

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST

Last Updated: October 8, 2024

**LEGEND FOR CHART BELOW:**

COMPLETED
IN PROGRESS
NOTED
ITEMS TO DISCUSS

Owner: 1 Rosetta Street Inc. c/o LEV Developments Inc.  
 Architect: ICON Architects  
 Planner: Arcadis  
 Civil: Arcadis  
 Transportation: Paradigm Transportation Solutions Ltd  
 Landscape: MEP Design Inc  
 Noise & Wind: SLR Consulting Ltd.  
 Geotech/HydroG: Terraprobe

ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>Planning &amp; Development Review</b>		John McMulkin <a href="mailto:jmcmulkin@haltonhills.ca">jmcmulkin@haltonhills.ca</a> 365-355-5367		
	<b>Site Plan</b>	Staff appreciates that pedestrian accesses from the resident parking area within the podium of Buildings 1 & 2 have been provided to the Metrolinx lands to the south and Saint Michaels Street. However, there does not appear to be direct access through the buildings to the GO Station from the north side of the site in accordance with our previous comment. A direct pedestrian connection should be provided for residents of Building 3 and users of the park.	John McMulkin	Team	Direct access is proposed via a north south sidewalk from John Street to Caroline Street, which transitions to a 2.5 m accessible pedestrian trail to the Metrolinx lands.
	<b>Planning Justification Report - General</b>	Replace the rendering on the first page with the updated Building Rendering that matches the material composition and other changes to the façade designs as illustrated in the latest elevations in accordance with comments from the Urban Design Peer Review.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	The updated PJR has the latest renderings of the buildings that illustrate proposed material composition and façade designs to address comments from the Town and the Peer Reviewer
	<b>Planning Justification Report - General</b>	It is premature to use information presented at the February 27, 2023, Public Open House for the Georgetown GO Station Area/Mill Street Corridor Secondary Plan Review as a means for justifying increased building height or road network as part of these planning applications	John McMulkin	Arcadis	Noted. This has been removed.



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>PJR - Section 4</b>	Section 4.1 shows maps of land use alternative options presented by the project consultant (Sajecki Planning) at a Public Open House on February 27, 2023 for the Georgetown GO Station Area/Mill Street Corridor Secondary Plan Review. These maps are considered preliminary and do not reflect what may be presented in the draft Preferred Land Use Plan for the project. They were presented solely for the purpose of engaging the public, and do not reflect the current policy framework for building height for the High Density Residential/Mixed Use Area II designation. At this time it is inappropriate to use these maps in this submission for the purpose of justifying building height increase. Additionally, it has not been made clear that these maps were presented in the early stages of a Secondary Plan Review, where a draft Preferred Land Use Plan has not been presented publicly or endorsed by local Council. Please remove the maps accordingly.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	Noted. This has been removed.
	<b>PJR – Section 6</b>	Section 6.1.2 states: “As seen in Figure 6-1, during the Georgetown GO Station Secondary Plan Update Presentation, options shown do not identify St. Michael’s Street to be closed in the draft Secondary Plan massing.” The presentation being referenced here was the Public Open House on February 27, 2023, when the Secondary Plan Review was still very much in its early stages. The map being presented as Figure 6-1 was created by Sajecki Planning and does not reflect a Town staff position on whether Saint Michaels Street should be open or closed. The Options 1 and 2 maps at this event were presented solely for purposes of soliciting feedback from the public on potential land use concepts for the High Density Residential/Mixed Use Area II designation. As such, please remove these maps and the associated commentary.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	Noted. This has been removed.
	<b>PJR – Section 6</b>	Section G.4.3.1 of the Official Plan provides a list of what the Town would consider a significant public benefit (i.e., bonusing triggers), which includes the provision of affordable or special needs housing. While the inclusion of affordable housing units within the development cannot be mandated given the Major Transit Station Area has not yet achieved “Protected” status, a clearer commitment to affordability should be provided to better align with the Town’s Official Plan and provincial policy.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	The proposed development is providing a range of unit sizes with different price points and unbundling parking. This will allow the proposed development to cater to a variety of demographics.
	<b>PJR – Section 6</b>	Building on what has already been provided regarding bonusing triggers, consideration should be given for a ground floor space (leasable or purchasable) for commercial use. Town staff would work with the Applicant on defining a range of appropriate uses for this. Ideally this would be designed to attract pedestrian traffic; however, parking and increased traffic implications would be considered when defining what uses could be accommodated.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	An Amenity Flex Space can be accommodated at the ground floor of Building 2. Considerations for a day-care or an event space have been integrated within the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. There is no additional parking proposed for this use.

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
	<b>Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment</b>	The Floor Space Index (FSI) is indicated as 3.16 in Part A and 3.4 in Part 2. Based on using the gross site area (pre road widening) taken from the site plan, the FSI is calculated at 3.195 (~3.20). As such, please revise these FSI numbers to “3.20 (pre road widening)”.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	The FSI has been updated to 3.31 (Pre Road Widening).
	<b>Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment</b>	The site is located within the North Precinct of the Georgetown GO Station Area Secondary Plan but Section H3.9 only applies to the Mill Street Corridor Precinct. To ensure this section can apply to the site and that all other relevant policies of the Official Plan are applicable, add a policy under Part 2 that changes Section H3.9 to indicate that Special Policy Areas apply to the North Precinct in addition to the Mill Street Corridor Precinct. In addition, under the “Text Change” heading in Part A indicate that Section H3 is to be amended by changing Section H3.9 accordingly.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	In our interpretation, Section H3 contain the policies for the Georgetown GO Station Area Secondary Plan. Subsection H3.5 provides policies for the GO North Precinct, while H3.6 provides policies for the Mill Street Corridor Precinct. H3.9 provides Special Policy Areas for the entirety of the Georgetown GO Station Area. The proposed Official Plan Amendment identifies a new Special Policy Area under Section H3.9.
	<b>Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment</b>	Add “II” beside “High Density Residential/Mixed Use Area” in Part 2.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	The proposed OPA has been revised.
	<b>Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment</b>	Add “, River Drive” beside “Metrolinx rail lands” in Part 2	John McMulkin	Arcadis	The proposed OPA has been revised.
	<b>Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment</b>	Change “PART 2- BODY OF THE AMENDMENT” to “PART B – THE AMENDMENT”.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	The proposed OPA has been revised.
	<b>Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment</b>	A small portion of River Drive abuts the east side of Building 1. Please change “Rosetta Street” for this portion to “River Drive” on Schedules 1 & 3 and add a special provision to Schedule 2 indicating the following: Minimum required exterior side yard (River Drive) – as shown on Schedule 3 of this By-law.	John McMulkin	Arcadis	The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment has been revised.
	<b>Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment</b>	Please see the attached Zoning Officer’s comments memo for additional comments regarding the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment	John McMulkin	Arcadis	Noted.
	<b>Urban Design</b>	Confirm why the recessed balconies on the West Elevation of Building 2 were not carried forward above the crash wall and along the South Elevation of Buildings 1 & 2. Were the balconies enclosed as Juliet balconies to address noise and vibration requirements from the railway authorities given these façades are adjacent to the railway? Ideally the recessed balconies on Building 3 and on the other façades of Buildings 1 & 2 would be carried forward to these façades to create a cohesive design that articulates the façades, provides visual permeability, and reduces the visual impact of the overall mass and upper storeys.	John McMulkin	Arcadis / SLR	Enclosed Noise Barrier (ENBs) are proposed for units facing the rail corridor for proper noise mitigation of the existing rail operations per the recommendations in the Acoustics Report.

