

August 15, 2023

Our File # ET122001-16

Julie Nolan

Community Planner
Town of Collingwood
55 Ste. Marie St., Suite 302
Collingwood, ON L9Y 0W6

**Re: Sixth Street Residential Development (D084222)
Second Site & Landscape Review**

Dear Ms. Nolan:

As requested, we have reviewed the site planning and landscape components of the proposed Sixth Street Residential Development at 560, 580, and 590 Sixth Street in the Town of Collingwood. The following plans and documents were provided by the Town to inform our review:

- Comment Response Matrix (undated);
- Public Comment Responses (undated);
- Draft Plan of Subdivision (Van Harten Surveying Inc., Rev 4 - July 11, 2023);
- Site Plan & Site Statistics and Central Block Parking Plan & Details, dwgs. A1.0 and A1.1 (CS&P Architects Inc., Rev 9 - July 10, 2023);
- Grading Plan PH1, General Servicing Plan, and Black Ash Creek Sections, dwgs. SW1, SW2, and SW3 (Husson, Rev 4 - July 11, 2023);
- Existing Conditions Plan, Tree Preservation Plans, and Landscape Details, dwgs. EX-1, TP-1, TP-2, and LD-1 (Landmark Environmental Group Ltd., Rev1 - June 26, 2023);
- Tree Inventory, Analysis, and Preservation Report (Landmark Environmental Group Ltd., June 2023);
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (Husson, July 2023);
- Architectural and Urban Design Report (CS&P Architects Inc., R1 - July 2023);
- Traffic Impact Study & Comment/Response (JD Northcote Engineering Inc., Revised July 31, 2023);
- Letter Re: EIS Addendum (Azimuth Environmental Consulting Inc., July 6, 2023);
- Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Golder Associates Ltd., March 1, 2018);
- Letter Re: Environment Review Services (GEMTEC Consulting Engineers, June 22, 2023);
- Letter Re: Attainable Housing Proposal (Georgian Planning Solutions, July 21, 2023).

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

TREE PRESERVATION & REMOVALS

1. As a general comment, the Tree Inventory, Analysis, and Preservation Report was thorough, well-presented, and based on sound arboricultural practices. The recommendations were well-coordinated and presented in a format that is clear to both review authorities and future contractors, which is appreciated. Overall, we are supportive of the tree assessment findings, boundary tree assessment, recommendations, and overall tree preservation strategy.

2. Based on the Comment/Response Matrix, we understand that preserving trees within the Sixth Street road allowance is not possible due to the impacts of the future road improvements and the proposed sidewalk addition. As the Sixth Street improvements are anticipated to advance concurrently with the development, we concur that these trees should be removed.
3. In context of the above, the Architectural and Urban Design Report makes several statements indicating that the Sixth Street trees will be retained and integrated as a buffer for the development (e.g., Section 1C, 4D, 6A, etc.) Revisions are required to amend the report in context of the Sixth Street improvements and proposed tree removals.
4. On Drawings TP-1 and TP-2, notes identify offsets for tree protection fencing (from tree trunks) for some areas. We recommend that notes/dimensions be added to **all** tree preservation areas to identify minimum fence offsets required to preserve their critical root zones.
5. As per our previous comments, trees to remain on adjacent properties (Trees A to L) and boundary trees (Trees 17 to 22) should be shown on the engineering drawings with accurate canopy driplines. Furthermore, site grading and servicing plans should be revised to ensure that the proposed works (including trenching) do not encroach beyond the tree protection zones (TPZs) and their respective fence limits.
6. During future development approval submissions, notes should be added to the Site Servicing Plan to reflect trenching recommendations in the Tree Inventory, Analysis, and Preservation Report. Such notes should indicate that 'excavation and trenching near Trees E, F, G and H for the storm sewer shall be executed using small machinery and be operated with care in mind for adjacent trees along the extents of the tree preservation zones as shown on Drawings TP-1 and TP-2. Furthermore, any roots encountered are recommended to be pruned cleanly to promote new growth and to reduce the chance of infection'.
7. The Tree Inventory, Analysis, and Preservation Report recommends the removal of several boundary trees (Trees 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13). As these trees have shared legal ownership with the owners of 590 Sixth Street under the Ontario Forest Act, a 'consent to remove' agreement should be obtained from the neighbour granting permission to harm or destroy the subject trees.
8. Tree 16 is identified as a boundary tree within the Holden Street road allowance which is owned by the Town. As it is necessary to remove this tree for the continuation of Holden Street, we assume that the Town grants permission for its removal.
9. Page 8 of the Tree Inventory, Analysis, and Preservation Report, recommends preserving boundary Trees 17 to 21, however, the report also states that a 'consent to remove' agreement should be obtained for these trees. Clarification is required as to whether these trees are to be removed or preserved.
10. The Tree Inventory, Analysis, and Preservation Report also identified 3 Colorado Blue Spruce (*Picea pungens*) bordering 21 Chamberlain Crescent which are below the 15cm DBH threshold but may warrant tree protection fencing. We recommend that these trees be added to the drawings.
11. Generally, all recommendations related tree preservation and mitigation measures outlined in the Tree Inventory, Analysis, and Preservation Report, should be incorporated into the Tree Preservation Notes on Drawing LD-1. We acknowledge that some of the recommendations have been reflected, however, they are not comprehensive. Examples of missing recommendations that should be incorporated are as follows:

