

Victoria and Cassino Comment and Response Table
103 Victoria Road N, Guelph
May, 2022
18172B

No.	Comment	Response
	Planning Services	-
1.	Urban Design staff support the Landscape Planner's comments to preserve as many trees as possible on site (along the north property line and in the northeast corner in particular). Therefore, the minimum setback should be 6.0m from the north property line.	All buildings are setback at least 6m from the northerly lot line.
2	This will also decrease the impact of 3 storey units facing the adjacent townhouse development.	Noted.
3	In order accommodate this, it is recommended moving Blocks A & B approximately 1.0m closer to Cassino Ave so there is a 6.0m setback. Consider moving Block F closer as well.	Blocks A and B have been shifted towards Cassino Avenue so there is a 6.0m setback. Block F has been moved toward Cassino Avenue by 0.41m.
4	Push Block E & closer to Block F so they meet the 15m separation requirement.	The 15m separation distance between Blocks E and F has been achieved.
5	Consider staggering Block D south and flipping the visitor parking to be adjacent to the common amenity area. The road should jog as well so the trees are preserved in the rear yards of Block D.	This comment was reviewed. The preferred approach is to keep the parking spaces away from the common amenity area in order to maximize usable space.
6	Maintain pedestrian circulation as direct as possible.	Noted. Direct pedestrian circulation has been maintained.
7	Ensure the number of risers for Blocks C & D meet the Built Form Standards for Midrise and Townhouse Dwellings. Carefully consider the grading and topography so that door sills do not exceed 1.5 metres above the adjacent sidewalk.	Noted. Building elevations will be determined through the site plan stage.
8	Consider the use of existing materials in the area. Please use a predominantly masonry finish. Avoid vinyl finishes.	Noted. Building elevations will be determined through the site plan stage.
9	Additional details will be discussed during the site plan review stage. Refer to the Built Form Standards regarding cladding, materials, landscaping, street trees, etc.	Noted.
10	The front doors of units adjacent to Cassino Avenue shall face the public right of way, rather than the internal private road.	The front doors of Building F will face Cassino Avenue. The setback between Buildings A and B and Cassino Avenue will allow for appropriate landscaping adjacent to the street. Landscape plans will be prepared at the site plan stage. Upgraded elevations for the units siding onto Cassino Avenue will be provided at the site plan stage.
11	Upgraded elevations shall also be provided for units siding onto Cassino Avenue. Consider wrapping the porches around the corner as well as glazing and other material changes on these elevations.	Noted. This will be considered at the site plan stage.

12	Please note which buildings will require fire separations as per the OBC – gross floor area and building footprint.	Noted. This will be determined at the site plan stage.
13	Provide renderings of the noise wall to screen private amenity areas as required by the noise study. These should be integrated into the design of the buildings and landscaping rather than look like an add-on after the fact	A noise wall is not required.
14	As part of the site plan process further detailed comments will be discussed including reviewing and finalization of building materials, landscaping materials and other site plan level design elements will be completed through the site plan process. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a detail for pedestrian level lighting and street lighting for the internal streets. Architectural details • Hardscape materials • Materials details • Type and material of benches • Type and location of bicycle parking • Location of utilities, venting, A/C units etc. • Rooftop mechanical screening details. 	Noted.
Planning - Infrastructure, Development and Environmental Engineering – January 28, 2022		
1	Grading	
	Overall the proposed grading plan is generally satisfactory. Grading will be further assessed at the detailed design stage (site plan).	Noted.
	Show existing contours at 0.5 m intervals over the entire Site and sufficient area (approximately 10m) of adjacent lands to establish the overall drainage pattern	Contours on REM-1 are 0.5 m separation. Topo survey extends to limits of the property only.
	. It is unclear if there is an external drainage area entering the site.	Any drainage from adjacent properties will be accommodated through the proposed design and detailed through SPA. However, can the City please provide any drainage information/design for the townhouse development to the north to understand the grades and drainage of the townhouse property.
	For the first site plan submission, please provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a separate Erosion and Sediment Control Plan; • Label Heavy Duty Silt Fence Barrier as per City SD 6-74B • Label Construction Entrance Mud Mat Detail for City Road Access - City SD 5-45; • Provide Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control around CBs, CBMHs and MHs as per City SD- 6-84. 	Noted. These will be included at the site plan stage.

