# 759 Maple Avenue - Comment Response Matrix

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| **Zoning - Nathan Dart** | |
| Height confirmation verified by an Ontario Land Surveyor which confirms elevation at midpoint of each unit at common driveway with measurement to peak of roof for each unit. | Height shown on elevations from fixed grade at mid point of road |
| If transformers or hydro vaults are required, they should be shown on site plan | |
| Provide full architectural plans reflective of current peaked roof design shown in Planning Justification Report (floor plans, elevations, roof plan), fully dimensioned in metric for evaluation | Plans fully dimensioned in metric |
| Survey to be signed and dated by Ontario Land Surveyor | Signed and stamped |
| Provide full elevations for the proposed building dimensioned in metric. | Elevations fully dimensioned in metric |
| Show height measurement from grade elevation at midpoint of each unit at common driveway with measurement to peak of roof for each unit to algin with grading information confirmed by Ontario Land Surveyor or P.Eng | Elevations fully dimensioned in metric |
| Provide dimensions for roof overhang projections for entry way | Dimensions shown on plans |
| Provide privacy screen heights | |
| Provide floor plans, in metric, labeled and dimensioned outside wall to outside wall or mid-point of common wall. Dimension all exclusive use patios, balconies, porches for amenity area/privacy area calculation. Dimension interior of garage to confirm parking compliance. | Plans fully dimensioned in metric |
| Notes:<br>• A Zoning Clearance Certificate for each building will be required for the construction of the building.<br>• Development charges will apply subject to various agencies by-laws.<br>• H- Removal is required prior to issuance of any approvals<br>• A demolition permit application is required for the existing dwelling on-site prior to zoning sign-off. | Noted. |
| **Halton Region** | |
| To ensure that Regional waste collection services can be provided in a safe and cost-effective manner, this proposal has been reviewed against the Region's Development Design Guidelines for Source Separation of Solid Waste. Halton Region provides the following comments:<br>Region waste is satisfied with the supplied Waste Management Plan prepared by Arcadis, dated May 24,2024.<br>Based on the submitted Waste Management Plan, it appears the proposed townhouse complex may be eligible for Regional waste collection via curbside collection from the designated concrete waste pad located at the entrance of the complex on Maple Avenue, once construction is completed and all 4 units are occupied. | Noted. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Municipal Servicing:<br>In accordance with the MOU, and to ensure water and wastewater services are provided in accordance with Regional requirements, Halton Region provides the following comments:<br>Existing Services:<br>Watermain:<br>A 300mm dia. watermain is located on Maple Avenue adjacent to the property.<br>A 400mm dia. watermain is located on Maple Avenue adjacent to the property.<br>Sanitary Sewer:<br>A 750mm dia. sanitary sewer is located on Maple Avenue adjacent to the property.<br>A 525mm dia. sanitary sewer is located on Maple Avenue adjacent to the property.<br>Please note that a Functional Servicing Report (FSR) prepared by Arcadis Professional Services (Canada) Inc., dated March 2024, was submitted with the application. | Noted. |
| Servicing General:<br>The FSR recommends that the site be serviced for sanitary sewers by connecting the development to the existing 750mm diameter trunk sewer that is located on Maple Avenue. Please note that the Region does not allow connections to trunk sewers. The applicant will be required to submit a deviation memo as part of the submission for a Regional services permit to address this connection. If the Region does not allow the connection to the trunk sewer, then it may be necessary to extend a local sanitary sewer to the site.<br><br>The FSR provided an analysis demonstrating what the proposed sewage flows generated from this development will be. The analysis provided in the FSR for the proposed flow from this development is based on Region of Halton standards.<br><br>The FSR recommends that the site to be serviced for water by connecting to the existing 300mm diameter watermain that is located on Maple Avenue. The FSR provided analysis that determines what the proposed water usage will be required to service this development. A fire flow test was also completed, and the results were included in the FSR. The fire flow test demonstrated that the existing water system in the area can accommodate the proposed development.<br><br>Please note that there are no impacts to the Region's water or sanitary sewer system from this proposed development as was demonstrated in the FSR submitted in support of this application. Due to this, Region has no objection to the proposed re-zoning of the property. | Noted. |
