



Town of The Blue Mountains

26 Bridge Street East
Box 310
THORNBURY, ON N0H 2P0
www.thebluemountains.ca

March 31, 2011

VIA EMAIL ONLY

John L. Tennant – The Community Advocate
PO Box 181
Owen Sound, ON N4K 5P3
thecommunityadvocate@sympatico.ca

RE: Thornbury Adult Lifestyle Village, Town Plot Lot 4 Napier W/S Consolidated & Updated Comments - Planning Act Applications

This is further to the letters, emails and discussions that have taken place between the Town and the Telfer Development Group and further to the comments provided by the public, commenting agencies and the Planning & Building Committee at the Statutory Public Meeting. In addition, it is in response to the recently submitted preliminary revised concept plan for the proposed development. The intent is that this letter is to consolidate and update Town Staff's comments on the subject application and to identify outstanding submission requirements.

Comments:

1. "Character":

- a. We continue to question how the proposed development conforms to Official Plan Section 4.27.1. In particular, an analysis of how the development proposal will maintain the "unique small town feel and character of the community" and how the proposed development is "consistent with the existing architectural and heritage features, and with the emerging recreational and tourist function of the area." It is required that further Planning Justification be provided, supported by input from an experienced and qualified urban design specialist. Updated architectural renderings and landscape drawings to support this would be beneficial.

In addition to Section 4.27.1, emphasis should be given to the General Development policies and Residential policies of Official Plan Section 4.27.2.(2) and 4.27.3.1. Specifically, further Planning Justification must be provided as to how the proposed development is compatible with the visual character of the community while contributing and enhancing the existing streetscape and adjacent uses. Once again, updated

architectural renderings and landscape drawings to support this would be beneficial.

- b. With respect to some specific “character” issues discussed, it is our opinion that:
- i. “Rear-lotting” of units is not supported by the policies of our Official Plan as they relate to the Thornbury Urban Community, nor good urban design. We note that the revised concept plan addresses this issue;
 - ii. Multiple drive access points along Napier and Victoria Street are not supportable both from a character as well as pedestrian walkability perspective. The revised concept plan addresses this by combining drive access points for each building block save for the block furthest north on Victoria Street. These drive access points will be limited to 6.0 metres maximum in width. It is our opinion that Unit 64 should be deleted so as to mitigate the concerns noted.
 - iii. The building elevations must provide for variety and avoid sameness so as to preserve the “character” of the community and promote good urban design. Various building heights, roof lines, setbacks, and other distinctions must be provided. Architectural elements and focus points throughout the development must provide for visual interest. The revised concept plan provides for vistas into the development whereas the “preliminary” elevations appear to provide some of the architectural elements that are indicative of the small town feel that is desired. We look forward to further building elevations in support of this along with detailed information related to the proposed materials of construction, colours, etc.
 - iv. The proposed Recreation Centre, not yet incorporated into the concept plan, has the opportunity to become a prominent building within the neighbourhood in terms of the view corridor from the intersection of Victoria and Napier Street and provide further integration of this development into the rest of the community. In this regard, Units 11 and 65 may impact the view corridor through to the Recreation Centre. Thought should be given to adjusting or deleting these units. In addition, detailed building elevations of the “private recreational facility” and vista imagery should be provided to assist in demonstrating integration and consistency in architectural design and massing.
- c. The proposed geared for “adults only” community projects an exclusive neighbourhood that does not integrate itself with the rest of the community. The revised concept plan addresses, to a certain extent, the issue of physical integration but the notion of an “adults only” community does not address social integration. Our preference is that the proposed development be geared for all age segments (especially in light of the fact that the site is in close proximity to our local elementary school).

As noted, the provision of a Site Plan, Landscaping Plans, Building Elevation Drawings, Planning Justification and Architect Review are required to demonstrate compliance with Official Plan policy. The current reports and plans provide a general picture of what is being planned, with no specific details on the elements proposed.

2. Buffering:

- a. Buffering in the form of vegetation, distance, fencing and other forms help to minimize potential land use conflicts from adjacent land uses and roadways while softening the visual impact of a proposed development. Buffering should include more than just one of the elements mentioned above. Combinations of distance separation and vegetation can help to visually blend the development in with the rest of the community.
- b. A balance between site design, overall density and buffering must all work together so that the cumulative effect of the development can still maintain the intent and direction of the Official Plan policies.

In support of the Site Plan application, detailed landscaped drawings are required with specific regard to the above noted.

