

The following is a consolidation of all comments received along with responses to such comments.

COMMENT SUMMARY		
Individual/Agency	Comment	Response
<p>T. Kastelic 389 Bayport Blvd.</p>	<p>Concerns expressed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is only one entrance/exit to this community which will eventually serve 491 residences. Believes this is a safety and traffic hazard and that an additional entrance/exit west of the proposed apartment towers should be built linking them to Harbourview/Fuller. Suggests this should be a condition of rezoning approval. - Suggests that Kaitlin should undertake to build and use a “temporary construction vehicle entrance road” from Harbourview into the community for all construction purposes so that ongoing construction traffic will not inconvenience existing residents and make a mess of Bayport Blvd. Notes that there was a previous road that was used in that spot to access the community but it has since been shut down but could likely be reactivated. Notes that this construction period will span 10 years and experience has shown that significant disruption, construction mess, mud and safety issues have already occurred with just the 20 or so townhomes that are currently being built. - Suggests that the two proposed apartment towers be reduced from 12 floors to 5 which would be a more appropriate height for this low density area. 	<p>A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by JD Northcote Engineering Inc. and submitted in support of the proposed development application. This study was peer reviewed by Stantec Consulting Ltd. on behalf of the Town and comments/questions were provided. Responses to such comments/questions have been included in correspondence from JD Northcote dated May 8, 2019. The updated Traffic Impact Study and related cover letter is included with this submission.</p> <p>In summary, the Traffic Study has concluded that the proposed development will not cause any operational issues and will not add significant delay or congestion to the local roadway network. A short-term improvement is recommended for the Harbourview Drive/Sunnyside Drive & Bayport Boulevard intersection; installation of a westbound no right turn on red restriction. A modification to the existing median on Bayport Boulevard is also recommended. This modification would provide a 6.0 metre lane width on the north and the south sides of the median, representing sufficient width to provide the necessary emergency access redundancy to accommodate the full development of the site.</p> <p>Viability and options for a potential temporary construction vehicle access have been explored, including the review for potential use of a pre-existing property entrance on Harbourview Drive along the north property boundary. It has been determined that a considerable amount of fill would be required to reconstruct this entrance and bring it into a condition which would be necessary to facilitate this type of entrance. A concept plan has been prepared to identify the potential location of a temporary construction vehicles access. The Temporary Construction Entrance Sketch is submitted with this report. This would be subject to any related approvals from the Town. It is noted that the location and use of this access is temporary only. This would accommodate construction vehicle access so as to reduce construction vehicle use of Bayport Boulevard.</p> <p>With regard to safety concern comments, an opinion letter has been prepared by David Hine Engineering Inc., an engineering firm with specific professional expertise in the application of the National and Provincial</p>

		<p>Building and Fire Codes. This correspondence notes that neither the Ontario Building Code nor the Ontario Fire Code regulate the number of streets that must access a subdivision. It is the experts' opinion that the addition of an extension of Drummond Drive to connect with Fuller Road or a temporary emergency access would not significantly impact response times. The fire opinion letter prepared by David Hine Engineering Inc. and dated July 26, 2019, is included with this submission.</p> <p>Previous approvals had contemplated three 8-storey condominium buildings. The proposal has been revised to include two 12-storey condominium buildings and 32 rear-lane freehold/condominium townhouse units along the Bayport Boulevard frontage. The overall design of the site, as a whole, takes into consideration Official Plan density targets, previous Draft Plan Approvals, and the site's context within the surrounding area. The Plan has been designed in such a way as to reflect and build upon the abutting townhouse development area which is under construction and to provide for a transition between the planned higher density form and the existing single detached units.</p> <p>The current zoning for the condominium tower block would permit a maximum building height of 30 metres (approximately 8 storeys). The draft Zoning By-law Amendment proposes an increase in building height from 30 metres to 40 metres. With regard to examples of other buildings of similar height, we would specifically note exceptions within the Town of Midland Zoning By-law: building height maximum of 38 metres for an existing 12 storey building at 699 Aberdeen Boulevard; and, building height maximum of 51 metres for 711 Aberdeen Boulevard which would permit a 16 storey building.</p>