| **Landscape - Nick Pirzas** | |
| Consider alternative design concepts that will result in fewer trees being proposed for removal. In the case that alternatives to the design are not possible, please provide detailed justification for the removal of every individual tree. Similarly, work shall be modified to avoid working inside the minimum tree protection zone of all trees. | Tree #2 is to be removed as it conflicts with proposed paving, which is needed for turning radii from proposed visitor parking spots.<br>Tree #3 is to be removed as work is proposed within the mTPZ and the tree is in poor condition, such as additional stress may further decline the tree. |
| The City's Public Tree By-law 68-2013 will be applicable to the proposed development. A public tree permit is required for all work around city trees, including the payment of the Tree Permit fee and securities for trees to be retained. Details regarding the issuance of a Public Tree Permit will be outlined in detail at the pre-building approval stage. | Noted. |

| | |
|---|---|
| The City's Private Tree By-law 40-2022 is applicable to the proposed development. A private tree permit is required for all work around private trees, including the payment of the Tree Permit fees and replacement tree securities (as required). Details regarding the issuance of a Private Tree Permit will be outlined in detail at the Pre-Building Approval stage. | Noted. |
| Removal of public and private trees will require a plan for replacement. Replacement of public trees will be in the form of cash-in-lieu of replacement based on the size and condition of the tree removed. Removal of private trees will require a certain number of trees to be planted based on the size of private trees being removed. Where there is no room for replacement of private trees, cash-in-lieu of replacement will be required. Specific compensation and replacement quantities will be identified at the Pre-Building Approval stage. | Noted. |
| Provide barrier free access to the 'pergola with seating' area. | A drop curb has been added to the path, providing barrier-free access to the pergola area |
| Show proposed catch-basins as per engineering drawings and modify planting locations to suit. | Need to Coordinate with Engineering drawings for CB locations |
| Show snow storage locations. | Snow storage locations added |
| Show soil volume and boundary per tree. 30m3 should be provided for stand-alone trees and 20m3 in shared areas. | Soil volume and boundaries added |
| If available, show all underground, at grade and overhead utilities and modify planting to suit. | Underground utility information not available, overhead/at grade utilities noted with no conflicts with planting |
| If available, identify any storm water infrastructure included swales, sub-drains, catch basins, pipes, etc. and modify planting to suit. | Need to Coordinate with Engineering drawings for SWM locations |
| Denote what sections of privacy fence are existing and proposed. | Ex and Proposed Privacy Fence locations noted |
| Fencing detail Elevation and Section are not aligned. Consider pressure treated wood in lieu of cedar. Detail is duplicated on two drawings. | Fixed alignment of Fence Detail, replaced cedar with pressure-treated wood (pine) |
| Add structural certification requirement for Freestanding Wall. | need a structural engineer to review |
| Add scale bar to the drawing. | added scale bars |
| The arborist report is to address the potential impacts of the freestanding walls and new privacy fencing proposed within the MPTZ's of existing trees including what mitigative measures will be required during and post construction. | |
| Information is to also include the degree of canopy clearing/raising that may be required. Incorporate findings in all documents. | information has been added to arborist report |
| Design modifications at the Pre-Building Approval stage should be investigated to retain tree #4. | Tree #4 can be retained if Site Plan is modified |
| City records show an Ivory Silk Lilac within the public right-of-way that is not shown on the tree preservation plans. Please verify if the tree was removed by the applicant. | Noted. |
