



January 6, 2022

Our File # ET120001-14

Summer Valentine

Director of Planning & Building Services
Town of Collingwood
55 Ste. Marie St., Suite 302
Collingwood, ON L9Y 0W6

**Re: Collingwood Harbour House (31 Huron Street) - D111320
Second Site & Landscape Review**

Dear Ms. Valentine:

As requested, we have reviewed the site planning and landscape components of the proposed Collingwood Harbour House (31 Huron Street) development in the Town of Collingwood. The following plans and documents were provided by the Town to inform our review:

- Comment Response Matrix (August 20, 2021);
- Proposed Site Plan and Site Statistics, dwgs. D-001 and D-002 (Streetcar, August 20, 2021);
- Architectural Floor Plans and Elevations, dwgs. D-080, D-90, D-100 to D-104, and D-120 (Streetcar, August 29, 2021);
- Architectural Elevations, dwgs. 1 to 5 (CEBRA, August 26, 2021);
- Architectural Renderings (undated);
- General Site Servicing Plan, Overall Site Grading and Sediment and Erosion Control Plan, and Construction Notes and Details, dwgs. C101 to C103 (Crozier, Rev 2 - August 12, 2021);
- Layout and Planting Plan and Details, dwgs. L-1, D-1, and D-2 (MBTW Group, Rev - August 20, 2021);
- Harbour House Parkette Concept (MBTW Group, undated);
- Site Plan - Photometric and Site Lighting Details, dwgs. E100, E101, and E102 (Crozier, Rev 1 - August 11, 2020);
- Urban Design Review (MBTW Group, August 19, 2021);
- Letter Re: Boundaries of the Collingwood Downtown Heritage Conservation District (Golder Associates Ltd., August 10, 2021);
- Shadow Study (CEBRA, undated);
- Memo Re: Sustainability Overview (Purpose Building Inc., August 18, 2021);
- Servicing and Stormwater Management Implementation Report (Crozier, August 2021);
- Letter Re: Traffic Opinion Letter Update (Crozier, August 18, 2021);
- Letter Re: Transportation Noise Study (HGC Engineering, July 30, 2021);
- Proposed Solid Waste Management Plan (CanAm Waste Products, August 2021);
- Construction Management Plan - Preliminary (Crozier, August 30, 2021);
- Landscape Cost Estimate (MBTW Group, August 25, 2021);
- Security Calculations (Crozier, August 11, 2021).

We offer the following comments and recommendations related to this submission:

TREE PRESERVATION

1. The 'Tree Protection Barrier' detail on Drawing C103 depicts incorrect site conditions (i.e., parking interface). This detail should be updated to reflect the specific conditions along Huron Street.

URBAN DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE

2. The Urban Design Review thoroughly outlines the proposed development in context of the goals and objectives of the Shipyards Community Master Plan (Urban Design Guidelines and Architectural Design Guidelines) and the Collingwood Waterfront Masterplan. We note that the Collingwood Urban Design Manual (UDM) was not referenced, as the above documents offer more district-specific guidance for development within the harbourlands. Regardless, we feel that the proposed development is generally consistent with the UDM, applying sound urban design principles and best practices.
3. The Urban Design Review provides substantial emphasis and justification for the development's interface with the public park, Huron Street, and Side Launch Way, however, we felt that the importance of the Heritage Drive aspect could have been better acknowledged. It would be helpful if additional renderings and associated urban design rationale were provided highlighting how the building and site support the 'gateway experience' inherent at the Heritage Drive intersection. This is particularly important from Huron Street's east approach and the north-south public trail connection at Heritage Drive and the Station Museum.
4. The Urban Design Review identifies that an interim plan should be developed for the provision of a pedestrian walkway along the municipal park block to provide temporary access to the proposed west-facing restaurants/patios (until such a time as the park is developed by the Town). We note that this temporary walkway is absent in the submission and clarification as to the proposed approach and division of responsibilities should be provided.
5. Streetscape treatments depicted along Huron Street and Side Launch Way are appropriate and are consistent with existing features and aesthetics along these road corridors. The extension of these streetscape treatments to Heritage Drive will connect Huron House to the downtown Heritage District and Shipyards and will help identify it as a gateway site.
6. We note that except for the driveway entrances and servicing works, all boulevard improvements are identified as being future works 'by Town' or 'by others'. We assume that this division of responsibility has been mutually agreed upon and we offer no further comment in this regard, unless otherwise directed by the Town.
7. Municipal sidewalks depicted along Side Launch Way and Heritage Drive differ between the Site Plan/landscape drawings and the engineering drawings. Given the urban nature of this development, we support having the sidewalks directly abut the site boundaries (as per the Site Plan and landscape drawings) so that pedestrian surfaces are continuous. This will also eliminate the narrow sod strip proposed along the edges of the site, as per the engineering drawings. Drawings should be coordinated and revised accordingly.
8. Bicycle parking has been provided on-site adjacent to the rear service entrance, which is beneficial for residences and retail users. We further recommend that bike parking, benches, and other pedestrian amenities be provided within the Huron Street boulevard, similar to existing Heritage District treatments further to the west. We assume this would be a component of the future streetscape works by the Town.

