use trail area and extend the lateral connected to Ex STM MH #1 and reuse the manhole for the storm control manhole for the public park. Staff will require an overflow system for the proposed infiltration system.	The existing storm MH2 will be decommissioned. Section 5.4.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to incorporate the proposed storm lateral connection for the parkland dedication area towards the existing 850mm diameter storm sewer, along Antibes Drive. Please refer to Proposed Servicing Figures (Fig3-1 and Fig3-2), found in Appendix F, for details.

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
2.11.3	In accordance with the City of Toronto Servicing Requirements for Different Built Forms, December 2015 (attached for reference), each building tower/podium is to have its own SWM facility. However, if this is not possible, a shared SWM facility for the site can be provided if the following conditions are met: - each tower/podium to have its own stormwater collection pipe system; - each collection pipe system to have its own monitoring system installed; The civil engineer is to advise the mechanical engineer consultant on the project of these requirements and the SWM Report and Servicing Plan shall include the following note: *"Each tower/podium, to have its own stormwater collection pipe system and each collection pipe system to have its own monitoring system installed. Prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit, the Owner shall submit drawings for the stormwater collection pipe monitoring systems to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Toronto Water. The Owner covenants and agrees at its sole expense to install and maintain a monitoring system for each stormwater collection pipe to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Toronto Water."*	Proposed Servicing Figures (Fig3-1 and Fig3-2), found in Appendix F, as well as Public Utilities Plan (PU-01), submitted separately, have been updated, to illustrate a separate stormwater collection pipe system, with a separate monitoring system installed for each tower/podium. In addition, Section 5.4 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as Fig3-1, Fig3-2 and PU-01, have been updated, to include the subject note.
2.11.4	Appendix C Storm Analysis: Please revise the calculations and figures accordingly to address all comments in this memorandum.	Appendix C of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated accordingly.
	Groundwater Discharge	
2.12	Section 6.3 Groundwater Flow	
2.12.1	Please be advised the Foundation Drainage Policy and Guidelines will apply to all new development applications received by the City of Toronto under the Ontario Planning Act, including all new Official Plan Amendments, Zoning By-Law Amendments, Plan of Subdivision applications, as well as new Site Plan applications, except for Committee of Adjustment applications, starting January 1, 2022. Please refer to the City website for the policy, guidelines and other information including required submittals to request an exemption: https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/water-environment/watersewer- related-permits-and-bylaws/sewers-by-law/managing-foundation drainage/	Noted.
2.12.2	This section and the report must be updated as required to reference a Final Hydrogeological Investigation which meets the City's Terms of Reference.	Section 6.0 and Appendix B of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been updated, to include the final Hydrogeological Review Report.
2.12.3	The applicant must confirm at the ZBA stage whether or not groundwater will be discharged to the municipal system in the short-term (during construction) and/or in the long-term (foundation drainage) and confirm there is capacity in the municipal system if discharge is proposed. If groundwater is proposed, exemption from the Foundation Drainage Policy is required. The applicant will not be permitted to change their proposal once zoning has been approved. Groundwater must be included in the sanitary capacity analysis if discharged to the municipal sanitary system or subtracted from Qallowable if discharged to the municipal storm system. Please confirm and clearly state the receiving municipal sewer for both short and long-term groundwater discharge.	Refer to the updated Hydrogeological Review Report, which describes expecting long-term and short-term discharge of infiltrated stormwater only to storm sewer network. Therefore, short-term and long-term groundwater discharge is required for the subject site. Also, refer to Section 6.0 of the FSR for details.
2.12.4	Short-term Discharge: Assuming that groundwater will be pumped and discharged to a municipal sewer during construction, the peak flow rate will likely exceed the value estimated in the Hydrogeological Investigation for short-term groundwater discharge. If short-term groundwater will be discharged to the municipal sanitary sewer, to ensure that the sanitary sewer capacity analysis is based on the worst case scenario of (existing peak sanitary flows + peak short-term groundwater flow) or (proposed/ultimate peak sanitary flows + peak long-term groundwater flows), please state the maximum permitted pump rate for short-term groundwater discharge to ensure that the findings of the post-development sanitary sewer capacity analysis remain valid.	Not Applicable. According to Section 6.1.2 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, short-term groundwater flow will be discharged towards the existing storm network, along Bathurst Street.
2.12.5	No Short-Term Discharge (Hauling Groundwater Off-Site): If the Property Owner does not wish to discharge private water to City's sewer, in the absence of a short-term discharge approval, the Property Owner shall ensure any private water (including but not limited to groundwater, construction wastewater, etc.) collected from the subject property is hauled away using a Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) approved hauler to ensure that no private water is discharged directly or indirectly into the City's sewage works and thereby comply with Municipal Code Chapter 681-Sewers. Provide a signed letter by the Property Owner confirming such. Refer to the letter template attached.	Noted.
2.12.6	Advisory: If it is proposed to discharge groundwater to the municipal sewer where the quality requirements have not been met, details of the proposed treatment system must be provided Toronto Water, EM&P Unit upon application for a discharge permit and appropriate provision for treatment must be factored in the design of the site in order to confirm that the water quality requirements for discharge to the municipal sewer will comply with the City's Sewer Use By-law, Chapter 681.	Noted.
2.12.7	Long-Term Discharge (Mechanical Certification Letter): If long-term groundwater is proposed to be discharged to a municipal sewer (with an exemption granted by the City via the Foundation Drainage Policy), the mechanical engineering consultant must submit a Pump Discharge Letter (refer to the letter template attached) at the zoning stage. Additionally, the owner will be required submit an application to Toronto Water, Environmental Monitoring & Protection Unit, for any short-term and/or any permanent dewatering system that is required for the building, and enter into an agreement and/or permit to discharge groundwater as required by the General Manager, Toronto Water.	Refer to Appendix B of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as Groundwater Review Summary Form, updated to include the updated groundwater discharge letter stamped and signed by the mechanical consultant. Applications for discharge will be submitted in Site Plan Approval process after full design development.
2.12.8	No Long-Term Discharge (Water-Tight Building Structure): If the proposed buildings will be designed completely water-tight below grade (no long-term groundwater discharge to the municipal system), the applicant shall provide three (3) certification letters (Owner, Mechanical Engineer, Structural Engineer) to the attention of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director, Engineering and Construction Services and copy GM of Toronto Water. Refer to the letter templates attached.	The proposed building structure will not be water-tight. Long-term discharge will be required for discharging infiltrated stormwater.
2.12.9	No Long-Term GW Discharge (Slab on Grade Building Structure): If the proposed townhouse buildings will be designed slab on grade, with no Private Water Drainage System (PWDS) (subsurface drainage system), with no long-term groundwater discharge to the municipal system, the applicant shall provide three (3) letters (Owner, Geotechnical Engineer and Mechanical Engineer) to the attention of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director, Engineering and Construction Services and copy GM of Toronto Water. Refer to the letter templates attached.	Townhouses are no longer being proposed in this Revised Proposal.
2.12.10	Servicing Report Groundwater Summary Form: An updated form is required to be resubmitted with the final FSR and must be coordinated with the Hydrological Review Summary Form. Please ensure the 2 forms are coordinated between the consultants completing the forms (owner information, etc.) and the forms are completely filled out (only the last column is to be completed by the City), and they are stamped, signed and dated. Both form templates have been attached for reference.	Groundwater Review Summary Form has been updated accordingly in coordination with Hydrological Review Summary.

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
2.12.11	If groundwater is proposed to be discharged to a municipal sewer (with an exemption granted by the City via the Foundation Drainage Policy), the following notes must be included directly in the revised FSR: *i. Servicing for this site includes discharge of private water into the City's sanitary sewer system. The owner shall apply for and obtain an exemption under City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681, Sewers (the "Sewers By-law"), where approved by the General Manager, Toronto Water, for the discharge of private water into the City's combined sewer system. Any acceptance of this drawing / report does not constitute an approval to connect a private water drainage system or to discharge private water to a City sewer, which approval must take the form of a discharge agreement executed by the General Manager, Toronto Water, in accordance with the Sewers By-law. If the owner is unable to obtain an exemption in the form of a discharge agreement, or does not remain in good standing, amendments to the approved site plan or a new site plan application may be required.* *ii. In absence of a short-term discharge approval, the Property Owner shall ensure any private water (including but not limited to groundwater, construction wastewater, etc.) collected from the subject property is hauled away using a Ministry of the Environment, Conversation and Parks (MECP) approved hauler to ensure that no private water is discharged directly or indirectly into the City's sewage works and thereby comply with Municipal Code Chapter 681-Sewers.*	Refer to Section 6.1.2 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report updated to incorporate the subject notes.
	Sanitary Servicing and Downstream Capacity Analysis	
2.13	Section 6.1. Existing Sanitary Drainage System: Clarify if the existing sanitary lateral is to remain or be removed. If any laterals are to be removed, document that existing sanitary laterals for the property are to be decommissioned in the City right of- way by City forces at the owner's expense.	Refer to Section 7.5 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, to maintaining the existing 200mm diameter sanitary lateral connection to the existing building.
2.14	Section 6.2. Existing and Proposed Population Flows: Ensure the listed peak flows match Appendix D. Currently minor discrepancies are noted.	Refer to Sections 7.2 and 7.2.1, as well Appendix D of the FSR/SWM Report revised accordingly to ensure consistency.
2.15	Section 6.3.3. Total Flow: It is unclear what the individual flow values represent. Provide a summary in table format and ensure the values match Appendix D.	A summary table has been included in Section 7.2.1 of the updated FSR/SWM Report ensuring that the values match those obtained from Appendix D.
2.16	Table 6-1: Please update to include all active and recent development applications draining to this sanitary sewer shed, including but not limited to 5830 Bathurst St., which per the September 2021 FSR has an existing Phase 2 population of 154 people and a proposed Phase 4 population of 174 people for a total of 328 people. Please also ensure all values (population, groundwater flows, etc. match the latest FSR's on the AIC. The 25 Fisherville Dr. development for example is proposed to have 2.0 l/s groundwater discharge to Fisherville Dr. and 2.0 l/s groundwater discharge to Russfax Dr. for a total of 4.0 l/s. It is the applicant's responsibility to consult the City's development applications website and ensure the correct and most up to date values are utilized and all relevant development applications are included prior to each formal resubmission. City AIC website: https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/applicationinformation- centre/.	Refer to Table 7.2 of the updated Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been revised to ensure that all the recent development applications have been considered for the estimation of the existing and proposed flows in the sanitary sewer network.
2.17	Section 6.4 Sanitary Sewer Capacity Analysis	
2.17.1	Model Conversion and Validation: Please clearly document all model updates including errors and omissions that were corrected.	According to "Appendix A-Protocol for Flow Monitoring and I&I Estimation" of the City of Toronto Sewer Capacity Assessment Guidelines, dated July 2021 and "Appendix C - Flow Monitoring Analytical Processing" of the City of Toronto InfoWorks CS Basement Flooding Model Studies Guideline, the most updated "City Owned" Flow Monitoring Data, were analyzed for the Calibration and Validation of the model. All model updates/revisions are fully documented in sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 of the updated Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis.
2.17.2	The following statements must be included directly in the FSR as it relates to the sanitary sewer capacity analysis: i. Verification the sewer analysis model correctly represents the sewer system, including any updates to the sewer analysis to reflect changes (i.e. sewer construction) since the model was initially prepared. ii. The model has been updated to include all sanitary peak flow rates including peak flow rates from groundwater being discharged to the municipal sanitary system from all active and recent development applications located within the affected sanitary sewer shed. iii. Best efforts have been made to include all peak flows from Private Water discharge agreements in the sanitary sewer shed.	Section 7.4 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as the Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis, submitted separately, have been updated to include the subject statements.
2.17.3	Private water / groundwater from the subject site and other development sites must be manually added to each applicable sewer section for the sanitary analysis. As such, they should be modelled as base flows in the InfoWorks model. Please document in the revised FSR.	Section 7.4 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as Section 4.0 of the Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis, submitted separately, have been updated, to state that private water/groundwater from the subject development and new developments were manually added in the model.
2.17.4	Applicants are responsible to complete their sanitary analysis up to the connection of the Maple Collector Sanitary Sewer (manhole City ID #: MH5512526066A) per the as-built drawing set. The Maple Collector Sanitary Sewer has been designated as a trunk sewer. Please document in the revised FSR.	Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis Report has been updated accordingly.
2.17.5	The FSR must clearly document the I/I value for WWF events (under the May 12, 2000 storm event) utilized in the model.	According to Section 5.4 Calibration Wet Weather of the updated Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis, comparison of Projected I&I value and Initial value of the model is discussed. SSOAP model was used for the determination of the Projected I&I value (2.48 l/s/ha). Since the initial I&I value (without RTK parameters adjustment) is larger than the Projected value, the utilized in the model I&I value was 3 l/s/ha (worst case scenario). Please refer to Figure B-6 and Figure B-7, found in Appendix B, for details.
2.17.6	The report must document how the section of Antibes Dr (currently associated with BFA 58 (EA study currently in progress)) which was not originally included in the BFA 28 model has been added into the model. Please confirm the utilized wastewater pattern, baseflows and RTK values utilized in the InfoWorks model. The applicant may wish collaborate with other applicants completing the downstream sanitary sewer capacity analysis within this sewer shed.	Since the BFA58 study is in process, we investigated alternative solutions for model calibration. The basis for deriving wastewater pattern, Baseflow (Dry Weather Calibration) and RTK hydrographs (Wet Weather Calibration) is the flow monitoring data. Using the most recent flow monitoring data as benchmark, parameters adjustment has been made to correct perceived errors and consider the influence of BF58 area to the model. Please refer to Sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 of the updated Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis for details.
2.17.7	Please be advised that while the EA has been completed for this sewer shed, the City continues to complete flow monitoring for a number of locations in this sewer shed. The applicant is recommended to reach out to Development Engineering to request the available data. If the applicant includes the updated flow monitoring data in their analysis, please document in the FSR how the model was updated and what information was used including time period and location of any new monitoring information not included in the original model.	The most recent "City Owned" flow monitoring data, recorded at MH4847808186, from March 2020 to January 2022 were analyzed. For Calibration of Dry Weather Conditions, two (2) periods with minimal precipitation and antecedent moisture conditions were selected. For calibration of Wet Weather Flows, respectively, three (3) storm events with different characteristics in terms of intensity and duration were selected. Please refer to Sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 of the updated Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis for details.
2.18	Section 6.5. Capacity Assessment Results	

