

1970 Brock Road, Pickering - First Submission Response to Comments
TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Biglieri Group Ltd.	City File: 20-008/P & A13/20 Address: 1970 Brock Road	TBG Project: 20635 TBG Client: Brock and Kingston Holdings Inc.
Page Number	Commenting Party	
1	Rogers Communication	
1	Elexicon Energy Inc.	
2	Enbridge	
2	MTO	
2	Metrolinx	
2	Conseil Scolaire Viamonde	
2	DCDSB	
2	City Fire Department	
3	Canada Post	
4 to 13	HIA Peer Review	
14 to 15	City Sustainability	
16 to 18	City Engineering	
19 to 24	City Planning	
25 to 31	Region of Durham	

1970 Brock Road, Pickering - First Submission Response to Comments			
The Biglieri Group Ltd.	City File: 20-008/P & A13/20 Address: 1970 Brock Road	TBG Project: 20635 TBG Client: Brock and Kingston Holdings Inc.	
Reference	Comment	Action By	Response
Rogers Communications Letter			
	Rogers Communications ("Rogers") has reviewed the application for the above Site Plan and has determined that it intends to provide cable and telecommunications services. Accordingly, we request that municipal approval be granted subject to the following conditions:	N/A	
1	Prior to Site Plan approval, the Developer/Owner will, at its own cost, grant all necessary easements and maintenance agreements required by those CRTC-licensed telephone companies and broadcasting distribution companies intending to serve the Site Plan (collectively, the "Communications Service Providers"). Immediately following registration of the Site Plan, the Developer/Owner will cause these documents to be registered on title.	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
2	Prior to Site Plan approval, the Developer/Owner will, with consultation with the applicable utilities and Communications Service Providers, prepare an overall utility distribution plan that shows the locations of all utility infrastructure for the Site Plan, as well as the timing and phasing of installation.	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time. Required prior to Site Plan Approval.
	In addition, we kindly request to, where possible, receive copies of the following documents:	N/A	
1	the comments received from any of the Communications Service Providers during circulation;	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
2	the proposed conditions of draft approval as prepared by municipal planners prior to their consideration by Council or any of its committees; and	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
3	the planners' report recommending draft approval before it goes to Council or any of its committees.	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
	Should you require further information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 905-436-4170	N/A	
Elexicon Energy Inc.			
	Further to the referenced File #A 13/20, (20-008/P), Elexicon Energy Inc. has no objection to the proposed Site Plan Application to a high-density mixed use development containing 860 residential units and 1,430 square meters of commercial floor space.	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
	The applicant or its authorized representative shall consult with Elexicon Energy Inc. concerning the availability of supply voltage, service location, metering, costs and any other details. These requirements are separate from and in addition to those of the ESA. Elexicon Energy Inc. will confirm the characteristics of the available electrical supply and will designate the location of the supply point to the applicant. Elexicon Energy Inc. will also identify the costs that the applicant will be responsible for.	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
	The applicant or its authorized representative shall apply for new or upgraded electric services and temporary power service in writing. The applicant is required to provide Elexicon Energy Inc. with sufficient lead-time in order to ensure: a) The timely provision of supply to new and upgraded premises; and/or b) The availability of adequate capacity for additional loads to be connected in the existing premises	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
	Please ensure that a minimum of 4.8m clearance is maintained from existing overhead conductors, which applies to all structures, equipment, and people.	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.
	Please find customer data form which needs to be completed before you proceed with the Development.	TBG	Noted. No action required at this time.

Enbridge Gas Inc. - Email			
Thank you for your circulation. Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application however, we reserve the right to amend our development conditions. Please continue to forward all municipal circulations and clearance letter requests electronically to MunicipalPlanning@Enbridge.com.	TBG		Noted. No action required at this time.
MTO Comments - Email			
Please be advised that the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has reviewed Official Plan Amendment OPA 20 008/P and Zoning By-law Amendment A 013/20 for a proposed high-density mixed-use development at 1970 Brock Road in Pickering. Please note that the subject lands are located outside of MTO's Permit Control Area for Highway 401, and as such our Ministry has no comments or concerns with the applications. I trust that the above is clear, however if you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to ask.	TBG		Noted. No action required at this time.
Metrolinx - Email			
The subject site at 1970 Brock Road, Pickering is located greater than 300 metres from a Metrolinx rail corridor and/or facility (outside our zone of influence). Given the circumstances, we have no comments regarding the subject application.	TBG		Noted. No action required at this time.
Conseil Scolaire Viamonde - Email			
The Conseil scolaire Viamonde has no comments regarding Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications (File No. OPA 20-008, A 13/20) for the proposed high-density mixed-use development at 1970 Brock Road.	TBG		Noted. No action required at this time.
Durham Catholic District School Board - Email			
Planning Staff at the Durham Catholic District School Board have reviewed the above noted Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Application.			
The Board has no objections to the proposal of a high-density mixed-use development containing 860 residential units and 1,430 square metres of commercial floor space. Multiple buildings including a mixed-use building containing 2 towers (34 and 31 storeys in height) connected by a 6-storey podium structure with commercial space on the ground floor. A 12-storey mid-rise residential building and 25, 3-storey townhouses proposed north of the towers.	TBG		Noted. No action required at this time.
Students from this development will attend St. Wilfrid C.S. located at 2360 Southcott Road, Pickering and St. Mary Catholic Secondary School located at 1918 Whites Road in the City of Pickering	TBG		Noted. No action required at this time.
If you have any further questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 905-576-6150 ext. 22211			
City - Fire Comments - Email			
My comments are: 1. Provide an OBC code matrix for each building 2. Each building to have a fire route in compliance with OBC 3.2.5.6. 3. The three story building does not appear to have a fire route	CMV		1. OBC Matrix to be provided at Site Plan Stage. Cannot be prepared with any accuracy based on Zoning level Drawings. 2. Fire Route drawing has been added to the Architectural set - see A101b 3. See A101b

Canada Post - Memo

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above noted application. Mail delivery to the 3 proposed towers (34, 31 and 12 storeys) 1430 sq. m. of commercial space and 25 three storey townhouses totaling 860 residential units will need to be centralized as per Canada Post's Delivery Standards Manual. A copy of the planning manual can be found here: https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf?_ga=1.255544584.102383918.1446243719	TBG + CMV	Noted.
For the 3 towers, the developer/owner must supply, install and maintain a central mail facility to Canada Post specifications; ensure that all mail delivery equipment is installed in a location that is readily accessible to the occupants and Canada Post personnel; ensure that all mail is accessible by persons with physical disabilities.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
Please ask the developer/owner to contact me well in advance of the construction start date to discuss a suitable mailroom location.	Client	Noted. Further contact to be initiated at SPA
The owner/developer must provide a rear-loading mailroom for any building with more than 100 units.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
For the commercial space and townhouse units mail delivery will be centralized via Canada Post community mailboxes.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
Canada Post asks that the owner/developer comply with the following conditions:	N/A	
The owner/developer agrees to include on all offers of purchase and sale, a statement that advises the prospective purchaser that mail delivery will be from a designated Community Mailbox.	Client	Noted. To be addressed at a later date by clause in SP Agreement and APS
The owner/developer will be responsible for notifying the purchaser of the exact Community Mailbox locations prior to the closing of any unit sale.	Client	Noted. To be addressed at a later date by clause in SP Agreement and APS
The owner/developer will consult with Canada Post Corporation to determine suitable locations for the placement of Community Mailbox and to indicate these locations on the appropriate servicing plans.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
The owner/developer will provide the following for each Community Mailbox site and include these requirements on the appropriate servicing plans:	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
An appropriately sized sidewalk section (concrete pad) to place the Community Mailboxes on.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
Any required walkway across the boulevard.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
Any required curb depressions for wheelchair access.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
The owner/developer further agrees to determine and provide a suitable temporary Community Mailbox location(s), which may be utilized by Canada Post until the curbs, sidewalks and final grading have been completed at the permanent Community Mailbox locations. This will enable Canada Post to provide mail delivery to the new homes as soon as they are occupied.	CMV	Noted. To be addressed at SPA
The owner/developer further agrees to provide Canada Post at least 60 days' notice prior to the confirmed first occupancy date to allow for the community mailboxes to be ordered and installed at the prepared temporary location.	Client	Noted
Further information can be found by visiting the following link to Canada Post's Delivery Standards Manual. https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf?_ga=1.255544584.102383918.1446243719	N/A	Noted
Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at the using the information below.	N/A	Noted

HIA Peer Review - Branch Architecture - Report			
2.0.	REVIEW OF HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT	N/A	
	I found the research and property assessment components of the report to be generally complete with select items requiring further review and consideration. With respect to the conservation approach, the proposal to set the heritage building within a new 'contemporized' landscaped setting and provide on site interpretation would serve to conserve the cultural heritage value and understanding of the property, however, the HIA does not provide a rationale for the proposed building relocation nor a full assessment of the negative impacts of the proposed development application. The HIA needs to provide further investigation, assessment, discussion and information on the negative impacts of the proposed development, specifically:	ERA	This is a general note. Addressed in responses below.
	Provide the assessment that determined that the building could not be retained in place as part of the site's redevelopment.	ERA	Addressed in HIA, bottom of pg 71 to pg 72. Identifies that relocation is considered necessary to meet the planning objectives on site, and references specific policies.
	Provide information on the proposed building relocation so as to demonstrate the feasibility of the move and the compatibility of the new location.	ERA	See new Section 7.2, Construction Staging, and Appendix D, letter from Greg McCulloch.
	Further assess and consider the negative impacts of the proposed development and site alterations on the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the property with respect to the heritage policy framework.	ERA	Comment addressed in section below.
	Further develop the conservation strategy based on the comments provided in this letter.	ERA	Comment addressed in section below.
	I recommend that ERA revise the HIA and advise on how the design of the development can be revised to limit or, preferably, eliminate the negative impacts on the Post Manor heritage property.	ERA	In response to the comments in their peer review, the Site Plan and configuration has been revised to provide the Post Manor with much more breathing room and space from contemporary construction, visibility on the corner of Brock and Kingston Roads, and less density more generally on site. See responses below for further detail.
2.1	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	N/A	
	Chain of Ownership	N/A	
	The report includes an abridged version of the property ownership as set out in the property's land abstract / parcel registry. It includes the date of registry, the grantor, grantee and quantity of land considered in the transaction.	N/A	
	When reviewing a property's land abstract, it is helpful to identify each legally registered transaction (named instruments) as well as the value of the transaction as they may relate to new construction. Common transaction types include: 'Bargain and Sales' (BS or B&S); grants; mortgages and release of mortgages; and agreement for lease transactions. The summary chart should identify the transaction type in order to provide a clear path of ownership.	N/A	
	Another informative piece of a land abstract is the "Consideration or Amount of Mortgage". The value of the transaction can be helpful in determining if the parcel was vacant or not at the time of sale as large increases in value from one sale/grant to the next often indicate the construction of a building. Further, the timing of mortgages may help date an addition or building on the property.	N/A	
	Other pieces of information included on the land abstract are: the 'Number of Instrument' (this is helpful when doing detailed tracking of transactions); 'Its Date' (date of application); and, 'Remarks' (here one may find other details related to the property location and limits, mortgage discharges, survey numbers, new plans of subdivision records, etc.)	N/A	
	The following chart for the subject property within Lot 19, Concession 1 provides addition information on the Instrument and Consideration so as to confirm the site's ownership and identify changes in property value. Additions I have made to the following ownership chart found in the HIA are shown in red text, and where the handwriting on original document is only partly legible the text is in italics. See Page 4 of the Peer Review document.	ERA	Revisions have been integrated on the basis of this research.
	Kingston Road Evolution	N/A	
	It would be helpful if the subject property was identified in these maps to clarify the property's placement along this primary corridor.	ERA	Done.
	Post Occupancy (1842-43 to 1886) The following research that may inform the HIA or future site interpretation:		