2	Traffic Study, Access, Parking and Transportation Demand Management	
	Proposed access on Cassino Avenue to be aligned with the Palermo Crescent (centerline to centerline). Provided concept plan and Traffic Impact Brief does not identify the centerline alignment	The centerline of Palermo Crescent is shown on the concept plan.
	Please see the City of Guelph's Site Plan Procedures and Guidelines document for bicycle parking provisions. Active Transportation is discussed within the Urban Design Brief, but no measures to support active transportation are recommended in the Traffic Impact Brief, or shown on the site plan	The location of bicycle parking will be determined at the site plan stage.
3	Municipal Services	
	Servicing Capacities: The City is updating the Master plan for water/wastewater. The City has sent the request to the City's consultant to confirm capacity within the existing system to accommodate the proposed development. Comments on the capacity will be provided separately at a later date.	Noted.
4	Storm Water Management	
	Since the design includes an infiltration gallery to help promote groundwater recharge, please confirm the permeability (K) (cm/s)/ infiltration rates (mm/hr) with permeameter tests conducted in the field (in-situ) in accordance with the Development Engineering Manual (DEM). As per the CVC/TRCA LID manual, it is noted that in-situ testing should be completed in the spring months.	Acknowledged. As noted in the FSR, the theoretical infiltration rate is much lower (and more conservative for this level of design) than the anticipated measured values. Infiltration rates will therefore be confirmed through SPA in accordance with City guidelines.
	The seasonal high groundwater elevation with four seasons of data is to be verified with submitting a Hydrogeological Assessment prior to final site plan approval. This information will confirm if the basement/garage floor elevation as proposed can meet the requirements of the Development Engineering Manual, which indicates a separation of 0.5m from the seasonal high elevation and support infiltration (1.0m separation from the bottom of the gallery to seasonal high elevation) and water balance as specified in the City's DEM.	Acknowledged. Please note that ongoing monitoring of sump pumps on adjacent properties is occurring in addition to continued monitoring of on-site MWs to fully understand the elevation of the groundwater table.
	It is noted in the swm report that the proposed infiltration gallery depth exceeds the maximum depth of 0.6m. Therefore, we ask the consultant to confirm if the depth could be reduced by increasing the galleries' length and/or width of the galleries? Based on the results found in the geotechnical report, 1m separation may not be achievable see Geotech comment below.	Once infiltration rates are confirmed through in-situ testing, infiltration gallery footprints and heights will be adjusted to suit. The design illustrated at this stage is a conservative estimate to show a 'worst-case scenario' for design dimensions. Through SPA, Stantec will refine the design as much as possible to achieve a lower profile of the proposed infiltration system.
5	Geotechnical Report	
	As noted in the geotechnical report, if dewatering is required, an Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (ESAR) or Permit to Take Water will be required from the MECP.	Noted.

	Data from BH102-20 states that water was encountered at 1.2m BGS. This the approximately the location for the infiltration gallery. Further, BH107-20 close approximately to infiltration gallery 2 revealed that water was encountered at 0.6m BGS.	
6	Noise Report	
	The noise feasibility is generally acceptable for the zone change application. However, a detailed noise study will be required at the site plan stage.	Noted. This will be addressed through the site plan process.
	Traffic volumes are forecast to only 10 years from the date of the study, but must be 10 years from the anticipated construction completion date	Noted. This will be addressed through the site plan process.
7	Environmental	
	A reliance letter from the qualified person (QP) was not submitted with the Phase I and II ESA reports.	A reliance letter is included with this resubmission.
	The property use is not changing to a more sensitive use (i.e. it is to remain residential); so, in accordance with the City's Guidelines an RSC is not required for the Site development.	Noted.
Planning - Infrastructure, Development and Enterprise – December 7, 2021		
	Overall Tree Inventory, Protection and Removals Plan was submitted with the application identifying 162 trees over 10cm in DBH. Of these I count 21 trees off-site (20 on adjacent private property, 1 on public right of way). There are 45 trees in which ownership is yet to be determined and more importantly, there several of these trees could be influenced/impacted by the proposal. It should be noted that the assessment date of the trees is unknown but should be recorded on the plans.	An updated Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan is included with this resubmission.
Staff Comments		
a	The Tree Inventory, Preservation and Removals Plan is not a complete TIPP. There is no indication of tree protection measures (fencing). Please refer to the City's Tree Technical Manual for requirements regarding tree protection fencing, specifications, details and mitigations, etc. Information is to be provided on a revised set of TIPP plans, including reference to the TTM, details, and specifications and most importantly means to mitigate potential impacts to trees to be protected on and off the site.	City Tree Protection Fence (TPF) details and specifications has been included on drawing TIPP-2. Recommended TPF locations to protect retained trees has been identified on drawing TIPP-1. Notes for tree protection from the City's technical manual has been included on drawing TIPP-2. It was assumed that the Project site will have fence (silt or construction fence) installed along the property line during construction, as such TPF was only recommended for trees that were located directly adjacent to construction limits and not for trees located beyond that on adjacent property.
b	Paige wire fencing as a minimum, held in place by t-bars is to be used to define the TPZ, as per City Standards. This method of fencing seems to be more rigid and permanent then snow fencing, and therefore more effective in keeping equipment and people out of the protected zone. Any sediment control required for the site can be used in concert with the TPZ.	City standards details for TPF fence were included on the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan drawing TIPP-2.

