URBAN STRATEGIES INC .
197 Spadina Avenue, Suite 600
Toronto, ON Canada M5T 2C8
www.urbanstrategies.com
tel 416 340 9004
fax 416 340 8400
admin@urbanstrategies.com

February 26, 2021

Sabrina Salatino
Senior Planner, Community Planning, City Planning, Etobicoke York District
City of Toronto
Etobicoke York District
2 Civic Centre Court, 3rd Floor
Toronto, ON M9C 5A3

Re: Combined OPA/ZBA/DPS Application, 2150-2194 Lake Shore Boulevard West and 23 Park Lawn Road – Resubmission

---

Urban Strategies Inc. is acting on behalf of the land owners, First Capital (Park Lawn) Corporation and 2253213 Ontario Limited, in support of the combined Official Plan Amendment (OPA), Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA), and Draft Plan of Subdivision (DPS) application to facilitate the redevelopment of 2150-2194 Lake Shore Boulevard West and 23 Park Lawn Road (referred to hereafter as 'the site' or '2150 Lake Shore').

First Capital made a previous OPA application in October 2019 on behalf of the land owners, as well as a first submission for this combined OPA, ZBA and DPS application made in May 2020. This resubmission provides revised reports, studies, and drawings in support of the proposed draft Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments, and Draft Plan of Subdivision, which together provide for the appropriate redevelopment of the site. Where relevant, these materials respond to staff comments received on May 2020 application. To this end, a consolidated matrix of all comments received on the May 2020 application, along with responses and related revisions, is attached to this cover letter.

First Capital and the Project Team look forward to continued engagement with the City and community through the review of this application and during the ongoing work on the Secondary Plan process, to continue to align the Master Plan and emerging policy framework, ultimately resulting in a mutually-supported vision for the redevelopment of the site.

Site Description

2150 Lake Shore is located in southeast Etobicoke on the northeast corner of Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard West. The site is approximately 11.2 ha / 27.6 acres in

URBAN STRATEGIES INC
197 Spadina Avenue, Suite 600
Toronto, ON Canada M5T 2C8
www.urbanstrategies.com
tel 416 340 9004
fax 416 340 8400
admin@urbanstrategies.com

size and was formerly occupied by an industrial bakery, which has since been demolished. Today the site is predominantly vacant, excepting a one storey BMO bank building located at the corner of Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard West.

The Current Master Plan Proposal

The Master Plan for the site has evolved from the May 2020 Proposal as a result of the continued effort to align with key feedback from various City departments, commenting agencies and the public (communicated through City staff), as well as with policy directions emerging out of the City's draft Christie's Secondary Plan.

The fundamental vision and key elements of the Master Plan remain consistent, including introduction of a new local street network, a relief road (Street A) to direct traffic away from Park Lawn and Lake Shore, and an integrated transit hub centered around a new GO station. The Master Plan also continues to provide a diverse network of open spaces. The Galleria, located at the heart of the project, has direct adjacency to the large new Community Park and provides a focal point and key pedestrian connections that knit together the project's range of new residential, employment, retail and institutional uses. The project continues to include diverse range of building types and distinct architecture, including fifteen towers with heights ranging from 28 to 70 storeys.

Key revisions to the Master Plan include the following key elements:

- **Boulevard Square Park** – in addition to the 1 ha Community Park, the current proposal adds the 2,500 m^2 Boulevard Square (previously proposed as a POPS) as a public park, bringing total on-site parkland provision to 1.25 ha.
- **New Community Benefits** – discussions on community benefits, to be secured through a Section 37 agreement with the City, have advanced, resulting in this resubmission illustrating how the proposed development could integrate certain community benefits including: two daycares, a community recreation centre, a public library and a not-for-profit human agency space. As noted above, discussions continue with the City on the delivery of these potential facilities, which are directly tied to the realization of the built form illustrated in the resubmission.
- **Provision for School Site** – discussions are ongoing between First Capital and the School Boards on the allocation of space for two elementary schools within the site, in keeping with the May 2020 proposal.
- **A Sunnier Community Park** – access to sunlight in the proposed 1 ha Community Park has been further enhanced by shifting height and density away from the south and east of the park.
- **Enhanced Street Wall along Park Lawn, Lake Shore, and the Loop Road** – a

197 Spadina Avenue, Suite 600
Toronto, ON Canada M5T 2C8
www.urbanstrategies.com
tel 416 340 9004
fax 416 340 8400
admin@urbanstrategies.com

number of built form refinements have been made to reinforce pedestrian-scaled street walls along these frontages.

- **Retention of the Water Tower in Station Square** – in response to City staff comments, the historic water tower is now proposed to be located in Station Square instead of the Community Park. Station Square is a prominent proposed privately owned publicly-accessible space located in proximity to the GO Station and the central Galleria, with visibility from the Gardiner Expressway.
- **Overall Redistribution of Height and Density** – the revisions noted above (enhanced sunlight in the Community Park, new potential community facilities, and reinforcing the pedestrian scale), have all resulted in overall shifts in heights and distribution of density across the site. This has included a modest increase in the overall density of the project, including non-residential density associated with potential community facilities, and 4.9% increase in residential density above the May 2020 proposal associated with the costs of delivering potential community facilities noted above.
- **A Wider Loop Road (Street B)** – the central loop road has been widened from a 23-metre right-of-way in the May 2020 proposal to a 26-metre right-of-way (22 metres alongside the park), reflecting discussions with City staff.

The Master Plan is still conceptual in nature, illustrating how development could unfold under the draft Official Plan Amendment, draft Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision. These instruments outline six phases of development, anticipated to occur over many years. This application has been filed in support of these policy instruments, which closely reflect the conceptual Master Plan, providing an appropriate degree of flexibility given the anticipated long-term build out of the site. These policy instruments provide for the orderly redevelopment of the site by implementing and building upon Site and Area Specific Policy 15, as well as the suite of other provincial and municipal policies that pertain to the site.

The Application Package

In support of this combined OPA, ZBA, and DPS Application, the following materials have been submitted digitally only at this time:

- Development Approval Resubmission Form
- Project Data Sheet
- Cover Letter and Comment/Response Matrix
- Master Plan and Planning Rationale Addendum
- Draft Official Plan Amendment
- Draft Zoning By-law Amendment

URBAN STRATEGIES INC .
197 Spadina Avenue, Suite 600
Toronto, ON Canada M5T 2C8
www.urbanstrategies.com
tel 416 340 9004
fax 416 340 8400
admin@urbanstrategies.com

- Draft Plan of Subdivision
- Digital Building Mass Model
- Shadow Study
- Pedestrian Level Wind Study
- Toronto Green Standard Checklist
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Natural Heritage and Environmental Impact Assessment
- Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan
- Air Quality Study
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment
- Transportation Impact Study Addendum
- Land Use Compatibility Study
- Functional Servicing Report
- Stormwater Management Report
- Geotechnical Study and Hydrological Review Letter
- Energy Strategy Letter
- Rail Safety Strategy Peer Review Letter of Response
- Architectural Drawing Set
- Basement Drawing Set
- Landscape Drawing Set
- Civil Drawing Set

First Capital appreciate the City's efforts to adjust submission protocols to allow this application to advance digitally during the COVID pandemic. Should physical copies of any of the materials be required at a later time, First Capital would be happy to coordinate this.

We look forward to ongoing conversations with City Staff to implement this exciting project. If there are any points requiring clarification please contact us directly.

Yours very truly,

URBAN STRATEGIES INC.

Cyndi Rottenberg-Walker, FCIP, RPP
Partner
416-340-9004 ext.214

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
	City Planning, September 8, 2020	**Sarah Henstock, Community Planning Etobicoke York; Corwin Cambray, SIPA**			
A	**General**				
Comments					
A.1	A staff report on the Christie's Planning Study and the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments application, as well as the Draft Plan of Subdivision application, is scheduled for Planning and Housing Committee on September 22, 2020. The report will be publicly available approximately one week prior to the meeting. The report brings forward the draft planning documents (Secondary Plan, Zoning By-law and Urban Design and Streetscape Guidelines) for the Secondary Plan Area, the majority of which is owned by First Capital Realty. The report also provides a status update on the development applications, and recommends that the draft Secondary Plan, Zoning By-law, and Urban Design and Streetscape Guidelines be used for the basis of further discussions and to guide further review of the development applications. In this case, further conversations and workshops between the City and First Capital Realty are expected to occur over the fall.	Noted.	USI		
B	**Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis**				
Comments - Land Use					
B.1	City Planning staff have no concerns with the shape and location of the lands designated General Employment Areas and Mixed Use Areas (as shown on the submission materials), provided that the proposed land use area crossing over Street 'B' (the loop road) is removed from the plans. Staff strongly emphasise the importance to establish the General Employment Areas lands as a prominent and recognizable office/business node within the early phases of development (particularly those uses listed in Column 1, Schedule B, SASP 15). It is important to note that the previous rationale for a continuous rectangular strip of Employment lands along the rail corridor and QEW, was to create a buffer from the proposed residential lands to the Ontario Food Terminal (OFT). This is still an important consideration given that more sensitive land uses would be in closer proximity to the OFT than previously anticipated. This matter requires to be addressed carefully as part of an approved compatibility/mitigation strategy because OFT is considered to be provincially significant employment lands with a Class 3 facility under the MECP D-Series Guidelines.	The portion of the proposed *General Employment Areas* crossing Street B has been removed, while retaining the 1.4 ha minimum size (please see Planning Rationale Addendum and the revised draft OPA). A revised Land Use Compatibility Study has been submitted, assessing the OFT as a Class 3 facility. Potential air, odour, noise and vibration emissions are not expected to impact the proposed development.	USI	Hatch	Planning Rationale Addendum, Draft Official Plan Amendment, Land use Compatibility Study
B.2	City Planning staff note that First Capital Realty is proposing the minimum required 1.4 ha of land (net) that would be reserved exclusively for Employment uses. It is also noted that FCR is proposing the minimum required 98,000 square metres of non-residential gross floor area in SASP 15. City Planning staff request First Capital Realty to submit a complete list of all the uses that are being proposed on the lands designated General Employment Areas. Note: the breakdown of proposed uses on the site should show an appropriate mix of non-residential land uses in accordance with the requirements of SASP 15 (Schedule B).	Proposed land uses will be confirmed during Site Plan Approval for respective stages of development. The proposed draft ZBA carries forwarded related SASP 15 policies - all land uses proposed to be permitted within the *General Employment Areas* are in keeping with Schedule B of SASP 15, and the required quantum and split between Column 1 and Column 2 uses are maintained.	USI	FCR/A&M	Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
B.3	First Capital Realty is required to ensure/demonstrate that the proposed amenity spaces for the residential uses are not to be within the lands designated General Employment Areas.	Noted. Amenity space will be detailed at Site Plan Control stage for relevant phases, and the team will demonstrate that these uses are not within the *General Employment Areas* at that time.	USI	FCR	

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Comments - Community Services and Facilities					
B.4	The original set of comments (dated January 22, 2020), followed by the addendums (dated May 8, 2020 and July 6, 2020) have been provided to the applicant. City Planning consulted with Children's Services, Parks Forestry and Recreation, Toronto Public Library and also undertook a survey of human service agencies in the area to share information on growth estimates and get feedback on estimated needs to support future growth. Based on the feedback we have received, the following has been identified by the sectors to support growth: two to four non-profit child care centres to support the proposed development on this site; a public community recreation facility to support the proposed development and estimated future growth in the surrounding area; a public library; and non-profit community agency space to support the proposed development and estimated future growth in the surrounding area. City Planning convened a meeting of your planning consultant, City staff and the TDSB and TCDSB in November 2019 to allow the school boards to present information on school capacity in the area. Both school boards have identified an interest in school facilities on this site. City Planning has requested that discussions continue with the applicant and the school boards to explore how schools could be accommodated on site.	Noted. Details on proposed community services and facilities are included in the Planning Rationale Addendum and are subject to successful resolution of ongoing Section 37 discussions. As Section 37 discussion and conversation with the City are ongoing, these facilities are still potential in nature. These facilities will only be voluntarily offered by FCR provided sufficient density is approved and related instruments allow for that density to be achieved. The proposal continues to provide space for two potential schools, with conversation with the School Boards ongoing. Provincial funding, approval, and various other processes with regards to realizing potential schools will be required.	FCR	USI/A&M	Planning Rationale Addendum
Comments - Sustainability and the Toronto Green Standard					
B.5	City Planning staff have reviewed the material submitted by Arup that responds to the sustainability policies of the City of Toronto including the Sustainability Strategy, and the Energy Strategy and the Green Infrastructure Strategy, as outlined in Site and Area Specific Policy 15. The application aims to integrate a holistic sustainability vision into the Master Plan by incorporating zero carbon, biodiversity, climate adaptation and resilience and water management among the guiding themes. Within the Sustainability Strategy, Arup has identified several emerging issues such as the embodied carbon impact of materials, public realm design for future climate and infrastructure design for climate hazards. The following includes a number of viable solutions that have been identified in the revised Energy Strategy Report (dated May 15, 2020): Toronto Green Standard Tier 4 has been identified as a performance level target under consideration; electric heating and cooling mechanical systems (ground-source heat pumps, electric boilers, and solar thermal collectors); solar PV ready design for tall buildings of the development; smart lithium ion batteries for energy storage, back-up power, peak shaving, and resilience; and to follow the City's minimum back-up power guidelines. City staff encourage further discussions regarding the above solution. Environmental Planning comments dated July 14, 2020, attached to this memo.	Noted. The sustainability strategy and corresponding viable solutions will be further discussed as the design progresses in subsequent Site Plan processes.	Arup		
B.6	The application includes a phased approach to build out and the applicant has indicated the intention of achieving Tier 3 and 4 levels of sustainability performance under the TGS Version 3. The applicant has indicated interest in pursuing Tier 4 building energy performance and has indicated Tier 3 levels of stormwater retention and reuse. Please clarify on the Checklist an interest to pursue Tier 2+ levels of performance. The Environmental Planning staff are available to provide ongoing technical support and will guide the Site Plan Control applications into the Development Charge Refund Program.	The project will formally pursue TGS Tier 1 at this time. We will continue to review and confirm our sustainability aspirations for the project as the design progresses in further detail at Site Plan stages.	Arup		
B.7	Applicants seeking Tier 2+ levels are encouraged to complete and submit the TGS High Performance Checklist early in the application process in order to ensure all performance measures will be considered throughout the design stages. The High Performance Checklist is required at the Site Plan application stage. <u>AQ 4.3 UHI Non-roof Hardscape</u> The TGS Statistics indicate 50% of the non-roof hardscape will be treated for Urban Heat Island. Please note, that 75% coverage is required for Tier 2+ projects. This performance measure will be evaluated at Site Plan Control approval process. <u>EC 1.1/1.2 Tree Planting Areas and Soil Volume</u> Soil volumes should be indicated on the landscape plan (or a soil volume plan) submitted to assess the ability to comply as part of the Site Plan Control approval process. Daylighting of utilities should be undertaken to ensure proposed tree planting within existing right-of-way can be provided (if applicable).	As in the response to comment B.6 above, the project will formally pursue TGS Tier 1 at this time. Soil volumes have been indicated on the ROW Tree Planting Plan (L200). SUE QL-B is currently being performed for utilities within the existing ROWs. QL-A will be performed during detailed design to confirm no conflicts, as required.	Arup	DTAH	Landscape Plans (L200 ROW Tree Planting Plan)

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
More Information Required - Sustainability and the Toronto Green Standard					
BB.1	GHG 1.1 – 1.3 Buildings Energy Performance The application indicates a multi-phase build out, so it will be important to consider how the development will address the City's GHG reductions goals to achieve near-zero emissions in building construction by 2030. On December 5, 2017 Council approved the Toronto Green Standard Version 3 performance measures. The report set out a four-tier set of energy performance targets, where the higher tier will become the new base requirement as the TGS is updated every four years (PG23.9). This provides the development industry with a clear understanding of future requirements related to energy performance and reduction of GHG emissions. The next update to the TGS (where the current Tier 2 levels of energy performance will become the new Tier 1) is expected to be in place by Spring 2022.	Noted. The implication of the TGS future cycles and the implications to multi-phase development like 2150 Lake Shore with a long build-out period has been discussed in detail among the project team. Various potential low-carbon community energy solutions have been investigated in the energy strategy report that would achieve TGS v3 tier 4 levels. Passive and active building design strategies and renewable energy system have also been discussed and/or evaluated in the energy strategy report.	Arup		Energy Strategy Report (October 2019)
BB.2	GHG 5.1 Resilience Planning Applicants are encouraged to complete the Resilience Checklist early in the application process in order to help inform design decisions. This performance measure will be required at Site Plan Control approval process for Tier 2+ projects.	Noted. The Resilience Checklist will be completed at Site Plan stage.	Arup		
BB.3	WQ 2.1 – 2.3 Stormwater Retention and Reuse Green Infrastructure solutions and low-impact development practices should be prioritized throughout the design process of this project. The measures outlined in the 2150 Lake Shore Green Infrastructure Strategy, including surface water control and green landscaping should be integrated into future Site Plan Control applications.	Noted. The green infrastructure and low-impact development practices noted in the Green Infrastructure Strategy will be integrated into the SPA submission.	Arup		
Comments - Section 37					
B.8	Initial conversations on the topic of Section 37 have started between the City and First Capital Realty. These conversations are on-going and will continue in the fall. Final Section 37 contributions will be secured upon any approval of the submitted development applications.	Noted.	USI		
Comments - Phasing and Implementation					
B.9	The proposed phasing plan included as part of the draft Secondary Plan aligns with the proposed phasing plan put forward by First Capital Realty. Further refinements of the phasing plan may be necessary as discussions advance over the fall.	Noted.	A&M		
Comments - General					
B.10	The Rail Safety Strategy, prepared by Hatch, is currently proceeding through a peer review process by WSP, which is considered a high level analysis of the proposed uses and building locations proposed on the site. WSP has provided the City with the first report (dated May 2020), which has been provided to FCR.	Noted. The 'Rail Safety Strategy - Peer Review Letter of Response' included with the submission provides responses to WSP's peer review. It is noted, however, that the Rail Safety Strategy was superseded by the more detailed 'Rail Safety Development Viability Assessment' report submitted in May 2020, and therefore, many of the comments raised in WSP's peer review have already been addressed in the latest report. It is noted that Metrolinx intends to initiate a peer review the latest 'Rail Safety Development Viability Assessment' report.	Hatch		Rail Safety Strategy - Peer Review Letter of Response
More Information Required - General					
BB.4	City Planning staff understand based on past conversations that the two digital billboards located on the property will be removed. Staff are seeking written confirmation that this will occur and an estimate of timing.	These two billboards will be maintained on the site until such time as they need to be removed for construction.	USI	FCR	

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
C	**Housing Policy**				
Comments					
C.1	The original set of comments (dated December 20, 2019), has been provided to the applicant. A Planning Rationale and a Housing Issues Report has been prepared by Urban Strategies Inc. and submitted with the new applications. These documents have been reviewed by staff. Approximately 7,139 residential units are currently being proposed. The current proposed overall unit mix and average target unit size for the residential portion of this development is as follows: | | Bachelor | 1 bedroom | 2 bedroom | 3 bedroom | Total | | % of units | 5.0% | 45.0% | 40.0% | 10.0% | 100.0% | | Avg Target Size (square feet) | 400 | 525-660 | 750-950 | 1100 | | *Source: Housing Issues Report* Approximately 15% of the total residential units are proposed to be two-bedroom plus den units ranging in size from 936-969 square feet. However, specific unit counts, unit mixes and unit sizes for each phase have not yet been determined.	Noted. The current proposed overall unit mix and average target unit size for the residential portion of this development has been revised as follows: Proposed New Targets UNIT TYPE | Unit Size NSA (sqm, sq ft) | % Mix STUDIO 40 430 5% 55% 1 BED 50 540 17% 1 BED + DEN 61 660 33% 2 BED 70 750 15% 35% 2 BED + DEN 88 950 20% 3 BED 102 1100 10% 10% However, these targets and estimates are based on GBA and GFA assumptions for the proposed conceptual Master Plan, and must be confirmed at each phase, as detailed design for respective stages of the development progresses. As such the proposed draft ZBA maintains an appropriate degree of flexibility to respond to market conditions and best practices, both of which are subject to change over time, in keeping with similar metrics in the Growing Up Guidelines and the Downtown Plan: " (W) All buildings containing dwelling units provided in each phase of development and at the full build out of the lot will include: (i) A minimum of 15 percent of the total number of dwelling units as two bedroom units; (ii) A minimum of 10 percent of the total number of dwelling units as three or more bedroom units; and (iii) An additional 15 percent of the total number of dwelling units will be a combination of two bedroom and three bedroom units, or dwelling units that can be converted to 2 or 3 bedroom units through the use of accessible or adaptable design measures."	USI		Architectural Drawing Package: Project Statistics, Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
Comments - Affordable Housing Strategy					
C.2	The approximate provision of 40% two-bedroom units and 10% three-bedroom units and proposed size of the two-bedroom plus den and three-bedroom units currently 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. As part of the review of the ZBLA application, specific unit counts by phase will need to be determined.	Noted. Please see response to comment C.1 above for proposed unit mix in the draft ZBA, which is proposed to apply at each phase of development and at full build out.	USI		Architectural Drawing Package: Project Statistics, Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
C.3	An average size of 1,100 square feet for the three-bedroom units would generally adequately support the unit size objectives of the Growing Up Guidelines to accommodate within new development a broad range of households, including families with children, which recommends three-bedroom units of 100 square metres or larger.	Noted.	USI		
C.4	The Growing Up Guidelines recommend that two-bedroom units be at least 87 square metres or larger. The majority of the proposed two-bedroom units should be designed to support the unit size objectives of the Growing Up Guidelines (to accommodate within new development a broad range of households, including families with children), as the Master Plan develops.	Noted. The majority two bedroom units (20% of the proposed 35%) are sized accordingly in the revised proposal.	USI		Architectural Drawing Package: Project Statistics Draft Zoning By-law Amendment

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
More Information Required - Affordable Housing Strategy					
CC.1	In each phase, a Housing Plan or equivalent mechanism will be required that specifies the unit mix by phase to ensure the unit mix requirements of the Secondary Plan are being met.	Noted.	USI		
CC.2	Staff would like to meet with First Capital Realty to discuss the most appropriate approach for securing the affordable housing requirements, as well as the confirmed approach along with proposed delivery mechanisms, design, location, and unit mix details that will need to be addressed in subsequent revisions to the Affordable Housing Strategy. This will need to be completed as part of the review of these applications as the development is now in the Zoning By-Law Amendment stage.	Noted. FCR is open to continuing discussion on these matters, and will reach out to set up a meeting. The approach is expected to be secured in a Section 37 agreement, with specific details (specific location, design, unit mix etc.) being determined at Site Plan stages for respective phases of development.	USI	FCR	
D	**Community Planning & Urban Design**				
Comments					
D.1	Overall, City Planning staff are pleased to acknowledge that the revised submission addressed some of the previously raised concerns and comments, however, there are still a number of modifications that are required for the next submission. The draft Secondary Plan, Zoning By-law and Urban Design and Streetscape Guidelines that will be presented to the Planning and Housing Committee on September 22 will outline the recommended vision for the Secondary Plan area on matters related to built form, parkland dedication, shadowing, separation distances and setbacks and stepbacks. Once First Capital Realty has reviewed the staff report on the Christie's Planning Study, City Planning staff would like to meet to further discuss areas of where the Christie's Planning Study and the applicant's Master Plan do not align and options to address.	Noted. The revised submission reflects a number of changes related to built form, parkland dedication, and shadowing, among others, responding positively to more specific comments from staff, and emerging directions through the draft Secondary Plan and ZBA. These are summarized in relation to specific staff comments and/or draft Secondary Plan directions in the Planning Rationale addendum.	A&M	USI	Planning Rationale Addendum
E	**Transportation Planning**				
Comments					
E.1	Please refer to the comments from Transportation Planning (dated July 27, 2020), attached to this memo.	Noted. Responses to comments are provided in section 9 of the Transportation Impact Study Addendum included with this submission.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
F	**Heritage Planning**				
Comments					
F.1	In a motion at the Etobicoke-York Community Council in 2016, Councillor Grimes requested that Heritage Planning staff research and evaluate whether the water tower is an important landmark in the neighbourhood. Heritage Planning staff have undertaken a preliminary examination of the property for cultural heritage value and have determined that, with the removal of the Christie factory buildings and only the water tower remaining, the property does not contain sufficient integrity to fully represent the historic bakery use. As such, staff will not be recommending designation or listing on the Heritage Register at this time.	Noted.	ERA		
F.2	Heritage Planning staff consider that the history of the Christie bakery on the site and its strong connection to the neighbourhood warrants commemoration. The Commemoration Strategy should include the retention of the water tower as described in both the proposal and the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). In this regard, a number of key principles are set out as follows: 1. The water tower remaining in its current location is preferred in an effort to continue to act as a commemorative marker to travelers along the Gardiner Expressway. 2. If the current location of the water tower cannot be maintained, a new location with continued visibility from the Gardiner Expressway is recommended. 3. If visibility of the water tower from the Gardiner Expressway is not possible, a new location with visibility from the public realm should be explored. 4. In an effort to retain the water tower's historic association with the former Christie bakery, staff recommend that the tower not be used for advertising but be reverted to its original one-colour painted appearance.	The current Master Plan proposes the relocation of the water tower to Station Square, at one of the significant civic open spaces on the site where visibility from the Gardiner Expressway can be maintained, and where the water tower can be viewed from other key areas including Park Lawn Road, the loop road, and the Community Park. Appendix 3 of the HIA includes a location analysis for the relocation of the water tower, which reflects the visibility criteria HPS staff have communicated. The use of the water tower for signage is consistent with its historic use: at the Christie Factory, it served as not only a functional apparatus, but also as a new opportunity for high-profile advertising to a growing audience of drivers along the Gardiner Expressway in the post-war era.	ERA		Heritage Impact Assessment

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
F.3	The HIA includes commemoration and interpretation strategies relating to a number of other historic themes, including natural systems and resources, key transportation routes, industrial production and leisure and recreation – all of which are supported by Heritage Planning staff and will be reviewed in consultation with Urban Design staff in the context of the public realm component of the subject application.	Noted. It is suggested that these themes are looped into the future Interpretation Plan.	ERA		
G	**Next Steps**				
Comments					
G.1	The above comments and attachments are a further assessment of First Capital Realty's Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments application, as well as the Draft Plan of Subdivision application. Additional comments will be identified through further discussions with staff and First Capital Realty as the Christie's Planning Study continues to advance.	Noted.	USI		
G.2	Finally, City Planning staff are aware that First Capital Realty has been working to understand costing information on various infrastructure elements. Please ensure that you provide your estimated costing of infrastructure expansion and upgrades as part of your next submission.	Noted. Conversations with City staff around infrastructure costing have been ongoing in the context of Development Charges for the development.	USI		
	Environment & Energy Division, July 9, 2020	**David MacMillan, Program Manager, Environment & Energy Division (EED)**			
H	**General**				
	EED staff reviewed and deemed complete the initial Energy Strategy Report on December 6, 2019, noting our interest to work with the applicant in several areas:	Noted.	Arup		
Comments					
H.1	Further exploration of renewable thermal energy solutions;	Arup is happy to further discuss the potential application of renewable thermal energy solutions such as solar hot water collectors / evacuated tubes on-site with the City of Toronto. During the master planning phase, the use of performance and savings of SHW versus solar PV was explored, and it was decided that solar PV is more beneficial from a technical and economic perspective for high-rise residential buildings.	Arup		
H.2	Strategies to achieve Toronto Green Standard Tier 4, especially passive design elements, as building architecture evolves through design development;	We are happy to further discuss with the City of Toronto on specific passive design elements to be further evaluated, however it is noted that the project is formally pursuing TGS Tier 1 at this zoning stage, with further details to be explored (including possibility for pursuing higher tier elements) at Site Plan stage.	Arup		
H.3	Implications of above- and below-grade (i.e. parking garage) development phasing on energy infrastructure;	As the building and block-based design is further developed at Site Plan stages, implication around development phasing on energy infrastructure will be further described.	Arup		
H.4	Alignment with Toronto Hydro on expected electrical demands and a possible secondary electrical feed;	Noted. Discussion with Toronto Hydro is ongoing.	Arup		
H.5	The implementation strategy for energy solutions, including the potential for partnering with third-party utilities (i.e. energy developers).	Noted. Discussion with district energy service providers is ongoing.	Arup		
I	**General**				
	The applicant has submitted a revised report that identifies a number of viable solutions, as well as others for further analysis, listed below:	Noted.	Arup		
Comments					

