Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Areas A-D

Comment #	Comment	Response
Rebecca Lau Correspondence Blocks A to D – July 9, 2021 Letter		
Key Comments		
General Planning Comments		
	Role of Private Green Space	
1a)	The City's new Official Plan, adopted by the City and approved by Halton Region in late 2020, states that proposals to redesignate lands within the Major Parks and Open Space designation shall only be considered by the City in conjunction with a statutory Official Plan Review. Can the Planning Justification Report include discussion to demonstrate how the proposed conversion of the subject lands to a residential designation responds to the urban structure as outlined in the City's New Official Plan?	See planning addendum which includes a review of the City's new Official Plan presently under appeal.
	With the proposed open space removal, is this neighbourhood appropriately served by parkland and open space or will this proposal result in a deficiency?	Yes. See Parks and Recreation comments. Additional parkland dedication has been requested and will be provided through the consideration of the applications. In addition, some lands that are now private open space are also being proposed to come into public ownership.
	What role does the private open space currently play in this community and how does it impact the overall character of the neighbourhood? How does redevelopment of parts of this open space impact this role and overall character? What is the envisioned role of the remaining private open space in the future?	The Millcroft was built as a residential community with a golf course weaving through it. With the golf course being maintained and the lots proposed being larger single-detached homes, the vision of the area will remain intact. The future of the remaining private open space is an 18 hole golf course.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Areas A-D

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Proposed Open Space/Walkway Blocks (Blocks 105 -107) and Trails in Areas A and B	
1b)	Please elaborate on and provide additional details of the proposed trails/open space walkway blocks in Area A & B. Are the trails intended to be accessible to the general public? Is a bridge proposed over Appleby Creek in Area A? Are the Open Space/Walkway blocks proposed to be dedicated to the City?	Based on feedback received from CH and Region, we are eliminating the bridge over Appleby Creek. The open space area is to be dedicated to the City. A linear park with trail is proposed between Areas A and B which is to be dedicated to the City through the consideration of the applications. All trails are proposed to be accessible by the public
	Landscape Buffers	
1c)	Will there be a fence separating the rear POTL lines from the buffer? How will the buffer be maintained and remain as a buffer in perpetuity?	Based on feedback received, Millcroft Greens is proposing to incorporate the buffer into the lot as opposed to keeping the buffer separate in condominium ownership. This amendment will address residents' concerns about public access to the buffer. The buffer will continue to be zoned O1.
	Why is a landscape buffer block proposed between Country Club Drive and Lot 83 (corner lot) in Area C, but not between other corner lots and the public street?	The buffer area on the east side of the condominium road is being eliminated and included within a proposed park. The buffer area on the west side is required to allow clear passage for golf carts.
	The existing RM2 zone adjacent to Area C requires a minimum 6 m landscape buffer next to a low-density zone. How has this factored into the proposed by-law?	A 6 metre landscape buffer is proposed between the proposed lots within Area C and the existing RM2 Zone. This 6 metre buffer will be in addition to the rear yard setback of 7.5 metres.
	The existing townhouses adjacent to Area C at 2175 Country Club Drive are setback relatively close to the shared property line (5.3-7.7 m), and townhouse units 13-15 (adjacent to the site) appear to have second storey balconies. A landscape buffer is recommended to be incorporated into the Zoning By-law for Area C next to the townhouses to mitigate potential overlook and privacy	The current proposal would see homes within Area C setback a minimum of 13.5 m from the property line of the abutting condominium townhouses at 2175 Country Club Drive. The 13.5 metres would include a 6 metre planted buffer plus a 7.5 metre rear yard setback. The setback from the common property line to the new homes is appropriate.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	impacts and provide a transition between existing and proposed buildings.	
	Privacy Grading, Building Height and Rear Encroachments	
1d)	Grading and topography of some lots in Areas A, B and D appear to provide for walk-out basement conditions, and the PJR notes that walk-out basements are envisioned for some lots. Are walk out basements also being considered for Area C?	Area C has no walkout conditions.
	Please provide typical cross sections illustrating how the proposed grades, proposed building heights, existing building heights, rear yard setbacks and proposed rear yard setbacks interface with the adjacent neighbourhood for dwellings with walkout basement conditions (e.g. Lots 24 & 25 in Area A; Lots 40-42 in Area B; and Lots 95 & 96 in Area D). This will allow staff to assess compatibility between the proposed built form and the existing dwellings.	Refer to Conceptual Open Space package prepared by Nak Design Strategies. Evaluation of grading on a lot by lot basis will occur at the detailed design stage.
	Overall Scaling, Massing: Unlimited Lot Coverage and Dwelling Depth, Increase in Building Height, Reduced Rear Yard Setbacks, Increased Encroachments	
1e)	The intent of the City's lot coverage regulations, along with maximum dwelling depth, yard setback and building height regulations, is to control building placement and massing to ensure that there is an appropriate balance between buildings and open space, support compatibility, to support a harmonious, pedestrian-scaled streetscape environment, and to provide for appropriate stormwater management.	Acknowledged.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Areas A-D

