

Table of Contents

Commenting Agency / Dept	Comment Date
Zoning	April 2, 2025
TRCA	March 19, 2025
Fire	March 7, 2025
Enbridge	February 19, 2025
CN	February 14, 2025
Planning	May 22, 2025
Engineering	May 7, 2025
Durham District School Board	April 16, 2025
Elexicon	March 10, 2025
Metrolinx	May 13, 2025
Sustainability Services	May 9, 2025
Region of Durham	June 4, 2025

#	Comments	Response By	Response
Zoning – Paula Viola			
	<u>Zoning Schedules</u>		
1	Please confirm the intent of Schedule II. There is no reference back in the wording of the Draft ZBLA to understand why it is needed.	ZPL	This was provided as a matter of consistent formatting as the schedule is present in other recent ZBA approvals. We do not object if Staff prefer to remove this schedule in the final version.
	<u>Tower Floor Plate:</u>		
2	The Draft ZBLA proposes: 8. viii) Maximum tower floor plate for a residential building: 850 square metres. Block 1 complies with the maximum. It is acknowledged that detailed drawings for Blocks 2-7 will be provided at SPA stage, however, please note that the site stats do not break down the various towers' floor plates within each Phase/Block. There is one cumulative floor area provided. Floor 8 would also need to be included as part of this Tower Floor Plate count. Zoning compliance cannot be confirmed for Blocks 2-7.	ZPL	As noted, block 1 complies and future blocks will be detailed at the time of future detailed design.
	<u>Parking:</u>		
3	The residential parking rate for Block 1 residential units has been met.	TFAI	Noted.
4	The visitor parking count requirement is: 101 spaces (0.15 spaces/unit @ 678 units, where 91 have been provided in the underground parking garage.	TFAI	Included in the draft zoning by-law are provisions that includes share parking formulas, parking reduction for car-share spaces, and off-site parking provisions. These matters are in an effort to manage transportation demand. Parking to be met as drafted in the zoning by-law amendment.
5	There are 3 additional spaces provided at grade. Please identify what their purpose is for—shared parking, retail users or visitors.	TFAI	To be confirmed through detailed design. As noted on the site statistics, these parking spaces are currently assigned to retail, and would facilitate short term trips.
6	The required number of commercial spaces for retail use is 58 spaces (1664m ² /100m ² x 3.5=58.4 spaces). The underground parking layout shows 55 retail spaces. If the 3 at grade parking spaces are to be for retail purposes, the 58 spaces would be met. Please ensure the retail portion is in GLFA.	TFAI	Noted.

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
7	If using the shared parking formulae, the overall parking requirement for Block 1 is 696 (542 + 154)	TFAI	Noted.	
8	A detailed review of the parking requirements for Blocks 2-7 will be completed when detailed plans are provided as part of SPA process. It appears the residential and visitor rates are being met, as per the site stats table.	TFAI	Noted.	
9	The loading spaces on Block 1 identify a clearance height of 4 metres, where the Draft ZBLA requires 4.2 metres for at least one loading space.	TFAI	Plans revised to depict leading space with min clearance of 4.2m.	
	<u>POPS:</u>			
10	Within Block 7, a portion of the proposed POPS would be located outside of the Block, and may be impacted by the future street A bulb. The calculated area within Block 7 would be 542m ² , where 750m ² is shown on draft Schedule VI.	ZPL	The road placement, phasing lines, building footprints etc, for phase 7 are all conceptual. Thus, the POPS will be refined as part of future detailed design. Note that public park revised so that size is substantially increased. POPS generally not required to satisfy parkland dedication.	
	<u>General text comments:</u>			
11	Item 12 xiv), within Table 1, states: Phases 5 and 7, as conceptually depicted on Schedule V of this By-law are not subject to maximum podium height requirements (Section (2).6) or maximum floor plate requirements (Section (2).9)." The reference should be to 8, rather than 9.	ZPL	The correction is noted and updated.	
12	It is recommended that a set of Live Work Unit provisions be included in the Draft ZBLA to scope the uses permitted within the ground floor and identify parking requirement for both the residential portion of the live work unit and the commercial. Further, as part of a future submission for Block 2, please ensure the live work units are identified on the plans and their floor area is consistent with the site stats. For reference, Zoning By-law 8149/24 contains Live Work Unit provisions, as well as parking requirements and a definition.	ZPL	Noted, live work unit provisions are provided for in revised draft ZBA.	

TRCA – Megan Cranfield

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
13	TRCA previously provided conditional support for the approval of these applications in our submission 2 comment letter, prepared by Stephanie Dore, dated May 30, 2024 (copy attached). Based on our review of the updated Comment Response Chart, dated February 6, 2025, we understand the submission 3 revisions were to address outstanding comments from other agencies, and TRCA's conditions will be addressed during the detailed design phase. However, per TRCA Comment #1, please advise the Applicant that our requirement for all development to be set back 10-meters from the regulatory floodplain elevation of 85 meters above sea level (masl) still applies. Though there has been new development northeast of the site, the development was designed such that offsite storage and conveyance of flood waters would not be impacted. As such, the floodplain is still present along Pickering Parkway north of the site and a portion of 1856 Notion Road, adjacent to Block 7. In summary, all comments and conditions outlined in TRCA's submission 2 comment letter still apply.	ZPL	Noted. No further action required.	
<u>Fire – Robert Watson</u>				
14	They have addressed our concerns for phase 1, however we will require further review for future phases. As per their comments in the responses they have not addressed our Siamese concerns and hydrants except for phase 1.	ZPL	Noted. We understand no further action is required. Future phases will be reviewed at the time of detailed design for those phases.	
<u>Enbridge – Willie Cornelio</u>				
15	Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.	ZPL	Noted.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response
<u>CN – Alexandre Thibault</u>			
16	Since the noise report has not been revised for the proposed application. Please find attached CN peer review comments regarding the noise study prepared by HGC Engineering, dated March 4, 2024. It is noted that the subject site is within 300 meters of CN's Main Line. CN has concerns of developing/densifying residential uses in proximity to railway operations. Development of sensitive uses in proximity to railway operations cultivates an environment in which land use incompatibility issues are exacerbated. The Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations reinforce the safety and well-being of any existing and future occupants of the area. Please refer to these guidelines for the development of sensitive uses in proximity to railway operations. These policies have been developed by the Railway Association of Canada and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. CN encourages the municipality to pursue the implementation of the following criteria as conditions of an eventual project approval:	ZPL	We note that applicant did not receive the CN peer review dated March 10, 2024 until comments provided in May 2025. Note that comments from CN do not note concern with the specific findings of the noise report. Comments can be addressed through detailed design.
17	The following clause should be inserted in all development agreements, offers to purchase, and agreements of Purchase and Sale or Lease of each dwelling unit within 300m of the railway right-of-way: <i>"Warning: Canadian National Railway Company or its assigns or successors in interest has or have a right-of-way within 300 metres from the land the subject hereof. There may be alterations to or expansions of the railway facilities on such rights-of-way in the future including the possibility that the railway or its assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand its operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity,</i>	ZPL	Noted.

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	<i>notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwelling(s). CNR will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under the aforesaid rights-of-way."</i>			
18	The Owner shall through restrictive covenants to be registered on title and all agreements of purchase and sale or lease provide notice to the public that the noise and vibration isolation measures implemented are not to be tampered with or altered and further that the Owner shall have sole responsibility for and shall maintain these measures to the satisfaction of CN.	ZPL	Noted.	
19	The Owner shall enter into an Agreement with CN stipulating how CN's concerns will be resolved and will pay CN's reasonable costs in preparing and negotiating the agreement.	ZPL	Noted.	