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
July 10, 2024	<b>Planning Comments from Open House</b>		John McMulkin		
	<b>Urban Design</b>	Concerns were raised by the community regarding the visual impact of Buildings 1 & 2 given they are proposed to be connected and will appear as one large mass, who requested a rendering of the view of Buildings 1 & 2 from the neighbourhood to the south. Through our Urban Design Peer Reviewer, staff has also requested a rendering of the view of Buildings 1 & 2 from the neighbourhood to the south (i.e., at the intersection of King Street and Queen Street) to better assess the visual impact. As such, please provide this rendering for review.		Arcadis/Icon	A rendering of the southern elevation of Building 1 & 2 has been provided and taken from the intersection of Queen St and King St at eye level to illustrate the view of the development from the neighbourhood as requested. A more reflective glass has been applied only to the centre units to differentiate this portion of the building to visually create a separation between building 1 & 2. These units are also recessed to also create a delineation between the two buildings. Please refer to the PJR and Architectural Drawing set.  Additionally, a rendering at the same intersection of Queen St and King St at eye level was created of the proposed townhouse development at 37 King Street to illustrate how the views of the development at 1 Rosetta will be substantially hidden once this development is complete.
	<b>Urban Design</b>	At the Public Open House, it was mentioned that the reason the buildings cannot be physically separated is to ensure that acceptable noise and vibration levels from the adjacent railway operations (e.g., MECP requirements) can be achieved within the interior of the site. This may also be why the balconies on the south side of Buildings 1 & 2 were enclosed as Juliet balconies, which staff has asked for clarification on in our 2nd submission comments as we had requested that the recessed balconies on the West Elevation of Building 2 be carried forward above the crash wall and along the South Elevation of Buildings 1 & 2.		Arcadis/Icon/ SLR/ LEV	Confirmed - the balconies on the south elevation of building 1 and 2 cannot be recessed similar to the West elevation of Building 2 due to existing noise levels. Enclosed noise buffers (ENBs) are required instead to mitigate stationary and transportation railway noise per MECP requirements.  CN Rail and MX Peer reviewers have reviewed the Vibration and Acoustics reports. MX has signed off on the proposed design, and CN Peer reviewer have requested more information regarding the proposed materials, which SLR Consulting have provided a response letter to address them in the submission.

OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>Urban Design</b>	Staff is aware of other developments adjacent to railways that have permeability between the railway and the interior of the site. As such, please provide confirmation from the railway authorities that the acceptable noise and vibration levels cannot be achieved within the interior of the site should the buildings be physically separated, as well as confirmation from them that the balconies on the south side of the buildings must be enclosed as Juliet balconies to meet these requirements.		Arcadis/ Icon/ SLR/ LEV	Regarding the difference between Building 1 & 2 being connected and not connected, SLR have provided in this submission an analysis that compares the two scenarios from a noise perspective. When the buildings are separated, noise levels will noticeably increase for the units located in the upper centre portion of Building 3 as well as the roof top amenity space on Building 3.  Additionally, blank walls on the interior elevations of Building 1 and 2 would be required to mitigate the noise and also due to privacy reasons, the spacing is too close between the buildings for ENBs to be proposed at this location. From a marketing and economic perspective, separating building 1 & 2 would create a loss of 20 residential units which is detrimental to the economic viability of this project. Further, end units provide premiums as windows could wrap around the unit on two sides creating a more desirable floorplan with more natural light, but in this scenario, the units would only be able to have windows on one side not being able to be marketed fully as a corner unit.
	<b>Shadow Impacts</b>	As mentioned at the Public Open House, the Supplemental Shadow Study will need to be updated should the proposal be revised to include the revised building footprints presented at the Public Open House.		Icon/ Arcadis	Updated shadow studies is provided in this 3 <sup>rd</sup> submission as part of Architectural package. Shadowing has either remained unchanged or has improved from the second submission due to Building 2 shifting further to the west and also further south casting less shadow on the existing homes on Caroline St.
	<b>Transportation</b>	As mentioned at the Public Open House, the Transportation Impact Study will need to be amended as part of the 3rd submission to assess the traffic impacts associated with the proposed road connection given this road connection was not included or assessed as part of the previous submissions.		Paradigm	St. Michaels extension is examined in the study. Refer to Section 3-5 in the updated TIS.
	<b>Transportation</b>	The Transportation Impact Study should also assess the impact of the closure of the railway underpass (currently a one-lane road) to vehicular traffic to/from the development site, in addition to assessing vehicular traffic to/from the development site should the underpass remain open to vehicular traffic.		Paradigm	Section 4.2.5 in the updated TIS discusses traffic operations with closure of the McNabb Street underpass.
	<b>Noise and Vibration</b>	Concerns continue to be raised by the community on the south side of the GO Station regarding noise levels potentially increasing within this neighbourhood as a result of the development. As such, please have your engineer provide commentary in the revised Noise and Vibration Study confirming whether noise and vibration levels will be increased in the surrounding neighbourhood, with particular attention given to the neighbourhood to the south.		SLR	SLR has provided an updated reflections analysis of the surrounding neighbourhood as part of this submission. The analysis demonstrates that the noise reflected off the new proposed buildings are negligible and the difference will not be noticed by the surrounding neighbourhood.

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
	<b>Noise and Vibration</b>	Once the revised Noise and Vibration Study is submitted, Planning staff intends on having the study peer reviewed to ensure that its conclusions and recommendations are appropriate.		SLR	Noted
	<b>Community Amenity</b>	The community continues to request through this development application and the Secondary Plan Review that the development incorporates a community amenity such as commercial space to provide a benefit to the surrounding community. Staff has also requested that office and commercial uses be incorporated to serve residents within the development and the neighbourhood as part of both our 1st and 2nd submission comments. As such, staff is still requesting that a community amenity be provided within the buildings.		LEV/ Arcadis/ Paradigm	The proposed ZBLA allows for the integration of a community space within the list of permitted uses.  Section 3.1 of the updated TIS includes the Flex space and the site’s trip generation reflects the non-residential land use.
	<b>Community Amenity</b>	As you are aware, we have had discussions with you about the potential inclusion of a community event space and/or a daycare centre within the development. At the Public Open House you mentioned that you are exploring the inclusion of a community event space within the ground floor of the buildings that can be rented out to the surrounding community. The HDR zone permits day nurseries, so no revisions to the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment would be necessary to permit this use; however, the proposed community event space would need to be added to the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment to permit this site-specific use, which would require creating a definition and a minimum parking requirement for this use.		LEV/ Arcadis/ Paradigm	The proposed ZBLA allows for the integration of a community space within the list of permitted uses. The proposed ZBLA has provided a provision that identifies that the Amenity Flex Space will not require additional parking spaces.  Section 3.1 of the updated TIS includes the Flex space and the site’s trip generation reflects the non-residential land use.
	<b>Tree Removal/ Wildlife Impacts</b>	Concerns were raised by the community regarding tree removal and impacts to the Pileated woodpecker species as a result of the construction of the Saint Michaels Street Extension.		TBC	SLR has been retained to do a natural heritage characterization study of the woodlot on the unopened St Michael St ROW. A call with Town Staff with LEV and SLR took place on September 5 <sup>th</sup> to discuss the Terms of Reference for the study. A site walk took place on September 19 <sup>th</sup> by an Ecologist at SLR. An additional site walk will take place in November when the leaves are off the trees to confirm findings.

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
		confirmed with Jeff Jelsma that a Scoped Environmental Impact Assessment is required in support of the construction of the Saint Michaels Street Extension to assess impacts to the flora and fauna in this area. As a starting point, an assessment would be required to determine whether the woodlot is a significant woodland, contains significant wildlife habitat and/or is another protected environmental area which requires the development/site alteration to demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. If you'd like, I can send you an example of a Scoped Environmental Impact Assessment for another development that was able to demonstrate that the hedgerow on/abutting the property is not a significant woodland. I have also provided a link to Halton Region's webpage containing their Environmental Impact Assessment Guideline to assist with the preparation of the study for your convenience here: <a href="https://www.halton.ca/The-Region/Regional-Planning/Regional-Plans,-Strategies-and-Studies/Environmental-Impact-Assessment-Guide-Update">https://www.halton.ca/The-Region/Regional-Planning/Regional-Plans,-Strategies-and-Studies/Environmental-Impact-Assessment-Guide-Update</a>		SLR	SLR has been retained to do a natural heritage characterization study of the woodlot on the unopened St Michael St ROW. A call with Town Staff with LEV and SLR took place on September 5 <sup>th</sup> to discuss the Terms of Reference for the study. A site walk took place on September 19 <sup>th</sup> by an Ecologist at SLR. An additional site walk will take place in November when the leaves are off the trees to confirm findings. A Letter will be provide to Town Staff after the site walk in November to confirm results/findings.
		Jeff has also requested that a Tree Inventory and Removals Plan be prepared documenting which trees are intended to be removed and which trees (if any) are intended to be preserved		Urban Arborist	A Tree preservation and removals plan and an update to the existing Arborist report with the consideration of St Michaels street being part of the new development is provided in this submission.
		Since the Public Open House was held we also received some comments from the community about green development should the applications be approved. They would like a green roof and native, drought-resistant plants and trees to be considered and are requesting a net zero building, which may include geothermal energy, air source heat pumps or other green energy infrastructure. Specifically, they would like you to consider having the concrete within the existing building crushed and recycled on site and used in the new buildings to lessen the environmental impact. This could be used to help achieve the points under the "Innovation" category of the Green Development Standards Checklist. I realize that it is early in the process, that this is a matter to be addressed as part of the Site Plan application and that you likely haven't determined all the green features that you intend on incorporating into the development yet, but if you could provide a response in this regard, that would be appreciated.		Team	Will review and consider green development practices – more details will be determined while going through site plan control when the details of the design of the building will be reviewed
	<b>Zoning Review</b>		Rachel Purdy		

