

January 12th, 2017

The Corporation of the Town of Halton Hills
1 Halton Hills Drive
Halton Hills, Ontario
L7G 5G2

Attention: Mr. Adam Farr
Manager of Development Review Planning, Development and Sustainability

Re: Request for Comments on Eden Oaks (Creditview Heights) Urban Design Guidelines and Architectural Control Guidelines.

Project No. 15051

Dear Sir,

We have received the revised Urban and Architectural Design Guidelines (UDGs) prepared by MBTW-Watchorn and the Architectural Design Guidelines (ADGs) transmitted to us by the Town for the above noted project.

We find that the revisions made to the Urban Design Guidelines document address some of the issues and concerns previously noted in our review letter dated August 29th, 2016, with the exception of a few items. Please note that we have prepared a matrix of comments which follows comments made on our previous review letter (dated August 29th, 2016)

Please note that we are reviewing the submitted documents against the Hamlet of Glen Williams Secondary Plan, including the Appendices (GWSP). Due to the sensitive nature of the site, we feel that the Applicant needs to emphasise certain issues in greater depth as per the requirements of the GWSP.

<p>UDG (June 2016 Rev) TABLE OF CONTENTS & PEER REVIEW COMMENTS (Dated August 29th , 2016)</p> <p><i>This column reflects the guidelines that were a part of the UDG document in the June 2016 Revision.</i></p>	<p>NEW UDG (December 2016 Rev) TABLE OF CONTENTS & NEW COMMENTS (Dated January 12th , 2016)</p> <p><i>This column reflects where the June 2016 Revision UDG document guidelines have been moved to or retained in the new December 2016 UDG document.</i></p>	<p>NEW ADG (December 2016) TABLE OF CONTENTS & NEW COMMENTS (Dated January 12th , 2016)</p> <p><i>This column reflects where the June 2016 Revision UDG document guidelines have been moved to in the new December 2016 ADG document.</i></p>
<p>1.0 INTRODUCTION</p>		
<p>1.1 Scope and Intent</p>	<p>1.1 Scope and Intent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - verbiage added with reference to ADGs. - mentions that architectural guidelines have been moved to ADGs - we still feel that a general statement for each topic should be mentioned in this document and then a reference made to the appropriate section in the ADGs. - Figure 3 on page 3 should show the trail network that is shown on page 18. 	<p>1.1 Scope and Intent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - please correct verbiage in last paragraph where Urban Design is mentioned.
		<p>1.2 The Structure of the Eden Oaks ADG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new section. No comments.
		<p>1.3 The Use of Language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new section. No comments.

<p>2.0 NEIGHBOURHOOD VISION</p>		
<p>2.1 Design Vision</p>	<p>2.1 Design Vision -Same. No further comments.</p>	<p>1.4 Architectural Vision - it is important to mention that while variation is required to create a hamlet-like environment, maintaining a coherent streetscape is also important. The guidelines need to ensure that a varied mix of styles and materials does not result in an incoherent streetscape. Please add verbiage either at the beginning or the end as a separate bullet ensuring this. Guidelines have been added throughout the document to achieve this, but a general statement under this section is important.</p>
<p>2.2 Street Pattern and Pedestrian Connections A typical street cross section has been illustrated on page 6 (figure 2.1) depicting a rolled curb road. To retain the rural hamlet character of the proposed development it is essential that this rolled curb cross section include an upgraded sidewalk from standard concrete to permeable pavers with an under drain. These pavers will allow for infiltration of surface water and require less salting thus meeting policy objectives for more environmentally friendly design. This unique aesthetic will also allow for a signaling of an entrance into the Glen thus serving as an acceptable alternative to a physical gateway structure.</p>	<p>2.2 Street Pattern and Pedestrian Connections</p>	