20	The Owner shall be required to grant CN an environmental easement for operational noise and vibration emissions, registered against the subject property in favour of CN.	ZPL	Noted.	
21	We ask for the attached Development Project Review Form to be completed by the proponent, allowing CN counsel to proceed with drafting a CN development agreement and environmental easement for the development in subject. CN will provide you with a CN clearance of conditions memo, once the CN development agreement and environmental easement are executed and registered on title.	ZPL	Project Review Form provided as part of resubmission.	
<u>CN Peer Review – Jade Acoustics</u>				
22	As requested, Jade Acoustics Inc. has reviewed the <i>Traffic and Land Use Compatibility Study (Noise)</i> dated March 4, 2024, prepared by HGC Engineering on behalf of Pickering Ridge Lands Inc.	HGC	Noted.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	This letter is a second peer review letter. The first peer review letter dated March 14, 2023 included our comments regarding the Noise Feasibility Study dated March 22, 2022, prepared by HGC Engineering for the west area (Phase 1) of the subject lands. The March 4, 2024 study addresses the entire residential development proposed to replace the existing commercial buildings. The proposed development is located at 1755 Pickering Parkway in the City of Pickering, on the east side of Brock Road, north of Highway 401. The CN Kingston Subdivision and Metrolinx/GO Transit Subdivision railway corridors are positioned south of Highway 401. The development consists of seven blocks with podiums and 12 towers ranging from 20 storeys to 43 storeys in height. We have reviewed the study with respect to noise issues related to rail traffic and CN. Other sources of noise have not been evaluated as part of this peer review. The CN, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) and Railway Association of Canada (RAC) "Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations" (RAC/FCM guidelines) and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MOE) guidelines have been used in this review. No original analyses have been conducted. CN should be consulted directly regarding any requirements unrelated to and in addition to the noise and vibration review/comments. We find that the report has generally been prepared in accordance with the applicable guidelines.			

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
23	Section 3.3.1 of the study indicates that as the location of outdoor amenity areas have not yet been confirmed, sound barrier requirements are not evaluated and included in the study. However, the site plan in Appendix A shows several outdoor amenity areas. The sound barrier requirements should be assessed based on the information provided on the site plan.	ZPL	The Planning Act approval at hand is for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment. Any specific site elements included in demonstration plans including outdoor amenity areas are in no way final and are subject to change through future approvals, such as Site Plan Approval.	
24	The acoustic performance requirements for windows and exterior doors are significant. An up to STC 47 glazing construction is recommended. Every effort should be undertaken to reduce the STC requirements by reducing the size of windows and exterior doors as windows having an STC 47 rating may not be readily available and exterior doors with this rating may not exist. Based on the study, it seems that exterior walls were not included in the assessment of the architectural component requirements with the explanation that the exterior walls are to be minimum 5 to 10 points better than the windows and exterior doors. Since the window/exterior door STC requirements are approaching the range of acoustic performance applicable to exterior walls, the exterior wall construction should be included in the determination of the architectural elements needed to meet the guidelines.	ZPL	Further comment from CN specifies that "...we can conclude that the proposed development is feasible and can be designed to meet the CN, RAC/FCM and MOE guidelines". The noted comment should be addressed through detailed design.	
25	Figure 1 (Key Plan) shows the west area of the subject lands similar to Figure 1 included in the March 22, 2022 study mentioned above. Figure 1 should be updated to show the proposed residential development addressed in the March 4, 2024 study.	ZPL	Further comment from CN specifies that "...we can conclude that the proposed development is feasible and can be designed to meet the CN, RAC/FCM and MOE guidelines". The noted comment should be addressed through detailed design.	
26	The CN letter included in Appendix D is almost three years old with respect to the date of the study. We acknowledge that the rail volumes have been projected to 2034 using a yearly increase of 2.5% over a time period of 13 years instead of using a typical time period of 10 years; however,	ZPL	This letter was dated a year after the original applications were submitted to the City. We have no control over the approval timelines with the City and suggest that it is not practical or reasonable to update studies because of the passage of time associated with municipal review times. We note that the redevelopment of the phase 1 lands will be subject to site plan approval. Accordingly, it would be	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	this approach is not generally acceptable. CN should be contacted to confirm the rail traffic data.		appropriate that if studies are required to be updated, they be done as part of future detailed design to capture most current rail volume data. Further comment from CN specifies that "...we can conclude that the proposed development is feasible and can be designed to meet the CN, RAC/FCM and MOE guidelines". The noted comment should be addressed through detailed design.	
27	An explanation should be provided regarding the angles of exposure used in the STAMSON calculation included in Appendix E. For the GO trains, a full angle of exposure from -90 deg. to +90 deg. has been used. An angle of exposure from -90 deg. to +45 deg. has been used for the freight/way freight/passenger trains. Due to the position of two rail corridors, these angles are expected to be equal.	ZPL	Further comment from CN specifies that "...we can conclude that the proposed development is feasible and can be designed to meet the CN, RAC/FCM and MOE guidelines". The noted comment should be addressed through detailed design	
28	Based on our review of the traffic and land use compatibility study (noise), we can conclude that the proposed development is feasible and can be designed to meet the CN, RAC/FCM and MOE guidelines.	HGC	Noted.	
29	As the proposed development is more than 75 m from the two rail corridors, a vibration assessment nor vibration mitigation measures are required.	HGC	Noted.	
30	These peer review comments should be incorporated into an updated noise study and submitted to CN for review. The recommendations and requirements included in the noise study will be included in the CN Agreement with the proponent.	HGC	Noted.	
City Development Department – Planning – Amanda Dunn				
	General Comments			
31	It is staff's understanding that the Applicant intends to sever the first phase of development through a Consent application. The Applicant is advised that following the first phase, the Applicant may be required to submit an	ZPL	Noted.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	application for draft Plan of Subdivision and register an M-Plan prior to issuing site plan approval for subsequent phases to allow for the creation of the future development blocks, and conveyance of the public roads and parkland to the City. The Applicant is advised that this will be included as part of Holding Provision within the draft Zoning By-law.			
32	Staff have received comments from the Durham District School Board (DDSB), dated April 16, 2024, indicating that DDSB has re-evaluated the application. Based on the projected pupil yield and the broader context of development in the area, a school site will be required. Recently, staff met with the DDSB to discuss the potential for locating school sites within the podium of high density developments. The DDSB was receptive to working with the City and developers to explore solutions for integrating schools into mixed-use buildings. Staff can arrange a meeting with the DDSB to further discuss their request for a school site and how it can be incorporated into a future phase of this development. The Applicant is advised that at a minimum, staff will request that the Applicant identify a feasible phase that a school site could be accommodated within the building podium as per the school board's requirements. Staff would seek to have the Applicant enter into an option agreement with the School Board, that should at the timing of the phased development, DDSB require the need for the school and attain funding for the school site, they are able to utilize the option. Staff also note that a potential school site may form part of the holding provisions, and request that the Applicant include permissions for a school use within the draft Zoning By-law.	ZPL / Bayfield	The project team has met with the DDSB and it is understood from this meeting that DDSB does not have certainty with respect to timing or location for implementation of a school on the subject lands, or if one is to be required. The proposed draft zoning will permit a school on all phases, and all future phases will be subject to preparation of a community services and facilities study, which will assist in reviewing whether new school facilities are needed to support redevelopment.	
