

| No. | Comment | Response |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Key Recommendations | | |
| 1 | The Panel appreciates the refinements to the proposal since it last attended the UDRP in 2019. | Noted and appreciated |
| 2 | The Panel recommends further refining the integration of the development with the public realm, with particular regard to the interactions at the ground level along St-Joseph Boulevard and the 1st level along Duford Drive. | The ground level has been redesigned to provide more generous tree planting areas with increased soil volumes, which will assist in greening the public realm. The proposed development includes 2 commercial units, which will contribute to animating the public realm, as will the open space and commercial patio at the corner of St. Joseph Boulevard and Duford Drive. |
| 2.1 | Consider encroachment agreements to further develop the public realm spaces and enable greater animation of the corner as a community amenity space and gateway element. | Due to previous experience attempting to negotiate encroachment agreements, this will not be pursued. It is our understanding that the city is not supportive of encroachment agreements due to their complexity and the liability and maintenance challenges; therefore, we will not be pursuing this recommendation at this time. |
| 2.2 | Consider embellishing that corner space for community use and to help anchor the building within a stronger public realm; further improving the relationship of the building to the streets surrounding it. | Noted, the corner open space is intended for semi-public and community use. It will mix both the commercial patio uses and the form and function of a semi-public space. |
| 3 | The Panel recommends refining and simplifying the podium expression by applying a brick materiality rather than spandrels at the north-east and south-west corners of the podium. | Noted, additional masonry has been added to further differentiate the podium massing to that of the tower. |
| 3.1 | The Panel suggests considering more of a feature architectural element along the eastern edge of the building, potentially referencing the flatiron approach of past renditions. | The old concept design was not functional in that area for residential use and was thus revised. Articulation of the corner is now achieved via different material expression. |
| 3.2 | The Panel suggests simplifying and selecting a singular cladding material for the backdrop of the proposed eastern plaza space. | The podium base has been simplified per updated elevations. |
| 3.3 | The Panel suggests wrapping the canopy and stone colonnade around the eastern portion of the podium at the corner to give it more depth as a ground level feature. | Noted, however proposed revision would be in conflict with City and Hydro services. |
| 4 | The Panel recommends adjusting some aspects of the material palette. | Alternative brick colours were reviewed but deemed inappropriate. Material palette overall has been simplified per the updated elevations. |
| 4.1 | The Panel suggests a warmer tone of brick, such as a red brick, at the podium level to further differentiate the massing of the podium from that of the tower portion. | See the response to the comment above. |
| 5 | The Panel recommends further exploring options for articulating the top element of the tower which screens the mechanical penthouse. | The mechanical penthouse will be designed to hide equipment and will visually integrate into the tower massing seamlessly. |
| 5.1 | Consider screening the mechanical penthouse at the top of the tower with a lighter material or architectural element rather than a dark solid brick wall. | Noted, this was considered; however, we concluded the contrast in colour made the mechanical penthouse more visually dominant and was discarded as an option. |

| No. | Comment | Response |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 6 | The Panel recommends further establishing a sustainability strategy for the site, with particular regard to how the site will manage stormwater run-off, retention, and drainage. | Further consideration to stormwater runoff has been completed, please see the revised civil materials. Additional and diverse tree plantings in the rear will also assist in preventing erosion and managing stormwater runoff, retention, and drainage. |
| Site Design & Public Realm | | |
| 7 | The Panel strongly recommends opening up the corner plaza element beyond the property line to provide a robust corner POPS/public realm at the intersection of St-Joseph Boulevard and Duford Drive, as previously contemplated in the 2019 UDRP submission. | Noted, however proposed revision would be in conflict with City and Hydro services |
| 7.1 | Consider including street trees and hardscaping beyond the property line along St-Joseph Boulevard and at the corner intersection. | Trees were considered for inclusion in the public right of way, however, the Geotechnical Report recommended that trees be placed more than 4.5 metres from the foundation wall of the building. There is not enough distance from the building wall to plant a tree with adequate soil volumes. |
| 8 | The Panel has concerns with the currently proposed curved retaining wall closing the plaza space off from the public. | The curved wall responds to the curve of the intersection and also maximizes the useable area within the private property. |
| 8.1 | Consider opening up the corner plaza element by either extending the retaining wall along Duford Drive straight out to the intersection or by minimizing the location of the retaining wall / seating, which is related to the potential restaurant, creating publicly accessible space beyond. | Noted, however site grading makes the suggested revision difficult without multiple steps. Steps would both limit the usable area of the plaza and reduce barrier-free accessibility. |
| 9 | The Panel recommends further developing the greenspace on the south side of the building along Duford Drive into a publicly accessed POPS with street trees, seating, and plantings. | Please note that a POPS has not been provided. The open area is a semi-public space with some proposed commercial seating. We are limited in tree options because of Hydro requirements as well as the Geotechnical Report recommendation to locate trees away from retaining walls to minimize disruption from roots. |
| 9.1 | Consider continuing the street tree planting from St-Joseph Boulevard around the corner and up the hill into the neighbourhood along Duford Drive. | Please see the response to Comment #7.6 in the Comment Response Table. |
| 10 | The Panel recommends pursuing the opportunity for public art in the corner plaza, and establishing the corner as a community gateway. | Noted. |
| 11 | The Panel has concerns with the potential for hydro lines to interfere with the long-term viability of the street trees along St-Joseph Boulevard. | We have proposed Elderberry along St. Joseph boulevard which is listed under Hydro One's list of trees / shrubs approved under 3m height. They are native and tolerant of urban conditions. |
| 11.1 | Consider working with the City to bury the servicing and hydro lines. | Burying the hydro lines was investigated, however, this presented new challenges to overcome related to underground hydro requirements. Unfortunately, this could not be pursued. |
| 12 | The Panel recommends treating the hardscaping in the public realm with pavers, including the driveway, rather than asphalt. | We are proposing pavers in areas other than the driveway which is proposed concrete. |
| Sustainability | | |
| 13 | The Panel recommends further developing the landscape, particularly with regard to water runoff, stormwater retention and drainage. | We are proposing a total of 17 trees with 5 of 6 species being native to Ontario. We are also proposing native White Cedars to screen the transformers and mechanical equipment. |