<p>E. and J. Milakowski 380 Bayport Blvd.</p>	<p>Comments expressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New proposal will create number of problems for the existing residents in this neighbourhood and the immediate area - New development proposal is of much higher density than Kaitlin's original plan, which was previously submitted and approved - Request to increase density from 22 units/hectare to 30 units/ hectare (for Area A), building 2 apartments 12 storey high with additional freehold/condominium townhouse units fronting on Bayport Blvd exceeds the reasonable density for this relatively small and environmentally sensitive area - Proposal is not in the best interest of the local residents and doesn't fit within the surrounding neighbourhood which consider the uses, massing, height, scale, architecture and details of adjacent buildings 	<p>That portion of the draft plan which will accommodate the street townhouse units, is proposed at a density of 30 units per net hectare. The Town's Official Plan (Section 3.3.6) states that Medium Density Residential development should generally not exceed 30 units per net hectare.</p> <p>The current zoning of the site for the 12-storey condominium buildings would permit a maximum density of 121 units per hectare. The proposed development in this area would be approximately 106 units per net hectare.</p> <p>See previous notes with regard to comments pertaining to the Traffic Impact Study, emergency access and building height.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal will create higher traffic on Bayport Blvd. during construction phase and after completion of the project - Request that Council and Planning Department approve Kaitlin's proposal under the original subdivision plan or consider the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower density for Area A and create extra space to allow for additional parking spots for residents and/or visitors • Lower density for Area B by allowing only 2 apartments 5 or 6 storeys high and rejecting additional freehold/ condominium townhouse units fronting again on Bayport Blvd. • Rezoning application for Area B from Residential Apt to Residential Townhouse zoning to allow for construction of additional freehold/ condominium townhouses should be rejected as too dense and contrary with the Town OP (Sections 1.3.1 and 2.4.4) • Entire development will be using Bayport Blvd as the only main road access to and from the area - no consideration for additional traffic generated by these higher densities using one access • Need to provide additional access to the area by opening current road provision of Harbourview Drive/Fuller to provide additional access in case of any emergency situations - extending Drummond Drive could also be a possibility • Are no provisions for additional parking area for residents and visitors to support this development • Proposal as submitted (with such high density) pose a public safety hazard and have no provisions for access to and from the area in case of any emergency situation requiring immediate evacuation <p>Observations provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Original Draft Plan Approval has lapsed and a new proposal needs to be reviewed and approved so Council may apply new rules and conditions of approval - New Plan for both areas A and B vs original plan will require rezoning permission to allow for much higher density that is being proposed for both areas A & B: New plan for Area A vs original results in density increase from 22 units/ha to 30 units/ha; and, new plan for Area B vs original will require rezoning permission from Residential Apt to Residential Townhouse zoning to allow for construction of additional Freehold/ condominium townhouse units while the original concept proposed only apartments for this area 	<p>Parking has been accommodated in compliance with the requirements of the Town of Midland Zoning By-law.</p>
<p>Comments received at Open House Hosted by Proponent</p>	<p>The following is a summary of verbal comments received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns about overall density and number of proposed units 	<p>The subject lands were previously draft plan approved and zoned (2007) for development of 567 residential units (60 single detached units, 50</p>

		<p>freehold townhouse units, 127 condominium townhouse and stacked townhouse units, and 330 apartment/condominium units in three multi-storey buildings with a maximum building height of 30 metres). Design of the development has changed from entirely condominium development to a combination of freehold and freehold/condominium townhouse units and two 12-storey apartment buildings.</p> <p>The proposed development includes a total of 471 residential units (148 freehold townhouse units, 32 freehold/condominium townhouse units with rear lanes, and 291 apartment/condominium units in 2 buildings with a maximum building height of 40 metres). The proposed density of the development is in keeping with the policies of the Town's Official Plan and reflects the general purpose and intent of the previous zoning and plan of subdivision approvals.</p>
	- Questions about available transit (bus routes and transit stops) in the area	We would defer to Town of Midland staff with regard to public transit comments.
