

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

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

2024 May

Third 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

[Urban Design](#)

[Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis \(Housing\)](#)

[Engineering and Construction Services](#)

[Parks, Forestry & Recreation - Urban Forestry](#)

[Parks, Forestry & Recreation - Parks Development & Planning](#)

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Urban Design

Kaari Kitawi, Planner, Urban Design North York

March 8, 2024

#	Comment	Response
<b>URBAN DESIGN</b>		
	<u>Parks and Open Space</u>	
1	Parks to comment further on park.	All comments from Parks have been addressed.
2	The diverse open spaces are thoughtfully designed, well located and distributed throughout the property. Good job!	Noted.
3	Please clarify has the multiuse trail decreased in width? It was previously shown as 7.6m but is now shown as 6m wide.	The width of the multi-use trail will be 9.1m, which is made of 6.1m width of land conveyance from 155 Antibes Dr and 3.0m width of land conveyance from 25 Cedarcroft and 5950 Bathurst St. 9.1m width. This satisfies the default width of 7.6m in the City's Multi-Use Trail Guideline.
	<u>Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Space (POPS)</u>	
4	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.	Landscape plan has been updated with a proposed POPS signage location. Further design details will be coordinated in the Site Plan Approval process.
	<u>Public Art</u>	
5	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.	Landscape plan has been updated with a potential public art location and artwork example. Further design details will be explored in the Site Plan Approval process.
<b>LOCATION AND ORGANIZATION RELATIVE TO STREETS AND OPEN SPACE</b>		
	<u>Building Address and Entrances</u>	
6	The retail at grade is noted and appreciated. The active uses at grade will animate the public realm and provide natural surveillance "eyes on the street".	Noted. New retail spaces and sufficient retail frontage area are provided for safe pedestrian accessibility.
	<u>Parking and Servicing</u>	
7	As discussed previously, the proposed underground garage should not limit opportunity for mature landscape and tree growth on site by providing quality soil with appropriate volume and depth.	Replacing a portion of existing garage with a new underground garage allows levelling the existing grading and provide a sufficient soil depth to support new canopy tree planting. We're also proposing soil cell system as a part of green infrastructure in the new construction to further support a long-term tree growth.
8	Underground exhaust vents located to minimize impacts on public sidewalk, outdoor amenity areas, dwelling units and neighbouring properties.	Noted.
	<u>Pedestrian and Cycling Connections</u>	
9	Coordinate bus stop with TTC.	This is being coordinated with the City's new cycle track and the boulevard upgrades. Further details will be coordinated in the Site Plan Approval process, as the City's design is being finalized.
10	Provide for safe and appropriate pedestrian/bicycle access to the underground parking garage.	Dedicated elevators and ramp access to the underground parking garage are proposed. Refer to the architectural Ground Floor Plan.
	<u>Grading Relationships</u>	
11	The underground garage should not impede site grading and landscaping opportunities including the integration of green infrastructure.	Please see response for comment #7.
12	Slope paved surfaces to drain into soft landscape areas to promote low-impact storm water management where possible	Grading is designed to drain towards soft landscape areas. We also proposed permeable pavers for low-impact stormwater management in POPS area. Design details will be further explored in the Site Plan Approval process.
<b>Building Massing and Design</b>		
	<u>Setbacks</u>	
13	The base building for Building A and B should be setback 3m minimum along Don Lake Gate and the multiuse trail. In the drawings provided for discussion in January 2023, showed the setback as 3m along Bathurst and 3.8m along the multi-use trail.	3m setback is provided towards Don Lake Gate and the multi-use trail. Refer to the updated Architectural Site Plan.
14	Setback the midrise building 3m minimum from the multiuse trail. In the January 2023 drawings the setback was shown as 3.8m.	3m setback is provided to the multi-use trail for Building A and Building C (Midrise). Refer to the updated Architectural Site Plan.
	<u>Tall Building/Mid-Rise Building/Low-Rise Building Standards</u>	
15	Avoid balcony wrap around	No wrap-around balconies will be proposed on the new buildings. Limited projecting and inset balconies are considered to improve on sustainable design performance.
	<u>Planning for Children</u>	
16	Refer to the <u>Growing Up</u> Study and Guidelines. This application should have consideration for some of the guidelines within this document.	Noted.
17	Provide a critical mass of large units primarily located in lower portions of the building.	We agree in principle and will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
18	Units should be adaptable and allow for layout change over time	Noted.
19	Provide flexible "multi-purpose rooms" for different users including children, youth and adults thought the day. The flexible space may be used for communal gathering and that includes a full kitchen; homework room with Wi-Fi for teens located in a visible area; rooms for toddler play than can be used for fitness or crafts in the evening, etc. These rooms should include generous storage space for moveable furniture.	We agree in principle and will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
20	Provide a workshop space for messy activities.	We agree in principle and will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
21	Encourage the social life of the building through social spaces in the lobby and corridors.	Noted.
22	The lobby should include a washroom as well as storage space for items like strollers	We agree in principle and will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
	<u>Retail</u>	
23	Refer to the Retail Design Manual.	Noted.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Urban Design

Kaari Kitawi, Planner, Urban Design North York

March 8, 2024

#	Comment	Response
	<u>Drawings - Perspectives, Elevations and Sections</u>	
24	The perspectives are appreciated.	Noted.
	<u>Pedestrian Wind Study</u>	
25	It is understood that some of the wind mitigation elements will be refined once the programming evolves, however, at this stage, priority should be given to the retention the existing trees. Particularly at the POPS. The wind study recommends canopy trees to increase comfort, unless large trees are proposed to be installed, the trees will take time to establish and provide the required canopy. See item #33 below.	Wind study consultant, Gradient Wind, advised the existing trees (Silver Maples) at POPS is not effective for wind mitigation, as the wind impact in this area is mainly in horizontal direction, and trees are only effective against downward wind pressure. Other effective wind mitigations against horizontal movement are proposed in POPS such as new planting with dense foliage and vertical barriers. Further landscaping and design details will be provided in the Site Plan Approval process.
26	The outdoor amenities should be comfortable for sitting. Indicate the details of additional mitigation for the grade related and above grade outdoor amenities.	We agree in principle and will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
27	The wind study indicates that the 2m tall wind screens will not suffice to mitigate wind conditions in the outdoor amenities on the 5 <sup>th</sup> floor. Programming and high quality design should not be compromised in the integration of further wind measures.	We agree in principle and will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
	<u>Sun/Shadow Study</u>	
28	Include sun shadow diagrams through out the 4 seasons. The winter diagrams are not included.	Sun-shadow study, updated with all 4 seasons, has been provided to staff for review in email on April 17, 2024.
	<b>LANDSCAPE, STREETScape AND PEDESTRIAN AMENITIES</b>	
	<u>Indigenous History and Cultural and Natural Heritage</u>	
29	Explore opportunity to integrate/showcase/make visible and or celebrate Indigenous history and or culture	Noted. We will explore opportunities to integrate and celebrate the indigeous culture through a form of a public artwork. Further details will be explored in the Site Plan Approval process.
	<u>Landscape Plans and Details</u>	
30	Landscaping on the site should provide appropriate front yard transition between the sidewalk on Bathurst, Antibes Drive, Don Lake Gate and the future Multiuse Pathway to promote year-round interest, biodiversity and pedestrian comfort.	Noted.
31	The open space on the west is appreciated. Ensure sufficient soil volume/depth to maximize tree planting opportunities.	Noted.
32	Provide QLA information in the streetscape sections.	This will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
	<u>Trees and Environment</u>	
33	As mentioned in previous comments and as promised in meetings adjust the extent of the underground garage on the east to preserve the large Silver Maples along Bathurst as many as possible. The wind study recommends introducing canopy trees to mitigate wind conditions, which would take a number of years to provide sufficient canopy. The existing trees could assist in mitigating the wind conditions. Retaining the trees particularly in the area along the proposed POPs should be prioritized.	In order to maintain the required parking rate accepted by Transportation Services staff, the full extent of the proposed underground garage is required, which requires the existing trees to be removed. Difficulties for tree retention were presented to staff, including technical letters prepared by the arborist (Kuntz Forestry), shoring engineer (Grounded Engineering), construction management (Clark Construction) and structural engineer (Honeycomb). Please refer to response to comment #25 in respect to wind mitigation. Applicant is looking forward to working with the City staff on providing new, local species for large canopy trees in the proposed POPS and develop further design details in the Site Plan Approval process.
	<u>Streetscape Improvements</u>	
34	Refer to the Streetscape Manual.	Noted.
	<u>Utilities</u>	
35	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.
36	All utilities (light standards, hydrants, overhead wires, vents, transformers, hydro vaults, cable boxes, meters, grates, etc.) indicated on appropriate plans and elevations.	Please refer to the updated Public Utilities Plan.
37	Trees, plantings and other landscape features coordinated with existing and proposed utilities.	This will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
38	Utilities and service connections located away from public streets, walkways, corners, entrances and/or integrated within building massing and landscape design.	Noted.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis (Housing)  
Denise McMullin, Planner, Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis  
January 3, 2024