| No. | Comment | Response |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 14 | The Panel recommends further greening the site, particularly along the south side of the building. | We are proposing a total of 17 trees with 5 of 6 species being native to Ontario. We are limited to where we can plant due to Geotechnical and Hydro restraints. |
| 14.1 | Consider stepping the site from the south of the building down to St-Joseph Boulevard, with a more naturalized landscape of trees and bioswales, to further manage stormwater on-site and contribute to the resiliency and sustainability of the neighbourhood. | We are proposing a total of 17 trees with 5 of 6 species being native to Ontario. |
| 15 | The Panel recommends providing less parking in favour of more space for sustainable and active transportation modes. | <p>125 resident vehicle parking spaces are provided when 0 are required. This does not exceed the maximum of 1.75 parking spaces per dwelling unit. 20 visitor parking spaces are required and provided. 0 commercial parking spaces are required and provided.</p> <p>205 bicycle parking spaces are provided for 206 units, whereas 103 are required, at nearly a 1:1 ratio. Bicycle parking is provided on the mezzanine level in individually lockable units for improved security compared to traditional bike rooms. This provides both bicycle and item storage in the same location for residents.</p> <p>Commercial bicycle parking is provided four times the required minimum, providing 8 spaces when 2 are required. Accordingly, the proposed parking supply can be rationalized.</p> |
| Built Form & Architecture | | |
| 16 | The Panel recommends refining the eastern elevation of the podium, as it is a particularly important view. | Noted, elevation articulation has been simplified per the updated elevations. |
| 16.1 | The Panel suggests the earlier design, which took more of a flatiron approach to the corner element, was more successful at capitalizing on the unique shape of the property parcel and creating a gateway element into the neighbourhood. | Noted, previous design was impractical from a cost perspective and from a City services perspective (Interference w/ Utilities, encroachment into City-owned property, etc). As such that concept is no longer being considered. |
| 16.2 | Consider the importance of that eastern corner view along the streetscape and as a gateway to the neighbourhood up the hill. | Noted. |
| 17 | The Panel has concerns with the window-wall element and how it wraps around the corners, both at the north-east corner and the south-west corner of the podium. | Noted, addressed in the updated elevations. |
| 17.1 | Consider using the podium brick material in place of the spandrels at both corner locations. | Noted. |
| 17.2 | Consider bringing the canopy and stone colonnade from the north façade around the eastern portion of the podium at the corner. | Noted, see response to comment to #3.3 above. |
| 18 | The Panel recommends pursuing a more contextual material for the podium than the black brick. | Noted, alternative colours were reviewed however not approved by Client. |
| 18.1 | Consider red brick, or a warmer tone than black brick, at this site. | See response to the comment above. |
| 19 | The Panel has concerns with the stark blank walls surrounding the garage entrance area. | Garage entrance area is now recessed and as such the blank wall massing has been significantly reduced. |
| 19.1 | Consider adding some architectural detailing to the lower 1- or 2-storeys of the building. | Noted, will consider moving forward into Construction Documentation. |