PLANNING JUSTIFICATION REPORT -ADDENDUM

APPLICATION TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW

1575 Hurontario Street PT LT 1, RANGE 2 CIR, AS IN VS170625 City of Mississauga

10422967 CANADA CORP

October 2019

GSAI File # 1130-002

Planning Justification Report Addendum Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. has been retained by 10422967 CANADA CORP (registered owner of the subject lands) to assist in obtaining the necessary planning approvals to allow for the redevelopment of 1575 Hurontario Street. The subject property is located on the east side of Hurontario Street, south of the Queen Elizabeth Way in the City of Mississauga. The development proposal includes 42 horizontal multiple dwellings (stacked back to back townhouses) within two blocks, 57 below-grade parking spaces and one vehicular access driveway from Hurontario Street to be shared with the adjacent lands to the south.

A Planning Justification Report was prepared by Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., dated December 2017 accompanying Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application. The purpose of this Planning Justification Report Addendum (the "Report") to the previously submitted Planning Justification Report is to provide further justification and/or rationale to the prestablished points, cite the recently updated Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and Region of Peel Official Plan, as well as the recently adopted City of Mississauga Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Guidelines (notwithstanding the original application predates the approved guidelines) and further, to address the relevant policy frameworks in the context of the latest set of revisions to the development proposal. The revised development proposal is outlined in section 3.2 of this Report.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION & SURROUNDING LAND USES

The subject property is located on the east side of Hurontario Street, south of the Queen Elizabeth Way and north of Hampshire Crescent in the City of Mississauga. The property is legally described as PT LT 1, RANGE 2 CIR, AS IN VS 170625, CITY OF MISSISSAUGA. The subject property has a frontage of approximately 30 metres on Hurontario Street and a total site area of approximately 3,800 square metres. The subject property is currently vacant but was historically occupied by a McDonalds restaurant which was demolished in the spring of 2009.

Surrounding land uses include the Queens Elizabeth Way (QEW) interchange, office uses and a public elementary school and police station to the north, single detached dwellings and Mary Fix Park to the west, single detached dwellings to the east, and single detached dwellings, a public elementary and secondary school, and office commercial uses to the south.

3.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

An original proposal for the subject site was submitted to Staff in December of 2017. Staff provided comment with regard to density, amenity area and built form. Since this time, this consulting team has taken the opportunity to liaise with staff and the area Councillor to determine a more palatable development proposal which is described in Section 3.2 of this Report.

3.1 ORIGINAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

The original development proposal included a greater density, proposing a total of 60 residential units. Block A was proposed to contain 32 stacked units, while Block B was proposed to contain 28 stacked units. The development proposal included a total residential gross floor area of 5,584 square metres and represented a floor space index of 1.5. Resident parking for the horizontal multiple dwellings was proposed at a rate of 1.0 space per unit and 0.24 spaces per visitor for a total of 74 proposed parking spaces. The underground parking structure was proposed to abut the north and south property lines (0.0 metres to a front or side yard) which raised concerns for the preservation of the trees along those property lines (located on the property of the adjacent landowners). Internal walkways were proposed at 1.3 metres in width.

Amenity area was previously provided for by way of a rooftop terrace, balconies and front yards as well as along the rear of the site.

3.2 REVISED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

This revised development proposal is the result of correspondence and feedback from City staff members in collaboration with other stakeholders, based on our original submission made in December 2017.

10422967 CANADA CORP is proposing to develop the subject property for 42 horizontal multiple dwellings (stacked back to back townhouse units) provided in two structures (21 units in Building A and 21 units in Building B). The 42 units will be accommodated by 56 below-grade parking spaces. There is one proposed access to the site from Hurontario Street. This access arrangement is proposed to be shared with the adjacent lands to the south which will complete the fourth leg of the existing intersection at Hurontario Street and Pinetree Way. The proposed development shall be subject to a future Draft Plan of Condominium application. The development proposal includes a total gross floor area of 3, 998.91m2 square metres and represents a floor space index of 1.04.

Resident parking for the horizontal multiple dwellings is proposed at a rate of 1.1 space per unit (46 spaces) and 0.25 spaces (11 spaces) per unit for visitors, totalling 57 proposed parking spaces. All parking is proposed to be accommodated below-grade.

The revised plans have reduced the size of the underground parking garage, which is now almost completely located below the building footprints. This has had an impact on the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan and accompanying Arborist Report as prepared by MEP, which has been revised and included as a part of this resubmission package. Comments and concerns raised by Staff with regard to tree preservation along the north and south property lines have been addressed per these latest revisions to the site plan and underground parking plan. We wish to note for staff that hand digging or less invasive excavation measures are proposed for on site works where tree root zones are present. These areas are further detailed in the Landscape Plan as prepared by MEP and the Grading Plan as prepared by CF Crozier and Associates.

In response to staff comment, the setbacks have been increased along the side yards and at the rear yard. The 10m setback along the Hurontario Street frontage has been maintained.

The revised development concept has been reconfigured to include a common outdoor amenity area at the rear (easterly portion) of the site. Detailed landscape plans will be provided through the site plan process with regard to the common outdoor amenity area. Private amenity area is provided by way of rooftop amenity, balconies and raised decks along the rear.

A revised servicing, grading and stormwater management strategy has also been addressed in this resubmission resultant of the revisions to the site configuration. A drainage swale has been provided along the northerly portion of the property (considered a "side yard"). In efforts to utilize existing municipal infrastructure, a stormwater and sanitary strategy was discussed with staff and the adjacent property owner (30 Maplewood). The strategy as presented in this revised proposal would allow our client to obtain an easement to connect into the existing services along Glenview/Maplewood Drive. As we understand, there is an existing storm easement over the subject site to convey external drainage from the lands to the north

(existing office use) which is to be maintained. Please see Section 5.0 & 6.0 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report as prepared by CF Crozier & Associates prepared in support of this application for further details. As originally proposed, the development will be serviced through a water service connection to the existing watermain on the east side of Hurontario Street.

The revised concept plan proposes a reduction in density (relative to the original submission), while generally meeting objectives of the recently adopted Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Urban Design Guidelines, discussed further in this Report.

4.0 LAND USE POLICIES

The policy justification contained within the previously submitted Planning Justification Report prepared by Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., dated December 2017, remains to some degree as it describes the ways in which the proposal generally presents consistency with the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement (2014, unchanged and currently under review) and is in conformity with the A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017, now replaced with 2019 version), Peel Region Official Plan (2016, now replaced with 2018 version) and Mississauga Official Plan (unchanged).

This document is to be read in conjunction with, and interpreted as an update to, the previously submitted Planning Justification Report. Additional land use policies have been noted in this addendum letter as they relate to the application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment, but only where they have not been provided in the original report. Where required, this report will build or expand on the original Planning Justification Report in terms of rationale and/or justification.

This Report will acknowledge the new Growth Plan policies adopted in May 2019 and the Peel Region Official Plan policies updated in 2018, which are relevant to the proposal. This Report will also discuss the recently approved (2018) Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Design Guidelines, and the ways in which the development proposal conforms to these guidelines. We wish to note for staff that the original proposal predates the formal adoption of the Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Design Guidelines and thus, this development should not be evaluated against the recently adopted Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Design Guidelines.

Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 will provide general overviews of the ways in which the development proposal is consistent with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement ("PPS"), and is in conformity with the A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and Region of Peel Official Plan.

4.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT, 2014

The current Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) came into effect as of 2014. The previously submitted Justification Report references the 2014 PPS. Therefore, additional justification and/or rationale has been provided only where necessary to address staff comment.

The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. Section 3(5) of the *Planning Act* requires that decisions affecting planning matters "shall be consistent with" policy statements issued under the Act. Section 1 of the PPS contains policies that provide direction to build strong communities through efficient development and land use patterns. The Provincial Policy Statement is currently under review, however as the proposed changes are still in draft, only the inforce PPS (2014) version was considered for this Addendum Letter.

The current Mississauga Official Plan ("MOP") land use policies applicable to the subject lands are not consistent with the intentions of the PPS. As required by Sections 2 and 3 of the Planning Act, the following

sections will demonstrate how the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment will bring the subject lands into consistency with the PPS.

Section 1 (1.1.1 and 1.1.3) of the PPS outlines policies associated with future development and land use patterns.

As mentioned in the report previously submitted, the proposed development conforms to Sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.3. To reiterate, the site is located within a Settlement Area and further, within the Hurontario Street intensification corridor. The amendments contribute to the range of land uses and housing stock within the City of Mississauga along an intensification corridor. The proposed development appropriately provides an increase in density to the surrounding neighbourhood, however is in a location well-serviced by existing transit services and which stands to benefit greatly from convenient access and proximity to the forthcoming Hurontario Light Rail Transit ("LRT"). This provides ease of access to commercial and institutional land uses which promotes the principles of creating a complete, walkable community. The proposal represents an efficient development and land use pattern in which existing and planned infrastructure and services can accommodate the proposed development. The proposal can be adequately serviced as exhibited in the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report prepared by Crozier & Associates which states that an extension of existing infrastructure provides adequate capacity to service to the proposed development.

The proposal will promote the efficient use of available land through a more compact built form (where it can be accommodated), which is encouraged by the PPS. The subject lands are located in an area planned to develop at higher densities (intensification corridor) which will support existing and planned transit services and further provides residents access to a range of services existing in the area. Efficient use of existing and planned transportation options and the provision of opportunities for active transportation generate the possibility of reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and improved air quality. The area also includes immediate access to the future Hurontario LRT, as well as a well-connected public transportation system, cycling network and walkability features (Section 1.5 of the PPS). The proposed development includes connections to existing sidewalks and nearby public transportation systems thereby encouraging walking and engagement with public transit as priority options for alternative modes of transportation.

Based on the above analysis, it is our opinion that the proposed development is consistent with the locational criteria for intensification and the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment are therefore consistent with the PPS policies for creating efficient land use patterns within Settlement Areas.