	- Concerns about only 1 road access into area	<p>A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by JD Northcote Engineering Inc. and submitted in support of the proposed development application. This study was peer reviewed by Stantec Consulting Ltd. on behalf of the Town and comments/questions were provided. Response to such comments/questions has been included in correspondence from JD Northcote dated May 8, 2019. The updated Traffic Impact Study and related cover letter is included with this submission.</p> <p>See previous notes relating to responses to traffic comments/questions.</p>
	- Suggestion of additional access from Harbourview (at point approximately mid-site where an old laneway was located). A suggestion was made that this could at least be used for construction access.	See previous notes regarding provision of a temporary construction vehicle access.
	- Questions about the timing for the completion of the subdivision (comments were expressed that they did not want to live in a construction zone for another 10 years)	We would anticipate that phasing and/or staging plans will be required for the proposed development and that these plans would need to address such matters as construction timing and the management of construction activities on the site. As previously noted, a potential temporary construction vehicle access has been identified and would be provided subject to all necessary approvals from the Town.
	- Concerns about sufficient parking for the proposed units and issues with on-street parking	Parking has been provided in compliance with the requirements of the Town of Midland Zoning By-law.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns about the height of the proposed condominium buildings (statements were made that individuals understood that these would be 2 to 3 storey buildings or 5 to 6 storey buildings) 	<p>The existing zoning would permit a building height maximum of 30 metres. This zoning was based on the original proposal for construction of three 8-storey buildings. The redesign of this block increases the height of the condominium buildings but reduces the number of buildings from 3 to 2.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns about impact on views from existing housing due to height of proposed condo buildings 	<p>It is recognized that completion of the development within Bayport Village will change current sight-lines from the single detached dwelling units which were constructed in the first phase of the Bayport Development. We note that previously approvals anticipated the construction of three 8-storey condominium buildings on the vacant block at the east end of the site.</p> <p>A two-dimensional sight-line analysis has been prepared based on the current vacant lot, the original 2007 proposal and the proposed redesign of this site. For purposes of this analysis, points along the southern edge of an existing residential lot on the south side of Drummond Drive have been used for the modelling exercise. Three sketches have been prepared to illustrate the comparison of sight lines based on the existing vacant lot, the original proposal and the revised design. The Projected Site Line sketches are submitted with this report.</p> <p>We note that the impact on sight lines between the 2007 proposal and the current design is relatively minor.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns were expressed about the lack of recreation facilities in the immediate area and questions raised about the recreation complex which was part of the original proposal. Statements were made that that this was to have indoor and outdoor pools, etc. that were to be accessible to all residents in the Bayport Village development. 	<p>Passive recreation will continue to be accommodated through the provision of parks, trails, etc. as was previously proposed. We also note that the proposed parkland block, to be conveyed to the Town, has been increased in size from 0.17 hectares to 0.29 hectares, as illustrated on the Revised Draft Plan submitted with this report.</p> <p>With regard to active recreation facilities, it is recognized that a clubhouse was proposed adjacent to the multi-storey condominium block. Final approvals relating to this clubhouse and the details of its use were not completed. The revised design proposes to retain the existing heritage structure and, once it is no longer required for sales office purposes, to repurpose it for a shared amenity space for the condominium units. Detailed design and additional Planning Act approvals will be required for the development of the condominium blocks. As part of this detailed design work, further consideration will be given to potentially accommodating use of this amenity space by the residents of the single</p>

