

Comment Summary DA-19-020

DRT Date and Time: **April 24, 2019, 9:00am**
 Property Address: **310 Frances Avenue, Stoney Creek**
 Agent: **Sarah Knoll, GSP Group**
 Jeff Paikin, NHDG
 Joe Giacomodonato, NHDG
 Mike Foley, NHDG
 Natasha Paikin, NHDG
 Sarah Knoll, GSP Group Inc. (Planning)
 Shem Myszkowski, KNYMH (Architectural)
 Wayne Harrison, KNYMH (Architectural)
 Marc Begin, KNYMH (Architectural)
 Steve Pongracz, Lanhack (Civil Engineering)
 Frank Westaway, dBA Acoustics (Noise)
 Dan Bacon, RWDI (Wind)
 Planner/Facilitator Assigned: **Melanie Schneider**
 Previous/Relevant file: **ZAC-08-079, OPA-08-19, 25T-200809**
 Internal: **Anita Fabac, Kathy Jazvac, Christie Meleskie (HSR),
 Sandra Lucas, Yvette Rybensky, Binu Korah,
 Melissa Kiddie, Victoria Brito, Sandra Al-Dabbagh
 (Dev. Eng), Alvin Chan, Cllr Pearson, Ana Cruceru**

Proposal: to construct a hybrid tall building composed of three towers having 48, 54, and 59 storeys in height, 2,409 parking spaces within a four storey podium and two levels of underground parking, 400 sq m of commercial space, and a total of 1,836 dwelling units, eight of which within ground-related units. Lands will be accessed from Frances Avenue and will include a rooftop amenity spaces above the podium structure.

Ground units are the only 3 bedrooms – the towers have 1 and 2 br units

- **Meeting to discuss solutions and comments**

Zone Category: Mixed Use Commercial “MUC-4” Zone, Modified
Official Plan Designation: Neighbourhoods

Recommend Conditional Approval: No

Concerns and Recommended Solutions:

- Major revisions to the development are required in order to meet applicable plans and policies. Supporting reports and plans, such as Sun Shadow, Wind Study, Noise Impact Study, SWM Brief, Water Generation Assessment, TIS, Parking Study, have not been supported by staff.
- Applicant is aware that Conditional Approval will not be granted at DRT meeting. Meeting will be structured as a working session to allow for discussions to determine best course of action for this site.

| Commenting Agency | Comment/Concern | Req'd Study/Report |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| Transportation Planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal comments outstanding – will provide comments on TIS after the meeting – no comments on site plan itself as of yet | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Traffic Impact Study • Neighbourhood |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIS under review – 5 year post-build horizon, expanded study area, mitigation evaluation, review of traffic signal at Frances Ave and Green Road, and improved pedestrian and cycling infrastructure required to be included in Study. Additional comments and revisions may be required • Quick review – quite a few upgrades to roadways, including North Service • May have to redo TIS – to MTO standards which are more stringent • Road works will be required which may include traffic signal installation (Frances Avenue and North Service Road?) – we know there is going to be a HUGE issue with this many issues (Cllr is having signals installed) • Concerned with Green and Frances, to the west and Service • Might be able to look at right in off of Green – but definitely not left out on to Green. • Needs to have all Transportation issues resolved prior to occupancy • Pedestrian cyclists – e/w for major route for water front trail – we need to protect • Neighbourhood Traffic calming • Parking reduction not supported without access to reliable transit infrastructure • 92-367 short term and 918-2295 long term bike parking spaces required • Show all pedestrian facilities on Site Plan • Provide wayfinding info to future residents • MTO doesn't usually allow off the Service Road and Transportation won't and MTO will have to look at it and it probably have a big challenge with them (Tran Plng) • This WILL BE A PHASED (1 tower per) • Right in off Green, Left out on Frances, and Right in and Right out on Service Road | <p>Traffic Calming Study (pre/post Conditional Approval?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External Works Agreement for road works • Revised TDM – really push transit use • NO LAYBY PARKING ON GREEN • CAN'T SUPPORT PARKING REDUCTION – without transit Sandra – we will have to look at it on a whole – if we don't have enough parking, how is this going to impact the rest of the neighbourhood • We need to make sure there is adequate parking • MS – quoted SR – parking reduction on one site doesn't mean its appropriate for another development • AF – we open to discussion regarding parking reduction without transit provided – need to know how are they getting around without transit available |
|--|--|--|