Section 1.4 of the PPS provides policies relating to housing.

The proposal includes a compact built form that will be designed with careful considerations to design standards and those features that can be used to create a desirable streetscapes and pedestrian realms.

The proposal will contribute to the overall housing stock in the area, while capitalizing on existing services and amenities and optimizing infrastructure capacities. The proposal offers a variety of unit sizes to assist with housing options. The proposed development therefore demonstrates consistency with Section 1.4 of the PPS.

The polices in Section 1.6 relate to land use and transportation and infrastructure facilities.

The proposal conforms to Section 1.6 as it will be serviced through the extension existing infrastructure and makes use of existing public signalized roads and future investments in public infrastructure, providing consistency with the policies contained within the PPS (1.6.4.2, 1.6.5.2).

The subject property is located along multiple existing local public transit bus routes connecting to a variety of local and regional terminals. Furthermore, the subject property is located along the future LRT transit corridor which is expected to be operational by 2022. The proposed development will be integrated into the existing Hurontario Street pedestrian sidewalk system to provide direct pedestrian connection to facilitate walkable access to existing and planned transit stops. The existing and proposed transit networks provide inter and intra regional transit opportunities.

The density currently permitted under the MOP (single detached dwellings) is limiting in nature as it does not permit for the amount of density that can be accommodated on site and by extension does not promote the efficient use of existing and future transit infrastructure investments (1.6.5.4, 1.6.7.4). The existing MOP designation therefore, is not in conformity with policy 1.6.5.5 which speaks to the interconnectedness of land use planning and transportation.

It is for these reasons that we are of the opinion that the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment demonstrates consistency with the PPS policies and further will continue to uphold the intended function of the area.

4.2 GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE, 2019

A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe ("Growth Plan") came into effect May 2019, replacing the 2017 Growth Plan. Under the Planning Act, all planning decisions with respect to land use shall conform to the Growth Plan. The Growth Plan is intended to be a framework for implementing the Province's vision for supporting strong prosperous communities through managing growth in the region through 2041. The 2019 Growth Plan builds from the progress of the former plan and provides stronger policies regarding the importance of optimizing the use of land and infrastructure as well as the achievement of complete communities.

As required by Sections 2 and 3 of the Planning Act, the following sections demonstrate the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment's conformity with the Growth Plan. The Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment conform to the Growth Plan in the following ways:

The proposed development demonstrates conformity with the policies of the Growth Plan as it proposes an increase in residential density in a location which is situated within the existing settlement area and delineated boundary. Specifically, the subject lands are located within an area where this amount of density is supportable by existing and planned infrastructure and services.

The proposed development promotes the policies of the Growth Plan as it represents residential infill and intensification in a settlement area and delineated built-up area with existing municipal water and wastewater systems as per the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by Crozier & Associates.

The proposed development is located in close proximity to existing and planned local public transit service which allows for the opportunity for higher-order transit connections. Furthermore, the proposed development is located in close proximity to the QEW/Hurontario interchange which allows for access and connection to the existing 400-series provincial highway network.

The development will support the creation of a complete community with close proximity to existing commercial areas along Hurontario, in addition to institutional uses such as elementary and secondary schools and recreational opportunities.

The Mississauga Official Plan identifies Hurontario Street as an *Arterial* road and an *Intensification Corridor*. The proposed development has applied high quality design principles to create an attritive public realm, streetscape and compact built-form. Appropriate streetscape elements along the Hurontario frontage will assist in the creation of a desirable public realm and will be provided by way of an upgraded boulevard treatment as required by the City of Mississauga. The proposal provides a communal outdoor amenity space and has been designed to include features such as trellises and benches.

The built form proposed is compact in design and proposes an increase in density, whilst prioritizing the public realm through architectural design elements.

Growth Plan policies relevant to the proposed development include Section 2.2.2 – Delineated Built-up Areas, and 2.2.6 – Housing which provides that:

Policy 2.2.2 (1) Delineated Built-up Areas, establishes the required target for development within delineated built-up areas:

2.2.2.3. All municipalities will develop a strategy to achieve the minimum intensification target and intensification throughout delineated built-up areas, which will:

- a) identify strategic growth areas to support achievement of the intensification target and recognize them as a key focus for development;
- *b) identify the appropriate type and scale of development in strategic growth areas and transition of built form to adjacent areas;*
- *c) encourage intensification generally throughout the delineated built-up area;*
- *d) ensure lands are zoned and development is designed in a manner that supports the achievement of complete communities;*
- *e)* prioritize planning and investment in infrastructure and public service facilities that will support intensification; and
- *f)* be implemented through official plan policies and designations, updated zoning and other supporting documents.

The proposed Official Plan and Zoning By law Amendment will support the City in achieving the residential growth targets mandated by the Growth Plan and to contribute to the goal of creating complete communities, by providing residential intensification in an area well-serviced transit opportunities which allows residents to access jobs, recreation and day to day services and amenities. The proposed development further conforms to this objective by intensifying lands within the delineated built-up area and along an intensification corridor.

As noted above, the proposed development is located in close proximity to existing and planned local public transit service.

The location of the site is conveniently within walking distance to Mary Fix Park, Queen Elizabeth Senior Public School, Mineola Public School and Port Credit Secondary School. These public facilities provide a variety of recreational opportunities for existing and future residents. The development will support the creation of a complete community with close proximity to existing commercial areas along Hurontario, in

addition to institutional uses such as elementary and secondary schools and recreational opportunities. The proposal also contemplates a common outdoor amenity area accessible by the residents of the proposal.

Appropriate streetscape elements along the Hurontario frontage will assist in the creation of a desirable public realm and will be provided by way of an upgraded boulevard treatment as required by the City of Mississauga.

The built form proposed is compact in design and proposes an increase in density, whilst prioritizing the public realm through architectural design elements.

It is the intention of this design team to work with guidelines put forth by the City of Mississauga to understand and implement particular urban design strategies (including the Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Guidelines, where feasible) with specific regard to appropriate massing and façade treatments, and fostering streetscape and pedestrian scenarios which will not cause undue impacts on the character of the area as it exists today.

The Official Plan and Zoning By law Amendment demonstrates conformity with the Growth Plan as it proposes transit supportive densities in an area that is appropriately serviced. Given the subject property's location, it's accessibility to several existing transit options along with future transit infrastructure improvements, reduced dependence on the automobile and a potential reduction in greenhouse gas emissions can be anticipated.

The location provides ease of access to multi modal transportation options and will therefore encourage residents to engage in alternative modes of transportation such as public transit and active transportation, which are both readily available in the area. Section 2.2.4 Transit Corridors and Station Areas, reads:

2.2.4.1.1	The priority transit corridors shown in Schedule 5 will be identified in official plans. Planning will be prioritized for major transit station areas on priority transit corridors, including zoning in a manner that implements the policies of this Plan.	
2.2.4.2	For major transit station areas on priority transit corridors or subway lines, upper- and single-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities, will delineate the boundaries of major transit station areas in a transit-supportive manner that maximizes the size of the area and the number of potential transit users that are within walking distance of the station	
2.2.4.3	Major transit station areas on priority transit corridors or subway lines will be planned for a minimum density target of:	
	b)160 residents and jobs combined per hectare for those that are served by light rail transit or bus rapid transit; or	
2.2.4.6	Within major transit station areas on priority transit corridors or subway lines, land uses and built form that would adversely affect the achievement of the minimum density targets in this Plan will be prohibited.	
2.2.4.9	Within all major transit station areas, development will be supported, where appropriate, by:	

- a. planning for a diverse mix of uses, including second units and affordable housing, to support existing and planned transit service levels;
- c. providing alternative development standards, such as reduced parking standards; and
- *d.* prohibiting land uses and built form that would adversely affect the achievement of transit-supportive densities.

Section 2.2.4.1 discusses priority transit corridors which will be further delineated in Official Plans. The City of Mississauga Official Plan Schedule 2 – Intensification Areas places the subject site within the 500m radius of a Major Transit Station Area (as discussed in the Planning Justification Report dated December 2017). The Growth Plan states that within Major Transit Station Areas ("MTSA"), development will be supported where appropriate by prohibiting land uses and built form that would adversely affect the achievement of transit-supportive densities. The existing land use permissions in the MOP are not most beneficial in achieving the intention of a MTSA as set forth in Section 2.2.4 of the Growth Plan. The proposed Official Plan Amendment will promote intensification in line with the policies outlined in the PPS.

Section 2.2.6 of the Growth Plan provides policy guidance related to housing, including Policy 2.2.6.2 which builds on the objective of previous sections, emphasizing the importance of achieving complete communities.

2.2.6.1 Upper- and single-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities, the Province, and other appropriate stakeholders, will:

- a) support housing choice through the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan, as well as the other policies of this Plan by: i. identifying a diverse range and mix of housing options and densities, including second units and affordable housing to meet projected needs of current and future residents; and ii. establishing targets for affordable ownership housing and rental housing;
- *b) identify mechanisms, including the use of land use planning and financial tools, to support the implementation of policy 2.2.6.1 a);*
- *d) implement policy* 2.2.6.1 *a), b) and c) through official plan policies and designations and zoning by-laws.*
- 2.2.6.2. Notwithstanding policy 1.4.1 of the PPS, 2014, in preparing a housing strategy in accordance with policy 2.2.6.1, municipalities will support the achievement of complete communities by:
 - *a) planning to accommodate forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan;*
 - *b) planning to achieve the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan;*
 - c) considering the range and mix of housing options and densities of the existing housing stock; and
 - *d)* planning to diversify their overall housing stock across the municipality."

The proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment conform to the policies of the Growth Plan by providing for land use permissions that increase residential density which is supportable

from a technical perspective as evidenced in the supporting studies provided in this submission. Therefore, the proposed amendments are in conformity when evaluated against the Growth Plan policies identified in Section 2.2.6.2. The subject property's adjacency to various transit opportunities, including future higher-order transit accommodates greater densities via intensification thereby reinforcing ridership and transit usage on an otherwise underutilized parcel of land.