9. Along the east building face, the architectural renderings and elevations depict roll-up garage doors and outdoor patios within the 3.0m site area adjacent to the Heritage Drive road allowance. In this same space, the landscape plans show a narrow unit paver walkway (1.5m approx.) and a planting bed with interpretive panels. It should be clarified what treatment is proposed, as there is insufficient space to achieve both objectives in this location.

PEDESTRIAN WALKWAYS

10. The Site Plan should be revised to depict the on-site planting bed proposed at the Heritage Drive intersection. The unit paver walkway remaining along the building should be accurately dimensioned.
11. The walkway along the north building face is broken to give priority to the 'delivery entry' and the grading has been revised to provide a depressed curb transition in this location. As such, a continuous row of tactile attention indicators is required on both sides of the drive aisle to delineate between pedestrian and vehicular environments in accordance with Ontario Building Code (OBC) - Article 3.8.3.2 (1) (h). We recommend referencing OPSD 310.039.
12. Further to the above, tactile walking surface indicators are required at the curb ramp for the accessible parking stall.
13. It appears that the concrete waste collection staging area is proposed in a location that will conflict with the walkway route along the north side of the building. To ensure that barrier-free pedestrian movement remains unobstructed on collection days, we recommend that the concrete staging area be shifted to the area north of the proposed walkway.

ACCESSIBLE PARKING

14. All accessible parking stalls in the underground parking garage (Levels P1 and P2) are identified as 'Type B' stalls, which is not permissible under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). Of the 5 accessible stalls provided on each parking level, a minimum of 2 stalls should be designated as 'Van Accessible' (Type A) and the remaining 3 could either be Type A or Type B stalls – AODA 80.36.(1) subparagraphs 2 i) and ii) and AODA Article 80.36 (2). Revisions should be made accordingly.
15. On Drawing C102, the 'Type A' accessible parking stall should be labelled to provide both the standard accessible signage (RB-93) and the additional 'Van accessible' signage (RB-93-T) as per AODA Article 80.34 (1). Revisions should be made accordingly.
16. Accessible parking signage for 'Type A' and 'Type B' stalls should also be identified for the underground parking garage (Levels P1 and P2).

LANDSCAPE

17. In the northeast amenity plaza, double flush concrete strips create stylized 'train tracks' through the grey unit paver plaza that focuses on a sculptural rail cart. In the planting bed, decorative concrete slabs are staggered with plantings to further reinforce the impression of the of the 'tracks'. We commend the designers for offering such an engaging reference to the Shipyards and see this as a beneficial space to discover along the waterfront. We note that additional information, labels, dimensions, and details for the amenity plaza and 'tracks' concept would be helpful in providing a better understanding of scale, relationships, and detail.

18. The precedent image provided with the landscape drawings shows the 'Rail Car' sitting on concrete pavers. It is unclear if this feature requires a footing or special mounting accommodations. Clarification and/or details should be provided.
19. The seatwall in the northeast amenity plaza is proposed as concrete with skateboard guards. This form of seating can be uncomfortable and physically challenging for seniors and users with mobility issues. We recommend adding some benches (with back and arm rests), similar to the existing public amenity space on the opposite side of Heritage Drive. As a preferred alternative to stand-alone benches, we suggest considering curved bench seating mounted to the top of the concrete wall. This would reinforce the curved lines in the space and the wooden slats would support the 'track' concept (e.g., Maglin Ogden bench, etc.) These benches can also be fitted with backs and arms rests for the length (or a portion) of the wall.
20. Details for the installation of the 'In-ground Historical Plaques' within the unit paver plaza should be included. We note that many of the existing plaques installed in the concrete trail along Heritage Drive have failed and we recommend that an improved detail and anchoring system be proposed.
21. With planting proposed on top of the underground parking structure, it is unclear how the amenity space planting bed will accommodate the required soil volume to support the deciduous trees. Detail 3 on Drawing D-2 shows a soil profile that is only 275mm deep (approx.) over the concrete structure, which is challenging for even shrubs and perennials, as the soil will dry out quickly. To provide a more appropriate soil profile, perhaps the entire planting area could be elevated by a planter wall matching the height of the seat wall. Further to better accommodating the tree plantings and improved soil moisture retention, this would increase the seating edge along the public plaza.
22. It should be confirmed whether or not an irrigation system will be provided to support the plant material.
23. 1.0m high concrete planters are proposed at the driveway entrances that are planted with 0.3m high junipers. We are concerned that at plant maturity, this feature will obstruct driver sightlines to pedestrians walking along the public sidewalks. We recommend reducing the height of the walls to 0.6m - 0.7m with the goal of maintaining an overall maximum height (wall + plantings) of 1.0m.
24. Detail 3 on Drawing D-2 depicts a planter curb on top of the concrete parking structure to separate planting beds from hard surfacing, however, this element is not represented on the landscape plan. To better clarify where the planter curb is proposed, it should be added to the plan.
25. For both the Planter Curb (Detail 3) and the Planter Wall (Detail 4) on Drawing D-2, we are unclear of the advantage of bringing the area drains to the top of the planting beds. The drains may be more effective at the bottom of the planting beds within a wrapped clear stone layer. Clarification should be provided.
26. The perennial planting bed proposed within the Heritage Drive road allowance should be omitted. These plantings will be highly impacted by winter salt, sand accumulation, and snowbanks, and it is likely that their survival will be poor and result in increased Town maintenance.
27. Further to the above, the on-site planting bed/interpretive panel proposed along the future Heritage Drive sidewalk will also be vulnerable to snowplow and snow loading damage, which is a common issue with junipers. Assuming that roll-up doors and patios are not proposed along Heritage Drive, we recommend that the planting bed/interpretive panel be moved beside the building (foundation planting) and the unit paver walkway be relocated adjacent to the proposed public sidewalk. This