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
2.18.1	The capacity results indicate that there will be surcharging in the sanitary sewer system during DWF including in sewer segments that were not surcharging during DWF. Similarly, the results indicate that there will be surcharging with less than 1.8m freeboard during WWF including above the manhole lids for a number of areas with proposed conditions worsening existing conditions. The sanitary sewer capacity analysis must comply with the latest version of the City's sanitary sewer capacity assessment guidelines: https://www.toronto.ca/wpcontent/ uploads/2021/07/96e4-ecs-specs-dcm-sewer-capacityassessment-guidelines-July2021.pdf. The engineering consultant is recommended to review the analysis requirements and process charts including steps for proposed mitigation in accordance with this document to ensure adequate capacity for this development. Note that any proposed privately funded mitigation measures within City right-of-way must be accompanied by a preliminary cost estimate. The consultant engineer may also wish to contact Development Engineering, once they have thoroughly reviewed and explored various mitigation solutions to informally discuss their proposal prior to another formal submission.	Noted. Refer to Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis Report. A preliminary cost estimate can be found on Appendix C of the Downstream Capacity Analysis Report, which is submitted separately.
2.18.2	Proposed sanitary drainage patterns should generally match existing condition sanitary drainage patterns. Changes in sanitary drainage patterns must be documented with appropriate justification and proper downstream sanitary analysis to confirm no adverse effects on the sanitary sewer system. Please document in the revised FSR.	Section 7.4 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as the Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis, submitted separately, indicate that the proposed mixed-use development at 155 Antibes Drive does not increase the risk of basement flooding and can be serviced by the upgraded sanitary network.
2.19	Section 6.6. Proposed Sanitary Connections:	
2.19.1	The proposed sanitary servicing proposal does not comply with the City of Toronto Servicing Requirements for Different Built Forms, December 2015. Please revise the design to be in conformance with the Built Forms document with particular attention to point towers and podium requirements. The Notice to Applicants document is attached for reference. Please revise the FSR and Servicing Plans accordingly. Note that regardless of ownership proposed building towers, proposed and existing residential buildings must have separate independent sanitary service connections to the municipal sewer system. The applicant must also review the townhome component of the Built Form document for servicing requirements.	Section 7.5 and Appendix F of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been updated, to incorporate separate sanitary lateral connections for each proposed tower/podium and parkland dedication area.
2.19.2	Sanitary control manholes are required to be located on private property, as close to the new property line as possible per Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681. Please clearly state these requirements, which are required for all proposed sanitary service connections.	All sanitary control manholes/chambers in Proposed Servicing Figures (Fig3-1 and Fig3-2), found in Appendix F, of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, are located within private property and as close to the new/old property line as possible.
2.19.3	200mmØ sanitary laterals have been proposed for the 2 proposed tower buildings which each have more than 6 times the capacity of the peak flow from the buildings. The City only allows sanitary service laterals sized with the capacity to convey the peak flow from the site / building. Larger sewer lateral sizes will not be permitted. Please investigate reducing the lateral size to 150mmØ which will also avoid requiring a proposed sanitary manhole at the City main in order to connect to the City sewer main per City standard T-1006.010. Please revise.	Proposed Servicing Figures (Fig3-1 and Fig3-2), found in Appendix F, and Section 7.5 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as Public Utilities Plan (PU-01), submitted separately, have been updated accordingly.
2.19.4	The report fails to describe which specific sanitary service lateral(s) private water / groundwater will outlet to hence requiring Private Water Sampling Access Point(s) and what the peak flow will be for each based on a certified Mechanical Pump Discharge Letter.	This comment is not applicable. Only infiltrated stormwater flow will be discharged into the municipal storm sewer infrastructure.
2.19.5	Please confirm and document in the report that all proposed and existing (to remain) sanitary service laterals have capacity to convey the peak sanitary discharge + any permanent groundwater discharge to them based on 450 litres/capita/day per City standards. If temporary groundwater will be discharged to the lateral, please also confirm it can convey peak temporary groundwater discharge.	This comment is not applicable. Only infiltrated stormwater flow will be discharged into the municipal storm sewer infrastructure.
2.2	Appendix D – Sanitary Data Analysis:	
2.20.1	Update all figures, tables and model outputs to address all comments in this memorandum.	Appendix D - Sanitary Data Analysis has been updated accordingly.
2.20.2	Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet: i. The unit breakdown doesn't match the Architectural Plans. Please review for consistency. For example, the number of 2-bed units for Building B does not match. Please update all calculations and report sections accordingly. ii. Provide an equivalent population for the public park per the City's Design Criteria (parkland: 10 persons/ha). iii. Peak Groundwater Flow must be substantiated by a stamped Mechanical Engineer Certification Letter.	i) Sanitary calculations have been updated, according to the latest architectural set. ii) Sanitary calculations have been updated accordingly. iii) Appendix B of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as Groundwater Review Summary Form, have been updated, to include the Certification Letter prepared by the Mechanical Engineer.
2.20.3	Some of downstream sanitary sewer data doesn't match City as-built record information. Please review invert elevations, pipe slopes and manhole top of grate information in conjunction with City as-built drawings. Particular attention should be provided to pipe slopes for pipe segments 26A and 27A and top of grates for manholes between pipe segments 20A-27A.	Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis has been updated, to illustrate the as built pipe information (surface elevations, slopes, inverts, etc.).
2.20.4	Provide a sanitary sewer drainage area plan generated from the InfoWorks model to illustrate the modeled area, all sub-catchment areas and contributing sanitary flows, including areas contributing I/I, for the analyzed sanitary sewers utilized in the model and document the total sewer shed drainage area.	Figures DAP1-A and DAP1-B found in Appendix B of the Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis have been prepared accordingly.
2.20.5	Provide the pipe profile Info Works model outputs showing pipe data, peak flows, finished grade, HGL information, etc., for all analyzed scenarios to be reviewed in conjunction with the table outputs. For all profile outputs, ensure the following rows at the bottom from the InfoWorks output are included for ease of reference: us inv (m AD), ds inv (m AD), grad (m/m), expr:Freeboard.	Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis has been updated, to include InfoWorks ICM long sections.
2.21	Depending on the proposed mitigation proposed for this development, specific wording will be required in the FSR. Further feedback will be provided by the City once an acceptable sanitary solution is determined by the applicant and the capacity analysis has been deemed generally acceptable by the City.	Noted. Section 7.4 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to incorporate the suggested mitigation measures.
2.22	Further to the above, we defer any further comments on the provided sanitary sewer capacity analysis until the required documentation is submitted for review. Be advised that further requirements and mitigative measures will be determined once a proper analysis is received and reviewed and will be based on the sewer capacity calculated from both the design flow and extreme wet weather flow conditions. Water Servicing and Fire Flow Demand & Analysis	Noted.
2.23	Section 7.0 Water Supply System: Include the following statements in the revised report: "Where there is a risk of contamination at a property, such as non-potable water, wastewater, or any other liquid, chemical or substance entering the waterworks that may affect the quality of the water supply, the owner of the property will install a backflow prevention device." "Backflow prevention devices will be selected, supplied, installed and tested at the owner's expense in accordance with Water Supply Bylaw, Chapter 851 of the Toronto Municipal Code, Ontario Building Code, CSA B64 and NFPA 13/14 standards and specifications."	Section 8.0 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as Section 5.2 of the Water Distribution Analysis Report, have been updated, to include the subject notes.
2.24	Section 7.2. Proposed Water Supply Requirements and Appendix E Water Data Analysis	
2.24.1	Ensure the population values used for domestic water calculations and analysis match the sanitary section and appendices. Please review and revise and ensure all sections of the report match and are consistent.	Section 8.2 and Appendix E of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been updated accordingly.
2.24.2	Please provide separate FUS fire flow demand requirements and calculations for the entire site, including all proposed buildings and existing buildings to remain, separately in the FSR. We note that each building has different parameters including GFA, exposures, building construction, etc. which drastically affect the required fire flow. The worst-case scenarios must then be evaluated.	Section 8.2 and Appendix E of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, as well as Section 5.2 of the Water Distribution Analysis, have been updated accordingly.
2.24.3	2.24.3 FUS Fire Flow Demand (Buildings A & E):	