The proposed unit mix and unit sizes diversifies the housing stock and will generate new housing opportunities. Existing employment opportunities and businesses, services, active transportation and recreation opportunities in the area support the additional housing proposed.

Overall, the proposed development adheres to above noted objectives by contributing to intensification targets while considering the achievement of complete communities, built form, scale and transition to adjacent areas through compact and inclusive and overarching urban design practices. Integration with the existing character area is discussed in Section 4.4.1 of this Report.

The proposed form of development will contribute to the intensification targets of the Growth Plan while achieving a desired urban form and scale which adequately and appropriately transitions from the intensification corridor to surrounding established residential areas.

4.3 **REGION OF PEEL OFFICIAL PLAN, OFFICE CONSOLIDATION DECEMBER 2018**

The Regional Official Plan ("ROP") is the primary long-range strategic land use policy document for the Region of Peel. The ROP adopted several policy amendments in 2018. Where relevant, those amendments have been included in this section along with the required rationale which evidences the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment(s) compliance with the ROP.

The ROP is a broad land use policy document, which provides Regional Council with a long-term policy framework for guiding growth and development in Peel Region while having specific regard for protection of the natural environment, managing renewable and non-renewable resources, and outlining a regional structure that manages such growth. It also provides guidance to the area municipalities in the preparation and implementation of their local Official Plans.

The Region has general objectives for lands in the "Urban System" as laid out in Section 5.3.1.

The goal of the defined Regional Plan's land use structure, in conjunction with the allocated growth forecasts, is to facilitate the development of healthy complete communities by offering a wide range and mix of housing, employment, recreational and cultural activities. These communities will be served and connected by a multi-modal transportation system that will enable the efficient use of land, public services, finances and infrastructure, while protecting and preserving the natural environment, respecting hazards and resources and the characteristics of existing communities in the Region (Policy 5.1.2). The proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment will bring the subject property into conformity with the Regional Plan by creating a transit-supportive, serviced and pedestrian friendly development in an area containing a mix of land uses.

The proposal offers a compact urban form which efficiently uses otherwise underutilized lands and capitalizes on established and future services and infrastructure further promoting the efficient use of land and transit supportive densities. The proposal considers the characteristics of existing services in the area by providing for an increase in residential density in an area that is well accommodated by a variety of day to day goods and services and provides access to popular destinations.

In addition to the policies previously provided in the Planning Justification Report dated December 2017, the ROP states that it is the policy of Regional Council to:

"5.3.3.2.5 Require the area municipalities to identify, where appropriate, intensification corridors, major transit station areas and other major intensification opportunities such as infill, redevelopment, brownfield sites, the expansion or conversion of existing buildings and greyfields in their official plans and support increased residential and employment densities within those areas to ensure the viability of transit and a mix of residential, office, institutional and commercial development."

"5.3.3.2.6 Identify the Hurontario Corridor linking the two urban growth centres as a Regional Intensification Corridor that provides:

a) prime opportunities for intensification;

b) opportunities for residents to live and work within the Regional Intensification Corridor;

c) a high intensity, compact urban form with an appropriate mix of uses including commercial, office, residential, recreational and major institutional – as designated and/or defined in area municipal official plans;
d) transit- supportive and pedestrian oriented urban forms;

5.3.3.2.7 Direct the area municipalities to define the boundaries of the Hurontario Regional Intensification Corridor and identify appropriately in their official plans, consistent with the policies in this plan.

The subject site is situated within the Hurontario intensification Corridor as defined by the City of Mississauga Official Plan. The Regional Intensification Corridor policies require land uses to be of the highest density and of a compact urban form. The proposal is appropriately intensified as per the intention of the Region of Peel's vision for the Regional Intensification Corridor and is further supported by its location (designation) within the Intensification Corridor as defined in the Mississauga Official Plan which is to be discussed in the forthcoming portions of this Report. Although the proposal is suited along an intensification corridor, it is acknowledged through the development proposal that the subject property is also situated on the edge of a mature character area, being the Mineola Character Area, and thus the proposed development balances the priorities of the intensification corridor with those of the character area as discussed in Section 4.4.1 of this report.

Intensification Corridors are defined as:

"Regionally significant, multi-functional, linear concentrations of urban development providing a range and mix of commercial, office, major institutional, residential, recreation and cultural services or facilities that supports higher-order transit service and links urban growth centres together."

The location of the subject lands provide residents with the opportunity to connect with not only the immediate neighbourhood but also access to surrounding areas. This provides opportunities for employment, recreation and access to day-to-day services. The proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendments also contribute to increasing range of residential uses that support higher order transit.

The proposed development represents compact, efficient intensification of an existing underutilized property with a mix of uses at an intensity that is supportive of existing transit and opportunities for future light rapid transit along the Hurontario Intensification Corridor. The proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-

law Amendment therefore conform to the Intensification Corridor policies of the ROP. The height and FSI restrictions imposed by the current MOP designations are not in conformity with the ROP policy direction as the FSI range is conceivably too low for the Regional Intensification Corridor.

Policy 5.5 – Growth Management makes specific reference to complete communities by providing a guiding principle to the Plan, in that the decision-making process of land development, resource management and investment, is to build compact, vibrant and complete communities.

Growth management policies of this Plan contribute to the achievement of complete communities within the Region of Peel. Specifically, Policy 5.5.2 includes the following:

"5.5.1.1 To optimize the use of the existing land supply of the Region by directing a significant portion of growth to the built-up areas through intensification, particularly the urban growth centres, intensification corridors and major transit service areas.

5.5.1.5 To optimize the use of existing and planned infrastructure and services.

5.5.1.6 To support planning for complete communities in Peel that are compact, well-designed, transit-oriented, offer transportation choices, include a diverse mix of land uses, accommodate people at all stages of life and have an appropriate mix of housing, a good range of jobs, high quality open space, and easy access to retail and services to meet daily needs.

5.5.1.7 To protect and promote human health."

The above noted policies from Section 5.5 of the Region of Peel Official Plan effectively rationalize the proposed development based on its proposed elements and location. The ROP directs growth to the builtup area and the Hurontario Intensification Corridor through intensification and the provision of a mix of residential, employment and recreation uses in close proximity to one another. The use of existing and planned infrastructure and services is optimized, and existing and future transit is supported.

The proposal will take advantage of both planned and existing infrastructure and services in the area and capitalize on public sector investments. The proposal supports the creation of complete communities as it provides a compact, well-designed, transit-oriented development which will include the provision of housing options effectively catering to people at all stages of life while providing ease of access to services and amenities in the area. The immediate area is well-serviced by commercial and retail services that meet daily needs of future residents and transit opportunities which are able provide connectivity to the surrounding area.

The Region's general policies for growth management relevant to the proposed development include the following:

"5.5.2.1 Direct the area municipalities to incorporate official plan policies to develop complete communities that are compact, well-designed, transit-oriented, offer transportation choices, include a diverse mix of land uses, accommodate people at all stages of life and have an appropriate mix of housing, a good range of jobs, high quality public open space and easy access to retail and services.

5.5.2.2 Direct a significant portion of new growth to the built-up areas of the community through intensification.

5.5.2.4 Prohibit the establishment of new settlement areas."

As outlined above, new growth is to be directed to the Region's Urban System in pedestrian friendly, transitsupportive urban development. Intensification is encouraged where complete communities and transit supportive development can be achieved. The proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment reinforce the objectives for complete communities as outlined by the ROP.

The development proposal (revised) serves as a transitional area between the Hurontario intensification corridor and the adjacent existing low-density neighbourhood, specifically through the siting of the proposed buildings towards the Hurontario frontage and further providing rear yard separation. The increased rear yard setback (from Building B to the existing low density residential) allows for the retention of existing mature trees for screening purposes to the existing low density residential uses.

Section 5.5.3: Intensification indicates that a significant portion of new growth should be directed to builtup areas, promote compact urban form and intensification. The proposed Amendments generally intensification objectives per the ROP.

The subject lands are within the Urban System and direct growth to the built-up area through intensification of an underutilized parcel of land which through the proposed development, will utilize existing infrastructure and services and capitalize on infrastructure investment.

The location of the subject lands, along an intensification corridor, and within a MTSA provides a unique advantage to realize the areas intended function which, per the direction offered in the relevant policy frameworks, is to host more intensified developments and a mix of uses. The proposal includes the intensification of the subject lands to be developed with an FSI beyond that which was originally envisioned under the local policy planning framework however, is designed to be compatible with the surrounding land uses in terms of uses permitted, height, scale, massing and transition. The proposal will respect and optimize the existing and planned conditions of the surrounding neighbourhood by balancing objectives of intensification corridors, MTSAs and those of the Mineola Character Area.

The proposed development supports the further establishment of a vibrant neighbourhood by providing for urban design solutions, an enhanced streetscape and fosters complete communities.

As noted in Section 5.9.5 Inter and Intra Regional Transit Network:

"5.9.5 The Inter and Intra Regional Transit Network

The existing road network, even with additions and expansions, will not accommodate the long term travel demands of Peel's projected residents and workers at acceptable levels of service. A considerable portion of trips will have to be accommodated by alternative modes of transportation, including transit. The implementation of transit supportive measures and the enhancement of transit services will be needed in order for this to occur."

Policies and objectives of the Region, as it relates to Inter- and Intra-Regional Transit include the following:

"5.9.5.1.2 To support and encourage the development of an economically feasible, effective and efficient, sustainable and safe inter- and intra-regional transit network and encourage connectivity and coordination between transit services.

5.9.5.1.4 To support and encourage transit – supportive development densities and patterns particularly along rapid transit corridors and at designated nodes such as transit terminals, urban growth centres, GO stations and mobility hubs.

