



Via Email

November 17, 2021

Mr. Michael Telawski
Vice-President Land Development
Docasa Group Ltd.
c/o Trinison Management Corp.
8600 Dufferin Street
Vaughan, Ontario L4K 5P5

Dear Michael,

**Re: Response to Urban Design Comments
Docasa Group Ltd. Urban Design Brief
160 Burnhamthorpe Road West
Z.1317.06 & 24T-21004/1317
Town of Oakville
JGWL Ref No.: W-2377**

As requested, we have reviewed the Town of Oakville's Urban Design Comments dated July 19, 2021 regarding the above-noted application and provide the following response (in bold italics) to each of the comments. A copy of the updated UDB dated November 17, 2021 is also attached for your resubmission to the Town.

Landscape (comment provided by Philip Wiersma)

1. [Circ 1] Regarding the General Urban (as per schedule "A"), these lots should have the minimum rear yard maintained at 7m as per the parent zoning regulations.

Response: The minimum rear yard will be 6m as permitted in other approved developments (at least Shieldbay & Star Oak) in North Oakville.

2. [Circ 1] As per section 8.1.6 of the Burnhamthorpe Road Character Study, vehicular access to Burnhamthorpe Road should be provided through local roads, and not directly from private driveways. The lots abutting Burnhamthorpe Road should be revised to provide vehicular access from rear lanes.

Response: No change to the draft plan. The plan will continue to reflect the Master Plan and the Burnhamthorpe Study preferred cross-section that is added to the Docasa UDB (see Item #5 below). Direct frontage with driveway access will be provided along Burnhamthorpe Road.



3. [Circ 1] To provide additional space for on street parking opposite the Park and School, all lots abutting Street B should be revised to provide vehicular access from rear lanes.
Response: No change to the draft plan. Lots were re-oriented at the request of the Town to front onto Street 'B'.

4. [Circ 1] Urban Design Brief – 6.3 Neighbourhood Activity Node. Revise text to state that streetscape treatment “will be upgraded” instead of “may be upgraded”. Enhanced pedestrian amenity including a hardscaped planting and furnishing zone will be necessary in this area.
Response: Modification made as requested.

5. [Circ 1] Urban Design Brief – 6.4 Streetscape Design. Brief should discuss the proposed streetscape design proposed along the Burnhamthorpe Road frontage. Treatment is to be consistent with the direction contained in the Burnhamthorpe Road Character Study.
Response: A new section (6.4.3 – Burnhamthorpe Road) has been added that includes a high level discussion regarding the streetscape design along Burnhamthorpe Road that runs adjacent to the north boundary of the Docasa Group Ltd. lands.

Built Form (comments provided by Jana Kelemen)

6. [Circ 1] Single-detached homes (Lots 145-161) with vehicular access from public street are not an appropriate condition along Burnhamthorpe Road (see also comment # 2 above). Rear lane-based houses should be proposed along Burnhamthorpe Road and guidelines for such product should be added to the Built Form Section. The lane should be proposed to continue behind the Block 162 as well (connecting from Street G to Street C). As proposed, Block 162 could potentially feature a noise wall along Burnhamthorpe Road West which is not a desirable condition. With an L-shaped lane, all units along Burnhamthorpe Road West would face the road with built form and not with private amenity areas which would eliminate the need for any future noise barrier.
Response: No change to the draft plan. See Item #2 above.

7. [Circ 1] Block 171 should be redesigned to face Street F and Street B. As proposed, this Block is facing a parking lot of the Block 178 which is not a desirable condition.
Response: No change has been made to the draft plan. The site plan design for the mid-rise blocks is only conceptual at this point and parking areas have not been finally determined. These blocks will go through the Town's SPA process to address any incompatibilities prior to any approvals. Also, on-site surface parking, as conceptually shown, could be reduced or eliminated if on-street lay-by parking were allowed to contribute to the commercial parking requirements.

8. [Circ 1] UDB Section 6.5 Built Form (first paragraph) should mention compliance with not only North Oakville Urban Design and Open Space Design Guidelines, but also with the Livable by



Design Manual. This document should also be mentioned in the Implementation Section (see also comment #17).

Response: Modifications made as requested. Additionally, a new section that discusses the Livable by Design Manual has been provided in Policy Context section 3.8 of the UDB.

9. [Circ 1] Even though the document speaks to pedestrian-friendly design of built form with ample windows, some of the illustrations show houses with limited or no fenestration at the ground level (for example pg. 25 and 27). Please either replace these illustrations with designs featuring more windows at the ground level, or eliminate these images from the document.

Response: Some modifications to the images have been made as requested. However, it is noted that due to the lot sizes, not all dwellings will be able to accommodate ground level fenestration. Where this is not possible, glazing will be provided in the front doors (including full-height glass + transoms) to facilitate overlook of street and allow light penetration into the dwelling. We have added a new bullet to this effect in Sec. 6.5.1.

10. [Circ 1] For the Section 6.6.3. Street Townhouse Dwellings, add the following standard based on Livable by Design Manual direction: "For residential units directly accessed from the public realm, raise the entrances no more than 0.9m higher than the elevation of the abutting sidewalk".

Response: The LBDM does not contain the words "no more than" and we do not feel comfortable making this very technical commitment in the UDB when finished floor levels are dictated by engineering requirements and site grading conditions. Instead, we have added a new bullet that states: "Elevated main entrances should be avoided wherever feasible for residential units directly accessed from the public realm. The use of sunken foyers may be required." We feel this is a more appropriate method to address concerns with elevated entrances in a guideline document. Also, through the architectural design review process, builders are asked to provide sunken foyers and other provisions to lessen the impact of elevated entrances where adverse grade conditions are present.