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
i	i. Please ensure all GFA values utilized in FUS calculations match the Architectural Plans exactly (prior to GFA deductions).	FUS Fire Flow Demand Calculations for Buildings A & E have been updated according to the latest architectural set.
ii	ii. In accordance with the Water Supply for Public Fire Protection 1999 guide by Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS), unless the building will be / is of fire-resistive construction ('C' = 0.6), no short-form calculations for the area calculation is permitted and the entire GFA must be assessed. Please see below comment.	The proposed new buildings will be designed as fire-resistive construction in accordance with Ontario Building Code.
iii	iii. Type of Construction: FUS fire flow calculations which use a 'C' value of 0.6 to calculate the fire demand for a building is for fire-resistive construction only (fully protected frame, floors, roof, i.e. reinforced concrete building) as per the Water Supply for Public Fire Protection 1999 guide by Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS). The FUS guideline defines fire-resistive construction as "any structure that is considered fully protected, having at least 3-hour rated structural members and floors. For example, reinforced concrete or protected steel." If the engineer uses a 'C' value of 0.6 in the FUS calculations, to support these assumptions, a certification letter signed, sealed and dated from the Architect is required for all buildings which use this value. The letter needs to clearly state the type of material proposed to construct the specific building(s) and that the material is of fire-resistive construction per FUS 1999 Guidelines. Additionally, the letter needs to confirm and clearly state that "vertical openings and exterior vertical communications are properly protected (one hour rating)" if the short form calculation for A is to be used to calculate the Fire demand. The certification letter will be required to be appended to the FSR as part the ZBA application.	Appendix B of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to include the certification letter provided by architect consultant, dated 22 February, 2023.
iv	iv. Occupancy factor: It is our understanding that the occupancy of these types of buildings are of limited combustible nature and a 15% reduction is applicable. Please review and revise.	Water Calculations have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Appendix E and Appendix J of the updated FSR-SWM Report, for details.
vi	v. Sprinkler Credit: Provide a letter from the Mechanical Consultant confirming whether the existing building has been and which specific proposed buildings are being designed with a fully automatic sprinkler system as per "Water Supply for Public Fire Protection 1999 edition" page 18, item 3, and the 30% reduction applied is appropriate, to validate your assumptions in fire requirement (FUS) calculations. The certification letter will be required to be appended to the FSR. The letter requirements are: a) In order for the engineer to get credit for a 30% reduction in their fire flow calculations, the letter must confirm that the sprinkler system will be a fully automatic, in accordance with FUS 1999 Guidelines. b) The letter must confirm that the sprinkler system will be designed to conform to NFPA 13 and other applicable NFPA sprinkler standards. c) The letter must include the full municipal address of the site and the City zoning application number. d) The letter must be signed, sealed and dated by a qualified Ontario licensed Mechanical Engineer, P.Eng. e) The letter must be addressed to: Attention: Executive Director, Engineering and Construction Services c/o Manager, Development Engineering North York Civic Centre, 4th Floor 5100 Yonge St. Toronto, Ontario, M2N 5V7	Appendix B of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated, to include the certification letter provided by mechanical consultant, dated October 13, 2023.
vi	vi. Exposure Factor: The listed exposure factors appear low. Please provide an Exposure Factor Figure to scale to illustrate the measured exposure distances for all buildings on site.	Water Calculations have been revised accordingly. Please refer to Appendix E of the updated FSR-SWM Report, for details.
2.24.4	Pressure Loss Calculations: Please update to address all comments in this memorandum. Please provide a detailed hydraulic watermain analysis for all proposed fire service connections, which is required to verify pressures and flows at the connection points the buildings (can be spreadsheet format). The applicant is to provide with the next revised submission a water distribution analysis for all fire service connections to verify that the water pressures and flows are adequate to service this development and to verify the size of the proposed fire lines. Please clearly document all variables including pipe size, pipe length, Hazen Williams 'C' factor, etc. Please ensure 'C' factors match the City's Design criteria (Staff currently note discrepancies). The hydraulic watermain analysis must factor in friction losses through the water service and appurtenances as well as elevation changes. If minimum required fire flows cannot be met, the consultant engineer is to identify the required improvements to the existing municipal watermain system to support this zoning by-law amendment application.	A Water Distribution Analysis has been prepared accordingly. Based on the results of the subject analysis, submitted separately, the water pressures and flows are adequate to service the future water demands of the subject property, with no adverse impacts to the municipal system, for all the scenarios. Please refer to Appendix B, for details.
2.25	Section 7.3. Existing and Proposed Fire Services: Please confirm and document that all of the building's Siamese (fire department) connections will be within 45m of a fire hydrant per Fire Code and OBC requirements.	All of the building's Siamese connections will be within 45m of a fire hydrant, as shown in the architectural site plan (A103.S). Also refer to Section 8.3 of the updated FSR.
2.26	Section 7.4. Proposed Watermain Connections	
2.26.1	The proposed water servicing proposal does not comply with the City of Toronto Servicing Requirements for Different Built Forms, December 2015. Please revise the design to be in conformance with the Built Forms document with particular attention to point towers and podium requirements. The Notice to Applicants document is attached for reference. Please revise the FSR and Servicing Plans accordingly. Note that regardless of ownership, proposed residential building towers and the existing building must have separate independent domestic water service connections to the municipal sewer system (h-connection). Please also review the townhome component of the Built Form document for servicing requirements.	Each proposed tower/podium has its own water service connection to the municipal water infrastructure. Please refer to Section 8.0 and Servicing Figure in Appendix F of the updated FSR-SMW Report, for details. Section 8.4 and Appendix E of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report have been updated, to incorporate separate water lateral connections for each proposed tower/podium and parkland dedication area.
2.26.2	The proposed water servicing proposal does not comply with OBC Section 3.2.9.7 (4). "If the building is 84 m or more high, measured between grade and the ceiling level of the top storey, the building shall be served by no fewer than two sources of water supply from a public water system". All buildings which exceed 84m must have 1 water fire service connection to a municipal watermain and a 2nd water fire service connection to a separate municipal watermain. Please refer to the "Building Higher Than 84 Metres" section of the City's Design Criteria.	Buildings A and B exceed 84m in height and a second fire service connection has been proposed for each building, according to the "Building Higher Than 84 Metres" section of the City's Design Criteria. Please refer to Section 8.3 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report.
2.26.3	Please document that all proposed and existing buildings must have a separate water meter, detector assembly, and backflow preventer in accordance with City standard SD-4. This water related mechanical equipment must be located in a separate mechanical room at the location of the point of entry of each water connection into the building.	All proposed and existing buildings will have a separate water meter, detector assembly and backflow preventer as per the City standard SD-4. Proposed Servicing Figure (Fig3-1 and Fig3-2), found in Appendix F, has been updated accordingly.
2.26.4	Indicate the requirements for a water meter chamber and back flow preventer within the proposed public park.	This will be addressed in Site Plan Approval stage.
	Multi-Use Trail & Municipal Storm Sewer and Easement	
2.27	We have been advised by City Planning and Transportation Services Staff that a new east-west connection (multi-use trail) is required along the northern limit of the site (between Bathurst Street and Antibes Drive). A conceptual ultimate plan will need to be submitted within the zoning submission which includes functional engineering drawings. These drawing shall be coordinated between all three affected landowners (5950 Bathurst St., 155 Antibes Dr. and 25 Cedarcroft Blvd).	A Conceptual Ultimate Plan (CU-01), found in Appendix G, has been prepared, including cross sections for the multi-use trail.
2.28	The Architectural plans, Landscape plans and Engineering plans all must include notation on the plans which state that the lands to be dedicated to the City for the purpose of a future multi-use trail as "lands to be conveyed to the City in an unencumbered manner for a nominal sum, to the satisfaction of the City".	Refer to architectural plan (A103.S), landscape plan (L-100) and all civil engineering plans updated, to include the subject note.
2.29	There is an existing municipal sewer easement along the northern limit of the site. This easement contains an existing municipal storm sewer which falls within the general area of the proposed Multi-Use Trail. The City requires that the municipal storm sewer be located entirely within a City right-of-way. Where this is not possible, a municipal easement which complies with current City standards must be provided. The City of Toronto Design Criteria for Sewers and Watermains Manual, Chapter 1 - Easement Requirements, outlines municipal easement requirements. Please confirm and document in the FSR whether the land to be conveyed to the City will achieve the required minimum municipal easement width.	The proposed land conveyance to max width of 6.1m fully contains the existing municipal storm sewer, including the full extent of the existing easement. Refer to architectural master site key plan (1/S100.s) and Site Plan (A103.S) for proposed conveyance area and location, as well as refer to Conceptual Ultimate Plan (CU-01) for details.