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
I.1	Meeting Toronto Green Standard Tier 4;	Evaluation of strategies to achieve TGS Tier 4 is ongoing by the project team, including discussions with a potential district energy service provider. At this time, the project is formally pursuing TGS Tier 1. Please also see response to comment H.2 above.	Arup		
I.2	Electric heating and cooling mechanical systems (ground-source heat pumps, electric boilers, and solar thermal collectors);	Noted.	Arup		
I.3	Solar PV ready design for tall buildings of the development;	Noted.	Arup		
I.4	Smart lithium ion batteries for energy storage, back-up power, peak shaving, and resilience;	Noted.	Arup		
I.5	Following the City's Minimum Back-up Power Guidelines.	Noted.	Arup		
J	**General**				
	EED staff have reviewed the revised Energy Strategy Report and intend to secure implementation of the following through future development agreements between the Owner and the City:	Noted.	Arup		
Comments					
J.1	Construction and maintenance of the development in accordance with Toronto Green Standard Tier 4 Energy Efficiency, GHG, and Resilience (or the highest Tier on the date of Site Plan Application submission);	Noted. Discussion with district energy service providers is ongoing.	Arup		
J.2	Installation of a solar PV and/or solar thermal system and electricity storage, where technically and economically viable;	Noted.	Arup		
J.3	Consideration of low-interest loans through the City's Sustainable Energy Plan Financing (SEPF) program to aid the implementation of items 1 and 2, above;	Noted.	Arup		
J.4	Collaboration with Toronto Hydro to establish a distribution system design which maximizes distributed generation, electricity storage, and resilience potential;	Noted.	Arup		
J.5	Share three years of post-occupancy operational energy usage data for each building of the development.	Noted, however this will require further discussion with the owners, future developer/landlord/tenants, and/or district energy service providers.	Arup		
	Toronto Building, May 29, 2020	**William M. Johnston, P.Eng., Chief Building Official and Executive Director**			
K	**General**				
	Your property is subject to the City-wide Zoning By-law No. 569-2013, as amended. Based on By-law No. 569-2013, your property is proposed to be rezoned to CRE, EL and OR.	Noted.	USI		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Comments					
K.1	In the preamble, #4, since various heights are to be proposed on the entire site, does Diagram 3 need to exist?	Since the site was formerly designated employment, our understanding was that Diagram 3 was necessary to bring the site into the 569-2013 height overlays (which are not shown on the site).	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
K.2	In the preamble, #5, does the requirement of a PA need to exist if specific parking standards are being written into the by-law with most parking requirements not being applied to the proposed uses?	#5 in the preamble has been maintained for now; however we are open to discussion on this. Our understanding was that we needed to apply a PA, and then provide certain exemptions in the By-law.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
K.3	In the preamble, #6, why is lot coverage being added to the by-law if it does not exist in any zones being created?	Please see response to comment K.1.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
K.4	For all of the uses that are being added to the zones which do not currently exist in the by-law, definitions will need to be created.	FCR is open to discussing appropriate definitions for any currently undefined uses with City staff, as required.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
K.5	In section J(iii), explain what "Above Base Park" is.	We have removed this language.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
K.6	In section K(vi), the reference is incorrect. There is no section F(ii).	Noted. The team has double checked and corrected referencing in the revised Draft ZBA.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
K.7	In section O, the reference to 50.5.40.70 refers to lanes. Ensure that this is correct as it does not read correctly.	Noted. Setback references have been updated.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
K.8	For the parking requirements in R(iii), is the office requirement going to apply to any use in an office buiding? This will need to be further clarified to prevent any confusion.	All of the proposed buildings are mixed use; parking rates are intended to apply to specific uses not buildings.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
K.9	In section W, the location of the water tower should be kept within the OR zone.	The Water Tower is no longer proposed in an OR zone, at the request of the City. This proposed regulation has been maintained to allow for the appropriate relocation of the water tower.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
K.10	Permitted projections need to be addressed in the by-law.	Agreed. Permitted projections have been added to the revised draft ZBA.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
K.11	The following sections need to be addressed or notwithstood: In the CRE Zone: 50.10.40.1(2); 50.10.40.30; 50.10.40.70; 50.10.40.80; In the EL Zone: 60.10.40.70.	Noted. These sections have been addressed within the revised draft ZBA.	USI		Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
K.12	Confirmation of whether or not a by-law for the former Etobicoke by-law needs to be written.	Our preference is to bring the site into 569-2013, which is nearly in force now. For discussion with City Planning and zoning team.	USI		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
	Economic Development and Culture (EDC), August 31, 2020	**Matthew Premru, Economic Development Officer**			
L	**General**				
Comments					
L.1	**Proposed location of Employment designated lands** EDC is generally in agreement with the proposed ("L") shape and location of the lands designated General Employment provided that a minimum of 1.4 ha of land (net) can be demonstrated and that these lands will be reserved exclusively for Employment uses (to be enshrined in the Zoning By-law and SASP), particularly those listed in 'Column 1' under SASP 15. In that regard, EDC requests clarification, perhaps in list format of the range of uses proposed on lands to be designated General Employment. The previous rationale for a rectangular strip of Employment lands largely along the railway/QEW was to create a buffer from the proposed residential lands to the Ontario Food Terminal. This is still a valid and important consideration given that more sensitive land uses may now be in closer proximity to the OFT than previously anticipated therefore it's an item that needs to be carefully addressed as part of an approved compatibility/mitigation strategy.	Please see response to comments B.1 and B.2. The proposed configuration of the *General Employment Areas* maintain a strong presence and visibility for the majority of proposed employment uses, by the virtue of being located along the Gardiner and Rail Corridor. As noted, a portion of the *Generally Employment Areas* has been brought into a prominent location in the Galleria - the central heart of the site - this location is in close proximity to the proposed GO Station, as well as a range of retail uses. It is also adjacent to the proposed 1 ha Community Park. All of these factors make this location one of the most attractive and high value places in the site, providing a vibrant and central location to integrate employment at the heart of the project. No land use compatibility concerns have been raised with locating employment in this location, and/or residential uses along the northern edge of the proposed 1 ha Community Park.	USI	FCR	Planning Rationale Addendum, Draft Official Plan Amendment, Land use Compatibility Study
L.2	**Compatibility/Mitigation** EDC staff note the submission of an Air Quality Study (employing MECP D-6 Guidelines), Land Use Compatibility Study (MECP D-1, D-2, D-6) and Noise Impact Study (NPC-300). As per usual protocol, EDC recommends that these reports be sent for an independent peer review. Prior to doing so however, EDC recommends that the above reports be amended and re-assessed as necessary with the understanding that the Ontario Food Terminal is considered to be a Class 3 facility under the MECP D-Series Guidelines.	Noted. Peer review comments on the Air Quality Study and Noise Impact Study have been received and reflected on the revised version of these reports. The project team understands that the Land Use Compatibility Study was not peer reviewed. Responses to peer review comments have also been included with this submission.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment, Noise and Vibration Impact Study
L.3	**Traffic** EDC remains concerned about any potential adverse traffic effects impacting the viability of the Ontario Food Terminal. It is our understanding that further Traffic Impact Studies will be undertaken for each future phase of development on the site and that the TMP exercise will also assess these impacts as well as propose mitigation measures. EDC asks that the OFT is continued to be considered an important stakeholder in the consultation process including on matters directly related to traffic.	Noted. The signalized Ontario Food Terminal driveway to Park Lawn Road is included in the analysis study area.	BA		Traffic Impact Study Addendum

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
L.4	**Building/Site Design and Future Growth** EDC is encouraged by the initial provision of 'Column 1' employment uses beyond the minimums set out in SASP 15, and we share in FCR's view that this site has the potential to become a preeminent office destination. As part of doing so, it is important to establish this location as a prominent and recognizable business campus at the earliest time possible. Besides zoning permissions to construct employment related uses prior to the lifting of any holds ("H"), EDC requests that the vast majority of minimum 'Column 1' uses be required in the first two phases of construction. In maintaining prominence under the proposed General Employment land configuration it will also be important for the 2 main building clusters in both Block 1 (adjacent to GO Station) and Block 2 (across from main park and adjacent to the Galleria feature) to largely appear and relate as a unified node. Presently there is a partially intervening residential tower proposed (Building D2-1) however this could be mitigated by maintaining strong pedestrian connections and a sense of continuity by ensuring employment uses at least on the lower and ground floors if a relocation of that building is not possible. Furthermore, no other areas in the Plan will be able to as effectively accommodate the desired further employment generation and demand for growth over time. For this reason, EDC requests a site layout and building designs that are amenable to future growth and expansion opportunities, particularly for SASP 15 'Column 1' uses. EDC also encourages a range of employment building types to be considered beyond office structures to accommodate 'Column 1' uses. EDC looks forward to remaining engaged in this process including discussions leading to any subsequent resubmissions.	The *General Employment Areas* is spread evenly between the first three phases of construction, not the first two. Regardless, the timing and delivery of non-residential uses was already carefully negotiated and agreed upon through the OPA 231 settlement, and codified in SASP 15: "3. A minimum of 98,000 square metres of non-residential gross floor area will be provided at full build out of all the lands outlined in Schedule A. Development of this non-residential gross floor area: ... b. will be constructed in each phase, prior to, or concurrent with residential development to provide a balance of employment and residential growth in all phases of development;" FCR is committed to complying with this agreed upon policy direction, and is not in agreement with further restrictions on the timing and delivery of non-residential uses above and beyond this. FCR understands and agrees with maintaining flexibility for potential growth of non-residential uses such as office over time, should market demand support this. It is our opinion the proposed draft ZBA provides appropriate flexibility in this regard, both in terms of maintaining appropriate flexibility for architectural refinements at the site plan stage, as detailed design and planning for specific uses is better understood (e.g. allowing for incorporation of office or other employment uses in mixed use buildings), and by not stipulating a maximum GFA for non-residential uses on the site (e.g. which may proportionally increase within the overall maximum GFA cap for the site).	USI		Zoning By-law Amendment
	Engineering and Construction Services, September 3, 2020	**Grace Tesa, P.Eng., Manager (Acting), Development Engineering Etobicoke York District**			
M	**Zoning**				
A. Revisions and Additional Information Required for Plans and Studies					
	The owner is required to amend the Studies and/or Drawings to address the following comments and resubmit for the review and acceptance by the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services prior to approval of the zoning by-law amendment.	Noted.	Arup		
Transportation Services					
M.1	Comments will be provided upon receipt from Transportation Services.	Noted.	BA		
Engineering and Construction Services					
Comments - General					
M.2	Discussions with Legal Services will be required to possibly incorporate Phasing within the Subdivision Agreement.	Noted.	Arup		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
M.3	The FSR will require comprehensive review in the subsequent submission when the flow monitoring, hydrant testing and all other information is available.	Noted. Hydrant testing was completed and included in the FSR. Flow monitoring is partially complete (ongoing) and the information obtained to date has been used to update the models in the SWM/FSR. Further updates will occur after complete data is available.	Arup		
M.4	Executive Summary, page ii, indicates the functional servicing report discusses sanitary and water servicing requirements for the redevelopment ...The functional servicing report must discuss the sanitary, water and storm requirements as it relates to capacity to support the proposed development. The storm section will not be as detailed as a stormwater management report but it will identify if improvements are required and provide a high-level summary of the proposed SWM techniques for the various sites. The applicant to include a stormwater section in the Functional Servicing Report, which is consistent with the terms of reference in the development guide. A stormwater management report is still required to support the subdivision application.	Noted. Stormwater section has been incorporated in the functional servicing report to provide a high-level summary of the proposed SWM systems and techniques.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.5	Executive Summary, page ii, indicates (1.1 ca/100m2) and (3.3ca/100m2). The applicant to indicate what does ca stand for? (assuming ca stands for capita) The City standard is 1.1 persons/100m2 and 3.3 person/m2. The applicant to revise and replace ca with the word persons.	Ca stands for capita. As requested, this has been replaced with 'persons' in the report. The standard for office used is 3.3 persons/100m2 as noted on page 34 of the Functional Servicing Report.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.6	Executive Summary, page ii, the table with GFA and population equivalents is not consistent with the project statistics provided by the architect. The applicant to review and revise as required.	Noted. We have removed discrepancies and explained how the Design Criteria uses population equivalencies based on GFA for office / commercial that may make our calculation sections look slightly different.	Arup		
M.7	Table 1 – Land Use Mix on page 3, is not consistent with the table in the Executive Summary, page ii. The applicant to review and revise as required.	Noted. We have removed discrepancies and provided an explanation of how the Design Criteria uses population equivalencies based on GFA for office / commercial that may make our calculation sections look slightly different.	Arup		
M.8	It would be prudent for the applicant to undertake a title search to identify any municipal easements within the limits of the subject site.	A legal plan has been prepared KRCMAR showing easements within the site. No municipal easements were found when doing a title search in the adjacent area.	Arup		
M.9	The Servicing strategy (services to each building) will be reviewed in detail during the review of the detailed subdivision engineering plans.	Noted.	Arup		
M.10	The road cross sections are not typical City standard sections; therefore, we will require approval from all the applicable Utility Companies and City Departments.	Noted. The design of the road cross-sections is part of the ongoing coordination with the City and all relevant utility companies to ensure the appropriate (in accordance with City standards) soil cover, vertical and horizontal clearances between below ground elements.	Arup		
Comments - Storm/ Stormwater Management Report					
M.11	Objectives, page 2 of the SWM report is missing the objective to determine the capacity of the existing storm sewer and identify required upgrades. The applicant to review and revise as required.	Noted. We have added this wording in.	Arup		Stormwater Management Report
M.12	Page 3, 14, 22 & 24 (check entire report) of the report, indicates Error! Reference source not found. The Applicant to review and revise as required.	Noted. The report has been updated to remove this issue.	Arup		
M.13	Page 17 asking City to confirm if climate change to be considered. The applicant to simply apply current City criteria.	Noted. We have applied the current City criteria.	Arup		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
M.14	Page 19 (page 23 also mentioned) of the SWM Report, Outline Strategy, indicates the City to confirm availability of the approved overland flow routes downstream of the site. The City will not be able to confirm this information. The applicant will be responsible to do their own title searches to determine if there are any overland flow routes in easements also, they will have to conduct their own surveys to confirm topography such that an overland flow route will work and not adversely impact adjacent properties.	Based on the available topographic information, background information from Humber Bay Shore Precinct Plan, we have assessed the overland flow routes, indicated the flow split and flow direction along the Lake Shore Boulevard West, Park Lawn Road and overland flow routes from Lake Shore Boulevard to Marine Parade Drive (per Functional Servicing report for Humber Bay Shore Precinct). This needs to be confirmed based on additional topographic investigation of this routes.	Arup		
M.15	Page 21 of the SWM Report, Water Balance, indicates the reuse of mechanical cooling and grey water requirements. The applicant to keep in mind Water Balance run-off is supposed to remain on site. It is our understanding cooling water and grey water ends up in the sewer, which would defeat the purpose of water balance.	Noted. Per Toronto Green Standard V3 - Tier 3 WQ 2.3 (3) (which is our SWM aspiration for the site, however Tier 1 is formally pursued as the project requirement at this time) the Water Balance requirements will be met through infiltration, evapotranspiration, water harvesting and reuse. The report has been revised to reflect these requirements for Water balance. Acceptable uses may include but are not limited to toilet flushing and landscape irrigation.	Arup		
M.16	Page 23 of the SWM Report, Municipal Road, indicates the relief road dips and the runoff from that area will be pumped to Park Lawn Road. This is not an ideal situation for the municipality, ongoing maintenance of a pump, not to mention the issues that develop if the pump is not functioning and we receive a storm. The applicant to exhaust all avenues to use gravity drainage first. The applicant to investigate introducing a high point along the relief road to eliminate the low point and the need for a pump.	The relief road (Street A) is currently analysed in the City's TMP. Following TMP completion, stages 3 and 4 of the Environmental Assessment process for this road design (including storm drainage) will be evaluated by the FCR team. This will include alternative option analysis of both a pumped and gravity solution.	Arup		
M.17	The City will require comprehensive details of the storm sewer upgrades.	Noted. This has been added to the report.	Arup		
M.18	The applicant to review City storm drainage plan MC 2525 /3 to identify how much run-off was considered to the existing surrounding storm sewers.	Noted. This plan has been reviewed to confirm the existing runoff coefficient of the site and the corresponding flow to the surrounding sewers from the site.	Arup		
M.19	The proposed storm water drainage plan illustrates a larger pipe discharging into a smaller pipe. This will not be permitted. The applicant to review and revise as required.	Noted. The Proposed Stormwater Drainage layout (LSB-ARP-XX-XX-DR-CD-60000) drawing has been revised to show the updated pipe sizes.	Arup		Stormwater Drainage Layout Drawing LSB-ARP-XX-XX-DR-CD-60000
Comments - Sanitary					
M.20	Page 19 of the FSR indicates that Park Lawn Road has a 250 mm sanitary sewer. The sanitary sewer along Park Lawn Rd from approximately the rail corridor towards Lake Shore Blvd W was reconstructed a number of years ago to accommodate the development on the west side of Park Lawn Rd. For Engineering Plans see information below:To request an Engineering Drawing for sewers, watermains and road works in electronic format email EngDrawings@toronto.ca or phone 416-338-7954.For water or sewer service connections, call 311. For each drawing, a processing fee of $20.00 + HST applies, payable by credit card.	We have obtained the available records from Eng Drawings already as part of our initial works on this assignment. Information about the updated sewer on Park Lawn Road has been included in the FSR and model.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.21	The FSR indicates that sanitary flow monitoring is underway, as such the applicant will be required to resubmit the FSR when the monitoring is complete.	Noted. Flow monitoring is ongoing and data to date has been included. Updates will occur after a wet weather event is observed and will be included in the next FSR submission.	Arup		
M.22	The FSR indicates that sanitary flow monitoring is underway, as such the applicant will be required to resubmit the FSR when the monitoring is complete.	Noted. Flow monitoring is ongoing and data to date has been included. Updates will occur after a wet weather event is observed and will be included in the next FSR submission.	Arup		
M.23	The applicant to note, flow monitoring data must be collected between May and November and the monitoring data must cover a period of sufficient length to record data from at least two storm events with a return frequency greater than the City's 2-year design storm event.	Noted. Flow monitoring is ongoing and data to date has been included. Updates will occur after a wet weather event is observed and will be included in the next FSR submission.	Arup		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
M.24	The City will require comprehensive details of the sanitary sewer upgrades.	Preliminary details of the required mitigation/upgrade plans for sanitary network are be provided in the revised FSR. Further upgrades may be required based on wet weather flow monitoring data	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.25	The proposed Sanitary Drainage Layout Plan is not illustrating the correct existing sanitary sewer pipe sizes along Park Lawn. The applicant to review and revise as required.	Noted. This has been updated.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
Comments - Water					
M.26	The applicant to provide hydrant test information in the report. Hydrant tests can be arranged through the City's website. https://www.toronto.ca/services-payments/water-environment/water-sewer-related-permits-and- bylaws/water-related-permits/fire-hydrant-flow-test-permit/	Hydrant Tests were performed on September 22nd and are included in the revised FSR.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.27	The City will require comprehensive details of any watermain upgrades.	Based on initial modelling, it does not appear that any upgrades to local watermains within the right-of-way are required.	Arup		
M.28	The applicant will be required to provide water modeling as part of the subdivision process and for the ECA application to confirm sizing and capacity.	Noted. All Hydraulic model, Water, Sanitary and Storm will be submitted to the City for review and permitting process during next stage.	Arup		
Comments - Groundwater					
M.29	The applicant to add a Groundwater Section to the FSR and indicate whether or not groundwater will be discharged to the sewer and confirm whether or not the receiving sewer system has the capacity to accommodate the groundwater and the anticipated flows from the subject site.	There is a perched groundwater table at ~3m below grade, and within the bedrock at ~10m below grade, as per existing information. The information about groundwater is summarized in the FSR report and the Hydrogeo report has been added as appendices. Currently, it is considered that the groundwater does not discharge to the municipal sewer at this stage. This approach will be reassessed based on additional investigation at later stage.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
Toronto Water					
Comments - General					
M.30	Subdivision should be designed so that each block or phase is also able to meet current City SWM criteria for quality and Water Balance requirements at time of actual development (or site plan application).	This strategy needs to be discussed with the City in various meetings. We cannot agree at this time to meet requirements for each block. There is a potential to use empty parts of site during early phases to meet requirements. The project is meeting Tier 1 TGS and targeting TGS Tier 3 for water balance.	Arup		
M.31	Water - preliminary comments already stated LEED standards can only be used to size water service lines. Water demand must be based on City Design Criteria. Further comments will be provided once more thorough analysis is completed.	Noted and removed the scenario. The analysis was performed on LEED values for comparative purposes but the results did not vary greatly.	Arup		
M.32	Marine parade sanitary sewer is known to have capacity issues. Field investigation for actual as built inverts should be completed for analysis if sanitary flow from the site is proposed to flow along Marine Parade rather than Lakeshore. Based on the Schaeffer's report when Humber Bay shores development was completed, there would be minor surcharging at full build out of the area. There also could be some issues with elevation crossing under the Gardiner and that sewer may require deepening. Ensure all current as built information is being used for the model. As far as Toronto Water is concerned there is no capacity left.	After review of comments and conversation with Toronto Water, Arup has adjusted the routing to Lake Shore Boulevard. However, a portion of the early phases still drains to Marine Parade Drive through Park Lawn sewers (existing). We have flow monitoring points on Marine Parade Drive and will update our analysis after a WWF event is experienced. Once we have our full WWF model calibrated, we will ensure that there aren't impacts to Marine Parade Drive or the pipe beneath the Gardiner Expressway. If the pipe in Marine Parade is exceeding capacity then we will divert more of the flow to Lake Shore Boulevard.	Arup		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
M.33	No flow reduction beyond the Design Criteria will be permitted for sewer capacity analysis and design purposes as outlined below. This doesn't mean they shouldn't use the low flow fixtures and that the energy efficiency won't be acknowledged (i.e. TGS or LEED) but just not as it applies to the city's sewer system.	Noted. The analyses undertaken uses the design criteria flows.	Arup		
M.34	The applicant can use 240 l/c/d for residential or 250 l/c/d for ICI equivalent populations for analysis purposes. 450 l/c/d must be used for the design of new sewers, which is consistent with current criteria.	Noted. These values are being used in our calculations.	Arup		
M.35	There exists some flow contribution to The Queensway pumping station from the 225-mm sewers in The Queensway (from High St towards east to MH3224006653). This flow is missing in the analysis.	Part of this pipe length is shown to be abandoned, however, we have updated the existing flows to the pumping station to include the remaining contribution area. Negligeable flows from the area still being serviced by the PS (5 dwellings noted in census data) are included.	Arup		
M.36	In order to facilitate the modelling review, the InfoWorks ICM model(s) should be submitted together with the report(s) for next submissions.	InfoWorks model will be included in the next submission once calibrated with WWF.	Arup		
M.37	Page 19, last paragraph: The statement: "The hydraulic capacity of these pipes was unknown" is not appropriate. It is suggested to delete it.	Noted. This has been addressed in the revised report.	Arup		
M.38	Page 22, paragraph "Blocks A1and A2 ...", typo error: delete duplicated word "should" in the last sentence.	Noted. This has been addressed in the revised report.	Arup		
M.39	Page 23, Table 17, Eq. Population: The wastewater flow from commercial areas is computed based on GFA. What does the equivalent population represent for?	Existing development flow and downstream flow analyses were based on commercial contribution of 250 l/ca/day and calibrated using flow monitoring data. Proposed commercial flows were based on GFA (180,000 L/floor area in ha/day, as per Design Criteria). Commercial population equivalent was calculated as it was included in the total population used for calculating the Harmon Peaking Factor.	Arup		
M.40	Page 24, Section 3.5, Table 18: Comments from SAP and PPD Managers are needed.	It is our understanding that the City will circulate to commenting parties as required.	Arup		
M.41	Page 26, missing geometry information: What type of information is missing? The modelling results given in this report are derived from the model simulations with assumed data for the missing information, aren't they? How reliable are they?	The analysis presented is based on best available data. Some MH and pipe depths are missing from the TWAG data, however a thorough SUE investigation has just been completed and all models will be updated to reflect actual depths and locations for the next submission. To date, we have been able to confidently estimate depths based on known information and slopes, and believe the models to be a reliable assessment at this stage. Further updates will be made based on SUE and additional flow monitoring data that is still being collected.	Arup		
M.42	Page 26, point 4 under "Further modelling ...": It should be Section 3.5 (not 3.7, typo error)?	Noted. This has been addressed in the revised report.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.43	Page 26, Section 7: The capacity of The Queensway pumping station must be considered in the analysis to determine whether any upgrade is needed due to the flow increase under this development. This is missing in this report.	The City was able to provide very limited data on the pump station and its capacity requires further analysis. It is discussed in the FSR in limited detail. Any further information on the PS, its capacity, and its condition, would be greatly appreciated.	Arup		
M.44	Appendix F, "Calculation Inputs" Table, page 1 of 3, Proposed Residential Average Flow: 450 (not 250, typo error).	Noted. This has been addressed in the revised report.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.45	Appendix F, "Flow Calculations for Designing New Local Sewers" Table, page 1 of 3, "Population Equivalent": Check the unit (not l/sec) and see Comment 5 above. Where is the extraneous flow?	Noted. This has been addressed in the revised report.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
M.46	Appendix F, "Flow Calculations for Designing New Local Sewers" Table, page 1 of 3, "Total Peak Flow": The number in this field/column is not the total of peak residential and commercial flows. What is this total for?	This has been clarified in the revised FSR.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
Solid Waste and Recycling					
Comments - General					
M.47	Although Solid Waste matters must be addressed at the Site Plan approval stage, please see comments in Background Section of this memo, which should be addressed or at least considered, in the next submission to ensure that the proposed development is eligible for City collection services.	Noted. Waste rooms and associated areas have been identified on basement plans for reference.	Arup		
B. Preliminary Zoning By-law Amendment Conditions					
M.48	The owner is required, as a condition of approval of the Zoning By-Law Amendment Application, to:	Noted.	Arup		
Transportation Services					
M.49	Comments will be provided upon receipt from Transportation Services	Noted.	Arup		
Engineering and Construction Services					
M.50	Submit to the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services for review and acceptance, prior to approval of the rezoning application, a Functional Servicing Report to determine the storm water runoff, sanitary flow and water supply demand resulting from this development and whether there is adequate capacity in the existing municipal infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development;	A Functional Servicing Report was submitted with the May 2020 application, with the revised version included with the current resubmission.	Arup		Functional Servicing Report
M.51	Make satisfactory arrangements with Engineering and Construction Services and enter into the appropriate agreement with the City for the design and construction of any improvements to the municipal infrastructure, should it be determined that upgrades are required to the infrastructure to support this development, according to the accepted Functional Servicing Report and Traffic Impact Study accepted by the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services.	Noted.	Arup		
M.52	Within the lands municipally known in the year 2020 as 2150 & 2194 Lake Shore Blvd W and 23 Park Lawn Rd., no person shall use any land or use any building or structure unless the following municipal services are provided to the lot line and the following provisions are complied with, as per the approved phasing plan: (a) all new public roads have been constructed to a minimum of base curb and base asphalt and are connected to an existing public highway; and (b) all sanitary and storm sewers, water mains, and appropriate appurtenances, have been installed and are operational.	Noted.	Arup		
M.53	The applicant will be required to provide space within each block of the development for the installation of maintenance access holes and sampling ports on the private side, as close to the property line as possible, for both the storm and sanitary service connections, in accordance with the Sewers By-law Chapter 681. The applicant to provide plans illustrating the above condition has been satisfied.	Noted.	Arup		
MM	**Subdivision**				
A. Revisions and Additional Information Required for Plans and Studies					
	The owner is required to amend the Draft Plan of Proposed Subdivision and/or provide additional information to address the following comments and resubmit for the review and acceptance by the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services.	Noted.	Arup		
Transportation Services					
MM.1	Comments will be provided upon receipt from Transportation Services	Noted.	BA		
Engineering and Construction Services					
MM.2	Comments noted above in the Zoning section will need to be addressed for the Subdivision Application.	Noted.	Arup		
B. Preliminary Draft Plan of Subdivision Conditions					