11. [Circ 1] Please add "of significantly different colour schemes" to the last sentence on pg. 34 (Section 7.2 Architectural Variety). There are several corners in NO which were built as described and if the kitty-corner lots are identical with the same colour scheme, they do not provide a desirable outcome. The sentence should read: "Identical kitty-corner lot elevations of significantly different colour schemes are acceptable."

Response: Modification to bullet point made as requested.

12. [Circ 1] Eliminate sentence "To provide variety along the streetscape, some dwellings may feature side entries" in Section 7.4. According to Livable Oakville Plan (and consequently the urban design standards in the Livable by Design Manual), Section 6.9.6: "Main principal entrances to buildings should be oriented to the public sidewalk, onstreet parking and transit



facilities for direct and convenient access for pedestrians.” Main entrances should be oriented to and visible from the street. Side entries are not desirable and different techniques should be used to achieve a variety along the streetscape.

Response: *Bullet eliminated as requested.*

13. [Circ 1] Revise Section 7.4.2 Exterior Materials and Colours to clearly note that stucco may only be used as an accent material (Livable by Design Manual, Section 3.3.16: “... Incorporate high quality stucco only as an accent material.”).

Response: *Modification made regarding use of stucco to bring in line with LBDM.*

14. [Circ 1] In Section 7.5.1, eliminate the last sentence “Situating light fixtures above the garage door to break-up the massing.” Light fixtures above garage doors do not help breaking-up the massing; the other techniques mentioned in this Section should be used instead. Also, revise the 7th bullet point on page 39 to: “Where a double car garage is contemplated, 2 individual garage doors / bays separated by a pier should be proposed.”, and eliminate the following sentence: “Where single 16ft (4.9m) wide garage doors are proposed they should be patterned to appear as 2 individual doors, where feasible.”

Response: *Modifications to this section made as requested.*

15. [Circ 1] In Section 7.8.3 Upgraded Rear and Side Architecture, add “varied façade planes” or similar wording to the list of applicable enhancements to encourage the use of projections and recesses for the facades backing onto the public realm. Many of the large homes backing onto SWM ponds, school sites and parks are designed with one-plane rear façade and do not provide the desirable interest and the same architectural quality as the front elevations.

Response: *A new bullet was added to address this “Use of varied façade planes is encouraged in the composition of publicly exposed rearscapes, including a combination of jogged and flush wall faces, in order to create visual interest.”*

16. In Section 8.1.3, eliminate ‘generally’ from the following sentence: “Main entrances should generally be visible from the street and clearly defined.” According to Town’s Livable by Design Manual, Section 3.3.11, “Orient main entrances towards the public realm to improve legibility and contribute to the pedestrian environment.” Also see comment #12 above (Livable Oakville policy 6.9.6).

Response: *Modification made as requested.*

17. [Circ 1] Section 9.1 Architectural Control Process should be revised to include the conditions below (comment #18), as some of the required wording is missing in this Section (for example, submission of typical floor plans). Also, “and the Town’s Livable by Design Manual” should be included in the first sentence after North Oakville Urban Design and Open Space Guidelines.



Response: Implementation Section 9.1 has been modified as requested and now includes wording as per conditions noted below.

Draft Plan of Subdivision

18. [Circ 1] Following conditions should be included in the Draft Plan of Subdivision Agreement and the Implementation Section of the UDB should be revised to include and address these conditions:

Conditions to be satisfied prior to Marketing and Sales:

1. That the Owner agrees to implement the Town approved Urban Design Brief [date] to the satisfaction of the Town.
2. The Owner shall submit elevation drawings (all facades) and typical floor plans (all levels) for all models on lots not subject to Site Plan Approval to Planning Services Urban Design staff for review and approval. Upon acceptance, these drawings shall be added as an Appendix to the Urban Design Brief. The Owner agrees that compliance with this condition is required prior to the Owner marketing or selling any such units.
3. That the Owner shall select a control architect who shall ensure all development which is exempt from Site Plan Approval process, proceeds in accordance with the Town-approved Urban Design Brief. The Owner shall submit a letter to the Town from the selected control architect acknowledging the following:
 - i. a control architect has been retained for this subdivision and does not have any perceived or real pecuniary interests or conflicts with performing the required duties;
 - ii. the control architect acknowledges the final Urban Design Brief prepared for this subdivision and agrees to implement the same;
 - iii. the control architect is responsible for ensuring the Town-approved models, as appended to the Urban Design Brief, will be sited in accordance with the Urban Design Brief direction;
 - iv. the control architect will ensure that any sold units meet the design direction and criteria of the Town-approved Urban Design Brief, prior to submitting for building permit review;
 - v. the control architect will discuss with Town staff any identified issues; and the control architect will submit stamped/signed drawings with the building permit application in accordance with the foregoing.

Response: The above conditions have been incorporated into the Implementation Section of the UDB.



Zoning

19. [Circ 1] The appropriate minimum area of a viable commercial space should be included in the proposed Zoning By-law for the Block 178, as well as the requirement for a min. height of 4.5 m for the first storey for Blocks 177 and 178.

Response: The 4.5m min. ht., if required, would only need to apply to Block 178 as it is the only block that will contain commercial uses on the ground floor. This would be addressed in the ZBL.

Please call if you have any questions or concerns with our peer review comments. I would be pleased to discuss this matter in greater detail with you and/or the applicant.

Yours truly,

JOHN G. WILLIAMS LIMITED ARCHITECT

David Stewart, MCIP, RPP