		<p>detached dwelling units which were part of the first phase of the Bayport Village development.</p> <p>Active recreation facilities and programs would be accommodated by Town of Midland facilities and through the Town's programs.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questions were raised about who is responsible for clearing the snow from around the Canada Post super mailbox and whether Kaitlin would consider ensuring this is done. 	<p>The comment has been noted and we would propose that any such provisions be considered and addressed through the phasing and/or staging plans which will be required for the proposed development.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individuals noted that they understand that the site is tight but there are some concerns about the stacking of building materials over portions of the existing sidewalk and issues with construction/trades vehicles making Bayport more difficult to navigate. 	<p>These comments related to construction activity which is currently underway. The comments have been noted. The proponent is and will continue to work on addressing these concerns. We would also note that the provision of a temporary construction access combined with approved phasing and/or staging plans will also assist to address these issues.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questions were raised about accommodating some commercial uses in this area to service the area residents. 	<p>A commercial block along the east side of Harbourview Drive, south of Bayport Boulevard, was part of the original concepts/approvals. This block remains within the ownership of the proponent. A concept plan has been prepared for the potential development of a hotel on this site which is anticipated to include a restaurant as well as some small scale retail uses. The proposed development would be subject to separate Planning Act approvals from the Town.</p>
Submission and Deputation on behalf of Bayport Village Residents	<p>Comments and concerns expressed as follows:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roads, Traffic and Access (external) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TIS based on November 27th, 2018 traffic counts but July 27th would present much different picture - TIS should reflect the peak summer months - Acute problem with drivers running the red light at Harbourview/Bayport intersection and potential to be a huge safety risk with only one exit road out of subdivision 	<p>A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by JD Northcote Engineering Inc. and submitted in support of the proposed development application. This study was peer reviewed by Stantec Consulting Ltd. on behalf of the Town and comments/questions were provided. Response to such comments/questions has been included in correspondence from JD Northcote dated May 8, 2019. The updated Traffic Impact Study and related cover letter is included with this submission.</p> <p>See previous notes relating to responses to traffic comments/questions.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roads, Traffic and Access (internal) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One and only entrance into and out of the subdivision - Town needs to assume Bayport Boulevard if Drummond Drive cannot be completed 	<p>See previous notes with regard to comments pertaining to the Traffic Impact Study and emergency access.</p> <p>The assumption of Bayport Boulevard would be subject to Town of Midland criteria and would follow the Town's standard process.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential to create long line up of cars on Bayport Boulevard during peak morning hours, waiting for light to change at Harbourview - Increase in density will create congestion at intersection and impact ability of homeowners at entrance of Bayport to get in and out of their driveways - Safety risk if property and adequate pedestrian access is not provided - Ask that an additional road to access the main roadway network be considered - Engage Midland Fire and other EMS support services for assessment of adequacy of response times - Ensure that school buses will have ready and timely access to and from the subdivision and neighbourhood children have safe places and sidewalks to wait for buses - Request that construction road be provided to move construction off of Bayport Boulevard as quickly as possible 	<p>See previous notes with regard to the potential provision of a temporary construction access. While the temporary construction access is in place and subject to related Town approvals, the access could be used for emergency access should the need arise.</p> <p>See previous notes relating to required phasing and/or staging plans.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Question of what the easement is for that connects Condo Road A and Harbourview Drive 	<p>This reflects an easement which was registered on the lands in favour of The Hydro-Electrical Power Commission of Ontario in October 1955. The easement is still legally in place and, therefore, is required to be identified on the draft plan.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking and By-laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strict parking by-laws should be in place for Bayport Village as well as tight and responsive parking enforcement - No capacity within this proposal for parking on any street as narrow roads must be clear of vehicles at all times to eliminate any blockages that would impeded Town/EMS/School services - No designated space for guest parking to support the townhouse blocks and no other parking options in immediate area outside of the subdivision - Issue that Bayport Boulevard and cul-de-sac have become access point and an “illegal” parking opportunity for those using the public park/path/Rotary Trail/access to Gawley Park - Have not been privy to any discussion regarding a parking by-law framework that would govern this subdivision 	<p>The draft plan has been designed in keeping with the Town’s parking requirements.</p> <p>We would defer to Town of Midland staff with regard to enforcement related comments.