c	Of the 165 trees, I count 56 stems that have been proposed for removal to accommodate development.	The revised TIPP drawings identify 160 trees inventoried, 83 trees to be retained and 77 to be removed.
d	Please ensure to determine through a professional land surveyor all tree ownership on the plans. When doing so, ensure to add 'Boundary' trees to the ownership category. It would appear that approximately 20 trees could be classified as such and therefore should be identified to ensure they are preserved and protected and/or have consent to remove from all owners.	The Project Arborist completed a site visit April 2022 to review trees along the boundary of the Project property. Tree ownership was confirmed. Trees that appeared to be boundary trees that were not originally legally surveyed were tagged and a legal survey was completed. Boundary tree ownership and ownership of all trees inventoried has been identified on the Tree Inventory Table, table 1.
e	The proposal should move towards preserving and protecting trees rather than removing trees, especially those along the boundary.	Tree preservation was recommended for healthy trees located along the Project boundary in support of facilitating the development.
f	If a tree has the potential of being injured during works then it should be subject to mitigation measures to better its chances of survival.	City mitigation measure notes have been included on drawing TIPP-2.
g	Tree #111 is the only tree at this time identified as a Municipally owned tree. Please ensure it is shown as protected.	There was no construction or development occurring adjacent to this tree, however to satisfy city request TPF has been shown for this tree on drawing TIPP-1.
h	If and when the TPZ is proposed within the dripline there should be clear direction on the drawings as to where Root Zone Compaction Protection (RZCP) is required or has potential to be needed. Any work within the dripline of a tree must be overseen by the certified arborist.	Encroachment into a tree's dripline for this project will be to complete construction for the project. So, either excavation to decrease grade or there will be increasing of the grade. As such it is assumed that the area will be impacted and the area within the TPF will be left untouched. Therefore no RZCP has been specifically identified. The encroachment within a tree's TPZ has been reviewed to determine if the tree can survive this type of impact. Tree protection and management notes have been included on the TIPP drawings for management of trees especially during construction so that tree/root management will mitigate impact to trees.
i	As part of the Recommended Mitigation Measures - Trees to be retained that may potentially be injured by construction activities should be monitored during works taking place by a certified arborist to ensure the correct direction and/or work can be provided. Post construction monitoring should also take place and any mitigating measures, such as deep root fertilization or pruning, should be directed/performed by a certified arborist.	Understood. City tree mitigation notes have been included on drawing TIPP-2.
j	Of the 59 stems noted to be removed, only 8 would be classified as exempt under the tree bylaw due to poor health, dead or species. Therefore 51 trees would be eligible for compensation using the Aggregate Caliper Ratio as per the Tree Technical Manual. However, this is subject to change once ownership and action is clearly identified for those trees noted as 'TBD'.	Ownership of trees has been confirmed. Tree's that are exempt from the bylaw have not been included for compensation. Tree's identified to be removed and eligible for compensation have been identified on Table 1, on dwg TIPP-2, and also the compensation quantity for tree replacement.
k	Given the extent of removals proposed, staff believe the full tree compensation required will not be achieved on site. Of the trees proposed for removal, approximately 238 new trees would need to be accommodated for on-site. Cash-inlieu will be required for a portion of the compensation	Compensation quantities along with the total cash in lieu has been identified on dwg TIPP-2. The landscape plan can use this total compensation quantity and determine the deficiencies based on the proposed planting.

I	<p>Trees to be protected along the boundary limits could be subject to substantial excavation due to the proposed retaining wall systems. Please discuss and provide possible mitigation measures to be taken pre/during and post development to ensure tree survival. I'm most interested in mitigating soil disturbance during excavation, placement/removal of soils over root systems, and compaction of soils behind the new walls; as well as any potentials of structural instability of trees due to proposed works.</p>	<p>Due to retaining wall trees located within this area will be removed including tree #22 that should be able to be retained in the amenity area. Trees located adjacent will be protected. Retaining wall proposed along north property line conflicts with Planning comment #1 where the buildings were set back 6m to help retain trees. If proposed retaining wall remains through to detailed design, then it is recommended that the Project arborist meet with the contractor prior to commencement of construction for retaining wall to review adjacent trees and discuss possible mitigation measure.</p>
---	--	--