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Transportation Services					
MM.3	Comments will be provided upon receipt from Transportation Services	Noted.	BA		
Engineering and Construction Services					
MM.4	The following preliminary draft plan of subdivision conditions are typical conditions used in subdivision agreements. They will develop over time with subsequent submissions and further discussions with the Applicant, Legal Services and City Planning.	Noted.	USI		
MM.5	1. The owner shall enter into a Standard Subdivision Agreement with the City for the construction of all municipal services required to service this subdivision and post adequate securities for this servicing, all to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services. The Agreement will, among other things, address matters regarding engineering services, the assumption of services, soil and groundwater quality, conveyances to the City, fees, financial securities, requirements for building permits and grading and building siting control.	Noted.	USI		
MM.6	2. Street A, B and C on the Draft Plan shall be dedicated to the City as public road and must be designed and constructed as a fully serviced XXm wide public road allowance conforming to City of Toronto Standards.	Noted.	USI		
MM.7	3. Dedicate all roads, corner roundings and road widenings shown on the plan for this development to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services.	Noted.	USI		
MM.8	4. Convey all necessary easements (internal and external) to the City shown on the plan for this development to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services.	Noted.	USI		
MM.9	5. Convey lands required to the City for Park purposes.	Noted.	USI		
MM.10	6. Prepare all documents to convey lands in fee simple and easement interests to the City for nominal consideration, such lands to be free and clear of all physical and title encumbrances to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services in consultation with the City Solicitor.	Noted.	USI		
MM.11	7. The Owner is required to submit a draft Reference Plan of Survey to the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services, for review and approval, prior to depositing it in the Land Registry Office. The reference plan should: (a) Be in metric units and integrated to the 1983 North American Datum (Canadian Spatial Reference System and the 3 degree Modified Transverse Mercator Projections); (b) Delineate by separate PARTS the lands to be conveyed to the City, the remainder of the site and any appurtenant rights-of-way and easements; and (c) Show the co-ordinate values of the main corners of the subject lands in a schedule on the face of the plan.	Noted.	USI		
MM.12	8. Pay all costs for preparation and registration of reference plan(s).	Noted.	USI		
MM.13	9. The owner shall conduct an environmental site assessment for lands to be conveyed to the City in accordance with the terms and conditions of the standard subdivision agreement, including providing payment for a peer reviewer and submission of an RSC.	Noted.	USI		
MM.14	10. The owner shall submit financial securities in accordance with the terms of the standard subdivision agreement.	Noted.	USI		
MM.15	11. The owner shall pay engineering and inspection fees in accordance with the terms and conditions of the standard subdivision agreement.	Noted.	USI		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.16	12. Provide a detailed Stormwater Management Report, and apply stormwater management techniques in the development of this subdivision to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services.	A Stormwater Management Report was provided as part of the application materials.	Arup		Stormwater Management Report
MM.17	13. Pay for and construct all municipal infrastructure required to service the Plan of Subdivision, including municipal infrastructure external to the plan of subdivision.	Noted. Conversation on infrastructure cost sharing/ Development Charges is currently ongoing with the City.	Arup	A&B	
MM.18	14. Prior to the registration of the Plan of Subdivision, the Owner shall make satisfactory arrangements with THESL and THESI for the provision of the electrical distribution system and street lighting, respectively, to service the Plan of Subdivision.	There are ongoing discussions with Toronto Hydro with respect to the provision of power supply to the site, including connections to the proposed buildings and street lighting. Further discussions should clarify the total supply available in nearby substations as well as the specific electrical distribution strategy for the buildings and public realm lighting. Separate discussions are taking place with a potential district energy provider to support the design, construction and operation of the ground source heat pumps for the buildings - key item part of energy strategy to reduce demand and grid dependency.	Arup		
MM.19	15. Written confirmation from THESL and THESI that said arrangements have been made with respect to the installation of the electrical distribution system and street lighting, respectively, for the Plan of Subdivision, including the provision of any financial requirements set out in any agreement with THESL and THESI shall be provided.	Please see response to comment MM.18. There is no written confirmation yet from Toronto Hydro on the final electrical distribution system approved for the site, however, discussions are ongoing.	Arup		
MM.20	16. In addition to the other financial security obligations contained in this Agreement and notwithstanding Section 25.5 of the main body of this Agreement, prior to the earlier of release for construction of services or prior to the registration of the Plan of Subdivision, the Owner agrees to provide the City with financial security in the amount of 130% of the value of the cost estimate of the street lighting required to be installed under this Agreement, to the satisfaction of Chief Engineer and Executive Director and Chief Engineer, Engineering & Construction Services.	Noted.	Arup		
MM.21	17. The Owner is required to provide certification from a Structural Engineer that the existing structure(s) on-site to be retained, including but not limited to, retaining walls, culverts, ditch inlet catchbasins and headwalls, have been inspected and confirmed to be in good order with regards to drainage and structural stability.	Noted.	Arup		
MM.22	18. Prior to registration of the Plan of Subdivision, submit to the Chief Engineer and Executive Director of Engineering and Construction Services for review and acceptance, a detailed infrastructure phasing plan outlining the necessary infrastructure required to service all phases of the lands.	Detailed infrastructure phasing plans will be provided in detailed design stages. The infrastructure proposed so far has been completed to guarantee adequate servicing throughout all the different development phases.	Arup		
C. Background					
Transportation Services					
MM.23	Comments will be provided upon receipt from Transportation Services	Noted.			

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Solid Waste and Recycling					
MM.24	Multi-Residential Component: **Block A** - Shared loading (Phase 2) Block A – Shared loading (Phase 2) Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, is level (+-2%), and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. 2. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space that will be at least 160.4 square metres, have an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, constructed of 200mm reinforced concrete and have a grade of no more than 2%. 3. Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will be level (+/-8%), have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum 4.5 metres wide throughout and 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. 4. Revised drawings must indicate that any/all overhead doors the collection vehicle will be passing through have a minimum width of 4 metres and a minimum overhead clearance of 4.4 metres. 5. Revised drawings must annotate that a trained on-site staff member will be available to manoeuvre bins for the collection driver and also act as a flagman when the truck is reversing. In the event the on-site staff is unavailable at the time the City collection vehicle arrives at the site, the collection vehicle will leave the site and not return until the next scheduled collection day.	1 - A Type 'G' loading space is being proposed to service the residential refuse and recycling collection for this Block. Please refer to drawing Ax0-001 under "General Notes". 2 - Smaller dedicated staging pad area of (2mx4m=8sm) has be noted next to the Type G loading area on all Loading Level plans (based on The Well development as the precedent). 3 - Please refer to drawing Ax0-001 under "General Notes". 4 - Please refer to drawing Ax0-001 under "General Notes". 5 - This is a detailed operations matter, proposed to be dealt with at the Site Plan stage and noted on relevant reports.	Adamson	BA	Basement Drawing Ax0-001
MM.25	Building A1 Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 191.92 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Noted. Some of the information required will be addressed at the Site Plan stage, as the Zoning level of design does not show the level of details required to addressed these comments. 1 - Information will be conveyed at the Site Plan stage. 2 - Refer to drawing Ax0-001 under "General Notes". 3 - Area is noted on plans. 4 - Area is noted on plans. 5 - Information will be conveyed at the Site Plan stage.	Adamson		Basement Drawing Ax0-001 Phase 1 : Ap2-092-CD Phase 2 : Ap2-092-A Phase 3 : Ap2-092-D Phase 4 : Ap2-091-B Phase 5 : Ap2-092-E Phase 6 : Ap2-091-F
MM.26	Building A1 - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Letter will be provided at a later stage.	Structural		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.27	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. “Retail Waste Only”). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only".	1 - Non-residential & Residential waste rooms are independent and accessed independently. 2 - Noted & Not Applicable. 3 - Noted & Not Applicable.	Adamson		Basement Drawing Ax0-001 Phase 1 : Ap2-092-CD Phase 2 : Ap2-092-A Phase 3 : Ap2-092-D Phase 4 : Ap2-091-B Phase 5 : Ap2-092-E Phase 6 : Ap2-091-F
MM.28	Building A2 Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the “City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments” and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 150.06 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		
MM.29	Building A2 - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Please see response to comment MM.26.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.30	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. “Retail Waste Only”). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled ""Retail Waste Only""."	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		
MM.31	Building A3 - Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. “Retail Waste Only”).	Noted.	Adamson		
MM.32	Building A4 Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the “City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments” and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 124.06 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		
MM.33	Building A4 - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Please see response to comment MM.26.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.34	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. “Retail Waste Only”). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only"."	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		
MM.35	**Block B** – Shared loading (Phase 4) Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the “City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments” and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, is level (+-2%), and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. 2. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space that will be at least 97 square metres, have an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, constructed of 200mm reinforced concrete and have a grade of no more than 2%. 3. Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will be level (+/-8%), have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum 4.5 metres wide throughout and 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. 4. Revised drawings must indicate that any/all overhead doors the collection vehicle will be passing through have a minimum width of 4 metres and a minimum overhead clearance of 4.4 metres. 5. Revised drawings must annotate that a trained on-site staff member will be available to manoeuvre bins for the collection driver and also act as a flagman when the truck is reversing. In the event the on-site staff is unavailable at the time the City collection vehicle arrives at the site, the collection vehicle will leave the site and not return until the next scheduled collection day.	Please see response to comment MM.24.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.36	Building B1 Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 98.58 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		
MM.37	Building B1 - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Letter will be provided at a later stage.	Adamson		
MM.38	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. "Retail Waste Only"). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only".	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.39	Building B2 Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 190.62 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		
MM.40	Building B2 - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Please see response to comment MM.26.	Adamson		
MM.41	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. "Retail Waste Only"). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only".	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.42	**Block C** – Shared loading (Phase 1) Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, is level (+-2%), and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. 2. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space that will be at least 65.5 square metres, have an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, constructed of 200mm reinforced concrete and have a grade of no more than 2%. 3. Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will be level (+/-8%), have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum 4.5 metres wide throughout and 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. 6. Revised drawings must indicate that any/all overhead doors the collection vehicle will be passing through have a minimum width of 4 metres and a minimum overhead clearance of 4.4 metres. 7. Revised drawings must annotate that a trained on-site staff member will be available to manoeuvre bins for the collection driver and also act as a flagman when the truck is reversing. In the event the on-site staff is unavailable at the time the City collection vehicle arrives at the site, the collection vehicle will leave the site and not return until the next scheduled collection day.	Please see response to comment MM.24.	Adamson		
MM.43	Building C1 Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 195.3 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		
MM.44	Building C1 - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Please see response to comment MM.26.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.45	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. “Retail Waste Only”). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only".	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		
MM.46	**Block D1**– Shared loading (Phase 1) Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the “City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments” and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, is level (+-2%), and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. 2. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space that will be at least 59.7 square metres, have an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, constructed of 200mm reinforced concrete and have a grade of no more than 2%. 3. Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will be level (+/-8%), have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum 4.5 metres wide throughout and 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. 4. Revised drawings must indicate that any/all overhead doors the collection vehicle will be passing through have a minimum width of 4 metres and a minimum overhead clearance of 4.4 metres. 5. Revised drawings must annotate that a trained on-site staff member will be available to manoeuvre bins for the collection driver and also act as a flagman when the truck is reversing. In the event the on-site staff is unavailable at the time the City collection vehicle arrives at the site, the collection vehicle will leave the site and not return until the next scheduled collection day.	Please see response to comment MM.24.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.47	Building D1 Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 180.22 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		
MM.48	Building D1 - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Please see response to comment MM.26.	Adamson		
MM.49	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. "Retail Waste Only"). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only".	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.50	**Block E**– Shared loading (Phase 5) Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. 25 of 29 C:\Users\gtesa\Desktop\Submission Reviews\2150 Lakeshore Blvd #1 OZ #1 SB comments to planning July 2020 signed.doc Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, is level (+-2%), and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. 2. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space that will be at least 46.7 square metres, have an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, constructed of 200mm reinforced concrete and have a grade of no more than 2%. 3. Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will be level (+/-8%), have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum 4.5 metres wide throughout and 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. 4. Revised drawings must indicate that any/all overhead doors the collection vehicle will be passing through have a minimum width of 4 metres and a minimum overhead clearance of 4.4 metres. 5. Revised drawings must annotate that a trained on-site staff member will be available to manoeuvre bins for the collection driver and also act as a flagman when the truck is reversing. In the event the on-site staff is unavailable at the time the City collection vehicle arrives at the site, the collection vehicle will leave the site and not return until the next scheduled collection day.	Please see response to comment MM.24.	Adamson		
MM.51	Building E Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 146.42 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.52	Building E - Cont. In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Please see response to comment MM.26.	Adamson		
MM.53	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. “Retail Waste Only”). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only".	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		
MM.54	**Block F**– Shared loading (Phase 6) Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the “City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments” and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate the Type G loading space has an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, is level (+-2%), and is constructed of a minimum of 200 mm reinforced concrete. 2. Revised drawings must indicate and annotate a staging pad abutting the front of the Type G loading space that will be at least 46.7 square metres, have an unencumbered vertical clearance of 6.1 metres, constructed of 200mm reinforced concrete and have a grade of no more than 2%. 3. Revised drawings must indicate that all access driveways to be used by the collection vehicle will be level (+/-8%), have a minimum vertical clearance of 4.4 metres throughout, a minimum 4.5 metres wide throughout and 6 metres wide at point of ingress and egress. 4. Revised drawings must indicate that any/all overhead doors the collection vehicle will be passing through have a minimum width of 4 metres and a minimum overhead clearance of 4.4 metres. 5. Revised drawings must annotate that a trained on-site staff member will be available to manoeuvre bins for the collection driver and also act as a flagman when the truck is reversing. In the event the on-site staff is unavailable at the time the City collection vehicle arrives at the site, the collection vehicle will leave the site and not return until the next scheduled collection day.	Please see response to comment MM.24.	Adamson		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
MM.55	Building F Based upon the information available, Solid Waste Management will provide bulk lift compacted garbage, recycling and organic collection services to this component of the development. Collection of waste materials from this component will be in accordance with the "City of Toronto Requirements for Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Services for New Developments and Re-Developments" and Chapter 844, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Collection will be subject to the following conditions being met: 1. Revised drawings must annotate the waste compactor within the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must label the method of waste separation that will be used and that the method will be one of the following; a single chute with a tri-sorter, two chutes with one equipped with a bi-sorter or three separate chutes. 3. Revised drawings must indicate a waste storage room of a minimum 189.84 square meters. 4. Revised drawings must indicate a bulky storage room of minimum 10 square metres. 5. Revised drawing must show waste chutes on all residential floors.	Please see response to comment MM.25.	Adamson		
MM.56	Building F In addition to the conditions above that must be noted on revised drawings and before solid waste collection services are to begin the City will need to be provided with: A letter certified by a professional engineer that in all cases where a collection vehicle is required to drive onto or over a supported structure (such as an underground parking garage and grading) the structure can safely support a fully loaded collection vehicle (35,000 kilograms) and conforms to the following: • Design Code - Ontario Building Code • Design Load - City bulk lift vehicle in addition Building Code requirements • Impact Factor - 5% for maximum vehicular speeds to 15 km/h and 30% for higher speeds	Please see response to comment MM.26.	Adamson		
MM.57	Non-Residential Component The commercial/retail component of this development being ineligible for City of Toronto collection, must store, transport and make arrangements for collection of all waste materials separately from the residential component. Collection of wastes from the commercial sector of this site will be in accordance with Chapter 841, Solid Waste of the Municipal Code. Separate retail waste containers are to be utilised and it will be necessary for the retail sector to have their bins identified (i.e. "Retail Waste Only"). 1. Revised drawings must indicate a storage space for the waste that will be generated by the commercial component of this development. This non-residential waste room must be independent from the residential waste room and must be accessible without entering the residential waste room. 2. Revised drawings must indicate if it is planned for the non-residential component to make use of the type G loading spaces and if so, then the non-residential component will only schedule use of the type G loading space on different days from the collection days of the residential component to ensure that the Type G loading space will be vacant for City Waste Collection. If it is not planned for this component to use the type G loading spaces then this must also be noted. 3. If loading space is to be shared the commercial bins must be labelled "Retail Waste Only".	Please see response to comment MM.27.	Adamson		
MM.58	Toronto Green Standard Solid Waste TGS Tier 1:Solid Waste TGS Tier 1: SW 1.1 has not been satisfied SW 1.2 has not been satisfied SW 1.3 has not been satisfied SW 1.4 has not been satisfied	Solid Waste Strategies will be incorporated at Site Plan stage. All Residential and Non-Residential waste rooms and associated areas have been noted in the basement plans for reference at this time. Please also refer to the TGS checklist for relevant items.	Adamson	Arup	TGS Checklist

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
	Transportation Planning, September 3, 2020	**Richard Beck, Program Manager, Transportation Planning; Josh Bassett, Senior Planner, Transportation Planning**			
N	**General**				
N.1	The following comments are provided on the Transportation Impact Study prepared by BA Group, dated May 2020, and the Architectural drawings and Draft Plan of Subdivision drawings submitted as part of the current Official Plan & Zoning By-law Amendment application as well as the Draft Plan of Subdivision, submitted by First Capital Realty for 2150 & 2194 Lake Shore Boulevard West and 23 Park Lawn Road. Transportation Planning staff are pleased to acknowledge that the revised submission addressed some of the previously raised concerns and comments. The comments found within this memo seek resolution to outstanding comments made on the original Official Plan Amendment application (File No. 19 239170 WET 03 OZ), as provided by the City of Toronto on December 20, 2019 and March 25, 2020, and provides new comments on the recent submission made by FCR on May 15, 2020. The draft Secondary Plan, Zoning By-law and Urban Design and Streetscape Guidelines will be released with the Staff Report to Planning and Housing Committee on September 22, 2020. The policies of the Secondary Plan will contain mobility policies that guide the following: the local street network, transit hub, active transportation, mid-block connections and parking and loading.	Noted.	BA		
N.2	Summary: Transportation Planning requests that the applicant make revisions to their Transportation Impact Study, Official Plan & Zoning Bylaw Amendment application as well as the Draft Plan of Subdivision with respect to the following items: travel demand forecasting and traffic operations; transportation demand management; vehicle parking rates; active transportation network; site access; parking structures; pick-up and drop-off; loading; public and private street network including in-street facilities; streetscape, and right of ways; and transit facilities related to the proposed Transit Hub and other on-site transit facilities. Specific requests regarding these items are described below in the following memorandum.	Noted, revisions to the Transportation Impact Study have been made as per the comment responses.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
Travel Demand Forecasting and Traffic Operations					
Outstanding requests for resolution from March 25, 2020					
N.3	The analysis provided to date by the applicant includes the following: Area Mobility Assumptions, Multi-Modal Travel Demand Forecasting, Transit Hub Activity Projection, Transit Travel Assessment, Vehicle Travel Assessment, Active Travel Assessment and Traffic Operations. Transportation Planning and Transportation Services staff have the following concerns related to this analysis: • The applicant's traffic simulation models are not properly calibrated. Transportation Planning has assessed the model submitted to-date by the proponent and the Gardiner is operating at free-flowing conditions, which is inaccurate. Transportation Planning finds that the proponent's analysis has no up–to-date baseline traffic conditions, which will need to be provided by the Park Lawn – Lake Shore Transportation Master Plan (TMP) work. If the traffic simulation model has been updated to reflect this, it must be submitted to Transportation Services and Transportation Planning for review. • Transit Ridership forecasting has no input from the City of Toronto GTAV4 model.	The above is addressed through analysis material submitted to the City of Toronto by BA Group on January 18th, 2021. Furthermore, it should be noted that all model calibration was performed by AECOM, the City's TMP consultant, and that BA Group utilized AECOM's calibrated base models, as reviewed and approved by the City, in order to conduct its analysis. Inputs received from the City of Toronto based on EMME regional modelling have been compared against BA Group's forecasts in Section 6.5. The comparison indicates t that the forecasts prepared by BA Group can be considered as representative of the likely Site trip generation, when compared with the outputs of the City's model. Whilst not directly comparable to the assumptions made for the Site specifically, it is noted that this also included comparison of transit mode splits.The Site GO Transit ridership projections have also been compared against Metrolinx's ridership projections for the proposed Park Lawn Station in Section 6.7, which indicates that the projected Site GO ridership can be completely accommodated by the ridership projected by the IBC, with additional ridership capacity available for other nearby existing and background developments.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.4	It should be noted that the ongoing modelling/analysis that AECOM has provided to BA Group should be incorporated into the TIS, for review and consideration, as part of the next submission.	Noted. The analysis has been updated to incorporate the above mentioned modelling received from the City, as discussed in Section 6.0 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
N.5	The applicant must revise their TIS report with the following inputs: • Outputs from the City's GTAV 4 ridership model. The City has received ridership information from Metrolinx and has shared it with the applicant. • Updated baseline traffic conditions that will be determined through the TMP work being led by Transportation Services. o The travel times will need to be checked against the new assumptions from Metrolinx which are still outstanding. o The travel times assumed for various parts of Toronto/GTA need to be checked against the new assumptions from Metrolinx, GTAV 4 model, and updated GGH model which are still outstanding. For more detailed comments provided on these items, please see Appendix A: Travel Demand Forecasting and Traffic Operations:	As discussed above, the analysis has been updated to incorporate outputs from modelling received from the City. Details are provided in Section 6.0 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
Vehicle Parking Rates					
The comments found below reflect the May 2020 submission					
N.6	The applicant has proposed a parking rate comparable to Policy Area 1. Transportation Planning cannot support the proposed vehicle parking rate at this time. Proxy locations outside of Toronto's Yonge Line 1 corridor must be used. The level of transit service and active mobility infrastructure on the Yonge corridor is not comparable to the subject site. It is recommended that the consultant look at Liberty Village Exhibition GO station area, or the Bloor-Dundas West GO station area as a comparable analysis to assess parking demand. Is expected, that parking provision rates within the Plan Area will reflect the high availability of transit in the Plan Area and will be flexible to be reduced over the course of the development. The Secondary Plan will include conditions that require the monitoring of parking utilization through each development phase and may allow for rates to be reduced with subsequent phases of development. If after Phase 1 and 2 for example, it is seen that parking demand is dropping, the City may enact reduced rates for remaining phases. Given that in each phase of development the City will require individual site plans, the parking arrangement and design may be refined. • Transportation Planning supports the concept of shared parking between non-residential uses to maximize the efficiency of the supply. Further details on the sharing of parking spaces will need to be developed. • Transportation Planning supports not including commuter parking on-site. • Transportation Planning agrees on minimizing the vehicle parking supply while ensuring that the demands of the site are met. Maximum rates for the site may be considered by Transportation Planning.	Noted. The parking rationale has been updated to incorporate the above mentioned items in the analysis, as provided in Appendix B of the Transportation Impact Study addendum.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
Active Transportation Network - Cycling Infrastructure					
N.7	The following comments were prepared with input from Transportation Services, as well as Cycling and Pedestrian Projects Group, and will be further refined through the Plan of Subdivision process.	Noted.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Outstanding requests for resolution from March 25, 2020					
N.8	Preliminary comments on the cycling network proposed as part of this development are outlined below: • Access to GO Station – Revised drawings must include a dedicated, direct cycling facility that connects the bicycle parking for the station to the larger cycling network, the Access Street (applicant's "Relief Road" or Street A) Multi-use Trail (MUT), and the (Loop Road or Street B). This could be done through the transit plaza or via another route. If another route is chosen, it would have to be highly visible from the external road network. Providing a direct route will minimize the number of people choosing to cycle through the shared space.	Two dedicated bicycle facilities provide direct connection between the wider cycling network and the GO station bicycle parking. A bi-directional cycling facility on the east boulevard of Park Lawn Road provides a dedicated cycle facility between the Martin Goodman Trail access at the intersection of Park Lawn / Lake Shore Boulevard, and the Lake Shore Boulevard cycle track facility and the secured, and covered station bicycle parking, accessed at the lower level of the station building, off of Park Lawn Road). A second, bi-directional bicycle facility on the loop road provides connections between the Lake Shore Boulevard cycle tracks and the covered station bicycle parking located in Station Square. The covered bicycle parking located in Station Square is in close proximity to the loop road facility to minimize the number of people cycling through the shared space.	BA		
N.9	Public Street B (Loop Road) – Revise plans to show a uni-directional cycling facility on the internal Loop Road. A bi-directional facility does not prioritize active transportation access over motorist access. This facility type is not preferred for new roads especially when there is significant development on both sides of the road. Uni-directional facilities provide transit riders an easier and more intuitive crossing of the bike lane than bi-directional facilities.	It is our understanding that the City of Toronto is generally supportive of a bi-directional cycling facility on the loop road through ongoing design working meetings. In our opinion, a bi-directional cycling facility on the outer loop provides a higher degree of accessibility to community oriented destinations such as the potential schools, potential community centre, the integrated transit hub and the Community Park. In addition, a bi-directional facility minimizes conflicts and delays along the TTC streetcar route. Dedicated, protected crossing facilities at the Lake Shore Boulevard uni-directional cycle lanes will ensure that cyclists have a safe and defined crossing location.	BA		
N.10	The Loop Road intersects with Lake Shore Boulevard. Intersection design from uni-directional facilities to uni-directional facilities would be safer and more intuitive than from bi-directional to uni-directional.	Please see response to comment N.9.	BA		
N.11	Additionally, it would be easier for cyclists to navigate south of the intersection onto Shore Breeze Drive and Silver Moon Drive to connect the waterfront trail.	Please see response to comment N.9.	BA		
N.12	Public Street C - Provide uni-directional cycle tracks on public street C to connect the Loop Road with Park Lawn Road.	Bicycle facilities are provided through Park Lawn Gardens POPS area to connect the bi-directional cycling facilities on the loop road (Street B) and Park Lawn Road.	BA		
N.13	Private Street D – This appears to provide direct access to the north end of the site and is a suitable location for additional cycling infrastructure.	Private Street D is intended to provide local road access to development block D3 and E. There is a right-in / right-out intersection condition at the relief road. Vehicle volumes along Private Street D are expected to be minimal and cycling in a shared 6.6m roadway is considered to be appropriate given the context.	BA		
N.14	Park Lawn Road – Subject to input from the TMP will maintain our requests for the provision of a uni-directional or bi-directional cycling connection on Park Lawn Road from Lake Shore Boulevard to The Queensway.	Noted. A bi-directional cycling facility is being proposed on the east boulevard of Park Lawn Road between Lake Shore Boulevard and the existing rail corridor, along our site boundary. Further information and direction following the outcome of the TMP will help determine the location and type of facility between the rail corridor and the Queensway.	BA		
N.15	Further workshops between the applicant, the City, and TTC is required.	Please see response to comment N.14. Workshop with the City has been held in February 2021.	BA		
The comments found below reflects the May 2020 submission					