5.9.5.2.1 Support the implementation and protection of rapid transit corridors as shown of schedule G, as well as those additional higher order transit, bus rapid transit or priority transit corridors proposed on regional roads by the area municipalities or provincial transit authorities."

5.9.5.2.10 Encourage the intensification of residential and non-residential development at nodes and mobility hubs and along corridors to support a higher level of transit services and other sustainable modes.

5.9.5.2.13 Support gateways and interconnections between the local bus network and future transitways, especially at Urban Growth Centres and other mobility and transportation hubs."

The proposed development conforms to the policies of Section 5.9 of the Region of Peel Official Plan. The roadway (Hurontario Street) that provides access to the subject site provides higher-order movement of people and goods (per its designation as an Arterial Road) and offers opportunities for inter and intraregional connections. The proposal incorporates priority elements such as short and long term bicycle parking opportunities, whilst the location provides for activity and design that support and encourage transit usage and ridership.

The subject site has direct access to the proposed LRT along Hurontario Street, which makes the subject site an ideal candidate for higher density residential development. The proposed development, which includes 42 units, will promote ridership and support a higher level of transit service within the area, as desired by both the ROP and Mississauga Official Plan. This development will provide a mutually beneficial relationship in terms of ridership and connectivity for the residents. As discussed, the density proposed supports the public investments in the existing and future transit network. It is for these reasons that the revised proposal is in conformity with the Region of Peel Official Plan.

It is for these reasons that we are of the opinion that the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment demonstrate conformity with the policies of the Region of Peel Official Plan (Sections 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.5.1, 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 5.9 as outlined above) as it will facilitate the creation and maintenance of healthy and complete communities located along both an intensification corridor, within an MTSA and within the Urban System of the Region of Peel.

4.4 CITY OF MISSISSAUGA OFFICIAL PLAN (MARCH 13, 2019)

The City of Mississauga Official Plan ("MOP") provides direction for the next stage of the city's growth and articulates a vision for a future Mississauga through specific guidance for both the public and private sectors in the ongoing evolution of the City. The MOP provides planning policies to guide the City's development to the year 2031, as required by Provincial legislation. The MOP provides policies to manage and direct the physical change of the city and the effects of such change on the social, economic, cultural and natural environment as well as to set out the goals, objectives and policies to guide future development, redevelopment and intensification within the City. It also forms the basis for detailed land use designations and urban design policies.

The following sections demonstrate how the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications aligns with the overall objectives and policies of the City of Mississauga Official Plan and demonstrates how the specific height and density policies applicable to the subject lands can be brought into conformity with the PPS, Growth Plan and Region of Peel Official Plan

Beyond those policies identified in the Planning Justification Report dated December 2017, we acknowledge and provide the following in addition thereto:

5.1.3	Forecast growth will be directed to appropriate locations to ensure that resources and assets are managed in a sustainable manner to:		
	 b) utilize existing and proposed services and infrastructure such as transit and community infrastructure; c) minimize environmental and social impacts; d) meet long term needs; 		
5.1.4	Most of Mississauga's future growth will be directed to Intensification Areas.		
5.1.7	Mississauga will protect and conserve the character of stable residential Neighbourhoods.		

The development proposal protects the character of the stable residential neighbourhood (Mineola) through careful site and building design considerations (including but not limited to increased rear and side yard setbacks, strategic landscaping and retention of mature trees). The Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment will permit for a built form on a site situated along an intensification corridor and within a MTSA that will best achieve the intention of those designations, whilst respecting the established character area and further act as a transitional area to the existing low density residential built form and an intensification corridor.

Section 5.3 Neighbourhoods states the following:

"5.3.5.2	Residential intensification within Neighbourhoods will generally occur through infilling and the development of existing commercial sites as mixed use areas.
5.3.5.5	Intensification within Neighbourhoods may be considered where the proposed development is compatible in built form and scale to surrounding development, enhances the existing or planned development and is consistent with the policies of this Plan.
5.3.5.6	Development will be sensitive to the existing and planned context and will include appropriate transitions in use, built form, density and scale."

The residential intensification proposed on the subject site is an appropriate form of infill for an otherwise underutilized parcel of land, located along an Intensification Corridor and within a MTSA. The site will be accessed through an existing signalized intersection. The site is situated along Hurontario Street where it will provide a transition to the lower density built form to the east. The density and scale of the development proposal as been revised so to provide for greater setbacks which aid in the ease of transition. The site to the north is a 3 storey office building. The development proposal is also suitable in providing a transition from this existing land use. The development proposal is consistent with the above noted policies of the MOP.

The development proposal intends to satisfy the intention of the existing character area and the policy initiatives put forward in both local area official plans and upper tier policy directives, such as those directing intensification to designated areas.

Section 5.4 Corridors reads:

5.4.4 Development on Corridors should be compact, mixed use and transit friendly and

appropriate to the context of the surrounding Neighbourhood and Employment Area.

5.4.5 Where higher density uses within Neighbourhoods are directed to Corridors, development will be required to have regard for the character of the Neighbourhoods and provide appropriate transitions in height, built form and density to the surrounding lands.

While we recognize that is the proposed development is adjacent to a stable mature neighbourhood, the upper tier policy initiatives direct growth, via infill, to areas designated intensification corridors and those sites well-serviced by transit. The proposal, although not mixed use in nature, is situated in an area that is largely characterized by a mix of uses, such day to day services and amenities, access to recreational and institutional opportunities and transit opportunities which support the development proposal.

The Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment, as well as the revised development concept have regard for the existing low density residential and accordingly, propose rear and side yard setbacks and planting strategies that provide an ease in transition and acknowledge the privacy of existing residential land uses.

The development proposal contemplates a medium density residential development along an intensification corridor, however recognizes the stable character area values which is consistent with the PPS and provides conformity with the Growth Plan and the ROP.

Furthermore, with respect to policies on Corridors:

5.4.8	Corridors will be subject to a minimum building height of two storeys and the maximum building height specified in the City Structure element in which it is located, unless Character Area policies specify alternative building height requirements or until such time as alternative building heights are determined through planning studies. Except along Intensification Corridors and within Major Transit Station Areas, the minimum building height requirement will not apply to Employment Areas.
5.4.11	Hurontario Street and Dundas Street have been identified as Intensification Corridors. These are Intensification Areas. Additional Intensification Corridors may be identified in the future.
5.4.14	The Hurontario Street Intensification Corridor is comprised of lands along Hurontario Street from Lake Ontario in Port Credit to the city's limit to the north as shown on Map 5-1: Hurontario Street Intensification Corridor
5.4.15	A number of Light Rail Transit Stations, which will be located along the Hurontario Street Intensification Corridor to serve the proposed light rail transit system are a form of Major Transit Station Areas. The Major Transit Station Areas are identified on Schedule 2: Intensification Areas and the Light Rail Transit Stations are identified on Schedule 6: Long Term Transit Network."

As per the policies in Section 5.4 as outlined above, the proposed development is appropriate based on the site's location within a Corridor, Intensification Corridor and a Major Transit Station Area (within 500

metres (1,640 feet) of a higher-order transit station, as shown on Figure 1 - MOP, Schedule 2 - Intensification Areas). Conversely, the current MOP designation is not in conformity with Section 5.4 Corridors when defining appropriate densities on the subject lands, per the defined roles of lands located within a Corridor, Intensification Corridor and MTSAs.

As outlined above, these areas are intended to serve at higher densities than others throughout the City and Region. The proposed development is located in an area designated for intensification which provides justification when considering the proposed change in the permitted density. Approval of this development will positively contribute to achieving the City's envisioned growth targets through infill intensification, provide for beautification along a corridor and work live and play opportunities without sacrificing the integrity and character of the existing area.

We acknowledge that Section 5.4.8 defers to Character Area Policies. The Mineola Character Area policies (outlined in Section 4.4.1 of this Report) only encourage buildings to be one to two storeys in height. This can be interpreted as a guideline and subject to case by case considerations and should be revisited based on the merits of the development proposal. As such, we would encourage staff to refer to higher level policies included in the PPS, GPGGH, ROP and MOP as related to residential intensification in appropriate areas which are well served by transit and offer a mix of uses to foster complete communities. We note that the "Corridor" policies as referenced above are intended supersede these policies outlined in Section 5.4.8.

The proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment and those policies captured therein, are in conformity with the intentions of the MOP by providing for intensification in a suitable area which is well-serviced by existing infrastructure and capitalizes on public sector investments such as the future Hurontario LRT.

Section 5.5 Intensification Areas speaks about directing future growth within the City of Mississauga to intensification areas which area areas to be developed at densities which are high enough to support frequent transit service and a variety of amenities. Intensification areas particularly promote the efficient use of lands through developments that involve multi storey buildings and structured parking facilities.

The proposed development will ensure that a greater density of residents can be accommodated on the site (through the proposed medium density built form) than the existing vacant state of the site or potential built form permitted as per the current low-density Official Plan designation. The proposed increase in density will efficiently use existing services and infrastructure without the requirement for improvements and will contribute to transit ridership within the Major Transit Station Area for the forthcoming Hurontario LRT.

As noted previously, the subject property is serviced by MiWay bus routes 103, 19, 19A and 19B seven days per week. All four routes provide a connection to and from the City Centre Transit Terminal where connections can be made to routes 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 20, 21, 28, 34, 61, 61A, 66, 68, 76, 91, 107, 109, 110, as well as Brampton Transit route 502. These routes provide connections between the subject property and nearby GO Transit stations (Port Credit, Cooksville and Square One) for regional transit services as well as the Sheridan College Hazel McCallion Campus and the University of Toronto Mississauga Campus. The nearest northbound bus stop from the subject property is approximately 40 metres walking distance north towards South Service Road and the nearest southbound bus stop is approximately 300 metres walking distance south towards Indian Valley Trail.