| | (Applicant) | |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Development Engineering | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised TIS required per Transportation Planning Comments. If upgrades to work network required, External Works Agreement will be used as a Special Condition • Detailed review of Grading, Servicing, Erosion and Siltation Control not completed until development has been Conditionally Approved • Waste Generation Report exceeds allotted density for this development, being 250ppha. The City is in the midst of evaluating infrastructure needs for the Millen Shores area which includes the subject lands. Scope of necessary upgrades will be determined through this Study for the subject lands • Phasing is imperative to allow this development to proceed. 250ppha are permitted to be constructed before sanitary sewer infrastructure is improved. Approximately 300 dwelling units can be accommodated at this time. • Hydrant flow tests not sufficient for scale of development proposed in reference to required fire flow. Hydraulic modelling is being completed by the City • Permanent dewatering is not permitted. • Sanitary – is significantly exceeding – system CANNOT SUPPORT – Millen Shores study includes this site, but is not complete through review – Current CAP – is 190.74 TOTAL as of right based on capacity – If they go with just the 190 units they would not meet the minimum number of units • Even if they would go with 1 Tower – the Phasing plan would still have to be revised to allow only 250 ppl per hectre... • Special Condition – upon completion of Sanitary Services must be completed • Must redirect the flow to the east, rather than to green... then the main trunk needs to be extended under the QEW • If we do it its 5+ years, if they | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydrogeological Report for underground parking structure • Revised Functional Servicing Report • Conditions cannot be issued until engineering comments have been addressed • Development premature |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Conservation Authority</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWM Brief reviewed and requires compensation treatment. Level 2 quality control required. • Localized flooding from uncontrolled stormwater discharge could come from municipal road easement. Development Engineering to review this item. • Maximum 70% lot coverage should be maintained to limit storm quantity control as most water will be discharged to Stoney Creek Watercourse No. 1 • Proposed development needs to incorporate Bird Friendly Design Refer to Toronto Best Practices guidelines • Existing watercourse on site regulated by HCA – HCA Permit required • Grading design to reflect 2012 “Green Millen Shores Estates Stormwater Management Report” which acknowledges the Regulatory Floodline Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical Report for underground parking structure • Revised SWM Brief • Conditions 2(a), 2(c), 3(b), 3(c) • Steve P – has met with them to resolve this issue – Post/Pre is going to match |
| <p>Building</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm lands are merged on title • North Service Road deemed front lot line • Residential on Ground floor not permitted??? (Must be above commercial) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melanie S – would like to see more commercial on ground floor – she would support variance for the main floor residential IF more commercial • 3.0m rear yard setback required to Frances Ave, 0.68m setback proposed (Tower 1) and flankage yard • 55,031sqm amenity space required, 33,169.3sqm proposed, 1,806 sq m of which as combined indoor amenity area • 50% lot coverage required, 25% of which required in front yard. Total 20.8% proposed – AF – this was supposed to be more of the Tower in the park concept – she has concern – MS this will go well into Ana’s comments • 5m landscape strip required adjacent to street, 0.6m min setback proposed along | |