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
2.3	Staff appreciate the cross-sections provided for the Multi-Use Trail on Drawing SG- 01. Please ensure the drawing as an appendix to the FSR. On all cross-sections, please update to indicate approximate finished grade, limits of proposed / existing buildings including underground parking structure including horizontal distances to the sewer, private services, total ROW width, all existing municipal easements and sewers including those on 25 Cedarcroft Boulevard, the unsupported open excavation limit per OPSD 802.03 based on proposed finished grade, the public parkland dedication, and indicate the property addresses. It appears that OPSD 802.03 has not been correctly illustrated, which requires a vertical base of 1.2m before sloping at a 1:1 ratio. Also confirm the sections are to scale. Please also provide an additional cross section at the pinch point located approximately half way between Sections A-A and B-B. The zone of influence for the municipal sewer for fully unsupported excavation must be contained completely within the land conveyance. Additional width (beyond Table 2 in the City's Design Criteria Manual) may be required to achieve this. Additionally, the zone of influence for nearby structures cannot impact or impart any loading on municipal infrastructure. Please illustrate zone of influence for all nearby structures and services. City Staff will need to see the revised cross sections before providing further feedback.	Conceptual Ultimate Plan (CU-01), found in Appendix G of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, has been prepared to include the updated cross sections for the multi-use trail. OPSD 802.030 standard drawing has been used to design the ZOI of the existing 1050mm diameter municipal storm sewer.
2.31	A separate section in the FSR is to be added and shall include a discussion on the multi-use trail, the existing municipal storm sewer and easement and the area to be conveyed to the City as covered above.	Refer to Section 3.0 in FSR for details related to the existing municipal storm sewer, easement and the area to be conveyed to the City.
2.32	City Requirements for municipal sewers with municipal easements / land conveyances with municipal sewers: i. Surface treatment: grass and asphalt is permitted, however expensive landscaping (such as concrete, permeable pavers, units pavers, vegetation, etc.) and contaminated soil is not permitted. ii. The proposed municipal easement / land conveyance for City ROW must be free and clear of all title and physical encumbrances including expensive landscaping, trees, utilities, light standards, benches, signs and other street furniture, private pipes, utilities and structures such as footings, buildings and retaining walls. iii. Trees / planting vegetation must be kept outside of municipal easements and must be kept a minimum distance from the sewer centre line to 5m (~15 feet) on either side to continue/allow for access and maintenance, and aid in reduction of roots growing in the sewer. This clearance also applies around maintenance holes. iv. The minimum distance between a sewer exterior wall and any structure (such as soldier pile, tieback (from shoring), retaining wall, footing, underground parking garage, building, etc.) is to be 3m. This minimum 3m clearance is to avoid impacting the structural integrity of the sewer, allow for maintenance of the sewer and access to the maintenance holes, and also allow for future rehabilitation or repairs of the sewer system. For sewer radius sections (curves), the clearance is increased to 5m due to the challenges in physically locating the sewer. v. Note that Municipal Chapter 681 (Sewers) prohibits service connections into easements. Additionally, private services crossing easement lands is not permitted.	Noted. Refer to civil engineering conceptual ultimate plan (CU-01) and landscape plan (L-100) for a conceptual design of multi-use path as per the City's multi-use trail guideline. In accordance with the comments, excessive surface treatment and landscaping are minimized within the private property adjacent to the land conveyance with the existing municipal sewer and within its zone of influence.
2.33	Advisory: The applicant will be required, as part of the site plan process, to complete a pre-construction CCTV investigation (per OPSS 409 and TS 409) of the existing municipal storm sewer to verify the condition of the municipal sewer and submit the documentation to the City for review and acceptance	Noted.
2.34	Advisory: It is unclear how storm drainage will be accommodated on and around the multi-use trail once constructed. Detailed grading, servicing and stormwater management design with a discussion in the SWM Report will be required as part of the SPA process.	Noted.
2.35	Advisory: Per standard City requirements, the applicant must undertake environmental site assessments for lands to be conveyed to the City per City standards including providing payment for a peer reviewer and the submission of the required contaminated site assessments, Record of Site Condition (RSC), etc.	Noted.
2.36	Advisory: The applicant shall submit for review and acceptance, prior to depositing in the appropriate Land Registry Office, a Draft Reference Plan of Survey, in metric units showing the co-ordinate values at the main corners of the development lands, and delineating thereon, by separate PARTS, the lands to be conveyed to the City.	Noted.
2.37	The City defers any further comment until the aforementioned material has been submitted for review. Detailed comments and conditions will be provided upon formal submission.	Noted.
3	**Hydrogeological Review Report, 155 Antibes Drive, Toronto, ON, revised dated August 31, 2021, prepared by Grounded Engineering; Hydrological Review Summary Form, signed and stamped by Nicholas Ng, P.Eng., dated December 13, 2021, prepared by Grounded Engineering;**	
3.1	A Final Hydrogeological Investigation is required to be submitted with the ZBA/SPA application and must meet the City's Terms of reference for Hydrogeological Investigations. The Hydrogeological Investigation will not be reviewed by City staff in detail until a final stamped report is submitted, in accordance with City's Terms of reference, accompanied by a coordinated Hydrological Review Summary Form and Servicing Report Groundwater Summary Form. The City's Terms of reference for Hydrogeological Investigations can found at the following link: https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/application-formsfees/ building-Toronto-together-a-development-guide/application-support-material terms- of-reference/	Noted.
	Preliminary Hydrogeological Investigation Report Comments	
	General Comments	
3.2	Please include the City's ZBA file number on the title page.	ZBA file number is included in the title page.
3.3	The owner shall confirm whether the proposed Development will be under a single ownership (standard condominium corporation, a co-operative or a single rental property owner) or is a common element condominium. Confirm and clearly state the ownership type for the proposed development in the Hydrogeological Investigation.	At this time, multiple ownerships (i.e. different condominium corporations) are anticipated for the proposed developments, and this is considered in the updated Hydrogeological Report dated October 19, 2023.
3.4	In accordance with the City's Terms of reference for Hydrogeological Investigations, a minimum of five (5) groundwater wells shall be installed at locations that represent the entire proximity of the site. It is noted that 6 groundwater wells were installed and monitored however all of them are located on the east side of the site. Furthermore, it is understood that infiltration measures are proposed on the west side of the site however no groundwater wells were installed to evaluate groundwater levels in that area.	Refer to the updated Hydrogeological report for additional groundwater well locations.
3.5	In accordance with the City's Terms of reference for Hydrogeological Investigations, static groundwater level measurements shall be monitored at all wells located within the property for a minimum of 3 months with measurements taken every 2 weeks for a minimum of 6 measurements.	Refer to Appendix A in the updated Hydrogeological report.
3.6	Update to date water quality data must be collected within nine (9) months prior to the date of submission. Additionally, a scanned original chain of custody record for the samples must be included with the report.	An updated sewer set can be collected and provided.

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services
Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering
Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
3.7	It is understood that the existing building on site is to be retained, which includes an underground garage structure. Please confirm (field investigate, provide record drawings, etc.) and document the existence of any existing Private Water Drainage Systems that connect to or outlet to a municipal sewer system. Confirm if there will be any renovation(s) or alteration(s) to the existing Private Water Drainage System (foundation drainage system, weeping tiles, pump systems, etc.) and how it will be handled in conjunction with the proposed development (connected to the proposed Private Water Drainage System, etc.). Please ensure the Hydrogeological Investigation factors in the entire subject site, including proposed buildings, underground structures and existing buildings to remain. Please revise the report accordingly.	The existing underground garage structure will not be enlarged nor depend in depth, and the existing drainage system will remain. Short-term and long-term groundwater discharges are discussed for the proposed parking garage in the updated Hydrogeological report.
	Site Description	
3.8	Advisory: If multiple condo boards/ legal entities will be formed, the future condo board/ legal entity who will assume the responsibilities for the service connection through which discharged groundwater will occur, shall also assume responsibilities of the Private Water Drainage System. The legal entity which assumes the responsibilities of Private Water Drainage System must comply with Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681 and Chapter 851). This individual will be required to enter into a Sanitary Discharge Agreement under Section 6 of City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681 and will be responsible for compliance with Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681 and Chapter 851. Additionally, all equipment (treatment system, flow meter, sampling access point, etc.) for the Private Water Drainage System shall be on their property.	Noted.
	Construction Dewatering	
3.9	Note: The discharge of private water, including groundwater, directly or indirectly into City's sewage works is prohibited under Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 681, Sewers (MCC681), unless the subject property has obtained discharge approval in the form of a discharge agreement in accordance with MCC 681-6 from Toronto Water, Environmental Monitoring and Protection Unit.	Noted.
3.10	Confirm if the Property Owner wishes to discharge Private Water / groundwater to City's sewer during construction / dewatering phase. Revise the Functional Servicing Report to include the construction dewatering volume (L/day) and the maximum short-term pump peak flow rate (L/s) for the development, for sewer capacity review. Clearly identify the proposed discharge sewer and its street name.	Short-term discharge is anticipated to be required. Refer to Section 6.0 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report for dewatering volume and max short-term pump peak flow rate.
3.11	Advisory: Should there be any change in groundwater quantity, the Property Owner shall submit revised Functional Servicing Report to the City, for sewer capacity review.	Noted.
3.12	Advisory: In absence of a short-term discharge approval, the Property Owner shall ensure any private water (including but not limited to groundwater, construction wastewater, etc.) collected from the subject property is hauled away using a The Ministry of the Environment, Conversation and Parks (MOECP) approved hauler to ensure that no private water is discharged directly or indirectly into the City's sewage works and thereby comply with Municipal Code Chapter 681-Sewers. Private Water Drainage System	Noted. Short-term discharge agreement will be
3.13	The Professional Mechanical Engineer shall design and provide the groundwater pump peak discharge rate for the proposed Private Water Drainage System. The groundwater pump peak discharge rate shall be designed based on the maximum discharge flow rates (per minute and per day) established in the Final Hydrogeological Report.	Noted. Refer to the groundwater peak flow letter provided by the mechanical engineer, signed and stamped, enclosed in the updated FSR. Design details will be available in Site Approval process.
3.14	The Property Owner shall provide peak flow rate (L/min& L/sec) for groundwater discharge from the groundwater sump pumps into the City sewer as designed by the Mechanical Consultant based on the proposed pump schedule. This data is required for assessing the capacity for the peak discharge flow into the City's sewer system. The groundwater peak discharge flow rate (L/min& L/sec) shall be incorporated into calculations on the Functional Servicing Report. Please refer to the attached letter template for long-term (PWDS) groundwater discharge to be prepared by a qualified licensed Mechanical Engineering Consultant.	See response to comment 3.13 above.
3.15	Note: Once the pump information is provided by the Mechanical Engineer as set out above and reviewed and accepted by the City, the Functional Servicing Report shall be revised where necessary to incorporate any changes to the groundwater pump peak discharge rate into the calculations for assessing the receiving sewer capacity.	Noted.
	Hydrological Review Summary Form	
3.16	An updated form is required to be resubmitted with the Final Hydrogeological Investigation (which meets the City's Terms of reference) and must be coordinated with the Servicing Report Groundwater Summary Form. Please ensure the 2 forms are coordinated between the consultants completing the forms (owner information, etc.) and the forms are completely filled out (only the last column is to be completed by the City), and they are stamped, signed and dated.	Refer to Hydrological Review Summary Form (dated to August 2018 template) included in the Hydrogeological Review Report, coordinated with Groundwater Summary Form, enclosed in this resubmission.
B. (PRELIMINARY) OFFICIAL PLAN / ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT CONDITIONS		
1	Pay for any and all costs associated with traffic control signal modifications at any and all intersections analysed in the traffic impact study, including but not limited to phasing optimization/timing modifications, hardware and plant modifications etc.	As per the TIS, no hardware recommendations were proposed under future conditions for signalized study intersections. Refer to detailed response in the TIS addendum.
2	2. Provide parking spaces in accordance with the following minimum requirements; Residential Condominium Use and Townhouse - 1-Bedroom Units: 0.9 spaces per unit; - 2-Bedroom Units: 1.0 space per unit; - 3+ Bedroom Units: 1.2 spaces per unit; - Visitor Spaces: 0.2 spaces per unit; - Townhouse: 1.0 space per unit;	Please see the updated vehicular parking analysis in Section 1.3.2 in TIS addendum, which confirms the proposed parking supply will either meet and exceed ZBL requirements and / or future parking demand. The recent update of the zoning by-law (89-2022) does not require minimum resident parking and has reduced visitor parking requirements, which the proposed parking supply complies with.
3	The subject site is required to provide a minimum of three (3) Type "G" loading spaces;	Refer to architectural plan (A202.S) for three Type "G" loading spaces proposed for Buildings A, B and E. Also refer to detailed response provided in the TIS addendum.
4	Include the following definitions in the Site-Specific By-law for this project: i. Provide 1 Type "G" loading spaces with dimensions of 13.0m in length, 4.0m in width, and 6.1m of vertical clearance; ii. The minimum dimensions of a parking space are 2.6m wide by 5.6m long by 2.0m high. The width must be increased by 0.3m for each side of the parking space that is obstructed more than 1.0m from the front or back of a parking space.	Refer to the zoning by-law addendum draft enclosed in this resubmission.
5	Provide accessible parking in accordance with the following minimum requirements: i. 5 accessible spaces plus 1 space for every 50 parking spaces in excess of 100 parking spaces are required to be dedicated as accessible spaces.	Please see the updated vehicular parking analysis in Section 1.3.2 in the TIS addendum, which confirms the proposed accessible parking supply will meet zoning by-law requirements.
6	Submit to the Chief Engineer & Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services for review and acceptance, prior to approval of the rezoning application, a Site Servicing Review to determine the storm water runoff, sanitary flow and water supply demand resulting from this development and demonstrate how this site can be serviced and whether the existing municipal infrastructure is adequate;	Noted.
7	Submit, prior to the approval of the rezoning application, revised plans/documentation with respect to Condition No. 6 above, to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services;	Noted.