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.16	Public Street A (Relief Road) – In the October 2019 OPA submission, the applicant proposed an MUT on the north side of the street. The applicant has removed this facility entirely from the May 2020 submission. Transportation Planning requests that the MUT be reinstated and switched to the south side of this street to eliminate the need to cross the road to connect to the site. Additionally, the existing Legion Road MUT appears to be on the south side as it approaches Park Lawn Road; having the Access Street MUT on the south side would avoid lowering the priority of pedestrians and cyclists to motorist and avoid a two-stage crossing of Park Lawn Road for users of the MUT. Including an MUT and complete streets concepts on Public Street A will also help keep the road from becoming a high speed bypass route for cars. This is subject to review by the TMP.	A fulsome design review of the appropriateness, location and design of a cycling facility along the relief road is being undertaken as part of the TMP process. It is of our opinion that a cycling facility along the south side of the relief road is not appropriate given the boulevard conflicts with the GO Station and school bus pick-up / drop-off and site driveways / private road intersections.	BA		
N.17	It is likely that the intersection of Park Lawn Road and Lake Shore Boulevard will need some special intersection treatments to facilitate bike movements from the bi-directional facility ending on the north east corner of the intersection to the trail connection in the south west corner of the intersection, making this a good candidate for protected cycling intersection design. It is recommended the applicant explore this concept in their revised TIS report. Further workshops between the applicant, City, and TTC as well as consideration as part of the TMP is required.	Noted. The design of this crossing will continue to be coordinated and addressed as part of the ongoing design coordination work, and will be done in context with the ongoing area TMP.	BA		
Active Transportation Network - Bicycle Parking					
The comments found below reflects the May 2020 submission					
N.18	Transportation Planning generally supports bicycle parking rates and shower facilities. Bicycle parking infrastructure must comply with Toronto Green Standards (TGS) Version 3.0 (Tier 2, Zone 2). For more detailed comments provided on these items please see Appendix A: Bicycle Parking Note: Continued review of the bicycle infrastructure will occur through the development process to ensure that cycling demands are met. At the Site Plan application stage for each phase of development, it is requested that the applicant provide more details regarding the bicycle infrastructure that will be used for outdoor short-term bicycle parking and indoor long-term bicycle parking. These details can include renderings or specification sheets, manufacturer information, and model numbers.	Noted. Bicycle parking provisions are currently being planned to satisfy Toronto Green Standards Version 3.0 (Tier 2, Zone 2) requirements.	BA		
Site Access, Parking Structures, Pick-up and Drop-Off (PUDO); and Loading					
The comments found below reflects the May 2020 submission					
N.19	Given that subsequent Transportation Impact Studies will be required at each development phase of site plan approval, amount and arrangement of all PUDO areas and laybys will revaluated based on updated travel behaviour and operational demands. Transportation Planning still maintains that the applicant shall work to secure all PUDO activities within convenient underground facilities on site or at-grade near vehicle accesses and residential accesses and egresses.	Noted.	BA		
N.20	Below-grade loading and servicing facilities for developments must be provided. Loading entrances and accesses are encouraged to be consolidated and shall be limited.	Noted. Loading access is being consolidated to the main signalized basement access from the relief road for Phases 1-5. A shared loading / parking site driveway is being planned for Phase 6.	BA		
N.21	It is recommended that as part of the applicant's revised functional plans, a comprehensive wayfinding strategy be developed for all users as part of ongoing development of TDM measures for the site.	Noted. More detailed wayfinding and signage plans as part of the TDM strategy will be developed during the Site Plan stage.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Below Grade Encumbrances related to Parking, Loading and Servicing					
The comments found below reflects the May 2020 submission					
N.22	Generally, the City discourages the encumbrance of public streets below grade to facilitate tunnels to connect blocks for the purposes of parking, loading and servicing. Below grade encumbrances may be considered to facilitate connections only in circumstances where no other alternatives can be achieved. These considerations generally will be balanced with the overall policy objectives being targeted in the Secondary Plan and are subject to review and approval by Transportation Services and Engineering and Construction Services. However, no parking of any kind will be permitted below public streets.	Noted. Below grade tunnel connections have been minimized, and no parking is being proposed beneath public streets. It is noteworthy that the tunnel connections between the different phases of the Master Plan enable vehicles to circulate between different development blocks underground. This facilitates a minimization of driveway intrusions within the at-grade public realm and are critical to the foundation of the Master Plan proposal.	BA		
Transportation Demand Management (TDM)					
The comments found below reflects the May 2020 submission					
N.23	Transportation Planning agrees in general with the measures proposed in concept.	Noted.	BA		
Outstanding requests for resolution from March 25, 2020:					
N.24	A comprehensive travel behavior monitoring program strategy is expected as part of the Secondary Plan process. The applicant is requested to reflect these in subsequent TIS report revisions for each phase of development. It is requested that the applicant meet with the City and its relevant divisions to workshop these initiatives prior to submitting future revisions to the TIS report.	Noted.	BA		
Street Network					
N.25	All transportation routes, street cross-sections, and their configurations - including but not limited to pedestrian clearways, cycling infrastructure, transit infrastructure, and vehicular travel lanes within proposed and existing public streets - shall adhere to City requests and transit service provider standards. Further direction may apply amendments to these standards will be secured in a comprehensive set of Urban Design Guidelines developed through the City-led Secondary Plan process with input from the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The applicant is expected to adhere to these guidelines through the development application process and reflect this work in subsequent revisions to the Transportation Impact Study. Generally, it is expected the rights-of-way of all public streets (existing and proposed) will prioritize pedestrian, active, and transit modes over private vehicles.	Noted.	BA		
Public Street A					
N.26	The applicant should proceed with furthering the design of the Public Street A. The design must be informed by the City led TMP through all stages of the development process and will adhere to ongoing input from staff. Transportation Planning (in consultation with Transportation Services), at this time, does not support the re-configuration of the Gardiner Ramps at the east end of the site, but further analysis of the ramps is being conducted through the TMP process.	Noted.	BA		
N.27	It is Transportation Planning and Transportation Services position that the road is required to serve the development (this is being evaluated by the TMP).	It is considered that Street A will play a role in serving broader regional demands while also serving the proposed development. Street A is not wholly required to service the proposed development. This is being considered further, together with discussions related to the basic cross-section and right-of-way of Street A, as part of the Park Lawn – Lake Shore TMP. Cost sharing and other related considerations will be advanced as part of the finalization of the Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision and other applicable processes.	BA		
N.28	Further discussions with First Capital regarding completion of Phases 3 and 4 of the Municipal Class EA for the Access Street will be required.	Noted. Phases 3 and 4 are understood to be required and will be undertaken by Arup in accordance with MCEA guidelines.	Arup		
Internal Street Layout (Including Public Streets B, C, and Private Street D)					

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.29	The draft Secondary Plan will show the proposed street network.	Noted.			
Approximate Rights-of-way (ROWs) widths of Public Streets					
Internal Streets					
N.30	The ROWs and cross sections proposed for the public streets and boulevards are required to be revised as per the Zoning Bylaw and Draft Plan of Subdivision application: Note: All in street facilities including but not limited to car travel lanes, cycling facilities and transit facilities are subject to further discussion and approval by City Planning, Transportation Services and the TTC	Noted.	BA		
N.31	Public Street B – Transportation Planning request a consistent right-of-way of a minimum of 28 m (with uni-directional streetcar loop service) to a maximum of approximately 32 m (with bi-directional streetcar loop service) as per the considerations below to achieve excellence in complete street design that prioritizes pedestrians, active modes, and transit over motorists. • 3 m pedestrian clearways • 2 m tree/planting zone • Uni-directional protected cycle tracks on each side which includes appropriate buffer space • Two-way vehicle operation (one travel lane per direction) • Uni-directional dedicated streetcar facility, or; • Bi-directional dedicated streetcar facility - protecting barricades installed for safety and horizontal curves are subject to discussion with TTC.	A planned right-of-way of 26.0 metres (22.0 metres adjacent to the Community Park) is being proposed, consistent with discussions during the design workshops held with the City of Toronto in recent months. This planned right-of-way will accommodate minimum 3.0 metre pedestrian clearways, a 2.0m planting zone, bi-directional cycle tracks (3.5 metres typical), a typical 6.6m wide pavement for vehicular traffic, and a minimum 3.5m dedicated TTC R.O.W. with 1.0 m edge zone for pole infrastructure.	BA		
N.32	Public Street C – Transportation Planning requests a consistent right-of-way width of 20 m with the following: • 2.1 m pedestrian clearways • 2 m tree/planting zone • Please see further comments from Urban Design on Streets and Vehicular Accesses • Uni-directional protected cycle tracks on each side • Two-way vehicle operation (one travel lane per direction)	Minimum 2.1 metre pedestrian clearways are provided together with tree planting zones are incorporated within the planned 20.0 metre public right-of-way. Two-way vehicle operation, with an additional westbound left-turn lane at the Park Lawn Road signalized intersection is also proposed consistent with prior submissions. Bicycle facilities connecting between Park Lawn Road and Street B are provided through Park Lawn Gardens POPS area.	BA		
N.33	Private Street D - Should be designed to integrate into the public realm and meet all the City's objectives for new streets. Public easements over the street will ensure public access.	Private Street D will be designed to integrate into the public realm and will be designed with the City's objectives in mind. Public easements over the street will ensure public access.	BA		
Existing and Proposed Public Streets external to applicants Draft Subdivision Plan					
N.34	Pubic Street A – The total ROW is subject to analysis from the TMP. Requested: • 3 m pedestrian clearways • 2 m tree/planting zone • Bi-directional bike facility/MUT with appropriate buffers • Vehicle operations and lane configuration subject to analysis from the TMP and review from City Planning, Transportation Services, TTC and Metrolinx	The design of Street A (relief road) is being done in coordination with the area TMP and review from the applicable departments. A fulsome design review of the appropriateness, location and design of a cycling facility along the relief road is being undertaken as part of the TMP process. It is of our opinion that a cycling facility along the south side of the relief road is not appropriate given the boulevard conflicts with the GO Station and school bus pick-up / drop-off and site driveways / private road intersections.	BA		
N.35	Park Lawn Road – under assessment by the TMP. Currently, the Official Plan identifies the right-of-way width of Park Lawn Road to be 36 m. Any conveyances required beyond 36 m to provide the below requests will be addressed through the Secondary Plan process: • 3 m pedestrian clearways • 2 m tree/planting zone • Bi-directional bike facility/MUT on the east side with appropriate buffers • Vehicle and operations and lane configuration subject to analysis from the TMP • Vehicle and transit operations and lane configuration subject to analysis from the TMP and review from City Planning, Transportation Services, TTC and Metrolinx	Park Lawn Road is designed to accommodate elements within a 36m ROW. The street is being designed with a minimum 3.0 metre bi-directional cycling facility on the east boulevard. 1.5 metre wide tree planting zones are being provided on either side of the cycling facility to provide adequate buffers. A minimum 2.4 metre wide pedestrian clearway is being provided on the east boulevard. No changes to the boulevard on the west side is being proposed.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.36	Lake Shore Boulevard West – Under assessment by the TMP. Currently, the Official Plan identifies the right-of-way width of Lake Shore Boulevard West to be 36 m. Any conveyances required beyond 36 m to provide the below requests will be addressed through the Secondary Plan process: • 3 m pedestrian clearways • 2 m tree/planting zone • Uni-directional protected cycle tracks on each side which includes appropriate buffer space (subject to further discussion with Transportation Services). • Vehicle and operations and lane configuration subject to analysis from the TMP • Vehicle and Transit operations and lane configuration subject to analysis from the TMP and review from City Planning, Transportation Services and TTC	Lake Shore Boulevard is designed to accommodate elements within a 36m ROW. The street is being designed with a minimum 3.0 metre wide pedestrian clearway on the north and south side of the street. A 2.1 metre pedestrian clearway is being provided in front of the new public park (Boulevard Square) to maintain a viable tree planting zone. 1.8 metre wide uni-directional cycle tracks are being proposed. A minimum 7.0 metre wide TTC dedicated centre-running right-of-way is being proposed, subject to TTC review.	BA		
Transit					
N.37	<u>Transit Hub and GO Station:</u> <u>Park Lawn Road:</u> • Transportation Planning appreciates and supports the concept for bus facilities on Park Lawn Road. The bus stops north of Lake Shore Boulevard should be placed so that they provide an excellent connection to the proposed Park Lawn GO Station. Both the northbound and southbound bus stops should include a connection to the GO Station platform. TTC will provide further direction on the appropriate locations and sizing. • May 20th TIS report 4.1.3 -- Bus Interchange Considerations (pg. 54-55): We request clarification on whether Metrolinx requires/anticipates any GO Bus service to the station. Can the proposed bus stops on Park Lawn Road and/or TTC streetcar loop accommodate GO Buses if necessary, whether for future regular GO Bus service, or for use by temporary shuttles in the case of disruption to GO Rail service?	Bus platforms are being incorporated into the design of Park Lawn Road at the new signalized intersection with the underground parking garage ramp. The location of these bus stops, adjacent to the signal provides pedestrians with a designated safe crossing location that will enable them to transfer to / from the GO station and streetcar loop. In addition, secondary accessible ramp accesses on the west side of Park Lawn Road will allow passengers to access the GO station platforms without a need to cross Park Lawn Road, if desired. No GO bus service has been identified by Metrolinx.	BA		
N.38	<u>Public Street B (Loop Road):</u> Transportation Planning is aware that additional materials were sent to the TTC (for review by BA Group to address the TTC's previous comments related to bi-directional vs. uni-directional streetcar service) however, staff have not yet received a thorough analysis to warrant a review, therefore, this analysis will be a requirement with the next submission. The design of Public Street B will be informed by the outcome of the TTC's review. See comments above regarding the preferred cross section width and minimum sizes of pedestrian clearways, landscaping, etc. • Transportation Planning supports the TTC's general comments on transit facilities and operations on Street B (Loop Road) as provided to the applicant on December 20, 2019. • Transportation Planning request clarification on the May 2020 TIS Report - Design Considerations (pg. 51): The Report notes TTC comments indicate that streetcar loop right-of-way does not need to accommodate bus operations in the same ROW. Discussion with the applicant and the TTC is required to clarify if there is an alternative arrangement to provide service to the station in the event of bus substitution for the 501/508 (e.g., to accommodate track work somewhere along those lines)?	Noted. A temporary bus service (during track work) route has not been identified. Buses can run on both the streetcar ROW and or the street.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Outstanding requests for resolution from March 25, 2020					
N.39	Transportation Planning and TTC request that the applicant conduct an analysis to determine whether double-track/bi-directional operation of streetcars may help reduce the potential bottlenecks at the accesses and egresses from Lake Shore Boulevard; this reduction would be beneficial to all road users.	This comment has been addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		
This comment reflects the May 2020 submission					
N.40	The analysis should evaluate this transit service design by considering the principles below: • Serving People - how well does the design meet the demand for travel in terms of helping passengers, drivers, goods and services get to where they need to go, and in terms of improving equity or fairness by bringing better transportation services to all parts of the city? • Strengthening Place - how well does the project strengthen and connect neighbourhoods, balance the functions of serving as a travel corridor and a place-building agent, and protect and enhance the quality of the site's urban environment? • Supporting Prosperity - how affordable is the project to build, operate and maintain, and how well does it support the city's economic development goals, improve its competitiveness, and deliver the greatest ridership/travel volumes at the least cost?	Noted.	BA		
APPENDIX A					
Travel Demand Forecasting and Traffic Operations					
Outstanding requests for resolution from March 25, 2020					
N.41	The future shares of various modes represent significant modal shifts (particularly to GO transit) and should be justified with regional travel demand modelling or other numerical analysis techniques combined with expert judgment. This has yet to be applied and is required revision.	The projected mode shifts were justified in the October 2019 OPA submission transportation report through a detailed review of proxy areas that are considered to have a similar context to the expected future context of the site, including transit access and land use mix and density. Engineering judgement was applied in considering to what extent information from each proxy area was relevant to the future context of the site area and appropriate mode shifts were estimated on this basis. Important to note is that the proxy data consistently demonstrated that in high density areas with convenient access to higher-order transit and reasonable travel times to Downtown, transit usage was high. These elements are all consistent with the future context of the site and are of strong relevance to expected future travel patterns in the area. Furthermore, inputs received from the City of Toronto based on EMME regional modelling have been compared against BA Group's forecasts in Section 6.5 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum. The comparison indicates that the forecasts prepared by BA Group can be considered as representative of the likely site trip generation, when compared with the outputs of the City's model and therefore provides further validation to the assumptions within the forecasting.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.42	Further explanation of the sources of the transit capacity numbers is required. It is unlikely that TTC or GO would operate services with the amount of excess capacity assumed. In the case of TTC, is the applicant looking at the capacity on the outer parts of a service which reaches capacity before most of these riders would be alighting? Continued discussion between Metrolinx, the City and the applicant is required to ensure that sufficient GO capacity can be provided to serve the subject site.	Transit capacity was calculated at the stops adjacent to the site based on existing ridership and projected additional transit ridership from the area in the future. Transit-oriented development and facilitating increased transit utilization is strongly and regularly supported through multiple City of Toronto and provincial policies and is a cornerstone of transportation planning. In this respect, transit service would and should be monitored and adjusted over time to respond to increasing demands as necessary. It is noted that TTC has not raised any concerns with regards to capacity of transit services. With respect to GO service specifically, as discussed in Section 6.7 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum, there is sufficient projected future capacity to service the projected GO Transit trips generated by the site when compared against the Metrolinx projections, with excess capacity available for the other surrounding development.	BA	Hatch	Transportation Impact Study Addendum
N.43	Trip distributions will need to be checked against the City's regional travel demand model (GTA Model v4) results. The City will be seeking measures to increase the amount of local trip making through resubmission of the TIS report required as part of the development review process.	The analysis has been updated to incorporate outputs from modelling received from the City. Details are provided in Section 6.0 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum. Given the mix of land uses proposed, local trip making associated with the proposal is expected to be notable, as outlined in the October 2019 OPA submission transportation report.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
N.44	Not all proxy sites used are comparable to the subject site. □ It has not been demonstrated that there will be sufficient office use in the local area to attract the number of trips the applicant has anticipated. The proxies of Yonge-Eglinton and Yonge-St Clair have significant local office employment comparatively and rapid transit service level frequencies of 3 minutes; thus, they are not considered appropriate proxy sites. □ Transportation Planning recommends the following proxies: Liberty Village/ Exhibition GO, and Dundas-Bloor West GO	While the context is not identical, Yonge-St Clair and Yonge-Eglinton are both considered to be strongly relevant to the expected future context of the site, particularly with respect to access to higher order transit, travel time to Downtown and mixed-use nature of the area. It is noted that Liberty Village and Bloor-Dundas were also considered and outlined in the TIS, along with Kipling and Mimico. Furthermore, as discussed above, inputs received from the City of Toronto based on EMME regional modelling have been compared against BA Group's forecasts in Section 6.5 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum. The comparison indicates that the forecasts prepared by BA Group can be considered as representative of the likely site trip generation, when compared with the outputs of the City's model and therefore provides further validation to the assumptions within the forecasting.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.45	The active transportation mode share appears ambitious and will require refined forecasting and TDM measures to support this outcome.	As outlined in the TIS, given the mixed-use nature of the site, substantial interaction is projected to occur between the proposed and surrounding land uses. The projected active transportation mode share includes these interaction assumptions. Overall, this approach is consistent with the comment above that indicates that the City will be seeking to increase the amount of local trip making and TDM measures to support this outcome will be implemented as part of the development. Furthermore, as discussed above, inputs received from the City of Toronto based on EMME regional modelling have been compared against BA Group's forecasts in Section 6.5 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum. The comparison indicates that the forecasts prepared by BA Group can be considered as representative of the likely site trip generation, when compared with the outputs of the City's model and therefore provides further validation to the assumptions within the forecasting.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
N.46	The applicant must demonstrate that there is sufficient unused capacity on the Lake Shore GO line to absorb all of these projected GO trips.	As reviewed in Section 6.7 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum, there is sufficient projected future capacity to service the projected GO Transit trips generated by the Site when compared against the Metrolinx projections, with excess capacity available for other surrounding development.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
The comments below reflect the May 2020 submission					
N.47	Trip generation and mode share for the two schools: o The applicant concludes 85% walk mode share for "local" students, and PUDO [pick-up/drop-off] mode share for the other 15%. It's not clear where this mode split comes from. Clarification is required. o PUDO city-wide is closer to 30% for elementary students (from TTS), so 15% seems low especially given the auto-centric land use surrounding the development. Clarification is required	The adopted 85% walk mode split and 15% PUDO mode split for local students was estimated on the basis of the context of the Site and surrounding area. Of particular note is that the local population expected to service the schools is largely located within an approximate 5 minute walk of the proposed schools, either within the Site itself or within the nearby buildings along Park Lawn Road, Lake Shore Boulevard West and Marine Parade Drive. Furthermore, robust pedestrian facilities are proposed in and around the site to facilitate and encourage pedestrian movements, including sidewalks, dedicated pedestrian spaces and signalized crosswalks across Lake Shore Boulevard West, Park Lawn Road and the proposed Street A (relief road). As a result, it is assumed that the majority of people travelling to and from the school locally would take advantage of the favourable proximity and pedestrian infrastructure. In this respect, travel patterns associated with trips to and from the school are expected to differ from those schools within the City which are located in more suburban contexts, where less people would live within such close proximity. As such, the city-wide PUDO mode split of 30% for elementary schools is not considered to be directly applicable in this instance. Furthermore, with the development of the Site as a mixed-use hub and the construction of the GO Station and associated transit hub, the Site and surrounding area into the future is not expected to be auto-centric, rather it is expected to facilitate and encourage transit and active transportation modes.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.48	School buses are being treated like local transit, but must be treated as a separate category as the behaviour is different. This must be revised.	The revised multimodal trip generation in Section 6.2 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum has categorized school bus separate to local transit.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
N.49	As a general comment, the pickup/drop-off mode share seems low considering how many planned PUDO areas are proposed on the site suggesting an over-supply of PUDO areas. Please see detailed comments on PUDO in the PUDO section of this memo.	The pick up/drop off areas currently shown on the plans is in response to Metrolinx's request for the provision of 30 pick up/drop off spaces.	BA		
N.50	The City led TMP is assessing the broader transportation network in the area which significantly impacts the application. Understandably, the applicant has not applied this assessment to their analysis because this work has not been completed.	As discussed above, the analysis has been updated to incorporate outputs from modelling received from the City. Details are provided in Section 6.0 of the Transportation Impact Study addendum.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
Bicycle Parking					
The comments below reflect the May 2020 submission					
N.51	No secured long-term bicycle parking facilities are to be located more than one level above grade or one level below grade within the development's blocks or GO Station lands.	Preference will be made for long-term bicycle parking to be located within one level of the ground floor. Should bicycle parking be located deeper within the basement, a mechanical mean (i.e. dedicated bicycle elevator) will be incorporated into the design to provide ease of access to the bicycle parking areas. Detailed design will be addressed during the Site Plan application stage.	BA		
N.52	Access to below-grade or above-grade secured long-term bicycle parking facilities are to be provided primarily with bicycle parking stairs (shallow grade stairs with bicycle rails), bicycle ramps, or dedicated bicycle elevators.	Noted.	BA		
N.53	Transportation Planning request that all short-term bicycle parking is to be located at-grade to improve visibility and convenience for visitors to the site.	An appropriate amount of short-term bicycle parking will be located at-grade on private property, POPS and public parks to improve visibility and convenience for visitors to the site. Short-term bicycle parking is also located within buildings with appropriate and visible wayfinding signage to maximize ease of access. ROW bicycle parking will also be provided and design during the SPA design process. Landscape drawing L203 illustrates 134 proposed surface bike parking spaces, not including ROW bicycle parking spaces.	BA	DTAH / GrossMax	Proposed Surface Bike Parking Drawing within the Landscape Drawings Package (L203), Basement Drawings
N.54	Transportation Planning request additional outdoor weather protected convenience bicycle parking located at-grade to improve visibility and convenience for visitors to the site.	Additional outdoor weather protected bicycle parking is being proposed within Station Square to improve visibility and convenience for visitors to the site. Additional outdoor covered bicycle parking may be considered at other locations within the Master Plan, during further stages of planning and design.	BA		
N.55	Transportation Planning request that bicycle repair facilities be provided for each phase of development within the secure designated long-term parking facilities. In addition, bicycle repair facilities should also be provided within the GO Station lands.	Noted. Bicycle repair facilities are an important TDM measure which helps improve the appeal of cycling as a mode of choice. They will be incorporated into the building design as part of the Site Plan Application stage of approval and design.	BA		
N.56	Transportation Planning request that the applicant work to secure a funding partnership to supply Toronto Public Bike share facilities in appropriate locations within Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces on-site and within the GO Station lands	Noted. Opportunities to locate Bike share facilities will need to be considered through the appropriate Site Plan Approval and Draft Plan of Subdivision process for respective phases of development, and may be considered on both public and private land. Any related funding partnerships / contributions should be identified as part of the finalization of development contributions package.	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
N.57	Note: • All transportation data sources used in the applicant's analysis should be included in appendices in the back of the Transportation Impact Study (TIS Report). This includes but is not limited to turning movement count sheets, signal timing plans, transit data, pedestrian count data etc. with the dates clearly indicated. If transportation data have been adopted from other studies, then that source data must also be included. • The resubmissions of the applicant's TIS REPORT in each stage of the development review process must reflect the TMP's findings. • Further to the above and given the uncertainty regarding forecasting on a 20 year buildout, all operations including proposed signals are subject to submission of subsequent Transportation Impact study updates (including signal warrant analyses) for each phase of development and are subject to approval by Transportation Services.	Noted. Transportation data sources were attached in the appendix of the October 2019 OPA transportation report.	BA		
	Parks, Forestry and Recreation, July 9, 2020	**Rosanne Clement, Manager, Development Unit**			
O	**General**				
O.1	Applicability of Parkland Dedication At the alternative rate of 0.4 hectares per 300 units specified in Chapter 415, Article III of the Toronto Municipal Code, the parkland dedication requirement is 95,187 m2 or 105.5 % of the net site area (net site area after public road conveyances: 90,243 m2). However, for sites that are greater than 5 hectares, a cap of 20% of the net site area is applied to the residential use while the non-residential use is subject to a 2% parkland dedication. In total, the parkland dedication requirement is 15,382 m2. The applicant is required to satisfy the parkland dedication requirement through an onsite dedication. The total land required to be conveyed is 15,382 m2 and the land must comply with Policy 3.2.3.8 of the Toronto Official Plan.	The revised proposal includes a 1 ha public a park and a 0.25 ha public park, with the remaining dedication requirement proposed to be met via cash-in-lieu.	USI		Planning Rationale Addendum
O.2	The applicant has proposed a 1 hectare parkland conveyance at in the central-north portion of the site, located north of Street B (the loop road) and west of Private Street D. The location of the park is acceptable, however, the proposed total parkland conveyance of 1 hectare represents an under dedication of approximately 5,382 m2. In order to satisfy the full parkland dedication requirements, the applicant must provide at minimum an additional 5,000m2 of parkland	Please see response to comment O.1. Total of 12,500 m2 parkland is proposed, with the remainder proposed as cash-in-lieu.	USI		Planning Rationale Addendum
O.3	The applicant is requested to expand the size of the proposed 1 hectare park by an additional 2,000-3,000m2. The expansion of the park should be north along Private Street D at the proposed location of Residential Building D3-3 as per the Subdivision Concept Plan P1, prepared by Adamson Associates Architects (dated by the Architect 05/04/20). The expansion of the park will achieve the City's vision for a larger community park in this high-density site and provide opportunities for outdoor public recreation facilities while serving a range of other passive and active recreation, community gathering, and ecological functions, to serve the anticipated future population of this development. The park addition must be in a shape appropriate for public programming, with no narrow pinch points.	The proposed large 1 ha onsite Community Park provides significant opportunities for a range of outdoor public recreation uses and facilities. It is noted that this area is in the highest quintile of parkland provision per capita in the City, and is already very well served. Onsite parkland dedication has now been expanded via the addition of a 0.25 ha public park in the revised proposal, helping to ensure delivery of additional public park facilities in the earlier phases of the project. Now over 80% of the parkland dedication requirement is proposed to be met through onsite dedication, with the remainder as cash-in-lieu. Recreational facilities are further augmented by a proposed community centre. Considered together alongside the range of additional POPS spaces proposed, this represents a truly exemplary range of facilities, ensuring the existing and future population's needs will be well-served.	USI		Planning Rationale Addendum