	In 1848, on the nights of August 18th and 20th, the Post property was subject to arson; fires were set at the dwelling and barn.	ERA	
	The 1851 Personal Census shows the Post family (Jordan, Matilda, Elizabeth, Robert, Charles, Ardelia and John) as well as three labourers and servants (William Bell, Leonard Gray and Jane Linton) living together in a one-and-a-half storey stone house. The census record also identifies other buildings on the property including a vacant house and "1 Saw Mill Cost £ 300 Power to drive 2 Saws Produces about 400 (?) feet per annum)" that employed two persons.	ERA	
	The 1851 Agricultural Census for Jordan Post of Concession 1,2, Lot 19 describes the farm as 133 acres with 83 acres under cultivation, 20 acres under crops, 60 acres under pasture, 3 acres gardens or orchards and 50 acres under wood or wild. The cultivated lands included 1 acre of barley, 4 acres of Indian corn, 1/2 acre of potatoes. It produced 50 bundles of hay and 50 pounds of wool. The livestock was made up of 2 steers, 4 cows, 2 calves, 8 horses, 20 sheep, and 11 pigs. From these 200 pounds of butter, 5 barrels of pork and 1 quality of cured fish were produced that year.	ERA	
	The 1851 census offers a snapshot of residential typologies of the time. In Looking for Old Ontario, McIlwraith states that, "fewer than 3 percent of Ontario house in 1851 were stone". A review of the Pickering's 1851 census found that of the 1022 residences, 37 buildings or 3.6% were classified as a 'stone house'. This speaks to the rarity of pre-1850 stone houses in Pickering and across Ontario.	ERA	As the historical research section of this HIA is already quite detailed, we have not integrated this content to date, but appreciate the additional research and would be happy to use it to inform a future Interpretation Plan.
	The 1861 Agricultural Census for Matilda Post at Concession 1, Lot 1 describes the property as a 34 acre farm with 34 acres under cultivation, 2 acres under orchards or garden. The cash value of farm was \$2,000 and the cash value of farming implements or machinery was \$400. The cultivated land was made up of 7 acres of fall wheat (70 bushels), 2 acres of turnips (1000 bushels), 1 acre of mangel wurtzel (field beet) (800 bushels), and 400 bushels of carrots. The value of the amount of hay produced is illegible. As the property was not divided until later, it is possible that after Jordan's death the remainder of the farm was leased out as there are others listed at Concession 1, Lot 1 including George Leng, Joseph Gordon and Charles Swallow	ERA	
	Deverall Occupancy (1886-1908) To supplement this summary of the Deverall's time here, I have attached a detail of the property as shown on the Map of the Township of Pickering by Charles E. Goad in 1895.	ERA	
	Hurst Occupancy (1908 - 1926) The above photograph shows the front elevation of the house in 1925. Noted differences from the existing include: the simple vertical board treatment at the base of the verandah; the very fine eaves profile; the rainwater collector in front of the fascia (at the corner); and the landscaped setting. Also attached is the Gidual Landowners' Map (c. 1917).	ERA	This photograph has been integrated into the HIA on page 29.
	Hettget-MacGregor Occupancy (1926-1943) The subject property was included in the buildings Eric Arthur documented across Ontario in the 1920's and 1930's. He and architecture students at the University of Toronto documented many examples of the architecture of the early years of Upper Canada's settlement. The focus was on buildings erected during the 'pioneer period', up to around 1840.	ERA	See note two columns down.

	<p>The subject property is listed in Arthur's 1938 publication <i>The Early Buildings of Ontario</i> as one of the approximately 200 buildings "inspected, photographed or measured". It is one of two in Pickering and is named "House, stone McGregor, corner of Brock Rd." 15 The residence reflects the "Characteristic Features of the Early Ontario House" described by Arthur:</p> <p><i>These may be listed as follows: Simple rectangular plan with or without flanking wings; a symmetrical arrangement of windows about a central doorway; a low-pitched roof which is usually gabled but may be hipped or "cottage-roofed" (as they are sometimes called in Ontario); the use of double-hung divided windows; a central or flanking chimneys; eaves of a slight projection; use of stone, brick, frame or mud brick construction.</i></p>	ERA	No action required
	<p>I have undertaken preliminary inquiries with the Ontario Archive's archivist and confirmed that this house forms part of their Eric Arthur Collection. My review of the preliminary inventory of the collection indicates that there are glass plate negatives listed under MacGregor (2 items) dated August 21, 1929 (creator 41-C-3/1-2, container A-1142). I have submitted a further inquiry with respect to the architectural measured drawing collection. Access to the archives is limited due to the current extenuating circumstances.</p>	ERA	Both photographs have been located at the Ontario Archives and are now included on pg 32 of the HIA.
	<p>I strongly suggest that ERA pursue locating this documentation of the building. Photos, notes and/or record drawings may shed light on alterations undertaken to the building since then and in particular in the late 20th century following the fire that "...broke out in the kitchen, swept up the stairway to two bedrooms and part of the roof."</p>	ERA	Pages 34-36 of HIA have been revised to include two new sets of drawings by Eric Arthur students, and we have added some commentary on the replacement of the rear stairs as a result of the 1950s fire.
	<p>Building Evolution</p>		
	<p>As described in the HIA, the residence and larger property has undergone a number of additions and alterations that relate to its evolution from a 19th and 20th century farm to a commercial building within a strip mall. For clarity I have provided diagrams showing the changes to the house's footprint and exterior (with reference to archival photos) and the existing building. Further, I agree with the items identified in the HIA for further study including the possible former chimney at the south wall and the origins of the marble fireplaces. I also encourage further inspection with respect to the original layout of the house.</p>	ERA	No action taken here at this time. We have continued to identify these as items for further study, and could build this out in a future Conservation Plan.
	<p>Show below is a floor plan for a typical Ontario farm house as depicted in an article entitled <i>Rural Architecture: A Cheap Farm House</i> published in <i>The Canada Farmer</i> in 1864. While these drawings were published several decades after the construction of Post Manor, they show the typical arrangement of rooms in a center hall plan as applied to a one-and-a-half storey Ontario farmhouse. As shown the ground floor consists of a parlour and bedroom to the right side of the hall, a large dining room to the left, and a kitchen wing at the rear. Of note, as suggested by the author and as is the case here, the construction of the rear kitchen wing was often completed later to reduce the initial cost of the house construction. The second floor allowed for four bedrooms as well as a linen closet at one end of the hall</p>	ERA	This type of destructive testing and research work has not been undertaken at this time, as the focus has been on revising the conservation strategy and proposal to address the major heritage impacts identified. We could conduct further research in service of a future conservation plan if required.
	<p>Post Manor had a similar room layout. For instance on the ground floor, the south half of the building may have been a dining room with a centrally placed fireplace at the south wall. This seems possible given the location of the south chimney (currently not linked to a fireplace and required to heat a mid-19th century house adequately) and the modern uses found at the rear of this space (modern washrooms, storage and a small stair).</p>	ERA	
	<p>To inform this aspect of the building design, I suggest completing select core holes at the interior walls to determine approximate age the walls. For example, work completed as part of the 1960's renovations will likely be modern drywall on nominal size studs whereas 1840's era walls will be made of traditional lath and plaster (either accordion or early sawn lath style) on true size lumber.</p>	ERA	

	This investigation should be paired with a closer visual review of the existing detailing of the woodwork and stairs. For instance, a visual comparison of the front stair versus the rear stair shows differences in the design and construction that reflect the differing construction methods and materials of the respective eras. Further, I would expect that a set of original (180 year old) servant stairs would display heavily worn treads.	ERA	We agree that the servants' stairs have been replaced, as identified in the Eric Arthur students' drawings now included on pages 35-36 of the HIA. The servants' stair has now been removed as a heritage attribute in the Statement of Significance.
2.2	Cultural Heritage Value Assessment		
	The HIA includes an assessment of all four existing properties found within the subject application with respect to the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 - Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest. I agree with the finding that 1970 Brock Road satisfies these criteria and that the remaining properties at 1980 Brock Road, 1670 Kingston Road and 1680 Kingston Road do not.	ERA	No action required.
	With respect to the value assessments for 1970 Brock Road, I have the following comments:	ERA	See below.
	Post Manor is a fine example an early Ontario house or 'cottage' in Pickering. At its simplest, the Ontario cottage is a symmetrical, one or one-and-a-half storey building with a gable or hipped roof. This style is known for its symmetry and regular proportions. The front door is placed in the central bay with windows arranged on either side within 3 or 5 bays. The exterior symmetry is often mirrored in a central hall floor plan, with rooms on either side of the hall. The building type is thought to have been introduced by early British military and British settlers influenced by 18th century Georgian traditions.	ERA	Our understanding is that our value assessment and Statement of Significance speaks to this. We phrase the Ontario Cottage a little differently, as an Ontario Farmhouse.
	The house displays many characteristics of the Regency style of architecture. The Regency style arrived in Canada in 1815 following the American Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars, and remained a popular style into the 1840s. The Regency cottage is the five bay configuration of the Ontario cottage. Characteristics of this style include: symmetrical plans and elevations; single or one-and-a-half storey structures typically with hipped or gabled roofs with broad eaves; deep verandahs on one or two fronts; classical based mouldings, windows and entrances; large windows often with low sills or french doors opening onto the verandah; and, verandah roofs with a bell-cast profile and exposed rafters.	ERA	The cultural value assessment and Statement of Significance has been slightly revised to account for the house's Georgian- and Regency-style influences.
	The date of the building varies in records from 1841 (designation by-law) to 1842-3 (HIA). Review of the tax assessment records at the Pickering Archives or Ontario Archives may determine the year the house was built and may also shed light on the date of the rear wing as taxes would have been adjusted accordingly.	ERA	As identified on pg 47 of the HIA, the Pickering Archives could not be accessed due to COVID, and while we did visit the Ontario Archives, they only have assessment rolls that date back to 1851, so we were unable to confirm the exact year of construction.
	There remains a visual link between Post Manor and the Post Cemetery. The intimacy of this visual connection has been diluted by the widening of Kingston Road, but the view is currently unobscured.	ERA	The value assessment and Statement of Significance, as well as the conservation strategy, have been revised to reflect this value. We have also included a diagram of views that exist to Post Manor from the intersection, on page 55.
	With respect to if the building is a landmark, I agree that the community should be consulted. The building is a long-standing fixture at the primary intersection, has an unobstructed view to those traveling west along Kingston Road, and is visually distinct from the surrounding streetscape.	ERA	Section 3.1, on page 48, acknowledges the community engagement that has been undertaken, and the resulting understanding that Post Manor is considered a landmark on the intersection of Brock and Kingston Roads is now reflected in the value assessment and Statement of Significance.
	With respect to the heritage attributes listed in Draft Statement of Significance, I have the following comments / clarifications within the noted sections:		
	Attributes that convey the mid-19th-century Ontario farmhouse building type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Symmetrical 5-bay arrangement of the front (east) elevation • Centre hall plan • Elements of the Regency style residence 	ERA	Done.

	<p>Attributes that convey high craftsmanship, and association with wealthy property owners Jordan and Matilda Post</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exterior granite fieldstone walls with large squared quoins • Window shutters and brackets • Confirm vintage of the rear 'servant' stair • Add the interior window casings that extend to the floor (found within the front rooms on the ground floor) • Marble mantels within the original house and rear wing (three in total) • Consider the 'arched entrance to the basement' noted in the existing Reasons for Designation 	ERA	Done. The servant stair has been removed as an attribute, as it does not appear to be original, and the arched entrance to basement is included as an attribute of the farmhouse typology, rather than as an example of high craftsmanship and association with the property owners.
	<p>Attributes that convey Post Manor's historic relationship to the Post Cemetery (see photos on the following page)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The visual connection to the Post Cemetery across Kingston Road • The view of the front (east) elevation as understood traveling along Kingston Road 	ERA	This has been address in two new attributes: Location on the corner of Brock and Kingston Roads, and visibility at the corner of Brock and Kingston Roads.
2.3	HERITAGE POLICY FRAMEWORK		
	The heritage policy framework the following should also consider the following as part of the HIA and its assessment of the proposed development:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial Policy Statement (2020) <p>1.7 Long-Term Economic Prosperity</p> <p>1.7.1 Long-term economic prosperity should be supported by:</p> <p>e) encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes;</p>	ERA	This has now been included on pg. 60.
	<p>A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2019)</p> <p>1.2.1 Guiding principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and promote cultural heritage resources to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of all communities, including First Nations and Métis communities 	ERA	This has now been included on pg. 61.
2.4	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, CONSERVATION APPROACH AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT & MITIGATION		
	Building Relocation		