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Staff are concerned that the proposed zoning standards (exemption from lot coverage and dwelling depth, reduced building setbacks, increased encroachments for porches/decks into the front yard and rear, increased building heights) could result in overdevelopment that does not maintain the above intent of the City's Zoning By-law	See planning addendum and revised draft Zoning By-law.
	If the building envelope is proposed to be only controlled through yard setbacks and building heights, what would the resultant maximum lot coverage, dwelling depth and FAR be for a typical lot? How does the resultant coverage, dwelling depth and FAR compare to the surrounding context? The proposed zoning regulations would allow for a greater amount of impervious area than would normally be permitted in the base R3.2 zone. What impacts would this have on stormwater management? Does the resultant impervious area meet the City's Stormwater Management Design Guidelines? Has the impact of increased encroachments for porches and lanai/loggia on stormwater management been considered?	See planning addendum and revised draft Zoning By-law.
	Trans Canada Pipeline (Areas A and D)	
1f)	TransCanada Pipelines has commented that all roads, buildings and structures are to be setback at minimum 7 m setback from the pipeline easement. Based on this requirement, the development concepts for Areas C & D would need to be amended. Additionally, TCP has advised that facilities are to be constructed to ensure drainage is directed away from the right-of-way. Based on this	The designs for Areas C and D have been amended to reflect the need for a 7 metre setback and is now satisfactory to TCP.

Comment #	Comment		Response
	requirement, it appears that significant redesign of Area D would be needed to accommodate the required setback.		
Draft Zoning By-law			
	Proposed Site Specific Standard	Staff Comment	
Front Yard	4.5 m to dwelling and 6 m to attached garage.	Combined with proposed private road width, increased height and porch encroachments, and reduced side yard setbacks, staff are concerned that the proposed 4.5 m front yard setback would contribute to a built environment that is not compatible with the surrounding streetscape or neighbourhood character. If an increase in building height is proposed, a corresponding increase in front yard setback (i.e. greater than the minimum required 6 m) should be provided. Front yard setback to garage should be increased to 6.7 m to ensure a 6.7 m driveway length.	We are of the opinion that the 4.5 metre setback is appropriate and compatible. See definition of compatible/compatibility in the existing and new Official Plans. Front yard setback to garage has been increased to 6.7 metres.
Driveway Length	6 m	Increase to 6.7 m in length to ensure cars do not overhang into private road or sidewalk.	See above comment.
Rear Yard	1 Storey: 4.5 m 1.5 Storey:	The proposed rear yard would allow shorter dwellings to project further into the rear yard than taller dwellings. Staff have concerns that	See revised draft Zoning By-law. We are of the opinion that the proposed rear and side yard setbacks are appropriate

Comment #	Comment		Response
	6 m 2 Storey: 7.5 m	this could result in privacy and noise conflicts between the proposed 1 and 1.5 storey-dwellings and future adjacent backyards. Please increase the rear yard setback for 1 and 1.5-storey dwellings to align more similarly with the proposed 2-storey dwelling setback, and consider increasing the side yard setbacks for 1 and 1.5-storey dwellings as well. A 3 m encroachment into the rear yard is also proposed. This could limit what can be accommodated in the rear yard, e.g. pools, sheds, etc., particularly for 1 and 1.5-storey lots. Are future residents likely to encroach into the landscape buffer in the future, given the proposed rear yard setbacks and proposed encroachments? What are the proposed rear setbacks for corner lots?	and will not result in privacy and/or noise conflicts especially where adjacent to a 6 metre landscape buffer. See planning addendum and revised draft Zoning By-law. The rear yard setbacks will be the same for corner lots.
Side Yard	1 or 1.5 storey side: 1.2 m and 0.6 m other side (instead of 1.2 m on both sides) 2 or more storey side: 1.2 m	To ensure that there is adequate space for residents to access the rear yard, if a 0.6 m setback is proposed on one side, the total distance between buildings should be at least 1.8 m. This should be specified in the zoning by-law. Please be aware that the Building Code does not allow building openings (e.g. windows, doors) in exterior walls that are setback less than 1.2 m from the property line.	Agreed. See revised draft Zoning By-law. Acknowledged.

Comment #	Comment		Response
	(instead of 1.8 m)	Staff have general concerns with the proposed side yard setbacks. Appropriate side yard setbacks help to achieve an appropriate balance between building and open space, alleviate perceived massing and contribute to compatibility.	See revised draft Zoning By-law. City staff will need to elaborate on theses concern as the intent is to provide compatible single-detached dwellings adjacent to existing development.
Exterior Side Yard	3.0 m instead of 4.5 m	Please confirm whether 'exterior side yard' is the same as a 'street side yard' as defined in the City's Zoning By-law 2020. Assuming the proposed setback is referring to a street side yard, the reduced setback would encroach into the established building line and would not fit in with the established streetscape along Country Club Drive and Millcroft Park Drive. Corner lots in the vicinity of Area C generally exceed the minimum 4.5 m setback, and corner lots in Area D generally meet or exceed the minimum 4.5 m setback. Street side yard setbacks should be increased to reflect existing setbacks in the surrounding context in order to facilitate a harmonious streetscape. Given the other proposed performance standards that contribute to additional building massing, a setback larger than 4.5 m should be provided in order to minimize the effect of the additional massing on the streetscape.	Confirmed. See revised draft Zoning By-law. Exterior side yards are proposed at 4.5 metres in accordance with the current zone standards. An increased exterior side yard setback beyond 4.5 metres is not justified.
Building Height		Staff have concerns that the proposed increase in building height for 1.5 and 2-	See revised draft Zoning By-law. We do not share these concerns.