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Spaces and By-laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional stress on Rotary Trail and Public Park 	<p>Requirements for the location and use of parks and other public uses are identified by the Town of Midland. A park block was identified within the proposed draft plan (Block 37). The proposed draft plan has been revised</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disrespectful use of public path (i.e. off-leash dogs, cyclists, golf carts & electric vehicles) and limited/no sight line visibility due to height of wall - Path traffic will increase - Need by-laws or rules of usage that can be enforced and a plan for better oversight in this area - Public park will be more heavily used - Issue with maintenance and clean-up of weeds and overgrowth in boulevards and other unsightly spaces 	<p>to increase the size of the park block from ± 0.17 hectares (± 0.42 acres) to ± 0.29 hectares (± 0.71 acres).</p> <p>We would defer to Town of Midland staff with regard to comments relating to use and maintenance of public spaces.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on Delivery of the Community Concept <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was originally marketed as a Lifestyle Community – offering largely single family homes and mix of freehold and townhouse condominium with clubhouse amenities - Proposal does not fit within the surrounding neighbourhood - Two 12-storey high-rise apartment towners do not fit the overall aesthetic, look or intent of the development - Assurance was made that these were condominiums not apartments and want to ensure that this is the case and that there is no confusion - Freehold/condominium townhouse units look more like New York style “brownstones” and do not fit the architecture or aesthetic of the surrounding neighbourhood 	<p>The original draft plan approval (2007) included 567 residential units; being a combination of single detached dwellings, street townhouses, block townhouses, stacked townhouses and high-rise apartment/condominium buildings. The development was based on a full range of tenure forms including freehold single detached and townhouse lots as well as standard condominium and common elements condominium units. The first phase of the subdivision was registered on April 20th, 2010 as Plan 51M-953. The single detached units within the registered plan have been built and are occupied. Construction is occurring on the townhouse blocks within that plan.</p> <p>The original concept for the second phase of this development has been modified from being an entirely condominium development to a combination of freehold and freehold/condominium townhouse units along with an apartment/condominium complex. The overall development within this area will still be based on a combination of single detached dwellings, townhouse units and high-rise condominium buildings.</p> <p>The overall design of the site, as a whole, takes into consideration Official Plan density targets, previous Draft Plan Approvals, and the site’s context within the surrounding area. The Plan has been designed in such a way as to reflect and build upon the abutting townhouse development area which is under construction and to provide for a transition between the planned higher density form and the existing single detached units.</p> <p>The high-rise buildings are proposed as condominium units.</p> <p>The design of the freehold/condominium townhouse units offers another type and form of housing unit to future residents. Elevations and detailed design have not as yet been finalized. Final design will reflect architectural elements in the surrounding area. These units will incorporate the use of materials and colours which are similar to those of the single detached and townhouse units in the surrounding area. We will continue to work with Town of Midland staff in the preparation of final designs and elevation</p>

		drawings. It is our understanding that the Town of Midland has, in the past, included a condition of draft plan approval requiring the preparation of an Architectural Control Plan along with provisions to be included in the related subdivision agreement to carry out the recommendations of the Architectural Control Plan. We would anticipate that the Town would use a similar approach as it relates to this development.
Mary Oliver 401 Bayport Boulevard	<p>Comments and questions, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of roadways to enter and existing the subdivision for residents, emergency vehicles and service vehicles. - Timing when the extension of Drummond Drive will occur - Options could include either a continuation of Street B, within proposed plan, to exit onto Harbourview Drive or an early completion of the Drummond Drive extension to Fuller Avenue - The freehold/condominium townhouses are industrial in appearance and positioned too close to the road - The 12 storey high-rise buildings are institutional and commercial in design and should be kept to the background in a downtown cityscape, not towering over a residential waterfront community - The 3 low-rise buildings that were originally planned could incorporate roof top terraces that would provide all its residents with an outdoor space and re-establish the open space in front of the buildings along Bayport Boulevard. - Should be provisions made for visitor parking throughout the area proposed for the freehold townhouses 	See previous notes relating to traffic, emergency access, architectural design, density and parking.