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN




<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
		The text in the By-law does not need to include the measurement for each setback, rather the schedule can be referenced. For example: Minimum required front yard (Rosetta Street) – as shown on Schedule 3 to this By-law;  Ensure that Caroline Street is referenced in special provision (x); and Add label for River Drive, and provision for exterior side yard to River Drive as shown on schedule.		Arcadis	The proposed ZBLA has been updated.
		Schedule 3, which will need to be legible on 8.5" x 11" paper only needs to show the major setbacks and massing. Setbacks should be rounded down, and heights need to be legible. For example, the setback to the south lot line on the massing schedule does not need to be shown 3 times. Text size for heights needs to be increased.		Arcadis	The proposed ZBLA Schedule 3 has been updated.
		Provision (iii) indicates no portion of the building excluding parapets – height as per schedule. However, notes at the bottom of Schedule 3 indicate that the height is measured to the top of the parapet; this needs to be re-worded. Note on Schedule 3 should not mention parapet, and the height measurements on the schedule need to be reduced to reflect the height to the top of the building without the parapet.		Arcadis	The proposed ZBLA has been updated.
		Provision (iv) should be 6.0 metres based on the measurements shown on elevations		Arcadis	As per the provided Architectural Drawings, the mechanical projection is 5.6 metres.
		Remove provision (xi) as this is not required.		Arcadis	The proposed ZBLA has been updated.
		Remove provision (xiv) for the number of buildings as this is not required and is confusing, as what is referred to as Building 1 and 2 is one building.		Arcadis	Building 1 & 2 are two separate buildings, however this provision has been removed in the updated ZBLA.
		Label the corresponding buildings on Schedule 3 Building 1, Building 2 and Building 3 and make sure established grade reference below the schedule is updated.		Arcadis	The proposed ZBLA has been updated.
		Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2010-0050 requires the parking to be rounded up when the calculation results in a partial space, therefore the visitor parking is one space short. Additional space to be provided, or site-specific zoning by-law to be amended to require 0.98 spaces/unit for visitor parking rate.		Arcadis	The proposed ZBLA has been updated.
	<b>Accessibility Review</b>		John McMulkin		
		Too many units ... if we decreased the quantity of apartments while increasing the size of units they would bring the parked vehicle spaces ratio closer to realizing our town's requirements	Renee Brown, Deputy Clerk	Icon/LEV	Noted
	<b>Building Review</b>		Mei Wang Building Service		



**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
	<b>General</b>	The submitted site plan has proposed one private hydrant and one fire department connection to serve all three buildings. This is not permitted. In according to NFPA14-2013 7.12.2, "High-rise buildings shall have at least two remotely located fire department connections for each zone." Therefore, at least two remotely located fire department connections shall be provided to each building. Each fire department connection shall be located within 45 m distance to a hydrant.	Mei Wang	Icon / Arcadis	This has been updated on the Architectural Plans and servicing plans
	<b>General</b>	The proposed 10" storm lateral is not adequate to serve all three buildings. (OBC Table 7.4.10.9.)	Mei Wang	Icon/Arcadis	The storm lateral is 450 mm, the orifice tube is 10" (250 mm)
	<b>General</b>	Review the Fire Route's centreline radius for compliance with OBC2012, Division B – Part 3, Article 3.2.5.6. for "Access Route Design".	Mei Wang	Icon/Paradigm	This has been updated in the Site Plan
	<b>General</b>	Clarify item 3.08 on the OBC Data Matrix for "High Building" considering the requirements of OBC2012, Division B – Part 3, Article 3.2.6.1. for "Additional Requirements for High Buildings".	Mei Wang	Arcadis	This has been clarified in the OBC Matrix
	<b>Site Servicing</b>		Mei Wang	Arcadis	The jellyfish has been shifted upstream of the underground tank as requested. Cleanout still in discussion.
	<b>Development Engineering Review</b>		Reece D'Souza		

OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	OPA Comments	<p>As discussed in various meetings between Town staff and the Owner’s representatives, the Town is requesting written commitment from the Owner confirming that they agree to design and construct, at their cost, the road extension of St Michaels Street from Caroline Street to John Street and the multiuse path from Caroline Street to the Georgetown GO Station. The design of the roadway would be completed through the site plan review process and construction would be facilitated through a separate development agreement with the Town.</p> <p>With this commitment, the Town is willing to accommodate narrower ROWs (less than the required Official Plan widths) requirements for Caroline Street and River Drive and forgo our requirement to widening the existing section of St Michaels Street and the creation of an urban cul-de-sac because the desired extension of St Michaels Street will address the Town’s concerns with traffic circulation and provide suitable access for Town maintenance vehicles. The design for the new section of St Michaels Street would accommodate the existing right of way width by requiring a sidewalk only on one side of the roadway and accommodate the existing topography by permitting infrastructure such as retaining walls or reinforced slopes within the road allowance. The only buried infrastructure the Town would require would be for street light electrical distribution to support the specific lights for this new section of roadway. In addition to the above, the Town would support the use of the existing section of St Micheals Street from Caroline Street to the Georgetown GO Station as a construction laydown area, provided Page 2 of 3 the new section of St Michaels Street from Caroline Street to John Street is open to the public for use.</p> <p>Without this commitment the Town would need to pursue road widenings consistent with our Official Plan, which would require the full width of Caroline Street and River Drive but would also include a widening on the existing section of St Michaels Street and a cul-de-sac at the end of the existing St Michaels Street to provide a suitable roadway as per our Official Plan to facilitate vehicle traffic and access.</p>	Reece D’Souza	Arcadis	<p>A draft Memorandum of Undertaking has been provided to Town Staff in June 2024 for comment. Discussions between LEV and their Team with Town Staff are in progress on the terms and scope of the St Michael Street works. Further discussions to take place on the construction of the road and conveyance of the portion of St Michael Street that will be closed by the Town and form part of the 1 Rosetta Development proposal.</p> <p>A conceptual design of the St Michael Street road extension and the multiuse path from Caroline St to the GO Station have been included in this submission. Further refinements will be completed in the Site Plan Control stage in consultation with Staff when all the additional Topo surveying and SUE works have been completed. The pedestrian ramp design will be reviewed with Staff to determine the best design to accommodate the grade changes. In anticipation of reviewing the ramp and providing some flexibility for design, the minimum underground parking ratios in Phase 2 will be slightly adjusted for a bit of buffer for updates. These parking ratios are provided in the Draft Zoning Bylaw with this submission and discussed in the PJR.</p>
	Site Plan Application Comments	<p><b>Water Balance</b> According to the Water Balance report, there is a positive increase of 772m3/year of additional run-off. While it’s understood that a two-level underground parking garage prevents infiltration, an effort should be made to reduce the impact of increased flows to the Town’s system and the outlet into the Credit River. Clarify what best efforts have been made to reduce the impact of the site on the Town’s system and outlet of the Credit River.</p>	Reece D’Souza	Arcadis/ MEP	Water will be re-used for the splash pad in efforts to reduce the run-off flows.

OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>Parking Foundation &amp; Water Table</b> The parking foundation may be impacted by the water table. The water table is at 253.5 masl (Phase 2 ESA) and the underground level 2 is 253.70 masl; the potential impact of groundwater discharge due to an undetermined shallow ground water flow pattern must be quantified as the foundation drains could result in continuous flow rates into the Town’s system and will need to be accounted for within the Quantity Control measures. Confirm this at the Site Plan Review stage.	Reece D’Souza	Arcadis	Noted.
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>Restoration Work</b> The Developer shall be responsible for restoration improvements that need to be completed to Caroline Street and Rosetta Street as part of this project. Improvements include but are not limited to the installation of curb, resurfacing, and sidewalk.	Reece D’Souza	Arcadis	Noted. The construction of half of the ultimate Road Allowance for Caroline and Rosetta Streets have been shown on the proposed grading and servicing plans.
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>Draft Condo Plan</b> Provide a draft condo plan to aid with review of the Site Plan Application.	Reece D’Souza	LEV	A Condo plan can be provided during the site plan review process
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>Construction Mgmt Plan</b> Submit a detailed Construction Management Plan; this document shall be dynamic and updated by the Developer’s consultants/contractor throughout the project duration.	Reece D’Souza	LEV/Arcadis	The Civil consultant to prepare a detailed construction management plan prior to permitting.
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance Manual – SWM</b> Submit an Operations and Maintenance Manual for the overall SWM design. Include a perpetual maintenance schedule and anticipated costs for a complete life cycle and replacement. Jellyfish Filter cartridges have a significant cost, and the future condominium board must be made aware of these expenses.	Reece D’Souza	Arcadis	The standard performance specification for the Jellyfish filtration treatment device has been included within the FSR/SWM package.
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>FSR</b> Page 87 of 102 in the pdf of the Functional Servicing Report, the Pre-Development Storm Catchment Area Plan, seems to be missing the catchment ID’s drainage direction and outlets.	Reece D’Souza	Arcadis	The DAP’s have been adjusted to include the required details.
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>Sidewalks</b> The sidewalks on the ROWs must be updated to continue through the driveway entrances because these are private roads/driveways, not Municipal intersections. Pedestrians have the primary right of way.	Reece D’Souza	ICON/ MEP	The sidewalks have been updated in the Site Plan
	Site Plan Application Comments	<b>Civil</b> Jellyfish Filter shall filter water prior to entering the storage tank; adjust the location accordingly. See redline drawing for visual note.	Reece D’Souza	Arcadis	The jellyfish has been adjusted to be located upstream of the tank.

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
	<b>Transportation</b>		Ivan Drewnitski idrewnitski@haltonhills.ca 905-873-2600 ext. 2328		
	<b>Transportation</b>	Transportation supports Development Engineering and we continue to express the need for the St Michaels extension.	Ivan Drewnitski	Paradigm	The St. Michaels Street extension is considered in the updated TIS. Refer to Sections 3-5 in the updated report.
	<b>Transportation</b>	Comment #6 appears to be unaddressed still. After a review of ITE Trip Generation Manual, it appears the greater result of either the fitted curve or average rate was still not utilized.	Ivan Drewnitski	Paradigm	Please refer to Section 3.3 of the updated TIS for the updated site trip generation.
	<b>Transportation</b>	The future background synchro report volume inputs (for all the intersections) do not match the future background figures within the report. It's assumed this error is carried forward within the future total analysis. Revise the synchro model and corresponding synchro traffic analysis sections for all study area intersection to reflect a correct future traffic operation conditions. With this said, there may be additional comments pertaining to the received Transportation Impact Study as it relates to the traffic analysis.	Ivan Drewnitski	Paradigm	Section 4 of the updated TIS considers revised future traffic scenarios (background and total).
	<b>Transportation</b>	Transportation staff cannot support the parking rates being proposed for this development. The reduced parking rate proposed is not supportable to justify such a significant decrease in parking.	Ivan Drewnitski	Paradigm	Please refer to Section 6 of the updated TIS for the revised parking study.
	<b>Transportation</b>	Convex mirror is required at grade for the access ramp to resident underground parking.	Ivan Drewnitski	Paradigm	Please refer to Appendix E of the updated TIS for the traffic signage plan.
	<b>Transportation</b>	Traffic signage and pavement markings to be noted on the plan. Please refer to the Ontario Traffic Manual regarding the type and location of signs and pavement markings. Traffic calming features such as speed humps, raised crossings/intersections, textured crosswalks, etc should be incorporated in the design. A note should be incorporated with reference made to the Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) for the type, design, location, and installation of signs and pavement markings. A traffic signage and pavement marking legend should be included to show a visual blown-up spec of all signs and pavement markings.	Ivan Drewnitski	Paradigm	Please refer to Appendix E of the updated TIS for the traffic signage plan.

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
	<b>Transportation</b>	There are significant safety concerns with the expected high pedestrian volumes internally within the road network (mix of garbage pick up, loading vehicles, visitors, and tenants). At Site Plan stage, the site is encouraged to consider the installation of speed humps, raised crossings/intersections, textured crosswalks, etc. should be explored and incorporated into the design. This shall be identified in the updated Traffic signage and pavement markings plan.	Ivan Drewnitski	Paradigm	Please refer to Appendix E of the updated TIS for the traffic signage plan.
	<b>Recreation and Parks</b>		Kevin Okimi Direction or Parks and Open Space 905-873-2601 x2274		
1		There is limited parkland in the area and increased density will put pressure on existing and planned parks near the neighbourhood.	Kevin Okimi	Team	As a part of the site redesign, the proposed privately owned park has been increased and proposes both active and passive amenity areas.
2		We acknowledge that outdoor amenity and landscape spaces are shown on the plans provided. Through the site plan process, outdoor amenity space and landscape areas will be reviewed in detail.	Kevin Okimi	Team	Noted.
3		Urban Design Review of landscape elements (in addition to building massing/elements) will be required through the site plan process, pending approval of the Official Plan and Zoning Amendments.	Kevin Okimi	Team	Noted.
4		The proposal shows a “park” over top of the underground parking garage including playground and splash pad. Staff acknowledge the applicant proposes a Privately Owned Public Space (POPS) and is requesting Parkland Dedication Credit. As noted when staff met with the applicant, there are no current policies providing parkland credits for POPS and Bill 23 provisions regarding POPS are not yet in force. However, Council has contemplated them in principle based on past studies. Further, high density developments are required to provide outdoor amenity space (private for all building residents) to serve the residents of the development, which is to be provided within the development site, and is independent of any public parkland proposal.	Kevin Okimi	Team	Discussions in progress and a draft POPS agreement will be provided to Town Staff at the end of zoning/early SPA

OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
		<p>The applicant should submit a detailed proposal including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Demonstration of how the public access will be clearly identified to ensure to create a welcoming space for use by the public, as well as any restrictions on the use of the space.</li> <li>b. Sample legal agreements which demonstrate how public access will be legally secured in perpetuity (i.e. ROW, Easements, etc.).</li> <li>c. Demonstration of how private amenity spaces will be separated from proposed POPS areas and that adequate private amenity space is provided. The Town’s general requirement for private amenity space is 2.5 sm for every bedroom that exceeds the unit count. Please provide a consolidated package showing all outdoor amenity spaces included in the calculation tables, as well as a detailed chart of units including bedroom counts. This information is generally available in certain documents (i.e. Planning Justification, Functional Servicing) but for the POPS review, it should be submitted as a summary package.</li> </ul>	Kevin Okimi	LEV / Arcadis	Amenity Spaces are described within the PJR. The illustration is provided in the Architectural Plans and Landscape Plans. A summary package will be provided in the future for the POPS discussions.
		<p>This will allow Staff to bring forward a Council report to determine if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Council will accept a POPS arrangement to be applied to the overall parkland dedication for the project.</li> <li>b. Any reduced rate of credit for a POPS arrangement.</li> <li>c. Any specific conditions for perpetual maintenance, use, operations, replacement, and management of the space.</li> </ul>	Kevin Okimi	LEV	In Progress, a draft proposal will be provided to Town Staff for further consideration of receiving parkland credit
5		The pedestrian connectivity map will need to be confirmed pending final POPS determination should public access be confirmed as part of the POPS review.	Kevin Okimi	LEV / ICON / MEP	Noted and will be provided
	SPA	<b>We also note the following conditions will be secured through the Site Plan Approval process:</b>	Kevin Okimi		
1	SPA	Prior to the issuance of Site Plan Approval, landscape standards and related securities as contained in the Site Plan Application Guide will be secured to the satisfaction of the Recreation and Parks Department. If minimum standards can not be met, enhanced landscape treatments may be required (masonry features, enhanced fencing, etc.). Some of the landscape widths adjacent to neighbouring properties do not appear to meet the minimum standards. Any 0 Lot line setbacks will have facades addressed through the Urban Design Review.	Kevin Okimi	LEV/ MEP	Noted

