



February 25, 2021

Our File # ET120001-14

Mr. Adam Farr

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
Site & Landscape Review**

Dear Mr. Farr:

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:

- Town of Collingwood Site Plan Application, File D111320, received July 31, 2020;
- Town of Collingwood Application for OPA, ZBA, Holding and Temporary Use Amendments, File D14320, dated July 24, 2020;
- Town of Collingwood Zoning By-Law Amendment Draft (undated);
- Letter Re: First Submission REVISED - ZBLA (D14320) and Site Plan (D111320) to Mark Bryan (Town of Collingwood) from Andrew Pascuzzo (Pascuzzo Planning Inc.) dated Nov. 16, 2020;
- Pre-consultation Comment/Response (undated);
- Planning Justification Report (Pascuzzo Planning Inc. July, 2020);
- Proposed Site Plan & Statistics, dwgs. D-001 and D-002 (Streetcar, July 30, 2020);
- Architectural Elevations (Streetcar & CEBRA, July 30, 2020);
- Architectural Renderings (Streetcar & CEBRA, July 31, 2020);
- Architectural Floor Plans and Elevations, dwgs. D-090, D-091, D-100 to D-103, D-120 and D-121 (Streetcar, July 30, 2020);
- Landscape Plan & Details, dwgs. L-1 and L-2 (C.F. Crozier & Associates, Rev 2 - July 31, 2020);
- Site Plan - Photometric and Lighting Details, dwgs. E100 & E101 (C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc., Rev 0 - July 31, 2020);
- Urban Design Summary - Supplementary (Streetcar Developments Inc., November 30, 2020);
- Urban Design Manual Responses (October 22, 2020);
- Heritage Design Brief (CEBRA, July 31, 2020);
- Heritage Impact Assessment (Golder Associates Ltd., November 11, 2020);
- Shadow Study (CEBRA, undated);
- Legal and Topographical Survey (Patten & Thomsen Limited, undated);
- Construction Mobilization Plan (July 31, 2020);
- Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessments (Archaeological Services Inc., August 2002);
- Preliminary Hydrogeological Assessment Reports Summary (Terraprobe, July 31, 2019);
- Geotechnical Investigation Update (Terraprobe, July 31, 2020);
- Letter Re: Impact of Stationary Noise Sources to Andrew Pascuzzo (Pascuzzo Planning Inc.) from Sheeba Paul (HGC Engineering) dated July 30, 2020;

- Servicing and Stormwater Management Implementation Report (Crozier Consulting Engineers, dated July 2020);
- Letter Re: Traffic Opinion Letter to Les Mallins (Streetcar) from Alexander Fleming and Madeleine Ferguson (C.F. Crozier and Associates Inc.) dated July 31, 2020;
- Harbour House Security Calculations (C.F. Crozier & Associates, July 31, 2020).

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

ARCHITECTURE

1. This site is predominantly situated as a 'gateway' into both the heritage downtown and the harbourlands and currently offers the only notable viewshed of the Collingwood Harbour and grain elevators from the Huron Street corridor. These attributes led to recommendations in the Collingwood Waterfront Master Plan (CWMP) that determined that a stepped building massing would be appropriate for this site, with higher sections toward the west and lower portions to the east. We are concerned that the proposed 6-story elevation would eliminate the visual connection to the waterfront and wonder if a stepped approach would maintain some of the 'openness' that currently defines this gateway. As the authors of the CWMP, we defer to the Town's urban design peer reviewer, Brook McIlroy, to guide this perspective.
2. Based on the 6-storey proposal, we find the site and architectural design modifications proposed through the 'Urban Design Summary' to be both positive and beneficial. We have the following comments in this regard:
 - a. Extending the commercial interface along the urban park to the west would be beneficial, as it would add diversity to the public engagement opportunities (patios, stores, etc.) and help activate the park.
 - b. The prominence of the new southwest entrance and the addition of 'wood' façade materials helps to soften the hard edges of the current building design. Given the importance of the Heritage Drive intersection, we would also suggest that the southeast corner explore a similar treatment to increase the 'gateway' presence of the building from the east.
 - c. While we appreciate the visual connection being made to the grain elevators, we feel that during winter months the white and grey colour scheme may appear bleak. The addition of the 'wood' corner entrances further helps to diversity the visual experience and give the building a stronger and warmer presence during all seasons.
 - d. Changing the upper-level material to a light-coloured brick adds a little more warmth and texture to the building façade than the metal siding currently proposed.
 - e. While we find the rooftop openings unique and intriguing, they appear to inhibit available views to Georgian Bay. We wonder if an opportunity is being missed for these rooftop terraces.
 - f. We suggest recessing the ground-floor level slightly from the upper residential units to create some horizontal façade relief between the grey and the white massing, and to provide some rain protection.
3. Waste storage areas have been identified inside the building, however, it is unclear how they are accessed by residents/businesses or how collection will occur. Further information should be provided outlining the proposed waste management strategy.