E. Nicholls	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - changes to original design/services that purchasers were not made aware of i) shorter driveways which will not accommodate larger vehicles or enough parking spaces ii) possible elimination of a sidewalk iii) no provision of visitor parking iv) very heavy traffic on a relatively narrow road which is bisected by unkempt boulevards v) impacts from ongoing construction activities/vehicles 	<p>See previous notes relating to traffic, parking and construction activities.</p> <p>With regard to pedestrian movement, the proposed roads within this plan include a sidewalk on one side of the road, in keeping with the provision of the Town of Midland Official Plan.</p>
Michael Hamelin 587 Bayport Boulevard	<p>Comments and concerns as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Questions as to the legal entity in possession of the property - Kaitlin Corporation conducts business under many names and numbered companies which is not unusual but can make it difficult to ensure document 	<p>The legal owner of the subject property is 2428568 Ontario Ltd., being a numbered company under the control of the Kaitlin Corporation.</p> <p>The Subdivision Agreement for the first phase of this development remains in place. Compliance with the terms of the agreement would remain within</p>

	<p>list the correct legal entity. Should be known which legal entity the Town is entering into a contract with.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correspondence included a review of items from the Subdivision Agreement for Phase 1 along with Town of Midland staff responses. - Did the Stormwater Management Report Addendum address the revised configuration of the subdivision? - The Traffic Study did not identify improvement options to address operational deficiencies and does not references “near misses” occurring at the existing intersection. - The Traffic Study data collection forms did not identify the weather conditions and the person who performed the counts. - The Traffic Study was performed in November which could skew the results as many resident’s winter in the south. - Correspondence includes references to class action lawsuits and suggests that the Town Solicitor should review this. - Establish the proper legal entity and bring the original subdivision agreement into compliance. - Re-examine the design and operation of the traffic signals at the Harbourview Drive and Bayport Boulevard intersection. - Ensure that the proper bonds and insurance are established to protect Midland taxpayers. - Remove the boulevard islands for safety concerns. 	<p>the jurisdiction of the Town. The Town continues to hold securities relating to the development of Phase 1.</p> <p>The entering into of a Subdivision Agreement between the owner and the Town as well as the posting of all necessary securities will be required for the next phase of the development.</p> <p>Stormwater Management Reports were submitted for the original Draft Plan Approval as well as with more recent consent and zoning approvals related to the redesign of specific townhouse blocks within Registered Plan 51M-953. An Addendum Report was prepared by WMI & Associates Ltd. and submitted in support of this development proposal.</p> <p>See previous notes regarding traffic comments.</p>
<p>Summary of comments expressed at Statutory Public Meeting</p>	<p>The following is a summary of verbal comments expressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern with only one entrance/exit point. Consideration should be given to an additional road to access Harbourview, particularly to accommodate emergency services access. vi) Concern that traffic study was conducted in November and note that a summer study should be done. vii) Modifications/adjustments should be made to existing intersection to accommodate additional traffic and possibly flashing lights on Harbourview to advise when the light is going to change viii) Ensure that sufficient public space and sidewalks are provided. ix) Concern that there is insufficient resident and visitor parking. x) Construction entrance should be provided. xi) Should ensure that public spaces are properly maintained. xii) “Unassumed Road” signs should be posted at entrance to the subdivision. xiii) Temporary emergency access should be provided. 	<p>See previous notes relating to traffic, emergency access, parking, public spaces and construction activities.</p> <p>In addition to the sight line analysis previously referenced, a Shadow Analysis has also been prepared by RAW Design and is submitted with this report. This Analysis illustrates the difference between shadows which would result based on buildings constructed to the current maximum height (30 metres) and those resulting from buildings constructed to the proposed height (40 metres). This takes into account shadows from both easterly and westerly directions. The increased height of the proposed buildings would result in differing shadow patterns, however, this difference would be considered relatively minor in nature as illustrated on the Shadow Analysis drawings.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> xiv) Islands at the entrance of the subdivision are a safety risk and should be removed. xv) Concern regarding traffic safety along Harbourview heading south-westerly towards Bayport Boulevard intersection. xvi) Concern about sun shadow issues due to more compact form high-rise buildings and impact on sight lines (views to west and views south-easterly from Drummond Drive) xvii) Concerns with wind factors as a result of proposed condominium buildings xviii) Concern with snow clearing and snow storage xix) Concerns with impacts from on-going construction activities xx) Concern that the condominium units will be used for short term rentals xxi) Services should be provided in the parks xxii) Concern that the fire hydrants were not accessible this winter due to construction activities xxiii) Concern that the condominium building will not be sold out xxiv) Question as to whether the water table will support the proposed building 	<p>A Functional Servicing Report prepared by R. J. Burnside & Associates and dated July 2005 is on record with the original Draft Plan Approval (File: MD-T-0602). An addendum to the 2005 Functional Servicing Report has been prepared by WMI & Associates Ltd. The addendum Report addressed the redesign of the proposed development and determined that the proposed flows are calculated to be less than what were anticipated by the Functional Servicing Report associated with the previous subdivision approvals (MD-T-0602).</p>