33	A Municipal Class EA for the new Highway 401 road crossing from Notion Road to Squires Beach Road identifies land requirements to support the road crossing. The	ZPL	As noted by the comment, the land expropriation is not related to the at-hand OPA and ZBA applications.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	Applicant is to convey (approximately 0.17 hectares) of the eastern portion of lands, free of encumbrances, to the City of Pickering for future road allowance. Please revise plans to illustrate the future conveyance. A draft reference plan will be required to be submitted to City staff for review and acceptance as part of the Draft Plan of Subdivision/Site Plan Approval process and will be secured as part of the conditions of approval. Please confirm the land/size requirements for the land conveyance with Engineering Services.		Provision has generally been made in the conceptual development plans to leave this general area free and clear of proposed development in anticipation of a future expropriation. Per Traffic comments below, it has been noted that this crossing is not planned within the next 10 years minimum.	
34	Please include legends on the plans. For example, on plan SPA151 there should be a legend on the plan which illustrates the uses proposed per indicated colour.	ZBA	Uses are labelled on plans.	
	<u>Land Use and Urban Design</u>			
35	Comment 10 from staff's previous comment letter dated August 16, 2024, has not been addressed. Although staff agree that the phasing of future development is not determined, staff do not agree that the use of office space can be determined through detailed design. Staff request a commitment to the inclusion of office space as part of the proposal, and will require a minimum amount of office space be included within the Zoning By-law. Please revise the plans and site statistics table to include office space area. Clarification is required as to what the 23-storey tower fronting Pickering Parkway labelled as "Proposed Commercial Tower" is to contain (i.e. amount of office and/or retail space).	ZPL	The tower in block 6 of the conceptual demonstration plans has been relabelled to Office as requested, symbolising the potential configuration of uses in this future phase. As represented on this conceptual plan, there is a multitude of possibilities for future phases, that could include uses such as office, residential, commercial, institutional etc., and likely a mix of several uses. The structuring of the various iterations of the Draft ZBA that has been to permit this suite of uses, with the specifics to be determined at the time of detailed design. In our opinion it is not good planning to dictate the specific GFA requirements of a particular use in a phase in the long-term future without regard for the realities of market conditions. Indeed, the recent Watson growth management study contracted by the City specifically refers to diminishing need for office space which this comment directly contradicts. We continue to be amenable to including permissions for office in future phases. It is not appropriate in our view, however, to <i>exclusively</i> require a particular use for a particular phase when timing and future use demands are unknown.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
			If demand for office grows in the future the owner will be <i>organically</i> incentivized to develop office use. This zoning requirement is unnecessarily restrictive and is not based on Official Plan policy.	
36	Staff note that as per the submitted Urban Design Brief dated January 2025, the proposed towers have been revised to include the greatest heights along the Highway 401. However, it appears that Block 7 includes a 20-storey tower that does not meet the 45-degree angular plane from adjacent townhouses. The Applicant is requested to stepback the proposed tower to ensure appropriate transition is provided from the adjacent townhouse dwelling units.	ZPL	Noted, podium of building meets angular plane. It is noted that the buildings being transitioned to are further set-back and separated from the site by a private road that surrounds the dwellings. It is understood that the intent of the angular plane is to provide transition, which is accommodated. Note further that shadowing of buildings to adjacent townhouses is limited to certain periods of the day.	
37	The Applicant has introduced 7 storey podiums, in accordance with Policy 11.A.10.1(c)(i) of the Draft Urban Design Guidelines (DUDG), the applicant is requested to revise the podiums to provide a minimum height of 3 storeys to a maximum of 6 storeys and revise the plans and draft zoning by-law accordingly.	TFAI / ZPL	The Draft ZBA has been revised to limit podium heights to 6 storeys and plans updated to reflect this.	
38	In accordance with policy 2.15.1.v. of the DUDG, buildings shall have a maximum tower floor plate of 750 square metres. The submitted plans should indicate the maximum floor plate area for the proposed towers, please revise plans accordingly. The Applicant is advised although we can provide some flexibility, the maximum floor plate staff could support is 850 square metres with appropriate justification with regards to why 750 square metre floor plates cannot be adhered to, and a minimum tower separation distance of 25 metres or greater.	TFAI / ZPL	Staff have confirmed that 850 square metres is acceptable as a maximum floor plate area in our meeting of June 25, 2025.	
39	A revised Sun/Shadow Study is to be provided. The siting and location of buildings should maximize sun exposure and strive to achieve five (5) consecutive hours of sun on public parks as measured on March 21, June 21, and	TFAI / ZPL	A revised sun/shadow study is included depicting the latest site configuration. The park location is central to the site, which maximizes exposure and access, and follows good site design principles. The park location is generally consistent with	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	September 21. Staff still have concerns with the submitted Shadow Study for March, September and December; June appears to be sufficient. Staff note that for Block 1, it appears the location of tower placements is having the most shadow impacts on the park space. The Applicant should explore the potential relocation of buildings and towers, and/or the reduction in building heights in order to reduce shadow impacts on the proposed park spaces.		the placement identified by OPA 38. In our review, the heights of buildings in Block 1 have minimal impact on shadows over the park at the identified times, and drastic reduction in building height would be needed for any meaningful benefit to sunlight, which in our submission is unnecessary. For example, in the early evening in March and September for approx. 2h the upper storeys of Phase 1 buildings cause shadowing over the public park.	
40	The submitted draft Zoning By-law includes live-work units. Please revise the draft Zoning By-law to include provisions for Live Work Units that includes permitted commercial/retail uses for the ground floor area and a parking rate for both the residential and commercial components.	ZPL	ZBA Updated to include provisions live work units.	
	<u>Affordable Housing</u>			
41	Staff require a commitment towards affordable housing or other types of housing forms (such as rental). Although it is acknowledged that this would be determined phase by phase, staff is seeking a commitment to the inclusion of a minimum amount of affordable housing units through the review of the subject Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications.	ZPL / Bayfield	We remind City Staff that there is no policy or legislative “requirement” or pre-requisite to provide affordable housing as part of the submitted applications, despite this comment which identifies this as a requirement. Inclusionary Zoning is the only tool that can ‘require’ affordable housing commitment, which is only applicable in Major Transit Station Areas or where there is a Community Planning Permit System in place. We are familiar with several other similar applications in the City of Pickering that provided little to no affordable housing commitment. Despite this not being a requirement, Bayfield provides a letter that outlines their proposed affordable housing commitment. In addition, by way of increasing the supply and mix of housing, it is anticipated that the market prices will respond accordingly.	
42	The Applicant has included the permissions of townhouse dwelling units within the draft zoning by-law and had previously advised staff that townhouse dwelling units could be incorporated within the podium construction.	ZPL	The plans are conceptual. Townhouse-style dwellings could be incorporated in any phase and as noted is proposed to be permitted in the Zoning By-law.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	Larger style family units are encouraged, please advise in which phases and podiums this type of housing form would be proposed, and the amount of units.			
43	Further to the City's policies on affordable housing, the applicant is advised that in accordance with Envision Durham's policies 3.1.16 to 3.1.24, especially policies 3.1.18, 3.1.21 and 3.1.24., the Applicant is encouraged to consider other forms of housing types. The Applicant is encouraged, where feasible, to increase the amount of these larger style family units, as well as commit to providing some rental and/or affordable housing units. Please identify per phase of the development the mix of unit sizes, accessible units, and affordability measures. In other recent developments, applicants have partnered with affordable housing providers or retained a portion of units to rent at reduced rates. Given the scale of this development, an affordable housing strategy is essential.	ZPL / Bayfield	The plans are conceptual, and future phases can continue to deliver a broad range of housing types, sizes, and tenures. The proposed draft zoning by-law is designed to allow flexibility, and the conceptual plans are not intended to 'lock in' a specific form, unit mix, etc.	