3. Stormwater Management Area:

- a. The proposed Stormwater facility will not be accepted as parkland dedication. This facility is to be owned and maintained by the Developer in accordance with Town Engineering Standards.
- b. The proposed stormwater management facility, given its prominent location at the intersection of Napier and Victoria, presents an excellent opportunity to showcase the development. The revised concept plan addresses this to a certain extent. As noted previously, the elimination of Units 11 and 65 may assist in this regard.
- c. The proposed Stormwater facility is to be designed as a natural feature to fit in with character of the community. A deep hole with chainlink fence will not be accepted
- d. The submitted Stormwater Management Report must be updated to take into consideration the existing flows from adjacent lands.

4. Open Space and Parkland Dedication:

- a. The revised concept plan appears to depict rear wall to rear wall distances of approximately 13.0 metres. As you are aware, the Town of Thornbury Zoning By-law requires in residential zones a minimum "rear yard" of 9 to 10 metres (or an 18.0 – 20.0 metre rear wall to rear wall distance). This space is traditionally used for private amenity purposes and is indicative of the social character, built form and special separation character of the

community. While we are not insisting on an 18.0 – 20.0 metre separation, a minimum of 15.0 metres would be supportable from our perspective.

- b. The revised concept depicts rear yard setbacks of 10 metres, we consider this acceptable.
 - c. “ample on site open space” will not fulfill parkland dedication requirements. The Town will require a cash-in-lieu of Parkland Dedication of 5%.
5. Landscaping Requirements:
- a. Landscape Drawings prepared by an Landscape Architect are required with details on streetscape design, buffering, other landscape features and plantings throughout the development.
 - b. Landscape Drawings also to incorporate character and buffering elements as previously noted.
6. Density:
- a. As you are aware, the Official Plan provides for a maximum density for the subject lands. In this regard, Town Staff have not focused on unit count, other than to ensure that the maximum is not exceeded, our focus is on how the density is handled across the site and how it addresses good urban design (not just from the periphery of the site but also internal to the site such that it creates great spaces for future residents).
7. Connectivity:
- a. Future road connections and walkway connections should be incorporated into the plan connecting as a minimum the adjacent development block to the east and potentially to the south. Specifically, the east-west road will be required to be designed as a public highway with a minimum width of 20.12 metres through to the easterly property line.
8. Building Elevations:

In addition to the comments found under the heading of “Character”, the following comments are applicable:

- a. The “priority units” in the proposed development concept, from a neighbourhood design perspective, should have a higher level of elevation design, articulation and detailing. Priority units are those units next to the ‘gateways’ into the development, prominent corner units and those units adjacent to open space features. This sensitivity is reflective of good urban design. Please have regard to the Draft Urban design Guidelines available on our website.

9. Unit Parking and Visitor Parking:

- a. Parking space dimensions appear to be undersized. A minimum of 2.7 x 5.8 metres is required. Please provide details.
- b. Adequacy of parking for visitors will be reviewed in the context of a revised submission. It is encouraged that visitor parking be provided in a consolidated fashion so as to ensure year round access re maintenance and to maximize landscape areas adjacent to units. Perhaps this consolidated parking area could be provided in conjunction with the proposed Recreation Centre.

10. Blanket Consent Application:

- a. The blanket consent application to permit land leases to exceed 21 years is not supported at this time by Planning Services Staff. We are not aware of an instance in the Province where this type of consent has been granted and are concerned with the potential ramifications. Furthermore, we do not feel sufficient justification has been provided to support this request.

11. Public Meeting Comments:

- a. Public submissions including letters, neighbourhood meeting minutes and comment spreadsheets have been provided. Please ensure that the revised Planning Justification Report addresses the themes of the issues raised and, where applicable, are incorporated into the revised plans.

12. Stage 1 – 2 Archaeological Assessment

- a. Acceptance of the Archaeological Assessment Report and recommendations are still required from the Ministry of Culture.

13. Environmental Soils Investigation (Phase 1 and Phase 2 environmental study)

- a. Please submit all supporting documents related to the Phase 1 and 2 Environmental Study (previously requested).

14. Other Items:

- a. Servicing allocation: is available upon execution of Development Agreement and payment of all applicable development charges.
- b. Development Charges are due in part at time of Development Agreement (Hard Costs) and at time of Building Permit (Soft Costs). A reduction in Development Charges will not be further considered by the Town.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Otherwise we continue to look forward to a resubmission package.

Upon receipt of the resubmission package, Planning Staff will review same for completeness. A complete submission will then be reviewed by our Development Review Committee meeting where further comments will be provided if warranted. Subsequent to this, and given the revisions currently contemplated and the comments provided in this report, a second non-statutory Public Meeting will be scheduled.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Shawn Postma', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Shawn Postma, Planner II
Town of The Blue Mountains.

cc: Paul Shaw, pshaw@bellnet.ca