| | | |
|------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>Frances Ave, 5 m along North Service Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 m landscape strip required adjacent to any zone other than commercial or industrial zones. 3.6 m landscape strip proposed along (P5) Zone, otherwise, no landscape strips clearly shown on Site Plan • 2,763 parking spaces required, 2,387 for residential and 22 for commercial proposed. Lay-by parking along Green Road may not be supported and would be subject to an Encroachment Agreement with Public Works. Layby parking is NOT supported • Provide separate accesses to parking for commercial and residential uses – Sandra Lucas – going to be putting people at risk if the commercial access is off Green • Anything in the P5 can't be counted towards the required open space calculation – nor required parking • AF – anything required in the MUC zone needs to be provided within the MUC zone • Sarah – do we include that P5 area with calc for the area • Sarah – landscape striped – yards were reduced – but not the landscape strips were not – MS – are looking at reducing the landscaping strips – supportive of variance | |
| <p>Growth Planning</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm tenure of development. If three sperate condo corps, joint use agreements would be required • Any encroachments should be shown on necessary plans as they would be detailed in future Draft Plan of Condo applications – for encroachments for balconies too • Provide additional barrier free surface parking • Municipal addresses assigned for each tower and each ground related unit on Green Road. • Consult MTO • Loading – for tower 1- applicant indicated that it would be for drop off uses only | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is no phasing – it could be any type of condo application • Are they separate corps per tower? • Where is the snow storage going? • Garbage – underground one – AC's concern – is getting garbage in and out – ensure waste trucks can get in and out |

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No barrier free for visitors | |
| Waste Management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is eligible for municipal waste collection, given waste generation is within limits Show truck movement on Site Plan 13m turning radii required Road base needs to support 35,000kg Prior to Occupancy, an Agreement for On-Site Collection of Municipal Solid Waste must be executed 18m head approach required for private roads within waste collection route On site parking and snow storage prohibited in waste access route or collection area Internal storage room required that must be well ventilated, rodent proof, and separate from a living space. Collection limit of one garbage bag/container per dwelling unit per week. Size of collection vehicle and frequency shall be determined by dwelling units within each building | |
| Public Health | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pest Control Plan will be required as a Special Condition |
| Councillor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in support of development as currently proposed – wants to work with staff and applicant to come up with solution that works for everyone | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Snow Storage Sidewalks |
| Canada Post | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal mail room will be required Provide standard wording in Site Plan Undertaking | |
| Forestry | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing municipal trees may be impacted by development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree Management Plan Landscape Plan Street Tree planting fee |
| HSR | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lands serviced by trans-cab – will be a challenge to service with just this level of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversations are happening about extension of |

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>current service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No funding available to accommodate route expansion in 2019. Funding may be re-evaluated in 2020 budget • Site will be monitored as part of consideration for future transit plans | <p>services however not able to discuss at this table.</p> |
| MTO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTO permit required • Provide 14m setback from MTO lands | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTO Permit • Site Plan, SWM, TIS, Lighting Plan required for Permit review |
| Union Gas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing lines service site, if relocation is required, it shall be at the cost of the developer | |
| Planning Comments | | |
| Cultural Heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site meets 3 of 10 criteria for archeological potential • Pettit family plot may be located on site – so far can't find any evidence that it is here – so caution is to be put on undertaking • Arch assessment completed which has determined it is highly unlikely that the family plot is located on the subject lands. No further concerns from a municipal perspective | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caution Note on future Site Plan |
| Natural Heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake Ontario within vicinity which is identified as a Core Area. Feature is important for migratory birds. Development will have potential impact and needs to be designed in a bird friendly manner (first 12m height is the most critical – however it is important that birds may migrate at a higher level, so they need to be looked at) • Existing private trees may be impacted by development proposal • Direct lights downwards to avoid attracting migrating birds at night • Look to Markham and Toronto for the Bird Friendly guidelines | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bird Impact Assessment • Stewardship initiatives (brochure – for entire area) for future residents to show how the new residents can impact and how they can assist to protect the area – some opportunities to put some green roof areas amenities to mitigate the loss of habitat in the area – it allows the functionality |