	<u>Parks, POPS and Amenity Spaces</u>			
44	The Council endorsed Parkland Dedication By-law 8142/24 states for redevelopment that is greater than five hectares in area, 15% of the land shall be conveyed as parkland. Further, the parkland By-law indicates that Privately-owned and Publicly Accessible space (POPS) are designed and secured through a public easement for public uses, such uses shall be applied as 50% credit towards the parkland requirements. Based on the Parkland Dedication By-law, 1.42 hectares of parking land is required, the proposal (inclusive of 50% credit towards proposed POPS) is proposing 1.28 hectares of parkland, the proposal is approximately 0.14 hectares short. Please revise the proposed plan to ensure compliance. Alternatively, the Applicant has advised through the comment matrix dated February 6, 2025 that any additional parkland	ZPL / Bayfield	A large public park is proposed to fulfill this requirement, totalling 14.57% of the site area (13,833 sq.m). The remaining parkland can be achieved through cash in lieu or POPS.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	requirements will be met through both POPS and cash-in-lieu. The Applicant is advised that as a result of the proposed density and built form being proposed, the requirements of the minimum parkland is to be provided through increasing the proposed public park space, or increasing the areas of the proposed POPS, in consideration of comment 15 below, versus providing cash-in-lieu.			
45	Staff note the inclusion of 7 POPS, the size of the POPS generally meet the minimum size of the City's guidelines for POPS (750 square metres in size) as outlined within the Council endorsed Strata and POPS Guideline (refer to Appendix II of Report PLN 27-24). The guidelines indicate that POPS shall: • Have a minimum of 15 metres of frontage onto an open and maintained public road; • Should front open municipal roads to the south and/or west to maximize access to sunlight; • POPS should provide a minimum of five consecutive hours of sunlight during the course of the day; • POPS shall measure a minimum of 750 square metres in size each; and • A minimum of 25% of the POPS area shall be comprised of vegetation and planted material. The applicant is required to illustrate that the other criteria have been met.	ZPL / Bayfield	Noted.	
46	The plans have illustrated a 1,031.9 square metres, POPS as part of Phase 1. However, the landscape plans provided do not illustrate how the POPS will function. POPS are meant to be spaces which are furnished, programmed and maintained by the private owner/condominium corporation for public parkland or other recreational purposes which permits public uses. Please revise the landscape plans accordingly, and refer to section 3.8 of the DUDG for further direction.	ZPL	Detailed design will be completed at site plan approval.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
47	Please revise the POPS illustrated in Phase 7, to be within the proposed private property limits.	TFAI	Note that plans are conceptual in nature.	
48	Please ensure the sizes of the proposed POPS are consistent on plans and schedules (i.e. although POPS 7 is identified as being 852 square metres, because it is partially outside of the block/phase it is approximately 542 square metres).	ZPL	Please note that the Draft ZBA will be the approval instrument, setting out minimum POPS areas per phase to be enforced at SPA. Some phases as shown on the site plan vary slightly as plans are conceptual at this stage.	
	<u>Street Network, Design, Traffic and Parking</u>			
49	Previous comment from staff have not been addressed with regards to surface parking. Surface parking shall be provided (such as lay-by parking) to accommodate patrons of the public park space and the commercial/retail tenants. There does not appear to be any surface parking shown, please incorporate some surface parking to support both grade-related retail/commercial uses and for accessibility purposes.	TFAI	Additional surface parking has been added, including lay-by parking around the public park. Per the Draft Urban Design Guidelines (S. 2.5.3), "New developments are encouraged to reduce or minimize surface parking on site". The proposed design has accordingly minimized surface parking while addressing City comments. It is important to note that the existing site has substantial surface parking available which will remain in place, being only incrementally removed as the phases progress. Surface parking will only be fully removed from site as part of phase 7, which is projected to be many decades in the future. With regard to long-term planning trends, we suggest that the City and Region will be better served by bolstering active transportation and public transit connectivity over this long-scale time period, as is identified in City and Region Official Plans.	
50	The proposed signalized intersection between the north-south public road (street B) and Pickering Parkway does not meet the Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) guidelines for spacing and results in a misalignment that creates a jog at the existing Wal-Mart plaza access. Staff require that the proposed intersections be aligned with the lands to the north, and where warranted and required signalized.	RVA	Intersections to Pickering Parkway revised per City comments.	
51	Comments from the City's Engineering Services dated May 7, 2025 indicate that all City roads should have a 20.0	RVA / ZPL	Noted. Public roads have been widened to 20 metres where lay-by parking is located. As per previous comments from MTO and City, it is undesirable to locate lay-by	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	metre right of way width, to accommodate a complete street which can also encompass lay-by parking (with a minimum width of 2.5 metres), bike lane, landscaping and sidewalk and to support healthy street trees.		parking in the area by phase 1 to prevent back-up onto Brock Road, thus the road width is narrowed to 18.5m in this section, representing the removal of this 2.5 metre-width parking, plus an extra 1.0 m of width for other boulevard features. Note that the City's Urban Design Guidelines for the Kingston Road Corridor identify ROW widths of between 17m-19m in the Brock Precinct, with the connection to Brock Road at the subject lands identified as a width between 15.5m-17.5m. The ROW width is proposed to be increased in accordance with Staff comments, despite the Urban Design Guidelines, and to accommodate layby parking.	
52	Please include all bicycle parking statistics on the submitted site plan within the site statistics table. Please include bicycle parking spaces for commercial uses at grade.	ZPL	Required bicycle parking is established by the Draft ZBA. Specifics of bike parking locations will be detailed via site plan application in accordance with these established rates. Please be reminded that the conceptual plans have been included for demonstration purposes only, and the approval document will be the OPA and ZBA.	
53	The submitted draft Zoning By-law includes commercial parking rates. Please include these rates on the statistic table on site plan. It appears some blocks have not provided the commercial parking (Block 4, Block 5 and Block 7). Please clarify and identify if a shared parking formula is proposed. The submitted TIS does indicate shared parking, but references the Town of Newmarket's Zoning By-law. Please refer to Section 5.5 Shared Parking of the City of Pickering's approved consolidated Zoning By-law 8149/24.	ZPL	Required commercial parking is established by the Draft ZBA. Specifics of commercial parking locations will be detailed via site plan application in accordance with these established rates. Please be reminded that the conceptual plans have been included for demonstration purposes only, and the approval document will be the OPA and ZBA.	
54	Please ensure the loading spaces provide a clearance of 4.2 metres as per the City's consolidated Zoning By-law and revise the plans and statistics as well as draft zoning by-law accordingly.	TFAI / ZPL	Please be reminded that the conceptual plans have been included for demonstration purposes only, and the approval document will be the OPA and ZBA.	
	<u>Wind Study</u>			
55	A submitted Wind Study dated February 1, 2024 was provided and identified that the windiest/uncomfortable conditions are situated in Block 1 during the winter and spring, and the conditions are expected to impact sections	ZPL	Noted, to be refined through detailed design.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	of the east sidewalk along Brock Road and the multi-use pathway to the north of Block 1. The windiest conditions are situated between Blocks 1 and 2, where a region of uncomfortable conditions is predicted, and impacts the roadway over the private driveway. Additionally, it was advised through the Wind Study that the setbacks from Tower 1A from the west and north podium elevations be increased to improve the wind directions. As the Applicant is intending to proceed with Block 1 first, staff recommend that the re-location or placements of the towers in Block 1 be examined to determine if it could improve the wind conditions as well as address shadow impacts as identified in comment 9. Further it was identified that Blocks 4 and 5 be examined as the safety criterion is also exceeded within these areas. One of the recommended conditions is that further wind testing as well as a Migration Strategy to improve wind comfort and resolve safety conditions be developed prior to future Site Plan submission.			