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
O.4	The remaining balance of the required parkland dedication should be achieved through a conveyance of another 2,000-3,000m2 of on-site parkland. PFR's preferred location for the second park is along Lake Shore Boulevard West. This second park would function as a local park and provide opportunities for passive and active recreation, civic and community activity space, and would be a gateway to the new community from the surrounding existing community. The park must have generous public street frontage(s) to provide the greatest possible benefits of safety, accessibility and visibility for those accessing the park. The park must be in a shape appropriate for public programming, with no narrow pinch points.	Please see response to comment O.3. An additional 0.25 ha park has been proposed along Lake Shore Boulevard West.	USI		Planning Rationale Addendum
O.5	Recommendation in the Planning Report PFR is interested in securing the design and construction, by the applicant, 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 clause will require the approval of City Council; *City Council approve a development charge credit against the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for the design and construction by the applicant of the Above Base Park Improvements to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry & Recreation (PFR). The development charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the applicant 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.*	Noted.	USI		
Conditions of Parkland Conveyance					
O.6	If this application is approved, the following conditions of approval are recommended to be included:				
Recommended Conditions of Approvals - Design Unit Comments					
O.7	1. *Sun and shadow conditions* - The development must be designed to support pedestrian comfort in the large community park and achieve a minimum of 5 hours of continuous sunlight on at least 90% of the park on the spring and autumn equinoxes.	The revised proposal exceed the proposed draft Secondary Plan metric, providing 6 continuous hours where 85% of the park is free of net new shadows at the equinoxes.	AAM	USI	Planning Rationale Addendum
O.8	2. *Wind Conditions* - Buildings must be located and massed to limit and/or mitigate wind impacts on the park. Wind conditions in the majority of the park must be suitable for sitting (long exposure).	In general, building locations and modifications to massing can have a positive influence on wind condition in the park space. However, a similar improvement to conditions can be achieved by the use of more localized features in the park itself. Strategically planned landscaping – green landscaping features (trees, bushes, topography) or hardscaping such as windscreens or art installations can achieve desired results. It is recommended that when the usage of the park space is established, local mitigation features be considered.	RWDI	A&M	Pedestrian Wind Study
O.9	3. *Park connections* –Connections must be provided from the community park to other open spaces, POPS, natural areas and parks in and surrounding the Secondary Plan Area through clear sightlines, trails, green streets, cycling lanes and signage. While the wide green streets and largos included in the proposal contribute to a well-designed public realm, a more visually and environmentally significant connection from the park to the South Mimico Creek Trail and the Martin Goodman Trail is required. A corridor between the above mentioned three sites that is pedestrian, cyclist, pollinator and animal friendly should be provided. PFR appreciates that the applicant has shown ramps from the GO station on the west side of Park Lawn in order to connect the site to the South Mimico Trail. Ramps should also be included on the east side in order to provide a safe and direct link from the South Mimico Trail to Station Square and beyond to the neighbourhood park.	The Master Plan and street network was designed with a multi-layered purpose that includes: providing green links into the community, existing streets and active transportation routes; creating a distinct and non-grid based neighbourhood; and mitigating strong lake winds. Unfortunately, it is not possible to provide a direct visual sightline to the Martin Goodman Trail or to the South Mimico Trail. Through conversations with Metrolinx, the west ramp has been replaced with elevator access to meet their winter maintenance needs. A ramp linking Station Square to South Mimico Trail is not financially feasible. In addition to providing green complete streets, the team proposes to incorporate comprehensive signage and wayfinding within the site that would highlight all of the internal and external public realm amenities.	BA	GrossMax/ DTAH	

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
O.10	4. *Proposed Park Programming* - The applicant has proposed a park program concept as part of their overall vision for the site, but it is important to note that the park design will be subject to a detailed process, which will include public engagement.	Understood. The design is a placeholder and tests different program uses but the team understands that the park design will be subject to a public process.	GrossMax/ DTAH	A&M	
Recommended Conditions of Approvals - Development Unit Comments					
Parkland Dedication					
O.11	1. The applicant shall convey the parkland prior to first condominium registration of any building within the Phase in which the parkland is located, per drawing, entitled, "Project Statistics by Phase (P1)", prepared by Adamson Associates Architects (dated by the Architect 05/15/20).	Noted.	USI		
O.12	2. The applicant will be required to convey the 15,382 m2 portion of the development site for public parkland purposes. The parkland conveyance is to be free and clear, above and below grade of all physical obstructions and easements, encumbrances and encroachments, including surface and subsurface easements, unless otherwise approved by the General Manager, PFR.	Please see response to comments O.1 - O.4. 1.25 ha of onsite parkland dedication is proposed, with the remainder to be met via cash-in-lieu.	USI		Planning Rationale Addendum
O.13	3. The applicant will be required to pay cash-in-lieu for any remaining balance of the parkland dedication prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit.	Noted.	USI		
O.14	4. Prior to the Issuance of the First Above Grade Building Permit, the Owner shall register a Section 118 Restriction, pursuant to the Land Titles Act, in priority, against title to the Park Block(s) to be conveyed in fee simple to the City for the purpose of the on-site parkland dedication, to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor, until such time that the lands are conveyed to the City, to the satisfaction of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation.	Noted.	USI		
O.15	5. The applicant is to pay for the costs of the preparation and registration of all relevant documents. The applicant shall provide to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor all legal descriptions and applicable reference plans of survey for the new parkland.	Noted.	USI		
Fire Separation Distance – Ontario Building Code (OBC)					
O.16	6. Prior to the fee simple transfer of the Park Blocks to the City, the Park Blocks shall nonetheless be deemed to be parkland in respect of the limiting distance requirements of the Ontario Building Code Act, 1992. Parks, Forestry & Recreation staff advises that the applicant must design the building to achieve Ontario Building Code (OBC) setbacks related to fire separation on their own site on the portions of the building that abut the park. The greater of a 5 m setback or the required setbacks which meet the OBC for fire separation will apply to any building located next to a park. Prior to the issuance of any above grade building permit, the applicant will be required to demonstrate adequately that the OBC requirements have been achieved to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.	FCR		
Environmental Assessment					
O.17	7. Prior to conveying the parkland to the City, the applicant must: 7.1. Submit a Qualified Person Preliminary Statement Letter, that is dated and signed by the applicant's Qualified Person, as defined in Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended, describing the lands to be conveyed to the City, and identifying what environmental documentation will be provided to the City's peer reviewer to support this conveyance; all environmental documentation consistent with O. Reg. 153/04 requirements shall be submitted with reliance extended to the City and its peer reviewer and any limitation on liability and indemnification is to be consistent with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, insurance requirements or such greater amount specified by the Executive Director, Engineering & Construction Services (ECS) and copy to the General Manager, PFR. (See the Policy for Accepting Potentially Contaminated Lands to be Conveyed to the City under the Planning Act adopted by City Council on February 10 and 11, 2015)	Noted.	FCR		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
O.18	7.2. Pay all costs associated with the City retaining a third-party peer reviewer including all administrative costs to the City and submit an initial deposit of $8,000.00 towards the cost of the Peer Review in the form of a certified cheque, to the Executive Director, ECS. The applicant must submit further deposits when requested to cover all costs of retaining a third-party peer reviewer;	Noted.	FCR		
O.19	7.3. Submit, to the satisfaction of the City's peer reviewer, all Environmental Site Assessment reports prepared in accordance with the Record of Site Condition Regulation (O. Reg. 153/04, as amended) describing the current conditions of the land to be conveyed to the City and the proposed Remedial Action Plan based on the site condition standards approach, to the Executive Director, ECS	Noted.	FCR		
O.20	7.4. At the completion of the site assessment/remediation process, submit a Statement from the Qualified Person based on the submitted environmental documents, to the Executive Director, ECS for peer review and concurrence, which states: 7.4.1. In the opinion of the Qualified Person: 7.4.1.1. It is either likely or unlikely that there is off-site contamination resulting from past land uses on the development site that has migrated onto adjacent City lands that would exceed the applicable Site Condition Standards; and 7.4.1.2. To the extent that the opinion in 7.4.1.1 is that past migration is likely, it is either possible or unlikely that such off-site contamination on adjacent City lands poses an adverse effect to the environment or human health. 7.4.2. Land to be conveyed to the City meets either: 7.4.2.1. the applicable Ministry Generic Site Condition Standards (Tables 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and 9; subject to applicable exemptions as stated in O. Reg. 153/04) for the most environmentally sensitive adjacent land use; or 7.4.2.2. the Property Specific Standards as approved by the Ministry for a Risk Assessment / Risk Management Plan which was conducted in accordance with the conditions set out herein.	Noted.	FCR		
O.21	7.5. The Qualified Person's statement, referenced in condition 7.1 above, will include a Reliance Letter that is dated and signed by the applicant's Qualified Person, as defined in O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, confirming that both the City and the City's peer reviewer can rely on the environmental documentation submitted, consistent with O. Reg. 153/04 requirements, and the Qualified Person's opinion as to the conditions of the site; all environmental documentation consistent with O. Reg. 153/04 requirements and opinions shall be submitted with reliance extended to the City and its peer reviewer and any limitation on liability and indemnification is to be consistent with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, insurance requirements or such greater amount specified by the Executive Director, ECS.	Noted.	FCR		
O.22	7.6. For conveyance of lands requiring a Record of Site Condition (RSC): 7.6.1. The applicant will File the Record of Site Condition (RSC) on the Ontario Environmental Site Registry; and 7.6.2. The applicant will submit the Ministry's Letter of Acknowledgement of Filing of the RSC confirming that the RSC has been prepared and filed in accordance with O. Reg. 153/04, as amended, to the Executive Director, ECS and to the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.	FCR		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Park Construction - Base Park Improvements					
O.23	8. The applicant, at their expense, will be responsible for the base construction and installation of the parkland. The Base Park Improvements include the following: a. Demolition, removal and disposal of all existing materials, buildings, foundations and associated servicing; b. Grading inclusive of 300mm depth topsoil supply and placement. Where lands have been environmentally risk assessed in accordance with MECP regulations, the required depth profile of the environmental soil / soft cap will be 1.5 m of engineered fill compacted to 95% SPD and certified by the consulting engineer; i. In the case of a risk-assessed site, all materials brought on site shall comply with the site-specific standards outlined in the Certificate of Property Use. In the case where no risk assessment of the site was required, all materials brought on site shall comply with the Ontario Reg. 153/04 Table 3 RPI standards; c. Sodding #1 nursery grade; d. Fencing, where deemed necessary; e. Sanitary and storm service connections with manholes at streetline; f. Water and electrical service connections; (minimum water: 50mm to the street line including backflow preventers, shut off valves, water metre and chamber; electrical connection to the street line and electrical panel in a lockable cabinet (100 Amp service)); g. Street trees along all public road allowances abutting City-owned parkland; and h. Standard park sign (separate certified cheque required).	Noted.	FCR		
O.24	9. All work is to be completed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.	FCR		
O.25	10. If any element of the Base Park Improvements are deemed to be unnecessary by the General Manager, PFR, the applicant will submit a certified cheque for the agreed upon value equivalent.	Noted.	FCR		
O.26	11. Prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit, the applicant shall submit a cost estimate and any necessary plans for the Base Park Improvements to the Park Block(s) to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.	FCR		
O.27	12. Prior to issuance of the first above grade building permit, the applicant shall post an irrevocable Letter of Credit in the amount of 120% of the value of the Base Park Improvements for the parkland to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. No credit shall be given towards the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for costs associated with Base Park Improvements. Regardless of the value of the Base Park Improvements Letter of Credit at the time that the Owner is required to construct the Base Park Improvements, the Owner is obligated to construct the Base Park Improvements in accordance with Section 8, whatever their cost might be a the time of construction.	Noted.	FCR		
O.28	13. The construction of the Base Park Improvements to the park blocks shall be completed upon Registration of Condominium for the first building within the Phase in which the parkland is located, per drawing, entitled, "Project Statistics by Phase (P1)", prepared by Adamson Associates Architects (dated by the Architect 05/15/20). Base Park construction must be completed to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. Unforeseen delays (e.g. weather) resulting in the late delivery of the park block shall be taken into consideration and at the discretion of the General Manager, PFR when determining a revised delivery date for the park block.	Noted.	FCR		
O.29	14. Should the applicant undertake Base Park Improvements on the park block following conveyance of the park block to the City, the applicant must obtain a Park Access Agreement (PAA) from PFR's Planning, Design and Development section. The PAA will outline in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, and duration to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The applicant will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the applicant on the park.	Noted.	FCR		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Temporary Fencing					
O.30	15. Prior to conveyance of the parkland, the applicant shall be responsible for the installation and maintenance of temporary fencing around the parkland until such time as the development of the park block is completed.	Noted.	FCR		
Parkland Grading and Drainage					
O.31	16. Prior to conveyance of the parkland, the applicant shall ensure that the grading and drainage of the adjacent development blocks are compatible with the grades of the parkland to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted. Plot elevations and entrances, site grading, Stormwater Strategy (including geocellular storage under the park) and the landscape layout are being designed in a coordinated way to meet the standards.	Arup		Grading Plan
O.32	17. The applicant must provide documentation from a qualified environmental engineer that any fill or topsoil brought onto the site meets all applicable laws, regulations and guidelines for use in a public park.	Noted.	FCR		
Credit against DCs for Above Base Park Improvements					
O.33	Should the applicant agree to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements for a development charge credit against the parks and Recreation component of the Development charges, the following condition applies: 18. The applicant agrees to design and construct the Above Base Park Improvements to the new parklands for a development charge credit against Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The development charge credit shall be in an amount that is the lesser of the cost to the applicant of installing the Above Base Park Improvements, as approved by the General Manager, PFR, and the Parks and Recreation component of Development Charges payable for the development in accordance with the City's Development Charges By-law, as may be amended from time to time. The applicant is required to submit a design and cost estimate to be approved by the General Manager, PFR, and a letter of credit equal to 120% of the Parks and Recreation Development Charges payable for the development. The design, cost estimate and ultimately the letter of credit will be required prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit.	Noted.	FCR		
Above Base Park Improvements					
O.34	19. The applicant will be responsible for designing and constructing the Above Base Park Improvements to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. Areas to be addressed in the design of the Park are: park programming, sustainable design and plantings, community and public safety, ground surface treatments, seating, vandalism prevention etc. Final design and programming of the parkland shall be at the discretion of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.	FCR		
O.35	20. Prior to the issuance of the first above grade building permit building within the Phase in which the parkland is located, per drawing, entitled, "Project Statistics by Phase (P1)", prepared by Adamson Associates Architects (dated by the Architect 05/15/20), the applicant is required to submit working drawings, specifications and landscape plans showing the scope and detail of the work for the Above Base Park improvements for review and approval by the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.	FCR		
O.36	21. The construction of Above Park Improvements to the park block shall be completed upon Registration of Condominium for the first building within the Phase in which the parkland is located, per drawing, entitled, "Project Statistics by Phase (P1)", prepared by Adamson Associates Architects (dated by the Architect 05/15/20). Above Base Improvements must be to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. Unforeseen delays (e.g. weather) resulting in the late delivery of the park block shall be taken into consideration and at the discretion of the General Manager, PFR when determining a revised delivery date for the park block.	Noted.	FCR		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
O.37	22. Should the applicant undertake Base Park Improvements on the park block following conveyance of the park block to the City, the applicant must obtain a Park Access Agreement (PAA) from PFR's Planning, Design and Development section. The PAA will outline in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, and duration to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The applicant will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the applicant on the park.	Noted.	FCR		
Warranty					
O.38	23. The applicant, upon satisfactory completion of the construction and installation of the Above Base and Base Park Improvements shall be required to guarantee such work and associated materials. The applicant shall provide certification from their Landscape Architect certifying that all work has been completed in accordance with the approved drawings. Should the cost to construct the Above Base Park Improvements as approved by the General Manager, PFR be less than the Parks and Recreation component of the Development Charges for the development, the difference shall be paid to the City by certified cheque prior to a reduction of the Above Base Park Improvement Letter of Credit. Upon the City's acceptance of the certificate, the Letter(s) of Credit will be released less 20% which will be retained for the 2 year guarantee period known as the Parkland Warranty Period.	Noted.	FCR		
O.39	24. Upon the expiry of the Parkland Warranty Period, the outstanding park security shall be released to the applicant provided that all deficiencies have been rectified to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR.	Noted.	FCR		
O.40	25. As-built drawings in print/hardcopy and electronic format, as well as a georeferenced AutoCAD file, shall be submitted to PFR. The submission must include a complete set of "as built" plans provided electronically on CD in PDF format and in a georeferenced AutoCAD file, and two (2) sets of full sized bond hard copies. The plans shall include, but not limited to: specifications locations of all hidden services, and all deviations from the design drawings, shop drawings, inspection reports, minutes of meeting, site instructions, change orders, invoices, certificates, progress images, warrantees, close out documentation, compliance letters (for any play structures and safety surfaces), manuals etc. The files are to be organized in folders, including a file index and submitted with written warranties and related documents such as lists of contractor, sub-contractors together with contact persons, telephone numbers, warranty expiry dates and operation manuals.	Noted.	FCR		
O.41	26. Spare or replacement parts, special tools, etc. as provided by manufacturers, if any, are to be provided to PFR.	Noted.	FCR		
Advisory Comments - Parkland Occupation - Construction Staging					
O.42	The stockpiling of any soils or materials or use as an interim construction staging area on the conveyed parkland is prohibited unless an agreement, other than a Park Access Agreement, has been obtained from the Manager of Business Services PFR– Christina Iacovino, 416-392-8578. The agreement, if approved, will outline in detail the insurance requirements, extent of area permitted, permitted use, tree removal and replacement, duration, restoration plan and costs, and compensation to the satisfaction of the General Manager, PFR. The agreement must be secured prior to the issuance of any shoring and excavation permits. The applicant will indemnify the City against any claim during any interim use of or work carried out by the applicant on the park. Any compensation accrued shall be applied to park improvements within the ward in consultation with the Ward Councillor.	Noted.	FCR		
O.43	The applicant will be required to provide an environmental assessment report, prepared by a Qualified Person, at the end of the permitted occupation to verify that the parklands continue to meet the applicable laws, regulations and guidelines respecting sites to be used for public park purposes. If deemed necessary, the applicant may be required to provide an RSC after the staging period. The applicant will be responsible for paying all costs associated with the City retaining a third-party peer reviewer for the environmental addendum and for another RSC if required. The construction of the park shall commence only after the verification that the parklands continue to meet the applicable laws, regulations and guidelines respecting sites to be used for public park purposes.	Noted.	FCR		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Section 37 Benefits: Community Recreation Centre					
O.44	If the applicant of the property enters into a Section 37 Agreement with the City as part of this development application, this unit requests to be involved in the negotiations. Funds directed towards parks and facilities within the Ward should form part of the benefits package.	Noted. Section 37 conversation with the City has been ongoing and it is understood that this has involved PFR.	USI		
O.45	As indicated in the City's consolidated Without Prejudice comments to the applicant in March 2020, PFR is requesting a 65,000 square foot community recreation centre ('CRC') to be provided as a Section 37 benefit.	Noted. Please see response to comment B.4. A potential Community Centre has been proposed in the current Master Plan proposal within Block E, at a location specified by PFR as being preferred. Voluntary provision of this facility is subject to further Section 37 negotiation, and approval of proposed densities.	USI		Planning Rationale Addendum
O.46	The applicant's latest submission contains no indication of a CRC as part of the proposed development. PFR acknowledges the applicant's position that the package of community benefits that will be delivered to the City must be understood holistically, as there are various other community benefits that are being explored/requested. However, PFR is also concerned that no space for a CRC has been identified or mentioned in this submission. As indicated in March 2020, the preferred location for the CRC is within Block E, along Lake Shore Boulevard West, north of the Loop Road. This location allows for the CRC to be in a highly visible and accessible location, with frontage on a major street and across from the proposed on-site park. Design parameters for the CRC are shown in Appendix 1 of the March 2020 comments.	Noted. Please see response to comments B.4 and O.45.	USI		Planning Rationale Addendum
Park/School Interface					
O.47	As indicated in the March 2020 comments, PFR's primary objective is to preserve as much public access to the park for the surrounding growing community. The applicant is requested to work with the school boards to maximize the schools' outdoor exterior play and recess areas for all students both within private green space at grade and on the building podium(s). Schools should meet their open space requirements on their own land and the applicant cannot assume that parkland will function as the school's open space.	Conversation is ongoing with the School Boards, including the spatial requirements of outdoor playspace. The current Master Plan proposal maximizes the podium playspaces. Further discussions are required with the City and the School Boards on the potential to co-locate a school yard within the Community Park.	USI		
Pet Amenities					
O.48	The applicant's proposed Urban Design Guidelines indicate that the park should provide space for pets. However, given the current rise in dog-owning populations, especially within high-density developments, the applicant is expected to provide on-site dog amenities with proper disposal facilities such as dog relief stations within the buildings to accommodate future residents' needs and help alleviate pressure on parks. Please refer to Toronto's Pet Friendly Design Guidelines and Best Practices for New Multi-Unit Buildings.	Noted.	USI		
Water Tower					
O.49	The applicant's Heritage Assessment Plan, prepared by ERA Architects INC in 2019, recognizes the cultural heritage of the existing water tower. The Plan proposes the temporary removal of the water tower in order to accommodate the construction of Street "A" followed ultimately by the conservation and relocation of the tower onto the lands proposed to be conveyed as parkland.	Noted.	ERA		
O.50	PFR does not support the recommendation in the Heritage Assessment Plan. PFR's position is that the water tower should not be located on future parkland. The preferred location for the water tower is on a POPS within the site.	In response to this comment, the water tower is proposed to be located within Station Square, a prominent POPS within the Site.	ERA		Heritage Impact Assessment
O.51	Any relocation, alteration, and programing proposals for the water tower should be reviewed and approved by Heritage Infrastructure and Development Services.	Noted.	ERA		
Urban Forestry					
O.52	Comments regarding any necessary street tree plantings and requirements under the Trees Bylaw or the Ravine and Natural Feature Protection Bylaw will be forwarded directly to your attention by Urban Forestry.	Noted.	DTAH		
	Urban Forestry, July 9 2020	**Max Dida, Supervisor - Tree Protection & Plan Review, Etobicoke York District**			
P	**General**				

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
P.1	Toronto's urban forest plays an important role in making Toronto a clean and beautiful city. Trees significantly enhance all new development and renewal projects, enhancing both the quality and value of our environment. The City's Official Plan recommends policies that have been adopted by City Council that call for an increase in the amount of tree canopy coverage. City Council has adopted the objective of increasing the existing 28 percent tree canopy coverage to 40 percent. The planting of large growing shade trees on both public and private lands should be an important objective for all development projects. The early co-ordination of utilities and other infrastructure elements with the soil volume and air space required to permit the growth of large growing trees is particularly important.	Noted. Please refer to the TGS checklist as well as landscape drawings that illustrate the draft ROW planting plan and soil volume.	DTAH	GrossMax	TGS Checklist ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200,L201)
Comments - Official Plan Amendment Application					
P.1	Urban Forestry has reviewed the submitted materials and does not object to the proposed Official Plan Amendment. We recommend that the following specific objectives should be incorporated into the policies of the proposed in the future circulations:	Noted.	DTAH	GrossMax	
P.3	A. At the earliest stages of design, special attention should be given to the retention and protection of existing healthy mature trees, located on City road allowance or private property, over the planting of new/replacement trees, as large mature trees provide significantly greater contributions (e.g. environmental, community benefits) than new or small trees. Please be advised that there are existing by-law protected trees, located on City road allowance and private property.	Currently, the Master Plan does assume the removal of all trees on private property. We are in agreement with the planting of large canopy trees for long-term benefits in the proposed design. The existing trees in the ROW, including by-law protected trees, will require further examination as there may be conflicts with the proposed cross section of both Lake Shore Blvd W and Park Lawn Rd. The team will work together with TS and Urban Forestry to come to a resolution.	DTAH	GrossMax	Landscape Drawings (L100 and L102)
P.4	B. The proposed new public and private road(s) should be designed to city standards including satisfactory street tree planting with sufficient soil volumes (minimum 30m3 of soil per tree or shared trees) to allow the growth of large growing shade trees to maturity, and planning municipal servicing and utilities in a manner that is compatible with trees existing within the road allowance.	Noted. Please refer to Landscape Drawings. Coordination along Lake Shore Blvd W and Park Lawn Rd will require future coordination with TS and Urban Forestry.	DTAH	GrossMax	ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200)
P.5	C. Buildings and underground building structures should be designed and built with sufficient setbacks from the property lines, proposed and existing public and private roads, to allow for the satisfactory planting of large growing shade trees on private and/or city road allowances as per the City of Toronto specifications.	Noted. The building setbacks have been coordinated with the City of Toronto. This submission includes setback modifications as a result from collaborative workshops between City of Toronto staff and the project team.	DTAH/GrossMax	A&M	Architectural Drawings
P.6	D. The development of land should be designed and built from the earliest stages with sufficient soft landscape area in order to achieve or exceed the city's private and public (street) tree planting requirements, as defined under the Toronto Green Standard – Version 3, Tier 1 of the Ecology section.	Noted.	DTAH	GrossMax	TGS Checklist; Proposed ROW landscape planting plans (L-201).
Comments - Zoning By-law Amendment Application					
P.7	Prior to approval of any zoning bylaw amendment application, the applicant is advised to demonstrate that they can comply with all elements of the city's Toronto Green Standards, including the parts of the ecology section, which pertain to existing and proposed trees.	Please refer to the TGS Checklist. A number of items within the Ecology section will require detailed design which will be completed at Site Plan stage. These items are noted on the TGS checklist.	DTAH	GrossMax	TGS Checklist
P.8	The applicant is advised to provide designs with greater opportunities for the planting of long-lived native and large shade trees in situations or environments where their growth to maturity would be unconstrained.	Noted and agreed. Please see the proposed ROW planting plans.	DTAH	GrossMax	ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200)

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
P.9	Urban Forestry directs Community Planning to the following sections of the Official Plan, which support our position: Section 3.4.1: The Natural Environment 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. Please see the proposed ROW planting plans.	DTAH	GrossMax	ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200)
Comments - Existing Trees					
P.10	1. Where it is not possible to retain a tree that qualifies for protection under the City of Toronto's Tree By-law (s), or where construction activity will encroach upon a protected tree's minimum tree protection zone, it will be necessary for the applicant to submit an application requesting permission to injure or destroy the trees in question to Urban Forestry. There is a fee of $362.33 (subject to change) for each tree included in an application. Payment may be made by certified cheque, money order, Visa, MasterCard, AMEX or debit, and must be submitted with the application. The application fee for boundary/neighbour trees is $758.52 (subject to change) for each tree included in an application;	Noted.	Hatch	FCR	
P.11	2. Where the trunk of a private bylaw tree to be injured or removed straddles the property line, or is wholly located on an adjacent property, Urban Forestry will notify the owner(s) of the tree(s) that an application to injure or destroy the tree(s) has been received. In cases where neighbouring trees will be affected, it is strongly recommended that the applicant contact the property owner to discuss protection of the trees, or if this is not possible, removal and replacement. A permit to injure or destroy trees does not grant authority to injure or destroy neighbouring trees or encroach in any manner onto adjacent private properties without the neighbouring owner's consent. The applicant is advised that the determination of ownership of any subject tree(s) is the responsibility of the applicant and any civil or common-law issues which may exist between property owners with respect to trees must be resolved by the applicant;	Noted.	Hatch		
P.12	3. The arborist report is indicating that tree nos. 91 to 117, 186 to 218 and 220 to 235, are protected under Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 608, Parks, Article VII, categorized under City of Toronto tree category 3. The applicant is advised that there is no City parkland within the area of the proposed construction (study area). It is Urban Forestry's opinion that the land were these trees are located is MTO land, however it is the applicant responsibility to clarify. Please review and revise accordingly;	Trees located in this area have been identified as City Park trees. This land is considered City land according to the land Registry. With respect to the City's Tree Category - trees located here were identified as Category 3 trees.	Hatch		
P.13	4. The applicant is advised that tree nos. 186 to 192 are protected under the Ravine and Natural Feature Protection by-law and should be categorized under City of Toronto tree category 4. Please review and revise accordingly.	These have been revised to be categorized under City of Toronto tree category 4.	Hatch		
P.14	5. The applicant is advised that the area north and north-west of 2150 Lake Shore Blvd West, is not part and/or not included on the Survey Plans and/or Topo Survey Plans provided with this application. Also, this area is not included on the Draft Plan of Subdivision provided. Urban Forestry requires a revised Survey Plans, Topo Survey plans and Draft Plan of Subdivision indicating all areas of the proposed construction included on the Study Area and Project Location area as per the Tree Preservation Plan, Figure B;	The Draft Plan of Subdivision have been updated along with the Arborist Report. A Tree Preservation Plan is included in the submission but please note that as all trees will be removed. As mentioned above, the existing trees along Lake Shore Blvd W and Park Lawn Rd will need to be coordinated between TS and Urban Forestry. The ROW cross sections differs than the existing, which would result in the loss of the existing trees and addition of new street trees with appropriate soil volumes.	DTAH	GrossMax	Draft Plan of Subdivision, Arborist Report, Tree Preservation Plan (L100-L102)
P.15	6. The applicant is advised that the appropriate tree protection hoarding is not shown. Please provide revised Tree Preservation Plan(s) indicating locations where protective hoarding is to be installed for all trees;	There is no tree hoarding identified as all site and ROW trees will be removed.	DTAH	GrossMax	Tree Preservation Plan (L100-L102)