| Refer to the link below for items that will be required at the Pre-Building Approval stage which includes checklist of requirements for arborist reports, tree preservation drawings, tree inventory tables, boundary/neighbouring trees, replacement requirements, securities, etc. Please ensure that your arborist has thoroughly reviewed and addressed all applicable information accordingly prior to your submission to ensure a complete application is made. https://www.burlington.ca/en/planning-and-development/resources/Zoning-Clearance-Certificates/FORESTRY-FAQ---final.pdf | |
| Further information pertaining to permits, tree protection policies and other applicable items, are available for your arborist at Burlington.ca/forestprotection and within the City's Guide to Tree Protection. | exploratory air spade/root excavation is prescribed for these trees to confirm root impacts and whether injury permits are required for affected trees. |

| | |
|---|---|
| At this time the report does not clearly identify the proposed permitting requirements (i.e., what trees are proposed for an injury permit and/or removal permit). The proposed development shows extensive construction work proposed within the minimum tree protection zone (MTPZ) for trees along the northern boundary. A pre-construction tree root investigation report will be a requirement to support the tree permit application for the subject property documenting exploratory root excavation of all affected trees along the Northern Boundary to confirm root impacts and proposal for permit requirements identified. This report shall also comment on the degree of canopy clearing/raising required to facilitate construction. Any and all mitigative measures as a result of the findings will need to be incorporated into the arborist report and TP plans. | Noted. |
| Any requests associated injury or destruction permits for trees not solely owned by the applicant (e.g., neighbouring trees and/or boundary trees) will require written consent form the property owner and be submitted as part of the Pre-Building Approval stage. Details as to what to include in the submitted consent letter please refer to Forestry's Checklist and FAQ document as identified herein. | Overhead/at-grade ulilities observed on site not in conflict with trees |
| Ensure all utilities / servicing existing and proposed are identified and assessed by the Arborist to include on the tree protection plan. Currently the tree protection plan is missing these details. | Noted. |
| Ensure that trees and tree protection zones are illustrated on civil and/or engineering drawings to ensure cohesion in the review. | |
| **Development Engineering** | |
| All plans to use the same base layer. | Noted. |
| Identify existing and/or proposed property lines on all plans. | Noted. |
| Identify existing and/or proposed easements on all plans. | Noted. |
| Identify all applicable external agency setbacks on all plans. | Noted. |
| All private utilities must be constructed within the subject property limits. | Noted. |
| City Plan and Profile drawings may be downloaded from the Open Data Portal. | Noted. |
| Should the application be approved, the development would be subject to a Grading and Drainage Clearance Certificate process, details can be found on the City's website: https://www.burlington.ca/en/planning-and-development/grading-and-drainage-clearance-certificate.aspx | Noted. |
| A residential development agreement, or other type of agreement on title, will be required to ensure warning clauses are on title. Warning clauses would also need to be included in any future condominium declarations should the ZBA be approved. | |
| IF the existing access easement (Inst. No. 554430) is no longer required between the two private parties, it may be worthwhile for the subject property owner to pursue legally dismissing the easement. Has there been any discussion on dismissing the ex. easement? If so, please include a summary in the application materials. | |
| Please consider how headlight trespass can be mitigated, typically dense coniferous plantings and a double board wood fence (without gaps) is the preferred mitigation measure, however the concept plan submitted does not appear to provide space for this option. Still appears to be no space for landscape buffer along north and east property lines which could be useful in mitigation of headlight trespass, please advise how headlight mitigation will be provided for at the GDCC stage. | |
| If the ZBA is approved, when undertaking detailed design, please consider private outdoor lighting for the private laneway and visitor parking, the City's outdoor lighting guideline should be followed: https://www.burlington.ca/en/building-and-renovating/resources/Urban-Design-Guidelines/Lighting%20Design%20Guidelines.pdf | |