	<u>Provincial Planning Statement (2024)</u>			
56	The Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) indicates that Planning authorities should support the achievement of complete communities by accommodating an appropriate range and mix of land uses, housing options, transportation options with multimodal access, employment, public service facilities and other institutional uses (including schools and associated child care facilities) [...] recreation, parks and open spaces and other uses to meet long-term needs, and improve accessibility for people of all ages and ability and improve social equity and overall quality of life for people of all ages, abilities, incomes, including equity-deserving groups. The applicant is encouraged to provide a diverse range of housing types (accessible, various sizes and tenures). The PPS also identifies that housing shall be	ZPL	Noted.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	permitted and facilitated that allows for all types of residential intensification, including the development and redevelopment of underutilized commercial and institutional sites (e.g. shopping malls and plazas) for residential use, development and introduction of new housing options within previously developed areas, and redevelopment, which results in a net increase in residential units. The proposed development is located within an existing commercial plaza and is promoting the use of more housing.			
	<u>Potential Site Contamination</u>			
57	Comments provided from the Region of Durham dated August 27, 2024 identified that the supplementary Phase Two ESA noted that the results of the chemical analysis conducted on groundwater samples, indicated that the site condition standards for groundwater has not been met. Further, the supplementary Phase Two ESA concluded that the change in land use from commercial to residential constitutes a change to a more sensitive land use, and as such a Record of Site Condition (RSC) is required. The Applicant did not address this comment, or provide any revised material such as the submission of an RSC. The Applicant is advised that this may be required prior to Site Plan Approval, and/or a condition of draft plan approval, and may be peer reviewed at the sole cost of the Applicant. Further, the Applicant is advised that a Holding Provision (H) may be included as part of the implementing Zoning By-law for this requirement.	DSC	Noted. RSC can be provided at later date prior to site plan approval.	
	<u>Noise Study</u>			
58	As per the Region of Durham comments dated August 27, 2024, City staff agree and will require that additional noise studies be conducted for each phase of development to be submitted with the associated site plan applications.	ZPL / HGC	Noted.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	<u>Other Matters</u>			
59	Should all of the comments provided from staff contained in this letter, as well provided from internal departments and external agencies be addressed, staff will begin to prepare a draft Zoning By-law for the applicant to review, based on the submitted revised draft Zoning By-law.	ZPL	Noted.	
60	Please note that Official Plan Amendment 38 is now in force and effect for the subject lands. However, an Official Plan Amendment is still required as a result of the proposed heights, please revise the draft Official Plan Amendment accordingly.	ZPL	Noted.	
<u>Development Services – Engineering Services</u>				
	<u>General Comments</u>			
61	Comment 1 from our previous memo dated July 19, 2024 has not been addressed. This site is within the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) regulated area. Written approval from MTO must be provided to the City prior to approval. We understand that MTO is satisfied with the Land Use proposed in principle. Provide a copy of the email referenced in the response matrix for the City's records.	ZPL	This email has been included in the submission.	
62	Update the street names for all streets on all drawings and reports once available.	TFAI	Street names updated.	
	<u>Site Plan</u>			
63	All previous Development Services comments have been addressed.	TFAI	Noted.	
	<u>Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report</u>			
64	All previous Development Services comments have been addressed.	Odan	Noted.	
	<u>Water Resources Comments - Master Servicing Review</u>			

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
65	The City's preferred ultimate storm sewer alignment has been shown on the Attachment. The proponent's proposed interim storm sewer alignment, to facilitate the initial Phase(s), of the development is acceptable pending the following conditions are met: a. New storm sewers shall be constructed within the Ultimate ROW, downstream of the "Transition Point", ultimately connecting into Pickering Parkway, as shown on the attachment. b. That the temporary storm sewers, east of Building A, at the "Transition Point" be abandoned.	Odan	This is reflected.	
	<u>Capital Projects & Infrastructure - General Comments</u>			
66	All City roads should have a 20.0m right-of-way width as opposed to 17.0m and 18.5m. A 20.0m right-of-way width provides adequate room to support healthy street tree growth while accommodating pedestrian facilities on both sides, utilities, streetlighting and snow storage.	RVA / ZPL	Noted. A 20.0m ROW has been provided, per City comments, to facilitate lay-by parking. In locations where lay-by parking is not feasible, such as Block 1, an 18.5m ROW is proposed representing the subtraction of the 2.5m of lay-by parking, plus an extra 1.0m width for additional plantings. Note that the City's Urban Design Guidelines for the Kingston Road Corridor identify ROW widths of between 17m-19m in the Brock Precinct, with the connection to Brock Road at the subject lands identified as a width between 15.5m-17.5m. The ROW width is proposed to be increased in accordance with Staff comments, despite the Urban Design Guidelines, and to accommodate layby parking.	
	<u>Transportation & Traffic Comments</u>			
67	Transportation & Traffic comment 2 from our previous memo dated July 19, 2024 has not been addressed. The response does not address the concerns regarding the proposed signalized intersection between the north-south public road (Street B) and Pickering Parkway, which does not meet TAC guide spacing requirements and is not acceptable to the City. The misalignment will create a jog at the existing Walmart access, which is undesirable. Street	RVA / ZPL	Based on the revised conceptual plan for the ultimate build-out of the development, it is intended that the easterly most access (Street E in TIS) along Pickering Parkway will become the main signalized intersection and designated as a public roadway which will satisfy the spacing requirements.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	B should be aligned with the existing north access, given that there are no approved plans for development north of the site. Confirm whether the east-most northsouth road (Street E) can be designed as a public roadway with a signalized intersection at Pickering Parkway, improving intersection spacing and operational safety.			
68	Transportation & Traffic comment 10 from previous letter dated July 19, 2024 has not been addressed. The Urban Design Brief (page 37) proposes a public right-of-way (ROW B) with bike lanes on both sides, yet the response to Comment #4 states that Street B will not include bike facilities. Confirm the intended design and ensure consistency across all site plans and documentation. The City strongly recommends taking every opportunity to enhance connectivity within the future cycling network.	TFAI / RVA	Noted, street network has been updated in this submission. Multi-use trail anticipated through extent of Street A.	
	<u>Traffic Impact Study Comments:</u>			
69	The latest Site Plan (SP A006, dated 2025-01-20) does not include streets named D and E. Revise the traffic report to reflect the current site plan for consistency and ease of review.	RVA	As these street names represent roadways associated with future development phases and do not impact the development of Phase 1, they can be revised as part of future traffic study submissions.	
70	Provide drawings for each phase that illustrate the extent of public roadway construction in relation to existing commercial operations.	TFAI	Detailed design drawings will be provided through future Draft Plan of Subdivision application.	
71	With respect to Figures 2.2 & 5.1, Walmart Access 2 and Pickering Ridge Access 2 are offset. This geometric misalignment should be documented correctly under existing conditions. Update all relevant diagrams throughout the report accordingly.	RVA	While it is acknowledged that there is an offset between these driveways, given their proximity, the intersection would function as a traditional four leg intersection and was reflected as such in the January 2025 and previous TIS submissions for analysis purposes. The intersection has since been revised to not connect to phases beyond those directly interfacing with Pickering Parkway, serving a more limited function as a result.	
72	With respect to Figures 2.5 & 2.6, ensure that the latest Durham Region Transit service map is referenced. Route 211 runs along Pickering Parkway, with stops on both sides	RVA	The Durham Region transit map and stop locations presented in the report represented the most current information available at the time of completion of the January 2025 report. This information can be updated in	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	of the road at the proposed intersection of the north-south public road. Update the report accordingly.		future traffic study submissions to support future phases as it has little impact to any of the analysis presented in the January 2025 report.	