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
P.16	7. The current provided Site Plan does not show existing protected trees that would be affected by the proposed development. Urban Forestry requires revised Site Plan as well as Grading and Servicing Plans and Composite Utility Plan showing all protected trees to be removed, injured or preserved with appropriate tree protection hoarding for remaining trees on or within 6.0 m of the subject site;	There is no tree hoarding or protected trees identified as all site and ROW trees will be removed.	DTAH	GrossMax	Tree Preservation Plan (L100-L102)
P.17	8. The Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan(s) indicates existing by-law protected trees, located on City road allowance and private property, that are proposed to be removed and injured, to facilitate the proposed development. However, it is unclear the reason for the removal and/or injury of several trees. For example, City road allowance trees, tree nos. 118 to 126, have been proposed to be removed and tree nos. 135 to 138 and 148 to 151 to be injured. Please provide more information in the revised report(s);	These trees are no longer included in the Tree Preservation Plan figures as they are located outside of the Study Area, and are not anticipated to be impacted.	Hatch		
P.18	9. If approval is granted for removal of City-owned trees, the owner is advised that a Tree Amenity Value is required to cover the appraised value, removal and replacement costs for trees involved. An Agreement for Contractors to Perform Arboricultural Services on City Owned Street Trees must be completed and submitted to Urban Forestry for approval prior to any work to be performed on trees located on the City road allowance.	Noted.	Hatch		
P.19	10. The owner is advised that submission of an application does not guarantee a permit will be issued. Once a completed application is submitted, a notice of application may be posted at the site for 14 days to provide an opportunity for the community to submit comments. Once the notice expires, Urban Forestry consults with the Ward Councillor to determine if a permit to injure or destroy trees should be issued. Urban Forestry may be required to submit a report to the Etobicoke York Community Council to consider the application and as part of the review process; you may be required to submit revised plans to address the intent of the tree by-laws as indicated above.	Noted	Hatch		
P.20	11. Urban Forestry advises that removal/injury of bylaw-protected trees may not occur until the prior written approval of the General Manager, Parks Forestry and Recreation, has been issued to the applicant by Urban Forestry (Tree Protection & Plan Review), and the works that require the tree removals/injuries are permitted and commence (or are imminent) in accordance with approved plans.	Noted	Hatch		
Comments - Tree Planting					
P.21	1. Urban Forestry TPPR administers two tree planting requirements: the planting of trees as required under the Toronto Green Standard (TGS), and the planting of trees required under the city's tree bylaws as a result of the removal of protected trees (private and city-owned). For trees to be deemed satisfactory under either requirement, they must be i) large growing long lived species (preferably native shade trees), ii) have access to the required soil volumes, and iii) be spaced appropriately; a) Bylaw-required tree planting: Under this application, as a result of number tbd private tree removals the planting of number tbd satisfactory replacement trees on the site (excluding the ROW) will be required (standard replanting ratio of 3:1). Payment in lieu of bylaw-required planting will be accepted for the shortfall between the number of trees required and the number of satisfactory trees proposed. The payment amount is calculated based on $583 per tree.	The City has required the following compensation ratio for the removal of trees on past projects : Private Removal 1:1 ; City Removal 3:1 City Injury 1:1; Ravine Removal 3:1 Injury 1:1; Park Removal 3:1 Injury 1:1. These compensation ratios were applied to impacted trees in the revised Arborist Report.	Hatch		Arborist Report
P.22	2. Please be advised that there is no information provided regarding the trees species, tree species size, the quantity of tree species on Context Site & Landscape Plan & Tower Separation, prepared by Allies and Morrison LLP, revision no. P2, dated May 15, 2020. Please review and revise accordingly;	Please refer to proposed ROW landscape planting plans and tree planting plan.	DTAH	GrossMax	ROW Landscape Planting Plan and planting plans in Landscape Drawing Package (L200-L202)

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
P.23	3. For landscaped open space areas over any underground structure, including parking structures, where tree planting is proposed, the applicant must provide and maintain the following: □ minimum of 1200 mm between the top of the structure and the final grade at the base of the tree is required; □ this 1200 mm includes any protective board over waterproofing membranes, any insulation that would be required in the case of a heated structure below, an engineered drainage layer and the specified soil; □ the soil specifications are: a minimum of 600 mm of sandy loam soil, comprising of 50 to 60% sand, 20 to 40% silt, 6 to 10% clay, 2 to 5% organic with pH of 7.5 or less; □ the sandy loam soil must be topped with a minimum 300 mm of minimum 2 year old woodchip mulch. The first lift of mulch must be dug-in with the sandy loam soil; □ each tree requires a minimum of 30 m3 of soil/tree, or 20m3/tree if planted collectively. It is recommended that the 30 m3 of soil for each tree is contiguous in order for the trees to share the soil volume for their mutual benefit.	Noted. Minimum of 1200mm is targeted. Detailed drawings will be submitted at the SPA stage.	DTAH	GrossMax	ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200)
P.24	4. It is essential to plan the locations of utilities early in the development process to ensure that sufficient tree planting can be accommodated and that the installation of any proposed utilities will be done in a way to avoid conflict with any tree plantings. For example, utility boxes or poles should be grouped together and all underground utilities proposed should be constructed in a common trench (a cross section is required). It is not acceptable to eliminate tree planting locations for the installation of utilities. Final adjustments to tree planting locations must be decided in conjunction with a complete Composite Utility Plan (CUP) that shows all existing and proposed above ground and below ground utilities along with the proposed tree plantings. Urban Forestry requires a CUP accompanying the Landscape Plans and Landscape Details showing the locations for proposed street trees and all utilities to be installed on the City road allowance;	Noted.	DTAH	GrossMax	ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200)
Comments - Draft Plan of Subdivision					
Recommended Conditions of Approval					
P.25	1. Prior to the registration of the plan of subdivision, the Owner agrees to provide a street tree planting plan, in conjunction with a composite utility plan that indicates the species, size, and location of all proposed street trees, as these relate to the location of any roads, sidewalks, driveways, street lines and utilities. The street tree planting plan will be to the satisfaction of Parks, Forestry and Recreation.	Noted. Please see the proposed ROW planting plans and coordinated CUP drawing.	DTAH/GrossMax	Arup	ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200), Composite Landscapeand Utilities Plan in Civil Drawings (LSB-ARP-XX-XX-DR-CU-80000)
P.26	2. Prior to the registration of the plan of subdivision, the Owner agrees to post a Letter of Credit in the form and from an institution, acceptable to the City Treasurer, equivalent to $583 per tree, as a Financial Security, to guarantee the planting including the maintenance of the street trees for a minimum period of two (2) years to the satisfaction of Parks, Forestry and Recreation.	Noted.	DTAH	GrossMax	
P.27	3. Prior to acceptance of engineering drawings by Engineering and Construction Services, the Owner agrees to provide a composite utility plan, showing the location of all underground and above ground utilities, as well as proposed tree planting locations, to the satisfaction of Parks, Forestry and Recreation and Engineering and Construction Services.	Noted. Please see the proposed ROW planting plans and coordinated CUP drawing.	DTAH	GrossMax	ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200), Composite Landscape and Utilities Plan in Civil Drawings (LSB-ARP-XX-XX-DR-CU-80000)
P.28	4. The Owner agrees to contact Parks, Forestry and Recreation, Tree Protection and Plan Review or his/her designate prior to commencement of street tree planting. The Owner further agrees to plant the street trees in accordance with the approved street tree planting and composite utility plans, to the satisfaction of Parks, Forestry and Recreation.	Noted.	DTAH	GrossMax	

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
P.29	5. Following the planting of the street trees, the Owner agrees to provide a Certificate of Completion of Work and an as-installed plant list in the form of a spreadsheet identifying the street trees, as shown on the approved planting plan, by street address. The as-installed plant list will also include tree species, caliper, condition and specific location of the trees by identifying two points of references (i.e. distances in metres from the curb, sidewalk, driveway, utility pole or pedestal).	Noted.	DTAH	GrossMax	
P.30	Urban Forestry also advises the applicant that all requirements and related approval process of the City's Tree By-laws must be completed prior to Community Planning's Final Zoning Amendment Report to Community/City Council for this application.	Noted.	Hatch	DTAH/GrossMax	
	Urban Forestry Ravine & Natural Feature Protection, June 8, 2020	**Yaroslaw Medwidsky, Project Manager, Ravine & Natural Feature Protection**			
Q	**General**				
Q.1	A small portion of the proposed public street A is subject to provisions of the City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 658 – Ravine & Natural Feature Protection. The application and plans have been reviewed by RNFP on behalf of the General Manager of Parks, Forestry & Recreation. The information below represents comments from RNFP regarding that portion of the property, which is protected by the City's Ravine & Natural Feature Protection by-law.	Trees located on ravine designated lands have been identified in the revised Tree Inventory Table, Tree Preservation Plan and Arborist Report.	Hatch		
Q.2	RNFP does not object to the Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision, in principle, subject to the applicant addressing the following comments under the City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 658 – Ravine & Natural Feature Protection at time of Draft Plan of Subdivision and/or Site Plan Approval.	Noted. The design will progress during SPA.	DTAH	GrossMax	
1) Additional/Revised Plans Required					
Q.4	<u>Arborist Report</u> The applicant/owner shall submit a revised arborist report to RNFP for review and approval. The arborist report shall be completed to the minimum standard detailed in the City's document "Guidelines for Completion of an Arborist Report" at www.toronto.ca/trees/ravines and the satisfaction of RNFP. The Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan indicates that six (6) ravine trees will be injured to facilitate the proposed development. However, it is not clear the cause(s) of these tree injuries. More construction details should be provided in the revised report.	Please see the revised Arborist Report. In the revised report, it is noted that there are no injuries anticipated for ravine trees, but only removals. These are for trees located on the East side of Park Lawn and in the NW corner of the project site. Please also refer to the proposed ROW landscape plans. More detailed construction details will be provided during the Site Plan stage.	Hatch	DTAH	Arborist Report, ROW Landscape Planting Plan in Landscape Drawing Package (L200)
Q.5	<u>RNFP By-law Note</u> The applicant/owner shall add the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection By-law note (below) to all site and construction drawings, to advise contractors of the regulated area, and the penalties associated with unauthorised activities: *Ravine & Natural Feature Protection By-law* *The Ravine & Natural Feature Protection By-law, Chapter 658 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code regulates the injury and destruction of trees, dumping of refuse and changes to grade within protected areas defined in Schedule A.* *Under this by-law protected trees may not be removed, injured or destroyed, and protected grades may not be altered, without written authorisation from Urban Forestry Ravine & Natural Feature Protection, on behalf of the General Manager of Parks, Forestry & Recreation.* *Convictions of offences respecting the regulations in the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection By-law are subject to fines, and the landowner may be ordered by the court to restore the area to the satisfaction of the City. A person convicted of an offence under this By-law is liable to a minimum fine of $500 and a maximum fine of $100,000 for each tree destroyed, a maximum fine of $100,000 for any other offence committed under this chapter, and/or a Special fine of $100,000. A person convicted of a continuing offence, including failure to comply with ravine permit conditions is liable to a maximum fine of not more than $10,000 for each day or part of a day that the offence continues. RNFP 0608*	Noted.	Hatch		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Q.6	Sediment Controls The applicant/owner shall submit a legible sediment control plan with an appropriate scale indicating location of sediment control measures that shall be in place during construction to RNFP for review and approval. Sediment control measures shall adhere to Ontario Provincial Standards (OPSD-219.130).	Sediment control plan will be submitted at the site plan stage, as construction staging details have not been determined at this stage.	Arup		
Q.7	Landscape/Planting Plans The applicant/owner shall submit a legible landscape/planting plan with an appropriate scale to RNFP for review and approval. The plan shall detail all proposed soft/hard landscaping surfaces plus proposed improvements to the natural environment including proposed tree and shrub species, the proposed quantities sizes, and locations.	Please refer to the Landscape Drawings that denotes planting beds and plant material.	Hatch	DTAH	Landscape Drawings
2) Advisory Comments					
Q.8	Toronto Green Standards The applicant/owner shall submit an updated Toronto Green Standards (TGS) to RNFP for review and confirm that items under Tier 1 Ecology regarding urban forestry to be met within RNFP Limit.	An updated TGS checklist (Tier 1) have been submitted including items relating to ecology. A number of items within the Ecology section will require detailed design which will be completed at Site Plan stage. These items are noted on the TGS checklist. We understand that the checklist will be circulated to RNFP.	Arup		
Q.9	RNFP Permit Application – Tree Removal/Injury Trees on private property, protected by the Ravine & Natural Feature Protection By-law will be injured or destroyed if this site plan is approved. Trees protected by this bylaw may not be removed, injured or destroyed without written authorisation from RNFP. The applicant/owner will be required to obtain a RNFP Permit from RNFP. This permit may be subject to conditions.	Noted.	Hatch		

	Toronto Transit Commission, August 6, 2020	Anjhela Salonga, Senior Transportation Planner - Project Development and Planning			
TTC Ref IDs	**General**				
	We have reviewed the plans with respect to transit and the related transit infrastructure, and have provided comments in the attached consolidated response table. The attached table also includes comments that TTC has submitted on previous design submissions to First Capital's consultants and TTC has yet to receive formal responses to these comments.	Noted.	BA		
	Please note comments in response to BA Group's Christie's 2041 Streetcar Operations Analysis sent to TTC on July 24, 2020 will be submitted separately upon further discussions with the City and First Capital's consultants.	Noted.	BA		
	Should temporary lane closures and/or stop relocations be required as part of the developer's construction management plan, TTC requires that the developer contact TTC Closures and Diversions at least 16 weeks prior to the planned construction work. TTC may require the developer to pay fees associated with the proposed work due to considerations such as service diversions and/or other temporary structural requirements.	Noted.	BA		
Comments - WIP Functional Plan dated February 13, 2020					
SP-01	~~TTC Transit Stops Planning prefers the S1 and N3 stop locations identified on the attached plan.~~ ● Stops need to be designed as per TTC's Stop Design Guidelines and accommodate for 2 standard buses (28m - tangent and the platform) at each stop. **Comment no longer applies, refer to comment 43.**	Noted.	BA		
SP-02	Cycling Design ● Will there be a proposed design for bicycle lanes on Park Lawn?	A bi-directional cycling facility on the east boulevard of Park Lawn Road provides a dedicated cycle facility between the Martin Goodman Trail access at the intersection of Park Lawn / Lake Shore Boulevard, and the Lake Shore Boulevard cycle track facility and the secured, and covered station bicycle parking, accessed at the lower level of the station building, off Park Lawn Road).	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
SP-03	Queue Jump Lanes ● Any proposed queue jump lanes and potential requirements for queue jump lanes will need to be reviewed and approved by the Transit Priority Measures Working Group.	Noted.	BA		
SP-04	Cycling Design ● Will there be a proposed design for bicycle lanes on Park Lawn?	Please see response to comment SP-02.	BA		
SP-05	Design of the streetcar right-of-way does not need to accommodate for bus operations in the same right-of-way.	Noted.	BA		
SP-06	TTC does not have specific design preference for raised vs. separated track bed. We require safe and effective delineation for TTC streetcar operations from pedestrians and general road traffic. The design shall demonstrate how this requirement can be met and show how various modes of travel will be coordinated within the site.	A raised track bed with curb is being proposed for the streetcar route along the loop road to help separate general road traffic and provide effective delineation. A 1.0 metre edge zone will separate any pedestrian / cycling facility from the streetcar right-of-way and also provide adequate space for TTC pole infrastructure.	BA		
SP-07	No need for physical separation of streetcar, but should provide physical and visual cues of streetcar track for pedestrian safety.	Noted. Please see response to comment SP-06.	BA		
SP-08	When details are available, TTC would like to review the underground structural portal in relation to the streetcar track above. The design of the portal may impact the track design.	Noted, pending detailed design of underground structural portal.	BA		
SP-09	How will overhead infrastructure be accommodated in the plaza area?	A 1.0 metre zone adjacent to the track within Station Square will be protected for TTC pole infrastructure. The design and location of these poles will be coordinated with landscaping and other relevant parties.	BA		
SP-10	Sharp curve may result in increased noise and passenger discomfort. Review curve radius to lessen impact.	Noted. Track curve and alignment will meet TTC minimum curve radii requirements will be coordinated with the Master Plan design.	BA		
Comments - BA Group Presentation Slide Decks titled 2150 Lakeshore TTC/City Meeting - March 16, 2020					
SP-08	Demonstrate the pedestrian flow in the track area adjacent to the unloading platforms. Explore opportunity to shift the unloading platform next to the underground parking portal closing to the building face to discourage pedestrian flow in that area.	Noted.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
SP-09	As previously requested, TTC requires traffic modelling showing the outcomes of one-way track versus two-way track operations in relation to the Lake Shore Blvd. intersections. City and/or BA Group to confirm if additional information is required from TTC for you to undertake modelling work.	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		
SP-10	There are operational concerns with streetcars intersecting the proposed bi-directional cycle track on the east side of the site. In order to mitigate conflicts, we request that the design team consider relocating the cycle track inside the loop road, to provide a safe and efficient crossing.	The City of Toronto is generally supportive of a bi-directional cycling facility on the outer boulevard along the loop road following coordination during ongoing design working meetings. In our opinion, a bi-directional cycling facility on the outer loop provides a higher degree of accessibility to community oriented destinations such as the school, potential community centre, Transit Hub and Community Park. Dedicated, protected crossing facilities at the Lake Shore Boulevard uni-directional cycle lanes and at Street 'C' will ensure that cyclists have a safe and defined crossing location.	BA		
K.Madill-01	Turnouts and radius must compile with our standard track arrangements, Track drainage, Lubrication, Clearances will need to be assessed. Input from SCI will be available as design progresses. Refer to attached Typical Intersection Layout drawing nos. S-3-202 and S-3-203.	Noted, to be addressed as part of the detailed design process.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum pages 27-31

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
K.Madill-02	Refer to attached drawings for additional typical streetcar infrastructure standards for reference.	Noted, thank you.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 30
K.Madill-03	3.3m streetcar ROW - Dimension adequate for tangent track sections. On curve sections, the dimension needs to be adjusted to account for different swing of cars based on curve radius (e.g. smaller the radius, car needs more room). Vehicle clearances need to be checked during track alignment design phase (streetcar template on CADD). Min clearance must be met. Refer to attached Vehicle Engineering dwgs (No. 25956r02, 25125, 26444) for values. Must consider inswing, outswing, super elevation, etc.	Noted. Streetcar ROW along the loop road has been increased to a minimum of 3.5 to allow for additional vehicle clearances as a result of the curved sections.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 34
K.Madill-04	2.5m clearance between the edge of the 3.3m streetcar ROW and chamber lids - Dimension adequate.	Noted.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 34
K.Madill-05	Depth of the TTC utility-free zone underneath the streetcar tracks - Allow for 1300mm. Refer to attached drawing titled "PUCC Stamp for Streetcar Tracks 2 (002)".	Noted, design and coordination of utility infrastructure is ongoing.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 34
R. Vella-01	1.0m edge zone reserved for OCS poles - 1m edge proofing is adequate in addition to the vehicle clearance envelope. For the most part we would be cantilevering from the sidewalk side.	Noted.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 34
M. Al Naib-01	Provide design safety measures to prevent vehicles from entering TTC ROW	A raised track bed with concrete curb along the dedicated streetcar facility on the loop road is being planned to prevent vehicles from entering the TTC right-of-way. Further design and coordination with TTC pending.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 7
M. Al Naib-02	What safety measures are in place for the un-signalized intersection?	Unsignalized intersections will operated under side street stop control. Appropriate signage will be introduced to alert drivers, pedestrians and cyclists of streetcar operations.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 36
M. Al Naib-03	a. Has an agreement reached/drafted regarding responsibilities and funding for future capital/Maintenance? b. Has an agreement reached/drafted regarding responsibilities and funding for future capital/Maintenance for width beyond TTC ROW standards?	Noted.	BA		
Comments - Bi-Directional Scenario Comments - May 22, 2020					
SP-11	Refer to 2020-05-05-Park-Lawn-Bi-directional Option-R02.pptx	Noted.			
SP-12	501 Long Branch to Church and 504 Park Lawn to Broadview streetcars will access the proposed GO Station via an east-to-north left turn (maximum of 6 LRV's per hour) or a west-to-north right turn (maximum of 18 streetcars per hour) movement from Lake Shore Blvd. W. onto Loop Road (east leg) utilizing bi-directional tracks in the centre of Loop Road (east leg) between Lake Shore and the GO station and a counterclockwise two track loop, as shown, conceptually, in the attached marked-up drawing.	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		
SP-13	Streetcars exiting the site will make a south-to-west right turn (maximum of six streetcars per hour) or a south-to-east left turn (maximum of 18 streetcars per hour) from Loop Road (east leg) onto Lake Shore Blvd. W.	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		
SP-14	The streetcar tracks on Loop Road (east leg) will be in the centre of the road with all traffic movements to and from the segment of the Loop Road with streetcar tracks restricted to right-in/right-out.	It is our understanding that a bi-directional scenario is no longer being pursued.	BA		
SP-15	The counterclockwise track in the loop (station) will feature two tracks with two adjacent alighting platforms, parallel layover and circulation tracks and two boarding platforms with crossovers after the alighting platforms and before the loading platforms, as shown in the attached marked up drawing.	It is our understanding that a bi-directional scenario is no longer being pursued.	BA		
SP-16	The alighting and loading platforms should be shifted as shown in the marked up drawing to better balance the walking distance to/from the GO platforms and reduce the overall distance to/from the GO platforms and the surrounding neighbourhood.	It is our understanding that a bi-directional scenario is no longer being pursued	BA		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
SP-17	Transit operations on Loop Road will improve as there will be more separation and less conflicts between LRV's and pedestrians.	It is our understanding that a bi-directional scenario is no longer being pursued	BA		
SP-18	Transit and traffic operations on Lake Shore Blvd. will improve due to the removal of the signals at Lake Shore/Shore Breeze Dr. which will be converted to right-in/right-out intersection.	Noted.	BA		
SP-19	The bi-directional scenario will not necessarily increase the footprint of the streetcar infrastructure on the site since there will only be a double track on the east side of Loop Rd. and at the streetcar loop interfacing with the proposed Park Lawn GO Station.	It is our understanding that a bi-directional scenario is no longer being pursued	BA		
SP-20	The consultant should provide: • Shortest Travel Time • Longest Travel Time • Average Travel Time • Standard Deviation • 85%ile Travel Time • 95%ile Travel Time	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		Assumptions and Expected Results from the Traffic Impact Study
SP-21	The information should be provided for the following three travel time segments of each scenario • Eastbound through • Westbound through • Westbound to Eastbound loop.	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		Assumptions and Expected Results from the Traffic Impact Study
SP-22	The start and end points of the travel time segments should be outside the of the area of influence of the proposal (i.e. the entry point should be well upstream of the back of the maximum queue of any new signal and the end point should be downstream of any new signal).	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		Assumptions and Expected Results from the Traffic Impact Study
SP-23	The Consultant should be required to conduct 10 simulation runs of each scenario and provide us with the models and the raw data from which the summaries are developed.	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		Assumptions and Expected Results from the Traffic Impact Study
SP-24	Assumed service levels: • 501 Long Branch to Church - every 10 minutes (6 streetcars/hr.) • 504 Park Lawn to Broadview – every 5 minutes (12 streetcars/hr.)	This comment was addressed in the response to TTC comments submitted by BA Group to the TTC and the City of Toronto on January 18th, 2021. Please refer to said document, as well as to its companion analysis results package and simulation model files for details.	BA		Assumptions and Expected Results from the Traffic Impact Study
Comments - Draft Plan of Subdivision Comments - July 30, 2020					
SI-01	At this time, due to the proximity of adjacent TTC substations in the area (Humber Loop ~1km and Kipling ~5km away), Subway Infrastructure recommends inclusion of 1 new substation within the site, as close to Lakeshore Blvd as possible. Sizing and access/maintenance requirements shall be to TTC standards (DM, Master Specs, etc.). A load flow simulation study will be required in preliminary design phase to validate the need for a new substation.	Details relating to transit infrastructure needs will be reviewed through the detailed design process for any new TTC facilities with appropriate responsibility being assessed and determined through the City-led design processes for any such improvements / changes.	BA	Arup	
MP-01	Further Design Coordination will be required in order to demonstrate the overhead network/coordination with Streetcar power and associated Clearance/Cover.	Noted. This will be addressed as the design is further developed.	BA	Arup	Proposed Power Network in Civil Drawings (LSB-ARP-XX-XX-DR-CU-71002)
MP-02	Will the abandoned Overhead network and Hydro network be removed as well?	This will be determined by the TTC / City of Toronto as part of any street design and engineering processes.	BA	Arup	Proposed Power Network in Civil Drawings (LSB-ARP-XX-XX-DR-CU-71002)

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
SP-25	Need to clarify that TTC does not intend to "relocate" Humber Loop. The new loop at Park Lawn GO would "supplement existing streetcar infrastructure, such as Humber Loop, and enhance transit service flexibility in the area	Noted.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 39
SP-26	The connection of 66 Prince Edward/80 Queensway on Park Lawn requires entrances to the GO Station on both sides of the street to enhance accessibility, convenience, and safety. The need for the western entrance should be stated clearly.	Noted. Secondary accessible access ramps to/from the GO station platforms are now being proposed on the west side of Park Lawn to enhance accessibility, convenience and safety to/from the Transit Hub. These entrances will also provide additional access points for TTC customers to access rail platform without the need to cross the signalized Park Lawn Road intersection.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 39
SP-27	Figure 3 – Remove routes 176 and 145 from the map	Noted.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 40
SP-28	TTC accepts BA Group's rationale to adopt locations S3 and N3. ● Stops need to be designed as per TTC's Stop Design Guidelines and accommodate for 2 standard buses (28m - tangent and the platform) at each stop.	Noted. The Bus platforms are located south of the proposed new signalized intersection with Street C.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum page 54 and 55
SP-28	How will conflicts between streetcars, pedestrians and cyclists be mitigated in the Loop Rd.? The bike lane should be relocated to avoid the conflict between streetcars and cyclists. The applicant will need to provide clear delineation of uses, such as yield signage for cyclists and provisions to separate pedestrians from streetcar traffic.	It is our understanding that the City of Toronto is generally supportive of a bi-directional cycling facility on the loop road through ongoing design working meetings. In our opinion, a bi-directional cycling facility on the outer loop provides a higher degree of accessibility to community oriented destinations such as the school, potential community centre, Transit Hub and Community Park. Dedicated, protected crossing facilities at the Lake Shore Boulevard uni-directional cycle lanes will ensure that cyclists have a safe and defined crossing location. Appropriate signage for cyclists and pedestrians will help sure safety of all road users.	BA		Transportation Impact Study Addendum
	Metrolinx, July 28, 2020	**Kelvin Ng, Third Party Projects Officer, Third Party Projects Review**			
R	**General**				
R.1	Metrolinx is pleased to provide comments regarding the new Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision application for the proposed master planned community/GO-Station development at 2150-2194 Lake Shore Boulevard West and 23 Park Lawn Road (the "Subject Lands"). The Subject Lands are located immediately adjacent to Metrolinx's Lakeshore West rail corridor (Metrolinx Oakville Subdivision). Please note comments provided on April 9th, 2020 on the previous Official Plan Amendment application (Appendix A) are still applicable. It shall further be noted that the comments stipulated in this letter only relate to Metrolinx concerns regarding the subject development's adjacency to the active rail corridor and the applicant shall work with the City of Toronto to fulfill any other requirements.	Noted.	Hatch		
Proposed Park Lawn GO Station					
R.2	Metrolinx has recently completed and approved an updated Initial Business Case (IBC) for the proposed GO station that found it to be a beneficial addition to the GO network. However, it should be noted that no agreement to develop the proposed GO Station is in place at this time, and the proposed GO station has not received Metrolinx approval. As such, the references in the Official Plan Amendment and the Zoning By-Law amendment to a proposed GO station are being included at the applicant's risk.	Noted.	Hatch		
Official Plan Amendment					