| | |
|---|---|
| At GDCC stage a geotechnical report will be required and will need to include recommendations for foundation drainage/sump systems. i.e., will the foundations be constructed in groundwater? Is there a special sump system recommend, back up pump, oversize pit, etc. | Noted. |
| RIGHT OF WAY<br>1. A Municipal Consent Permit is required for any works on public lands, including but not limited to temporary staging, grading, servicing, construction or disturbance of vegetation. At the GDCC stage, actual locations and inverts/obverts of above and buried infrastructure will be required to ensure there are no conflicts with the proposed servicing design. | Noted. |
| 2. There is an upcoming capital project, for Maple Park infrastructure renewal schedule for 2029, across from the subject property. The capital project scope and timing are subject to change. The capital project should not affect the proposed development. | |
| FUNCTIONAL SERVICING & STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT<br>1. All documents to be prepared in accordance with the Council approved Stormwater Management Design Guidelines (COB SWM), as amended. | Noted. |
| 2. To be stamped and certified by a Professional Engineer. | Noted. |
| 3. External agencies (Conservation Halton, the Region of Halton and MTO) may review the report. If differing requirements exist between them and the City, the most stringent criteria shall apply. | |
| 4. The City's Stormwater Engineer has provided the following criteria:<br>a. Quality Control (COB SWM 6.1.4.1 and 6.1.4.2):<br>• Enhanced 80% TSS removal achieved with a treatment train approach. An OGS will only be credited with 50% TSS removal.<br>• OGS CA-ETV certified units only.<br>• OGS to be sized to capture and treat a min. 90% of the runoff volume.<br>• Rooftop areas may be considered clean if the flows are separated from non-roof areas as per COB SWM 3.6 and 6.1.4.1.<br>• Due to the small area of the proposed development property, cash in lieu may be considered instead of installing an OGS, when a civil consultant is contracted, please have them reach out to Annette.simpson@burlington.ca to discuss quality control strategies for the site. | Noted. |
| b. Quantity Control (COB SWM 6.1.1.1):<br>• Discharge to a storm sewer control post development flows to pre-development flows for the two through 100 year storms<br>• Section 3.5 indicates an 80mm orifice plate to be utilized, please revise (including calculation) to an orifice pipe. The orifice pipe needs to be located fully within the subject property limits.<br>• Appendix A, predevelopment drainage area plan DAP-01 looks to indicate only part of the site currently drains to Maple Ave., one over land flow route arrow to Maple and two to the rear yard, what is the drainage divide? This must be considered in the pre-development flow to Maple Ave., i.e., if only 1/3 of the site currently drains to Maple, then the post-development would be controlled to the predevelopment flow to Maple.<br>• Appendix A, pre and post development drainage area plans, DAP-01 and DAP-02 – are there any external drainage areas? If so, please include in the calculations for the property.<br>• A max. pre-development imperviousness of 36.0% (C = 0.50) for re-development is to be used for the pre-development calculations.<br>• If stormwater storage is required on site, a concrete superpipe is the preferred storage method. A cultec type system is not preferred due to the limited amount of space available on site and the challenges around long term maintenance/replacement.<br>Erosion Control (COB SWM 3.4 and 6.1.2):<br>• Not required | b. The post development discharge control method has been updated accordingly.<br>The pre-development drainage area plan (DAP-01) has been updated to show the area draining to Maple. The drainage divide has been shown as well.<br>No external drainage has been identified.<br>The max pre-development runoff coefficient has not been exceeded.<br>Ungerground PVC pipe storage has been included as the quantity control method. No Cultec System is proposed.<br><br>Noted. |

| | |
|---|---|
| d. Water Budget (COB SWM 3.5 and 6.1.3):<br>• Strongly recommend the first 5mm of rainfall be retained and infiltrated or reused onsite. | This recommendation will be considered at the GDCC stage and upon receipt of the HydroG report. |
| e. Groundwater:<br>• Because the stormwater quantity control facilities must maintain a minimum 1m separation from groundwater, please provide seasonally high estimated groundwater elevation (if underground stormwater storage is proposed). | This will be addressed once a Geotechnical Report is completed. |