73	With respect to Section 4.5.1 (page 15), engage with Durham Region Transit to explore opportunities for improving transit stop facilities near the subject site, particularly along the proposed north-south public road (Street B, per the latest Site Plan SP A006).	ZPL	Durham Region Transit has been circulated on this application, and their comments are addressed below in this matrix.	
74	With respect to Section 7.1, the City's capital budget forecast (2026-2034) does not include the Notion Road Crossing over Highway 401. Provide a future traffic analysis scenario that excludes this crossing.	ZPL / RVA	Based on the study Terms of Reference provided to the Region on February 22, 2023 and responded to on March 13, 2023 it was understood and agreed upon that the Notion Road fly-over would be implemented during the 2031 horizon year of the study based on all information available at the time. Considering this may now be implemented further into the future and would only impact future development phases (not the current application for Phase 1), it is suggested that this analysis be completed under future traffic study submissions to support future phases when a more definitive timeline for the implementation of the Notion Road fly-over is better known.	
75	With respect to Appendix 19, the Autoturn diagram for a WB-20 tractor trailer appears to slightly overlap with the opposing lane. Confirm and revise accordingly. Additionally, include an aerial photo of Brock Road in these diagrams to assess potential impacts on through lanes. Confirm if the exiting WB-20 tractor-trailer will affect the northbound through lane.	RVA	Revised WB-20 trailer Autoturn diagram provided. Aerial photograph included.	
	<u>Landscape & Parks Development Comments</u>			
76	All previous Landscape & Parks Development Comments have been addressed. Additional comments will be provided at the site plan stage.	Studio TLA	Noted.	
<u>Durham District School Board – Yan Yu</u>				
77	DDSB staff has re-evaluated the application, as well as the Comment Letter issued on July 20, 2022. Based on a revised pupil yield, approximately 1059 elementary pupils,	ZPL / Bayfield	The project team has met with the DDSB and it is understood from this meeting that DDSB does not have certainty with respect to timing or location for	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	and 1059 secondary pupils could be generated by the above noted application. Staff has reviewed the information on the above-noted plan and recognize that as part of the larger development within this area, a school site would be required. DDSB staff continue to be open to discussions with the Town and its development partners to identify an appropriate site that would meet elementary school needs. Should you have any questions, please contact me via email at yan.yu@ddsb.ca.		implementation of a school on the subject lands, or if one is to be required. The proposed draft zoning will permit a school on all phases, and all future phases will be subject to preparation of a community services and facilities study, which will assist in reviewing whether new school facilities are needed to support redevelopment.	
<u>Ellexicon – Usman Khan</u>				
78	Further to the referenced File # OPA 22-002P and A 05-22, subject to the caveats set out in this letter, Ellexicon Energy Inc. has no objection to the proposed Site Plan Application to permit a 7 phased mixeduse development consisting of 7 buildings with 12 towers that range in height from 20 to 43 storey. A total of 5,297 residential units are proposed with 26,098 square meter of retail/commercial area on subject land. The applicant or its authorized representative shall consult with Ellexicon 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. Ellexicon Energy Inc. will confirm the characteristics of the available electrical supply and will designate the location of the supply point to the applicant. Ellexicon Energy Inc. will also identify the costs that the applicant will be responsible for. In some cases, an expansion of Ellexicon's distribution system (as such term is defined in the Distribution System Code issued by the Ontario Energy Board) will be required in order to be able to connect the customer to Ellexicon's distribution system. When an expansion is necessary, the Distribution System Code requires that a distributor perform an economic evaluation to determine if the future	ZPL	Noted, clearance for Site plan approval.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	revenue from the customer(s) will pay for the capital cost and on-going maintenance costs of the expansion project. If a shortfall between the present value of the projected costs and revenues is calculated, the distributor may propose to collect all or a portion of that amount from the customer(s). The evaluation is basically a discounted cash flow calculation that brings all costs and revenues to their net present value. This model, in general, follows the methodology, the set of common elements and related assumptions provided in Appendix B of the Distribution System Code. Elexicon will provide an Offer to Connect once an official request for electric services is received. 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			
<u>Metrolinx – Neha Kulkarni</u>				
79	Hi Amanda, Thank you for circulating the above noted application to Metrolinx. I note comments were previously provided on June 14, 2024. All the comments are still outstanding and need to be addressed prior to the final Site Plan Approval. No additional comments at this time.	ZPL	Noted. June 14 th comments pertain to site plan approval. Will be addressed as part of future SPA submission.	
<u>Sustainability</u>				
80	We have no objection to the approval of the applications mentioned above.	ZPL	Noted.	
<u>Region of Durham (additionally refer to mark-ups)</u>				

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
81	The Region of Durham has reviewed the revised amendments, plans and materials submitted in support of the above noted applications and we offer the following revised comments. Our previous comments dated January 26, 2023, and August 27, 2024 with respect to Regional services and transportation remain applicable, except where noted below.	ZPL	Noted.	
	<u>Regional Servicing</u>			
82	The Region of Durham Works Department has reviewed the above-noted zoning amendment and official plan amendment applications and offers the following comments. Phase 1 of the development, identified as Block 1, includes: • A development area of 0.936 Ha and 0.258 Ha of future public right-of-way); • constructing 2 mixed-use towers, each having heights of 31storeys, connected by a 7-storey podium; and • proposing a total of 678 apartment units and 1,664 square metres of new commercial floor area.	ZPL	Noted.	
83	Municipal Servicing The proposal is a multi-phased mixed-use development that would ultimately have an estimated population of 13,338 people (assuming 2 bedroom units at 2.5 people per unit, per Region of Durham criteria for Blocks 2 - 7). Servicing the development will require significant sanitary and water supply infrastructure upgrades.	Odan	Noted.	
84	Water Servicing As per Regional Works first submission comments, it is recommended that Phase 1 of the subject development be serviced via a dead-end watermain from Brock Road. Should the applicant continue to propose looping of the	Odan	Noted. Detailed response to follow.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	watermain to Pickering Parkway in Phase 1, the Region will not permit private servicing for the existing commercial development to be interconnected with the new, local watermain. Existing water servicing for the commercial developments must remain separate.			
85	Sanitary Servicing Phase 1 cannot be serviced via the existing local sanitary sewers. The applicant will be required to replace existing local sanitary sewers with trunk sanitary sewers (TSS) within the Pickering Parkway right-of-way. The TSS will service Phase 1, full buildout of the subject site, and future upstream development. The applicant is proposing to construct a sanitary sewer along Notion Road to Orchard Road to utilize the remaining capacity in the Orchard Road Trunk Sanitary Sewer on an interim basis for the early phases of the proposed development. Based upon flow monitoring, the remaining capacity within the Orchard Road 750 mm diameter sanitary sewer is estimated to be 150 litres per second. Ultimately, the entirety of the site and the greater future development drainage area would be diverted from the Orchard Road 750 mm diameter sanitary sewer to a future trunk sanitary sewer that would replace the interim local sewers on Notion Road. Sanitary drainage in the ultimate full build out scenario would be conveyed south on Notion Road to a future pumping station south of Hwy 401 and would eventually be serviced via a connection to the York Durham Primary Trunk Sanitary Sewer. The applicant shall note that the timing for these future projects is unknown. However, once the pumping station south of the Hwy 401 has been completed, it will trigger	Odan	Noted. Detailed response to follow.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	the ultimate sanitary servicing of this development via diversion of sanitary drainage to the proposed Notion Road Trunk Sanitary Sewer. <u>Sanitary capacity is allocated on a first come, first served basis at the time of executing a development agreement with the Region of Durham.</u>			
86	Master Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, by Odan Detech Consulting Engineers April 10, 2024 Revision With subsequent submission(s), please include plans that clearly identify the scope of water and sanitary servicing installation through all seven phases of development. Please demonstrate how the servicing will progress from Block 1 – Phase 1 to full build-out. Please include details of plans for ownership and identify any/all required easements in each phase.	Odan	Noted. Detailed response to follow.	
