



Appendix	C
SRPRS	19-021
File(s)	D02-18021, D03-18010

November 22, 2018

MEMO TO: Amanda Dunn, Planner II

FROM: Isa James, Senior Urban Designer

SUBJECT: Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium, and Site Plan Approval
Applicant Name: 2539144 Ontario Inc.
Legal Description: PLAN 4667 PT LOT 13 RP 65R8260 PT PART 1
Municipal Address: 15 Colesbrook Road
Town File Nos: D02-18021, D03-18010, D05-18004 and D06-18036

The subject lands are located on the southwest corner of Gamble Road and Colesbrook Road. The lands across Gamble Road to the north consist of open space. The lands to the west and south are occupied by two storey detached houses built on recently subdivided lands while the lands to east have single detached houses on large lots that are anticipated to be further subdivided in the future.

The lands are designated as Neighbourhood in the Official Plan. Medium-density uses such as low-rise townhouses and walk-up apartments are permitted in the Neighbourhood designation on lands adjacent to an arterial road to a maximum density of 50 units per hectare.

The applicant is seeking permission to develop the lands as an 18-unit condominium townhouse development. The proposed density is given as 42.86 units per hectare.

Staff have reviewed the application in accordance with the Council approved Town-wide Urban Design Guidelines (UDG), and provide urban design comments below. To expedite the review of the re-submission, please have the applicant include a cover letter detailing how each of the comments listed below has been addressed.

Archaeological Assessment

The subject lands are located within 300m of a water source and adjacent to an historical transportation route. An archaeological assessment should be completed prior to commencement of any soil disturbance, issuance of planning approvals and/or site alteration permit.

General Comments:

We are disturbed by the lack of grading coordination between the subject lands and the neighbouring properties that would result in significant height differences between the proposed 3-storey townhouses and the adjacent two storey houses on lands that, according to the grading plan, would be approximates 2.5 m lower in elevation. We are not supportive of the development proposal as presented.

Official Plan Policies

Development is to be compatible with the existing character of adjacent and surrounding areas with respect to predominant building forms and types; massing; general patterns of streets, blocks, lots and lanes; landscaped areas and treatments; and the general pattern of yard setbacks. A concept showing a potential development plan for the adjacent properties was submitted in support of the applications.

1. The concept plan should include the lands to the south and southeast of the subject lands to allow for a more complete understanding of how the proposed lot fabric and built form would affect the visual qualities of the neighbourhood.
2. The proposed development would be autonomous within the neighbourhood. It does not mesh with the existing development pattern in terms of grading, lot fabric and road layout and does not allow for potential connection to lands yet to be developed. Consider different development scenarios to better integrate with existing and potential future development patterns.

Draft Zoning By-law Amendment

3. If the development is to be in the form of a parts-in-common condominium, individual lot-related zoning regulations should be applied.

Site Plan

4. The site is very tightly laid out. The majority of the proposed townhouses are too narrow relative to the neighbourhood context. We are particularly concerned about the proposed 5.54m unit widths, 5.55m rear yard and 0.72m side-wall separation from a sidewalk and 1.27m separation from parking area dimensions. (The latter two dimensions relate to end units where side lot lines are missing from the drawings.)
5. The proposed development requires the construction of tall and long retaining walls in the southeast corner of the site that would negatively impact the Wiley Avenue streetscape. The proposed 3-storey townhouses in conjunction with the proposed grade difference would result in unacceptably taller built form than the adjacent dwellings to the south.
6. The retaining walls, in conjunction with the proposed 5.5m rear yards for the units on the south side of the site, would result in an unreasonable loss of back yard visual privacy for the existing residents to the south and potential new residential lots to the east. The site and concept plans should be revised to eliminate these undesirable development consequences.
7. Remove any retaining walls that would be the responsibility of individual property owners.
8. The Site Plan indicates independent lots for the townhouses, but does not provide proposed lot lines for the easterly end units of Blocks 1 and 4. Lot lines should not coincide with pavement edges. Car and truck bumper overhang zones should be incorporated into the site layout to avoid damage to fencing.
9. Corner units should have their front doors facing public streets. (Also see comment 12 below.)
10. The blocks flanking Colesbrook Road should adhere to the same setbacks from the street as the existing neighbouring houses. (Also see comment 13 below.)

Urban Design Brief (UDB)

11. Include a section that deals with site grading problems and how they will be addressed so that the use of retaining walls will be minimized and the new houses will integrate with the existing built forms and topography.
12. The site plan in section 4.2 is significantly distorted.
13. The UDB lacks a notation that townhouses adjacent to Gamble Avenue and Colesbrook Road have their front doors facing the public street and that visible and easily accessible walkways connect the front door to the public sidewalk in accordance with the Town-wide UDG.
14. The Town's UDG includes Section 6.3.2 noting that a minimum landscape setback between low-rise residential buildings and the public right of way, consistent with adjacent buildings, be provided. The neighbouring houses are set back approximately 6m from the road whereas the proposed townhouse blocks would be set back only 3.06m from the road.

Landscape Plans

15. Ganged gas and hydro meters require screening from public view.
16. We anticipate noise fencing will be required for some rear yards in the development. Noise fences as well as privacy fencing and details will be required to be shown on the landscape plans.
17. Any noise fencing should be screened from public view by shrubs and trees.

Built Form/Elevations

18. Rear and flankage elevations for the proposed townhouse blocks would be visible due to setbacks that are shorter than neighbouring buildings and due to the proposed raised grades of the subject lands. Flankage and rear elevations currently lack sufficient articulation. Break up extensive brick areas with treatments reflective of the quality of the front elevations.
19. The proposed colour selections are not harmonious with those found in the existing neighbourhood. The proposed colours range through an almost white stone through to black metal cladding and black raised seam metal roofs. The colours of the

neighbourhood are much more muted and involve far less contrast in the dark to light colour range and saturation. Black should be restricted to detail elements only and the stone shade and saturation values should be increased.

Material and Colour

20. Provide coloured renderings with the next submission.

We will provide detailed comments and request sample boards and the completion of the *Exterior Material and Colour Schedule* for the proposed development once the form of the development is closer to acceptance by the Town.