Town of Midland Heritage Committee	<p>The Committee have concerns regarding the future of the heritage building located at 640 Bayport Boulevard. The building is on the Town's Heritage Inventory and Registry due to its significant cultural heritage value. Based on an evaluation of the heritage value of the property, the Committee intends to recommend to Council that the property be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.</p>	<p>The structure is currently being used as a sales office. The development design proposes to retain the existing heritage structure and, once it is no longer required for sales office purposes, to repurpose it for a shared amenity space for the condominium units. Redesign and repurposing of the structure would be based on consultation/discussions with the Town of Midland, including the Heritage Committee. The Town's intentions for recommending designation under the Ontario Heritage Act will be considered. It is noted that adaptive reuse of the building should be accommodated so as to provide a sustainable mechanism to assist with ongoing maintenance and preservation of the building itself.</p>
Town of Midland Stantec Peer Review of Traffic Impact Study	<p>General comments or areas for clarification or requests for additional information were identified. The Peer Review concludes as follows:</p> <p>“Generally, the study presents the analysis and findings in an acceptable manner and identified the impacts of the proposed development on the transportation network. The TIS should also include an assessment of the sightlines from the site access and discuss the need for the extension of Drummond Drive considering the limited access for emergency vehicles. Some minor clarification and revisions will also need to be applied to the TIS as summarized in the general comments.”</p>	<p>A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by JD Northcote Engineering Inc. and submitted in support of the proposed development application. This study was peer reviewed by Stantec Consulting Ltd. on behalf of the Town and comments/questions were provided. Response to such comments/questions has been addressed through updates to the Traffic Impact Study and as identified in correspondence from JD Northcote dated May 8, 2019. The updated Traffic Impact Study and related cover letter is included with this submission.</p> <p>See previous notes relating to responses to traffic and emergency access comments/questions.</p>

<p>Additional Comments expressed by Town of Midland Staff</p>	<p>Additional items/comments have been expressed relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Update to the traffic impact study required to address peer review comments; ii) Provision of a second road access to the development, specifically to address emergency vehicle access; iii) Provision of a shadow analysis for the condominium building in relation to the proposed increase in building height; iv) Consideration of options or alternatives to broaden the range of built form types and provide a greater range and mix of unit typologies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The peer review comments from Stantec Consulting Ltd. have been addressed through updates to the Traffic Impact Study, as identified in correspondence from JD Northcote dated May 8, 2019. The updated Traffic Impact Study and related cover letter is included with this submission. ii) The Traffic Impact Study concluded that the proposed development will not cause any operational issues and will not add significant delay or congestion to the local roadway network. A short-term improvement is recommended for the Harbourview Drive/Sunnyside Drive & Bayport Boulevard intersection; installation of a westbound no right turn on red restriction. A modification to the existing median on Bayport Boulevard is also recommended. This modification would provide a 6.0 metre lane width on the north and the south sides of the median, representing sufficient width to provide the necessary emergency access redundancy to accommodate the full development of the site. <p>As noted previously, the Traffic Impact Study has concluded that an additional access point is not required to accommodate the proposed development. To address the comment from Stantec Consulting Ltd. regarding emergency access, the Traffic Impact Study includes modifications to the existing median on Bayport Boulevard to provide a 6.0 metre lane width on the north and south side of the median.</p> <p>In addition to the Traffic Impact Study, Kaitlin retained the services of David Hine Engineering Inc., being an engineering firm with specific professional expertise in the application of the National and Provincial Building and Fire Codes. An opinion letter has been prepared and is submitted with this report. Such opinion letter states, that It is the experts' opinion that the addition of an extension of Drummond Drive to connect with Fuller Road or a temporary emergency access would not significantly impact response times.</p> <p>Also, a construction access will be accommodated as part of the proposed development. The provision of this temporary entrance will facilitate the reduction of construction vehicle use of Bayport Boulevard. This entrance could also, on a temporary basis and if required, be used for emergency vehicles thereby augmenting the emergency access redundancy.</p>
---	--	--