2.0 Engineering and Construction Services

Matthew Mannella, P.Eng. Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering

Date: May 9, 2022

#	Comment	Response
8	Enter into a financially secured Development Agreement for the construction of any improvements to the municipal infrastructure, should it be determined that upgrades are required to the infrastructure to support this development, according to the Site Servicing Review and Traffic Impact Study accepted by the Chief Engineer & Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services;	Noted. Should it be required, we will work with the City to secure the Development Agreement for the construction of any improvements to the municipal infrastructure in the future Site Plan Approval process.
9	Include the site-specific By-Law, a requirement to provide space within the development for installation of maintenance access holes and sampling ports on private property, as close to the property line as possible, for both the storm and sanitary service connections, in accordance with the City of Toronto Sewers By-law Chapter 681.	Refer to the zoning by-law addendum draft enclosed in this resubmission.

3.0 Parks, Forestry & Recreation - Urban Forestry
David Bostock, Acting Supervisor – Tree Protection & Plan Review
Nick Biffis, Urban Forestry Planner
Date: May 9, 2022

	Comment	Response
Matters Required Prior to Enactment to the Zoning By-Law		
	Toronto's urban forest plays an important role in making Toronto a clean and beautiful city. Trees significantly enhance all new development and renewal projects, enhancing both the quality and value of our environment. The City's Official Plan recommends policies that have been adopted by City Council that call for an increase in the amount of tree canopy coverage. City Council has adopted the objective of increasing the existing 28 percent tree canopy coverage to 40 percent. The planting of large growing shade trees on both public and private lands should be an important objective for all development projects. Suitable conditions for tree planting must be considered integral to the design, planning, and construction of all development projects.	Noted.
	Zoning Bylaw Amendment Application 21 234538 NNY 06 OZ	
	Urban Forestry is not opposed in principle to the development of this site, however at this time we do not support the Zoning By-Law Amendment proposal, because aspects of the overall plan/concept for the site are, in Urban Forestry's opinion, inconsistent with parts of the City's Official Plan and council's objectives concerning tree canopy cover (summarized above), and do not fully demonstrate compliance with Tier 1 of the TGS- Version 3 (Ecology section).	Please see responses below. TGS version 4, tier 1 is being pursued in this resubmission.
	Specifically:	
	Existing Trees: Preservation and Removal	
1	Tree by-laws to protect and preserve trees on City and private property have been established in order to attempt to retain as much crown cover as possible, particularly where development is concerned. It is expected that retention and appropriate protection of existing trees will be considered when developing site plans, and whenever possible, buildings and driveways are to be diverted around trees. As proposed, this project would require the removal of forty-seven (47) privately owned trees on the subject site.	The Revised Proposal revised the site access and also the shape, location and orientation of the built forms to improve retaining the existing trees as many as possible while also addressing other comments by the City staff. Total 36 trees will be preserved, and 44 trees are being proposed to be removed (38 trees in project property, 3 trees in the City's right-of-way and 3 trees in the adjacent neighbouring properties for the City's future multi-use trail.) In place of these trees being removed, we're proposing total soil volume that can accommodate up to potential provision of 70 new trees on site. Please refer to the latest arborist report and the soil volume plan (L500)
2	Prior to approval of any zoning bylaw amendment application, the applicant should be required to demonstrate that they can comply with all elements of the city's Toronto Green Standards, Version 3, including the parts of the ecology section, which pertain to existing and proposed trees.	Please refer to TGS version 4 checklist and site statistics template enclosed in this resubmission, which provides reference to demonstrating compliance for tier 1 requirements at rezoning stage, including Ecology and Biodiversity items, that are applicable at rezoning level (items with an asterisk as per TGS guideline). Also, refer to the soil volume plan (L500) for tree planting schedule.
3	Urban Forestry directs Community Planning and Council to the following sections of the Official Plan, which support our position: *Section 3.4.1: The Natural Environment* *To support strong communities, a competitive economy and a high quality of life, public and private city-building activities and changes to the built environment, including public works, will be environmentally friendly, based on:* *d. preserving and enhancing the urban forest by:* *i. providing suitable growing environments for trees;* *ii. increasing tree canopy coverage and diversity, especially of long-lived native and large shade trees; and* *iii. regulating the injury and destruction of trees;*	Noted.
	Please contact Nick Biffis, Urban Forestry Planner by email at Nick.Biffis@toronto.ca if you require additional information.	Noted.

Recreation - Parks Development

Vitumbiko Mhango, Senior Project Manager, Parks Development & Planning
Andrew Tidswell, Planner, Parks Development & Planning

Date: March 17, 2022

	Comment	Response
Surrounding Area Parks		
	The City of Toronto Parkland Strategy is a 20-year strategic city-wide plan that guides long-term planning for new parks, park expansions and improvements, and improved access to existing parks. The Strategy includes a new methodology to measure and assess parkland provision, using the baseline of residential population against the area of parkland available across the city. According to the Strategy's methodology, the development site is currently in an area with 28 + m2 of parkland per person, which is comparable to the city-wide average provision of 28 m2 of parkland per person (2016). Given the future expected growth both on the development site itself and surrounding sites, a parkland deficit will be generated if no new parks are created. This anticipated parkland deficit must be addressed through the creation of a new park to serve the future population.	Noted.
Proposal for a Dedication of Parkland		
	This site is subject to a 5% parkland dedication rate, excluding the land that is used for the current existing building and the land that will be used for the multi-use path. In total, the parkland dedication requirement is 797.4 m2.	The Revised Proposal proposes 598 square metres of Parkland dedication, which exceeds 5% of the Net Site Area, which excludes the land conveyance area for multi-use trail and the existing land area used for the existing building and structure to remain. The calculation for this approach has been accepted in principle by Parks staff.
	The Owner is required to satisfy the parkland dedication requirement through an on-site dedication. The park is to be in the northwest corner, with frontage along Antibes Drive, and comply with Policy 3.2.3.8 of the Toronto Official Plan.	Noted.
	Drawing A103.S of the architectural plans prepared by BDP Quadrangle (dated by the Architect 08/31/21), demonstrates that the applicant has proposed an on-site parkland dedication of 797.4 m2 in the northwest corner with frontage on Antibes Drive, which is acceptable to the Parks Development Section.	Noted. On-site parkland dedication of 598 m2 is provided in the Revised Proposal.
	Drawing A103.S also demonstrates that a 5 metre setback has been proposed between the park boundary and any adjacent building face, which is acceptable.	Noted. 5 metre setback is maintained between the proposed midrise building and the parkland.
Recommendations in the Final Planning Report		
	The following recommendations will require the approval of City Council:	
1	*City Council approve that in accordance with Section 42 of the Planning Act prior to the first above grade building permit the Owner shall convey to the City, an on-site parkland dedication, having a minimum size of 797.4 square metres located in the northwest corner of the site, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation and the City Solicitor;*	
2	*City Council approve the acceptance of on-site parkland dedication, subject to the owner transferring the parkland to the City free and clear, above and below grade, of all easements, encumbrances, and encroachments, in an acceptable environmental condition.*	
	Parks Development is interested in securing the design and construction, by the Owner, of Above Base Park Improvements. There may be opportunities to use the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for this work. Further discussion is required. Should this be agreeable, the following recommendation will require the approval of City Council.	
3	*City Council approve a development charge credit against the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for the design and construction by the Owner of the Above Base Park Improvements to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PFR). The development charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the Owner of designing and constructing the Above Base Park Improvements, as approved by the General Manager, PFR, and the Parks and Recreation component of development charges payable for the development in accordance with the City's Development Charges By-law, as may be amended from time to time.*	
Conditions of Parkland Conveyance		
	If this application is approved, the following are general conditions that the parkland dedication will be subject to. Detailed conditions will be captured in the registered agreement.	
Conditions of Approval		
Parkland Dedication		
1	As per Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 415-28, prior to the issuance of the First Above Grade Building Permit the Owner shall convey parkland to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PFR).	Noted.
2	The Owner will be required to convey the 797.4 m2 portion of the development site for public parkland purposes. The subject parkland conveyance is to be free and clear, above and below grade of all physical obstructions and easements, encumbrances and encroachments, including surface and subsurface easements.	Noted. The proposed parkland is expected to be clear of any easement upon a complete land conveyance to the City.
3	The Owner is to pay for the costs of the preparation and registration of all relevant documents. The Owner shall provide to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor all legal descriptions and applicable reference plans of survey for the new parkland.	Noted.
Fire Separation Distance – Ontario Building Code (OBC)		
4	Prior to the transfer of fee simple of the Park Block to the City, the Park Block shall nonetheless be deemed to be parkland in respect of the limiting distance requirements of the Ontario Building Code Act, 1992. Parks, Forestry & Recreation staff advises that the Owner must design the building to achieve Ontario Building Code (OBC) setbacks related to fire separation on their own site on the portions of the building that abut the park. A 5 metre setback will apply to any building located next to the Park or, the required setbacks which meet the OBC for fire separation, whichever is greater. Prior to the issuance of the F**irst Above Grade Building Permit**, the Owner will be required to demonstrate adequately that the OBC requirements have been achieved to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The City shall not enter into a Limiting Distance Agreement for the development.	5 metre setback has been provided between the midrise building and the Parkland.
Environmental Assessment		
	Please be advised that in accordance with the Policy for Accepting Potentially Contaminated Lands to be Conveyed to the City under the *Planning Act* adopted by City Council on February 10 and 11, 2015, **the City cannot accept lands without the fulfillment of the environmental assessment requirements described in Condition #5 below.** Depending on the site condition and remediation requirements, this mandatory process can take anywhere from **several months to 2 years** or more. It is strongly advised that the Owner consult their Qualified Person to understand their site-specific obligations and timelines required for their land dedication and to ***initiate this process early.*** **The City will not delay parkland conveyance for environmental-related reasons.** The City will under no circumstance accept lands with on-going groundwater and/or vapour monitoring.	Noted.