- would allow more forgiveness for sidewalk plows and create a wider combined (private/public) pedestrian space.
28. A unit paver or concrete strip should be provided along the property boundaries (on-site), adjacent to the proposed public sidewalks. This will provide a buffer for sidewalk plows and offset proposed plantings to reduce the potential for winter damage.
 29. All unit paver areas should be contained by a raised or flush concrete curb or other rigid boundary (retaining wall, building, etc.) where they interface with planting beds and soft landscape areas. Edge restraints should not be used.
 30. The proposed surface-mounted bike racks are proposed within a unit paver area. Footing/anchoring details should be provided demonstrating how the bike racks will be mounted. As an alternative, a concrete slab could be provided under the bike parking for surface mounting and to delineate the bike parking from pedestrian areas.
 31. To avoid congestion at the north service entrance doors, we recommend rotating the bike parking 90 degrees to be parallel with the parking stalls.
 32. Details for the Information and Interpretive Panels, Concrete Seatwall, and Planter Walls are considered conceptual, with footings being noted as 'to be determined'. In this context, we recommend that the following general notes be added to the details:
 - a) The contractor is responsible to provide shop drawings stamped by a structural engineer licenced in the Province of Ontario for final approval by the landscape architect prior to commencement of construction.
 - b) Structural works shall be reviewed and certified by the design engineer and the contractor is responsible to coordinate and accommodate required inspections.
 33. For Details 1 and 2 on Drawing D-2, OPSS.MUNI 351 and OPSS.MUNI 355 should be referenced to establish minimum material and construction standards for concrete paving and unit paving, respectively.
 34. Based on the specified trees, we calculate the overall mature canopy provided by this development to be 796 m², which is 17.0% of the 4,690 m² site area. We note that this is a reduction from the first submission's canopy coverage. We concur that given the high-density nature of the development, it would be difficult to accommodate further tree plantings on site to achieve the 30% canopy coverage required by the Town's Urban Design Manual (UDM) - Section 10G. We recommend that the Town consider an exemption to this requirement based on design merit.
 35. Little Giant Cedar (*Thuja occidentalis* 'Little Giant') is intolerant of salt and snow loading and as such, it may not be the best choice directly adjacent to sidewalks. Similarly, Arctic Fire Dogwood (*Cornus sericea* 'Farrow') is proposed adjacent to the parking lot and is intolerant of salt. We recommend considering alternative species in these locations.
 36. In the Plant List on Drawing L-1, all deciduous and coniferous shrubs should be noted as being supplied in 3 gal. pots.
 37. The Notes for 'Mulch' on Drawing L-1 should be revised to be 75mm shredded cedar bark mulch as per the Town standard planting details included on the same drawing.
 38. On Drawing L-1, drawing notes should be updated to omit references to the 'Town of Shelburne' and be replaced by the 'Town of Collingwood'.

SECURITIES ESTIMATE

39. The following items were not included in the 'Landscape Cost Estimate' or the 'Security Calculations' and should be added:

- Tree Preservation Fence - Modular Metal: \$25.00/m
- Planting Soil Mixture: \$50.00/m²
- Planter Curb: \$110.00/m
- Benches: \$1,800.00/each

40. Generally, the unit prices provided in the 'Landscape Cost Estimate' are reflective of current market values for their respective items. However, the following items are below their market range for supply and installation and should be increased as follows:

- Bike Racks (post & ring): \$900.00/ each

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

ENVISION-TATHAM



David Wood BLA OALA CSLA
President

W:\Projects\2020 Projects\ET120001 Collingwood Development Review\14 Collingwood Harbour House\14_documents\L_2022.01.06_Valentine_D111320.docx

Copy – Mark Bryan, John Velick, Sheldon Hancock, and Wendy Martin via email