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
2	SPA	A Tree Preservation Plan will need to be prepared to address any tree removals proposed as part of the redevelopment. It should be prepared by an arborist or other qualified professional, and must address compensation for trees to be removed. Landscaping required as part of the site plan design requirements are not considered compensation. If compensation plantings can not be accommodated on site, the Town will consider off site locations at nearby/adjacent open space areas or may consider a payment in lieu of compensation plantings. The Town acknowledges that there are not a significant amount of trees on the existing property.	Kevin Okimi	LEV/ MEP	Noted.
3	SPA	Pending a final decision on any POPS Credit for Parkland, Prior to the issuance of Site Plan Approval Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland shall be paid per the Official Plan, By-law 2022-0043 and the Planning Act to the satisfaction of the Recreation and Parks Department. Please note that there is currently a cap of \$13,200 per medium or high density residential unit or 20% of the land value whichever is greater (2023 rates) for the GO Station Secondary Plan area as approved by Council. The rates/cap are subject to change on an annual basis (could be updated in future years). This application is considered a high density residential. Provisions of Bill 23 (reduced caps) have not yet been incorporated into the Town’s Parkland Dedication Bylaw but will be applied to any final calculation, once any credits are applied for POPS as noted above.	Kevin Okimi	LEV/ MEP	Noted.
	<b>Metrolinx - Critical &amp; Technical Comments</b>		Mohammed Mirza AECOM		



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>Setbacks</b>	<p>On pdf 13/84 and other parts of the report, it states - "Applying this to the proposed development would suggest that the rail safety setback is to be measured from the future location of the nearest rail of track BB47 shown in Figure 6; being the existing second closest spur/layover track."</p> <p>a. As per Metrolinx's confirmation, it is implied that the measurement shall be from the existing outermost track boundary and not from the future closest track location. The track layout shown in Figure 7 is based on 60% design and is not the current condition. Please revise throughout the report; The use of minimum load of 200kN, where AECOM guidelines result in zero impact load, is appropriate.</p> <p>b. Although the sensitive and high occupancy uses for this site seem to be outside 30m setback, the required setback mentioned (15m) in Table A (pdf page 15/84) and other places in the report do not comply with Metrolinx guidelines (which is 30m for residential irrespective of the type of track). Please revise throughout the report;</p> <p>c. We reached out to Metrolinx to confirm if Metrolinx tracks are classified as spur/layover tracks or are mainline tracks; Metrolinx confirmed that the tracks are classified as Layover Tracks (non-mainline);</p> <p>d. Architectural Drawings (Appendix A) and Crash Wall Design Report (Appendix B) provided under Appendix A have not been updated;</p>	Mohammed Mirza	ICON/Arcadis/ Partum	Plans have been updated to reflect the 30m setback measurement taken from the outermost track. Further discussions and design review of the crash wall are in progress.
	<b>FSR</b>	Section 5.3 – the report states that the site will discharge to the River Dr storm sewer. Please clarify if this is the River Dr storm sewer flowing east from the site (from Rosetta St), or the River Dr storm sewer that flows west at St Michael? And please confirm that this is the only storm outlet that will be utilized by the site.	Mohammed Mirza	Arcadis	Flowing east from Rosetta St, and this is the only storm outlet to be used.
	<b>FSR</b>	Appendix D, second page: the storm sewer design sheet refers to a 'Metrolinx sewer'. Please clarify where this is, and confirm that the site is not discharging to this sewer under proposed conditions.	Mohammed Mirza	Arcadis	The site is not discharging here under proposed conditions.
	<b>Site Plan &amp; Cross-section</b>	On August 15, 2023, Metrolinx confirmed that the rail safety setback has to be measured from the outermost track boundary. Please revise and add this dimension to the drawings and documents;	Mohammed Mirza	Icon/MEP	Dimension notes are shown on the landscape plan L-1.0.  Dimensions are also shown on the Site Plan



OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
		<p>Since this is a Conceptual Design review, the scope of this review is limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Review of Rail Safety Study for the proposed Adjacent Development Rail Safety Mitigation package;</li> <li>b. Review Structural design and calculations of Adjacent Development Safety Barrier (i.e., Crash Wall);</li> <li>c. Review Stormwater Management Report for surface and underground water;</li> </ul> <p>We have only received the Design of Crash Wall report and assumed that this is submitted as to fulfill the requirement of item #b from above. The remaining items #a and #c are still pending; Comment not addressed as AECOM has till date not received a Rail Safety Study document for review. Till date we only received b and c from the above.</p>	Gowre Manookare	LEV/Partum / Stephensen	Rail Safety Report submitted and comments received in April and August 2024 and being reviewed. Structural Engineer reviewing crash wall design
	<b>Metrolinx Planning Comments</b>	Received July 14, 2023	David Tsai, Project Manager		
		Metrolinx is in receipt of the Landscape Plan prepared by MEPDesign, dated May 19, 2023. A revised landscape plan showing the required rail corridor setback should be submitted	David Tsai	MEP	Dimension notes are shown on the landscape plan L-1.0.
		Metrolinx notes that an updated Noise and Vibration Impact Study has been submitted to our satisfaction. Based on the timing of approval, updates to the study may be required. The proponent may obtain Metrolinx's most up-to-date rail forecast by submitting a request to <a href="mailto:raildatarequests@metrolinx.com">raildatarequests@metrolinx.com</a> ;	David Tsai		completed
	<b>Rail Safety Study</b>	A Rail Safety Study must be completed to confirm that the protection package (setback and barrier) meets or exceeds Metrolinx safety standards. This study will need to be reviewed by Metrolinx and our Technical Advisor (AECOM). Track volume data required to prepare the aforementioned study can be obtained by contacting Metrolinx at <a href="mailto:raildatarequests@metrolinx.com">raildatarequests@metrolinx.com</a> ;	Mohammed Mirza	Partum	Rail Safety Report was provided to MX/AECOM and comments have been received in April and August. Updates are being completed for a future submission to MX.
	<b>Storm Water Drainage Report</b>	A stormwater drainage report, prepared by a qualified consultant, shall be submitted for the review and satisfaction of Metrolinx and our Technical Advisor (AECOM). Drainage from the subdivision shall be channeled away from the rail corridor, and any proposed alterations to the existing drainage pattern affecting Metrolinx property must receive prior concurrence from Metrolinx. The analysis must include the final safety barrier (crash wall) design within the scope of the report;	Mohammed Mirza	Arcadis	Report has been reviewed and deemed acceptable

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
	<b>Track Monitoring Plan</b>	It should be noted that if any excavation/drilling work impacts MX Track’s Zone of Influence (per Appendix W of GO Transit Track Standard), a track monitoring plan must be submitted for MX Stakeholder review. The track monitoring requirements were not addressed in the submitted geotechnical report;	Mohammed Mirza	BIG / Partum	Noted – under review
	<b>River Drive Accessibility</b>	It should be noted that Metrolinx will require River Drive to be accessible at all phases of construction for future station works. Particularly during the estimated timelines below: Phase 1: Mid 2024 to Early 2026; and, Phase 2: Early 2027 to Mid 2028;	Mohammed Mirza	LEV	Noted
	<b>Fire Exit – Commercial Agreement</b>	Metrolinx notes that a ground-floor pedestrian access/fire exit is proposed on the southern edge of the mutual property line, with the pedestrians exiting on Metrolinx owned lands. This pedestrian access will require the applicant to enter into a commercial agreement with Metrolinx subject to Metrolinx internal stakeholder’s approval	Mohammed Mirza	Team	Access to parking garage has been updated and relocated onto private lands and illustrated in Architectural and Landscape Plans
	<b>Pedestrian Connection – Site &amp; Go Station</b>	Metrolinx Stations Planning notes that there is a general lack of connection and permeability between the development and Georgetown GO Station. Permeability within the subject site appears sufficient, but due to its adjacency to a GO Station, safe and convenient connection to the station lands prioritizing pedestrian circulation should be coordinated between the development and GO Station connections (i.e. future pedestrian tunnel north of the existing tracks);	Mohammed Mirza	LEV/Icon	Access to parking garage has been updated and relocated onto private lands and illustrated in Architectural and Landscape Plans
	<b>Landscape</b>	It is recommended that street furnishings and planters do not obstruct a wide and accessible pedestrian path;	Mohammed Mirza	MEP	Noted
	<b>Wayfinding</b>	It is recommended that the applicant consider providing wayfinding features within the development that direct residents and guests towards safe paths (i.e. formal crosswalks and sidewalks) to the Georgetown GO Station. Please consult Station Planning’s Architectural markup comments attached as Appendix D and the Metrolinx Wayfinding Design Standards (DS-03) for reference: <a href="http://www.gosite.ca/engineering_public/DesignStandards/Designstandards.aspx">http://www.gosite.ca/engineering_public/DesignStandards/Designstandards.aspx</a>	Mohammed Mirza	ICON	Noted