Recreation - Parks Development

Vitumbiko Mhango, Senior Project Manager, Parks Development & Planning
Andrew Tidswell, Planner, Parks Development & Planning

Date: March 17, 2022

	Comment	Response
5	**Prior to conveying the parkland to the City,** the Owner must:	
5.1	Submit a Qualified Person Preliminary Statement Letter, that is dated and signed by the Owner's Qualified Person, as defined in Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended, describing the lands to be conveyed to the City, and identifying what environmental documentation will be provided to the City's peer reviewer to support this conveyance; all environmental documentation consistent with O. Reg. 153/04 requirements shall be submitted with reliance extended to the City and its peer reviewer and any limitation on liability and indemnification is to be consistent with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, insurance requirements or such greater amount specified by the Executive Director, Engineering & Construction Services (ECS) and copy to the General Manager, PFR;	Please find the Preliminary Statement Letter by Grounded Engineering with Environmental Assessment reports and Record of Site Condition, enclosed in this resubmission. Peer Review will be provided in Site Plan Approval.
5.2	Pay all costs associated with the City retaining a third-party peer reviewer including all administrative costs to the City (7%), and submit an initial deposit of $8,000.00 towards the cost of the Peer Review in the form of a certified cheque, to the Executive Director, ECS. Submit further deposits when requested to cover all costs of retaining a third-party peer reviewer;	Noted.
5.3	Submit, to the satisfaction of the City's peer reviewer, all Environmental Site Assessment reports prepared in accordance with the Record of Site Condition Regulation (O. Reg. 153/04, as amended) describing the current conditions of the land to be conveyed to the City and the proposed Remedial Action Plan based on the site condition standards approach, to the Executive Director, ECS;	Please see response to comment #5.1 above.
5.4	At the completion of the site assessment/remediation process, submit a Statement from the Qualified Person based on the submitted environmental documents, to the Executive Director, ECS for peer review and concurrence, which states:	Please see response to comment #5.1 above.
5.4.1	In the opinion of the Qualified Person:	
5.4.1.1.	It is either likely or unlikely that there is off-site contamination resulting from past land uses on the development site that has migrated onto adjacent City lands that would exceed the applicable Site Condition Standards; and	Noted.
5.4.1.2	To the extent that the opinion in 5.4.1.1 is that past migration is likely, it is either possible or unlikely that such off-site contamination on adjacent City lands poses an adverse effect to the environment or human health.	Noted.
5.4.2.	Land to be conveyed to the City meets either:	
5.4.2.1.	the applicable Ministry Generic Site Condition Standards (Tables 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9; subject to applicable exemptions as stated in O. Reg. 153/04) for the most environmentally sensitive adjacent land use; or	Noted.
5.4.2.2.	the Property Specific Standards as approved by the Ministry for a Risk Assessment / Risk Management Plan which was conducted in accordance with the conditions set out herein.	Noted.
5.5	The Qualified Person's statement, referenced in condition 5.1 above, will include a Reliance Letter that is dated and signed by the Owner's Qualified Person, as defined in O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, confirming that both the City and the City's peer reviewer can rely on the environmental documentation submitted, consistent with O. Reg. 153/04 requirements, and the Qualified Person's opinion as to the conditions of the site; all environmental documentation consistent with O. Reg. 153/04 requirements and opinions shall be submitted with reliance extended to the City and its peer reviewer and any limitation on liability and indemnification is to be consistent with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, insurance requirements or such greater amount specified by the Executive Director, ECS.	Please see response to comment #5.1 above.
5.6.	For conveyance of lands requiring a Record of Site Condition (RSC):	
5.6.1.	File the Record of Site Condition (RSC) on the Ontario Environmental Site Registry; and	Please see response to comment #5.1 above.
5.6.2.	Submit the Ministry's Letter of Acknowledgement of Filing of the RSC confirming that the RSC has been prepared and filed in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, to the Executive Director, ECS and to the General Manager, PFR.	Please see response to comment #5.1 above.
6	**As a pre-condition of Site Plan approval**, the Owner must provide a complete Environmental Phase I and subsequent Phase II report(s), if required, to be peer reviewed through the City process per Condition #5 to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR and Executive Director, ECS. Should the Owner convey the parkland after 18 months of all of the Environmental assessment reports, the cost of updating such reports will be at the expense of the Owner.	Noted.
	Park Construction	
	Base Park Improvements	
7	The Owner, at their expense, will be responsible for the base construction and installation of the parkland. The Base Park Improvements include the following:	Noted.
a	Demolition, removal and disposal of all existing materials, buildings, foundations and associated servicing;	
b	Grading inclusive of 300mm depth topsoil supply and placement. Where lands have been environmentally risk assessed in accordance with MECP regulations, the required depth profile of the environmental soil / soft cap will be 1.5 m of engineered fill compacted to 95% SPD and certified by the consulting engineer;	
i	In the case of a risk-assessed site, all materials brought on site shall comply with the site-specific standards outlined in the Certificate of Property Use. In the case where no risk assessment of the site was required, all materials brought on site shall comply with the Ontario Reg. 153/04 Table 3 RPI standards;	
c	Sodding #1 nursery grade;	
d	Fencing, where deemed necessary;	
e	Sanitary and storm service connections with manholes at street line;	
f	Water and electrical service connections; (minimum water: 50mm to the street line including backflow preventers, shut off valves, water metre and chamber; electrical connection to the street line and electrical panel in a lockable cabinet (100 Amp service));	
g	Street trees along all public road allowances abutting City-owned parkland; and	
h	Standard park sign (separate certified cheque required).	
8	All work is to be completed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.
9	If any element of the Base Park Improvements are deemed to be unnecessary, the Owner will submit a certified cheque for the equivalent value, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.
10	**As a pre-condition of Site Plan approval,** the Owner is required to demonstrate the incorporation of the servicing connections (civil and grading plan) in the parkland dedication, as noted within the Base Park Improvements.	Noted.
11	**Prior to the issuance of the First Above Grade Building Permit,** the Owner shall submit a cost estimate and any necessary plans for the Base Park Improvements, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.

Recreation - Parks Development
Vitumbiko Mhango, Senior Project Manager, Parks Development & Planning
Andrew Tidswell, Planner, Parks Development & Planning
Date: March 17, 2022

	Comment	Response
12	**Prior to the issuance of the First Above Grade Building Permit,** the Owner shall post an irrevocable Letter of Credit in the amount of 120% of the value of the Base Park Improvements for the parkland to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. No credit shall be given towards the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for costs associated with Base Park Improvements.	Noted.
13	Noted. The construction of the Base Park Improvements to the park block shall be completed within one year after the issuance of the **First Above Grade Building Permit,** to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. Unforeseen delays (e.g. weather) resulting in the late delivery of the park block shall be taken into consideration and at the discretion of the General Manager, PFR when determining a revised delivery date for the park block.	Noted.
14	Should the Owner undertake Base Park Improvements on the park block following conveyance of the park block to the City, the Owner must obtain a Park Access Agreement (PAA) from the local Park Supervisor and Landscape Architecture Unit. The PAA will outline in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, and duration to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The Owner will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the Owner on the park.	Noted.
	Temporary Fencing	
15	Prior to conveyance of the parkland, the Owner shall be responsible for the installation and maintenance of temporary fencing around the parkland and its maintenance until such time as the development of the park block is completed.	Noted.
	Parkland Grading and Drainage	
16	Prior to conveyance of the parkland, the Owner shall ensure that the grading and drainage of the adjacent development blocks are compatible with the grades of the parkland to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.
17	The Owner must provide documentation from a qualified environmental engineer that any fill or topsoil brought onto the site meets all applicable laws, regulations and guidelines for use in a public park.	Noted.
	Credit against DCs for Above Base Park Improvements	
	Should the Owner agree to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements for a development charge credit against the Parks and Recreation component of the Development charges, the following conditions apply:	
18	The Owner agrees to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements to the new park for a development charge credit against Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The development charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the Owner of installing the Above Base Park Improvements, as approved by the General Manager, PFR, and the Parks and Recreation component of Development Charges payable for the development in accordance with the City's Development Charges By-law, as may be amended from time to time.	Noted.
19	**Prior to the issuance of the First Building Permit** or the permit that triggers the payment of the Development Charges, but in no event shall it be later than the issuance of the First Above Grade Building Permit, the Owner shall submit a Letter of Credit equal to 120% of the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges.	Noted.
20	**Prior to the issuance of the First Above Grade Building Permit,** the Owner shall submit a cost estimate and any necessary plans including working drawings, specifications, and landscape plans showing the scope and detail of the work for the Above Base Park improvements, for review and approval by the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.
	Above Base Park Improvements	
21	The Owner will be responsible to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. Areas to be addressed in the design of the Park are: park programming, sustainable design and plantings, community and public safety, ground surface treatments, seating, vandalism etc. Final design and programming of the parkland shall be at the discretion of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.
22	The construction of Above Base Park Improvements to the park block shall be completed within one year after the issuance of the First Above Grade Building Permit to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. Unforeseen delays (e.g. weather) resulting in the late delivery of the park block shall be taken into consideration and at the discretion of the General Manager, PFR when determining a revised delivery date for the park block.	Noted.
23	Should the Owner undertake Above Base Park Improvements on the park block following conveyance of the park block to the City, the Owner must obtain a Park Access Agreement (PAA) from the local Park Supervisor and Landscape Architecture Unit. The PAA will outline in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, and duration to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The Owner will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the Owner on the park.	Noted.
	Warranty	
24	The Owner, upon satisfactory completion of the construction and installation of the Above Base and Base Park Improvements shall be required to guarantee such work and associated materials. The Owner shall provide certification from their Landscape Architect certifying that all work has been completed in accordance with the approved drawings. Should the cost to construct the Above Base Park Improvements as approved by the General Manager, PFR be less than the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for the development, the difference shall be paid to the City by certified cheque prior to a reduction of the Above Base Park Improvement Letter of Credit. Upon the City's acceptance of the certificate, the Letters of Credit will be released less 20% which will be retained for the 2 year guarantee known as the Parkland Warranty Period.	Noted.
25	Upon the expiry of the Parkland Warranty Period, the outstanding park security shall be released to the Owner provided that all deficiencies have been rectified to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.
	As-built drawings in print/hardcopy and electronic format, as well as a georeferenced AutoCAD file, shall be submitted to PFR. A complete set of "as built" plans shall be provided electronically in PDF format and in a georeferenced AutoCAD file, in addition to two (2) sets full size bond hard copy the General Manager, PFR. The plans shall include, but not limited to specifications, locations of all hidden services, and all deviations from the design drawings, shop drawings, inspection reports, minutes of meeting, site instructions, change orders, invoices, certificates, progress images, warrantees, close out documentation, compliance letters (for any play structures and safety surfaces), manuals etc. The files are to be organized in folders, including a file index and submitted with written warranties and related documents such as lists of contractor, sub-contractors together with contact persons, telephone numbers, warranty expiry dates and operating manuals.	Noted.
27	Spare or replacement parts, special tools, etc. as provided by manufacturers, if any, are to be provided to PFR.	Noted.
Advisory Comments		
	Parkland Occupation - Construction Staging	