The planned Hurontario-Main LRT project will provide a high-frequency service to the Hurontario-Main corridor between the Port Credit GO Station and the GO Station in Downtown Brampton while providing expanded connections to the existing MiWay bus network. The proposed LRT line is to have 26 stops, including one located at Mineola Road which is approximately 700 metres walking distance south from the

subject property and another located at North Service Road which is approximately 500 metres walking distance north from the subject property.

The intensification of this area contributes to the long-term preservation of the environment and promotes environmentally sustainable development through the efficient use of land and the provision of a multimodal transportation system.

Chapter 9 of the Mississauga Official Plan outlines policies and objectives for the physical layout of the city focusing on the goal of sustainable urban form based on the urban system and city structure with high quality design.

- *"9.1.3 Infill and redevelopment within Neighbourhoods will respect the existing and planned character.*
- 9.1.5 Development on Corridors will be consistent with existing or planned character, seek opportunities to enhance the Corridor and provide appropriate transitions to neighbouring uses."

The proposed development, with an FSI of 1.04 and a proposed maximum height of 3 storeys presents a development scenario which is able to provide balance between the existing two-storey residential neighbourhood and the planned vision of Hurontario as an Intensification corridor with planned higherorder transit. The proposed development represents an increase in density which utilizes an infill site for compact and efficient development.

Further site design ideas can be addressed during detailed site design stages to address the buildings fluidity with the existing character area (colour, materials etc.). The Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment intends to satisfy both upper tier policy directive, and those policies put forth in the character area through the proposed built form and massing in efforts. It is the intention to maintain the existing character area, and also present conformity with upper tier policies by providing for appropriately located infill intensification along an Intensification Corridor and within a MTSA.

"9.1.9 Urban form will support the creation of an efficient multi-modal transportation system that encourages a greater utilization of transit and active transportation modes."

The proposed development will have direct access to the future Hurontario LRT which is considered higher order transit. Introducing 42 residential dwelling units with direct access to the future LRT best utilizes the future higher-order transit and promotes multi-modal transportation.

9.5.1.5 Developments will provide a transition in building height and form between Intensification Areas and adjacent Neighbourhoods with lower density and heights.

The proposed development is situated on Hurontario Street, however backs on to an established residential neighbourhood. The site is therefore the optimal location of bridging intensification targets of the corridor and the low-density Mineola neighbourhood through careful design strategies that are intended to be sensitive to the existing area.

Further to the above, Section 9.2.2 Non-Intensification Areas states that Neighbourhoods are a part of Non-Intensification Areas. Section 9.2.2.1 states the following:

"9.2.2.1 Heights in excess of four storeys will be required to demonstrate that an appropriate transition in height and built form that respects the surrounding context will be achieved."

The proposed built form is three storeys in height and therefore does not meet the four-storey benchmark as noted above in policy 9.2.2.1. Additionally, section 9.2.2 states:

"Where increases in density and a variety of land uses are considered in neighbourhoods and Employment Areas, they will be directed to Corridors"

As noted above, the subject site falls within a designated Intensification Corridor as defined in Sched 1c, Urban System of the City of Mississauga Official Plan. Therefore, notwithstanding the Neighbourhood policies, the proposed density and built form generally satisfy the intentions of the MOP.

The following policies from the MOP speak to Official Plan Amendments:

"19.5.1 City Council will consider applications for site specific amendments to this Plan within the context of the policies and criteria set out throughout this Plan. The proponent of an official plan amendment will be required to submit satisfactory reports to demonstrate the rationale for the amendment; including, among other matters:

a. that the proposed redesignation would not adversely impact or destabilize the following:

• the achievement of the overall intent, goals, objectives, and policies of this Plan; and

• the development or functioning of the remaining lands that have the same designation, or neighbouring lands; and

b. that a municipal comprehensive review of land use designations or a five year review is not required;

c. that the lands are suitable for the proposed use, and a planning rationale with reference to the policies of this Plan, other applicable policies, and sound planning principles is provided, setting out the merits of the proposed amendment in comparison with the existing designation;

d. land use compatibility with the existing and future uses of surrounding lands; and

e. the adequacy of engineering services, community infrastructure and multimodaltransportation systems to support the proposed application."

The proposed Official Plan (and Zoning by-law) Amendments to facilitate the development of 42 stacked back to back townhouse units will not adversely impact or destabilize the overall objectives and goals of the Official Plan. Conversely, the Official Plan Amendment to re-designate the lands from low-density to medium density implement the Official Plan's vision for a walkable, transit-supportive Mississauga, where growth and intensification is concentrated to Corridors. The site is located on the periphery of the residential low density designation and therefore, will not disturb the general intent of the policy. Section 1.4.4 of the Mississauga Official Plan notes that the vision articulated in the Plan is contingent on understanding that considerations, although potentially conflicting, must be "effectively balanced" to ensure that land use planning decisions align with larger City building objectives. It is conceivable, then, that the Official Plan

Amendment which proposes to redesignate the subject lands is required to bring the Official Plan into consistency with the PPS and conformity with the Growth Plan and Regional Official Plan. The Official Plan Amendment does not require a municipal comprehensive review, and the adequacy of engineering services, community infrastructure and transportation systems has been achieved.

4.4.1 MINEOLA NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER AREA

The subject property falls within the Mineola Neighbourhood Character Area, which is one of the 23 Neighbourhood Character Areas in Mississauga. Chapter 16 of the Official Plan outlines general policies for Neighbourhoods, as well as Character Area specific policies. The Mineola Neighbourhood Character Area is bordered by the Credit River to the west, Queen Elizabeth Way to the north, Cawthra Road to the east and the Canadian National Railway to the south.

The site is situated within Special Site 2 of the Mineola Character Area, which is bordered by Queen Elizabeth Way and Cotton Drive along the Hurontario corridor. Special Site 2 permits a broader range of uses including offices, medical offices, commercial uses and personal service uses.

The Mineola Character Area includes Urban Design Policies including streetscape policies:

"16.18.1.2 On lands adjacent to Hurontario Street, the existing mature vegetation, well landscaped appearance and generous setbacks will be maintained to reflect area character. As Hurontario Street is a gateway to the Character Area, as well as Port Credit, consideration should be given to: additional tree planting, a sodded boulevard, a bicycle route and a right-of-way design that is sympathetic to the character of the area."

As reflected on the Site Plan, the area character has been considered with respect to setbacks and landscaping. The revised Site Plan proposes a 10m setback from Hurontario Street, which will consist of soft landscaping. As we understand, there will be an upgraded boulevard treatment area requirement along the Hurontario Street frontage which will be addressed through the detailed site design process with staff. A landscaped amenity area is also proposed at the rear of the site. There is a building setback of approximately 24.8m proposed at this time. Tree planting has been included as part of this development. Mature vegetation has been retained where possible. Please consult the revised Tree Plan prepared by MEP for further details.

The Mineola Character Area also includes Land Use policies. Of note:

- "16.18.2.1 Notwithstanding the Residential Low Density I and Residential Low Density II policies of this Plan, the Residential Low Density I and Residential Low Density II designations permit only detached dwellings.
- 16.18.2.2 Notwithstanding the Residential Medium Density policies of this Plan, the Residential Medium Density designation permits only townhouse dwellings."

The proposed Official Plan Amendment proposes to re-designated the lands from 'Residential Low Density I' to 'Residential Medium Density' to permit the proposed development. Due to the subject property's location with frontage on Hurontario Street, a Higher Order Transit Corridor, and the planned future Hurontario LRT, the Official Plan Amendment is required to bring the property into consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement and conformity with the Growth Plan.

The proposed Stacked Back to Back Townhouses are, in our opinion, appropriate in satisfying the medium density policies. The Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Dwellings, and implementing Zoning B-law, request 3 storeys in height which is in line with the typical townhouse dwelling policies. Additionally, the development proposal offers benefits beyond the traditional townhouse development as no parking is provided at grade, therefore creating a more desirable pedestrian realm and proposes both private and communal amenity area. Additionally, the built form and building footprint will be similar to a traditional townhouse dwelling, however will accommodate a greater amount of density. The increase in density is seen as desirable since the site is located in an area which is directed by Provincial, Regional and Municipal policies alike to host residential intensification based on its geographic location and surrounding services such as, but not limited to, the Hurontario LRT and mix of uses already existing in the area.

"16.18.5.2.2 d) the use must be of a nature and intensity that results in a parking demand which does not negatively impact the function of Hurontario Street nor abutting local roads. In this regard, applicants for rezoning will be required to demonstrate, through the submission of traffic studies, parking justification studies and business operation information, that the proposed use is suitable for its location. Developments which result in a reduced parking demand are preferred;..."

The proposed development will not generate traffic that has negative impacts on the intended function of the Hurontario road network. As outlined in the Traffic Impact Statement, and further evidenced in the Parking Study, prepared by C.F.Crozier, the use and density of the proposed development is not expected to generate unduly parking demands or generate traffic that is unmanageable by the existing road network. The nature and density of the proposed development are appropriate for an arterial road which will soon have Light Rapid Transit. With the future higher-order transit along this corridor, parking demands are expected to decrease.

With regard to access arrangements, we note the following from the Mineola Character Area policies:

"16.18.5.2.2 f) where appropriate, mutual driveway access will be permitted between abutting property owners provided this arrangement is registered on title;"

A shared access arrangement between the property owner of the subject proposed development and the property owner of the neighbouring property to the south is proposed. This arrangement states that mutual driveway access will be developed, in accordance with the subject site's development. In addition, access to the proposed development is proposed via a private condominium road, rather than individual driveways to units. This minimizes accesses from Hurontario Street, an arterial road.