<p>It is my opinion that the HIA does not provide a convincing rationale for the relocation of Post Manor. Considering the negative impacts of the proposed development on the heritage attributes of Post Manor, the building would be best served in its current location and within a landscaped setting at the corner of the Kingston and Brock Roads.</p> <p>In general, building relocation is considered a last resort to conserve a built heritage resource. This is articulated in the Official Plan's cultural heritage policy (highlighted):</p>		<p>ERA/TBG</p>	<p>It is our assessment that on-site relocation of the heritage resource is necessary in order to accommodate the density targeted for this site by municipal planning policy – given the site's location at a Gateway, Transit Junction, and a Mixed-Use Type A designation within the Kingston Road Intensification Plan, UDGs and OPA 38. These are locations that are targeted for Signiant density, up to 5.0 FSI (4.5 FSI proposed). If left in situ, the required density would be located in too close proximity to the heritage resource, or would need to be further reduced to the extent that it would no longer meet the municipal planning objectives for the site.</p> <p>It is critical to note that the building's exact physical location is not considered a character-defining element, or heritage attribute. The revised Statement of Significance does identify "Location on the corner of Brock and Kingston Roads" as a heritage attribute, and although the current proposal still contemplates relocation, the building's "location on the corner" is now conserved due to the proposed Gateway Plaza. There is no longer any building proposed that cuts off the house's position on the corner.</p> <p>It is our perspective that the house's relocation forms part of a defensible conservation strategy in this revised submission, and that major mitigation measures (including the Gateway Plaza) have been implemented to offset any adverse impact of relocation.</p>
<p>City Policy Guidelines for Use and Reuse 8.9 City Council shall consider the following guidelines on the use and reuse of heritage resources: (a) maintain, if possible, the original use of heritage structures and sites, and if possible, retain the original location and orientation of such structures; (b) where original uses cannot be maintained, support the adaptive reuse of heritage structures and sites to encourage resource conservation; and (c) where no other alternative exists for maintaining heritage structures in their original locations, allow the relocation of the structure to appropriate sites or areas .</p>			
<p>And in the Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines: Standard 1: Conserve the heritage value of an historic place. Do not remove, replace or substantially alter its intact or repairable character-defining elements. Do not move a part of an historic place if its current location is a character-defining element .</p>			
<p>And in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit's Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties: Respect for Original Location Do not move buildings unless there is no other means to save them .</p>			
<p>The Kingston Road and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Plan, Section 3.3.8: Heritage Buildings, heritage building policy recommendations state that buildings of heritage significance should be preserved and identifies several examples of preservation approaches (listed in order of increasing impact) including, "...keeping the buildings in their existing location, moving buildings to a more appropriate location on the same site to incorporate with new development, or replacing buildings with an urban landscaped feature speaking to its significance and history..." And, with respect to Post Manor, Section 4.5 of the Plan: Brock states that, "Redevelopment of the lands on the northwest corner of the Kingston Road and Brock Road shall seek the preservation of and incorporation of the Post Manor". In short, given the significance of Post Manor, it is to be either retained in place or retained on site.</p>		<p>ERA/CMV/TBG</p>	<p>Post Manor is proposed to be retained on site.</p>

	<p>When considering building relocation I recommend that the following are satisfied:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and assess strategies to maintain the building in situ. 2. The new building placement conserves the property's cultural heritage value and heritage attributes. 3. The conservation strategy provides for the conservation of the building in an equal or enhanced setting. 4. An experienced heritage building mover has determined that the building can be moved safely. 	ERA/CMV/TBG	<p>As noted in columns 106-109, it is our assessment that alternatives to building relocation (i.e. retention in situ) are not feasible on this site, given the density targets for this site that are expected in accordance with municipal planning policy. To summarize again, the site's location at a Gateway, Transit Junction, and a Mixed-Use Type A designation within the KRIP, UDGs and OPA 38 all direct density up to 5.0 FSI in this location (4.5 FSI proposed).</p> <p>It is our assessment that the expected density cannot be achieved in any reasonable configuration on this site if the heritage resource were left in situ. Having said this, the house's exact physical position is not identified as a heritage attribute; and the location-based attribute in the revised Statement of Significance is conserved in the revised submission. Substantial mitigation measures have been built into this submission to offset any adverse impact of relocation, including building up the landscape character around the building to reduce any impact of its closer proximity to Brock, achieved in part through the adjacent Post's Corners Plaza.</p> <p>The revised proposal thus meets Branch's identified objectives #2-4. The new building placement: (2) conserves the property's value and attributes; (3) provides for the building's conservation in an enhanced setting, with restored rural-style green landscaping and a substantial gateway plaza to the south, which will serve to activate and 'green' the site; and (4) see Appendix D for a letter from Greg McCulloch, building relocation specialist, that confirms that the building can be moved safely in his assessment.</p>
	With respect to the above I have the following corresponding comments and questions:		
1	Retain building in original location:		
	The HIA does not indicate that, prior to considering building relocation, ERA first assessed retaining the building in place. As the above noted heritage guidelines and policy identify building relocation as a last resort, the HIA should include analysis and discussion demonstrating why ERA recommends that the building is not retained in place.	ERA/CMV/TBG	See response above.
2	Building Placement		
	The proposed location of the Post Manor is to the northeast of its existing location. The HIA states that the building will move 15.4m to the east and (as scaled off the architectural drawings) approximately 20m north. Incorporating the proposed road widening, Post Manor will have a 13.07m setback off Brock Road. In addition, new structures are to be provided to the north, south and east of Post Manor	ERA/CMV/TBG	
	This proposed placement maintains the building's east-facing orientation and it's direct relationship with Brock Road. However, it does remove Post Manor from it's original corner placement at Kingston and Brock Roads, alters it's proximity to the intersection at Brock and Kingston Roads, reduces the front yard setback from Brock Road, and (with the introduction of a new building to the south) removes the building from its long-standing visual connection to the Post Cemetery at the southwest corner of the intersection.	ERA/CMV/TBG	It has been determined through additional community engagement that the house is a local landmark at the corner of Brock and Kingston Roads. As a result, the scheme has been revised so that Post Manor continues to be located on the corner of Brock and Kingston Roads
	In evaluating the impact of the proposed building placement, it is important to determine if Post Manor is a local landmark. ERA's cultural heritage value assessment states that Post Manor does not hold the visibility or prominence for it to be considered a local landmark, but suggests that community engagement is required to understand if it is valued as a local landmark. I agree and suggest proceeding with appropriate consultation and, if found to be a landmark, that the aspects that mark it as a landmark are recorded and considered in ERA's assessment of the proposed development.	ERA/CMV/TBG	

3	Building Setting		
	The setting of the building has changed significantly over its life as reflection of the area's evolution from farmland to an element in an urban setting. The original farm property was subdivided several times before it was redeveloped as a commercial strip mall. The building's setting has also changed from a dwelling on a large farm (with the house largely visible from the adjacent roads) to a smaller farm (with many mature trees and hedges) to the most recent setting of the building within a strip mall and with the landscape largely removed for surface parking. Further, over time the building's setbacks have been altered in response to road widening and the realignment of Brock Road.	ERA	
	The conservation strategy's Interpretive Landscape Plan is intended "to interpret and 'contemporize' Post Manor's rural agricultural heritage." In essence, Post Manor is to be relocated within a designed picturesque landscape at its new location. The intent of this approach is restore the building as part of a landscaped setting and engage in an opportunity to interpret rural heritage themes on site.	ERA	The revised landscape approach incorporates a decorative fence defining the dwelling's front yard, and a central gate.
	I support the conservation approach to restore the building within a landscaped setting and to use this as an opportunity to provide interpretation.	ERA	
	With respect to the Interpretive Landscape Plan, I encourage ERA to incorporate historically based design elements to strengthen the building's pedestrian relationship to Brock Road and define the historic view. To this end I suggest reviewing the following historic photos which show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A decorative fence defining the dwelling's front yard facing Brock Road; and • A central gate suggesting a front path from the sidewalk to the front stair / door which would be in keeping with the symmetry of the architecture. 	ERA	
	I also recommend reviewing the proposed location of the mature trees with a landscape architect to verify that the below grade conditions can accommodate them. An overlay of the landscape plan on the P1 Level Parking Plan suggests conflicts.	ERA/CMV	In order to prioritize the potential growth of landscape features to full maturity (and in particular the ones that frame and characterize the farmstead lot from the intersection), we have designed the current site plan so that there is no excavated area located below the Post's Corners Plaza. See graphic on page 82. This will ensure that trees planted in this area can grow to maturity and support the rural-style landscape character we're aiming to establish.
4	Feasibility of Relocation		
	The HIA does not include an assessment by a heritage building mover that confirms that Post Manor is a good candidate for relocation. Questions I have about the building relocation include:	ERA	See notes below.
	Given the fact that the building has three parts - original house, rear wing and rear basement entry - will it be moved as one element or in parts?	ERA	Per the letter in the HIA Appendix D, the building will be loaded and relocated in one piece, but the cold cellar entrance, the foundation, and elements of the basement will be salvaged prior to relocation.
	How much of the building will be dismantled and rebuilt at the new location?	ERA	
	What is the anticipated sequencing given that the building will likely need to be moved in stages? Steps may include: securing the building for the move; lifting and shifting the building in full or parts on site; documenting and/or cataloguing building elements to dismantled and rebuilt; dismantling and rebuilding the basement at the new location; and setting the building on the rebuilt foundation.	ERA	See Section 7.2 for a description and diagram of the proposed construction staging and sequencing.
	Given that the full site will be fully excavated to constructed the parking levels below, how will the building relocation fit into a site staging plan? Will Post Manor need to be moved multiple times?	ERA	
	How will the heritage building (with its basement retained in full) sit and be supported in relation to the directly adjacent underground parking structure? A section drawing would be useful to demonstrate that there are no conflicts.	ERA	In the new scheme, the land under the heritage building is unexcavated for parking. A new basement area will be created once the house has been moved to its new location, but there will be no directly-adjacent underground parking structure.

Impacts of the New Construction			
	It is my opinion that the HIA does not identify all the negative impacts of the proposed development. I recommend that ERA revisit the Heritage Policy Framework and provide additional information and discussion with respect to negative impacts. I have identified the following negative impacts in addition to those identified in the HIA:	ERA	See notes below.
	Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden (Ontario Heritage Tool Kit)	ERA	The proposal has been revised to substantially pull back higher-density development from close proximity to the heritage resource. Having said that, as demonstrated in the shadow study highlighted on pg 74 of the HIA, the proposed development will still result in shadow impacts on the wood-shingled roof. Given the roof's current condition as identified in Section 4.1, the current roof is nearing the end of its useful life, in part due to these types of impacts that are happening even when there is no high-density development on site. We propose on pg 73 some mitigation measures that might be implemented when the roof materials are replaced in future.
	Based on a review of the shadow study, I am concerned that the shadows cast by the proposed new buildings (and most significantly by the new tower along Kingston Road) will have a negative impact on the heritage attributes of the building and the proposed interpretive landscape. The proposed new buildings to the south and west will result in Post Manor and the proposed landscape being in shadow for a significant proportion of the year.	ERA	
	An attribute of Post Manor is the wood shingle roof at the original house and verandah. Wood shingle roofs require adequate ventilation and sunlight to remain dry and avoid deterioration. Damp or saturated shingles are susceptible to distortion (cupping), decay (rot) and organic growth. I am concerned that, given the amount of time the roof will spend in the shade, the wood shingles will deteriorate at an accelerated rate	ERA	
	Also, the interpretive landscape plan includes for a range of plantings to create a 'lush' landscaping including but limited to: front-yard mature trees; a tree-lined pedestrian driveway; and an orchard. I am concerned that the restricted access to direct sunlight and shadows cast by the proposed buildings will negatively impact the viability of the landscape plan. I recommend that a landscape architect review and comment on the viability of this landscape given amount and timing of shadow shown in the shadow study as I am not confident the trees and plantings will receive the conditions it needs to thrive.	ERA	
	Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance (Ontario Heritage Tool Kit)		
	While the HIA acknowledges the density and proximity of the of the proposed development, it does not state that the proposal is sympathetic or compatible with Post Manor. The HIA states the opposite: <i>The height and proximity of the new building south of the farmhouse, and the proximity and mass of the parking ramp north of the farmhouse, both represent an impact on Post Manor's setting and ability convey its value. As farmhouses are rural building types, their setting and landscape is considered critical in their ability to convey value and legibility as heritage resources .</i>	ERA	In our assessment, the revised proposal addresses these concerns, by retaining the Post Manor at the corner and providing it with breathing room and landscaping to maintain a more rural-style character.
	I agree with ERA's assessment that the height, proximity and massing of the new construction will impact Post Manor, and in a negative way. I recommend that ERA work with the design team to develop alternative options that reconsider the placement of Post Manor and where the massing, height and proximity of the new buildings are sympathetic to and compatible with Post Manor. Alternatives should consider: retaining Post Manor at its original corner location; limiting shadow impacts of new construction; preserving visual connections and views; providing adequate 'breathing room' around Post Manor (in the form of greater separation distances); and, the general compatibility of the new development with Post Manor.	ERA	
	Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship (Ontario Heritage Tool Kit)		