4. As the architectural and site designs evolve, it would be helpful if future development renderings could accurately depict the proposed aboveground utility infrastructure, light standards, and landscape treatments.

SITE DESIGN

5. The Heritage Impact Study and the architectural renderings explore continuous decorative surface treatments extending into the municipal boulevards (from building-face to road curb). As a 'gateway' development into both the downtown and the harbourlands, there is merit in strengthening these transitions through the streetscape details, particularly at the Heritage Drive intersection. However, the Planning Justification Report indicates that the Town is responsible for boulevard streetscaping and we defer to the Town as to merit of this position.

Regardless of whether streetscape implementation is the responsibility of the applicant, the Town, or both, it would be beneficial if the landscape design reflected a greater vision in support of the 'gateway' objective. As such, we recommend that the site design be comprehensive and include the Huron Street, Heritage Drive, and Side Launch Way boulevards to ensure that the on-site works constructed through this application are compatible with future streetscape enhancements by the Town, should they be deferred.

6. Where the parking lot meets the east building façade (internally), additional clearance should be provided between the wall striations and the curb to account for bumper encroachments of parked vehicles.
7. The parking stall directly across from the underground parking entrance should be eliminated to avoid vehicular conflicts.
8. Bicycle parking should be provided as an amenity for visitors and the businesses along Huron Street. Bike parking should be located within 15m of the entrances in accordance with Collingwood's Urban Design Manual (UDM) - Section 8G.

PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

9. The rear parking lot is identified as being for retail parking, however, pedestrian access is not provided to the businesses. We recommend that an on-site pedestrian route be provided to Huron Street, particularly if the Side Launch Way and Heritage Drive sidewalks are deferred until future streetscape works are completed.
10. Dimensions should be provided for the proposed pedestrian walkway along the north building face, particularly at the façade striations. We recommend that the walkway be a minimum width of 2.1m in consideration of bumper encroachments of parked vehicles and maintaining minimum accessible clearances.
11. Similarly, all proposed pedestrian walkways should be dimensioned to confirm that a minimum width of 1.5m has been achieved in accordance with UDM Section 8.A.7 and AODA requirements.
12. The walkway along the north building face should be continuous through the 'delivery entry' to provide an unobstructed barrier-free walkway to the building entrance. This can be achieved through a depressed sidewalk/curb condition at the delivery entry, with a 5% max. grade transition on either side.
13. The proposed walkway within the northeast planting/seating area provides access to Side Launch Way and Heritage Drive but does not provide any connection for residents and visitors of Harbor House. We recommend that the amenity area be better connected to the development and that barrier-free access be provided.

14. Further to the above, we recommend that the proposed walkway within the northeast planting area be 2.0m wide and be located adjacent to the parking stalls to provide better pedestrian access and to avoid the need for retail customers to walk along the drive aisle/entrance to access businesses along Huron Street.
15. The material for the proposed walkway within the northeast planting area should be noted on the plans and it should be detailed/specified and added to the securities estimate.