#	Comment	Response
<b>Rental Intensification Policy 3.2.1.5</b>		
1	The Housing Issues Report Addendum Letter indicates that a tenant survey was conducted from July 17, 2023 to August 4, 2023 with the existing tenants of 155 Antibes Drive to determine ways to improve the existing common areas and amenity spaces of the building and identify new common areas and amenity spaces as part of the redevelopment. As an outcome of the of the survey results, the owner has shown the following improvements in the resubmitted materials to building/site:	Noted.
a	A new dedicated, enclosed Type G loading space for the exclusive use of the existing building that will have direct interior access to the lower ground floor corridor.	
b	a new east-facing lobby located off the proposed new driveway and accessibility improvements to the existing west-facing lobby, common areas and amenity spaces.	
c	Improvements and expansion to the existing storage locker area, indoor amenity area (currently a gym), mailroom and laundry room.	
d	Outdoor on-site improvements including and outdoor terrace, additional planting and landscaping, pedestrian connections, a children's play area, community garden and outdoor gathering space.	
e	A dedicated bicycle parking space with maintenance station and bike ramp	
2	The applicant is asked to provide a set of floor plans that show the existing parking garage and common areas without the proposed overlay to better assess the extent of the common area and amenity improvements.	Basement plan has been provided to staff for review in an email on March 19, 2024.
3	The Housing Issues Report indicates that the existing building contains 273 parking spaces below grade and 99 spaces at-grade (comprised of 29 visitor and 70 resident parking spaces). The original application retained 164 parking spaces in the below-grade portion of the existing building, whereas the revised proposal shows a further reduction in parking to 116 spaces, inclusive of 12 visitor parking spaces representing a proposed resident parking space/unit ratio of 0.40 for the existing building. The redevelopment of three new buildings on the site proposes 641 new residential parking spaces for the new 892 units representing parking space/unit ratio of 0.72 for the three new buildings. The survey indicated that approximately 90% of tenant respondents use the below-grade parking garage often. Please provide the parking utilization rate of the existing building and if there is a loss in actively used tenant parking, staff recommend levelling out the ratio of residential parking/unit ratio between the existing building and the proposed building. This could include providing direct access to parking spaces between the existing garage and the proposed parking garages.	In order to meet the minimum parking rate required for the site, a total of 744 resident parking spaces and 60 visitor parking spaces are proposed being available for both existing and future residents through the connected underground garage. At minimum, 167 of the eligible existing tenants, who had parking lease at the time of the first development application notice, will be secured with at least one parking space. Future parking demand will be managed by a combination of lease turnovers in the future and several traffic demand management proposed for the development.
4	Prior to Site Plan Approval for the development, the applicant is required to develop a construction mitigation plan and tenant communications strategy to mitigate the impacts of construction of the proposed development on existing and future residents.	Noted.
5	As part of the Site Plan Approval process, the rental housing improvements will need to be secured through one or more agreements with the City, and to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner.	Noted.
6	As part of the Site Plan Approval process, the applicant is asked to confirm in writing that the proposed improvements to the existing rental housing will not constitute community benefits under Section 37 of the Planning Act.	Noted.
	If you have any questions or wish to discuss, please do not hesitate to contact Denise McMullin, Planner at (416) 395-7133 Denise.McMullin2@toronto.ca	Noted.
<b>Unit Mix</b>		
7	The provision of (33.4%) net new two-bedroom units and 88 (10%) net new three- bedroom units supports the unit mix objectives of the Growing Up guidelines, Official Plan housing policies, and the Growth Plan's growth management and housing policies to accommodate within new development a broad range of households, including families with children	Noted.
8	Guideline 3.0 of the Growing Up Guidelines 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. The average 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom unit size is 65 square metres and 84.7 square metres, respectively, which does not support the unit size objectives of Guideline 3.0. The applicant should consider providing some 2- and 3-bedroom units that meet the guidelines to better accommodate a broad range of households, including families with children, within the proposed development.	The proposal provides new two-bedroom units in average size of 69 sq. m. and new three-bedroom units in average size of 85 sq. m. These units will be designed with open concept layouts for increased space efficiency and functionality. A variety of different unit sizes and types will help to meet distinct needs of different families, as outlined in the Growing up Guidelines. In our opinion and, at this stage in the development approval process, this proposal has had an appropriate regard for the Growing Up Guidelines. Detailed unit layout and sizes will be further explored in the Site Plan Approval process.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
<b>PART I - REZONING APPLICATION COMMENTS</b>		
<b>A. REVISIONS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT</b>		
1.1	<b>Transportation Services</b>	
a	Provide an updated Transportation Impact Study Addendum to address the comments outlined in Traffic Assessment – Section E.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
b	Provide visitor parking in accordance with the minimum rates identified under Condition B (2).	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
c	Provide accessible parking in accordance with the minimum rates identified under Condition B (4).	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
d	The Parking Plans must be revised to include the additional typical dimensions for accessible parking spaces and parking spaces adjacent to obstructions, such as walls and pillars that extend beyond 1.0m from the front or rear of the parking space, with an additional clearance of 0.3m on each side of the obstruction.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024, and the updated underground parking plan with typical parking dimensions provided.
e	Demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the Toronto Green Standard (TGS) Version 3.0, as further discussed in Section E.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
f	The site frontages on Bathurst Street, Don Lake Gate, and Antibes Drive are designated as a "Bike trail/Multi-use trail". The applicant is required to address the following comments from the cycling group regarding the design of the cycle track and the requirement to secure a clearway to install cycling infrastructure and cycle track in the future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bathurst Street: The Cycling and Pedestrian Projects team has developed a design for the project, incorporating uni-directional cycle tracks along the site frontage on Bathurst Street. To accommodate a wider boulevard for the sidewalk, cycle track, TTC concrete pad platform, and the TTC bus shelter while adhering to setback requirements, it is proposed to reclaim the southbound right-turning lane of the Bathurst Street and Drewry Avenue/Don Lake Gate Intersection. Please refer to the shared drawing regarding the details of the cycle track design and the configurations of various infrastructures along the Bathurst Street site frontage.</li> <li>Don Lake Gate: the proposed modifications to Don Lake Gate entail relocating the north curb along the site frontage southward, effectively narrowing the westbound roadway to a width of 6.0 m while ensuring fire access is maintained. An exception is made for the approach to Antibes Drive, where the width should be 6.3 m to accommodate a 3.0 m left turn lane and a 3.3 m right turn lane for TTC bus right turns. Additionally, a westbound uni-directional cycle track, with a default width of 2.1 m, will be incorporated. In the preferred boulevard configuration, a landscape zone is designed with trees positioned adjacent to the new southward-shifted roadway curb. Following this, there will be an intermediate-level cycle track featuring a beveled curb per T-990.300 standards. Existing light standards are to be maintained, with the beveled curb strategically placed just south of them. Furthermore, the boulevard plan includes a reconstructed and widened sidewalk, providing a 2.1 m wide pedestrian clearway and additional width to accommodate light standards.</li> <li>Antibes Drive: Please retain the current curb-to-curb road width along the site frontage on Antibes Drive.</li> </ul>	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
g	The applicant must submit acceptable Functional Plans (including pavement marking and signage plan) illustrating the modifications to the pavements and signages and road improvements (ex. new bike/multi-use trail) along the site frontage on Bathurst Street, Don Lake Gate, and Antibes Drive.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
h	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 trucks, city solid waste collection vehicles, and passenger vehicle turning templates will be required to confirm the road design.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
i	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.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
j	Remove all existing easements prior to conveying the land to the City	Noted.
k	Please provide a conceptual ultimate functional plan for the future Multi-Use Trail as per the City's Multi-Use Trail Design Guidelines, including pavement marking and signage plan. The plan must include the intersection of this multi-use Trail at the existing public roads. All conveyances must be dedicated in clear title and at no cost to the City, where no construction may encroach or be built upon.	Refer to attachment 3 for the Functional Plan provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024, and the ultimate concept plan for the multi-use trail prepared by SVN Architects + Planners, included in this resubmission.
l	The applicant must submit a cost estimate for the new Multi-Use Trail, to the satisfaction of Transportation Services.	Refer to the preliminary cost estimate for multi-use trail prepared by SVN Architects + Planners, included in this resubmission.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Solid Waste Services</b>	
	<u>Multi-Residential Component – Building E (Existing Building)</u>	
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. Revised drawings must provide an accurate scale.	The vehicle maneuvering diagrams (VMDs) have been updated with the noted requirements and are shown in Attachment 4 of the updated Transportation Impact Study addendum dated April 22, 2024. The diagrams are also reflected in the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S
b	Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, minimum width of 4.5 metres throughout and be 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. Full notation missing.	Refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S for full notations. All access driveways for the collection vehicle will meet the minimum required clearances as noted.
c	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate that a minimum of 8 square meters of the staging is pad is located at the front of the Type G, out of the total 25.9 square meters required. The remainder may be located along the side of the Type G. The minimum vertical clearance must be 6.1metres.	Min. 8 square meter of staging pad with a vertical clearance of 6.1m has been provided in front of every Type G loading. Please refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S.
	<u>Multi-Residential Component – Building A</u>	
a	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a garbage storage room a minimum floor area of at least 124.32 square metres. Currently when measured under scale, only 102.8 square metres is provided. Current drawings also show another garbage room in the parking garage. This garbage room must be removed, however bulk storage can stay.	Garbage storage room meets min. area of 124.32 sq. m. Refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S. Also, the additional garbage room in the P1 level has been removed. Refer to the updated P1 Level Plan, A153.S.
b	Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, minimum width of 4.5 metres throughout and be 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. Full notation missing.	Refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S for full notations.
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. Revised drawings must provide an accurate scale.	Please see response to 1.2 (a) above.
d	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate that the staging pad is located at the front of the Type G loading space will be at least 43.2 square metres, has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres. Currently when measured under scale only 39.93sq metres is provided.	Min. area of 43.2 sq. m of staging pad has been provided in front of the Type G loading with an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1m. Please refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S.
	<u>Multi-Residential Component – Building B</u>	