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
R.3	Metrolinx has reviewed the subject Official Plan Amendment application and our comments are set out below: 1. Notwithstanding the comments above pertaining to the proposed GO station, Metrolinx has no objections to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as currently prepared.	Noted.	Hatch		
Draft Plan of Subdivision					
R.4	Metrolinx has reviewed the subject Official Plan Amendment application and our comments are set out below: 1. Metrolinx has no objections to the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision application.	Noted.	Hatch		
Zoning By-law Amendment					
R.5	Metrolinx has reviewed the subject Zoning By-Law Amendment application and our comments are set out below: 1. As part of site-specific zoning, a rail safety setback shall be designated and sensitive uses shall not be permitted within the setback area. The site-specific zoning shall be updated with language consistent with the following: <u>Rail Safety Setback:</u> All residential and commercial spaces shall be set back 30 metres from the railway right-of-way unless a setback reduction is granted through consultation with Metrolinx. Sensitive uses shall not be permitted on developer lands within the intervening setback area.	Noted. Metrolinx has provided (in writing) permission to reduce the recommended 30-metre setback to 25-metres provided a higher order safety barrier is considered. This written approval is contained within the Rail Safety Strategy Peer Review Letter of Response prepared by Hatch.	Hatch		Rail Safety Strategy Peer Review Letter of Response
R.6	2. With the potential future expansion plans of the Oakville Subdivision/Lakeshore West Corridor to facilitate additional rail capacity and service improvements, the Applicant shall continue to engage Metrolinx to ensure developments suitably accommodate rail expansion while reflecting prevailing rail setback requirements.	Noted. Applicant has been continuously engaging Metrolinx throughout the GO Station design process, including the discussions on the rail setback requirements	Hatch		
R.7	3. Metrolinx is in receipt of the Rail Safety and Development Viability Assessment Report prepared by Hatch Ltd. and our comments on the Report are set out below: i. Jordan Guard Rails and Positive Train Control (PTC) system shall not be relied on as rail safety risk mitigation measures.	Noted. Jordan guard rails are not thought of as a mitigation measure but rather are considered as part of the review of the existing rail corridor conditions. Jordan Guard Rails (also known as 'Inner Guard Rails') are used on railway bridges to prevent trains from leaving the track, if they were to derail. The rail bridge over Park Lawn Road uses Inner Guard Rails. As part of the site-specific assessment, these guard rails were recognized as a contributing factor to the overall level of safety within the rail corridor. Additional mitigation measures are proposed within the developer lands to protect from rail corridor risks (life safety and quality-of-life).	Hatch		
R.8	3.ii. References on level boarding at the proposed Park Lawn GO Station platform shall be removed as it relates to potential rail safety risk mitigation measures.	Noted. Similar to the Jordan Guard Rails, the future station will include level boarding platforms (which are considerably higher than the standard platforms that exist today). As part of the site-specific assessment, high platforms were recognized as having a potential impact during a derailment scenario. Importantly, they are not considered part of the mitigation measures but they are considered factors that could affect a potential derailment.	Hatch		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
R.9	3.iii. The GO rail traffic information utilized in this Report does not reflect the current rail traffic forecast. The Applicant is encouraged to contact Third Party Projects Review to obtain the correct rail data information and update the Report.	At the time of writing, Metrolinx was in the process of updating their rail traffic forecasts. In January 2021, Metrolinx completed the rail traffic forecasts. Hatch has since reached out to Metrolinx to request this information. The future resubmission will include up-to-date rail traffic forecasts. Additionally, it is understood that the rail corridor experiences some of the highest volumes of trains on Metrolinx's network. The mitigation measures proposed at the development site are designed to account for the worst case scenario.	Hatch		
R.10	3.iv. It is noted that safety barriers are typically constructed entirely on private property and structurally isolated from the adjacent structure(s). The proposal to integrate the crash wall into the Station building for Block D1 may have potential operational and maintenance impacts, as such will be subjected to Metrolinx's Deviation Process for review and approval.	Hatch is developing the crash wall maintenance proposal as per Metrolinx's request, and once ready, will issue this to Metrolinx for review and feedback/approval.	Hatch		
R.11	3.v. The proposed Park Lawn GO Station has underground elements both immediately adjacent and below the active rail corridor, as such, additional details are required on the railway loading implications under normal operating circumstances as well as in the case of a derailment.	Noted. Further discussion with Metrolinx required for clarification. The existing guidelines do not stipulate loading requirements for structures.	Hatch		
R.12	3.vi. Further review of the Rail Safety and Development Viability Assessment Report by Metrolinx's Technical Advisor is required. The Applicant shall contact Third Party Projects Review to initiate the Technical Review. It shall be noted that the cost of the technical review shall be borne by the Applicant.	Applicant was informed that Metrolinx is preparing the Letter of Effort which will be issued to the Applicant in order to commission the Technical Advisor to commence the technical peer review of the Rail Safety and Development Viability Assessment Report.	Hatch		
R.13	4. Metrolinx is in receipt of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment prepared by Hatch Ltd. and our comments are set out below: i. The GO rail traffic information utilized in this Assessment does not reflect the current rail traffic forecast. The Applicant is encouraged to contact Third Party Projects Review to obtain the correct rail data information and update the Report.	At the time of writing, Metrolinx indicated that rail traffic forecasts were being updated, hence the discrepancy. Updated rail traffic forecasts have been completed by Metrolinx (January 2021) and have been requested. Future submissions will account for the updated rail traffic.	Hatch		
R.14	4.ii. Additional vibration sensitive receptors shall be installed closer to the active rail corridor in the proximity of Block D1 to provide supplementary information on vibrational impact from the rail corridor on the private development.	Hatch completed vibration measurements at the nearest distance from Block D to the rail tracks. Please see Table 6-1 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
R.15	4.iii The Metrolinx warning clause for railway right-of-way is as follows: i. **Warning**: Metrolinx, carrying on business as GO Transit and UP Express, and its assigns and successors in interest has or have a right-of-way within 300 metres from the land and the subject hereof. There may be alterations to or expansions of the rail facilities on such right-of-way in the future including the possibility that GO Transit or any railway entering into an agreement with GO Transit to sure the right-of-way or their assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand their operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwelling(s). Metrolinx will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under the aforesaid right-of-way.	Noted.	Hatch		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
R.16	4.iv. The Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment will need to be updated with the correct information which can be provided by Metrolinx. The Applicant is encouraged to submit the updated Assessment to Metrolinx for Review and feedback in advance of the next municipal submission.	At the time of writing, the current rail forecast was not available. However, the assessment and report have been updated to reflect year 2037 metrolinx train volumes. Please note that all trains were assumed to be diesel trains with two locomotives and 12 cars, as it is unknown whether the train types and compositions shown in the data would be achievable by the time the proposed development is occupied.	Hatch		
R.17	5. A safety barrier is to be provided in conjunction with the setback (standard form is an earthen berm). While the intervening space between the active rail corridor and the private development may be occupied by a potential future Metrolinx Station/Facility, rail corridor exposure remains a relevant issue. As such, the provision of crash walls or alternative safety barriers, such as free-standing caissons, columns, or bollards shall be explored to ensure adequate rail safety protection is provided.	As indicated in the Rail Safety Assessment, a continuous crash wall safety barrier is proposed on the site to provide derailment protection for the structures closest to the rail corridor.	Hatch		
R.18	6. A vegetation clearance zone, to be measured from the edge of the active rail corridor, shall be provided and shall meet all Corridor Maintenance and Electrification standards.	Noted. The 7m clearance zone for electrification provided in the Metrolinx Vegetation Guide 2020 will be referenced.	Hatch		
R.19	7. Metrolinx is in receipt of the Stormwater Management Report prepared by Arup Canada Inc. (May 2020). We offer no further comment at this time.	Noted.	Hatch		
R.20	8. Metrolinx is in receipt of the Air Quality Impact Assessment Report prepared by Hatch Ltd. (May 2020). We offer no further comment at this time.	Noted.	Hatch		
R.21	9. With respect to electrification, the applicant's lead engineer shall provide a letter acknowledging that the proposed development will satisfy the following standards for infrastructure near the rail right-of-way (Note: links for the following standards included in the original comment file): • Electric Traction Enabling Works (MX-ELEC TRAC EW-SPEC-2016-REV1) • Enabling Works ET Standard (MX-ELEC TRACT EW-DW-2016-REV1) • Structures Passing Over Electrified Corridors (MX-ELEC STR-SPEC-2017-Rev3.0) • Interim Standards for the Selection of New Electronic Devices and Cables in Metrolinx Facilities (MX-ELEC EMI-SPEC-2017)	Noted, the station design follows these standards and Hatch will provide a letter to this effect.	Hatch		
R.22	Moving forward, the applicant should continue to engage Metrolinx, and as required, our Technical Advisor, throughout the project planning process to ensure that Metrolinx's concerns are appropriately addressed. To assist these future stages of project planning, Metrolinx has provided the below list of standard considerations for any forthcoming Site Plan Application on the Subject Lands to the City of Toronto	Noted.	Hatch		
Appendix A - comments on initial OPA application (not previously included)					
Proposed Park Lawn GO Station					
R.23	The applicant has proposed a development including a proposed new Park Lawn GO Station on the Subject Lands, which is currently under review by Metrolinx. As per Metrolinx's Market Driven Strategy, Metrolinx welcomes transit oriented community proposals at, or adjacent to Metrolinx's rail corridors and GO stations. Such projects have the potential to attract more riders to the GO network and enable access to transit by foot. However, it should be noted that no agreement to develop the proposed GO Station is in place at this time, and the proposed GO station has not received Metrolinx approval. As such, the references in the Official Plan Amendment to a proposed GO station are being included at the applicant's risk.	Noted.	Hatch		
Official Plan Amendment Application (19 239170 WET 03 OZ)					
R.24	1. Notwithstanding the comments above pertaining to the proposed GO station, Metrolinx has no objections to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as currently prepared.	Noted.	Hatch		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
R.25	2. Metrolinx is in receipt of the Rail Safety Strategy prepared by Hatch Ltd. Due to current prevailing policies, Metrolinx requires a minimum 25 metre setback for 'sensitive use' for developments in proximity to Principal Main Line rail corridors that can be achieved through horizontal and vertical distances when combined with a higher-order safety barrier such as a crash wall. i. Given the potential integration between the proposed Park Lawn GO Station and the private development, the setback may be measured from the active rail corridor.	The Rail Safety Strategy has been superseded by the Rail Safety Assessment prepared and submitted as part of the May 2020 submission.	Hatch		
R.26	2. ii. Non-sensitive uses such as quick retail, convenience amenities, and fast casual restaurants are only permitted within the setback or transitory area between the station and private development space if rail derailment protection is situated between the rail corridor and these non-sensitive uses. However, if any of the above non-sensitive uses are included as part of a potential future GO station, these will be at Metrolinx's sole discretion and approval. Any such train derailment protection measures shall be on constructed the developer's lands.	Noted. Hatch are currently in discussion with Metrolinx to permit the derailment protection measures (crash wall) to be located within the station building. The details of this agreement have not yet been finalized.	Hatch		
R.27	2.iii. Should the proposed development contemplate an overbuild structure above the transit corridor, an agreement with Metrolinx to construct in Metrolinx's air space above the transit corridor will be required, including a minimum vertical clearance from the top of rail of 15.25 metres to accommodate Metrolinx transit infrastructure.	Overbuild is not currently being considered in the design. The current Rail Safety Assessment provides up-to-date setback measurements and building layouts.	Hatch		Rail Safety and Development Viability Assessment Report (May 2020)
R.28	Moving forward, the applicant should continue to engage Metrolinx, and as required, our Technical Advisor, throughout the project planning process to ensure that Metrolinx's concerns are appropriately addressed. To assist these future stages of project planning, Metrolinx has provided the below list of standard considerations for any forthcoming Zoning By-Law Amendment and Site Plan Application on the Subject Lands to the City of Toronto.	Noted.	Hatch		
Future Zoning By-law Amendment Application					
R.29	The following are Metrolinx comments to be addressed during the zoning by-law amendment process. 1. As part of site specific zoning, a rail safety setback shall be designated and sensitive uses shall not be permitted within the setback area. The site specific zoning shall be updated with language consistent with the following: <u>Rail Safety Setback:</u> All residential and commercial spaces shall be set back 30 metres from the railway right-of-way unless a setback reduction is granted through consultation with Metrolinx. Sensitive uses shall not be permitted on developer lands within the intervening setback area.	Please see responses to comments R.5 and R.25.	Hatch		
R.30	2. A safety barrier is to be provided in conjunction with the setback (standard form is an earthen berm). While the intervening space between the active rail corridor and the private development may be occupied by a potential the future Metrolinx Station/Facility, rail corridor exposure remains a relevant issue. As such, the provision of crash walls or alternative safety barriers, such as free-standing caissons, columns or bollards shall be explored to ensure adequate rail safety protection is provided.	A crash wall is proposed as the primary safety barrier to protect from a train derailment. Detailed designs will be submitted to Metrolinx and the City for review upon completion. The crash walls will be designed to account for the worst-case scenario within the rail corridor.	Hatch		
R.31	3. Further to the Official Plan Amendment comments, the applicant shall submit a detailed Rail Safety and Risk Mitigation Report, as required by the City of Toronto, to justify deviations from established rail safety requirements and to demonstrate that safety can be suitably maintained when sensitive development is proposed with direct exposure to railway corridors. The Rail Safety and Risk Mitigation Report shall be submitted for review and satisfaction of Metrolinx and our Technical Advisor.	Please see response to comment R.12.	Hatch		
R.32	4. The applicant's underground structure is to be constructed at the mutual property line. As such, additional details are requested on the railway loading implications under normal operating circumstances as well as in the case of a derailment.	Noted, this will be further studied and addressed in the revised Rail Safety and Risk Mitigation Report.	Hatch		
R.33	5. A vegetation setback, to be measured from the edge of the active rail corridor, shall be provided and shall meet all Corridor Maintenance and Electrification standards.	Noted.	Hatch		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
R.34	6. The applicant shall engage a qualified consultant to prepare a Noise and Vibration Study for review and satisfaction of Metrolinx and our Technical Advisor.	A Noise and Vibration Study was submitted with the ZBA/DPS application and OPA resubmission in May 2020, and an updated version of the study is included with this submission.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
R.35	7. The applicant shall engage a qualified consultant to prepare an Air Quality Assessment for review and satisfaction of Metrolinx and our Technical Advisor.	An Air Quality Assessment was submitted with the ZBA/DPS application and OPA resubmission in May 2020, and an updated version of the study is included with this submission.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
R.36	8. With respect to electrification, the applicant's lead engineer shall provide a letter acknowledging that the proposed development will satisfy the following standards for infrastructure near the rail right-of-way: • Electric Traction Enabling Works (MX-ELEC TRAC EW-SPEC-2016-REV1) • Enabling Works ET Standard (MX-ELEC TRACT EW-DW-2016-REV1) • Structures Passing Over Electrified Corridors (MX-ELEC STR-SPEC-2017-Rev3.0) • Interim Standards for the Selection of New Electronic Devices and Cables in Metrolinx Facilities (MX-ELEC EMI-SPEC-2017)	Please see response to comment R.21.	Hatch		
Future Site Plan Control Application					
R.37	Regarding the subject development application, it is requested that at the time of Site Plan Control the following conditions be included as Metrolinx Pre-Approval Conditions (NOAC). It should be noted that some of the information identified is also detailed in Appendix I. 1. The applicant shall engage a qualified consultant to prepare and submit a final stormwater management report for review and satisfaction of Metrolinx and our Technical Advisor. Additionally, the applicant shall provide assurance that any safety barrier(s) will not alter the existing drainage pattern affecting Metrolinx land.	Noted.	Hatch		
R.38	2. The proposed safety barrier design shall be submitted to Metrolinx's Technical Advisor for review and satisfaction.	Noted. The safety barrier design will be submitted in due course.	Hatch		
R.39	3. The applicant shall satisfy all Metrolinx rail safety requirements and the applicant shall enter into an "Adjacent Development Agreement" with Metrolinx stipulating how applicable concerns will be addressed. The Agreement will include an environmental easement for operational emissions, to be registered on title against all residential dwellings within 300 metres of the rail corridor and in favour of Metrolinx (see Appendix II).	Noted.	FCR		
R.40	4. If entry into, above and/or below the rail corridor is determined to be unavoidable, the applicant must enter into a crane swing and/or tieback agreement with Metrolinx.	Noted.	FCR		
R.41	5. The applicant's solicitor shall submit a letter of undertaking to Metrolinx stipulating that the following warning clause will be inserted into all development agreements, offers to purchase and Agreements of Purchase and Sale or Lease of each dwelling unit within 300 metres of the railway right-of-way: Warning: Metrolinx, carrying on business as GO Transit and UP Express, and its assigns and successors in interest has or have a right-of-way within 300 metres from the land and the subject hereof. There may be alterations to or expansions of the rail facilities on such right-of-way in the future including the possibility that GO Transit or any railway entering into an agreement with GO Transit to sure the right-of-way or their assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand their operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwelling(s). Metrolinx will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under the aforesaid right-of-way.	Noted.	FCR		
R.42	6. Appropriate permits will be required for any works occurring within or immediately adjacent to the rail corridor (to be administered through Metrolinx's Technical Advisor).	Noted.			
	Toronto Catholic District School Board, May 29, 2020	**Michael Loberto, Superintendent, Planning and Development Services**			
S	**General**				

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
S.1	Please be advised that the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB) is in receipt of the revised Official Plan amendment and draft plan of subdivision applications 20 146488 WET 03 OZ ; 20 146496 WET 03 SB dated May 21, 2020. A total of 7,139 units are proposed for this development within 15 towers with heights ranging from 16 to 70-storeys. The TCDSB submitted comments for the original OPA submission # 19 239170 WET 03 OZ on December 6, 2019. TCDSB projections for local area schools surrounding this development proposal remain high including the need to pursue accommodation opportunities within Etobicoke to address significant enrolment pressures.	Noted.	FCR		
S.2	The TCDSB acknowledges the inclusion of school sites as part of the Christie Secondary Plan Study located near green space and will continue to work with the City and developer to secure the most optimal location for a school site.	Noted. The school locations proposed in the current Master Plan continues to be adjacent to the Community Park.	FCR		
S.3	Due to the current Covid-19 pandemic the public Open House that was scheduled to take place, March 24, 2020, for the Park Lawn Lake Shore Transportation Master Plan and Christie's Planning Study has been postponed. TCDSB staff look forward to attending the rescheduled open house for the Christie Planning Study at a future date, to further explore school opportunities as part of this proposal. The TCDSB will continue to monitor development growth in this area as it relates to cumulative impact on local schools. The TCDSB requests notification of any modifications, community consultations, appeals or notices of decision relating to this development application or related applications.	Noted.	FCR		
	Toronto District School Board (Toronto Lands Corporation), September 1,	**Amar Singh, Senior Planner, Land Use Planning, Toronto Lands Corporation**			
T	**General**				
T.1	Toronto Lands Corporation (TLC) has reviewed the above-noted development application resubmission dated May 15, 2020, proposing a Master Plan with a mix of uses, including fifteen towers with heights ranging between 16 and 70 storeys and containing approximately 7,139 residential units, employment, park, services, entertainment and retail uses and a new Park Lawn GO Station. As previously identified in our December 19, 2019 letter, the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) requires a new elementary school in this community to accommodate students anticipated from this significant development.	Noted.	FCR		
T.2	During the summer, TLC met with the applicant, separately and jointly with the Toronto Catholic District School Board, to discuss the latest application submission, preliminary feedback on the proposed design concept, and real estate matters with respect to the proposed elementary schools. A future design workshop with both school boards is anticipated to commence during the fall to further explore potential design concepts. TLC appreciates the applicant's support for a new TDSB elementary school in this application resubmission and in ongoing discussions.	Noted. The project team has continued to engage with the TDSB on preliminary design requirements, and looks forward to continued coordination and future workshops.	FCR		
T.3	TLC looks forward to continue working with City staff and the applicant on the formation of this Master Plan and through the process of realizing this potential elementary school. More detailed comments will be provided on the subsequent application submission. TLC is interested in the secondary plan for this site and would appreciate the earliest opportunity to review the draft secondary plan to ensure the proposed policy framework supports the need for a TDSB school.	Noted.	FCR		
	Toronto Hydro, May 29, 2020				
U	**General**				

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
U.1	Toronto Hydro is in receipt of your email sent to utility.circulations@torontohydro.com. The information and comments provided herein are for INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY and may NOT be used for the purposes of a Full-Stream Permit Application pursuant to the City of Toronto's Municipal Consent Requirements. The drawing attached hereto is being provided for the purposes of planning only, and must not be used for construction. The Applicant shall be liable for and shall indemnify and hold harmless Toronto Hydro for any damages, losses, liabilities, costs, expenses, including legal fees and consequential damages relating to any act or omission by the Applicant in the use of the attached drawing(s) for any purposes apart from planning on behalf of the Applicant. (Note: See original comment files for applicable standards and drawing)	Noted.	Arup		
U.2	In order to identify Toronto Hydro infrastructure in the drawing, locates must be completed in the field.	Noted. The team is currently performing SUE QL-B works, and the results will be included in the CUP.	Arup		
U.3	All proposed work must maintain the minimum horizontal and vertical clearances as per Toronto Hydro Construction Standard 31-0100, 31-0500 & 31-0700, attached hereto. Clearance measurements are taken from the edge of the hydro plant to the edge of the proposed work.	Noted. Clearance requirements will be included in detailed design of the proposed works on Lake Shore Boulevard West and Park Lawn Road.	Arup		
U.4	Once the Applicant's planning is complete, the Applicant must submit its drawings to Toronto Hydro once again pursuant to the Circulation and Sign-Offs procedure under the City of Toronto's Municipal Consent Requirements in order to receive Toronto Hydro's sign-off for the purposes of a Full-Stream Application.	Noted.	Arup		
Prior to Construction					
U.5	Request locates from Ontario One Call at 1-800-400-2255 or online at http://www.on1call.com. Review the ESA/TSSA Guideline for Excavation in the Vicinity of Utility Lines, available on the ESA Electrical Distribution Safety website: http://www.esaeds.info. Please contact our Customer Offers and Sustainment (COS) Dept. at 416-542-2533 for disconnecting power or Toronto Hydro plant removal before any demolition.	Noted. The team is currently performing SUE QL-B works, the results will be included in the CUP.	Arup		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
Relocations					
U.6	Toronto Hydro assets can be relocated at the expense of the Applicant. If the relocation of Toronto Hydro assets is necessary, please contact Utility Relocations group at utility.relocations@torontohydro.com to begin a relocation request. After sufficient information has been received to process a relocation request, Toronto Hydro relocation projects typically require 12 to 18 months to be completed. Toronto Hydro will require a deposit or full payment in advance of doing the work.	Noted. The team is currently performing SUE QL-B works, the results will be included in the CUP. When THES was coordinated with, and deposit for design work was given, it was agreed that several projects would occur (first phase supply, temporary power, relocations).	Arup		
Overhead Toronto Hydro Assets - General Guidelines					
U.7	Mechanical equipment such as crane and hoist shall not be operated within 3 m of lines or equipment. No awning, billboard, antenna mast, flag, roof or similar structure shall be installed on the public allowance or immediately adjacent to private property that is within 3 m of lines or equipment.	Noted.	Arup		
Overhead Toronto Hydro Assets - General Guidelines					
U.8	For heavy equipment operation in the vicinity of Toronto Hydro underground plant, ensure the requirements from Toronto Hydro Distribution Construction Standard 31-0500 are met. Breaking into, or accessing, cable chambers, vaults and handwells is not permitted without consent from the relevant Toronto Hydro Dept., and anyone found to have so done will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law and pursued civilly for any damage. Tunneling within 3m is deemed a conflict that requires a Professional Engineering report to resolve.	Noted.	Arup		
	Enbridge, July 8, 2020	**Alice Coleman, Municipal Planning Analyst, Long Range Distribution Planning**			
V	**General**				
V.1	Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions.	Noted.	Arup		
V.2	This response does not constitute a pipe locate, clearance for construction or availability of gas.	Noted. The team is currently performing SUE QL-B works, the results will be included in the CUP.	Arup		
V.3	The applicant shall contact Enbridge Gas Inc.'s Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea10@Enbridge.com to determine gas availability, service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping (including, but not limited to: tree planting, silva cells, and/or soil trenches) and/or asphalt paving.	Noted.	Arup		
V.4	In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, and any future adjacent developments, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas Inc. at no cost.	Noted. We are in discussions with Enbridge.	Arup		
	Bell	**Meaghan Palynchuk, Manager - Municipal Relations, Network Provisioning**			
W	**General**				
W.1	We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval: "The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada. The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."	Noted.	Arup		
W.2	The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.	Noted.	Arup		

Comment/ Response Matrix: May 2020 OPA/ZBA/DPS Application

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
W.3	It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada' s existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.	Noted. The project team is currently discussing bringing infrastructure into site with Bell.	Arup		
W.4	If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.	Noted. The project team is currently discussing bringing infrastructure into site with Bell.	Arup		
	Rogers, June 5, 2020	**Mabin Mathew, CAD Tech**			
X	**General**				
X.1	No Conflict - Rogers Communications currently has existing plant as marked on the attached drawing. Our standard depth in this municipality is: 1m. Please ensure you maintain clearances of 0.3m vertically and 0.6m horizontally.	Noted.	Arup		
X.2	Caution - Rogers Communications has aerial plant in this area, as it is indicated on the attached plans (Note: Please see Part 2 of 2 of original comment files for plan)	Noted.	Arup		
X.3	Caution - Fiber Optic Cable is present in the area of your proposed construction	Noted.	Arup		
X.4	Note - Please inform Rogers Communications well in advance of the proposed construction schedule in order to coordinate our plant relocation.	Noted.	Arup		
X.5	Note - Locates are still required. Call for locates at 1-800-400-2255	Noted.	Arup		
X.6	Note - Hand dig when crossing, or within 1.0m of existing Rogers plant.	Noted.	Arup		
X.7	Note - Plant is to Approximation.	Noted.	Arup		