ACCESSIBLE PARKING

16. The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) requirements for accessible parking takes precedence over the Comprehensive Zoning By-law's parking requirements. In this context, we offer the following comments related to the proposed accessible parking:
 - a. If more than one off-street parking facility is provided on a site, the number and type of accessible parking stalls shall be calculated separately for each off-street parking lot - AODA Article 80.36 (2). In context of this development, accessible parking should be as follows:
 - i. Retail Parking: Of the proposed 32 retail parking spaces, 2 stalls should be allocated as accessible ($32 \times 4\% = 1.3$ or 2 rounded-up) - AODA Article 80.36 (1). As such, 1 additional accessible space is required.
 - ii. Apartments: AODA calculations for accessible parking in multi-unit residential developments only applies to visitor/guest spaces, not the residential units. As such, of the proposed 33 visitor parking spaces, 2 stalls should be allocated as accessible ($33 \times 4\% = 1.3$ or 2 rounded-up) - AODA Article 80.36 (1). The proposed parking meets this requirement.
 - iii. In each of the retail (surface) and visitor (basement) parking lots, 1 stall should be designated as 'Van Accessible' (Type A) and the other could either be a Type A or Type B stall.
 - b. Type A and Type B stalls should be labelled and dimensioned on the Site Plan and drawings to confirm compliance with AODA requirements.
 - c. 'Van Accessible' (Type A) stalls shall have a minimum width of 3.4m plus a 1.5m hatched access aisle (total width = 4.9m) and Type B stalls shall have a minimum width of 2.4m plus a 1.5m hatched access aisle (total width = 3.9m). Alternatively, if two accessible stalls are side-by-side, they can share the 1.5m accessible aisle - AODA Articles 80.34 and 80.35.
 - d. Accessible parking signage required under the Highway Traffic Act should be identified and labelled on the drawings - AODA Article 80.37.
 - e. Further to the above, additional 'Van accessible' signage is required for 'Type A' stalls as per AODA Article 80.34 (1). This should also be labelled on the Site Plan. An example of the 'Van Accessible' sign can be found at the following link: <https://store.beaconlite.ca/products/rb-93t-van-accessible>
17. The accessible parking stalls in the underground parking garage should be located adjacent to the elevator vestibule, with a barrier-free pathway provided to the doorway from the hatched access aisles.
18. Accessible parking stalls in the surface parking lot should also be connected to a barrier-free walkway. We recommend relocating them to the parking row adjacent to the north building face, with access to an appropriate accessible curb ramp. As they are for retail parking, we recommend that the accessible stalls be located adjacent to Heritage Drive to minimize the distance travelled to businesses.

LANDSCAPE

19. The Landscape Plan (Drawing D-001) depicts blue, magenta, and orange boundaries that are not labelled or identified in the legend. These should be labelled for clarity and intent.
20. The architectural renderings and elevations depict planting along the west boundary (facing the public park) and the north edge of the building (facing Side Launch Way), which has not been reflected in the landscape submission. Additional planting should be added to soften these public interfaces, as depicted.
21. Notes on the landscape drawings referencing 'Tatham Engineering' for base information and engineering designs should be revised to indicate 'C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc.'
22. Based on the specified trees, we calculate the overall mature canopy provided by this development to be 1,086 m², which is 23.2% of the 4,690 m² site area. We note that Collingwood's Urban Design Manual (UDM) requires a minimum 30% canopy coverage for site developments (Section 10G). Additional trees should be planted to increase the canopy cover to meet Town standards.

SECURITIES ESTIMATE

23. For the 'Harbour House Security Calculations (Landscape)', the following items are below their market range for supply and installation and should be increased as follows:
 - Coniferous Tree (200cm height): \$400.00/each
 - Deciduous Tree (50mm cal.): \$475.00/each
 - Deciduous Shrub (3 gal.): \$45.00/each
 - Perennial/Groundcover (1 gal. pot): \$20.00/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_2021.02.25_Farr_D111320.docx

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