a	Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space will be at least 35.5 square metres. Currently when measured under scale, only 28.9 square metres is provided	Min. area of 35.5 sq. m of staging pad has been provided. Please refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S.
b	Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, minimum width of 4.5 metres throughout and be 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. Full notation missing	Refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S for full notations.
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. Revised drawings must provide an accurate scale	Please see response to 1.2 (a) above.
d	Revised drawings must indicate an oversized storage area of minimum floor area of at least 10 square metres. It is encouraged that the oversized storage area be located within or with direct access to the loading area. Revised drawings must also move the access for bulk storage so that residents can access it without entering the compactor room.	Min. area of 10 sq. m of bulk / oversize storage has been provided with direct access to garbage room and a separate, direct access to residents. Please refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S.
	<u>Multi-Residential Component – Building C</u>	
a	Revised drawings must indicate that the staging pad in building A, B or E accounts for the extra units from building C in order to sufficiently to account for the extra waste.	Min. required staging pad has been provided in front of Type C loading in Building C, and the garbage storage room for extra waste has been provided in P1 level via elevator access. Refer to the updated architectural drawings, A202.S and A153.S.
	<u>Multi-Residential Component – Building A&amp;B</u>	
a	Revised drawings must indicate a dedicated waste storage area that is on private property and large enough to allow storage of all non-residential waste material between collection days. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room.	Dedicated retail garbage rooms have been provided in Building A and Building B. Refer to the updated Ground Floor Plan, A202.S.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Engineering and Construction Services</b>	
a	Table 1.0 Summary: Land conveyance areas must be updated to reflect final areas for the park, MUT and the site, once all City divisions are satisfied.	Refer to the updated architectural Site Plan for updated land conveyance areas.
b	Consider renaming the existing building to Building D to avoid confusion.	Existing building is maintained as Building "E" for consistency in all submission materials.
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.	
	<b>General Comments</b>	
2.1	Executive Summary: Revise to address all comments in this memo. Also, the sentence which states "they will both end up discharging into the existing storm trunk sewer on Don River West Branch" is erroneous. Please revise to match the statement in Section 5.1 of the report which is correct. Please also correct this erroneous statement included in Section 10 and in Downstream Storm sewer Capacity Analysis.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.2	Executive Summary: The 2nd paragraph indicates Building C storm discharge will outlet to Antibes Drive, which is inconsistent with Section 5.1.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.3	Sanitary and Water Service Connections: Separate water and sanitary service laterals for Building A & B podiums are not required. Separate connections for podiums are only required when they are shared between two towers, which doesn't appear to be the case per the Architectural Plans. Please revise.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.4	Section 3.0 Site Proposal:	
2.4.1	The first paragraph indicates the property will be comprised of 4 parcels and the existing and proposed development are listed separately. This would seem to indicate that the land will be subdivided to sever the existing building from the new buildings, however based on the submitted Architectural, Landscape and Civil plans, this does not appear to be the case. If this will be the case, the applicant must clearly indicate how each land parcel will have independent servicing, SWM design and be self-contained for drainage without the need for easements. Additionally, all drawings including a Draft R-Plan will need to be revised to show the proposed property lines. Please review and revise.	Refer to the comments response letter, prepared by Lithos Group, dated April 4, 2024. This letter was previously provided to staff for review in email, dated April 4, 2024.
2.4.2	Phasing: This section indicates that the development will be constructed in phases however the phasing plan has not been outlined. The FSR and SWM Report must discuss servicing, drainage and stormwater management for each phase and if one phase depends on another phase for servicing or drainage. The Engineer shall ensure that the phases of the development are orderly and that each phase of development will have the appropriate municipal infrastructure to service that phase.	This will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.
2.4.3	Parkland dedication area: It is understood that the land dedication for the proposed public park is still in flux and likely requires revision. Please update the report accordingly to ensure the final parkland dedication area is used as accepted by PF&R department.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.5	Section 4.1 Terms of Reference: Remove reference to terms of reference dated "December 2007" as the current TOR is listed on the City's website.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.6	Section 11.0 Conclusions and Recommendations: Please update to address all comments in this memo.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
	<b>Storm Servicing and Stormwater Management Comments</b>	
2.7	The following comments from Part II: Site Plan Application Comments of this memo must be addressed as part of ZBA: Comments 2.11, 2.16, and 2.20-2.26.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
	<b>Sanitary Servicing and Downstream Capacity Analysis Comments</b>	
2.8	Section 7.3. Sanitary Sewer Capacity Analysis:	
2.8.1	Update to address comments provided on the Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis Report.	
2.8.2	Table 7-2 – New Developments: i. General Note: It should be noted that some developments, such as this file 155 Antibes Dr. and 5950 Bathurst St., have existing buildings being retained with new buildings being added. Therefore, the applicant should confirm and document if the existing model captures any flow from each site (i.e. population and groundwater (via baseflow) and add the necessary delta to achieve the total flow as required. Please document these updates in the report. ii. Per the Bathurst – Fisherville Block Plan Master FS&SWM dated June 2nd, 2023: a) 5 Fisherville Drive & 6040 Bathurst Street: Total population should be 2242 persons and peak groundwater should be 10.51 l/s to Fisherville Road. b) 25 Fisherville Road: Total population should be 1161 persons and peak groundwater should be 2.0 l/s to Fisherville Road and 2.0 l/s to Russfax Dr. c) 6020 & 6030 Bathurst Street has been excluded from the table. Please add in accounting for population and peak groundwater information. iii. 6035 Bathurst Street: Per the latest FSR, population should be 399 persons and peak groundwater is 0.64 l/s. Please revise. iv. 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: <a href="https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/application-information-centre/">https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/planning-development/application-information-centre/</a> .	Refer to the comments response letter, prepared by Lithos Group, dated April 4, 2024. This letter was previously provided to staff for review in email, dated April 4, 2024.
2.9	Section 7.4 Conclusions: Please update to address comments provided on the Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis Report.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.10	Section 7.5. Proposed Sanitary Connections:	
2.10.1	Proposed Building A, B and C: Refer to general comments above on servicing requirements for towers / podiums. Revise accordingly.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.10.2	Existing Building E: Advisory: Refer to Site Plan comments regarding "Reuse of sewer pipe lateral service connections".	Noted.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
2.11	Appendix D – Sanitary Data Analysis: Lateral Capacity Analysis Assessment Design Sheet: Include the lateral design / analysis for all proposed service connections including Building E. Ensure the lateral design matches the Servicing Plan.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12	Downstream Sanitary Sewer Capacity Analysis: Downstream Sanitary Capacity Analysis Report, dated November 8, 2023:	
2.12.1	Executive Summary: Update to reflect changes and updates in the report as per comments provided in this memorandum.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.2	Section 4.0 Sanitary Capacity and Overflow Analysis: i. Remove reference to BFA 85, which appears to be a type out. ii. 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 document the utilized wastewater pattern, baseflows and RTK values utilized in the InfoWorks model for all sewershed catchment areas. The applicant may wish to collaborate with other applicants completing the downstream sanitary sewer capacity analysis within this sewershed.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.3	Section 5.1 Recent Developments: Please revise per comments provided in Section 7.3 of the FSR.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.4	Section 5.2 Flow Monitoring Analysis: When using flow monitoring data, regardless if the data is from the City, the applicant must ensure the data and analysis complies with Appendix A – Protocol for Flow Monitoring and I&I Estimation of the Sewer Capacity Assessment Guidelines. This does not appear to be the case as one of the data points used in the report did not comply with Appendix A, 2. b) (i.e. >20mm rainfall) and as that data point should not be used for analysis. Please review and revise and ensure compliance with Appendix A.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.5	Section 5.3 Model Calibration – Dry Weather: Document and summarize the Per Capita Rate (L/cap/day) (i.e. for DWF) used after calibrating to NYE-010 monitoring data for analyzing existing developments in the model and existing developments added in to the model (i.e. Table 5.2). Also confirm that 240 L/cap/day was used for all new developments (i.e. Table 5.1) added to the model.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.6	Further to the above comment, as an appendix to the report provide supporting documentation for calibrated DWF under NYE-010 comparing flow (L/S) (modelled vs flow) to dates in graphical format. Please also document Average Daily Dry Weather Flow in graphical and tabular format and indicate important values such as Average Daily Volume, ADF, AD Peak Flow, Peaking Factor, Average Daily Minimum Flow, and Base Infiltration.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.7	Section 5.4 Model Calibration – Wet Weather: i. Refer to previous comments above on selecting appropriate storm events. ii. As requested over email to the applicant, provide supporting data, calculations and documentation for your linear regression I/I analysis, confirm the total drainage area (in ha) used in the analysis, and other important variables and calculations that clearly demonstrate how you arrived at 2.48 L/s/ha. iii. Reference is made to 3.0 l/s/ha however it's unclear where this value is taken from as it is assumed the base model includes a calibrated WWF I/I value (under NYE-010). Furthermore, if the applicant follows the procedures outlined in the City manuals and arrive at a WWF I/I value less than 3.0 l/s/ha, the applicant may use that value for their analysis. iv. As requested over email to the applicant, clarify and document in the report how peak rainfall intensity is factored into the linear regression analysis / graph.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.8	Section 6.0 Model Scenarios: i. Update Table 6.1 as required to address comments in this memo. ii. Confirm that 1.47 l/s/ha is a type out, which is referenced multiple times in this section. Please revise with the correct WWF I/I value.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.9	Section 7.0 Results: i. Please update to address all comments in this memorandum. ii. The capacity analysis results show there is not capacity in a number of downstream pipes within the ravine area during DWF and WWF and mitigation measures in the form of pipe upgrades are proposed. Please be advised this ravine area is TRCA regulated and a number of active development applications are draining to this sewer outlet. Therefore, should mitigation measures be required, discussions with City staff on the process and requirements for upgrades in the ravine must occur and the specific mitigation measures must be coordinated among all active developments dependent on this work.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.10	Figure2-1 and Figure2-2: i. Show the correct alignment of Pipe # 11A (which should drain south) and Pipe #12 (which should drain west) on plan view. ii. Mitigative measures (pipe upsizing in the valley) must be coordinated with the City and other active developments as commented above.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.12.11	Appendix A Supporting Documentation and Results for Dry Weather Flow: i. Provide model output information for DWF parameters. iii. Table 7.1, 7.2, 7.5 and profile view outputs: Please update to address all comments in this memorandum. ii. FIG4-1, FIG4-2 & FIG4-5: Refer to comments provided on Figure2-1 and Figure2-2.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.



# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
2.12.12	<p>Appendix B Supporting Documentation and Results for Wet Weather Flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Refer to previous comments above on selecting appropriate storm events and linear regression analysis.</li> <li>ii. I/I Analysis: It appears labelling is incorrect. Confirm if the yellow line should be I/I while the green should be DWF. Additionally, please document the Storm Statistics, Monitored Area Statistics and I-I Event Statistics.</li> <li>iii. Confirm total sub-sewershed area that I/I has been applied to. Based on the previously advised work along the Maple Collector Trunk Sewer and revised connections, the area is expected to be around 200 ha.</li> <li>iv. Based on our GIS records MH 4892908762.1 has a T/G of 184.46, MH 4873908583.1 has a T/G of 179.09 and MH 4869908575.1 has a T/G of 179.25. Please verify elevations with as-built drawings and revise accordingly. The applicant may also want to consider completing a field investigation and survey of the problematic manholes / sewers in the ravine to confirm design assumptions.</li> <li>v. Peaks flow for both Dry and Wet Weather appear to be high. Please confirm modelling assumptions and inputs.</li> <li>vi. SC2: Proposed DWF: There is a 69 l/s increase in flow between #5A &amp; #6A, a 37 l/s increase in flow between #12A &amp; #13A, a 41 l/s increase in flow between #17A &amp; #18A and a 18 l/s increase in flow between #21A &amp; #22A. Please confirm these increases are accurate as they seem high based on known development application peak flows.</li> <li>vii. Further to the above comments, ensure the model reflects population and flows as outlined in Table 7-2.</li> <li>viii. Update all model profile outputs and figures to address all comments in this memo.</li> <li>ix. FIG4-3, FIG4-4 &amp; FIG4-6: Refer to comments provided on Figure2-1 and Figure2-2.</li> </ul>	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.13	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.
2.14	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.	Noted.
<b>Water Servicing and Fire Flow Demand &amp; Analysis Comments</b>		
2.15	Section 8.0 Water Supply System and Appendix E Water Data Analysis:	
2.15.1	Confirm what version of FUS is being utilized. Note that the City has adopted the FUS 2020 version (with amendments) starting January 2023. If used, all calculations and analysis must conform to this version.	Refer to the comments response letter, prepared by Lithos Group, dated April 4, 2024. This letter was previously provided to staff for review in email, dated April 4, 2024.
2.15.2	<p>FUS Fire Flow Demand (Buildings A, B, C &amp; E):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Final Fire flow values must be rounded per FUS requirements.</li> <li>ii. Building E: Clarify where the GFA values for each floor were taken from. Based on the Project Data Sheet, the building has 26,731 m<sup>2</sup> of GFA across 16 stories, which works out to 1671 m<sup>2</sup> per floor.</li> <li>iii. Pressure Loss Calculations: Use an appropriate Hazen Williams 'C' value per Chapter 4 of the City's Design Criteria.</li> <li>iv. Type of Construction: The FUS fire flow calculations use a 'C' value of 0.6 to calculate the fire demand for the building which is only applicable for "Fire-Resistive Construction (Type I)" as per the Water Supply for Public Fire Protection 2020 guide by Fire Underwriters Survey (FUS): "A building is considered to be of Fire-resistive construction (Type I) when all structural elements, walls, arches, floors, and roofs are constructed with a minimum 2-hour fire resistance rating, and all materials used in the construction of the structural elements, walls, arches, floors, and roofs are constructed with noncombustible materials." 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 (existing and proposed) using this C value. The letter needs to clearly state the type of material to construct the specific building and that the material is of "Fire-Resistive Construction (Type I)" as per the FUS 2020 Guidelines. The letter must clearly reference all specific buildings within the site that are applicable under this construction type. Please ensure the letter references the specific City ZBA file number and municipal civic address of the subject site. Please append the letter to the FSR.</li> <li>v. Further to the above comment, if any vertical openings in the building (ex. interconnected floor spaces, atria, elevators, escalators, etc.) are unprotected, consider the two largest adjoining floor areas plus 50% of all floors immediately above them up to a maximum of eight. Where this is the case, the Architect letter noted above must document this.</li> <li>vi. Further to the above comment, if the FUS fire flow calculations use an effective area of the single largest Floor Area plus 25% of each of the two immediately adjoining floors then the above noted certification letter from the Architect must clearly specify that as per the FUS 2020 Guidelines, "all vertical openings and exterior vertical communications are properly protected in accordance with the National Building Code".</li> <li>vii. Further to the above comment, the letter provided by BDP Quadrangle dated February 22, 2023 in Appendix B needs to be updated to reflect the above comments and must be stamped / sealed. Please also ensure the letter is placed in Appendix E with the rest of the water analysis documentation.</li> <li>viii. Sprinkler Credit: Provide a letter from the Mechanical or Sprinkler Consultant confirming all proposed and the existing building will be or has been designed with a fully automatic sprinkler system as per FUS 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 Guidelines.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
2.16	Section 8.3. Existing and Proposed Fire Services: Separate fire lines for the podiums for Buildings A & B are not required. Since Building A & B are both taller than 84m they each require two fire service connections connected to two different municipal watermains. As such, Building B should have 1 fire line connected to Bathurst Street and one connection to Don Lake Gate. Building A should have the exact same setup and assuming the fire line can run through the underground garage to connect to the Don Lake Gate service connection. That fire connection can be shared between the two buildings since they have a common underground garage (i.e. 3 fire lines between Buildings A & B). If it is not possible to run an independent fire line for Building A to the fire line for Building B connected to Don Lake Gate, then Building A will require two fire lines connected to Bathurst Street with an isolation valve between the connections. Refer to Municipal Water Service Connections in Chapter 4 of the City's Design Criteria for more information.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.17	Section 8.4. Proposed Watermain Connections:	
2.17.1	Proposed Buildings A and B: These buildings are proposed to have 150mm fire lines and 100mm domestic lines. Given the size of the buildings, the City is concerned these lines may be undersized. Please review water line sizing with the Mechanical Engineering and revise as required. Additionally, please revise the domestic and fire water servicing design as commented in this memo.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.17.2	Existing Building E: This section references an "existing 150 mm diameter water lateral connection (to be maintained)". Based on City GIS records, there is an existing h-connection on Antibes Dr. with a 200mm fire line and 100mm domestic line both installed in 2014. Advisory SPA Comments: The applicant must verify connection details and confirm that the existing water service lateral meets municipal code and can be reused. Additionally, please document that the existing buildings has or will be retrofitted to have a separate water meter, detector assembly, and backflow preventer for this incoming water service in accordance with City standard SD-4. This water related mechanical equipment must be located in a separate mechanical room at the exact location of the point of entry of the water connection into the building per municipal code. Please revise the report and servicing plan accordingly.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.17.3	Section 8.5. Water Distribution Analysis Report and Water Distribution Analysis Report, dated November 8, 2023, prepared by Lithos Group Inc.: Please revise to address all comments in this memo including fire flow and water servicing design.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.18	Section 8.5. Water Distribution Analysis Report and Water Distribution Analysis Report, dated November 8, 2023, prepared by Lithos Group Inc.: Please revise to address all comments in this memo including fire flow and water servicing design.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
<b>Multi-Use Trail &amp; Municipal Storm Sewer and Easement Comments</b>		