<p>We appreciate the verbiage added as the second bullet under Section 2.2 which promotes informal planting within the ROW in order to retain the rural hamlet character. However, the Conceptual Landscape Plan does not depict the same idea. We strongly urge the Applicant to present diagrams in the Urban Design Guidelines document that appropriately illustrate the text. We suggest revising the Landscape plan to show informal planting along the ROW. The intent in the Guidelines document needs to be clearly stated and ensure that planting within the ROW is less structured, informal and includes varied native planting to ensure continuation of the existing natural environmental conditions.</p>	<p>- Figure 6 Concept Landscape Plan needs to depict informal landscaping along the Gamble Street extension. This can be achieved by changing the size and location of the tree circles as well as the density of trees in certain locations. The diagram continues to show a regulated pattern of trees in the ROW, even though the text is about informal planting.</p>	
<p>2.3 Lot Configuration and Building Location</p> <p>While we agree that streetscape variations can be achieved through a variety of design techniques such as architectural styles and details associated with them, varying setbacks, etc., we still believe that varied lot sizes are an important element to create a hamlet character. Architectural massing that results from similar lot widths do not allow for streetscape variation to occur in a hamlet format style. Different architectural styles are not a sufficient means to create a rural hamlet character. The informal built form image requires significant lot width variations. We</p>	<p>3.2 Lot Configuration</p> <p>-old section moved here in new UDG document.</p> <p>- one guideline has been removed. Should be added back.</p> <p>- reference should be made to Sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the ADG document.</p>	<p>2.3 Relationship of Houses to Street 2.4 Building Orientation</p> <p>- We note the additional guidelines relating to 'lot configuration' and 'building location' added, and are in agreement with them. No further comments.</p> <p>- The diagram (Fig.7) on Page 6 should show the East elevations of units in lot numbers 19 and 20 to have upgraded architectural treatment as well.</p> <p>-Under Section 2.4, last bullet replace "Lot depths...should..." with "Lot depths...shall..."</p>

<p>strongly encourage the Applicant to re-evaluate the lot sizes in order to meet the needs to retain a rural character for the hamlet.</p>		
<p>2.4 Architectural Elements</p>	<p>Section has been removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a section pertaining to architectural vision should be added under Section 2.0 Neighbourhood Vision. - we understand that all architecture related guidelines have been moved to the ADG's, but we feel there needs to be an overarching vision for the architectural requirements under Section 2.0. The same has been done for Landscape Design and should be introduced for Built Form Design as well. - this section should be renamed to Built Form criteria and should be an overview of the detailed guidelines mentioned in Section 3.0 of the new ADG document. It is important to have overarching principles in the UDG document which refers to the detailed principles in the ADG document. 	
<p>2.5 Landscape Elements</p>	<p>2.3 Landscape Elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 6 Concept Landscape Plan needs to depict informal landscaping along the Gamble Street extension. This can be achieved by changing the size and location of the tree circles as well as the density of trees in certain locations. The diagram continues to 	

	<p>show a regulated pattern of trees in the ROW, even though the text is about informal planting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Replace "P Gate" with "Controlled Access Pedestrian Link" in Figure 6 - How is the builder meant to achieve a connection between landscape and built form as mentioned in bullet 1? Please elaborate. 	
<p>2.6 Natural Environment</p>	<p>2.4 Natural Environment -old section moved here in new document. - no further comments.</p>	
<p>2.7 Open Space</p>	<p>2.5 Open Space -old section moved here in new document. - no further comments.</p>	
<p>2.8 Entrance The diagram on Page 14 appropriately labels two sites at the entrance of Street A as Gateway Sites. The diagram on Page 16 should show the East elevations of units in lot numbers 19 and 20 to have upgraded architectural treatment as well. This is integral to creating an entrance to the proposed development. The Applicant should refer to Section 8 Gateways of Appendix A of the GWSP for further clarification.</p>	<p>2.6 Entrance - The diagram (Fig.7) on Page 6 should show the East elevations of units in lot numbers 19 and 20 to have upgraded architectural treatment as well. Refer to this diagram under this section, where appropriate.</p>	