	While Post Manor was removed from its farm-like setting when the site was transformed to a strip mall, the house maintains a proximate and visual relationship with the Post Cemetery on the south side of Kingston Road. The relocation of the building and the insertion of a new building between it and Kingston Road will remove this visual connection and reduce the proximity of the historically linked sites. Further, the proposed relocation removes Post Manor as a visual marker and possible landmark along Kingston Road.	ERA	The revised proposal retains Post Manor's position on the intersection and visibility from the intersection, which maintains the connection to Post Cemetery, and maintains its role as a landmark along Kingston Road.
	New development should recognize heritage buildings and historic elements by facilitating opportunities for building and site design to reflect the scale, building materials, architectural style and other attributes of adjacent cultural heritage resources. (Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Urban Design Guidelines)	ERA	This question has not yet been addressed at this stage of this project. On sites that are projected under planning policy for higher densities, the most effective way that tall buildings can be compatible with low-scale heritage resources is through their materiality. The intent is that further development of the new buildings' design articulation and materiality will be delivered at the Site Plan Application stage.
	The HIA does not address this significant 'test' of the compatibility of the proposed development set out in the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Urban Design Guidelines. The proposed high-density development does not reflect the scale or architectural style of the one-and-a-half storey Regency cottage / house, and the submission material does not provide information of the building materials of the proposed buildings.	ERA	
	It is my opinion that the design of the proposed development requires further examination and revision to ensure that the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of Post Manor are conserved. The development should seek to retain and integrate Post Manor elegantly and sympathetically into the overall site plan in such a way that reinforces the building's significance as a long-standing historical element along Kingston Road. The design of the new buildings - placement, massing, height, scale, style and materials - should complement and enhance Post Manor and its setting within a new interpretive landscape.	ERA	
SUMMARY COMMENTS			
	In my professional opinion that the HIA completed by ERA demonstrates a good understanding the property history, condition and value, however, the impact assessment does not: provide a convincing rationale for the proposed building relocation; identify or address several significant negative impacts on the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of Post Manor; or demonstrate that the new construction associated with the proposed development is compatible with Post Manor.	ERA	See all notes above.
	With respect to the HIA, I recommend that it is revised in response to the information, comments and opinions provided in this letter with special attention to negative impacts.	ERA	
	I recommend that, as part of the ongoing approvals process, the heritage consultant/architect prepare and submit a Conservation Plan to City Heritage Staff for their review and approval, and that the owner enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement with the City	ERA	We agree, and would expect to provide a Conservation Plan as part of the ongoing approvals process, once a site strategy has been confirmed through HIA resubmissions and coordination with Staff.
	With respect to the Conservation Plan, I recommend that the report include the following:	ERA	
	A full written description of the conservation - rehabilitation and restoration - scope of work;	ERA	
	A Heritage Interpretation Plan detailing the multi-media interpretation strategy;	ERA	
	A Landscape Plan;	ERA	
	Heritage drawings of the building relocation, restoration and rehabilitation work (including building code and accessibility upgrades);	ERA	
	A description of site and/or building lighting (as applies);	ERA	
	A description of site and/or building signage (as applies);	ERA	
	Long-term building conservation and maintenance plan guidelines.	ERA	
	I trust that the comments provided are to your satisfaction. Please contact me should you require any further details or wish to discuss the contents of this letter.	N/A	

City- Sustainability - Memo			
	Our comments on the Sustainable Development Guidelines (SDG) report and checklist, appended within the planning rationale report, are as follows.	N/A	
	The proposal contains two site specific amendments:	N/A	
1	Mixed Use A, Gateway” redesignation with a higher density and FSI of 5.7 in place of the Pickering Official Plan’s current designation of “Mixed-Use Area Mixed Corridors” which permits a net residential density of over 30 and up to and including 140 dwellings per hectare and allows for an FSI of 2.5.	TBG	Note change to FSI from 5.7 to 4.5.
2	Multi-Unit, MU-XX” rezoning with many site-specific requirements as identified in the plans in place of the City of Pickering Zoning By-law No. 3036, which specify the site as “LCA-4: Local Central Area”.	TBG	Noted. Revised standards include in Addendum Planning Letter.
	The SDG checklist prepared by TBG identifies sustainability elements of the project with a goal to achieve Level 1 with all the required points and an additional 30 points. Further clarification is required for the following items:		
2(a)	SDG Item 4.11- Mixed Use Commercial – The rationale in the checklist indicates, “The proposed development locates street related commercial components at grade within mixed-use buildings” and claims three points. To be eligible to claim points on this, the proposal must satisfy the required item as per our following comment:	TBG	See response below.
	Item 5.3 – Design of Development – Density and Compact Built Form, of the SDG specifies that commercial component of the development requires minimum FSI of 0.35. The proposal, with a commercial component FSI of 0.11, needs revision to comply with the “required” sustainability element.	TBG	The proposed commercial GFA has been increased and now represents an FSI of 0.15. This also represents a complete replacement of existing commercial GFA on site. A commercial GFA of 0.15 complies with Section 5.3, which states: "OR <i>The project for a mixed-use development achieves a minimum combined residential/commercial density of 0.75 FSI with a minimum of 0.15 FSI of commercial component"</i>
2(b)	SDG item 4.13 – Apply Regional Precedents in Urbanism and Architecture – The rationale in the checklist indicates, “The proposal incorporates the adaptive reuse of a resource designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” and claims four points.	TBG	
	The City of Pickering, under the Ontario Heritage Act - Part IV, designated the site as a Heritage Building and as architectural and historical value or interest (Post Manor). In discussion with the City’s Planner II, Heritage, we learned about the following process on the heritage evaluation: 1. Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ERA Architects Inc. will be peer reviewed. 2. The Heritage Advisory Committee will provide their recommendations on the development. Based on this we will wait for the recommendations from the peer reviewer and the Heritage Advisory Committee to consider TBG’s allocation of four sustainability points on this item.	TBG/ERA	Heritage Resource is proposed to remain on site per plans provided. Use to remain commercial. Final user to be determined later in process, once approvals granted - as it typical. No change. Peer Review and Heritage Advisory Committee process to commence upon re-submission.
2(c)	SDG Item 6.11 Parking Management – The rationale in the checklist indicates “The TDM measures proposed in the submitted Transportation Impact Study to encourage alternate modes of transportation allowing reduction of vehicular parking requirements” and claims two points.		
	The Transportation Impact Study, prepared by the TMIG consultant, section 7 indicates following:		
	“The subject site is zoned LCA-4 by Site Specific By-law 2212/86, within Zoning By-law 3036. Parking requirements for the LCA-4 zone only consider commercial uses and do not contain parking requirements for the proposed residential uses. However, the subject site is adjacent to the area covered by the Pickering City Centre Zoning By-law 7553/17. We have therefore referenced the City Centre Zoning By-law to review the proposed parking supply in consideration of transit proximity in the study area.”		

	We recommend the inclusion of section 3.9 - Bicycle Parking Space Requirements of the Pickering City Center Zoning By-laws 7553-17 within the proposed zoning by-law amendment. Within such, the proponent should consider and comply with both the car and bicycle parking standards equitably. Providing only car parking spaces and eliminating bicycle parking is not desirable. We encourage TBG to consider the SDG Item 6.4 – Support for alternative transportation.	TBG/TMIG	Section 7.2 of the revised TIS provides City Centre bicycle parking rates and the proposed bicycle parking supply.
	We recommend the bicycle parking requirements as a required element. We encourage the proponent to claim two additional points by providing additional TDM measures as indicated in their report in section 8.1.1 Active Transportation Network; section 8.1.2 Rideshare Services; section 8.1.3 Micro transit.	TBG/TMIG	Noted.
2(d)	We recommend the proponent to prepare and submit a Bird Strike Analysis and a Bird - Friendly Design Report that considers how the proposed high-rise towers will address the issue of bird strikes.	CMV	Bird friendly tower design elements can be incorporated into detailed design and analysis provided through the Site Plan Application. Measures to prevent bird strike which can be considered at that time include dots at 50mm x 50mm above 16m.

City- Engineering - Memo			
1	General comments: As per the pre-consultation memo dated June2,2020,the impact of the development on ground subsidence was to be addressed .Please provide a report to address this.		
2	Draft 40 R Plan - No comments	N/A	Noted.
Proposed Site Plan:			
3	The notes on the plan appear to be for a different site in a different municipality. Update the notes as required .	CMV	Note removed.
4	At detailed design, the site plan is to include the location of all site accesses, Brock Road and Kingston Road curbs, curb radii, signage, and light locations	CMV	Noted.
5	The plan indicated the overhang of the tower over the driveway. Revise as required to show the entire ground leve, similar to the Preliminary Grading Plan.	CMV	Done.
FSR:			
6	In Section 4.1, update the 5 yr intensity calculation to 1082.901. The decimal is missing from the equation.	Valdor	The equation has been revised.
7	The design of the site should consider Low Impact Development (LID) measures.	Valdor	The retention volume has been incorporated in the tank design. The first 5mm of rainfall will be retained on site and stored at the bottom of the stormwater tank for irrigation.
8	Section 8.1 discusses the erosion and sediment controls (ESC) measures required for the site. Please be advised that at detailed design, ESC measures will be required for all phases of construction.	Valdor	Noted.
9	Section 10.0 of the report references City of Pickering SWM Guidelines dated 2012. The guidelines were updated in July 2019. Ensure the design complies with the most up to date guidelines.	Valdor	Noted. The Reference section has been revised accordingly.
10	All servicing drawings should be from the ground level, not underground parking level.	Valdor	Separate servicing figures have been created to show the ground level.
11	Site drainage is to be self contained. The preliminary grading plan shows drainage from the proposed townhouses draining overland to the adjacent properties. Update the design as required.	Valdor	The preliminary grading plan attached at the end of the revised FSR has been revised to ensure the site drainage is self contained.
12	A high point will be required at the property line within the proposed Brock Rd entrance to contain all draining on site.	Valdor	High point has been added to the property line for the proposed Brock Rd entrance.
13	All landscaped areas are to have minimum slope of 2%. There are areas of the site where less than 2% is proposed. Update the design as required.	Valdor	Slope of at least 2.0% is used for landscape areas.
Noise and Vibration Impact Study:			
14	Ensure the recommendations in the study are implemented with the detailed design of the site.	RWDI	Detailed design will be provided at Site Plan Approval.
Phase One and Phase Two Environmental Site Assessments:			
15	No comments	N/A	
Transportation Impact Study			
16	No comments	N/A	
Tree Inventory Report and Preservation Plan, and Tree Protection Plan			
17	No comments	N/A	
Water Resource Comments			
1	The stormwater management criteria for the proposed development requires the control of post-development peak flow rates to pre-development levels, for all storms from 2 year up to and including the 100 year event, using a maximum pre-development runoff coefficient of 0.5 .Refertothe pre - consultation letter dated June2,2020 and revise the design accordingly.	Valdor	The quantity calculation has been revised with a runoff coefficient of 0.5.
2	The Functional Servicing Report (FSR)and the proposed design have not addressed the erosion control criteria. As per the pre - consultation letter dated June2,2020 ,the first 5mm of every storm event must be retained on-site. Please revise the design accordingly.	Valdor	The design has been revised to store the first 5mm of rainfall at the bottom of the stormwater tank.
3	The City will only credit stand-alone oil-grit separator (OGS) units for up to 50% TSS removal. Please update the design to provide an overall treatment train approach providing at least 80% TSS removal.	Valdor	A Jellyfish filter unit has been introduced to achieve at least 80% TSS removal.