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
	SS Wilson Associates Consulting Engineers				
PR	**Noise and Vibration Impact Study**				
PR.1	**External (Impact of surrounding areas onto the development):**The Hatch report lists the modelled stationary noise sources from the surrounding developments as: the HVAC and truck traffic from the neighbouring food terminal. In addition to the above, based on a site inspection conducted by members of our staff, noise from the ventilation system of the neigbouring building at the south-west side of the development was audible. As such, the potential noise impact from this source should have been investigated. Due to the complexity of having to deal with this issue in the future, the developer in co-operation with the City Officials should provide steps to be followed in the immediate and in the future to deal with this issue, which may involve a requirement for the developer to undertake the necessary noise controls at the source at their expense, including feasibility of such work. We understand that there is ambient due to vehicular traffic from the nearby roads however, during the evening and nighttime, such equipment (number and size) are expected to be clearly audible and of concern to the future development. In summary, at the outset of this project, the proper mechanisms should be set by the developer on how to deal with this issue including confirmation from all concerned parties that such work is doable and can be pursued in the next stages of the planning process. Furthermore, although not audible at the time of the site visit, the potential noise from the following sources should be addressed: □ When one examines the aerial photos of the Food Terminal truck parking area to the closest future residential building, you will find the distance to be approximately 150m. There appears to be well over 100+ trucks on the Food Terminal property, a good portion of which are refrigerated trucks that are likely to operate during the nighttime periods. This noise is a Stationary Source that was not addressed in the Hatch study, and should be addressed. □ The impact from the garage grate located at the north-west side of the development. □ Two independent garage exhausts located on the west side of the development. □ The parking garage exhaust located on the south side of the development. □ Machine room vents located on the southeast side of the development.	Typically HVAC equipment/generators are enclosed, so they are not included as a noise source since the enclosure renders them insignificant. The food terminal road is included as a stationary noise source, and takes into consideration the volume of trucks in the terminal and their movements, as well as truck reefer noise. At this stage, the project does not have a mechanical consultant, therefore the systems listed have not been determined yet. Usually these details are finalized during the SPA stage.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.2	**Internal (Impact of the development onto itself):** The Hatch report lists the modelled stationary noise sources within the subject site as: the PA speaker. In addition to this source, please ensure that potential noise impacts such as garage ramps/grates, hydro transformers, etc. are also included in the assessment.	As mechanical equipment specific to this project is not yet available, past projects were used to determine the stationary noise sources associated with the station . These noise sources include the PA speakers and RTUs, even though it is understood from the station design team that RTUs will be enclosed to minimize visual impacts. Information regarding garage ramps/grates, hydro transformers are not yet available for this project. Once more details become available, this study will be reviewed, and if required, additional noise sources will be assessed if deemed significant. Section 3.2. and 8 recommends the Study be reviewed and updated if required, once these details become available. It is noted that these sources are typical of mixed-use developments. If, noise is identified to be a concern, it is expected it will be feasible to mitigate noise from these sources, by equipment selection, location, source and/or transmission path treatments.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.3	**Internal (Impact of the development onto its surroundings)**: The Hatch report states that “the site is not expected to impose noise impacts on adjacent sensitive land uses’’. We disagree with this statement and it should be revised to indicated the potential for noise impact of this development on the adjoining residential land uses if care and attention is not given to the noise issues in the next planning phases. During Site Plan Approval, once more detailed information becomes available for the mechanical systems of the proposed buildings, a detailed investigation should be undertaken to determine the potential noise impacts with recommendations of the appropriate mitigation measures, if any, to be included in the noise study. The following is a list of the stationary sources that should be considered: □ HVAC equipment □ Garage exhaust fans □ Possible garage ramps □ Diesel generators In addition, the appropriate warning clauses should be included in the noise report to reflect the outcome from the above investigation.	Noted. This statement has been modified to state the site is not expected to impose significant noise impacts on adjacent land uses. A detailed investigation can be performed once more information regarding the mechanical system becomes available. This is stated in Section 3.2.2. and 8 of the revised Air Quality Impact Assessment Report.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.4	For traffic noise modelling (rail and road), the Hatch report relied on the use of the FTA and FHWA noise models for rail and road noise respectively. While these models are used in the US, road and rail traffic noise in Ontario are predicted based on the MECP ORNAMENT and STEAM models, since reference to noise predictions as referenced in the MECP NPC-300 relies on the use of these two models. Moreover, many Municipalities only sanction the use of MECP-developed models. At this early stage of the Planning Process and the absence of clear written directions from the MECP as to the use of the US models, we are prepared to accept the findings of the HATCH study, being a pre-feasibility noise/vibration study. The City of Toronto Planning department may wish to add their comments regarding acceptability of these models in light of the foregoing statements.	Please note that Appendix A provides a comparison of the ORNAMENT/STEAM models vs FTA/TNM2.5. The main advantage of using TNM 2.5/FTA over ORNAMENT/STEAM is that these algorithms have been widely adapted to be used across multiple commercial software platforms. As a result, currently available, rigorously tested, and well supported noise modelling software packages such as Sound Plan and CadnaA have adapted the TNM 2.5/FTA models to produce noise contour maps and account for 3D geometry using ray-tracing methods. The contour mapping feature is unavailable with STAMSON 5.0, the latest software package that runs the ORNAMENT model. Further, the ORNAMENT model is not supported by the latest commercial noise modeling platforms. Noise contour maps provide a significant advancement to the understanding ofc noise and its impact on the surrounding community. Further ORNAMENT/STEAM may not be suitable for modelling the geometric complexity of the area (existing+future buildings, the rail overpass, Gardiner ramps) and is limited to the number of segments of road/rail that can be modelled at once. Finally, the MECP has approved the use of these algorithms/software package as they relate to Metrolinx Projects. Thus, this same model has been used for the Parklawn GO Station TPAP Study, as approved by Metrolinx.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.5	Stationary source noise modelling was undertaken with the use of Cadna/A noise prediction software. It should be noted that the Cadna model is based on ISO, which is acceptable.	Noted. This is indicated in Section 3.2.1 of the report.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.6	The Hatch report discusses the proposed relief road (Street A). Based on cursory examination of the connection from one end of the road to the other, it appears that this extension may carry significant traffic volumes that should be assessed and incorporated into this study. Therefore, depending on the expected future volumes, including truck traffic to be developed by the transportation consultant, the noise study should be updated to incorporate the noise requirements.	The assessment has been updated to include the relief road (Street A), based on traffic forecasts developed by BA Group. Please refer to Section Table 3-1 in Section 3.1.2 and Appendix D.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.7	The Hatch report states that future train volumes were not available from Metrolinx at the time of writing the report. Therefore, reliance was made on data from another noise/vibration modelling report dated September, 2017. Metrolinx has advised that traffic data is now available. Please update the noise study to reflect this data accordingly. Please ensure that a 10-year projection was assumed for the train predictions. In addition, please provide a copy of the train volumes used in the study.	The train volumes have been updated in the noise model to reflect Metrolinx train data. Note trains is for year 2037, which assumes a mix of diesel locomotives and different train consists. For the purposes of this study, it was assumed that all locomotives will be diesel locomotives. It was further assumed that all trains will consist of 2 locomotives and 12 cars.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.8	We note that the report makes reference to the need to use brick veneer or acoustically equivalent construction for exterior walls within 100m from the rail track. This statement is not in conformance with the MECP text which specifies: “All exterior walls of dwelling unit are to be constructed with brick veneer or acoustically equivalent masonry wall construction”. Therefore, the report should be modified to include the following statement as an acoustically viable solution to the use of brick veneer: “An acoustically equivalent wall construction must provide minimum sound Transmission Loss (TL) values of 35+dB from 63Hz and upward as designed by an Acoustic Engineer”.	This modification has been incorporated, please see Executive Summary, and Section 4.1.1, 5.1.1, and 8.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.9	It was noted in the Hatch report that Outdoor Living Area noise assessments were not completed due to the fact that the Station Square, Boulevard Square and the park will be publicly accessible areas. Please indicate where this exclusion is specified in NPC-300. If assessment is not required by the MECP, the City may wish to request an assessment of these areas for the common good of the public.	At this rezoning stage, insufficient details are available to identify the exact location and configuration of OLAs (e.g terraces, outdoor building amenity areas). Once these details become available, this Noise and Vibration Study will be reviewed, and updated if required, to assess noise at OLA locations. Regarding the Station Square, NPC-300 states that an OLA is part of a noise sensitive land that is "intended and designed for the quiet enjoyment of the outdoor environment and readily accessible from the building." It further states that OLAs include: backyards, front yards, gardens, terraces or patios, balconies and elevated terraces with a minimum depth of 4 metres, that are not enclosed, provided they are the only living area for the occupant or common outdoor living areas associated with high rise multi-unit buildings." The Station Square is not intended to be for the 'quiet enjoyment of the outdoor environment'. The proposed TTC Streetcar loop, a transportation noise source that would be accounted for an OLA sound level assessment, will travel through Station Square. A significant amount of passengers are expected to travel to/from the proposed Park Lawn Station. Further, Station Square is proposed as privately owned publicly-accessible space (POPS) not assigned to a specific residential building within the proposed development, and any non-resident would have access to this location, either for commuting or shopping purposes. As Boulevard Square Park and the Community park are both going to be City parkland, they are similarly not applicable.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.10	It is stated in the report that once detailed plans become available for the condominiums, OLA assessments will "likely" be required for terraces/balconies exceeding 4m in depth. This statement should be revised to remove uncertainty (i.e. "likely"), as this is a firm requirement by the MECP. Furthermore, it should be noted that as per the MECP, assessment will also be required for Outdoor Living Areas equal to or greater than 4m in depth, in addition to those areas which exceed 4m, as stated.	The statement has been revised to as per this comment. Please see Section 5.1.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.11	As required by the MECP, a warning clause should be included for those residential dwellings surrounding the proposed school to advise the future occupants of potential noise impacts.	Table 5-3 has been revised.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.12	In the event that any of the future buildings will not be fitted with mandatory air conditioning, as required by the MECP, a warning clause should be included for those dwellings requiring Provisions for Air Conditioning.	Table 5-3 has been revised.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.13	As required by the MECP, a warning clause should be included for all dwellings with sound levels of LAeq(day) = 55 to 60 and/or if LAeq (night) > 50 after using noise control measures, to advise the Purchasers/tenants that despite the use of noise controls, sound levels due to increasing road/rail traffic may interfere with some activities.	Table 5-3 will be revised to include this warning clause once an OLA assessment has been completed, as thresholds cited pertain to outdoor noise control measures (NPC-300 C7.1.1).	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.14	Although details for the proposed condominium buildings are not yet available, the report should address the MECP requirement for a warning clause for all units with a balcony.	Table 5-3 has been revised to address this comment. As noted, it is unknown whether all units will have balconies =>4 metres wide or other spaces consider an OLA.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.15	The study indicates that "discussions should be held with the TTC to determine ….". The issues include limiting streetcar speeds, track types, etc. Did the proponent and the City initiate such important discussion? This issue MUST be a condition prior to approval of this application and specifically to ascertain that the two parties could reach a decision regarding Streetcar vibration issues and that the agreed upon measures will be undertaken.	There have been ongoing discussions with the TTC, the TTC has been involved with many discussions related to the plan (in particular the width of the roadway and streetcar layout/track). The TTC is in agreement with the current application. Please note that the intent of the vibration assessment of the TTC Streetcar Loop is to ensure feasibility of mitigation. The study findings state that vibration levels can be mitigated at the worst-case location by means of resilient track work, reduced operating speeds, and/or floating slabs over special trackwork. Specific vibration controls are to be assessed and selected once further TTC track details on the loop design become available.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.16	The Hatch Study relied on prediction of rail and TTC streetcar vibration levels. Why did the consultant rely on generalized predictions while it has previously relied on the TTC, which has an extensive database of vibration levels that are more realistic for their streetcar vehicles? Similarly, railway vibration levels could have been measured on site as is the case with other submissions in Ontario.	Please note that vibration measurements could not be completed at the time of the previous submission in May 2020 due to the onset of COVID-19. Since then, however, measurements have been completed for trains traveling within the Metrolinx corridor. Please see Sections 3.3.1 and 6.1. Please note that the TTC was consulted and stated that detailed (spectra) for streetcars were not available. Thus, a comparison was made between FTA levels and vibration measurements for TTC streetcars found in the literature. Based on this comparison, the FTA train vibration emissions yield the highest vibration levels. Please see Section 3.3.3. Note that even if TTC streetcar vibration levels were available, these would need to be adjusted to account for expected operating conditions on site (ground conditions, speeds, curve radii, type of track and track support, type of LRV vehicle, etc.).	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
PR.17	Implementation Procedures should also include the following: Ø Prior to Draft Plan/Site Plan Approval of this development, Detailed Noise Control Studies should be required. Ø Any future Development Agreement(s) that may be required in connection with this phase of the planning process should include the requirements for all the necessary noise control measures and procedures as outlined in the noise study to the satisfaction of all concerned parties.	Section 7 of the report has been updated to address these comments.	Hatch		Noise and Vibration Impact Study
	BCX Environmental Consulting				
PR	**Air Quality Impact Assessment**				
	Study Area and Methodology				
PR.18	BCX observes that the AQIA reviewed air emission sources within km from the Proposed Development. As a first step, the study used Ontario's Guideline D-6 as a screening tool to determine significant industrial sources in the study area for the quantitative modelling assessment. The Class I industrial facilities approximately 800m southwest of the Proposed Development was screened out using the separation distance under Guideline D-6. The AQIA modelled the significant air sources including tailpipe emissions from the nearby local roads, highways, rail corridors and truck operations at the Ontario Food Terminal. BCX generally concurs with the study area, the screening methodology and the significant air sources assessed in the modelling exercise. BCX notes that the Humber Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is identified in Figure 2-1 but is not discussed in this section.	Details on the waste water treatment plant were included in section 3.3.2 of the report. We also note that only public information was able to be shared in this section on odour and contaminant releases.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Study Scenarios				

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.19	BCX Recommendation 1 The WWTP should be discussed in this section using Guideline D-2 as the screening tool. The WWTP's complaint history and local meteorology (i.e. wind direction) should be reviewed to determine if odour mitigations are required for the Proposed Development. Odour mitigation may include a warning clause in specific property agreement and/or provision for carbon filters for HVAC air intakes. With respect to the construction phase, the AQIA states that the potential air quality impact will be temporary, and a qualitative assessment was completed for this phase. The AQIA identifies that nuisance fugitive dust and tailpipe emissions from the construction activities may result in elevated air concentrations of particulate matter and combustion gases near the construction site in the short term. The AQIA recommends that these emissions be addressed through an onsite ambient monitoring program and mitigation measures. BCX generally concurs with the AQIA's assessment approach for the construction phase and the conclusion that the impacts from this phase are temporary and localized. BCX Recommendation 2 A fugitive dust management practices plan (BMPP) should be developed to prevent dust from migrating offsite during the construction phase and that the BMPP should follow Environment and Climate Change Canada's (ECCC's) guidance document entitled "Best Practices for the Reduction of Air Emissions from Construction and Demolition Activities" dated March 2005. As suggested in the guidance document, visual inspection, application of water and/or chemical suppressant, installation of wind barriers and limiting exposed areas should be routinely followed during the construction phase of this project. With respect to the existing and future cases, a quantitative modelling assessment was completed. BCX generally concurs with the AQIA's quantitative assessment approach for these two scenarios.	Noted, while Hatch agrees that a fugitive dust management practices plan should be developed as recommended, this is outside of the scope of the study.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Contaminants of Concern Addressed				
PR.20	BCX observes that the AQIA identified the primary contaminants from traffic sources in the study area as the contaminants of concern (CoCs) including fine particulate matter (PM2.5), NO2, CO, VOCs (assessed as acrolein, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, acetaldehyde, and formaldehyde) and PAHs (assessed as benzo(a)pyrene). BCX concurs with the CoCs assessed for the AQIA. BCX observes that suspended particulate matter (PM) instead of PM2.5 is listed as a CoC in Section 2.2 of the report. Suspended particulate matter refers to fugitive dust with a diameter of 44 um or lower. PM should be replaced with PM2.5 in Section 2.2 of the AOJA for clarity. Recommendation 3 - PM should be replaced with PM2.5 in Section 2.2 of the AQIA for clarity.	Agreed. As per recommendation, PM was replaced with PM2.5 in the report.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Air Quality Thresholds				
PR.21	BCX observes that Table 2-2 lists all available AAQCs, CAAQS and NAAQO for all CoCs. However, the study does not compare modelling results to all thresholds listed in Table 2-2. For example, NO; was only assessed against its hour and 24hr AAQCs and the annual National Ambient Air Quality Objective (NAAQO). No comparison to or discussion of the hour CAAQS for 2020 and 2025 and an annual CAAQS for 2025 was provided. BCX generally concur with the air quality thresholds used for the AOJA with the exception of NO2. Recommendation 4 Only list air quality thresholds in Table 2-1 used in the study to avoid confusion. As applicable, provide the appropriate rationale for selecting the air quality thresholds. Recommendation 5 Use the annual CAAQS for 2025 instead of the annual NAAQO for the future case scenario.	Text was added to the report to explain the selection of air quality thresholds. The applicable air quality criteria from Ontario was used in priority as CAAQS are only objectives. Hatch does not agree to use CAAQS objectives as applicable standards.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Ambient Monitoring Stations				

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.22	BCX observes that the Toronto Downtown Station data was identified as the closest station to the project site and the main station to develop background concentrations for the CoCs assessed (i.e.PM2.5, NO2, Of). Since this station does not have data for other CoCs, ambient background for other CoCs was taken from the closest/available stations as identified in Table 2-3 of the report. BCX concurs with the methodology used for ambient monitoring station selection but notes that the closest ambient monitoring station to the project site is Etobicoke South (NAPS ID 60435). This station has ambient data for NO2, Of, and PMz.s from 2010 to 2018. Recommendation 6 Although major discrepancies in ambient levels are not expected between Etobicoke South and Toronto Downtown stations, data from the Etobicoke South station should be reviewed and if necessary, the background concentrations should be updated using data from this station.	A comparison of Etobicoke South station data with Toronto Downtown was completed. No changes are to be applied to the report as there are no discrepancies.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Ambient Background Concentrations				
PR.23	The AQIA used the most recent 5 consecutive years of observation data from the ambient monitoring stations described in Table 2-3 of the AQIA. The 90th percentile concentration for each CoC was used as the background concentrations for short term averaging periods (i.e. hourly, 8-hour and 24-hour). The annual mean concentration for each CoC was used as the background concentration for long-term averaging periods (i.e. annual). The same background concentrations were assumed the future case scenario. The AQIA considers this assumption conservative since future air quality is expected to improve as a result of more stringent emission standards for automobiles. BCX concurs with the background calculation methodology and considers this approach conservative and appropriate.	Noted.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Emissions				
PR.24	BCX's findings and recommendations are presented by the type of major emission sources assessed in the AQIA as detailed below. The AQIA assumes all train engines are diesel fired. BCX observes that the emission rates for Metrolinx GO trains were calculated using Tier 4 (2015+) engine emission factors for both Existing and Future scenarios. Tiers 0 and 1 were used for CN and Via Rail trains. However, comment #4 of the Response #360807-H-EV-PLG-RFI-GE-0001_R document suggests that Metrolinx's current locomotives use Tier 2 engines. BCX concurs with the emission estimation methodology and assumptions with the exception of the engine Tier used for GO trains as described above. Recommendation 7 Provide the explanation for selecting of Tier 4 engines or update the GO train emissions using Tier 2 emission factors.	Tier 2 emission rates were used in the modelling as stated in the report for the existing case. Since the first submission, Metrolinx has provided additional information to Hatch on the existing fleet. Metrolinx has provided a mixed fleet (Tier 1 to Tier 4) for the Existing Case and they confirmed Tier 4 rates for the future case. The model was updated to include new information from Metrolinx.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
PR.25	BCX observes that the distances used for the emission rate calculations are lower than those used in the AERMOD modelling. For example, the emission calculation uses a distance travelled of 2000 m whereas the total length of each of the line volume sources representing train emissions are 2328 m. Train emissions are, therefore, underestimated. BCX also observes differences in emission calculation assumptions/methodology between the existing and future scenarios. For example, the existing case assumes the train was operating at on notch 8 for the total distance travelled whereas idling and various notches were considered for same distance travelled in the future scenario. No description of the assumptions/methodologies are provided in the report to explain the difference between the two scenarios. Recommendation 8 BCX recommends that the impact of using total length of line volume sources be reviewed to confirm the conclusions of the AQIA remain valid and if necessary, the emission calculation should be updated to reflect a total length of 2328m in the model. Recommendation 9 - Provide a description of the assumptions/methodologies used for the existing and future scenarios and explain the differences between the two scenarios.	The distance was updated to reflect the length of the sources in the model. The emission rates were also updated. Calculations methodology is based on the input data provided by Metrolinx for the Tier and the train schedule. More information was provided by Metrolinx since the first submission of the AQIA report. Metrolinx provided the 2037 train schedule and specified that as a worst-case scenario, all trains should be considered Tier 4 diesel trains even if electrification should already be implemented on the rail corridor. All details were added in the report.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Road Emissions				

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.26	Emission factors for road vehicles (i.e. passenger cars and trucks) were determined using US EPA MOVES. BCX has reviewed the MOVES input parameters/assumptions in Table 3-1 of the AQIA and concurs with these assumptions. BCX also compared the MOVES outputs in the AQIA with MOVES emission factors BCX used for similar projects. MOVES emission factors in the AOJA are generally align with the same order of magnitude expected for each vehicle classification. BCX reviewed the distances used to estimate road emissions. The appropriate road lengths have been used for each road link except for Road 9. The emissions for Road 9 were estimated based on a road length of 928m instead of 92.8m. These emissions are, therefore, overestimated. Recommendation 10 Although the emissions for Road 9 were overestimated and should not affect the conclusions of the AQIA, the study may benefit from an update to the Road 9 emissions which will produce more representative results.	Road 9 length was updated from 928 m to 92.8 m.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Truck Emissions from OFT				
PR.27	BCX observes that emissions from truck traffic entering and exiting the Ontario Food Terminal were included in the emission inventory. No emissions from truck idling and movement onsite were calculated due to unreliable idling times as stated in the AQIA. Recommendation 10 Although significant impacts from the Ontario Food Terminal operations on the proposed development are not likely expected (i.e. emissions of near ground level sources "drops off" quickly), a sensitivity analysis should be completed for the onsite trucking activities (i.e. truck travelling and idling) at the Ontario Food Terminal to confirm impacts from this source are insignificant.	As it is indicated in the comments, significant impacts from the Ontario Food Terminal are not expected. As stated in the report, there is not enough information available to do the sensitivity analysis on idling trucks as the number of trucks varies and was not made available to Hatch.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Emissions from Humber WWTP				
PR.28	The AQIA identified that potential odour and odour causing contaminants such as total reduced sulphur and nitrogenous compounds are emitted from the WWTP. The AIQA also provided a brief history of odour complaints at the WWTP since 2016 and a list of odour complaints received in 2017 and 2018. The study commented that the plant's odour reduction plan likely resulted in the reduction in the number of odour complaints in recent years. No assessment of the WWTP's potential odour impacts on the proposed development was included in the AOJA. In addition to odour and odour causing contaminants, the AOJA identified that Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are emitted from the WWTP. The AOJA provided a review of the EPA FIRE emission factors for the VOCs and concluded that the impacts of these compounds were insignificant since the emission factors are low. No emission calculations or modelling were completed for these contaminants.	Noted.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	AERMOD Monitoring				
PR.29	BCX observes that the correct averaging periods were selected for each contaminant. The urban dispersion coefficient was selected, which accurately describes the surrounding land use. BCX concurs with the general model set up for all CoCs.	Noted.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.30	BCX observes that the train emission rates were entered in the source summary pathway and multiplied by the number of trains per hour using an hourly variable emission factor. Road emission rates were entered directly as hourly variable emission factors, while using a unit emission rate in the source summary pathway. BCX generally agrees with this approach. Train and road emissions were represented by line volume sources in a separated configuration. The plume heights and widths of these line volume sources are representative of the emissions sources. However, the base elevations of the line source (Source ID: Express) representing the Gardiner Expressway section adjacent to the Proposed Development are incorrect (i.e. the elevation of the elevated expressway has not been considered). BCX observes some discrepancies between the source emission rates in the emission calculation tables and those in the AERMOD inputs including the maximum emission rates and/or variable emission factors (i.e. traffic counts). In addition, different source names are used in the emission calculation tables and the AERMOD inputs. Recommendation 11 Base elevations of the nodes for Line Source Expressway near the Proposed Development should be adjusted to reflect the elevated highway (i.e. change from approximately 90m to 96m). Recommendation 12 The emission inputs including source names should be reviewed and where they are inconsistent, the emission calculations and/or the modelling should be updated/rerun.	The elevation of the Expressway was updated in the model to 96m as recommended. Source names were updated. This does not impact the model results.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Receptors				
PR.31	BCX observes that a set of 79 discrete ground level Cartesian receptors, with a spacing of 50 metres, were used to represent the receptors at the Proposed Development. The base elevations of these receptors generally seem to align with the elevations shown in Google Earth. BCX notes that the modelling did not include any receptors at height to assess potential impacts at various floors of the proposed condominium buildings. This is particularly relevant because the expressway adjacent to the Proposed Development is elevated. Recommendation 13 Flagpole receptors should be added to all discrete receptor locations to assess air quality above ground level due to the presence of the nearby elevated expressway.	Hatch has used the recommended approach by the MECP guidelines for comparing AQ standards to predicted concentrations. As the different receptor heights are not known and sources are mostly emitted at ground level, it is expected that predicted concentrations at ground level are representative of the potential impact on receptors. A model run was completed with higher elevation for receptors and it has shown no increase in predicted concentrations. The report was updated to include those receptors.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Meteorology				
PR.32	BCX observes that a meteorological dataset, processed using the Toronto Pearson Airport observations, was used. Due to the proximity of the Proposed Development to Lake Ontario, the Toronto Pearson Airport Station is not representative of the meteorology at this site. The Toronto Island Airport Station is located approximately 6km to the east of the project site. In BCX's opinion, this station is representative for this project.	Agreed, as stated below, the model was updated to use Toronto City Center Station. The MECP provided a new data set.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
PR.33	The meteorological dataset used in the AOJA shows a surface roughness length ranging from 0.2 to 0.3 net res in all directions. The surface roughness values in this data set represent a general "crops" land use for the entire study area. This is not representative of the land use for this project since the Proposed Development is to be located in a suburban area on the shore of Lake Ontario. Recommendation 14 Modelling should be updated using a site-specific meteorological data set developed using Toronto Island Airport observations and site-specific land use information.	Meteorological data was updated with Toronto City Center data provided by the MECP.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	Terrain				

Comment/ Response Matrix: Technical Peer Reviews

Last Updated February 26, 2021

Ref#	Comments	Response	Response by	Support by	Doc Reference
PR.34	BCX observes that base elevations were extracted from historical terrain data (DEM format) obtained from the Ministry website. Tile 087 (DEM files) was used in the AERMAP terrain pre-processor to estimate the base elevations. In late 2019, the Ministry replaced the terrain data in DEM format with Canadian Digital Elevation Model (CDEM) data in GeoTIFF format on their website. BCX reviewed these elevations in AERMOD and they generally align with those noted in Google Earth. Recommendation 15 While BCX does not expect this terrain data change to have any significant impacts on the modelling results, Canadian Digital Elevation Model (CDEM) data in GeoTIFF format should be used for updating the study (if the model is to be rerun to address other recommendations).	Hatch noted that there were no difference between the two terrain data formats.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
PR.35	The current assessment requires updating to address the recommendations contained herein. Based on the updated assessment, the conclusions and recommendations should be updated as necessary.	Noted.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
PR.36	Based on BCX's experience assessing mid to high rise mixed-used developments in the close vicinity of major transportation routes, mitigation particularly at lower levels is often required to minimize potential air quality impacts. Typical mitigation measures include: limiting operable windows and balconies for residential units at low levels facing the major transportation corridors, locating air intakes for units at low levels facing the major transportation corridors at height or on the other sides of the building away from the transportation corridors, limiting outdoor amenity spaces at low levels facing the major transportation corridors, and providing warning clause on specific property agreements.	Noted.	Hatch		Air Quality Impact Assessment
	WSP Canada Group Limited ("WSP")				
PR	**Rail Safety Strategy**				
	WSP peer review report was provided in May 2020.	Responses to WSP peer review have been included in the rail safety strategy letter.	Hatch		Rail Safety Strategy - Peer Review Letter of Response