Recreation - Parks Development

Vitumbiko Mhango, Senior Project Manager, Parks Development & Planning
Andrew Tidswell, Planner, Parks Development & Planning
Date: March 17, 2022

	Comment	Response
	The stockpiling of any soils or materials or use as an interim construction staging area on the conveyed parkland is prohibited unless an agreement, other than a Park Access Agreement, has been obtained from the Manager of Business Services. The agreement, if approved, will outline in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, duration, restoration plan and costs, and compensation to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The agreement must be secured prior to the issuance of any shoring and excavation permits. The Owner will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the Owner on the park. Any compensation accrued shall be applied to park improvements within the ward in consultation with the Ward Councillor.	Noted.
	The Owner will be required to provide an environmental assessment report, prepared by a Qualified Person, at the end of the permitted occupation to verify that the parklands continue to meet the applicable laws, regulations and guidelines respecting sites to be used for public park purposes. If deemed necessary, the Owner may be required to provide an RSC after the staging period. The Owner will be responsible for paying all costs associated with the City retaining a third-party peer reviewer for the environmental addendum and for another RSC if required. The construction of the park shall commence only after the verification that the parklands continue to meet the applicable laws, regulations and guidelines respecting sites to be used for public park purposes.	Noted.
	Pet Amenities	
	Given the current rise in dog-owning populations, the Owner is expected to provide on-site dog amenities with proper disposal facilities such as dog relief stations within the building to accommodate future residents' needs. This will also help alleviate pressure on existing parks. Please refer to Toronto's Pet Friendly Design Guidelines and Best Practices for New Multi-Unit Buildings.	On-site pet amenities are provided in the Revised Proposal. Please refer to the landscape plan (L-100) for the proposed location and area.
	Urban Forestry	
	Comments regarding any necessary street tree plantings and requirements under the Trees Bylaw or the Ravine and Natural Feature Protection Bylaw will be provided by Urban Forestry.	Noted.
	For information regarding parkland dedication requirements, the applicant should contact Danielle DeMarsh, Project Officer, Parks Development at 437-339-2740 or danielle.demarsh@toronto.ca.	Noted.

5.0 Environment & Energy Division

Austin Barton, Research Analyst, Environment & Energy Division (EED)

Date: March 21, 2022

	Comment	Response
	EED staff have reviewed the document and it fulfills the requirement for a complete application.	Noted.
	The applicant is encouraged to coordinate with EED staff as they progress through design development with any further analysis of the measures identified in the report, including:	Noted.
	Compliance with the Toronto Green Standard, especially if targeting Tier 2 or higher levels of performance;	Noted.
	Integration of low-carbon energy solutions and exploring additional energy conservation measures as the proposal is refined throughout design development;	Noted.
	Back-up power for resilience during grid disruptions;	Noted.
	Identify opportunities for a low-carbon thermal energy network (district energy system) serving some or all of the buildings. If not feasible, the applicant is encouraged to design building mechanical systems for future connection (district energy-ready).	Noted.
	Identify opportunities for heat recovery from municipal infrastructure such as trunk sewers, and from any nearby waste heat sources (e.g. data centres).	Noted.
	If the applicant has not yet initiated a connection request with Toronto Hydro, explore with Toronto Hydro any opportunities for supply designs that support distributed generation, storage, and resilience.	Noted.
	The applicant is encouraged to calculate the whole-life carbon (i.e. full building lifecycle) of the proposed development using readily available lifecycle assessment (LCA) tools/software. (e.g. One Click LCA, EC3, Tally, Athena EcoCalculator, etc.), and discuss designs, materials, and processes that would reduce embodied carbon.	Noted. Refer to the updated Energy Strategy Report for the whole-life carbon analysis.

6.0 Transportation Planning (Site Plan Application comments)

Andrew Au, Program Manager, Transportation Planning
Marlon Gullusci, Assistant Planner, Transportation Planning
Justin Shin, Transportation Planner, Transportation Planning

Date: May 19, 2023 (via email correspondence with Marty Rokos, dated May 23, 2023)

Transportation Planning		
	Comment	**Response**
1	Please coordinate with the applicants at 5950 Bathurst Street and 25 Cedarcroft Boulevard to develop one full design of the proposed Multi-Use Path. The plan must show all 3 properties / developments and the abutting public roads and all trail connections, and clearly show all the required land conveyances.	Refer to architectural master key plan (1/A100.S) and architectural site plan (A103.S) for proposed land conveyances for future multi-use path. Refer to landscape plan (L-100) for a conceptual trail design as per City's multi-use trail design guideline.
i	The multi-use trail width default requirement, based on the City's Multi-Use Trail Guidelines Figure 4.03. default configuration would be require a corridor of 7.6m, which includes a 3.6m trail, signage, and clearances (but does not include landscaping). Therefore, assuming a 3.0m dedication from the 25 Cedarcroft Boulevard and 3.0m from 5950 Bathurst Street for the north portion of the MUT, plus an additional 8.4m from the 155 Antibes site for the remainder of the south portion, provides adequate space for the MUT and landscaping.	Please see response to comment 1 above for our proposed land conveyance location, area and width for the future multi-use path.
ii.	Please coordinate with ECS to determine if any additional property conveyances or easements are required for the servicing of the infrastructure located below the multi-use trail.	Please see response to comment 1.3 below.
iii.	Engineering and Construction Services (ECS) has specified that in addition the plan views, multiple cross-sections to scale are required along the entire length of the trail. On all cross-sections, the following should be shown: proposed trail features including trees, existing and proposed finished grade, limits of proposed / existing buildings including underground parking structures adjacent the trail, horizontal dimensions from these structures to municipal sewers, private services adjacent the trail, horizontal dimensions from these private services to municipal sewers, the zone of influence for all nearby structures and services, total trail ROW width (existing and proposed property lines), all municipal easements, all municipal sewers, the unsupported open excavation limit per OPSD 802.03 based on proposed finished grade for the existing municipal sewers and all proposed public parkland dedications. Note: zone of influence for municipal sewers for fully unsupported excavation must be contained completely within the land conveyance. Additionally, the zone of influence for nearby structures cannot impact or impart any loading on municipal infrastructure.	Refer to civil engineering drawing, conceptual ultimate plan (CU-01), which provides a plan view, sections and details illustrating the existing municipal sewer details, zone of influence, and other pertinent information as per discussion with Matthew Mannella, Senior Project Manager, Development Engineering. The area and width of the newly proposed land conveyance for future multi-use path in this resubmission fully captures the existing municipal sewer and the existing easement within the existing property.
2	Ensure that your Transportation Impact Study contains the following:	
i.	A section that provides an estimate, using an acceptable methodology, of the pick-up/drop-off activity that will be generated by the proposal and how that activity will be accommodated on-site.	Refer to the architectural plan (A103.S) for proposed thirteen PUDO locations and counts. Further details will be provided in the Site Plan approval process.
ii.	A section that discusses the bike parking requirements of the proposal in accordance with Zoning By-law 569-2013.	Refer to Section 1.3.1 in the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) addendum.
ii.a.	Access and egress to below-grade secured long-term bicycle parking facilities are to be provided primarily with bicycle parking stairs (shallow grade stairs with bicycle rails), bicycle ramps or dedicated bicycle elevators.	Refer to the architectural plans (A201.S and A202.S) for proposed accesses via dedicated ramp, stairs and bicycle elevators to long-term bicycle parking spaces.
iii.	A section that discusses how the project complies with all transportation-related requirements of the "in-force" Toronto Green Standard (TGS). More specifically, compliance with AQ1.1-AQ1.3, AQ2.1-AQ2.4, AQ3.1 and AQ3.2 of the TGS will be required.	All TGS version 4 tier 1 requirements are satisfied. Refer to response to each TGS item in the TIS addendum.
iv.	Transportation demand management (TDM) measures must demonstrate how each measure individually quantifies reducing single-occupancy auto-vehicle trips to meet above TGS requirements with appropriate and reasonable data/methodologies.	Refer to the proposed TDM measures in the TIS addendum, which exceeds the TGS requirement, AQ 1.1.
v.	We request that Toronto Parking Authority bike share stations be considered to be located on site to help facilitate expansion of the planned network and present opportunities for E-bike share stations to be easily connected to the electric grid on site.	Refer to the architectural plans (A103.S and A202.S) for Bikeshare stations (up to 45 docking stations for mix of e-bikes and regular bikes) proposed in a publicly accessible area. Proposed location was coordinated with Toronto Parking Authority staff.
3	Due to the site being on a transit priority segment and in close proximity to a surface transit priority network, TPA bike share stations should be located on site to help facilitate expansion of the planned network.	See response to comment 2.v. above.
4	Consider a mid-block connection in place of the proposed vehicular driveway access from Bathurst Street.	The proposed land conveyance for future multi-use path is to serve as a mid-block connection between Bathurst Street and Antibes Drive.
5	The proposed parking rate is excessive for the site, consider reducing the proposed parking supply and implement additional TDM measures as the proposed TDM plan must be much stronger to support the reduction of single-occupancy vehicle trips.	Proposed parking has been reduced. Refer to detailed response in the TIS addendum.
6	A network of pedestrian connections to support pedestrian desire lines as connections to the surrounding public right of way network is to be established as part of your multi modal study.	Refer to the architectural plans (A103.S and A202.S) for proposed driveway access with pedestrian and cyclist-friendly laneway proposed as woonerf connecting to the future multi-use path, to the proposed POPS area, and Bathurst Street with public sidewalk and future cycle track.
7	Proposed and existing curb cuts are to be consolidated. Each site must have a singular vehicular access.	A singular vehicular access is provided to the site from Antibes Drive.
8	Onsite Pickup and drop off (PUDO) must be consolidated. Multiple PUDOs on site are not supported and do not align with Official Plan policies. PUDOs within public Right of Ways will not be supported.	Refer to the architectural plans (A103.s and A202.S) for proposed PUDO locations to serve the existing building and the other proposed developments. Refer to the TIS addendum for detailed response.
9	The City requires the applicant to provide a minimum 2.1m pedestrian clearway within the municipal right-of-way.	Refer to architectural plans (A103.S and A202.S) and landscape plan (L-100) for 2.1m wide pedestrian sidewalks proposed along Bathurst Street, Don Lake Gate and Antibes Drive.