<p>We recommend the Applicant prepare additional guidelines under Section 2.8 of their document which shows how an appropriate entrance to the proposed development can be created without the need for a physical gateway structure. They should consider all the methods mentioned in Section 8 Gateways of Appendix A of the GWSP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - verbiage should be added about how the rolled curb street section and the unique streetscaping will create a gateway-like environment. - verbiage should be added about how landscape features like signage add to a gateway-like entrance. What specific landscape treatment should be provided to create a Gateway effect. - verbiage on unique street lighting at the Gamble Street extension at the entrance of the hamlet should be added. 	
<p>We recognise that Figure 7.1 on Page 32 attempts to show in detail the treatment of the Gateway location. We recommend the Applicant refer to this diagram under Section 2.8 and also elaborate further about the unique treatment of the Gateway lots and streetscaping. Consider adding annotations that clearly explain the need for upgraded architectural treatment, image examples of what a decorative metal fence could look like, additional unique landscape treatment, unique streetscaping with lighting and signage, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We recognise that Figure 14 on Page 14 attempts to show the treatment of the Gateway location. We recommend the Applicant refer to this diagram, and also elaborate further about the unique treatment of the Gateway lots and streetscaping. Consider adding annotations that clearly explain the need for upgraded architectural treatment, image examples of what a decorative metal fence could look like, additional unique landscape treatment, unique streetscaping with lighting and signage, etc. 	
<p>2.9 Integration into the Community</p>	<p>2.7 Integration into the Community</p> <p>No comments</p>	

<p>2.10 Surrounding Residential Area</p>	<p>2.8 Surrounding Residential Area - a guideline should be added on how the view looking into the new development from the existing surrounding development needs to be enhanced. - the built form and landscape quality at the Gamble Street entrance needs to be of an upgraded quality to ensure coherence with the surrounding residential area. Please add verbiage in this section that speaks to this point.</p>	
<p>3.0 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PROCESS</p>	<p>Section removed and moved to ADG document.</p>	<p>SECTION 6.0 DESIGN REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION - Section 3.0 from previous UDG document moved here. - Additions made. - No further comments.</p>
<p>4.0 COMMUNITY STREETSCAPE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS</p>	<p>3.0 COMMUNITY STREETSCAPE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS</p>	
<p>4.1 Street Type and Pattern</p>	<p>3.1 Street Type and Pattern - no comments</p>	
<p>4.2 Lot Configuration Acceptable verbiage has been added under Section 4.2 to address Lot Size variation, though we believe that variation in lot widths is more crucial and needs to be added as an important way to emulate the hamlet's</p>	<p>3.2 Lot Configuration - No further comments.</p>	

<p>random lot pattern. A brief explanation of how lot width variation helps achieve a rural hamlet character will be beneficial as well.</p> <p>The Applicant should note that Section 9 of Appendix A of the GWSP requires ‘setbacks, heights and housing locations’ documentation as a part of design review. While designs will be looked at on a case by case basis during future Approval and Permit applications, the GWSP requires a documentation of setbacks for the Design Review process, that is, this Peer Review process.</p>	<p>The Applicant should note that Section 9 of Appendix A of the GWSP requires ‘setbacks, heights and housing locations’ documentation as a part of design review. While designs will be looked at on a case by case basis during future Approval and Permit applications, the GWSP requires a documentation of setbacks for the Design Review process, that is, this Peer Review process. Should the Town require this to be a part of the Control Architect’s duties, then this comment can be ignored.</p>	
<p>4.3 Prominent Locations</p>	<p>3.3 Prominent Locations - Figure 13: Show the enhanced rear and side elevation upgrades as applying to lots 14 and 15</p>	<p>Section 5.0 Prominent Lot Location - Elaboration of guidelines mentioned in UDG provided in this section.</p> <p>-we appreciate the brief mention of prominent lots in Section 3.3 of the UDG document and a more descriptive set of guidelines in the ADGs.</p> <p>-We urge a similar treatment for all the sections, especially built form criteria.</p> <p>- For Gateway Houses, we urge the mention of the fact that all elevations are meant to be of enhanced character because of their visibility from outside the community, within the community and the trail.</p>