2.19	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 application which includes functional engineering drawings to indicate the required municipal infrastructure additions and modifications required. These drawing shall be coordinated between all three affected landowners (5950 Bathurst St., 155 Antibes Dr. and 25 Cedarcroft Blvd).	Conceptual ultimate plan for the multi-use trail, prepared by SVN Architects + Planner, and Transportation Functional Plan, prepared by RJ Burnside, were provided to staff for review in email, dated April 22, 2024. Functional Engineering Plan, prepared by Lithos Group, was provided to staff for review in email, dated April 4, 2024. Preliminary concept for multi-use trail has been accepted by staff based on the provided plans.
2.20	Advisory: This submission indicates a 6.1m wide land conveyance to the City from the 155 Antibes Drive property, which combined with a 3.0m wide land conveyance to the City from the adjacent properties, will result in a 9.1m wide municipal ROW for the proposed multi-use trail. Additionally, the limit of the land conveyance and hence new property line appears to line up with the extents of the existing municipal sewer easement. The plans also indicate the extent of permanent shoring wall for the building with a 3.0m offset from exterior wall of the existing municipal storm sewer within the City easement with the limit of the underground garage for the building beyond the 3.0m clearance. The architectural plans also indicate that balcony overhangs from the building will not encroach into the new multi-use trail and will be limited to private property. <b>Based on all of this, the City is generally acceptable to this proposal from a zoning perspective. Further details, analysis and review will be required at the SPA / detailed design stage.</b>	Noted.
2.21	Advisory: The multi-use trail, which will become a City right-of-way, cannot be encumbered by private infrastructure (structures, buildings, pipes, etc.). The applicant will be required to work with the City on the legal process to deal with the existing municipal easement and the conveyance of the new multi-use trail to form a new City right-of-way.	Noted.
2.22	Advisory: The applicant has inquired to the City about relocating municipal manhole MH4896509053 to ensure sufficient horizontal clearance is provided. The City may consider this relocation however the applicant must submit further technical analysis and supporting documentation including a pumping by-pass plan for the sewer prior to the City providing further feedback on this proposal. Sewer condition, manhole spacing and various other technical items will need to be reviewed. Additionally, City staff note that this manhole has not been shown to scale on the drawings.	City's storm manhole MH4896509053 is no longer proposed to be relocated.
2.23	Advisory: The existing private storm connection into the exiting municipal easement and all private servicing within the municipal easement / future multi-use trail area is required to be decommissioned and completely removed. Municipal Chapter 681 (Sewers) prohibits service connections into easements. Additionally, private services crossing easement lands is not permitted. Details on the required work including removals shall be provided at SPA / detailed design stage.	Noted.
2.24	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.
2.25	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.
2.26	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.
2.27	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.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
<b>3</b>	<b>Draft Plan of Subdivision Application</b>	
3.1	Given that the applicant will be conveying land and constructing a new City right-of-way (multi-use trail), the applicant shall submit a Draft Plan of Subdivision application. Submit a Draft Plan and other documents required per City's terms of references as part of a Draft Plan of Subdivision application. This application shall be submitted concurrent to the zoning application.	Land conveyance for the Multi-Use Trail will be conveyed by a means of in-kind contribution for Community Benefit Charge, and this will not require a Draft Plan of Subdivision application for rezoning at this time.
3.2	As part of the Draft Plan of Subdivision application. The Owner shall enter into the City's standard subdivision agreement and satisfy all pre-registration conditions for construction of the new City right-of-way.	Not applicable at this time.
3.3	The Owner shall agree to construct and make satisfactory financial arrangements including financial securities and engineering and inspection fees required to ensure the construction of all proposed municipal infrastructure works necessary for the new City right-of-way to the satisfaction of the Executive Director, Engineering and Construction Services in accordance with the prevailing City of Toronto policy as determined by the Chief Engineer & Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services. The requirements for municipal infrastructure for the new City right-of-way are to be constructed at the sole cost of the Owner. The Owner shall enter any necessary private cost sharing agreements with the adjacent landowners. Note that the City does not get involved in private cost sharing agreements.	Noted.
3.4	The Owner shall agree to construct and make satisfactory financial arrangements including financial securities and engineering and inspection fees to ensure the construction of all proposed municipal infrastructure and facilities that are external to the Site Plan and new City right-of-way, as recommended in the accepted Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer & Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services. The requirements for external infrastructure improvements are to be constructed at the sole cost of the Owner.	Noted.
3.5	The Owner shall undertake an environmental site assessment for lands to be conveyed to the City in accordance with the terms and conditions of the City's standard subdivision agreement including providing payment for a peer reviewer and the submission of a Record of Site Condition (RSC).	Noted.
<b>B</b>	<b>(PRELIMINARY) ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT CONDITIONS</b>	
	The owner is required, as a condition of approval and Rezoning Application, to:	
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.;	This will be considered in the future Site Plan Approval condition.
2	Provide parking spaces in accordance with the following minimum requirements; Visitor Residential - Resident Spaces: 0.646 spaces per unit; - Visitor Spaces: 2.0 + 0.05 spaces per unit;	Noted. These minimum parking requirements have been re-confirmed by staff in email on May 7, 2024.
3	Provide parking spaces in accordance with the following maximum requirements; Residential Condominium Use - Bachelor (Up to 45 m2): 0.7 space per unit; - 1-Bedroom Units: 0.8 space per unit; - 2-Bedroom Units: 0.9 space per unit; - 3+ Bedroom Units: 1.1 spaces per unit; - Visitor Spaces: 1.0 space per unit up to 5 units, 0.1 spaces per unit thereafter;	Noted.
4	Comply with the following parking space dimensional requirements;  (i)The minimum dimensions of a parking space shall be: • length 5.6 metres • height 2.0 metres • width 2.6 metres  (ii)The minimum dimensions of a parking space that is adjacent and parallel to a drive aisle shall be: • length 6.7 metres • height 2.0 metres • width 2.6 metres  The minimum dimensions of an accessible parking space shall be: • length 5.6 metres • height 2.0 metres • width 3.4 metres • with a 1.5m wide shared access aisle  • The minimum required width of a parking space shall be increased by 0.3 metres for each side of the parking space which is obstructed. • The side of a parking space shall be considered to be obstructed when any part of a fixed object such as, but not limited to, a wall, column, bollard, fence or pipe is situated within 0.3 metres of the side of the parking space, measured at right angles, and more than 1.0 metres from the front or rear of the parking space.	Noted.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
5	Provide loading in accordance with the following minimum requirements: Existing Building - 1 Type 'G' space; Building A, B and C - 1 Type 'G' space; - 1 Type 'C' space;	Required loading spaces have been provided for Buildings A, B, C and E (Existing). Refer to the architectural Ground Floor Plan.
6	Include the following definitions in the Site Specific By-law for this project: • Type 'G' Loading Space means a loading space that is a minimum of 4.0 metres wide, 13.0 metres long and has a minimum vertical clearance of 6.1 metres. • Type 'C' Loading Space means a loading space that is a minimum of 3.5 metres wide, 6.0 metres long and has a minimum vertical clearance of 3.0 metres. • Car-Share means the practice where a number of people share the use of one or more cars that are owned by a profit or non-profit car-sharing organization and to use a car-share vehicle, a person must meet the membership requirements of the car-sharing organization, including the payment of a membership fee that may or may not be refundable. Cars are reserved in advance and fees for use are normally based on time and/or kilometres driven and do include use of cars on an hourly basis; • Car-Share Parking Space means a parking space exclusively reserved and signed for a car used only for car-share purposes and such car-share is for the use of at least the occupants of the building	Noted. These definitions will be included in the Site Specific By-law amendment.