"16.18.5.2.2 h) street frontages are required to be enhanced with landscaping to reflect Hurontario Street's role as a gateway to the Mineola and Port Credit Character Areas. Onsite parking areas should not dominate the streetscape and are required to be appropriately screened by vegetation and landscape treatments which are complementary to the character of the area. In this regard the following will also apply: • a minimum of 40% of the front yard of interior lots, will be landscaped open space. Landscaped open space may include pedestrian walkways but will exclude paved parking areas; • corner lots will provide a total minimum landscaped open space area of 40% of the lot; • a landscape buffer ranging from 4.5 m to 7.5 m in depth will be provided along the Hurontario Street frontage; and • a minimum landscape buffer of 4.5 m in depth will be provided along side street frontages adjacent to parking areas; "

In addition to the above noted, on-site resident and visitor parking is located underground and therefore do not dominate the streetscape and are not visible from the public right-of-way. The proposal also achieves the required 40% landscaped open space area and prioritizes the preservation of mature trees which currently exist on the property.

A Draft Official Plan amendment is required to redesignate the subject property from *Low Density Residential I* to *Residential Medium Density* to permit the development of the proposed horizontal multiple dwellings and to remove the subject property from the Special Site 2 designation of the Mineola Neighbourhood Character Area. As the subject property is located on the periphery of the Special Site 2, adjacent to existing commercial office and institutional uses and is the location of a former convenience restaurant site, the proposed increase in density will not impact the integrity or character of the balance of Special Site 2 along Hurontario Street. Furthermore, the proposed development is consistent with the existing *Medium Density Residential* designation immediately west of the subject property which is not included within the Mineola Neighbourhood Character Area Special Site 2 boundary. These proposed amendments will facilitate the development of these lands for the proposed horizontal multiple dwellings.

There is no minimum or maximum FSI requirements or restrictions in the Mineola Character Area.

It is our opinion that the proposed development, along with the implementing Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law amendment are n keeping with the general intent of the Mineola Character Area and will not adversely effect the area as it exists today.

4.5 Back to Back and Stacked Townhouses Urban Design Guidelines, May 2018

Beginning in September 2016, the Planning and Building Department at the City of Mississauga prepared urban design guidelines for back to back and stacked townhouses which sets out design criteria. Concurrently, staff have conducted a review of the existing Zoning By-law regulations and recommended amendments to the Zoning By-law. On June 18, 2018, Planning and Development Committee approved the guidelines dated May 2018. As we understand, staff noted at that same meeting that:

"Development applications that are currently in process and have been deemed complete will be evaluated against the policies and regulations in effect at the time of submitting the applications."

Notwithstanding the proposed development is not subject to the Checklist and the Design Guidelines, the document as a whole were considered and respected in the revision and updates to the Site development concept/Site Plan.

The Urban Design Guidelines include a checklist of principles to be considered when designing a development that includes Back-to-Back and/or Stacked Townhouses. These principles are intended to ensure that new developments are compatible with and respect the existing and planned context through appropriate setbacks, tree preservation and landscape buffers.

Principle	Description	How the Proposed Development
		meets/exceeds

2.1 Zoning By-law	Refer to the Zoning By-law regulations that apply to the proposed built form. Generally BBTs and STs are zoned RM9, RM10, RM11 and RM12 or in combination with other zones	Development proposes an RM10 zone. A Zoning By-law Amendment has been provided as a part of this resubmission.
2.2 Building Height	New developments will be required to demonstrate an appropriate transition in building heights Maximum building heights of three storeys for BBTs and four storeys for STs	Proposed height is 3 storeys. Three storeys in an appropriate transition for a corridor with planned higher order transit (Hurontario LRT), which is adjacent to low-rise residential. Office to the north is 3 storeys in height.
2.3 Building Setbacks	When existing adjacent front yard setbacks vary, new buildings should align with the average setback between the two adjacent properties or the minimum zoning requirement, whichever is greater Where applicable, the planned context should be considered in determining the front yard setback	Front yard setback (Hurontario to nearest face of "Building A") is proposed at 10 metres, as requested by staff. This setback conforms to right of way requirements as noted by city staff and Metrolinx (in accommodating the Hurontario LRT). There is a setback to the Low Density Residential (east) of approximately 24.8m to the nearest main building face.
2.4 Separation Between Buildings	Separation distance between buildings should be the minimum setbacks as outlined in the Zoning By-law In the case of a front wall to front wall condition, the separation distance should be the greater of the 45° angular plane or the minimum setbacks as outlined in the Zoning By-law (See Figure 4) Where a basement unit forms part of a three storey development the minimum separation distance will be 15 m	Proposed distance between the two blocks is approximately 8.7 metres, which meets the minimum required separation in the parent by-law of 3 metres. N/A
2.5 Block length and Unit width	Excessively long blocks should be avoided The maximum length of a block should generally not exceed eight linear unit modules to promote pedestrian connections, allow for landscaping and provide a break in the massing (See Figure 5)	Length of each building block is 43 metres (7 units) which is less than the recommended 8 linear unit maximum. Unit widths range from approximately 6.10 metres to 6.25 metres.
2.6 Natural Features	Unit widths should be a minimum of 4.5 m to ensure sufficient sunlight into the unit New developments should preserve and enhance natural heritage features; including, trees, woodlands, valleys and wetlands	Proposed development takes into consideration natural heritage features and preserves mature vegetation where possible (see Landscape Plans, Tree Preservation/Arborist Report).