		<p>- While we note the guidelines which require Prominent Locations homes to have unique features and landscape treatments, guidelines regarding the following issues should be added (details of the types of enhancements):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the use of upgraded materials on building facades,• the use of upgraded materials for garage doors,• the use of upgraded materials for driveways, and• the use of architectural features like chimneys, bay windows, turrets, double height bay windows, stone lintels. <p>- In Figure 36, Lots 14 and 15 should also show rear and side elevation upgrades. Please correct. These lots are visible from adjacent areas due to slope conditions.</p> <p>- Introduce verbiage with “shall” that describes required rear and side elevations enhancements when viewed from outside the subdivision i.e. from valley, adjacent lots, trails.</p> <p>- Because slope conditions are an important factor in this development, lots w2.3 with adverse grading conditions should be considered Prominent Lots as well, and detailed guidelines on their treatment should</p>
--	--	--

		<p>be provided. Provide language for building location relative to walkout conditions, retaining walls, identify lot locations and measures for dealing with these.</p>
<p>4.4 Building Location and Orientation</p> <p>In order to heighten the rural hamlet image of the hamlet, block lengths should ideally be shorter. However, the addition of a mid-block break in the form of a pedestrian pathway is a welcome method to achieve a break in long block lengths. This path needs to be wide since it creates a direct link from the existing trail to the SWM Pond – the largest open space amenity in the hamlet.</p> <p>A wider mid-block break with increased sideyard setbacks for Lots 27 and 28 will create an appropriate mid-block break. The use of dense landscape will help screen the houses from the path for privacy purposes.</p> <p>So we encourage the Applicant to consider creating a sizeable mid-block path that serves as a proper built form and serves as a strong link through the new development to the existing rail trail.</p>	<p>Section removed</p> <p>- these guidelines should be reinstated in this section of the new UDG document.</p> <p>- We concur with the wider mid-block path.</p>	

<p>4.5 Elevation Variety</p> <p>While we appreciate the verbiage that has been added regarding how topography should be used advantageously, we feel a diagrammatic illustration of the same will help explain better the guideline presented. We believe that multiple and appropriate diagrams/cross-sections that appropriately show how elevation variety is based on existing topographical conditions will help show how the proposed development respects the existing environmental conditions. While we understand that each site will need to be looked at on a case by case basis by the Town during the Approvals processes, we believe that Guidelines need to present stronger verbiage and diagrams to show how the proposed development is context sensitive and respectful of the existing environmental conditions (topography and existing trees).</p> <p>The Applicant should note that Section 9 of Appendix A of the GWSP requires ‘setbacks, heights and housing locations’ documentation as a part of design review. Street elevations that show a diagrammatic variation in elevation treatment and heights is encouraged to illustrate what is meant by elevation variety.</p>	<p>Section removed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add a brief section back in and reference the respective detailed guidelines section in the ADGs. - Section 3.4 Building Height can be a part of this. - A section on Elevation Variety in the UDG document should be inclusive of building massing, building height, and exterior colours and materials. Each should reference the respective sections in the ADG document. 	<p>2.2 Elevation Variety and 2.6 Building Height Compatibility</p> <p>-Section 4.5 from previous UDG document has been expanded on in section 2.6 of the ADG document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Section 2.2, it mentions that “Special designs should be provided for prominent locations to address exposure to public view” Please acknowledge views from trails and beyond the subdivision (views from the valley up) and related possible requirements for enhanced rear elevations. Replace the word “should” with “shall”. - In the second bullet replace “should not” with “shall not” - In the last bullet, separate the point about requiring varied garage treatments and requiring porches to be the dominant feature as two separate points for clarity.
---	---	--