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPP • Landscape Plan |
| Parking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide additional surface parking spaces for towers • Ground related units to be fully outlined in underground parking plans • Show intuitively located commercial parking spaces • Several parking spaces within parking podium to either be eliminated to adjusted to allow appropriate maneuvering • Provide adequate separation between parking spaces and support columns in parking structure • Concerns with on-street parking as traffic increases through development • On-street parking permits may arise as a result of development, cannot guarantee this will be an sustainable parking solutions • Parking study not supported by staff – proxy site within a different context (transit and road network) • Use a proxy site close to subject lands – consider reaching out to nearby multiple dwellings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Parking Study – proxy site was not appropriate – based on report today – we cannot support parking reduction • Revised Underground parking plans |
| Urban Design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Break up podium to allow for ground level court yard • Enhance pedestrian movement through the site • Use Frances Avenue as the main interface with the neighbourhood – activate even further – lining it up with units to create that activity • Parkland faces a blank podium wall, activate this interface • Relocate loading spaces • Confirm intended commercial uses – encourage restaurants, cafes, grocery store – would be beneficial in creating that activity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further Sun Shadow review forthcoming • AF – reviewed purpose of DRP vs DRT • AF – discussed creating the opportunity splitting up the massing – and having different levels – • Why they placed the towers where they are – the intent of placing towers – |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>(both utility and interest)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Break up amenity areas (vertically and horizontally) – look at them as if they were at grade – network of pathways connecting different areas, etc • Introduce ground level amenity areas • Include greenery with all outdoor amenity areas • Pull the tower massing away from the townhouse dwellings and use mid-rise massing as a transition to larger massings • Sun shadow study shows towers will have a consolidated shadow and does not meet our requirements | <p>mature neighbourhood west of green – shadow impact is lined up and impact is minimized – majority of amenity spaces created is on the north side or covered (shadow from this development – N/A)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Away from the highway etc • They are shrinking tower and reducing the 2 bedrooms • They are down to 840 plate • Another level of underground parking |
| <p>Development Planning</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise Study to be revised to justify 56dBA levels for amenity area (outdoor living area – 55dBA required) • Site should be designed to use buildings as a natural noise barrier. Limit the use of Noise barriers • Site reviewed against Tall Building Guidelines • Reduce massing of podium – incorporate stepping in podium to match scale of adjacent developments • Step back towers from podium to ease transition • Provide separate accesses between commercial and residential uses • Provide maximum 70m long buildings – approx. 140m long massing proposed • Reduce tower floor plates to 750sqm – 952sqm currently proposed • Revise Wind Study to meet guideline | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised Wind Study • Revised Noise Study • Revised site design |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>parameters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain how and where wind mitigation is required – show on Landscape Plans and explain in Study • Staff concerned with some variances proposed including Parking, residential uses on ground floor (without adequate commercial) • Loading spaces to be screened or relocated from the yard • Ensure phasing does not cut off any dwelling units • Show all sidewalks • Expand commercial | |
|--|---|--|

The following agencies were circulated and had no comment:

- Hydro One
- Budgets and Finance
- CRTO (Roads and Traffic)
- Recreation
- Hamilton Fire Department
- Community Planning
- Open Space Development
- Parks & Cemeteries
- MPAC
- Bell Canada
- Cogeco Cable
- HWDSB
- HWSSB
- FPSB
- FCSB
- Horizon Utilities

Applicant provided a drawing – it doesn’t pull towers south, however there is a change.

Shadow – have a separate meeting to show the video/pictures of the hourly shadow impacts with towers placement – AF interested

Depending on resubmission – may need to come back to DRT Table

AF – appreciate the work already done – still some work to be done, but revised

Sarah – once agreeable outcome – we can discuss the variances.

Planning Committee - INFO report – to provide status update – very productive meetings – this is not the final – we are working together for positive outcome – not a horse race
Meeting – keep Cllr included – and Urban Design, Transportation, planning, etc