7	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.	Minimum accessible parking has been satisfied.
8	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;	Servicing capacity and municipal infrastructure have been reviewed and accepted by staff. Refer to the updated downstream analysis reports prepared by Lithos Group.
9	Submit, prior to the approval of the rezoning application, revised plans/documentation with respect to Condition No. 8 above, to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services;	Revised materials for comment #8 have been provided to staff for review and accepted.
10	Enter into a financially secured <b>Development Agreement</b> 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.
11	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.	Noted.
<b>PART II: SITE PLAN APPLICATION COMMENTS (as requested by staff to address in email, dated February 12, 2024)</b>		
<b>City Multi-Use Trail Comments</b>		
2.11	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 where required, in accordance with the Planning Act.	Noted. This will be provided in the future Site Plan approval.
<b>SWM Water Quality Comments</b>		
2.16	This section indicates that a MTD is proposed to treat runoff from a portion of the site. Please ensure the drainage area matches the final Grading Plan and provide a matching detailed sizing report for the proposed MTD.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.2	Advisory: If permeable pavers will be used to help achieve the water quality requirements for the development, please ensure the requirements for permeable pavers are clearly noted on the grading plan, site plan and landscape plan. Additionally, the landscape plan must include a cross-section detail of the proposed permeable pavers showing all relevant details including the storage bed requirements. Per the Toronto Water table, 80% TSS removal is only permitted for permeable pavers where they have a storage bed, otherwise 50% TSS is appropriate. The applicant may also wish to investigate the use of permeable pavers to help meet the water balance requirements for the site.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.21	Storm tanks / Cisterns: Specify the depth of sediment build up requiring cleanout	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.22	Please be advised that where manufactured treatment devices (MTDs) are proposed in a stormwater management plan, they must comply with the City's Design Criteria for Manufactured Treatment Devices for applications submitted on or after April 1, 2023. Please refer to the City's website for more information on the required submittal documentation: <a href="https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/water-environment/managing-rain-melted-snow/what-the-city-is-doing-stormwater-management-projects/other-stormwater-management-projects/design-criteria-for-manufactured-treatment-devices/">https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/water-environment/managing-rain-melted-snow/what-the-city-is-doing-stormwater-management-projects/other-stormwater-management-projects/design-criteria-for-manufactured-treatment-devices/</a>	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
2.23	Please include general maintenance and cleanout information / procedures from the manufacturer as an Appendix to the SWM report for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the selected water quality treatment products</li> <li>• the selected green roof system</li> <li>• the proposed storm tank/cisterns</li> <li>• any proposed LID / Green SWM features</li> <li>• pump systems (if required)</li> <li>• other water quality and quantity systems as required</li> </ul>	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
<b>SWM Water Quantity Comments</b>		
2.24	Section 5.1 Existing Conditions:	
2.24.1	A2 Pre: Based on the on-site investigation report, the majority of this catchment is picked up by on site catch basins and is directed to the existing municipal sewer on site within the City easement. However the entire catchment area may be used for the allowable release rate to Bathurst Street provided the storm sewer capacity analysis shows there sufficient capacity within the municipal storm sewer system.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.24.2	A4 Pre: Revise the description of this catchment to reference drainage towards the municipal easement (not Bathurst St.).	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.24.3	A7 Pre: Based on the on-site investigation report, this entire catchment is picked up by on site catch basins and is directed to the existing municipal sewer on site within the City easement. As such, both A6 and A7 Pre shall be used to calculate the allowable release rate for the multi- use path. Please revise the noted 2.2 L/s accordingly.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.24.4	It is unclear where Areas A4 Pre and A5 Pre outlet to, and whether drainage outlets into the 1,050mm storm sewer within the easement or drains to Antibes Dr which outlets to the 750mm-900mm storm sewer on Antibes Dr. The Site Investigation and Dye Test Report in the Appendix does not clarify this either. If flows drain to the Antibes Drive sewer, then these areas cannot be included in the Qallowable calculation for a connection to the storm sewer in the easement since the two municipal sewers have different outlets.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.25	Section 5.2 SWM:	
2.25.1	The post development catchment areas do not account for any uncontrolled drainage. The Grading Plan must therefore ensure that 100% of the site is captured and controlled.	Noted.
2.25.2	Advisory: Previous iterations of the report indicated the need to pump storm drainage. The applicant must investigate a gravity outlet in all cases as mechanical pumping creates inherent risk in terms of operation and maintenance. If a gravity connection is not possible, this must be clearly documented in the revised report. The revised SWM Report must include a detailed discussion on this areas storm outlet, mitigative measures in the event of complete system failure for the minor (piped) flow, where and how major overland flow will occur and confirmation that the building and adjacent properties will not be flooded. Additionally, the storm tank will need to be oversized for a worst-case scenario of pump failure during a 100-year storm.	Noted.
2.25.3	Section 5.2.1. Minor, Major Flow Route and Emergency Overland Flow Route: Please clarify how emergency overflow will occur for each storm catchment area on site including provisions included for storm tanks (perforated lids, etc.).	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.25.4	It must be confirmed and documented in the SWM report that the building's mechanical storm piping system draining into the proposed storm tank can convey the peak flow from 100-year storm. Also provide a stamped certification letter from the Mechanical Engineering Consultant confirming this appended to the SWM report.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.26	Section 5.2.3 Quantity Controls:	
2.26.1	Update to address all comments in this memo and ensure the information matches the appendices.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
2.29	Storm Sewer Capacity Analysis: Update to reflect comments on the Storm Sewer Capacity Analysis (see below comments).	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
<b>Downstream Storm Capacity Analysis Report, dated November 8, prepared by Lithos Group</b>		
2.33	Executive Summary:	
2.33.1	This section states "the storm sewer segments in each of the above noted roads are parts of separate storm network systems, they will both end up discharging into the existing storm trunk sewer". It is unclear what sewers and streets are being referenced here nor is there any trunk storm sewer in the area.	Refer to the comments response letter, prepared by Lithos Group, dated April 4, 2024. This letter was previously provided to staff for review in email, dated April 4, 2024.
2.33.2	Please clarify what storm sewer this analysis is for (i.e. storm sewer which runs through the municipal easement within the site). There are 2 other storm sewers within the area that have different outlets.	Refer to the comments response letter, prepared by Lithos Group, dated April 4, 2024. This letter was previously provided to staff for review in email, dated April 4, 2024.
2.33.3	Further to the above comments, 75.9 l/s is noted as the peak flow however discharge to the existing lateral which outlets to the storm sewer on Antibes Drive is not the same sewer as the storm sewer within the City easement.	Refer to the comments response letter, prepared by Lithos Group, dated April 4, 2024. This letter was previously provided to staff for review in email, dated April 4, 2024.
2.33.4	The analysis fails to capture the discharge from the development to the storm sewer on Bathurst Street which outlets to the municipal storm sewer located within the municipal easement on site. Please revise.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Engineering and Construction Services