<p>4.6 Exterior Colour Selection on the Street</p>	<p>Section removed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the two guidelines that were a part of the old UDG document were good general guidelines fit for a UDG document, and a good precursor to detailed guidelines in the ADG document. - these guidelines should be reinstated in this section of the new UDG document. This can be a part of 4.5 Elevation Variety. 	<p>2.7 Exterior Colour Selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Section 4.6 from previous UDG document moved to this section of ADG. - detailed guidelines provided. - We suggest the guidelines be geared towards both colours and materials. For example, identical material packages should not be permitted for adjacent houses. We request the proponent to include guidelines about material use repetition restrictions to ensure that the same model/elevation type with different material uses is not repeated. Essentially, we feel that a material difference between two houses of the same model type does not create a big enough difference to emulate a hamlet-like character on any given streetscape.
<p>4.7 Relationship to Grade</p>	<p>Section removed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add a brief section back in and reference the respective detailed guidelines section in the ADGs. 	<p>2.5 Relationship to Grade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Section 4.7 from previous UDG document moved to this section of ADG. - These guidelines are meant for a UDG document. In the ADG's detailed guidelines are required. We note the additional guidelines added to Section 3.10.1, but feel that the guidelines are geared towards garages only. Detailed guidelines on how entrances and landscaping will be treated in cases of adverse grading is important. We will let the proponent decide whether to

<p>4.8 Driveways</p>	<p>Section removed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add a brief section back in with general guidelines and reference the respective detailed guidelines section in the ADGs. - specific guidelines regarding dimensions and risers can be a part of the ADG document. 	<p>place these guidelines under Section 2.5 or Section 3.10.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In third paragraph, replace “special designs should” with “special designs shall” so there is consistency with Section 3.10.1 <p>4.5 Relationship to Grade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grading Information/Cross Sections: Indicate what is going to be covered in this section
<p>4.9 Driveway Treatment</p>	<p>Section removed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add a brief section back in with general guidelines and reference the respective detailed guidelines section in the ADGs. - this section can be clubbed with previous section (4.8 Driveways) 	<p>Section 4.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - guidelines moved from UDG document to this section of the ADG document. <p>Section 4.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - guidelines moved from UDG document to this section of the ADG document. - driveway treatment on prominent lots should be of an upgraded quality to match the upgraded elevation treatment. This can include use of higher quality materials/pavers.

<p>SECTION 5.0</p>		
<p>Architectural Design Vision and Objectives</p>	<p>General built form guidelines have been removed from the new UDG document. This section can be added to Section 2.4, where general built form guidelines should be mentioned</p>	
<p>SECTION 6.0 Specific Architectural Design Requirements</p>	<p>General built form guidelines have been removed in the new UDG document. This section can be added to Section 2.4, where general built form guidelines should be mentioned.</p>	<p>Section 3.0 Architectural Design Criteria</p>
<p>6.1 Influencing Styles</p>	<p>Section moved to ADG document</p>	<p>3.1 Influencing Styles - Is this section too generic essentially supporting any kind of built form? Would it be better to have a statement that indicates “Models shall reflect a diversity of built forms characteristic of the Glen Williams area and influencing styles” .</p>
<p>6.2 Consistency of Detailing on All Elevations</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document. - Add a brief section should back in with similar and more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document.</p>	<p>3.4 Consistency of Detailing on All Elevations - this section consists of general guidelines and should be a part of the UDG document (possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements/ Built Form Guidelines)</p>

<p>6.3 Massing, Shape and Proportions</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document. - Add a brief section should back in with general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document.</p>	<p>3.2 Building Projections - this section consists of detailed guidelines. No further comments. Section should remain here.</p>
<p>6.4 Main Entry</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document. - Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document.</p>	<p>3.5 Main Entry, Porch Design, and Detailing - we recognize the additional guidelines in this section. - a general set of guidelines (possibly the first paragraph of this section) should be added to the UDG document, which then refers the reader to Section 3.5 of the ADG document.</p>
<p>6.5 Roofs</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document. Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document. Please refer to ADG comments on the right column.</p>	<p>3.7 Roofs -we recognize the additional guidelines in this section. - a general set of guidelines should be added to the UDG document, which then refers the reader to Section 3.7 of the ADG document.</p>
<p>6.6 Enhanced Architectural Detailing</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document. - Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built</p>	<p>3.3 Enhanced Architectural Detailing - a general set of guidelines should be added to the UDG document, which then refers the reader to Section 3.3 of the ADG document.</p>