6.0 Others - Consolidated

Rogers, TCDSB, TDSB, TTC, Transportation Planning, Toronto Water, Hydro, Hydrological Review, Enbridge, Urban Forestry, NAV Canada, PWDS

Date: Varies

	Comment	Response
TCDSB Comments - Michael Loberto, Superintendent, Planning and Development Services		
	Please be advised that the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB) is in receipt of the zoning by-law amendment application 21 234538 NNY 06 OZ dated March 21, 2022. A total of 741 units are proposed for this development within 34 and 32-storey apartment buildings as well as 24 townhouses. With respect to this application, the TCDSB wishes to submit the following comments:	
	This development falls within the fixed attendance boundary of: • St Paschal Baylon Catholic School The closest Secondary schools serving this area are: • St Joseph Morrow Park Catholic Secondary School • Brebeuf College Catholic Secondary School	Noted.
	At this time, the local elementary school is operating at capacity and cannot accommodate additional students from the development as proposed. Sufficient space exists within the local secondary schools to accommodate additional students.	Noted.
	The TCDSB has engaged the City with respect to the Yonge Street North Planning, Study to communicate Catholic school interests in the area to the east. The TCDSB is actively pursuing creative and/or alternative accommodation opportunities along the North Yonge Corridor to address enrolment pressures been triggered by; the intensity and volume of development applications in the area, which is resulting in strain on local schools.	Noted.
	There is currently a capital plan to build a 510 pupil place replacement for St Antoine Daniel Catholic Elementary School with an anticipated opening date of 2023. Additionally, the construction of a 798 pupil place replacement school for St. Joseph Morrow Park Secondary School was completed at 3338 Bayview Avenue as of January 2021.	Noted.
	Due to concerns associated with school accommodation, the Toronto Catholic District School Board wishes to advise that should the development proceed to the satisfaction of the City, that the attached clauses be included in the City's conditions of approval and subsequently within any agreements of purchase and sale for the proposed units of this plan. Please also refer to the attached sign specifications for the Toronto Catholic District School Boards' development-site signage requirements.	Noted.
	The TCDSB will continue to monitor development growth in this area as it relates to cumulative impact on local schools. The TCDSB requests notification of any modifications, community consultations, appeals or notices of decision relating to this development application or related applications. Please direct correspondence to development.applications@tcdsb.org	Noted.
	Further to the comments provided, the TCDSB reserves the right to revise status at any time without further notice. Should you require additional information regarding our comments, please contact Tomasz Oltarzewski at (416) 222-8282. Ext. 2278.	Noted.
Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC) TDSB - Matt Bagnail, Intermediate Planner, Land Use Planning		
	Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC) has had an opportunity to review the above-noted development application proposing a residential development containing 1,024 residential units within two new towers of 34 and 37 storeys respectively, two new blocks of townhomes, and a retained rental apartment building (containing 259 units). In consultation with Toronto District School Board (TDSB) staff, TLC has determined that there is insufficient capacity at the local elementary school to accommodate students anticipated from this development. The local elementary school is Rockford Public School. TLC has also reviewed the Community Services & Facilities Study (CS&F) prepared by Urban Strategies Inc. in August 2021. While there have been minor changes to the October 2021 utilization rates of the assigned schools, the CS&F's conclusion that there is "limited capacity at the elementary school level to accommodate the proposed development" remains accurate. The status of local school accommodation should be communicated to new and existing residents to inform them that students from new development will not displace existing students at local schools. As such, TLC requests that the following pre-approval conditions be incorporated into the subsequent site plan agreement:	Noted.
1	The Owner shall erect and maintain signs, at points of egress and ingress of the development site, advising that: "The Toronto District School Board (the TDSB) makes every effort to accommodate students at local schools. However, due to residential growth, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all students. Students may be accommodated in schools outside this area until space in local schools becomes available. For information regarding designated school(s), please call 416-394-7526." These signs shall be to TLC's specifications.	Noted.
2	The Owner shall include the following warning clauses in all offers of purchase and sale/lease/rental/tenancy agreements of residential units for a period of ten (10) years from the date of this agreement: "Despite the best efforts of the Toronto District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available in the neighbourhood schools for all students anticipated from the development area. Students may be accommodated in school facilities outside the neighbourhood or students may later be transferred to other school facilities. For information regarding designated school(s), please call 416-394-7526. Residents agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, if bussing is provided by the Toronto District School Board in accordance with the TDSB's bussing policy, students will not be bussed from their home to the school facility, but will meet the bus at designated locations in or outside of the area. The above warning clauses (including this sentence) shall, for a period of ten years following registration of this Site Plan Agreement, be included in all agreements of purchase and sale and all tenancy agreements (including agreements to lease or rent) for residential units in the development covered by this Site Plan Agreement."	Noted.
3	The Owner shall advise the Toronto Lands Corporation of the estimated occupancy date and commit to providing the Toronto Lands Corporation with periodic updates on expected occupancy to ensure that the Toronto Lands Corporation has at least six (6) months' prior notice of the occupancy date. The intention is to provide the Toronto Lands Corporation and the Toronto District School Board with information for enrolment projections.	Noted.
	TLC's conditions may change as this application progresses through the planning process. TLC requests to be notified on all future public notices, resubmissions, appeals and other matters and requests to be included on the Interested Parties List with respect to this application. If you have any questions, please contact me at mbagnall.tlc@tdsb.on.ca.	Noted.
TTC - Alex Butler, Operations Planner - Project Development and Planning		
	TTC southbound nearside bus stop #123 on Bathurst Street at Antibes Drive and northbound farside bus stop #9279 at Antibes Drive at Plum Tree Way are located on the frontage of the site. To provide adequate room to operate the accessible ramp on our buses, and to accommodate both our standard and articulated buses, the applicant is required to provide a level concrete platform that is at least 16 metres in length and 2.4 metres in width from the curb as per City standard drawing T-310.010- 8 for both stops, shown on the attached marked-up sketch. The applicant should also ensure that the platform stays connected to the sidewalk for bus stop #9279.	Refer to architectural Site Plan (A103.S) and Landscape Plan (L-100) for proposed locations of a level concrete platform, at least 16 metres in length and 2.4 metres in width from the curb as per City standard drawing T-310.010-8 has been provided at Antibes Drive and Bathurst Street.

6.0 Others - Consolidated

Rogers, TCDSB, TDSB, TTC, Transportation Planning, Toronto Water, Hydro, Hydrological Review, Enbridge, Urban Forestry, NAV Canada, PWDS

Date: Varies

	Comment	Response
	We note that the applicant is proposing to locate trees along the Antibes frontage, one of which will conflict with bus stop #9279. For visibility and safety reasons, no trees should be placed within 2.4 metres of the edge of the road, for a distance of 20 metres on the approach to a transit stop marker. Therefore, as indicated on the attached marked-up sketch, the tree should be relocated elsewhere on the site or be omitted from the proposal.	Refer to architectural Site Plan (A103.S) and Landscape Plan (L-100) for tree locations. No trees are placed within 2.4 metres of the road edge for a distance of 20 metres on the approach to a transit stop.
	If you have any questions regarding the above comments, please contact Alex Butler, Operations Planner at Alex.Butler@ttc.ca.	Noted.
Rogers - Narendran Baskaran		
	Rogers Communications Canada Inc. has Aerial & buried fire and Aerial & buried coaxial plant in this area, as indicated on the attached plans. Caution is advised. Use Vac truck and expose ducts. Maintain minimum of 0.6m clearance. Hand dig when crossing or if within 1m of Rogers plant. Note: Plant is to approximation. Locates are required. Call for locates at 1-800-400-2255.	Noted.
	Rogers Communications currently has existing plant as marked on your drawing. Our standard depth in this municipality is 1m. Please ensure you maintain clearances of 0.3m vertically and 0.6m horizontally.	Noted.
	Caution Notes -Use VA truck and expose ducts, maintain minimum of 0.6m clearance. -Rogers Communications has aerial plant in this area, as it is indicated on the attached plans. -Fiber Optic Cable is present in the area of your proposed construction. Please obtain locates and maintain minimum 1.0m/1.0m clearance	Noted.
Toronto Hydro		
	Toronto Hydro is in receipt of your email sent to utility.circulations@torontohydro.com. The information and comments provided herein are for INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY and may NOT be used for the purposes of a Full-Stream Permit Application pursuant to the City of Toronto's Municipal Consent Requirements.	Noted.
	The drawing attached hereto is being provided for the purposes of planning only, and must not be used for construction. The Applicant shall be liable for and shall indemnify and hold harmless Toronto Hydro for any damages, losses, liabilities, costs, expenses, including legal fees and consequential damages relating to any act or omission by the Applicant in the use of the attached drawing(s) for any purposes apart from planning on behalf of the Applicant.	Noted.
	NOTICE TO CITY OF TORONTO: Toronto Hydro has NOT provided its sign-off pursuant to the Municipal Consent Requirements as of the date written above. Do NOT grant a Full-Stream Permit to the Applicant at this time.	Noted.
	In order to identify Toronto Hydro infrastructure in the drawing, locates must be completed in the field.	Noted.
	All proposed work must maintain the minimum horizontal and vertical clearances as per Toronto Hydro Construction Standard 31-0100, 31-0500 & 31-0700, attached hereto. Clearance measurements are taken from the edge of the hydro plant to the edge of the proposed work.	Noted.
	Once the Applicant's planning is complete, the Applicant must submit its drawings to Toronto Hydro once again pursuant to	Noted.
	the Circulation and Sign-Offs procedure under the City of Toronto's Municipal Consent Requirements in order to receive Toronto Hydro's sign-off for the purposes of a Full-Stream Application.	Noted.
Enbridge - Alice Coleman, Municipal Planning Analyst, Long Range Distribution Planning		
	Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. Sincerely,	Noted.
NAV Canada		
	NAV CANADA has evaluated the captioned proposal and has no objection to the project as submitted. Our assessment does not constitute an approval and/or permit from other agencies.	Noted.
	In the interest of aviation safety, it is incumbent on NAV CANADA to maintain up-to-date aeronautical publications and issue NOTAM as required. To assist us in that end, we ask that you notify us at least 10 business days prior to the start of construction. This notification requirement can be satisfactorily met by returning a completed, signed copy of the attached form and an Excel copy of the attached spreadsheet by email at landuse@navcanada.ca or fax at 613-248-4094. In the event that you should decide not to proceed with this project or if the structure is dismantled, please advise us accordingly so that we may formally close the file.	Noted.
	If you have any questions, contact the Land Use Department by email at landuse@navcanada.ca.	Noted.
	NAV CANADA's land use evaluation is based on information known as of the date of this letter and is valid for a period of 18 months, subject to any legislative changes impacting land use submissions. Our assessment is limited to the impact of the proposed physical structure on the air navigation system and installations; it neither constitutes nor replaces any approvals or permits required by Transport Canada, other Federal Government departments, Provincial or Municipal land use authorities or any other agency from which approval is required. Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada addresses any spectrum management issues that may arise from your proposal and consults with NAV CANADA engineering as deemed necessary.	Noted.
	This document contains information proprietary to NAV CANADA. Any disclosure or use of this information or any reproduction of this document for other than the specific purpose for which it is intended is expressly prohibited except as NAV CANADA may otherwise agree in writing.	Noted.