Marija Llic, P.Eng. Manager, Development Engineering

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

Date: January 26, 2024

#	Comment	Response
2.33.5	Further to the above comments, assuming proposed 100-year peak flows to the 750-825mm storm sewer on Antibes Drive is limited to the allowable release rate to that sewer, no storm sewer capacity is required. However, given that the applicant is introducing peak flows to the Bathurst Street storm sewer (which drains into the municipal storm sewer within the municipal easement on site) from area which currently is doesn't them, a storm sewer capacity analysis is required for that storm sewer system to confirm capacity. Accordingly, ensure the analysis considers all flows from the site and external drainage (5950 Bathurst Street and 25 Cedarcroft Drive) to that particular storm sewer. Please review and revise the entire report accordingly.	Refer to the latest updated reports included in this resubmission.
E	<b>BACKGROUND</b>	
	<b>TRANSPORTATION SERVICES</b>	
1	<u>Study Horizon</u> A standard five-year planning horizon (2027) was selected by the consultant for future traffic analyses. Given the scope and size of the development proposal, whether the site can be built entirely in 2027. Confirmation in this regard must be provided by the consultant. Also, further details are required with respect to the phasing of the development. If the development will consist of multiple phases, the multiple horizon years must be analyzed in the TIS.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
2	<u>Corridor Growth</u> A review of the traffic studies prepared for the background developments in the area indicates a general annual growth rate of 0.5 percent along Bathurst Street. Therefore, the Transportation Study must be revised to apply a nominal growth rate of 0.5 percent per annum in order to provide a more conservative assessment. Please be advised that corridor growth analysis should focus on intersections where two major arterial streets intersect.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
3	<u>Trip Generation</u> Based on the report, LUC 222 was applied to the proposed departments, and LUC 822 was used for retail uses. However, our review indicates that the total number of trips is inconsistent with our calculations and appears to be underestimated. Therefore, the following information must be provided:  -Land use subcategory -Setting/Location -Time Period -Trip Type -Average Rate -Directional Distributions  Additionally, a 38% trip reduction was applied based on TTS Ward 10 for non-vehicular trips. However, according to TTS Ward 10, the total non-vehicular trips (transit, walk, and cycle) was reported as 27%. Please clarify this discrepancy. All relevant data/information regarding this matter must be provided in the report's appendix.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
4	<u>Vehicular Queues</u> Some movements may experience longer queues that may require more than a single signal cycle to clear (i.e. the northbound left and, northbound through movements at Bathurst Street and Drewry Avenue/Don Lake Gate Intersection during the AM and PM peak hours). This is not acceptable. Appropriate mitigation measures must be assessed and provided for any movements that are projected to operate with queues that extend beyond adjacent intersection/available storage area as a result of the addition of site traffic to the road network. The transportation consultant hired by the applicant has proposed modifications to the existing timing plans for the Bathurst Street and Drewry Avenue/Don Lake Gate Intersection. These signal timing modifications aim to accommodate anticipated traffic volumes and address concerns related to vehicle queue length exceeding the lane storage capacity. A summary of the changes which has been proposed to the existing signal timing plan for future background and total future conditions had been provided and reviewed by our Traffic Signal Group. The proposed signal timing change has been deemed acceptable by the Traffic Signal Group, and the cost estimate for implementing the signal timing changes required for the development at the subject location has been provided. Please refer to the shared cost estimate for details regarding the cost of the proposed traffic signal modifications.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
5	<u>Pick-Up/Drop-Off Activity</u> A total of 13 pick-up/drop-off parking spaces are proposed at the ground floor level. The consultant must provide an assessment of the projected pick-up/drop-off demand for the proposed development in order to determine if the subject pick-up/drop-off spaces are adequate.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.
6	<u>On-Site Signage and Wayfinding</u> The retained transportation consultant must submit an acceptable on-site signage and wayfinding plan to help facilitate the safe movement of traffic and regulate the parking, loading, and pick-up/drop-off activity that is intended to be accommodated by the site. Prior to accepting the traffic impacts of the proposal, the Transportation Study from Burnside must be revised to address the above-noted issues. The proponent is advised that additional comments may be provided with respect to the traffic impacts of the proposal once a revised Transportation study is submitted for review and approval.	Refer to response provided in the Transportation Impact Study addendum, dated April 22, 2024.

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

**Parks, Forestry & Recreation - Urban Forestry**  
**Howie Dayton, Acting General Manager - Parks, Forestry & Recreation**  
**David Bostock, Acting Supervisor – Tree Protection & Plan Review**  
**Date: December 21, 2023**

#	Comment	Response
<b>Comments on the Zoning By-Law Amendment Application:</b>		
<b>A Policy Overview</b>		
1	The submission does not provide sufficient information to adequately allow for the assessment of the proposal nor does it adequately consider the preservation or enhancement of the urban forest. The City's Official Plan outlines objectives for the integration and balancing of environmental needs (e.g. canopy cover) and Urban Forestry expects a resubmission that fully considers these objectives; specifically, strategies for retaining existing healthy trees and the provision of dedicated and unencumbered space on the subject site and along the City road allowance for the planting of large-growing shade trees and their supporting infrastructure. <u>Significant revisions to the above- and below-ground footprint and design is needed to ensure new and existing trees can be adequately accommodated.</u> Specific sections from Chapter 3 of the Official Plan are provided below to emphasize the importance and prioritization of tree protection, tree planting, and suitable infrastructure that supports tree growth.	Detailed response letter prepared by Urban Strategies Inc., dated March 12, 2024, was provided in an email to staff for review, addressing the comments in regards to the tree preservation and planning policies.
<b>Section 3.1.1. The Public Realm</b>		
	Sidewalks and boulevards will be designed to provide safe, attractive, interesting and comfortable spaces for users of all ages and abilities by: a. providing well designed and co-ordinated tree planting, landscaping, amenity spaces, setbacks, green infrastructure, pedestrian-scale lighting, street furnishings and decorative paving as part of street improvements; b. locating and designing utilities within streets, within buildings or underground, in a manner that will minimize negative impacts on the natural, pedestrian and visual environment and enable the planting and growth of trees to maturity;	Noted.
	The preservation, long-term growth and increase in the amount of healthy trees will be a priority for all development. Development proposals will demonstrate how the protection, provision and maintenance of trees and their growing spaces above and below ground will be achieved.	Noted.
<b>Section 3.1.2 Built Form</b>		
	Development will be located and organized to fit with its existing and planned context. It will frame and support adjacent streets, lanes, parks and open spaces to promote civic life and the use of the public realm, and to improve the safety, pedestrian comfort, interest and experience, and casual views to these spaces from the development by: preserving existing mature trees wherever possible and incorporating them into the development site;	Noted.
	Development will promote civic life and provide amenity for pedestrians in the public realm to make areas adjacent to streets, parks and open spaces attractive, interesting, comfortable and functional by providing: a. improvements to adjacent boulevards and sidewalks including sustainable design elements, which prioritize street trees and may include one or more of the following: shrubs, hedges, plantings or other ground cover, permeable paving materials, bio-retention swales, street furniture including seating in various forms, curb ramps, waste and recycling containers, energy efficient lighting and bicycle parking facilities;	Noted.
	Outdoor amenity spaces should: g. accommodate existing and mature tree growth;	Noted.
<b>Section 3.1.4. The Natural Environment</b>		
	The urban forest is essential to the City's character. ...We must not only protect the existing urban forest, but also enhance it. ...Protecting Toronto's natural environment and urban forest should not be compromised by growth, insensitivity to the needs of the environment, or neglect. 1. 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.
<b>B Technical Comments</b>		
	The City of Toronto's Application Support Material: Terms of Reference outlines specific documents that must be submitted with all applications. The below information must be provided in order to allow for a complete and comprehensive review of the proposal. The applicant must refer to the City's website for a full description of each document and their specific technical requirements.	Noted.
1	<b>Public utilities Plan and Sectors</b> a. Utility data is to be provided as per the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Standard 38, to Quality Level B (QL-B). Where tree planting locations are proposed, provide utility data to Quality Level A (QL-A). QL-A provides precise horizontal and vertical utility information, typically obtained by exposure (i.e. "daylighting") using minimally intrusive excavation equipment. Quality level of the subsurface utility data should be clearly noted adjacent to the professional stamp of the consulting engineer, on all plans and documents as certification of the quality level. b. The Public Utilities Plan should be submitted as a separate plan, and also as an underlay (in grey) on the Landscape and Planting Plan and the Soil Volume Plan (SVP) and any soil cell drawings, if applicable.	As agreed with staff in phone call and email, dated April 22, 2024, updated QL-B survey and the City's DMOG information have been provided in the Public Utilities Plan and Landscape drawings. Updated landscape concept plan and soil volume plans with sections were provided for staff review in email, dated April 22, 2024. Staff confirmed acceptable to provide QL-A survey being required in the Site Plan approval submission.
2	<b>Soil Volume Plan and Sections</b>	
a	Provide a typical section drawing for each soil area, including all utilities and their associated clearances as listed in the City's Municipal Consent Requirements, Appendix O. i. For soil areas with subsurface structures (e.g. soil trench with a hydrant, light pole, etc.), provide additional section drawings as necessary to capture correlating changes to the growing medium volume. ii. Dimensions (including depth) of the excavation, the soil cell trench, and the soil profile for both typical sections and where the depth varies (e.g. at the tree planting area, where a different soil depth occurs over an underground utility/structure, etc.).	Updated soil volume plan and sections were provided for staff review in email, dated April 22, 2024.
b	Where soil cells are used to achieve soil volume, include the following: i. Manufacturer's site-specific soil cell layout in plan and sections to scale, stamped by a licensed professional Civil Engineer and a Structural Engineer in the Province of Ontario warranting that the product as proposed satisfies all City of Toronto loading requirements. ii. Manufacturer's product and installation specifications. iii. Soil Volume Plan to be stamped by a full member of the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects.	Detailed soil cell engineering drawings will be provided in the future Site Plan approval submission. This was accepted by staff in phone call and email, dated April 22, 2024.
<b>C. Tree Protection</b>		
1	<b>Provide a revised Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan to address the below:</b>	

# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Parks, Forestry & Recreation - Urban Forestry

Howie Dayton, Acting General Manager - Parks, Forestry & Recreation

David Bostock, Acting Supervisor – Tree Protection & Plan Review

Date: December 21, 2023

#	Comment	Response
	<p>a. In order to adequately preserve and protect the existing, mature canopy cover of trees 146-B, 147, 149, 150, 152-158, 161-163, and 1125-1131, the proposed footprint will need to be significantly set back. Below-grade features (including over-dig) will need to be kept outside the dripline of the trees while above-grade features (e.g. building footprint, walkway, hardscape) shall encroach minimally within the dripline, be built on piers, and be subject to the results of a root exploration to determine feasibility. Additional information regarding root exploration and/or root-sensitive excavation will be provided following the resubmission based on the above comments.</p> <p>b. If trees will be injured, provide details to the nature (e.g. specific building component/structure, landscape feature) and extent (e.g. TPZ encroachment percentage, proximity to tree base) of injury and provide an assessment of potential impacts, recommended mitigation measures, and suitable remedial care actions.</p> <p>c. If pruning is required for clearance to accommodate the building or construction access, detail the canopy pruning that will be required (sizes, locations, and number of branches to be pruned and the proportion of the crown that will be lost), include photographic mark-ups to illustrate the required pruning, and discuss the anticipated impacts to the tree(s).</p> <p>d. For ease of review, use a different font colour for all revisions within the Report and have it aligned with the font colour of the revision date.</p>	<p>In order to maintain the required parking rate accepted by Transportation Services staff, the full extent of the proposed underground garage is required, which requires the noted existing trees to be removed. In previous meetings and discussion with staff, difficulties for tree retention were explained to staff, including the provision of technical letters prepared by the arborist (Kuntz Forestry), shoring engineer (Grounded Engineering), construction management (Clark Construction) and structural engineer (Honeycomb).</p>
<b>D.</b>	<b>Toronto Green Standard</b>	
	The following comments pertain to applicable Tier 1: Ecology provisions of the Toronto Green Standard Version 3.0, apply solely to areas regulated by Municipal Code Chapter 813, Trees, and apply to at-grade large-growing shade tree plantings and soil volumes only.	
1	<p>EC 1.1 Tree Planting Areas and Soil Volume – Not Met</p> <p>a. Based on the site area of 18,413 m<sup>2</sup> (total lot area - proposed parkland), a total of <u>3,348 m<sup>3</sup></u> of soil is required for tree planting areas on site and within the public boulevard.</p> <p>b. Without the necessary QL-A utility information and related soil volume sections, it is not possible to assess the practicality of the proposed soil volumes and its ability to support trees. Refer to Section B for direction.</p>	<p>Soil volume of 4,121 m<sup>3</sup> is proposed in the updated soil volume plan, including updated soil volume sections, were provided to staff for review in email, dated April 22, 2024, which exceeds the soil volume amount required as per TGS, version 4, tier 1.</p>
2	<p>EC 1.2 Trees Along Street Frontages – Not Met</p> <p>a. Without the necessary QL-A utility information and related soil volume sections, it is not possible to assess the practicality of the proposed soil volumes and its ability to support trees. Refer to Section B for direction.</p>	<p>New tree planting has been proposed along the street frontage with required soil volume in the updated soil volume plan, provided to staff for review in email, dated April 22, 2024.</p>
3	EC 1.3 Parking Lots – Not Applicable	Noted.
4	<p>EC 1.4 Watering Program – Not met</p> <p>a. A detailed two-year watering program must be specified within the plans. Information regarding the frequency and amount of watering must be specified.</p>	<p>This will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.</p>
5	<p>EC 3.1 Native and Pollinator Supportive Species – Not Met</p> <p>a. Tree species have not been specified.</p>	<p>This will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.</p>
6	<p>EC 3.2 Invasive Species – Not Met</p> <p>a. Tree species have not been specified.</p>	<p>This will be provided in the future Site Plan Approval process.</p>
	Please contact Steven Pang at <a href="mailto:steven.pang@toronto.ca">steven.pang@toronto.ca</a> if you require additional information.	



# 155 Antibes Drive - Comments Response Matrix

## Parks Forestry and Recreation - Parks Development & Planning

Vitumbiko Mhango, Senior Project Manager, Parks Development & Planning

Andrew Tidswell, Planner, Parks Development

Date: December 21st, 2023

#	Comment	Response
<b>Surrounding Area Parks</b>		
	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.
<b>Proposal for a Dedication of Parkland</b>		
	New legislation impacting planning and land development across Ontario was implemented through Bill 23 (More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022), which received royal assent on November 28, 2022. Only certain sections of the Bill are in effect, while others may come into effect at a future date upon the Province developing and proclaiming regulations for those sections.	Noted.
	At the alternative rate of 1 hectare per 600 units as specified in Section 42(3) of the Planning Act, the parkland dedication requirement is 14,867 m2 or 133 % of the site area. However, for sites that are less than 5 hectares in size and are outside of a Parkland Acquisition Priority Area as defined in Chapter 415 Article III of the Toronto Municipal Code, a cap of 5% of the development site is applied to the residential use while the non-residential use is subject to a 2% parkland dedication rate. In total, the parkland dedication requirement is 563 m2.	As discussed and accepted by staff in email, dated March 6, 2024, 560 sq. m. of parkland dedication is acceptable proposed to meet the required 5% parkland dedication. Please refer to the updated architectural Site Plan.
	The Owner is required to satisfy the parkland dedication requirement through an on-site dedication. The park is to be in a generally triangular shape, located in the northwest corner of the site, adjacent to the multi-use path, and comply with Policy 3.2.3.8 of the Toronto Official Plan.	Noted.
	The comments in the annotated version of Drawing A104.S, attached below as Figure 1, must be addressed prior to the next submission. Drawing A104.S indicates that a portion of the park overlaps with the multi-use trail, which is not acceptable. The park should be reconfigured to achieve the full parkland dedication on-site, in addition to the conveyance of the full width of the multi-use path.	Comments provided in the memo have been fully addressed, and the revised parkland has been accepted by staff in email, dated March 6, 2024.
	Drawing A104.S also demonstrates that a 5-metre setback has been proposed between the park boundary and any adjacent building face, which is acceptable. This 5-metre setback must be maintained if the parkland is reconfigured.	5-metre setback between the parkland and the building face is maintained.
<b>Recommendations in the Final Planning Report</b>		
	The following recommendations will require the approval of City Council:	
1	<i>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.</i>	Noted.
2	<i>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.</i>	Noted.
	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.	Noted.
3	<i>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 &amp; 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.</i>	Noted.