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>Condo Docs – Warning Clause</b>	The Proponent shall provide confirmation to Metrolinx, that the following warning clause will be inserted into all Development Agreements, Offers to Purchase, and Agreements of Purchase and Sale or Lease of each unit within 300 metres of the Railway Corridor o Warning: Metrolinx and its assigns and successors in interest operate commuter transit service within 300 metres from the land which is the subject hereof. In addition to the current use of these lands, there may be alterations to or expansions of the rail and other facilities on such lands in the future including the possibility that Metrolinx or any railway entering into an agreement with Metrolinx or any railway assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand their operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwellings. Metrolinx will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under these lands.	Mohammed Mirza	LEV	Noted
	<b>Owner Agreements</b>	Per our previous comments, the Owner will be required to enter into the following agreements with Metrolinx: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• - Adjacent Development Agreement</li> <li>• - Tie-back Agreement</li> </ul> Per our previous comments, the Owner shall grant Metrolinx an environmental easement for operational emissions, which is to be registered on title for all uses within 300 metres of the rail right-of-way. The Proponent may contact david.tsai@metrolinx.com to initiate this process at their earliest convenience and note that the easement registration can take up to 6 weeks to complete. The Owner shall be responsible for all costs for the preparation and registration of agreements/undertakings/easements/warning clauses as determined appropriate by Metrolinx, to the satisfaction of Metrolinx. They shall also consider the timelines required to advance such agreements and reviews in their schedule accordingly.	Mohammed Mirza	LEV	Noted

OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>Construction Method</b>	<p>Please note that depending on the construction method, additional agreements and/or technical reviews will be required (i.e. shoring, tiebacks and crane swing) and as appropriate, the final development design will need to be reviewed by our Technical Advisor (AECOM), and to the satisfaction of Metrolinx if:</p> <p>The work is within 30 feet (9.2 metres) of any Metrolinx/GO Rail corridor</p> <p>The work is adjacent to the 30-foot (9.2-metre) limit of any Metrolinx/GO rail corridor and involving an elevating device (crane, boom truck, Genie Lift, etc.)</p> <p>The work is adjacent to the 30-foot (9.2-metre) limit of any Metrolinx/GO rail corridor and involves excavation that may impact the railway loading zone (soil disturbance, full locates required including Metrolinx)</p> <p>Please provide more information on your construction methodology when available;</p>	Mohammed Mirza	LEV/KOLER	Noted
	<b>Pedestrian Connection – Site &amp; Go Station</b>	As referenced in Appendix D, it is recommended that additional safety and customer experience measures be implemented to improve the direct pedestrian connection paths from the main entrance/lobby to the future Georgetown GO north tunnel entrance; particularly with respect to any pedestrian/vehicular conflicts through the parking area between the main lobby and the southern property boundary. For example, warning signals for vehicles, pavement treatments, curb radii reductions where feasible, or mirrors;	Mohammed Mirza	ICON/LEV	Noted
III-B1	General	Review was for structural and rail safety considerations only. Review for drainage, noise and vibration shall be done by subject area experts.	Devendra Dewangan	Partum	Comment only, no response required
	<b>Metrolinx Planning Comments</b>	Received March 15, 2024	David Tsai, Project Manager		
2	MX Comments	'The Ground floor plan' drawing shows the proposed south building situated immediately adjacent to the Metrolinx-owned lands to the south with no setback from the mutual property line. Metrolinx requests that a minimum of 3m setback from the property line be required for safety and maintenance reasons.		Icon/Paradigm	Due to the parking layout in the ground and P1 and P2 levels, there is little wiggle room to shift the crashwall north but the drive aisle was reduced to 6m from 6.7m and there is now a space of 1.39m from the property line to the face of the crash wall for added room for maintenance

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	Station Planning Comments:	<p>Big picture, this development is part of an MTSA and is geographically placed with the opportunity to provide a welcoming, direct connection between the development and Georgetown GO. Walkable connections between major trip generators (such as this proposed development) and transit stations are key to the transit supportive policies that the Province has been setting. Despite all these policies in place, if MTSA developments are not built with direct, accessible, and attractive pedestrian connections between the development and stations, whether that’s internally or externally, the connection between MTSA developments and transit will be subpar.</p> <p>The current design of the proposed development would serve as a good example of what to avoid for major internal circulation to/from the Station. As MTSA planning becomes more prominent throughout the province, it will be important to ensure the principle of internal pedestrian circulation to/from transit stations is considered. This proposed development will serve as a precedent of how adjacent Transit Oriented Developments are designed to facilitate important internal/external circulation to/from Stations, there is an opportunity for this development to act as a good precedent instead of a design precedent to avoid.</p>		Icon/MEP	Updates to the design have improved the pedestrian connections to the GO Station
		<p>The proposed development is a major trip generator directly abutting the GO station, and should be designed to be transit supportive to achieve multimodal access to the station. Key to multi-modal access is pedestrian circulation to/from the development and the GO station. The current design shows a connection to/from the station and development in a direct pathway, however it is not designed with pedestrian safety as a priority, nor is it welcoming or accessible to wheelchair users. If this is assumed to be the main point of access for residents and residential visitors to/from the station, it is recommended to design this as a more important point of access rather than a secondary point of access. Although vehicular speeds are not usually high in a residential parking lot, the same reason you would not want a main entrance connection require residents to walk through a parking lot to access a lobby or core elevators should apply to the main access point to the transit station, particularly in an MTSA.</p>		Icon/MEP	Updates to the design have improved the pedestrian connections to the GO Station
		<p>The Secondary Plan identifies the need for a well connected pedestrian system to maximize accessibility to the GO Station, improvements to the internal pedestrian circulation to ensure accessibility and formalized, direct connections to the station would better align with the Town’s Secondary Plan.</p>		Icon/MEP	Updates to the design have improved the pedestrian connections to the GO Station

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
		The section does not specify main or secondary entrances, and can be assumed that all pedestrian entrances should be spatially and architecturally prominent and welcoming. As the proposed development is adjacent to the GO station and part of an MTSA, it is recommended to design for a pedestrian entrance that welcomes residents and residential visitors to/from the building and GO station, as access to transit facilities is assumed to be a major attraction for residents who choose to live in the proposed development.		Icon/MEP	Updates to the design have improved the pedestrian connections to the GO Station
	<b>CN Railway</b>		<b>Ashkan Matlabi</b> <a href="mailto:proximity@cn.ca">proximity@cn.ca</a> T : 1-438-459-9190		
		The proposed crash wall report and design prepared by Stephenson Engineering, dated May 29, 2023, refers to updated Structural sketches addressing AECOM peer review comments. CN requires a technical note signed by AECOM reassuring CN that the updated design is satisfactory to AECOM	Ashkan Matlabi	AECOM	Noted
		The updated Noise & Vibration report prepared by SLR, dated May 26, 2023 was submitted to CN acoustic engineer to be peer reviewed and we will provide you with our comments as soon as the peer review is completed.	Ashkan Matlabi	CN	CN's Peer reviewer, Jade Acoustics, provided comments on the updated Noise and Vibration Report by SLR and a comment letter addressing the Peer reviewer's comments is included in this submission.
		CN engineering completed the review of the SWM report and they confirmed that the proposed drainage plan is to their satisfaction.	Ashkan Matlabi	CN	Review Completed
		Since CN is no longer the owner of the railway right of adjacent to the site (CN current right of way is located at approximately 40 meters from the subject site), we accept Metrolinx comment regarding the requirement for a safety fence expressed in the attached Response Matrix.	Ashkan Matlabi	LEV	Noted
		While the peer review of updated N&V and SWM reports are being processed, CN suggests for the attached Project Review Form to be completed and signed by the applicant allowing CN counsel to proceed in parallel with drafting a CN development agreement and registration of easement.	Ashkan Matlabi	LEV	Project Review Form was completed by LEV and sent to the Town and CN Rail on April 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2024
	<b>CN Railway – JADE Peer Review</b>	Received April 2024	Aaron Keey & Dalila C. Giusti Jade Acoustics		