87	Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report Block 1 – Phase 1, Odan Detech Consulting Engineers, January 29, 2025 Revision Section 4, Water Supply and Distribution, Redeveloped Site – The description of proposed Phase 1 water servicing is not consistent with the latest engineering plans; a local watermain is no longer proposed in the rear laneway of the existing single-storey brick retail building. Design sheets, drainage area plans, and engineering drawings must be consistent. Review and revise the submitted materials. Please see attached mark-ups of design sheets provided as part of Appendix B for Region Works Department comments.	Odan	Noted. Detailed response to follow.	
88	Civil Engineering Drawings, Odan Detech Consulting Engineers, January 2025 Revision	Odan	Noted. Detailed response to follow.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	Please refer to the attached engineering drawing mark-ups for required revisions and Works Department comments on the latest submission. At future detailed engineering and Site Plan application stages, the Region of Durham will require plan and profile drawings submitted for all external sanitary and water servicing, and/or municipal servicing proposed on easement, prepared in accordance with Region of Durham Design Specifications for Engineering Submissions. This shall include, but is not limited to, plan and profile drawings for the Pickering Parkway Trunk Sanitary Sewer and interim Notion Road sewers. The applicant shall coordinate the design of the proposed Pickering Parkway TSS with the downstream Metropia development that is currently under construction. The Metropia development was approved to be serviced via existing local sewers. In the follow-up to a meeting held October 24th, 2024, attended by the applicant, the City of Pickering, and the Region of Durham, the Region shared with the Applicant an acceptable servicing scheme for build-out of the subject lands as well as the following statement: <i>The Region will accept an interim sanitary sewer alignment through the future public park to allow for the first phase(s) of development to proceed while limiting impact to existing commercial uses on the property. In the ultimate condition, any sanitary sewer and watermain constructed through the public park must be abandoned/removed and servicing must be realigned through the eastern-most north-south public right-of-way.</i>			

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	The current submitted Civil Engineering Drawings for the ultimate condition leave sanitary servicing through the future public park. Should the City support a combined servicing easement through their public park, a 12.0m wide easement will be required over the proposed sanitary and storm sewers free and clear of any permanent features that would hinder access to the sewer. Otherwise, if servicing through the public park is not supported by the City, the sanitary shall follow the alignment of future public roads. <u>Easement Requirements</u> Any watermain and/or sewer that will be owned by the Region of Durham, not located within a public right-of-way, must be located within a regional servicing easement. Easements must be provided in accordance with Region of Durham Design Specifications for Engineering Submissions, Section 7, Easement Requirements. Easements must remain free and clear of any/all structures.			
	<u>Transportation</u>			
	<u>General Comments</u>			
89	Engineering drawings, including cross-sections, are required for roadworks on Brock Road at the Site Plan stage. The design of the Site access (i.e., future public road intersection) and northbound right-turn lane shall conform to Region of Durham and TAC standards. If the design cannot conform to the Region of Durham or TAC standards, the Applicant must submit rationale for the proposed design.	Odan	Site Plan advisory.	
90	There are inconsistencies in street names across submitted materials, specifically the Traffic Impact Study,	TFAI / RVA / Odan	Please see response to comment 59.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	Architectural Plans Master, and Preliminary Conceptual Plan. Review and make all necessary revisions. Please include street names in the Urban Design Brief.			
	<u>The Region has reviewed the report titled “1755 Pickering Parkway Mixed-Use Development Traffic Impact Study Report, Final, R. V. Anderson Associates Limited, January 2025” and offers the following comments:</u>	RVA / Bayfield	Noted.	
91	Section 4.5.1, Proposed TDM Measures (Unbundled Parking) The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) identifies unbundled parking as a standard TDM option. Confirm whether unbundled parking is being proposed for the development.	Bayfield	Confirmed that parking is expected to be unbundled.	
92	Section 8, Future (2036) Traffic Conditions The spacing between the existing signal at Walmart Access 1 and the proposed Street D/Walmart Access 2 intersection on Pickering Parkway is insufficient to accommodate an additional signal. The back-to-back substandard signal spacing will result in queue spillback, red light running, and create significant safety concerns. The proposal to add auxiliary lanes to help accommodate queueing is not sufficient to address the safety issues created by such closely spaced signals. The Region recommends that the City of Pickering consider restricting Street D to right-in/right-out only. If signalization is warranted, a more appropriate location from a spacing perspective would be to locate it at Street E, aligned with Walmart Access 3. The Region recommends that a raised center median be constructed on Pickering Parkway through Street D and the Walmart access to restrict turning movements and enforce the right-in/right-out configuration. The City of Pickering may want to consider constructing a raised median along	RVA	Based on the revised conceptual plan for the ultimate build-out of the development, it is intended that the easterly most access (Street E in TIS) along Pickering Parkway will become the main signalized intersection and designated as a public roadway which will satisfy the spacing requirements.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	the entire segment of Pickering Parkway to reduce conflicting movements associated with the driveways.			
93	Section 12.2, Table 12.4 (Estimated Bicycle Parking Supply) The TIS indicates that the proposed development will require a total of 2,679 bicycle parking spaces. However, it does not specify the actual number of bicycle parking spaces proposed or describe approximately where they are accommodated (ex., in parking garages, building entrances, etc.). Clarify the proposed number and approximate locations of bicycle parking spaces and confirm that the development will comply with the minimum required provision of bicycle parking spaces.	TFAI / ZPL / RVA	Confirmed that the development will comply with the minimum number of bicycle spaces as established by this zoning by-law amendment. The specific placement of bike parking will be identified through detailed design.	
94	Appendix 19 Although we agree with retaining the right-in/right-out access on Brock Road in principle, we will require design revisions, additional information, and commitments regarding future operations to achieve an acceptable design and help to ensure safe operations. The following comments will need to be addressed:	RVA / TFAI	Comment noted.	
95	a) The proposed concept design plan shows the entranceway into the Site only. Show additional details for context, from Pickering Parkway to the Highway 401 ramp, and include pavement markings and the full width of the Brock Road center median. Additionally, include the wheel paths for the design vehicle in the swept path diagram, not just the outer limits of the vehicle envelope.	RVA / TFAI	Conceptual drawing to be revised as noted and included in TIS addendum letter.	
96	b) The right-in/right-out access at Brock Road and Street A is closely spaced to the Highway 401 ramp terminal, limiting the available length for a dedicated right-turn auxiliary lane. The proposed design appears to maximize the parallel lane	RVA / TFAI	Considering that the right-in movement is free flowing into the site and no queuing is anticipated for this movement as presented in the January 2025 TIS report, the storage lane and taper could be adjusted accordingly to fit into the current space available.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	length, but the taper is shorter than appropriate for a major arterial road. The design should be revised to provide at least the minimum taper length for the 60km/h posted speed limit as per the TAC Geometric Design Guide Table 9.14.2 (14:1 taper ratio), with the balance of the available space being used for the parallel lane.		Revised Brock Road Access plan provided.	
97	c) As a right-turn lane designed to full Regional standards cannot be accommodated, the access design is insufficient to support safe and efficient access for heavy vehicles. Truck access to the Site should be via Pickering Parkway. The Brock Road access must be signed to prohibit trucks, and this will be a condition of Site Plan Approval.	RVA / TFAI	The conceptual drawing provided in Appendix 19 was designed to accommodate for the movement of WB-20 tractor trailers as shown through the auto-turn templates provided in the drawing. These templates have been revised on an updated conceptual plan provided in a TIS Addendum Memorandum. Once again it illustrates that heavy vehicles could be accommodated at the access.	