		<p>It is noted that the future extension of Drummond Drive and connection to Fuller Avenue is anticipated and has been planned for as part of the Draft Plan Approval related to the abutting lands to the north (251 Fuller Avenue). Conveyance of the land required for this road extension and construction of the road itself would be the responsibility of and carried out by the developer of the abutting property.</p> <p>The Town could pursue an earlier conveyance of the lands for the Drummond Avenue extension, however, this would involve the Town's formal acquisition or expropriation of these lands. The acquisition or expropriation of the right-of-way would be under the control of the Town. The construction of the road would then ultimately be under the control and responsibility of the Town and, we would assume, the owner/developer of 251 Fuller Avenue.</p> <p>The lands required for the extension of Drummond Drive are not within the ownership or control of Kaitlin Corporation. Appropriate background studies have been undertaken to address the question of need for a second access point to accommodate this proposed development. The Traffic Impact Study and Emergency Access Opinion Letter have both concluded that, in their professional opinion, the second access point is not required to accommodate the proposed development.</p> <p>While it has been determined, through proper analysis, that a second access point is not required, traffic circulation, including emergency vehicle access, will be improved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modifications to the existing centre median along Bayport Boulevard east of Harbourview Drive - Augmenting traffic circulation routes within the site through the construction of Street A and Street B; and - The temporary provision of a construction access from Harbourview Drive. <p>iii) Both a Sight Line Analysis and a Shadow Analysis have been prepared and are submitted with this report. The Shadow Analysis illustrates the difference between shadows which would result based on buildings constructed to the current maximum height (30 metres) and those resulting from buildings constructed to the proposed height (40 metres). This takes into account shadows from both easterly and westerly</p>
--	--	---

		<p>directions. The increased height of the proposed buildings would result in differing shadow patterns, however, this difference would be considered relatively minor in nature.</p> <p>iv) The proposed Plan of Subdivision represents the second phase of the development which was contemplated for this area. The development was and continues to be based on a full range of tenure forms including freehold single detached and townhouse units in Phase 1 as well as freehold townhouse units, freehold/condominium townhouse units and multi-storey condominium towers within Phase 2. The overall design of the site takes into consideration Official Plan density targets, previous Draft Plan Approvals, and the site's context within the surrounding area. The Plan has been designed in such a way as to reflect and build upon the abutting townhouse development area which is currently under construction and to provide for a transition between the planned higher density form and the single detached units constructed as part of Phase 1 of this development.</p> <p>We have examined mechanisms to potentially accommodate additional built form within the freehold townhouse portion of the proposed plan. We are suggesting that a flexible zoning approach would be possible and have revised the draft Zoning By-law Amendment to include flexible zoning provisions. The revised Zoning By-law Amendment is included with this submission. The provisions, as per Sections 4 and 5 of the revised Zoning By-law Amendment, identifies specific blocks and provides specific zoning regulations to accommodate either townhouse or single detached units. It is recognized that future Part Lot Control By-law(s) will be required for the division of these blocks whether townhouse or single detached units are constructed.</p>
County of Simcoe	<p>Subject lands are designated "Settlement" in the County Official Plan which permits, among other things, residential uses. It is noted that Settlement Areas are to be the focus of population and employment growth in the County. They note that there appeared to be an unevaluated wetland located on the subject property.</p> <p>With regard to waste collection, it is noted that the County waste collection can be provided to the freehold townhouses provided the roads are construction and maintained to County standards. The County does not provide waste collection services to residential buildings containing 6 or more dwelling units. The County may be able to provide waste collection to ground oriented units if the development has been designed and built to comply with County standards. The County will</p>	<p>The unevaluated wetland area which is referenced is actually located within the lands which were part of the previous draft plan approval and in which construction activities have already occurred.</p> <p>The freehold townhouse portion of the proposed development meets the County's standards for waste collection. The high-rise condominium buildings will be serviced via private waste disposal.</p> <p>Waste disposal for the freehold/condominium units may be able to be accommodated by the County along the Bayport Boulevard frontage of the</p>

	require draft plan conditions should it be determined that waste disposal service is possible.	units. Alternatively, it will be part of the related condominium elements and will be via private waste collection services.
Simcoe County District School Board	No objections to this development. Requests imposing specific draft plan conditions.	It is recognized that the required draft plan conditions will be employed.
Enbridge Gas Inc.	Does not object to the proposed application. Advises that application shall contact and make necessary arrangement for installation of gas main(s), meters, etc.	All necessary arrangements will be made.