| f. External Flows:<br>• Identify all external flows and safely accommodate them under the developed conditions to avoid upstream flooding or ponding. | Noted. |
| g. Overland Flow Route (COB SWM 5.3.2 and 6.1.1.3):<br>• Provide the emergency overland flow route on the plans and direct it towards Maple Ave. Include the neighbouring properties to ensure existing drainage patterns are being maintained. | The overland flow route has been added to the Grading Plan. |
| a. pre-development storm drainage area<br>b. post-development storm drainage area<br>c. grading Plan SG-01:<br>i. FSR Figure SGO1 indicates the existing elevation at the NW corner of the property at Maple Ave. as 91.60, which could be considered the constraint for the major drainage system for the property. The FFE is stated as 91.95, the TFW was not provided, however, typically the TFW is +/- 0.3m below the FFE, which would mean the TFW is proposed at +/- 91.65, considering this site will go through a GDCC application in the future, and although not a signal family lot, the City's standard drawing S-119 indicates min. 0.5m outside grade above front lot corner grade for lots with one way drainage. The grade at the outside of the foundation must be min. 0.15m below the TFW, therefore the TFW and any other openings should be min. 92.25 (91.6 + 0.50 + 0.15).<br>ii. Further, the grades at the rear (south side) of the units, do not appear to have a min. 2% - 5% slope away from the foundation<br>iii. The swale along the rear property line must be min. 200mm lower than the outside grade of the buildings<br>iv. The bottom of curb elevation at the rear of the property 91.31 is less than the grade at the entrance 91.37, the overland flow route must have positive drainage towards Maple Ave., with changes to TFW minimum, it is anticipated that the grades across the site will need to be raised.<br>v. The swale is proposed as concrete – what is the purpose? If it was grass it would contribute to a LID approach to slow down and infiltrate runoff.<br>vi. At the GDCC stage the downspouts will need to be shown on the grading drawing, they must outlet to a permeable surface, i.e., not on the driveway.<br>vii. At the GDCC stage the sump outlet will need to be shown and must outlet to a permeable surface or be connected to the storm system via a sump system | i. The FFE has been updated to 92.25.<br>ii. The grades surrounding the building have been upated as a result of the increased FFE and size of retaining wall.<br>Iii. The swale is at least 200mm lower than the outside grade of the buildings.<br>iv. The grades at the entrance have all been updated as a result of the increased FFE.<br>v. Due to the limited space, and as discussed over our previous meeting, avalley Gutter/Swale was introduced.<br>vi. The downspouts are shown on the drawings as requested.<br>vii. The sump outlet are shown on the drawings as requested. |
| d. Servicing plan SS-01:<br>i. Any storm sewers with less than 1.2m cover (over obvert of pipe) will require insulation, please clearly note on SS-01 which storm sewer runs require insulation and provide a detail. Please note that after grading is revised it may be that there is more cover and no insulation required.<br>ii. The FSR/SWM report section 3.1 indicates there is an existing 300mm storm in Maple, but according to the City's records, Drawing MM-7 from a mid-1980's capital project, it is a 375mm diameter, please confirm diameter and revise materials accordingly, before the site plan application.<br>iii. The existing municipal catch basin in the proposed entrance may need to be moved, to be confirmed at detailed design stage, as per section 5.2.5 of the City's SWM guidelines, catch basins should not be located within 1.0m of a driveway<br>iv. At GDCC stage, CB frame and cover in landscape areas are to be beehive S-176<br>v. At GDCC stage storm MH frame and covers are to be closed, stamped "Danger – Storm" | i. Storm pipes that have less than 1.2m cover have been labelled as insulated on the Servicing Plan.<br>ii. The existing storm sewer within Maple Avenue has been updated to 375mm.<br>Iii. The municipal catch-basin within the proposed entrance has been labelled to be relocated to be at least 1.0m away from the proposed entrance.<br>iv. The note has been added.<br>v. The note has been added. |

| | |
|---|---|
| e. any additional applicable plans<br>i. Has Transportation Planning agreed (in principal) to the 5m wide private laneway and 5.58m long driveways? The reduced dimensions are atypical.<br>6. Include a Letter of Reliance that allows the City to rely upon the documents. The city was not excluded from relying on the report, so a separate letter is not required. | |