Appropriate setbacks and buffers should be provided to existing and proposed natural features to ensure their health and continued growth Specifically, the natural heritage trees along the rear lot line, abutting the residential area and those along the north property line will be preserved where possible. As per the landscape plans prepared by MEP, there are additional plantings proposed. 2.7 Manipulation of site grades should be avoided Generally speaking, the site as it exists today, slopes downward (slighty) west to east and existing grades along property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer around the property Walls ☐ The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered Generally speaking, the site as it exists to adjacent property owners (Residential and commercial/office), additional plantings have been provided where appropriate. No below grade parking structures, casements, and hard surface areas are in the landscape buffer. ☐ The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered Maripulation of site grades along along the interests of adjacent property owners (Residential and commercial/office), additional plantings structures, relaming walls and hard surface areas are in the landscape buffer. At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are setting frade levation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) This rule does not apply as all proposed building are above grade. The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided. <		Appropriate aethopics and buffers should be	Specifically the network besite as the
features to ensure their health and continued growthresidential area and those along the north property line will be preserved where possible. As per the landscape plans prepared by MEP, there are additional plantings propaed.2.7 Grading and Retaining WallsManipulation of site grades along all property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer around the propertyGenerally speaking, the site as it exists today, slopes downward (slightly west to cast and existing grades along property lines are not subject to material change. Landscaped buffers have been provide for the landscaped buffer should be unencumbered bubley grade parking structures, casements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areasGenerally speaking, the site as it exists today, slopes downward (slightly west to cast exists to a cost and protect the interests of adjacent property owners (Residential and commercial/office), additional planting at have been proposed where appropriate. No below grade areas are in the landscape buffer schalts and hard surface areas are in the landscape buffer structures, reasment, reasting that and surface areas and hard surface areas (Gee Figure 6)At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this iter areas area in the landscape buffer should be unot which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)The use of retaining walls should be avoided.This rule does not apply as all proposed building sare above grade.Umplete and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)This rule does not apply as all proposed building are not exact of the site and four of which are taken around			
continued growthproperty line will be preserved where possible. As per the landscape plans prepared by MEP, there are additional plantings proposed.2.7 Grading and Retaining WallsManipulation of site grades along all property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer around the property imes are not subject to material change. Landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areasGenerally speaking. the site as it exists today, slopes downward (slightly) west to east and existing grades along all property lines. In order to provide for the landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areasCommercial/office), and hard surface areasImport the first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closes to the Context Grade (Gee Figure 6)At the most easterly property line, there is a neasement proposed with planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the diacent residential properties, however it is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the planting or daditional trees on the easterly tot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting or fade and our of which are taken around the aroided. Where retaining walls should be avoided.The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided.The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided.Umport the innited to a maximum of 0.6 m to omer than 1.8 m above grade.Use of retaining wal			0
 2.7 Manipulation of site grades should be davoided 2.7 Grading and Retaining Walls □ Match existing grades along all property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer around the property □ The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas □ The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its sere regime to (See Figure 6) □ Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be imited to a maximum of 0.6 m to unimet the need for railings and to a severe impacts from an eliminate the need for railings and to a constrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. 			0
2.7 Manipulation of site grades should be arainings motoided property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer around the property Grading and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer should be unencumbered Gradianes and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer should be unencumbered Landscaped buffer should be unencumbered Landscape duffer should be unencumbered and lard surface areas Landscape duffer should be unencumbered Landscape duffer should be unencumbered Walls Cesidential and commercial/office), additional plantings have been proyead where appropriate. No below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seking staff direction to understamd the bas its floor closest to the Context Grade and its a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context At the most easterly propertise, however it is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the site and round each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be imited to a maximum of 0.6 m to outout the should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to outout the should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to outout the red for railings and to to to to super the forme and partice form an use the ic/operational perspective		continued growth	
2.7 Manipulation of site grades should be avoided Generally speaking, the site as it exists 2.7 Grading and Retaining Generally speaking, the site as it exists Walls ☐ Match existing grades along all property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped Generally speaking, the site as it exists Walls ☐ Match existing grades along all property lines Generally speaking, the site as it exists Use of retaining walls are required, has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its Imate, stillites, severe grade changes Changes and hard surface areas ☐ The first storey means a storey of a building more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are ecking staff direction to understand the most preferred option moving forward when evaluating the planting at this rear secking staff direction to understand the agrade Image: Context Grade Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) This rule does not apply as all proposed to be or the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) This rule does not apply as all proposed to be or retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to to Use of retaining walls has been avoided have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an esthetic/operational perspective			
 2.7 Manipulation of site grades should be Grading and Retaining Walls Walls 			prepared by MEP, there are additional
 2.7 Manipulation of site grades should be Grading and Retaining Walls Walls 			plantings proposed.
Grading and Retaining avoided today, slopes downward (slightly) west to east and existing grades along property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped Walls	2.7	Manipulation of site grades should be	
Retaining	Grading and		
 Walls Match existing grades along all property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade (See Figure 6) Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of hichividual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of he site and fou			
 property lines and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer around the property □The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas □The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls sare required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the liminate the need for railings and to 		Match existing grades along all	
 and provide a minimum 3 m wide landscaped buffer around the property Inthe landscape buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas Inthe first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade (See Figure 6) The use of retaining walls are required, their height Schudt be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining walls are required, their heights are not expected to have adverse impacts from an esthetic/operational perspective Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the use of retaining sand to the store are the store are on the store of the store of the store are on the store of the	vv uns		
 landscaped buildifer around the property □ The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas □ The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade leevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the liminate the need for railings and to 			
 buffer around the property □The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas □The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade close Figure 6) □Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to to to the summation and four of which are taken around each individual building are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to to to the summation at the need for railings and to 			-
 □ The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas □ The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade is grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each whorded. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximum of 0.6 m to building blimited to a maximu		-	
 ☐The landscaped buffer should be unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas ☐The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade (See Figure 6) ☐Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are take		buffer around the property	
 unencumbered by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas □ The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to understand to to maximum of 0.6 m to understand to to a maximum of 0.6 m to understand to to a maximum of 0.6 m to understand to to a maximum of 0.6 m to understand to a maximum of 0.6 m to understand to to a maximum of 0.6 m to understand to a maximum of 0.6 m to unde			
 by below grade parking structures, easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas I → The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade is grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to comparison to compare the need for railings and to where appropriate. No below grade parking structures, retaining walls are more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to comparison to compare the need for railings and to where appropriate. No below grade areas are in the landscape buffer. At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most prefered option moving forward when evaluating the planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential properties, however it is proposed the planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential properties, however it is proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are there are no lower p			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
 easements, retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade (See Figure 6) Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to eliminate the need for railings and to parking structures, retaining walls and hard surface areas are in the landscape buffer. At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most proposed building at this reary and. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential proposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are to explicit of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesth			
 retaining walls, utilities, severe grade changes and hard surface areas □□The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade (See Figure 6) □□Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade (Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to eliminate the need for railings and to surface areas are in the landscape buffer. At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most preferred option moving forward when evaluating the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height Should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to entert and the need for railings and to surface areas are in the landscape buffer. At the most easterly proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most prefered option moving forward when evaluating the planting at the seaterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting or the seaterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting or the planting at the seaterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potentia		by below grade parking structures,	where appropriate. No below grade
 changes and hard surface areas and hard surface areas At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most preferred option moving forward when evaluating the planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential properties, however it is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to o biltiminate the need for railings and to 		easements,	parking structures, retaining walls and hard
 At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most preferred option moving forward when evaluating the planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential properties, however it is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. The use of retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to o At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most preferred option moving forward when evaluating the planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential properties, however it is our intention to provide additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective - 		retaining walls, utilities, severe grade	surface areas are in the landscape buffer.
 At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most preferred option moving forward when evaluating the planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential properties, however it is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. The use of retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to o At the most easterly property line, there is an easement proposed with plant material directly overtop, at this time. We are seeking staff direction to understand the most preferred option moving forward when evaluating the planting at this rear yard. There are existing trees on the adjacent residential properties, however it is our intention to provide additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective - 			· ·
 ☐ The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade (See Figure 6) ☐ Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to o Liminate the need for railings and to 			At the most easterly property line, there is
 ☐ The first storey means a storey of a building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade (See Figure 6) ☐ Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to o 			
 building that has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade Grade Grade i Grade i Grade i elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to the need for railings and to to the need for railings and to to <lito< li=""> to to <</lito<>		The first storey means a storey of a	
 has its floor closest to the Context Grade and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade (See Figure 6) □□Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height the use of retaining walls are required, their height the need for railings and to 			
 and its and its ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade Grade (See Figure 6) a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height to <lito< li=""> to to to to</lito<>			
 ceiling more than 1.8 m above the Context Grade Grade Grade Figure 6) a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height the use of retaining walls are required, their the use of retaining walls are required, their the use of retaining walls are required, the			· · · · ·
Grade (See Figure 6)adjacent residential properties, however it is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences.Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demostrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m toUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -			· · ·
 (See Figure 6) is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to eliminate the need for railings and to is our intention to provide additional screening for privacy purposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective - 		0	
 Each individual building will establish a grade elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Context Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7) The use of retaining walls should be avoided. Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to eliminate the need for railings and to screening for privacy purposes through the planting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences. This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade. Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective - 			
Each individual building will establish a gradeplanting of additional trees on the easterly lot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences.a gradelot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences.ContextThis rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.Which are taken around the perimeter of the siteThis rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m toUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		(See Figure 6)	
a gradelot line. We defer to staff on any potential planting preferences.contextplanting preferences.Grade means the average of 12 points, eight ofThis rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.which are taken around the perimeter of the siteThis rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -			
elevation based on 'Context Grade'. Contextplanting preferences.Grade means the average of 12 points, eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Use of retaining walls has been avoided where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to eliminate the need for railings and toUse of retaining walls has been avoided have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		•	
ContextThis rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -			• •
ContextThis rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)This rule does not apply as all proposed buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.Where retaining walls should be avoided.Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		elevation based on 'Context Grade'.	planting preferences.
eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.Where retaining walls should be avoided.Use of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an eliminate the need for railings and to		Context	
eight of which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)buildings are above grade and ceilings heights are more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Since there are no lower level units 		Grade means the average of 12 points,	This rule does not apply as all proposed
which are taken around the perimeter of the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)heights are more than 1.8m above grade. Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m toUse of retaining walls has been avoided have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		eight of	buildings are above grade and ceilings
the site and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)Since there are no lower level units proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.Where retaining walls are required, their heightUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -			°
and four of which are taken around each individual building (See Figure 7)proposed, proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.use of retaining walls should be avoided.be above grade.Where retaining walls are required, their heightUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		-	
individual building (See Figure 7)demonstrate compliance with having the ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.The use of retaining walls should be avoided.use of retaining walls are required, their heightUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -			
The use of retaining walls should be avoided.ceiling of the lower unit more than 1.8m above grade.Where retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m toUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -			
The use of retaining walls should be avoided.above grade.Where retaining walls are required, their heightUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		marriadul culturing (Dee I igure 7)	
avoided.Use of retaining walls has been avoidedWhere retaining walls are required, their height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m toUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		The use of retaining walls should be	e
Where retaining walls are required, their heightUse of retaining walls has been avoided where possible. Heights of those proposed have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -		0	
height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to eliminate the need for railings and to height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m to eliminate the need for railings and to height should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 m have been limited and are not expected to have adverse impacts from an aesthetic/operational perspective -			Has of retaining walls has been sucided
should be limited to a maximum of 0.6 mhave been limited and are not expected totohave adverse impacts from aneliminate the need for railings and toaesthetic/operational perspective -		•	
to have adverse impacts from an eliminate the need for railings and to aesthetic/operational perspective -		-	
eliminate the need for railings and to aesthetic/operational perspective -			-
			1
reduce landscape wall has been proposed to the		reduce	landscape wall has been proposed to the

long-term maintenance costs (See Figure 8)	north of the property and the max height has been limited to 0.5m
 Below grade units should be avoided Manipulation of site grades requiring retaining walls to accommodate below grade units is discouraged If a below grade unit is proposed, it must be a through-unit that has windows on both the front and rear of the building (See Figure 9), or be a double wide back to back unit (min. 9 m wide) (See Figure 10) Below grade units require a minimum of 6 m of private outdoor space located at the unit's floor level with unobstructed views and access to daylight (See Figure 6 and 9) All building projections including balconies and porches located over private outdoor spaces or windows of below grade units should not obstruct 	The proposed development does not include below grade units. No action or consideration for Section 2.8 is required. N/A N/A
access to daylight. See the Zoning By- law for projection regulations (See Figure 9 and 11)	
• New development should be compatible	Proposed development is consistent with
	the existing/planned context as it is only 3 storeys and is an appropriate scale for the
 For buildings over 3 storeys and where appropriate, stepback the upper floors or incorporate sloped roofs and half storeys 	location and future of the area (Hurontario LRT).
with dormer windows to reduce	N/A – the buildings are not over 3 storeys.
• Ensure new developments have a variety of facade articulation, building materials	Façade articulation, materials and colours to be addressed at Site Plan Approval.
• Blank facades on the visible end unit elevation are unacceptable. End units that are visible should have entrances,	Elevations have been refined/better detailed to assist staff in their review.
windows and architectural interest to animate the elevation Buildings should be designed with high quality and	Rooftop structures have been stepped back 3.4m.
durable materials to avoid long-term maintenance costs. Stone and brick is	Rooftop Access Structure is proposed to be 15.0m2.
 Stepback the structure for rooftop access (i.e. rooftop mechanical room) a minimum of 3 m from the exterior edges of the building to reduce visual impact 	Private rooftop amenity areas are stepped back 1.0m from building edge.
	 Below grade units should be avoided Manipulation of site grades requiring retaining walls to accommodate below grade units is discouraged If a below grade unit is proposed, it must be a through-unit that has windows on both the front and rear of the building (See Figure 9), or be a double wide back to back unit (min. 9 m wide) (See Figure 10) Below grade units require a minimum of 6 m of private outdoor space located at the unit's floor level with unobstructed views and access to daylight (See Figure 6 and 9) All building projections including balconies and porches located over private outdoor spaces or windows of below grade units should not obstruct access to daylight. See the Zoning Bylaw for projection regulations (See Figure 9 and 11) New development should be compatible with the existing context in terms of height, scale, massing and materials For buildings over 3 storeys and where appropriate, stepback the upper floors or incorporate sloped roofs and half storeys with dormer windows to reduce perceived height, scale and massing Ensure new developments have a variety of facade articulation, building materials and colours for visual interest Blank facades on the visible end unit elevation are unacceptable. End units that are visible should have entrances, windows and architectural interest to animate the elevation Buildings should be designed with high quality and durable materials to avoid long-term maintenance costs. Stone and brick is preferred. Stucco and wood are discouraged Stepback the structure for rooftop access (i.e. rooftop mechanical room) a minimum of 3 m from the exterior edges