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
1		<p>The following comments were provided in the first peer review and remain applicable after reviewing the updated Environmental Noise and Vibration Study, dated May 26, 2023. It is acknowledged that the noise study indicates the MOE requirement for brick veneer or masonry equivalent construction as it relates to dwellings within 100m of the railway line. The report does not mention that CN generally requires that the first row of dwellings be constructed of brick veneer or masonry equivalent construction regardless of the predicted sound level. For completeness, it is requested that these requirements are included in the updated noise study.</p> <p>This requirement is to apply to all south, east and west facing facades of the first row of buildings. As Enclosed Noise Buffer (ENB) are proposed, we would recommend that the brick veneer/masonry construction be applied to the inside wall of the ENBs. The exterior wall (Outer wall) of the ENBs can be constructed of a wall assembly having a rating of STC 52 or greater, as recommended in the noise report. The exterior wall requirements as currently noted in the report are not sufficient and need to be addressed in the updated noise report. Tables 10 and 11 should be updated accordingly.</p>		SLR/Icon	<p>Peer review comments addressed in a separate letter from SLR Consulting.</p> <p>Please refer to: '1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown – Environmental Noise and Vibration Study Peer Review Comment Response #2 – CN', Dated October 4, 2024.</p>
2		<p>In Sec. 4.7, specific to Table 18 and for general completeness, the footnote should mention that the higher section of barrier, being 3.95m high, was also included along with the 2.95m high barrier (in terms of the applicable receptors).</p>		SLR	<p>Peer review comments addressed in a separate letter from SLR Consulting.</p> <p>Please refer to: '1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown – Environmental Noise and Vibration Study Peer Review Comment Response #2 – CN', Dated October 4, 2024.</p>
3		<p>It is acknowledged that a mitigation summary table is included in the Appendix of the noise report (Table D1). Further to point 1., above, the ENB outer wall and ENB inner wall design requirements are to be clearly specified. It is also important to keep listed and included the exterior wall requirements for all dwellings with exterior walls without ENBs.</p>		SLR/Icon	<p>Peer review comments addressed in a separate letter from SLR Consulting.</p> <p>Please refer to: '1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown – Environmental Noise and Vibration Study Peer Review Comment Response #2 – CN', Dated October 4, 2024.</p>

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
4		<p>As a separate note on the mitigation measures that need clarification within the report, the Updated Noise Report dated May 26, 2023, includes inconsistencies between Tables 10 and 11 relative to Appendix D (the mitigation summary tables). For example, the exterior wall requirements do not match. Also, within the text of the report it is noted that the analysis was conducted with exterior walls set as STC 50, although the BPN work in the appendix uses STC 52 and Tables 10 &amp; 11 report STC 52.</p> <p>These inconsistencies within the text and tables unfortunately creates a situation where the final mitigation measures are unclear. However, as CN requires brick vaneer/masonry equivalent exterior wall construction, the report needs to be updated to reflect this requirement for the inner ENB walls and STC 52 for the exterior (outer) ENB Walls. In the final noise report, consistency across all text and tables should be addressed, taking into account as well the points above regarding exterior wall requirements.</p>		SLR	<p>Peer review comments addressed in a separate letter from SLR Consulting.</p> <p>Please refer to: '1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown – Environmental Noise and Vibration Study Peer Review Comment Response #2 – CN', Dated October 4, 2024.</p>
5		<p>The report includes STC requirements for the windows/exterior doors. However, in some cases, they are provided as 'composite' values. As this is confusing, the report should outline the STC requirements for the outdoor ENB and the inner ENB windows/exterior doors.</p>		SLR	<p>Peer review comments addressed in a separate letter from SLR Consulting.</p> <p>Please refer to: '1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown – Environmental Noise and Vibration Study Peer Review Comment Response #2 – CN', Dated October 4, 2024.</p>
6		<p>The following comment was made previously and still applies to the updated noise report. Section 7.0 of the updated noise report includes a bullet list of conclusions for the development. The last bullet point in the Stationary Noise Source section and the last bullet in the Overall Assessment section comment on the hypothetical situation of the metrolinx Georgetown layover station no longer operating. Instead of commenting on mitigation measures that may change the text should indicate that should Metrolinx change its operation or cease operations at the Georgetown location before the proposed development is considered, an updated noise and vibration report should be prepared. In addition, an updated noise report is to be circulated to CN for peer review as the mitigation measures may be altered and may impact the mitigation required to address CN operations.</p>		SLR	<p>Peer review comments addressed in a separate letter from SLR Consulting.</p> <p>Please refer to: '1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown – Environmental Noise and Vibration Study Peer Review Comment Response #2 – CN', Dated October 4, 2024.</p>



**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
Concl		We find that the noise and vibration report has generally been prepared with the appropriate guidelines considered. We do not anticipate that any of the comments in this peer review will alter the feasibility of the development; however the report does not provide clear and concise mitigation measures in a format that can be easily used in the preparation of the CN agreement.		SLR	Peer review comments addressed in a separate letter from SLR Consulting.  Please refer to: '1 Rosetta Street, Georgetown – Environmental Noise and Vibration Study Peer Review Comment Response #2 – CN', Dated October 4, 2024.
	Region Of Halton		Shelley Partridge, MPI, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner		
		Regional staff note that section 5.8 of the provided Geotechnical Investigation by Terraprobe Inc., dated October 7, 2020 states that Terraprobe has completed a Hydrogeological Report for this site to provide ground water control measures and estimate ground water discharge volume. Regional staff request that this information or related hydrogeological information be provided to Regional staff for review as part of the next submission for the subject applications. Given that the subject properties are located within the WHPA-Q, it is important to understand the potential long-term and construction dewatering that is expected for the proposed development.		Terraprobe/ LEV	Latest Geotechnical Report and Water Balance & Salt Management Plan provided in submission
		A new Section 59(b) notice will be required to proceed with this application. The requested hydrogeological information needs to be reviewed before the Section 59(b) notice can be issued. As per Section 59 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> , this application cannot proceed until a Section 59 Notice has been issued by Halton Region		Terraprobe/ LEV	Latest Geotechnical Report and Water Balance & Salt Management Plan provided in submission
		The application may also be subject to CTC SPP Planning policies identified below: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy SAL-3, a Salt Management Plan (SMP) may need to be submitted and approved as part of a complete application for development; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy REC-1: a Water Balance Assessment (WBA) may need to be submitted and approved as part of a complete application for development;		Terraprobe/ LEV	Water balance and Salt Management report have been completed – included in submission materials