Capital Projects- General Comments			
1	At detailed design, show connectivity to the Brock Road and Kingston Road sidewalks.	CMV	Noted.
2	Confirm the configuration of the underground parking garage accesses.	CMV	Plans provided.
3	Review the site layout between the Kingston Road mutual access and the underground parking access as it does not appear to provide sufficient space for stacking.	CMV	Entrance location to underground moved further into the Site.
Traffic Comments			
4	Section 2.1 of the Traffic Impact Study(TIS) states that Guild Road has an unposted speed of 50km/hour. The posted speed on this road is 40km/hour. Revise the report.	TMIG	Noted. The posted speed limit of Guild Road has been revised in Section 2.1 of the report.
5	Section 2.4 of the TIS states that the turning movement counts were provided by the City of Oshawa. Please confirm if this should be Region of Durham and revise accordingly.	TMIG	Noted. Section 2.4 has been revised accordingly.
6	The current accesses on Kingston Road and Brock Road will be maintained .Provide the proposed accesses widths and the radii.	TMIG	The Kingston Road and Brock Road access widths and radii are identified on the updated site plan.
7	Section 5.6 of the TIS has analysed the adjacent intersections with and without the future median BRT. With the future median BRT ,the accesses on Kingston Road and Brock Road will function as Right in and Right out. With the future median BRT and the proposed right in and right out accesses, many vehicles will take Guild Road, Royal Road, and other local roads to go to Brock Road north. This will increase the infill traffic in the area. Provide comments how this infill traffic can be reduced.	TMIG	Commentary regarding the future right-in/right-out conditions of the site accesses and the potential for traffic infiltration through adjacent local roads is discussed in Section 4.2 of the updated report. It is TMIG's opinion that only site traffic destined to the north would potentially use Royal Road and/or Guild Road as an alternate route due to site access restrictions. Based on trip generation estimates and trip distribution, it is estimated that only 5 site trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours would use Royal Road or Guild Road to travel north via an eastbound left-turn from Finch Avenue to Brock Road.
8	Vehicle maneuvering diagrams are required for the proposed design vehicles.	TMIG	A site circulation review was conducted using Auto TURN software, and has been summarized in Section 6.5 of the updated report. The Vehicle Manoeuvring Diagrams have been provided in Appendix M of the report.
Landscape & Parks Development			
1	Confirm the extent of the proposed POPS. It is unclear if it includes all of the outdoor space surrounding the mid-rise building, with the exception of the private spaces for the 3 storey townhomes.	TBG	The POPS space at corner of Kingston and Brock is ~1,900m2 in size (extending from Kingston north to the face of the Towns, and from Brock west to the face of the 6-storey podium. Further west the mews between the stacked towns and mid-rise block will be publicly accessible; but has not been included in the POPS calculation presented above). This represents ~15% of the site area.
2	The POPS shown on the concept landscape plan seem to be very sterile, though it is understood to be an interpretation of a rural agricultural heritage theme featuring linear orchards and wind rows, as indicated in the HIA report. Perhaps more soft landscaping could be provided in areas to still fit with this theme. Include programmed spaces in appropriate areas, such as seating clusters and a children's play area. These areas could also be delineated through the use of raised gardens, perhaps to be used for community gardening. Consider the inclusion of a shade structure for one of the seating areas. The Structure could mimic a heritage agricultural building. For consistency in surfacing, consider transitioning to rubber tile safety surfacing within the children's play area. The playground equipment should provide high visual/sculptural interest as well. Examples of such equipment are Kompan Corocord, Galaxy and Bloqx structures, and Jambette Citiplex structures. Following are links to these structures for your reference: https://www.kompan.com/play/corocord-rope-climbing/frame-nets/octanite https://www.kompan.us/play/corocord-rope-climbing/play-towers/skytwister-sensory https://www.kompan.us/play/corocord-rope-climbing/domes-spheres/explorer-dome https://www.kompan.com/play/play-systems/blogx https://www.kompan.us/play/play-systems/galaxy https://www.jambette.com/en/products-page/novelties/citiplex	ERA	The Post's Corners Plaza POPS incorporates additional programmable space, as seen in the Landscape Concept Package in Appendix E of the HIA. Raised gardens have also been included in the "kitchen garden" zone behind the farmhouse, in the traditional location of a kitchen garden, to be programmed by a potential future operator. We would recommend avoiding mimicking a heritage agricultural building because it's not best heritage practice, but would recommend the use of wood materials for street / plaza furniture (rather than very contemporary materials) to continue to convey a more rural-style character compatible with the farmhouse.
3	Indicate how the private spaces for the 3 storey townhomes will be separated from the public space. If low fencing is to be used to separate the public from the private areas and/or between residential yards, perhaps a style could be used that would tie in with the rural agricultural heritage theme. Confirm what the 'L' shaped areas shown on the plan represent.	ERA	The L-shaped area has been revised as an interpretive "Farmstead Lane" zone, but we have not articulated details over how the private spaces will be separate from the public space. This can be determined through detailed design submission.

4	Confirm if interpretive signage will be included within the landscape, to inform the residents and public about the history of the site.	ERA	Plaques / panels have been suggested as an element of a future Interpretation Plan (see section 8.3.1 of the HIA). This has not yet been confirmed, and will be officially determined as part of a future Interpretation Plan (which may be consolidated with the future Conservation Plan). To be submitted at Site Plan.
5	The Tree inventory Report and Preservation Plan indicates that 49 trees will be required for compensation based on the number of existing trees to be protected vs. removed. Should all required compensation plantings not be possible on site, cash-in-lieu for the balance remaining shall be paid as outlined in the City's current Summary of Fees and Charges.	ERA	Noted. To be further confirmed at Site Plan Stage.

City-Planning Memo			
	Below are key comments and concerns identified by the City Development Department. All comments received from external agencies and internal departments are attached for your review. Prior to staff proceeding with a final recommendation report, including a site-specific Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment, the City Development Department will require the following matters to be addressed.	N/A	
1	Relocation of the Post Manor heritage building:		
	The Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ERA Architects was peer reviewed by Branch Architecture. See attached peer review letter from Branch Architecture dated April 6, 2021. Below is a summary of the key concerns and comments identified by Branch Architecture.	N/A	
	The Post Manor is connected visually and historically to the corner of Kingston Road and Brock Road, and is a local landmark as expressed by members of the Heritage Pickering Advisory Committee, and by residents. Relocation of the building imposes negative impacts to the heritage attributes of the building. The proposal should be revised to consider the Post Manor remaining in its current location; the interpretive public park surrounding it should be a focal point of the development; and the proposed adjacent development should reflect the scale, building materials, architectural style and other attributes of the Post Manor. Shadowing should be minimised.	ERA/CMV/TBG	
	While the integration of a public space surrounding the heritage building is supportable, the relocation of the building to a pocket of the site with limited visibility from the main intersection does not meet the intent of the Draft Urban Design Guidelines, which is that built heritage features on focal sites should be accentuated to create a sense of place and enhance cultural identity. The Post Manor is further dwarfed in this location by the adjacent 34-storey residential tower and 12-storey residential building. The Draft Urban Design Guidelines encourage new development to recognize heritage buildings and historic elements by facilitating opportunities for building and site design to reflect the scale, building materials, architectural style and other attributes of adjacent cultural heritage resources	ERA/CMV/TBG	See responses to peer review comments above.
	Should Council approve the proposal, the heritage designation by-law will be amended to reflect current standards required by the Ontario Heritage Act. The City of Pickering will require a conservation plan and a letter of credit for the cost of replacing the house during the site plan approval	Client	Noted.
2	Building Height and Floor Space Index		
	If the general intent of the Intensification Plan is met, flexibility with massing and height may be considered on a site-specific basis. Design of the site and the proposed heights and floor spaces indexes (FSI) should demonstrate appropriate transition from the low-density residential lands to the north and west of the subject site. Further, the Draft OPA 38 requires that consideration shall be given to the interface of retail and office with residential uses and the provision of appropriate transitions between buildings and in height, mass and scale to ensure compatibility with established residential neighbourhoods. Despite encouraging intensification over time, City Council may limit net residential densities, floorspace indices, and gross leasable floorspace for the retailing of goods and services below the maximums set out in the draft OPA to address concerns related to such matters as design, compatibility and scale of development.	TBG	Understood. See responses provided in Planning Addendum Letter. TBG is of the opinion that the revised design provides for appropriate transition, building massing, and commercial relationship to the proposed POPS, Kingston Road and Brock Road. FSI has decreased by 1.2 from previous submission.

	The purpose and intent of the angular plane requirement is to minimize any potential adverse impacts to abutting properties with respect to shadowing, overlook, privacy and wind. In order to create a human-scaled environment along Kingston Road, the proposed tower heights shall be located within the recommended 45-degree angular plane requirements as established in the Draft Urban Design Guidelines along Kingston Road and adjacent to the lot lines at 1701 Kingston Road and 1995 Royal Road.	CMV/TBG	See Planning Addendum Letter. It is standard industry practice that Angular Planes from RoWs are applied to podiums and mid-rise buildings - not towers. The revised plans present minimal intrusion into the rear angular plane and only for portions of the building with 650m ² floorplates. The provided shadow impact study demonstrates minimal additional shadows are created by the portions of the building beyond angular plane. No adverse wind impacts or significant shadow impacts result from the massing of the tower beyond the angular plane on adjacent sites as the tower floor plate is limited in area resulting in "passing" shadows for less than one hour before noon on adjacent properties. After noon, additional shadows are primarily on the subject property or on public right of ways. Please see Planning Addendum letter for more fulsome analysis and shadow studies.
	Proposed building heights shall be lowered as a result of meeting the angular plane requirements from the established residential development to the north and along Brock Road and Kingston Road in order to achieve appropriate transition to existing development and create a pedestrian human-scaled environment along Kingston Road and Brock Road.	CMV/TBG	With the exception of the small portions of the top 5 floors of the proposed tower massing, all built form is within angular planes. Any mass beyond the angular planes is minimal. At grade, the ground floor commercial uses are recessed from the line of the podium above to provide a sheltered zone for pedestrian movement. Please also see comments above.
	The proposed 6-storey podium does not allow for ease of access into the site or sunlight penetration into the POPS. The Draft Urban Design Guidelines encourage block layouts should be designed to maximize views and vistas through development blocks and gateways. The Draft Urban Design Guidelines state that building articulation, including vertical projections, recessions, design treatments and other architectural details are encourage at gateway locations to create enhanced visual interest and a distinct sense of place. The proposed POP should be relocated adjacent to the Post Manor Heritage Building and at the intersection of Kingston Road and Brock Road to provide public access and to protect the views to the heritage building.	ERA/CMV/TBG	POPS relocated as requested.
3	Building Separation and Setbacks		
	Sensitive building placement helps ensure integration into the surrounding context and limits negative impact on adjacent streets and open spaces. The Draft Urban Design Guidelines establish minimum standards for building separation. A minimum separation distance of 15 metres shall be provided between facing buildings on sites with multiple buildings. On multi-building sites, it is encouraged that buildings are offset or angled away from each other to maintain privacy between facing units.	CMV/TBG	15m now provided between townhouse and mid-rise built form. At the closest point, the tower and the mid-rise building are 13.75m apart, but are at angles to each other therefore preventing direct facing views. The angles themselves result in this pinch point; however the vast majority of the tower and mid-rise building are separated by over 18m. See Planning Addendum letter.
	Building towers shall be subject to a minimum 25 metre separation distance, measured between the exterior edge of the building face.	CMV/TBG	Not applicable. Second tower has been removed.
	Buildings fronting Kingston Road and Brock Road shall be setback 5 metres from the front property line.	CMV/TBG	Achieved on Brock Road. The face of the podium at Kingston Road is setback 3.0m floors 2-6 and 4.5m at grade to facilitate greater separation between the townhouses and the mid-rise podium and between the mid-rise building and the tower. Proposal provides for weather protected pedestrian space at grade via building overhang, as well as 3m for at grade planting on private property. See Planning Addendum letter.
	A maximum tower floor plate of 750 square metres shall be maintained, as noted in the Draft Urban Design Guidelines. The proposal should be revised to maintain a minimum of 15 metres of separation between all buildings, while keeping a minimum separation distance of 25 metres between tower buildings. The buildings should be revised to be setback a minimum of 5 metres on both Kingston Road and Brock Road.	CMV/TBG	See notes on setbacks and separation distance above. Note that the two tower scheme has been revised to include only 1 tower at the far western edge of the site. The average floor plate of the tower (floors 7-24 and floors 25-32) is 842.5m ² . This is consistent with the methodology of calculation and maximum parameters used in the City Centre By-law. See Planning Addendum letter for further details and discussion.
4	Site Access		
	At the March 9, 2021 Virtual Open Meeting and June 7, 2021 Electronic Statutory Public Meeting, a number of area residents indicated that the submitted traffic study did not include Royal Road and Guild Road within the study area. Given that the proposal will have restricted right-in/right-out accesses, it is anticipated that there will be increased traffic flows along Royal Road and Guild Road. Please revise the Traffic Impact Study to include an analysis on the traffic impact on Royal Road and Guild Road, and any solutions to limit/restrict traffic infiltration on these roads from this development	TMIG	Noted. Guild Road and Royal Road have been added to the TIS analysis, as requested. Potential impacts from the development site traffic on these adjacent local roadways are discussed in Section 4.2 of the updated report.