98	d) Since the access will not be used by heavy trucks, the geometric design can be tightened up to help control entry speeds and reduce conflicts with pedestrians. The turn radii are to be reduced, and the triangular channelization island is to be removed (left turns are prevented by the raised median on Brock Road). The sidewalk alignment is to be revised to go straight across the driveway to minimize crossing distance and conflicts with turning vehicles.	RVA / TFAI	The conceptual right-in right-out access drawing provided in Appendix 19 illustrates that WB-20 tractor trailers can navigate the entrance and exit of the access. As part of the revised right-in-right-out conceptual drawing included in the TIS Addendum Memorandum the channelization has been kept to accommodate truck movements and provide a shorter staged crossing for pedestrian across the access.	
99	e) Given the high inbound right-turn volume, it is essential that free flow traffic conditions are maintained on Street A (i.e., no stop condition at Street C or other driveways). This is consistent with the current Site design and the TIS, but it must be explicitly acknowledged as part of Site Plan Approval.	RVA / TFAI	Comment noted.	
100	An addendum to the Traffic Impact Study addressing all the above noted comments is required. please include responses to each of the comments.	RVA	TIS Addendum Memorandum has been prepared as requested.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	<u>The Region has also reviewed the report titled “Pickering Design Centre, 1755 Pickering Parkway Urban Design Brief, Turner Fleischer, January 2025”, and offers the following comments:</u>			
101	Section 4, Development Concept The Region recommends Street D and E lane widths be reviewed, with Street D (street in line with Tower 2C and 4A access) maintained as a right-in/right-out access and Street E (street in line with Tower 4B and 5 access) widening to 11.25m, where feasible, to accommodate a full movement intersection. Street E should be aligned with the existing access to the north to support potential future signalization and to ensure appropriate intersection spacing and signal coordination, in accordance with Regional standards. The constrained right-in access on Brock Road should be acknowledged as it precludes safe entry for heavy vehicles, effectively prohibiting their use of this access. Also, please confirm whether Street E is a private or public roadway. As per page 36, the road is noted as a private road.	RVA / TFAI	See responses to 67. Based on the revised conceptual plan for the ultimate build-out of the development, it is intended that the easterly most access (Street E in TIS) along Pickering Parkway will become the main signalized intersection and designated as a public roadway which will satisfy the spacing requirements.	
	<u>Waste Management</u>			
102	Comments provided are with respect to providing multi-residential waste and recycling collection services on private property. All waste material from the commercial portion of the site will require private collection and must be separate from residential waste as per O. Reg 103/94. The Region’s decision to provide municipal collection is based on the Technical and Risk Management Guidelines for Municipal Waste Collection Services on	TFAI	Noted, non-residential garbage is separated.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	Private Property and for New Residential Developments in Durham Region, which can be found at the following link Technical Guidelines for Multi-Residential Service (durham.ca). On June 3, 2021, Ontario filed O. Reg. 391/21 under the Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act and made product producers responsible for the Blue Box program including collection. The Regional Municipality of Durham no longer provides service for the Blue Box program. Durham's recycling program is now managed by Circular Materials, the administrator of the common collection system and national not-for-profit organization that is committed to building an efficient and effective recycling system in Ontario. Visit Circular Materials for more information. The Waste Management Plan for multi-residential buildings with six or more dwelling units and stacked townhouses that utilize a central set out area must indicate how residents will dispose of their source separated waste material from their units, and how the property maintenance staff will manage residential waste material prior to collection. This should include dimensions of the internal waste storage rooms for the proposed site, sufficiently sized in a manner to receive and accommodate all garbage, household organics and dual stream Blue Box materials from residents and ensures sufficient movement for all waste bins. All receptacles will be legibly marked for garbage, household organics, dual stream blue box materials, and any other divertible materials. Buildings with waste chutes must ensure waste is sorted for municipal collection. Separate collection receptacles			

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	must be provided for household organics, dual stream Blue Box materials and garbage. The chute system on-floor front-facing chute panels must include garbage/organics/recycling (fiber)/recycling (containers) only. Those sites with greater than 30 units must install compactors to properly manage residential garbage. If the proposed site has a retail/commercial component, residential waste must be managed in a separate area and not be comingled. Refer to O. Reg. 103/94. For multi-residential buildings where internal or external collection by waste vehicles is proposed, overhead clearance of a minimum 7.0 metres, 18.0 metres straight approach for multi-residential collection areas and the truck width dimensions (See dimensions in Appendix “A” of the Technical and Risk Management Guidelines for Municipal Waste Collection Services on Private Property and for New Residential Developments in Durham Region) must be demonstrated to enable tip of front-end bins and side load carts must be shown on all drawings. All roadways must have 6.5 metres in width from curb face to curb face, 13.0 metres in turning radii to curb face and overhead clearance of no less than 7.0 metres throughout. Private roadways and driveways must be designed to allow the truck to move into and out of the site in a forward movement. Reversing onto a public roadway or oncoming traffic is not permitted unless a spotter is present and the Region has approved the method. Where trucks travel over underground parking, load weight of a waste vehicle must be confirmed and engineered. During construction, builders are responsible for collection and disposal of all residential waste until the Region			

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	approves waste collection services. For multi-residential units, occupancy must be >75%. The final approval on private roads by the Region will occur after construction and occupancy meet the Guidelines and submission of an Application for Service on Private Property is received by the Region's Waste Management division. Upon receipt, a final site review will be completed. Future development applications shall include a Waste Management Plan.			
103	Based on the foregoing, the Region's Works Department cannot provide favourable comment for the above-mentioned applications. Please provide the following with the next submission: - Traffic Impact Study Addendum to address the transportation comments. - Plan(s) for servicing installation of phases 1 - 7, including all details of ownership/easements.	RVA / Odan	Comment noted. TIS Addendum Memorandum has been prepared. Plans provided that detail phasing of site servicing.	
	<u>Durham Region Transit (DRT)</u>			
	The above noted file was reviewed from a transit perspective, and Durham Region Transit offers the following comments.			
104	TIS - Section 2.4.1 - Please be aware that Route 211 now services Pickering Parkway from Notion Road to the Pickering Town Centre.	RVA	The Durham Region transit map and stop locations presented in the report represented the most current information available at the time of completion of the January 2025 report. This information can be updated in future traffic study submissions to support future phases as it has little impact to any of the analysis presented in the January 2025 report.	
105	The eastbound stop at Pickering Parkway in front of the proposed Street 'B' entrance can be removed.	RVA	Can Durham Transit clarify the comment. No transit stops have been shown along Pickering Parkway in the TIS.	
106	<u>Conclusion</u> The proposed official plan amendment is intended to increase the permitted residential and commercial/retail	RVA / Odan	Comment noted. TIS Addendum Memorandum has been prepared.	

#	Comments	Response By	Response	
	densities on the subject site and it would also allow additional permissible uses, including medium and high density residential, which would facilitate the development of a total of 5,297 residential units and approximately 26,098 m² of non-residential gross floor area. The Region is generally supportive of the proposed development concept; however, the Region's review of the application has identified some concerns with the technical elements of the proposed mixed-use development that will require the submission of a revised proposal. The revised proposal and supporting documentation must address several issues, including the following: • The submission of a Traffic Impact Study Addendum to address the above noted transportation comments; and • One or more plans illustrating the installation of servicing for Phases 1 – 7 of the development, including all details of ownership/easements. Upon the submission of these documents, the Region will reassess the proposed development and determine whether it can support the adoption of the proposed official plan and zoning by-law amendment applications.			