	 The structure for rooftop access should not be greater than 20 m2, inclusive of stairs Rooftop outdoor amenity areas (common or private) should be setback a minimum of 1 m from the building's exterior edge to mitigate overlook concerns onto existing adjacent low density residential properties. This setback will not be required for internal units (See Figure 12) 	
2.10 Exposed Parking Structures	 Exposed parking structures should be avoided. Where portions of the underground parking structure are exposed, they should match the building materials Consolidate the entrances to underground parking structures within the same development to minimize the number of overhead doors Maintain the minimum soil volume over the parking structure to support the growth of the vegetation. The minimum soil volume varies based on the type of vegetation. Stairs exiting underground parking should be fully enclosed in glass to increase visibility and address issues of safety, security and weather protection 	The proposed development does not include any exposed parking structures. The proposed development has one consolidated entrance/exit to the underground parking, through the ramp at the rear of the site. Underground parking garage limit is revised. See Landscape/Arborist Report/TIPP/Site Plan To be addressed at detailed design stages.
2.11 Landscaped Soft Areas	 Landscaped soft areas are required adjacent to paved areas and around the perimeter of the site. To provide relief between buildings, landscaped soft areas should be distributed throughout the development Landscaped soft areas should be provided between entrances to individual units and sidewalks, public streets and condominium roads Pair individual landscaped soft areas to increase soil volume for tree growth particularly where there is a driveway (See Figure 13) Limit the number of stairs to a unit entrance from three to seven risers to maximize landscaped soft area, mitigate safety issues in the winter and reduce maintenance costs (See Figure 13) All stairs should be poured in place concrete. 	Landscape buffers have been provided along the perimeter of the site. Additionally, more significant landscaped areas are provided at the front, side(s) and rear of the site. Landscaped soft areas are provided between entrances to individual units and between the site and the sidewalk/public street. Maximum of 7 risers has not been exceeded.

	Precast stairs are not permitted	
2.12 Common Outdoor Amenity Area	 A common outdoor amenity area is required for all new residential developments with more than 20 units. The total space required is 2.8 m2 per dwelling unit or 5% of the site area whichever is greater Common outdoor amenity areas should be located in one central area, highly visible and accessible by all residents (See Figure 14) Unless a mews space is greater than the required separation distance in the Zoning By-law, a mews will not be considered a common outdoor amenity area Refer to the Outdoor Amenity Area Design Reference Note for additional details 	Common outdoor amenity area of 342.00m ² square metres has been provided as part of the proposed development. Located at the northerly (rear) portion of the property. This exceeds the minimum of 2.8m2 per dwelling unit (total 117.6m2) or 5% of site area (191.4m2) (whichever is greater). Common outdoor amenity area is located in a visible location at the rear of the site and is accessible by all residents. Design of outdoor amenity areas to be further refined at site plan stage.
2.13 Private Outdoor Space	 Each unit requires a private outdoor space with a minimum contiguous area of 6 m2. When located on a upper storey balcony the private outdoor space should be a minimum of 4.5 m2 The private outdoor space may be located at-grade, on a balcony, deck, porch or on a rooftop Recessed or partially recessed balconies are preferred. Projecting balconies shall be avoided (See Figure 15). If a projecting balcony is proposed, it may project a maximum of 2 m beyond any building façade. Balconies should be designed with solid or opaque materials or tinted glass when adjacent to existing low density residential Mechanical equipment, including air conditioning units located within a private outdoor space will be excluded from the minimum 6 m2 calculation 	Each unit has been provided with private outdoor amenity space based on the architects design. There is a total of 392.00m2 of private outdoor amenity space proposed. This is proposed via: - Ground floor unit: rear deck - Second Floor unit: balcony - Third Floor unit: balcony - Additional space: rooftop terraces

		Balconies/decks do not project any more than 2.0m from a building face. Please see elevation for proposed location and material.
2.14 Pedestrian Connectivity	Provide a sidewalk between every second block to allow connectivity (See Figure 16)	Only two buildings are proposed.
	Sidewalks will be located on one side of a condominium road. Sidewalks on both sides of the condominium road maybe required for large developments	Due to size of proposal, one sidewalk is proposed on the northerly portion of the driveway at 1.5m
	The following sidewalk widths will be required: - sidewalks abutting a road, where traversed by a driveway, minimum 2 m - sidewalk in all other areas, minimum 1.5 m	1.5m sidewalks are a standard size. It is not anticipated that adverse impacts will come resultant of this width as there are no traversing driveways. The sidewalk crosses the loading area for garbage collection, but no other driveways.
	There should be at least one barrier-free path of travel that meets AODA (<i>Accessibility for Ontarians with</i> <i>Disabilities Act</i>) standards throughout the site	
2.15 Waste Collection and Storage	Waste storage rooms, drop-off locations (i.e. garbage chutes) and waste collection points (temporary pick-up areas) should be considered early in the site design stage to ensure appropriate placement and functionality	At this time, the garbage staging area is proposed in the middle of the two residential buildings, away from the low density residential area(s). Due to size constraints, this is the most appropriate and feasible option for the garbage staging area. At the site plan level, we anticipate that an analogue situation will be required
	The waste storage rooms and the waste collection points (pick-up areas) should be located internal to the site and should not be visible from a public street or impact	that an enclosure situation will be required in order to screen the staging area and avoid adverse impacts on the residential dwelling units.

residential units or adjacent properties (See Figure 17)	
Above grade waste storage rooms/enclosures should be well screened and appropriately setback from existing uses and proposed dwelling units to minimize undesirable noise, odour and visual impacts (See Figure 17)	
	Noted and provided.
The waste collection facility should consider the space requirements for waste, recycling and green bins, along with bulky items (min. 10m2)	Garbage collection will be further refined
Waste drop-off areas should not be greater than 100 m from a dwelling unit and be easily accessible via a sidewalk	through site plan once direction from staff is received regarding the proposed garbage location.
Waste collection points (pick-up areas) should not encumber parking stalls or access to other elements of the development (i.e. fire route, entry to the underground parking garage, mailboxes, etc.)	
Waste collection points should be made of durable concrete and be at the same level as the road	

It is our opinion that the Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Guidelines have, where applicable and/or feasible, been reasonably satisfied. Although there are unique challenges with regard to site constraints associated with the size, grading and character area, we are of the opinion that the design of the site and details are generally in keeping with the guidelines presented above and further, represents an efficient use of the subject site.

5.0 CONCLUSION

It is our opinion that the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment are justified and appropriate as the MOP policies related to height and density, which are applicable to the subject lands, are not currently consistent with the PPS and does not conform with the Growth Plan and Regional of Peel Official Plan. This opinion is based on this review of the policy planning framework currently in effect for the subject lands. The supporting studies prepared to technically support the proposed development and to address the relevant Provincial, Regional and municipal requirements have demonstrated the proposed development satisfies both policy and technical requirements.

Intensification Areas and Major Transit Station Areas are areas which are defined and identified within the Plan as being the focus of intensification. The site is situated within these classifications, and directly linked with service to a planned Major Transit Station Areas as per Schedule 2 Intensification areas of the MOP. The area has been planned for and has the capacity to accommodate higher density built forms which can be supported by the existing mix of uses. The revised development proposal thoughtfully balances the neighbourhood character area policies with those policies which direct growth and intensification throughout the City of Mississauga. It is the intention of this design team to engage with the public and staff throughout the design process.

It is our opinion that the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment will bring the MOP into consistency with the PPS and conformity with the Regional Plan and Growth Plan and are justified for the following reasons:

1. The proposal introduces a change to the Mineola Character Area, without impact to the character area;

2. The proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment are consistent with and conforms to the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Growth Plan, policies regarding residential intensification in the Region of Peel Official Plan, the City of Mississauga Plan and the character area guiding policies and principles;

3. The proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment will allow the City's policies will bring the subject lands into consistency and conformity with Provincial and Regional Plans;

4. The proposed Official Plan Amendment provisions and Zoning By-law Amendment standards are appropriate to accommodate the proposed development based on the proposed heights, density parking and setbacks;

5. The proposed development is compatible with the surrounding land uses and will contribute to the overarching vision outlined in the MOP;

6. The proposed development is pedestrian friendly and transit-supportive as the development will be incorporated into the existing public sidewalk system to connect the site to Hurontario Street. This will provide a connection for residents to the existing bus transit system and future Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit system;

7. The proposed development represents housing types that contribute towards more affordable housing alternatives in this neighbourhood and aligns with the City's Official Plan housing policy framework of providing a variety of dwelling types for different life cycles and income levels;

8. The proximity of the proposed development to community amenities such as parks, community centres, schools, shopping, entertainment as well as bus routes, BRT routes and future light rail train networks contributes to the reduction in reliance on automobile use and encourages the use of active transportation and contributes to the development of complete communities;

9. The proposed development is compact in form while also considering risks to public health and safety through detailed analysis of sub-fields including landscape design, architecture, shadowing and engineering and servicing as well as the Stacked Back to Back Townhouse Guidelines; and,

10. The proposed development therefore contributes to the overarching policy objective of creating complete communities per its locational advantages and provision of outdoor amenity space;

Respectfully submitted,

GLEN SCHNARR & ASSOCIATES INC.

BRORD

Glen Broll, MCIP RPP Partner

Sarah Clark Planner