	Staff are awaiting formal comments from the Region of Durham Work's Department with respect to the submitted Traffic Impact Study.	TMIG	Region's comments have been received.
5	Mature Trees		
	Residents have expressed concerns regarding impact of the proposed development on the existing mature trees surrounding the property as the trees provide a privacy and noise buffer. To help minimize adverse impacts of the proposed development, staff recommend that all of the existing mature vegetation along the north and west lot lines be preserved. The minimum setback of the construction hoarding surrounding the existing trees should be a minimum of 1 metre from the dripline. Please provide confirmation that all shoring and below grade and above grade structures will be setback a minimum 1 metre from the dripline.	ERA	There are 31 inventoried trees surrounding the site in adjoining lands, none will be impacted by the proposed construction and the tree protection hoarding will be well beyond the minimum tree protection zone. See arborist report provided. There are 63 inventoried trees within the subject site along the north and west lot lines, all trees are proposed to be preserved except for two existing dead trees. 23 of those trees will require minimal excavation for shoring within the tree protection zone. Construction impact is considered to be minimal to negligible given that the site plan proposes an increase of softscape within and beyond the tree protection zones with the replacement of existing structures and asphalt with new topsoil.
6	Privately Owned Publicly-Accessible Public Space (POPS)		
	The proposed Privately Owned Publicly-Accessible Public Space (POPS) is largely cast in shadows for the majority of the day and year, and is located internally towards the site. As noted above, to provide visibility and easy accessibility the POPS shall be located at the intersection of Brock Road and Kingston Road.	ERA/CMV/TBG	Relocation has been provided and shadow impact on the heritage structure has been decreased significantly.
7	Loss of commercial space/office space		
The	The Intensification Plan and Draft OPA 38 directs major office use to the identified gateway location at the intersection of Kingston Road and Brock Road. Demonstrate the inclusion of office uses within the podium levels of a mixed-use building on the site.	TBG	The proposed commercial/retail GFA now matches the existing GFA. In addition the residential units proposed will have ability to accommodate work from home (WFH) functions which are expected to account for ~48 jobs (based on the Pickering D/C by-law calculations; which are extremely conservative given the changes to WFH patterns since 2017). See Planning Addendum letter for further discussion.
	A key concern raised by area residents is the loss of valuable retail/commercial space that service the surrounding communities. To ensure sufficient retail and commercial gross floor area is being replaced, staff recommend that the minimum commercial/retail GFA maintains the existing GFA	TBG	
8	Parking		
	Staff are concerned that the parking supply proposed for resident, visitor and commercial uses may not be sufficient to support the development. The submitted TIS states that the City Centre Zoning By-law provisions are appropriate, including incorporating a shared parking formula. However, the parking ratios within the City Centre by-law provisions may not be appropriate for the proposed development given that the lands are located outside the City Centre and are not within convenient walking distance to higher-order transit services such as the GO station. The proposed parking ratios may be peer reviewed. In accordance with the City's User Fee By-law, the applicant is responsible for reimbursing the City's full cost of the peer review.	TMIG/TBG	Parking rates that are equal to or more conservative than the City's City Centre By-law are summarized in Section 7 of the updated TIS. Of note, the future median-running BRT on Kingston Road will essentially be at the doorstep of the future residents living at the proposed development, and will act as a form of higher-order transit and a connection to other routes and modes of travel.
	To support the proposed grade-related commercial uses, staff strongly encourage an appropriate amount of surface parking should be incorporated.	TMIG/TBG	16 at-grade parking spaces are provided (including 2 barrier-free spaces) for the commercial uses in addition to underground parking.
	Consideration should be given to charging stations for electric vehicles and secure indoor bicycle storage space in the design of parking structures.	TMIG/TBG	Noted.
9	Shadows		
	A revised Shadow Study shall be provided. The siting and location of the buildings should maximize sun exposure and strive to achieve five consecutive hours of sun on public parks as measured on March 21, June 21, and September 21. In addition, the revised study should also evaluate shadow impacts within the development site, including an assessment of the shadow impact on any outdoor amenity spaces to ensure comfort and use of any proposed outdoor amenity areas. The revised Study shall include a written summary of the findings.	CMV	There are no public parks to consider. In terms of the site itself, the shadow study demonstrates a minimum of 3-4 hours of direct sunlight on all areas of the site for March 21 and September 21 and up to five hours for June 21. In terms of the POPS at Kingston and Brock, the shadow study demonstrates a minimum of 4 hours of direct sunlight on for March 21 and September 21 and 5-7 hours for June 21.
10	Comments from Planning and Development Committee		
	The following is a summary of comments and requested materials received at the Planning and Development Committee held on June 7, 2021:		
	questioned whether there was flexibility with height and density, and whether the developer would enter into meaningful dialogue with concerned residents;	TBG	Several Meetings with residents have occurred. Significant changes to the proposal have been provided.
	commented how the Kingston Road Intensification guidelines had notional heights identified, with the final product not including a defined maximum height;	TBG	Note that maximum height proposed remains under all applicable height maximums at time of initial application.

	concerned whether the Post Manor was in its original location, and that the developer would preserve its heritage attributes;	TBG/ERA	See comments above. Building to remain on site for entire duration of redevelopment.
	concerned how the density and proposed height would be reviewed by staff, prior to the recommendation process;	TBG	Review ongoing.
	concerned how the applicant would relocate the heritage building during construction, and how the Post Manor would be protected with those details being sought from the applicant;	ERA	See construction staging process on pg 70 of HIA. And we acknowledge that a Conservation Plan would follow the HIA once a site strategy has been accepted by the City, and this would provide the details of all the conservation work.
	concerned about the amount of vibration during construction;	RWDI	A construction management plan will be prepared at the Site Plan stage and will ensure that negative impacts are mitigated.
	concerned how Guild Road was not part of the Traffic Study, currently under review by City and Regional staff, including impacts on Royal Road and future growth of immediate area;	TMIG	Noted. Guild Road and Royal Road have been added to the Traffic study.
	concerned whether angular planes were appropriately addressed; and	TBG	See TBG Planning Addendum Letter and responses above.
	questioned whether access to underground parking would be off of both Brock Road and Kingston Road.	TBG	Access from both Brock and Kingston.
11	Comments from Area Residents		
	The following is a list of key comments and concerns expressed by the residents at the Electronic Public Open House meeting and written submissions received from approximately 30 residents, landowners and businesses:		
	Traffic and Access		
	concerned with the proximity of the proposed vehicular access on Brock Road to the intersection of Kingston Road and Brock Road and may cause safety issues for southbound vehicles on Brock Road and pedestrians;	TMIG	The access to Brock Road is located along the northern edge of the property to provide maximum available spacing between the access and the intersection of Brock Road and Kingston Road. The proposed access is located further north than the existing access.
	concerned that the restricted right-in and right-out accesses on Brock Road and Kingston Road will cause the future residents and visitors to increase traffic on existing local roads; and	TMIG	Concerns regarding site traffic infiltration to local roadways, such as Guild Road and Royal Road, are addressed in Section 4.2 of the updated traffic report.
	concerned that the low parking ratios will cause parking to spill onto local roads	TMIG	The proposed parking ratios are equal to or exceed the City Centre By-law parking rates and do not utilize a multi-use parking reduction. The presence of future median-running bus rapid transit route on Kingston Road will allow future residents to make use of reliable and frequent transit and active transportation options, reducing the need to own and park a car on-site. City by-laws are currently under review to reduce parking rates throughout the City.
	Height and Density		
	supportive of Council direction to increase density and provide more housing options, but requested that the proposed building heights be reduced near existing low-rise dwellings; and	TBG	Revised Plan removes entire eastern 34-storey tower - which was in closest proximity to low rise residential uses.
	concerned that the proposed density and level of intensification does not provide adequate on-site private or public amenity spaces to support the future residents of this development.	TBG	Large POPS now provided at corner of Kingston and Brock Road.
	Sunlight and Privacy		
	concerned that the existing dwellings on the east side of Royal Road will lose their easterly sunlight during the morning hours due to the proposed building heights; and	TBG	See revised shadow studies. Shadowing on residential units on Royal road very minimal. Maximum 1 hour.
	concerned about overlook and decreased privacy on properties immediately north of the subject property.	TBG	Existing trees along west and north property line to be protected. This will provide for privacy in the existing rear yard spaces. Townhomes and mid-rise building - being the built form in closest proximity to the existing low-rise residential will respect the angular plane - further limiting privacy concerns.
	Heritage House		
	questioned whether the Post Manor is structurally stable to be moved and how it will be protected during construction; and	TBG	See information from heritage building consultant. Building can be moved safely and a staging plan has been developed to ensure this is accomplished in the safest manner possible.
	commented that the proposal should be revised to incorporate the Post Manor in its current location.	TBG	See HIA and responses above from ERA. There is no heritage value in the current location of the building. The revised location allows for additional visibility of the Post Manor at the intersection of Kingston and Brock and allows for greater separation between the Post Manor and the proposed buildings.

	Other Comments		
	supportive of a mixed-use development to continue to provide retail and amenities for the wider community;	TBG	Commercial space is being provided at a 1:1 ratio as compared to existing commercial space on site.
	concerned that dust and noise pollution during the construction period will negatively impact surrounding homes;	RWDI	A construction management plan will be prepared at the Site Plan stage and will ensure that negative impacts are mitigated.
	requested drawings to demonstrate that the streetscape next to the proposed development in the perspective of a pedestrian; and	CMV	3D view provided at Brock Rd and Kington Rd. Further specific detail and refinement will be provided at Site Plan Approval Application.
	concerned that the proposal does not adhere to the Kingston Road Corridor Intensification Plan, the Draft Urban Design Guidelines and the concurrent City initiated Official Plan Amendment to implement the policies.	TBG	See Planning Rationale Report and Planning Addendum Letter. It is TBGs professional planning opinion that the proposal conforms to the intent of the Official Plan and has appropriate regard to the guidelines and policies of the Kingston Road Corridor Intensification Plan, the Draft Urban Design Guidelines and the OPA 38.
12	<p>Comments from Internal Departments and External Agencies</p> <p>The following internal departments and external agencies' comments received to-date are attached for your review and follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Canada Post, dated January 18, 2021 • Conseil Scolaire Viamonde, dated April 14, 2021 • Durham Catholic District School Board, dated April 23, 2021 • Enbridge Gas, dated January 11, 2021 • Elexicon Energy Inc., dated January 8, 2021 • City of Pickering, City Development, Sustainability, dated February 26, 2021 • City of Pickering, Engineering Services, dated April 8, 2021 • Metrolinx, dated February 4, 2021 • Ministry of Transportation, dated January 7, 2021 • Rogers Communications, dated February 9, 2021 • City of Pickering, Fire Services, dated April 14, 2021 • Branch Architecture, Peer Review, dated April 6, 2021 	N/A	Noted.
13	Conclusion		
	With your second submission, please provide a cover letter indicating how each comment/concern outlined above have been addressed. The following materials are required to accompany your next submission	TBG	This letter serves as the same.
	a letter outlining how the comments from external agencies, City Departments, members of the public have been addressed;	TBG	This letter serves as the same.
	all 4 sides of the Elevation Drawings and coloured renderings;	CMV	See Architectural package.
	revised cross-section plan illustrating the 45-degree angular plane requirements;	CMV	See Architectural package. Towers have only be evaluated against the northern angular plane. Podium, mid-rise building and towns against Kingston, Brock and rear angular planes.
	revised Site Plan (coloured);	CMV	See Architectural package.
	revised Heritage Impact Assessment;	ERA	See revised HIA
	revised Transportation Impact Assessment;	TMIG	The report has been revised.
	revised Functional Services and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report;	Valdor	See revised FSR
	revised Shadow Study and an accompanying report; and	CMV	See Architectural package and TBG Planning Addendum Letter.
	With respect to official plan or zoning by-law amendments the City may, at the time of a recommendation report to Council, require drawings in forming the official Plan or zoning schedule, in CAD or GIS format (compatible with either ArcGis Desktop 10.7.1, ArcGis Pro 2.6.1, or AutoCAD Map 3D 2018), and such files need to be georeferenced with a geographic coordinate system of: NAD83 UTM Zone 17N.	ALL	Noted.
	All PDF documents accepted that are intended to be uploaded to the City's website, must be accessible. Documents may include studies, reports, plans, presentations, and other PDFs.	ALL	Noted.
	The City of Pickering will not display external vendor documents on its website if they are not accessible, in order to meet the Province's Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) Information and Communications Standards To learn more visit WCAG 2.0 Level AA standards	ALL	Noted.

	<p>Accessibility Criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All studies, reports, plans and presentations etc. that result from this project must be provided to the City in an accessible format compatible to Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, meeting WCAG 2.0 Level AA standards. 	ALL	Noted.
	<p>Verification Process</p> <p>Prior to documents being posted on the City's website for this project, a letter of verification, stating that the documents provided are accessible must be received.</p>	ALL	Noted.
	<p>The attached City's Accessible Documents Vendor Checklist is to assist you in creating documents in an accessible format. The following tools/service providers may also assist you in the accessibility checking/compliance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free online accessibility checker tool • Adobe Acrobat Accessibility Checker • Aequum Global Access • AbleDocs • Equidox • eSolutions 	ALL	Noted.
	<p>Prior to finalizing your second submission, please arrange a meeting with City staff to discuss the above-noted comments. For further information or clarification, please contact me at 905.420.4660, extension 2169.</p>	TBG	Noted.