- a) "Vegetation removal or alteration is to occur outside the breeding bird season (April 1 to August 31) and the active roosting period for bats (April 1 to September 30). If clearing is to occur within the breeding bird window, the affected area must be screened by a qualified ecologist 48 hours in advance of scheduled clearing activities. If Bird nests are found, work within the area must cease until the nest has fledged, as per the federal and provincial Migratory Birds Convention Act. Should any clearing be required during the active roosting period for bats (April 1 to September 30), contact the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks for further direction (e.g., acoustic monitoring, exit surveys) to ensure conformity with the Endangered Species Act."
- b) "No equipment storage or refueling is to take place within the tree preservation zone as established by the preservation fencing."
- c) "Tree preservation fencing is to be removed only after construction on the site is complete."
- d) "During excavation of building envelopes, any roots encountered are to be pruned cleanly by qualified personnel to reduce infection and promote good health."
- e) "Existing tree branching that interferes with the development works may be lightly pruned by qualified personnel".

DRAFT PLAN

- 12. The crosswalks depicted on the engineering drawings differ from those outlined in the Architectural and Urban Design Report on Page 14. As we recognize that the layout/type of formal crossings will be determined by the final traffic control design (e.g., stop sign locations, etc.), we appropriately defer to the Town's Engineering Department to provide direction on the desired crossing locations. We note that crossings and traffic control should accommodate the safest and most convenient access to destinations within (and beyond) the development (e.g., parkland, Black Ash Creek Trail, etc.) with the goal of limiting unnecessary road crossings.
- 13. The south (east-west) crosswalk of the Holden/Street A intersection terminates at a townhouse driveway, which is not acceptable. Similarly, if crosswalks are provided as per the Architectural and Urban Design Report (Page 14), a conflict with a future townhouse driveway may also exist on the north (east-west crossing) of the Street A/Street B intersection. All final driveway and crosswalk locations should be coordinated to avoid such conflicts.
- 14. The applicant has committed to constructing a timber privacy fence along the south boundary of the development to the maximum height permitted by the Town's fencing by-law. We assume that this will be detailed during the development approval submission, following Draft Plan and OPA/ZBA approvals.

APARTMENT SITE PLAN

- 15. We understand that the Town has agreed that the site plan layout for Block 1 can be coordinated at the Site Plan Approval stage and as such, the layout demonstrated in the drawings and reports is considered conceptual. To assist in the future advancement of the Block 1 site plan, we maintain the following comments and recommendations:
 - a) Each apartment building appears to be joined by a centralized entrance structure that connects east and west residential towers. From a site planning perspective, we recommend that the building entrances be positioned to relate better to resident/visitor surface parking for improved accessibility, wayfinding, and general user convenience.

- b) Along the east and west ends of the driveway entrances, the internal walkways within the apartment block should directly connect to the Street 'B' sidewalk.
- c) Waste collection and snow storage areas are both proposed along Sixth Street and we are concerned that these features will be highly visible and present an unsightly 'back-of-house' appearance to the public realm. Alternative locations should be considered, or further information should be provided demonstrating how waste and snow storage will be screened/managed to address visibility concerns.
- d) The Comment/Response Matrix identifies that the proposed underground parking ramps cannot be relocated central to the parking lot, as the below-grade portion of the buildings does not extend far enough. This is acknowledged however, efforts should be made in the future site plan refinement to locate the parking garage entrances in locations that do not impede pedestrian movement from parking areas to building entrances, walkways, or other site destinations.
- e) Our previous comments identified that the Town's Urban Design Manual (UDM) requires that common outdoor amenity areas for multi-unit residential developments be provided at a rate of 10m² per unit (UDM Section 7S.47) and that a children's play space be incorporated (UDM Section 7S.48). However, the Comment/Response Matrix states that private open space requirements for the apartment block will be accommodated within the adjacent public park and not within Block 1. We defer to the Town as to whether an exemption of these private open space requirements would be considered, based on the submitted rationale.

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

Respectfully submitted,

ENVISION-TATHAM

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Wood', with a stylized, cursive script.

David Wood BLA OALA CSLA

President

W:\Projects\2022 Projects\ET122001-1 Collingwood Development Review\16 Sixth Street Residential Development (D084222)\documents\L_2023.08.15_Nolan_D084222.docx

Copy – Lindsay Ayers, Stuart West, & Wendy Martin via email