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
		<p>Provided with the second submission was an updated Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by Arcadis Professional Services (Canada) Inc. and dated June 1, 2023. In its present version, the study cannot be approved by the Region of Halton, as it is lacking information in key areas. An updated study will be required to address the following comments prior to Regional approval of the study.</p> <p>Watermain Analysis:                      The hydrant flow test results utilized as part of this FSR analysis were obtained by a Hydrant Flow test conducted on Monday December 14th, 2020 by Aquacom Contracting. An updated/more recent hydrant test will be required and the following information should be submitted to the Region:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Expected static pressures;</li> <li>b) Required fire flows;</li> <li>c) Expected fire flows; and a</li> <li>d) Fire Flow Certification Letter that is signed and stamped by a professional engineer that states the theoretical flow rate is at a pressure of 20 psi.</li> </ul>		Arcadis	<p>Hydroflow test was completed in early 2023                      A water service analysis report has been prepared by Arcadis separately, and included in Appendix B within the FSR/SWM.</p>
		<p>Field verification should ideally be obtained through a hydrant flow test of the hydrants in the vicinity of the development. Please ensure the results obtained are submitted as part of the FSR supporting documentation.</p> <p>Wastewater Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sanitary sewer design sheets are required to determine if any downstream capacity constraints exist. It is necessary for the Region to analyze the minimum velocity on actual flows; actual peak velocity calculated for each pipe to ensure adequate flushing velocities; and the maximum velocity with the pipe flowing full in the segment of pipes in the analysis. This has not been provided in the current FSR. The Engineer Consultant should ideally transfer the Sanitary Capacity Review results from Table 2: Gravity Main Results – Post Development Design Flows into the Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet provided.</li> <li>b) Please provide an isolated internal Sanitary Area Drainage Plan of the development site. This has not been provided in the current FSR.</li> </ul>		Arcadis	<p>Hydroflow test was completed in early 2023 – to review for FSR                      Sanitary downstream analysis has been conducted by Arcadis separately, and included in Appendix C within the FSR/SWM.</p>

**OPA/ZBA APPLICATION COMMENT TRACKER**

1 ROSETTA ST, GEORGETOWN



<b>ZONING COMMENTS</b>					
<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>City/ Agency Contact</b>	<b>Responsible Group</b>	<b>Status</b>
		The Functional Servicing Report has not been updated to reflect the most current unit count, as outlined in the provided Planning Justification Report. Section 3.2 of the FSR provides the domestic water supply demands based on a total unit count of 640 units. Please revise this unit count to reflect the latest number of residential units so that Regional staff can confirm the required servicing allocation for the proposed development. Through the Region’s first submission comments, it was expected that 365 SDEs of servicing allocation was required, so it should be expected that this number would be reduced slightly with the FSR being updated.		Arcadis	The unit count has been updated to reflect the most recent unit count of 659 units.
	<b>Waste Management</b>	Based on the information provided in the second submission, the following captures what remains outstanding, but these can be addressed through a future Site Plan process. 1. A stamped engineering letter must be submitted confirming that the travel path of the collection vehicle over the underground garage is designed to support the weight of a fully loaded collection vehicle (rated for 35 tonnes minimum). 2. A completed drive through agreement must be submitted before collection is to commence.		Arcadis/LEV	To review at SPA
	<b>Urban Design Review</b>		Anne McIlroy/ Nathan Flach 416 504 5997		
	<b>Urban Design Review</b>	Confirm why the recessed balconies on the West Elevation of Building 2 were not carried forward above the crash wall and along the South Elevation of Buildings 1 & 2. Were the balconies enclosed as Juliet balconies to address noise and vibration requirements from the railway authorities given these façades are adjacent to the railway? Ideally the recessed balconies on Building 3 and on the other façades of Buildings 1 & 2 would be carried forward to these façades to create a cohesive design that articulates the façades, provides visual permeability, and reduces the visual impact of the overall mass and upper storeys	Anne McIlroy/ Town Planning	ICON	Confirmed that the balconies were enclosed on the south elevation to address noise requirements from the railway authorities.  Please refer to SLR’s Update Environmental Noise & Vibration Study Dated September, 2024



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
A0	<b>Building Massing and Transitions</b>	<p><b>Building Length</b> The resubmission has rearticulated the south elevation on Buildings 1 and 2 by rearranging some upper portions of the glazing at the southeast, introducing green wall features along the south elevation between Buildings 1 and 2, and creating more consistent step-backs at upper floors along the south facade. These improvements will be discussed in Section 6 Building Façade Design &amp; Materials below.</p> <p>We note that the connection between Buildings 1 and 2 has been maintained as habitable floor area and has not been revised to physically separate the buildings nor as a narrow glazed corridor connection. There is still concern that Buildings 1 and 2 are in fact one long building with resulting shadow and view impacts, and do not present as two distinct masses. We reiterate our previous comment that Buildings 1 and 2 should be physically separated or, if necessary, connected by a fully glazed narrow (5 to 7 foot wide) corridor that allows sunlight and views through the connection.</p> <p>The overall visual impact of the building is difficult to envision, since the continuous south and west elevations are split between pages A301 and A302. We request that one additional rendering be produced showing the south and west facades of Buildings 1 and 2 in their entirety, from a view angle taken from the southwest at the intersection of King St. and Queen St. The visual impact of the proposed building will be better understood with the aid of this additional graphic.</p>	Anne McIlroy	ICON	<p>A rendering has been included in the architectural set showing the south/west facades of buildings 1 &amp; 2 from the intersection of King St and Queen St.</p> <p>Another massing study was completed of the proposed townhouse development at 37 King St. located at the N/W corner of Queen St and King St to illustrate the view impact to 1 Rosetta of this proposed development and potentially improve the noise reflections as well to this part of the neighbourhood.</p>



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>Common Amenity Space and Landscaped OS</b>	<p>We appreciate the provided tabulation of all common indoor and outdoor amenity spaces by program, and it is our opinion that the variety and amount of public and resident amenity space is appropriate for the proposed development. We observe that many of the indoor amenity areas are located at grade and will have views to landscaped areas. Although we understand building floor plans are schematic at this stage and do not include all door locations, where possible, it is recommended that access to exterior patio spaces is provided from indoor amenity space to promote activation.</p> <p>The proposed POPS has been reconfigured, increased in size, and is now fully buffered from vehicle traffic through the use of raised planters and shrubs as well as trees. It is recommended that due to the size of the adjacent exhaust shaft and proximity to the playground area, a combination of a 1 to 1.5metre-tall raised concrete wall (maintaining visual access above) and adjacent planting be provided to create visual and acoustic buffering. It is also recommended that engineered acoustic buffers be installed to mitigate fan noise from the exhaust shaft in the direction of the playground.</p>	Anne McIlroy	<p>ICON</p> <p>MEP</p>	<p>Noted and floor plans will be further refined in SPA</p> <p>The exhaust shaft is flanked by a 1 m high wall and a 0.45 high raised planter.</p>



ZONING COMMENTS					
Item no.	Category	Comment	City/ Agency Contact	Responsible Group	Status
	<b>Building Façade Design and Materials</b>	<p>As mentioned previously, the extension of the green wall at the east elevation of Building 1 is an improvement to the ground floor condition. At the Site Plan stage, details on façade materials, scoring patterns, and/or cladding systems should be provided for all facades and in particular, for larger expanses of solid walls illustrated in solid white along the north elevation of Building 2, as well as the west and south elevations of Building 3.</p> <p>A portion of the south elevation of Building 1 and 2 has been revised to include a living wall system at the upper portion of the façade where Buildings 1 and 2 meet. Although an interesting approach, we are concerned about the long-term viability of a living wall along this tall portion of the building. A living wall will require mechanical systems for watering and extensive hands-on year-round maintenance. We are concerned that access to the wall by maintenance staff will be difficult due to the height of the feature.</p> <p>The composition of materials along the west façade of Building 2 has been revised to present well-proportioned masses with dark brick and natural stone near the base, transitioning logically to glazing and white stucco at the upper building. The scale and proportion of each material block in the west façade is clear and sensible. This approach has not been carried through to the south façade of Building 1 where the material composition is less coherent and the relationships between brick, stone, and stucco portions are unclear and inconsistent. It is recommended that the approach taken to transition and blocking of materials along the west façade of Building 2 is carried through to the south façade of Building 1 as well as the north and northeast facades of Buildings 1 and 2 respectively. Various updates to the elevations have not been reflected in the provided renderings. We request that the renderings be updated to match the material composition and other changes to the façade designs as illustrated in the latest elevations.</p> <p>Finally, to better understand the proposed material palette, we recommend that physical material samples from manufacturers of each intended material (dark brick, natural stone, stucco, etc.) be supplied for review by Town staff as part of the OPA/ZBA review process.</p>		ICON	<p>Noted</p> <p>The living wall has been removed and replaced with high-reflection glass to reflect the sky and appear to recede into the building and to help create a visual separation between building 1 and 2.</p> <p>Update elevations for the project to reflect material, colours, building fenestration and articulation etc are provided in the Architectural Dwgs.</p> <p>Materials in ZBA/OPA are still being reviewed and further details of materials and colours will be presented in SPA.</p>