Region of Durham Comments Memo - dated August 13, 2021

	The Region of Durham Works Department has reviewed the above-noted applications, and the following comments are provided regarding conformity to the Regional Official Plan and Provincial Plans and Policies delegated Provincial Plan Review responsibilities, and Regional servicing and transportation		
	Region of Durham Official Plan		
	The Region of Durham Official Plan (ROP) designates the subject site as "Living Areas" in the Urban System with a "Regional Corridor" overlay along both Kingston Road and Brock Road. Living Areas allow a range of uses including residential uses, and limited office and commercial uses. Regional Corridors are intended to provide efficient transportation links to Regional Centres and Urban Growth Centres.	TBG	Noted.
	Portions of Regional Corridors with an underlying Living Areas designation that are identified as appropriate for higher density mixed-use development (such as residential, commercial, and/or offices) by the City of Pickering shall support an overall minimum long term density target of 60 residential units per gross hectare and a floor space index (FSI) of 2.5. The built form should consist of a wide variety of building forms, generally mid-rise in height, with some higher buildings, with development oriented to the corridor.	TBG	Noted.
	The proposed development will have a combined gross density of 709 units per hectare and an FSI of 5.6 which will contribute to the overall long-term density target of the Kingston Road/Brock Road corridor.	TBG	Please note revisions to application statistics. FSI proposed now 4.5.
	Affordable Housing		
	The ROP also supports a range and mix of housing types, sizes and tenures. The Region targets a minimum 25% of new housing to be affordable to low and moderate income households.	TBG	Noted.
	Major residential developments have a significant influence on the mix of housing throughout the municipality; therefore, development proposals should consider how they will contribute to the achievement of affordable housing targets for Pickering and Durham. Furthermore, major residential developments should also support a mix of housing including rental tenure and special needs housing.	TBG	Noted.
	Strategic Growth Areas such as the Pickering Urban Growth Centre (UGC) and Kingston Road/Brock Road Regional Corridor are well served by transit and should be the focus of higher density mixed use development in Pickering. Smaller units in residential apartments typically have lower costs compared with other forms of housing and may contribute to the supply of affordable housing options.	TBG	Noted.
	Developers should also consider leveraging government incentives for building affordable and rental housing, where available. Examples of such funding include the Ontario Housing Priorities Initiative, CMHC's Affordable Housing Innovation Fund and Rental Construction Financing	TBG	Noted.
	Holding Symbol		
	The ROP also includes implementation policies pertaining to the use and lifting of Holding symbols. Section 14.5.3 indicates that prior to passing a bylaw to remove the holding symbol, the Council of the area municipality shall ensure that: c) the owner has satisfied all the requirements of the Regional Municipality of Durham with respect to the provision of sewer and water services, Regional roads, and entered into any necessary agreements in this regard	TBG	See revised FSR. Adequate Sanitary Capacity is available.
	OPA 38		
	The subject lands are located within the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Plan Area and are subject to City initiated Official Plan Amendment (OPA) No. 38.	TBG	Noted.
	OPA No. 38 is intended to implement the vision and intensification plan for the Kingston Road Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node by introducing new policies and changing existing policies within the Pickering Official Plan to guide development. The policies will, if approved, promote land uses and built form that are transit-oriented, environmentally friendly and supportive of mixed use development and walkability	TBG	Noted.

	OPA No. 38 also specifies that required infrastructure improvements and transportation connections throughout the area will be identified in support of anticipated population and employment growth. The Region's comments on OPA No. 38 are currently being considered by the City.	TBG	Noted.
	The subject site is adjacent to Brock Road, a Type 'A' Arterial Road and a High Frequency Transit Network, and Kingston Road, a Type 'B' Arterial Road and Rapid Transit Spine, designated on Schedule 'C' – Map 'C3' in the ROP. Development adjacent to Rapid Transit Spines and High Frequency Transit Networks shall provide for complementary higher density and mixed uses at an appropriate scale and context in accordance with the policies relevant to the underlying ROP designation, and shall provide for buildings oriented towards the street, to reduce walking distances to transit facilities	TBG	Noted.
	The proposed mixed use development generally conforms with the ROP. The development will ultimately facilitate a mix of commercial and residential land uses with a variety of densities and heights in a gateway location at the northwest intersection of Kingston Road and Brock Road where high-density mixed uses and larger/taller buildings are encouraged. The ROP encourages the re-use, revitalization, redevelopment and rehabilitation of Urban Areas, based on local needs and priorities. The full development of the site is subject to the availability of sanitary servicing capacity	TBG	Noted. See revised FSR. Adequate Sanitary Capacity is available.
A Place to Grow (Growth Plan)			
	The Growth Plan requires that a minimum of 50 percent of all residential development occurring annually in the Region be within "Built-up Areas." The Growth Plan also requires all intensification areas to support vibrant neighbourhoods, by providing a diverse and compatible mix of land uses, including residential and employment uses and convenient access to local stores, services and public service facilities.	TBG	Noted.
	Infrastructure investment and other implementation tools and mechanisms will be used to facilitate intensification in Strategic Growth Areas, including the Kingston Road Regional Corridor and Specialty Retailing Node Intensification Plan Area. Planning for new or expanded infrastructure is to occur in an integrated manner, including evaluations of long-range scenario based land use planning, environmental planning and financial planning	TBG	Noted.
	The applications conform with the intent of the Growth Plan, subject to the availability of sanitary servicing capacity to enable the full development of the site.	TBG	Noted. See revised FSR. Adequate Sanitary Capacity is available.
Provincially Delegated Review Responsibilities			
	These applications have been screened in accordance with the terms of the Region's provincial plan review responsibilities.	TBG	Noted.
Noise Analysis:			
	The subject lands are adjacent to Brock Road, which is identified as a Type 'A' Arterial Road in the ROP and Kingston Road, which is identified as a Type 'B' Arterial Road. Commercial, residential and institutional uses surround the subject site.	RWDI	Noted.
	A Noise and Vibration Impact Study was prepared by RWDI, dated November 24, 2020. The report analyzed transportation and stationary noise sources. No vibration analysis was conducted. It is suggested that the report title be revised to reflect the analysis i.e. delete the reference to "vibration".	RWDI	Noted, "vibration" has been deleted from all.
	RWDI did not use traffic forecasts prepared by the Regional Planning Division for noise analysis purposes on Brock Road, Kingston Road or Finch Avenue, but used current traffic data that is collected by the Regional Works Department and "grew" it by 2% per year to 2030. However, the volumes they calculated are reasonable and are very close to what we have in our forecasts for Brock Road and Kingston Road. Finch Avenue figures are low but acceptable. If Regional Planning's volume forecasts were used, it is unlikely that they will make a significant change to the noise levels calculated in the study.	RWDI	Noted.

	RWDI applied incorrect speed limits for Kingston Road, which should be 60 km/h (they used 50 km/h), and for Finch Avenue (west side of Brock Road), which should be 60 km/h (they used 40 km/h, which is correct for Finch Avenue east of Brock Road). Since both errors are lower than what is posted, and the difference on Finch Avenue is a difference of 20 km/h, this raises some concern.	RWDI	The speed limits have been corrected in the revised study that has been provided.
	The percentages of trucks do not apply a heavy/medium split. However, the consultant used Cadna/A software, not Stamson. As such, we are unsure if that software requires heavy/medium split or just the overall truck percentage. Overall, the truck percentages are reasonable for Brock Road, but are low for Kingston Road and Finch Avenue (west of Brock Road).	RWDI	See the revised study that has been provided.
	The MTO data for Highway 401 is acceptable. We accept forecasts from MTO's modelling group (the Systems Analysis and Forecasting Office) or traffic group for current AADTs, with the latter having growth applied as was done for this study. The consultant's consideration for Highway 401 transportation noise sources makes the calculations more robust (even though it is about 950 m+ away).	RWDI	Noted.
Given the above comments, we recommend the following:			
	1) Request an Addendum letter to confirm whether the corrections to the speed limits to Kingston Road and Finch Avenue (west of Brock Road) still render the same results/recommendations for noise attenuation.	RWDI	See updated report and addendum letters.
	2) For future noise impact studies, please request forecasted traffic data from the Region's Planning Division. The data can be requested through and online form from the Region's website using the following link: https://forms.durham.ca/Noise-Analysis-Data-Request	RWDI	Acknowledged, future noise impact studies will request traffic data from the Region's Planning Division.
	3) There are no outputs provided in the study. Contour outputs for Cadna/A can be created for OLA and building facades and should be included in the addendum letter.	RWDI	See updated report and addendum letters.
	The Region requires detailed noise report(s) to be included with future Draft Plans of Condominium and Site Plan Applications, and these reports will need to be updated to include a detailed analysis and recommendations for each building.	RWDI	Noted and acknowledged.
Soil and Groundwater Assessment			
	The subject site is currently occupied by commercial uses. A Phase One Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by BAE Environmental, dated December 16, 2019, was submitted in support of the applications. The report identified some potential environmental concerns at the southwest portion of the site related to the remediation of a former gas station and recommended that a Phase Two ESA be prepared	TBG	Noted.
	A Phase Two ESA, prepared by BAE Environmental, dated January 17, 2020 was submitted in support of the applications. Results from the groundwater and soil analysis indicated that the samples met the Table 3: Generic Site Condition Standards for Use in a Non-Potable Groundwater Condition (July 2011) Residential.	TBG	Noted.
	In accordance with Ontario Regulation 153/04, as amended and the Region of Durham's Soil and Groundwater Contamination Protocol, the applicant shall submit a Record of Site Condition (RSC) to the MECP because the proposed development is introducing more sensitive land uses. The Region will require a copy of the RSC and supporting documentation, including the Ministry's acknowledgement letter and any audit and review correspondence including orders, Certificate of Property Use (CPU) issued by the MECP. The required RSC can be included as a condition of the future Draft Plan of Condominium and/or further processing of the Site Plan application.	TBG	Noted.
	There are no other matters of Provincial Plan review interest applicable at this time.	TBG	Noted.
Regional Servicing and Transportation			
	These applications were also reviewed from a Regional servicing and transportation perspective. Capacity availability to provide service for this site may change over time, as there are other active applications in the Kingston Road Corridor as well as other future projects anticipated that are early in the planning stage.		Noted.

	Regional Municipal Servicing		
	The development proposal is for 860 residential apartment units and 1,430 m2 of ground floor commercial uses in 2 towers (34 and 31 storeys in height).		Note changes to Statistics per revised Architectural materials.
	Without knowing the unit breakdown (number of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units) we are unable to determine the population for this development proposal and determine if there is adequate capacity available in the existing sanitary sewer system. If we were to use the Region's design criteria, the theoretical population would be approximately 1743 people. Based on this population the design flow would be 29 litres per second. Future development applications shall include a detailed unit breakdown for our review.	Valdor/CMV	Our updated FSR indicates the number and type of units and confirms that there is sufficient capacity in the downstream sanitary sewer.
	As Pickering intensifies, it is estimated that the sewage flows will exceed the conveyance capacity of the existing trunk sanitary sewer systems. Prior to the trunk sanitary sewer capacity being exceeded, the Region's conceptual plans call for two sanitary sewer pumping stations to be constructed that will convey flows to new connection points to the York-Durham Primary Trunk Sanitary Sewer.	Valdor	Noted.
	These two sanitary sewer pumping stations are outlined within the current Region's Capital Budget and 9-year forecast; however, they will be subject to further study as part of a Class Environmental Assessment. Timing for these two future projects and potential impacts on the timing for each individual intensification project along the Kingston Road Corridor and City Centre area will need to be monitored by the Region on a site by site and building by building basis.	Valdor	Noted.
	In general, there is some capacity available along the Finch Ave. / Notion Road sanitary sewer system. There are also many other active applications in the Kingston Road Corridor and there are future projects anticipated that are early in the planning stage.	Valdor	Noted.
	Replacing the 200 mm sanitary sewer on Brock Road, north to Finch Avenue will provide a suitable outlet for part of, and potentially all of this development. As plans for intensification along Brock Road, south of Kingston Road to Pickering Parkway take form, we anticipate that it will be possible to divert flow from this site at 1970 Brock Road to the south so that other lands in the vicinity of Finch Ave. and Brock Road can utilize the capacity available within the Finch Ave. / Notion Road sanitary sewer.	Valdor	The number of proposed units at the subject site has been revised from 860 to 650. Based on the reduction in the number of units proposed for the subject site, the modelling included in our updated FSR indicates that the existing 200mm diameter sanitary sewer on Brock Road has sufficient capacity so it does not have to be upgraded to a 300mm diameter sewer.
	Sanitary capacity is assigned upon execution of a development agreement with the Region of Durham.	Valdor	Noted.
	The subject property is located within the Zone 1 of Water Pressure District of the water supply system for Pickering. The estimated static water pressure for this subject property is approximately between 583 kPa (84 psi) to 593 kPa (86 psi).	Valdor	Noted.
	Records indicate the above existing commercial plaza block is currently serviced with a 100 mm domestic supply, a 150 mm fire line, and a 200 mm sanitary service connection off Brock Road.	Valdor	Noted.
	The proposed development has frontage along Brock Road and Kingston Road. Should new or larger water and sanitary services are required, water servicing is available to service the proposed development from the existing 300 mm PVC watermain along south side of Kingston Road or utilize the existing 150 mm PVC watermain stub off the existing 600 mm CPP feedermain along Brock Road. Any connection off the existing 600 mm CPP feedermain is not permitted. A new sanitary servicing connection can be available to the proposed development from the existing 200 mm PVC sanitary sewer on Brock Road.	Valdor	Noted.
	FSR- Valdor Engineering Inc. (November 2020)		
	The following comments are provided on the FSR with respect to the sanitary sewer and water supply systems:		
	2.2 Watermains & Service Connection		
Fig 2	Confirm and revise to the correct existing water service connections configuration.	Valdor	The existing water service connections are obtained from the Plan and Profile drawings requested from the Region.
	Provide the length of the proposed domestic water service (and fireline) connection from the property line (0.15 m) to the proposed building separately.	Valdor	Noted. See revised Figure 2