| NOISE AND VIBRATION FEASIBILITY STUDY | |
| 1. All documents to be prepared in accordance with the MECP's Environmental Noise Guideline Publication NPC-300, as amended. | Acknowledged |
| 2. To be stamped and certified by a Professional Engineer | Acknowledged |
| 3. External agency may review the report. If differing requirements exist between them and the City than the most stringent criteria shall apply. The subject properties are within the MTO regulated limits (<400m from the QEW) and within 1000 meters of the CN railway. | Acknowledged |
| 4. The study to include but not limited to the following:<br>a. Considered a Class 1 property. It was not explicitly stated in the report, however the NPC-300 criteria in the report is Class 1 criteria.<br>b. Identify offsite stationary noise sources that may require mitigation for existing and/or proposed development and provide the mitigation requirements. If offsite mitigation is required, then confirmation of a legal agreement between the development and offsite sources is required. Please note, adjacent property owners are not obligated to mitigate their onsite stationary noise sources, as it relates to stationary noise impacts on the subject development. The applicant is responsible for mitigating the exceedances within the limits of the subject development, which may require a site redesign.<br>c. Provide all model calculations for both onsite and offsite.<br>d. Provide any onsite noise measurements.<br>e. Use reflective surfaces for model calculations where applicable.<br>f. Provide capacity volumes received from the City's Transportation Services for roads using model calculations. Include the correspondence within the appendix.<br>g. Provide any correspondence from external agencies to confirm traffic and/or train counts within the appendix.<br>h. Provide all mitigating measure calculations including but not limited to window glazing, façade requirements, noise walls, etc.<br>i. Provide a key plan identifying points of reception.<br>j. Provide a key plan identifying sources of noise for both stationary and linear and including distances from subject property.<br>k. NPC-300 exceedances and/or max. points of reception required for every floor and side of the building.<br>l. Points of reception required for every neighbouring property.<br>m. Provide a table for the points of reception and include the allowable noise | Acknowledged.<br>a. Noise from the nearby facilities discussed in Section 2.2 is not expected to have a significant impact on the subjec site. Thus, the Class of the property was not discussed as a detailed stationary noise assessment was not considered necessary. |
| 5. Include a Letter of Reliance that allows the City to rely upon the documents. The City is not excluded (i.e., no limitations section) so a letter of reliance isn't necessarily required. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Comments on the Valcoustics Canada Ltd. Environmental Noise Feasibility Study, 759 Maple Ave. dated April 30, 2024: | |
| a. Generally, the report is satisfactory, and has incorporated the guidance points above provided by the City in the July 21, 2023 pre-consultation memo. | |
| b. The Maple Ave. STAMSON calculation utilized “absorptive” surface, but we ask that it be revised to “reflective” as there is only a small landscape area fronting the subject property, the use of “absorptive” for QEW is acceptable as there is a large park between the QEW and the subject property. Staff acknowledges that the change to absorptive for Maple may be inconsequential but ask for confirmation. | |
| c. Please include all the STAMSON calculations in the report | a. Acknowledged |
| d. Considering there will be no site plan application, we ask that recommendations are provided in the report, i.e., certification after construction that the recommended noise control measures were installed (windows, barrier, location of a/c, etc.) | b. The report will be updated to use reflective surface for Maple Avenue<br>c. The report will be updated to include all of the Stamson calculations.<br>d. A construction review should be undertaken one the development is built. |
| e. Please provide guidance to the builder on location of central air units for each of the units to ensure NPC-216 is met. i.e., place on roof, rear yard, somewhere else? | e. The location of central air units is beyond our expertise and an appropriate location should be determined by the relevant professional engineer. |