Comment #	Comment		Response
		storey dwellings, together with the proposed reduced front yard and street side yard setbacks, and the proposed private road width, would result in a built form that is not pedestrian-scaled or in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood character.	
		Staff also have questions about whether the additional height is appropriately separated from the rear yard for corner lots if they are to have walk out basements.	A maximum 2 storey building height (12.5 m storeys) with a 13.5 metre rear yard setback (7.5 metre setback plus 6 metre landscape buffer) is reasonable and appropriate.
		If an increase in building height is proposed, increases to front and side yard setbacks should be provided to maintain an appropriate balance between building and open space and achieve appropriate massing.	See revised draft Zoning By-law. Minimum side yard setbacks of 1.2 metres are appropriate in an urban context and compatible with existing development.
		Other questions/comments of clarification:	
		Clarify whether proposed height is for peaked or flat roof dwellings.	See planning addendum. The 2 storey product is based on a peaked roof design.
		Are more than two storeys proposed? The draft by-law says “iii. Two storeys or more”. Please note that buildings taller than 2-storeys and 10 m are generally not permitted in low-density residential zones in the City except for properties along Lakeshore Road and North Shore Boulevard. Please note the definition of “Height, Building” and “Grade, Fixed” in the City’s	See revised draft Zoning By-law.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Areas A-D

Comment #	Comment		Response
		Zoning By-law. If the rationale for the increase in building height is to accommodate walk out basements, staff note that building height is measured from fixed grade at the front of the property; walk out basements would therefore not contribute to the overall height of the building.	
Lot Coverage/FAR/Dwelling Depth	No Maximum	See General Comments. Staff are concerned that the exemption from lot coverage and dwelling depth, along with the proposed increase in building height and reduced setbacks, could contribute to a development that is out of scale with the surrounding context. If an increase to lot coverage or dwelling depth is proposed, it should be specified in the zoning by-law and the resulting additional massing should be mitigated by increasing setbacks and possibly reducing building height.	See revised draft Zoning By-law. Lot coverages have been added. With all other provisions, we do not see the need or justification for including a restriction on dwelling depth. See revised draft Zoning By-law. We do not share these concerns.
Encroachment into Front Yard or Exterior Side Yard for an Unenclosed Porch and/or Stairway	1.5 m instead of 0.6m	Will the porch be raised, be roofed over and/or have railings? If so, it would add to the visual bulk of a building. See above comments about the proposed front yard and street side yard setbacks, and overall massing of buildings. "Exterior Side Yard": Are porches envisioned in the side yards of the end lots not facing a public street?	To be determined. We do not have detailed building designs at this point. There are very few exterior side yard conditions. Porch encroachments up to 1.5 metres are possible.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Areas A-D

Comment #	Comment		Response
Encroachment into Rear Yard for lanai/loggia		How is a lanai/loggia different from a porch, deck or patio, as defined in the City's Zoning By-law? Please use existing terminology wherever possible. Are exemptions to Part 1, 2.3 (Patios, Decks, Balconies and Porches – Residential) proposed? Are second storey balconies proposed? Some of the photos on page 57 in the submitted Urban Design Brief show second storey balconies in the rear. Please note that second storey balconies and decks are not permitted as per Part 1, 2.3.2 & 2.3.3 of the City's Zoning By-law, and would not be supported by staff due to their privacy impacts. What impacts would the proposed increase in encroachment have on drainage and stormwater management? Are basements proposed under decks? If so, it may also have an impact on drainage and groundwater.	See revised draft Zoning By-law and updated encroachment provisions. Second storey balconies are not proposed.
Preliminary Development Concept			
	The following information should be included on the Development Concept Plans: • Building setbacks on plan to confirm maximum building envelopes are based on proposed zoning.		We have included with our submission detail Lot Plans prepared by Gerrard Design dated March 24, 2022 showing building envelope, coverage and setback details.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• Driveway length. Must be minimum 6.7 m on POTLs to ensure that longer vehicles can be accommodated without hanging over into private roadway. • Total site area of each redevelopment area	See revised draft Zoning By-law. A minimum 6.7 metres has been provided.
Additional Information		
	Site statistics for each redevelopment area or a list of lot area and lot widths for each proposed lot and block.	See updated Preliminary Development Concept plans prepared by Gerrard Design (SK-74) included with submission.