	Show the internal water service connection configuration how each building is serviced.	Valdor	The site servicing design indicates the water servicing up to the face of the underground parking garage as per standard practice. The individual buildings will be serviced by water lines within the parking garage which will be designed by the mechanical engineer at the Building Permit Stage.
3.2 Fig 3	Show the internal sanitary service connection configuration how each building is serviced.	Valdor	The site servicing design indicates the sanitary servicing up to the face of the underground parking garage as per standard practice. The individual buildings will be serviced by sanitary drains within the parking garage which will be designed by the mechanical engineer at the Building Permit Stage.
3.3	Replacing existing 200 mm sanitary sewer to a 300 mm sanitary sewer from Ex. MH. 30 to Ex. MH. 38 is required.	Valdor	The number of proposed units at the subject site has been revised from 860 to 650. Based on the reduction in the number of units proposed for the subject site, our modelling indicates that the existing 200mm diameter sanitary sewer on Brock Road has sufficient capacity so it does not have to be upgraded to a 300mm diameter sewer.
	Including the future intensification (population) design flow with the proposed development in the projected sanitary design sheet, there are number of downstream area with surcharge and capacity concern. Replacement or upgrading of pipes may be required along Finch Avenue and Orchard Road sanitary sewer easement. Refer to Notion Rd. Sanitary Drainage Analysis – Surcharge Area map.	Valdor	See response above
	The applicant should redetermine the hydraulic grade line and conduct downstream analysis based on the post-development conditions including the future intensification design flow as noted above. Provide new figures to indicate the level of surcharging for our review and comment.	Valdor	See response above. The PCSWMM profile and hydraulic grade line summary table are included in Appendix "C" of the revised report.
	Section 9 Summary Storm Drainage: It is noted that the major system will be comprised of an overland flow route that will convey runoff from rainfall events in excess of the capacity of the municipal storm sewer to a safe outlet.	Valdor	Noted
	Figure 5: Storm Servicing Plan The Plan shows an Emergency Overflow Grate in the northeast corner of the site. The location of this outlet is in close proximity to Brock Road. Will there be an impact to Brock Road in the event of the emergency overflow grate flooding? Is this drainage flowing directly to Brock Road? What depth/area of flooding would impact Brock Road? We require the applicant to address this concern	Valdor	As per standard practice the stormwater detention tank in the underground parking garage will have an emergency overflow grate in the event that the outlet becomes blocked or there is a rainfall event greater than the 100 year storm. Similar to an overland flow route, this drainage will be directed to the adjacent road as per standard practice.
	Draft 40R-plan We agree with the right of way dedication shown on Brock Road of 1.21 m and the sight triangle adjustment. The right of way dedications shall be provided free and clear of any encumbrances.		Noted
Waste Management:			
	Future development applications shall include a waste management plan. Requirements to receive municipal waste collection service on private roadways can be found in Schedule "P" of the Regional Waste Bylaw 46-2011.	CMV	Noted. To be provided at Site Plan. Truck turning diagrams have been provided at this time.
	If the development does not meet the Region's Guidelines and Standards for waste collection on private property, then the applicant will be responsible for retaining private waste collection services.	CMV	Noted.
Durham Region Transit and Active Transportation			
	These applications were reviewed from a transit and active transportation perspective.	TBG	Noted.
	The proposed site is located along the Kingston Road Corridor, designated as a Transit Spine and Brock Road corridor, a designated High Frequency Transit Network within the Region of Durham's Regional Official Plan (Schedule 'C' – Map 'C3' – Transit Priority Network).	TBG	Noted.
	Durham Region Transit (DRT) has reviewed the applications have no comments at this time.	TBG	Noted.
	The Durham-Scarborough Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study preliminary design business case, led by Metrolinx, is nearing completion and will be followed by the formal Transit Project Assessment Process EA later this year. The study recommends the conversion of the existing curbside BRT	TBG	Noted.
	As part of the Durham-Scarborough BRT study, please note that a one-way westbound cycle track along Kingston Road is proposed in the boulevard in front of the subject site, between the sidewalk and roadway. The elimination of the existing right-in only access will support cyclists	TBG	Noted, the existing RI/RO entrance to Kingston Road is not included in the current site plan, however, the existing full-moves shared access to Kingston at the western limit of the site will be maintained.

Traffic Impact Study:			
	The Region's Transportation Infrastructure and Traffic Engineering and Operations have reviewed the Traffic Impact Study for Brock and Kingston Holdings Inc. 1970 Brock Road prepared by TMIG, dated November 2020 and provide the following comments.		
1	Figure 1-2 Concept Plan - It has been noted in the report that the proposed right in/right out on Brock Rd is to be at the north limit of the site. The exact location of the restricted access on Brock Road should be clearly shown on the concept plan.	TMIG	Noted. The site plan and Figure 1-2 have been updated accordingly.
2	Section 2.4 – Baseline Traffic Data – It is noted that references to the turning movement count data was provided by the City of Oshawa, please verify that the Region of Durham provided the data.	TMIG	Noted. Section 2.4 has been revised; the Region of Durham provided the data.
3	Section 3.2 – Planned Study Area Network – As noted in the report the intersection of Kingston Road/Guild Road was analyzed as a non-signalized intersection as per Regional comments. For future reference, the intersection of Brock Road/Guild Road will be signalized as part of the planned BRT work on Kingston Road, and should be analyzed accordingly in future scenarios. Construction of the median BRT is now planned to start in 2022.	TMIG	As the construction of the median BRT along Kingston Road is now planned to start in 2022, all future background and future total analysis for the 2030 horizon year has assumed completion of the BRT. The intersection of Kingston Road and Guild Road was analyzed as a full-moves, signalized intersection under 2030 future background and future total conditions.
4	Section 4.0 Site Generated Traffic – Given the site's location on a planned rapid transit corridor, a trip generation reduction could have been applied to account for an increased non-auto mode share. Internal capture should have been considered between the residential and retail/office space uses according to the procedures in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook. Not applying these reduction results in a conservative estimate of the vehicular trip generation of the proposed development, i.e. a potential over-estimation of vehicle trips.	TMIG	Noted. Site Trip Generation was reviewed and the Region's suggested reductions have been applied. Table 4-1 provided in Section 4.1 summarizes the updates to the trip generation, which includes internal capture between the residential and retail spaces on-site in addition to a transit reduction of 30% to account for the site's proximity to the Kingston Road rapid transit corridor. The 30% mode split reduction was derived from Exhibit 5.6 of the "2018 Durham-Scarborough Bus Rapid Transit Study – Initial base Case Report", which identifies a Centre Median Transit mode split in Downtown Pickering of 33% by 2041 compared to a base case transit mode split of 19%. The 33% was rounded down to 30% for a measure of conservatism.
5	Section 5 Impact Analysis –	TMIG	
5a.	Please provide mitigating measures for the northbound left turn movement at Brock Rd/Kingston Rd, as the LOS is a C with the Future Background traffic but E once site traffic is included.	TMIG	Upon application of a PHF of 0.92, as per comment 5.b, the operation of the northbound left movement at Brock Road and Kingston Road deteriorates further under all traffic conditions. Of note, the northbound left movement experiences LOS F under both future background and future total conditions during the a.m. peak hour. It is recommended that the intersection be monitored after the implementation of the BRT and associated traffic control changes are in place.
5b.	PHF of .92 should be used for all scenarios for comparison. Any deviation from this value should be noted and justified in the body of the report.	TMIG	Compared to the first submission of the report, a PHF of 0.92 was used at all intersections under existing, future background, and future total conditions with the exception select movements at the intersection of Brock Road and Kingston Road. As noted in Section 5.2 of the updated report, select movements are operating with volume to capacity (v/c) ratios above 1.0, which is theoretically impossible. Accordingly, calibration measures were undertaken for those movements at the intersection of Brock Road and Kingston Road to bring the v/c ratio to 1.0 or less under existing conditions. During the a.m. peak hour, the PHF of the westbound left movement was increased to 0.94. During the p.m. peak hour, the eastbound through and westbound left movements were adjusted to have PHFs of 1.0 and saturated flow rates of 1950 to achieve a v/c ratio of 1.0 or less). The calibrations applied to these movements were carried forward into the future background and future total conditions.
5c.	The "Intersections (lanes, volumes & timings)" Synchro reports should be provided for review. The information provided in the report does not allow for the confirmation of appropriate modelling used for the signalized intersections, e.g. phasing, control mode, cycle length, etc. It is recommended that the Synchro reports be provided to the Region before the final submission so that the modelling can be reviewed, and any necessary changes addressed before the final submission.	TMIG	The Synchro reports appended to the revised report have been updated to include the "Intersections (lanes, volumes & timings)" information in addition to the HCM capacity reports.
6	Section 6.2 Corner Clearance - Due to the Region's concerns with the location of the right in/right out access on Brock Road, it would be prudent to secure a cross-access easement to the west when the future lands develop. Any measures to direct trips away from this access in close proximity to Kingston Road should be explored moving forward.	TMIG	Noted.

7	Section 8 Travel Demand Management - It is appreciated that the TDM section provides ample communication and information. It is requested that specific actions and responsible parties be confirmed. Additional measures should be considered, including potential reduction in parking supply, "unbundling" parking spaces from residential unit sales, and a robust ride share program.	TMIG	Additional TDM measures have been identified including the unbundling of parking spaces. A ride share program and any other additional TDM measure is to be considered by the Owner and provided subject to their discretion if there is sufficient demand based on monitoring.
8	Section 8.1.1 Active Transportation Network – In describing the active transportation network, as it is a key opportunity for TDM serving the subject site, further discussion on the planned directional cycle tracks along Kingston Road, as part of the Durham-Scarborough BRT project should be provided. Additionally, the Pickering ITMP identifies other nearby cycling connections beyond what is in the Regional Cycling Plan that could be described in this section. The site should provide cycling connections to the surrounding Regional and municipal cycling facilities. Secure indoor and outdoor bicycle parking and a potential repair station should also be provided.	TMIG	The planned cycle tracks are described in Section 8.1.1 of the revised report in the second submission. Cycling connections to the surrounding active transportation network are provided through the site sidewalk and driveway connections.
9	Section 8.2 Proposed TDM Measures – Pre-construction marketing material, a commuter options brochure, or communications strategy are TDM measures that are not directly conducted by City of Pickering or Durham Region staff. With respect to information distribution, at the request of the developer, Regional or City staff would be willing to provide information (e.g., transit route maps or schedules, brochures on cycling safety, etc.) and links to information (e.g., Triplinx, DRT online schedules) that the developer could disseminate to future residents. Also, the provision of pre-loaded PRESTO cards is not offered by the Region or City of Pickering, but it would be a great incentive if the developer did so.	TMIG	Noted. The wording of Section 8.2 has been updated to better reflect the resources and level of involvement City of Pickering and Durham Region Staff can offer to assist with the proposed measures.
10	Section 8.3 – Commuter surveys are not part of the Region's or the City's TDM scope of work at this time but would be supported if conducted by the developer or property management company to monitor baseline and follow-up commuter patterns.	TMIG	Noted. Commuter surveys would be based on residents and conducted on a volunteer basis subject to the Owner's discretion.
TIS	We will require submission of an addendum or revised TIS to address the above comments.	TMIG	Noted. A revised TIS and Response to Comments letter have been completed.
Conclusion			
	The proposed applications conform to the Regional Official Plan and we have no objection to the proposed amendments to the City of Pickering Official Plan and Zoning By-law subject to the inclusion of an appropriate Holding (H) Symbol on the subject site to demonstrate through a future site servicing agreement that there is sufficient sanitary servicing capacity to enable the full development of the site as proposed by the Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment to the satisfaction of the Region. Subject to the inclusion of the appropriate Holding (H) provisions, we have no objection to the proposed amendments to the City of Pickering Zoning By-law.	TBG	See revised FSR. Subject to Regional engineering review and confirmation of the conclusions TBG does not believe an "H" is required.
	The Region also formally requests that it be circulated any future Condominium and/or Site Plan applications for the subject site. Regional noise study requirements, matters associated with potential site contamination and transportation matters will need to be reviewed and addressed prior to the approval of future Site Plan and/or draft plan of condominium applications and the subsequent issuance of any building permits.	TBG	Noted.
Exemption Status			
	The application to amend the City of Pickering Official Plan was reviewed and is considered to have no significant Regional or Provincial concerns. In accordance with Regional By-law 11-2000, this application is exempt from Regional approval. Please advise the Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development of your Council's decision. If Council adopts an Amendment, please forward a record to this Department within 15 days of the date of adoption. This should include the following:		Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) copies of the adopted amendment; • A copy of the adopting by-law; and • A copy of the staff report and any relevant materials. 		Noted.
	If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Valerie Hendry, Project Planner, or myself (Gary Muller) at this Department.		Noted.