



Planning & Regulatory Services Department
Park and Natural Heritage Planning

Appendix	D7
SRPRS	19-097
File(s)	D02-17028, D03-17007 D05-17006

January 5, 2019

Memo To: Katherine Faria, Planner II - Subdivisions

From: Anant Patel, Parks Planner

File Number(s): D06-18053 (Site Plan)
Related File(s): D02-17028 (Zoning By-law Amendment)
D03-17007 (Subdivision)
D05-17006 (Condominium)

Applicant: Shcolyar, Gil & Maria and Shcolyar, Malvina
Location: 39, 35 & 27 Church Street North

Materials reviewed:

- Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., dated October 16, 2018;
- Draft Plan of Subdivision, prepared by Evans Planning, dated October 3, 2018;
- Existing Site Conditions, Proposed Site Plan Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan, prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., dated October 12, 2018;
- L-1, Landscape Plan, prepared by Mark Setter Associates Ltd., dated October 31, 2018;
- L-2, Planting Plan, prepared by Mark Setter Associates Ltd., dated October 31, 2018;
- LD-1, Landscape Details & Notes, prepared by Mark Setter Associates Ltd., dated October 31, 2018;
- LD-2, Landscape Details & Notes, prepared by Mark Setter Associates Ltd., dated October 31, 2018;
- SS-1, Site Servicing Plan, prepared by D.G. Biddle & Associates Limited, dated November 2018;
- SG-1, Site Grading Plan, prepared by D.G. Biddle & Associates Limited, dated November 2018;
- ES-1, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, prepared by D.G. Biddle & Associates Limited, dated November 2018;
- Functional Servicing Report, prepared by D.G. Biddle & Associates Limited, dated November 12, 2018.

Comments:

Parkland Dedication

1. The parkland area generated for this development does not create a viable park that can be programmed or contribute to the overall park system. Park staff will recommend to Council to accept cash in lieu of parkland dedication for this property in line with parkland dedication policies at the time of building permit issuance for this development application.

Site Plan

2. The proposed development will result in a loss of 66 native and non-native trees, and two polygons. An additional 19 trees and one polygon are recommended for removal due to their condition. It should be noted that there are ten trees with a trunk diameters of 50 cm dbh and greater that will be destroyed including a 100 cm dbh silver maple and four black walnut with a trunk diameter of 60 cm dbh and greater. In this regard, staff do not support the destruction of trees on abutting properties or trees along the property lines and the development proposal should be revised to preserve and protect trees # 378, 379, 381, 383, 386, 387, 389 and 456
3. The applicant will be required to restore the tree canopy within the development by securing tree plantings and/or compensation for the loss of these trees through the site plan agreement.



Planning & Regulatory Services Department
Park and Natural Heritage Planning

4. For those trees to be preserved and protected, we require tree protection fence to be installed and this shall be a condition of Site Plan Approval. Further, evidence of this tree protection fence having been installed is required prior to any site alteration permit or building permit being issued.
5. The applicant will be required to install a robust tree protection barrier along the minimum tree protection zone for the trees noted above and provide securities through the pending site plan agreements for preservation and protection of these trees. The amount of securities will be based on the ISA value to be provided by the applicant's consulting arborist.
6. The response letter in regards to the Heritage Impact Assessment notes the value in preserving the historic nature and context to the streetscape. The consultant is recommending that the number of these trees, including several unhealthy trees will have to be removed to enable the proposed development to proceed. However, the Arborist Report notes that these trees are in fair to good condition, and have a trunk diameters of 50 cm dbh and greater. The applicant should reassess the value and importance of preserving the trees to preserve the historic nature and context of the development.
7. The Site Servicing and Site Grading Plans will need to be revised to eliminate any grading, swales, servicing, infiltration galleries and infrastructure within the minimum tree protect zones for the trees noted above.
8. Please include a small planter or curb around the trees planted near driveways. This will deter cars from hitting the trees, and decrease probability of removing the tree to increase parking.
9. Please plant additional trees instead of the shrubs on the property in order to restore the tree canopy.
10. The Planting Plan and Landscape Details & Notes indicates that 4 Pyramidal European Hornbeam, 14 Chanticleer Ornamental Pear, and 6 Pyramidal English Oak are proposed to be planted. These trees are non-native to this area. Please provide for alternate species that are native.
11. The Town is over-represented in Maple Trees. Please reduce the overall percentage of Maple Trees in the plan, or eliminate Maple Trees and replace with alternate species that are native.
12. Points can be allotted for item 3.C.1 if a garden is built in the backyard. If this is the intent, provide the location on the landscaping plans and include the garden details on future landscape plan cost estimate.
13. Parks staff recommends that a screening fence be installed along the retaining wall.

I trust the above is of assistance. Should you require any further information regarding our comments, please contact the undersigned at (905) 771-2492.

Sincerely,

Anant Patel, B.URPI

Parks Planner

Park and Natural Heritage Planning