	<p>Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document.</p>	
<p>6.7 Exterior Building Materials and Colours</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section moved to ADG document. - Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document. <p>Please refer to ADG comments on the right column.</p>	<p>3.6 Exterior Building Materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a general set of guidelines should be added to the UDG document, which then refers the reader to Section 3.3 of the ADG document. We note the detail building material guidelines. No further comments for those additional sections. - In bullet 5, it should be specified that stucco as a single material is not acceptable and can only be used in combination with other materials. - Add verbiage to ensure that single material dwellings should not be repeated on adjacent lots and specify a maximum amount allowed for the entire development.
<p>6.8 Foundations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section moved to ADG document. - We are ok with the move 	<p>3.6.4 Foundation Detailing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - old UDG guidelines moved to this section. No further comments.
<p>6.9 Additions and Expansions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section moved to ADG document. - We are ok with the move 	<p>3.11 Additions and Expansions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - old UDG guidelines moved to this section. No further comments.

<p>6.10 Deck Architecture</p> <p>If the Town deems it acceptable to dis-allow any upper floor decks, then it is acceptable to not include deck architecture guidelines. However, if they are located in prominent locations or on facades visible from the street (Figure 4.2 on pg.16), it is integral that deck architecture be of high quality and coherent with the architectural style of the remaining unit. It is crucial that the Applicant mention deck architecture in some form in the document and also specify what is meant by “first floor decks”. (Under 4.7 in initial Peer Review letter dated August 29th, 2016)</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document.</p> <p>Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document.</p>	<p>3.10.2 Rear Walkouts, Rear Decks and Rear Balconies</p> <p>-Guidelines mentioned here are general and should be a part of the UDG document. Though we feel that this should not be a subsection to Adverse Grading, we will let the Proponent decide what works best for them. However, please note the following comments.</p> <p>-Additional verbiage about the design and material for balconies and decks should be added.</p> <p>- Please include verbiage that ensures compatibility of deck and balcony architecture with the house.</p> <p>- Add verbiage to ensure any visibility of the underside of decks and balconies sue to adverse grade changes need to be addressed through appropriate screening or enhanced architectural treatment of the underside. This includes visibility from the trails.</p> <p>- Add verbiage regarding maximum allowable depths of balconies and decks.</p> <p>- Add verbiage about requiring high quality of rear decks and rear balconies when they are visible from public streets and trails.</p>
---	--	--

<p>6.11 Utilities and Mechanical Equipment</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document. - Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document.</p>	<p>3.9 Utilities and Mechanical Equipment</p> <p>-No further comments</p>
<p>6.12 Garage Requirements</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document. - Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document.</p>	<p>Section 4.1 Garage Types and Locations</p> <p>- Please correct verbiage in first paragraph under Section 4.1 to read “..its mass shall be recessed back a minimum of 1.0 metres from the unit’s principal façade”.</p> <p>- First half of section 4.1.7 should be under section 4.1.6.</p> <p>- Second half of section 4.1.7 is an important guideline that is a general statement for all garages and should be placed under section 4.1, or even under the UDG document guidelines.</p> <p>- all the examples are mislabeled relative to the text.</p> <p>- add verbiage that clearly states that demonstrates the intended variation in garages as a component of built form. (Use the word “shall”</p>

<p>6.13 Garage Door Requirements</p>	<p>- Section moved to ADG document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add a brief section should back in with more general guidelines possibly under Section 2.4 Architectural Elements / Built Form Guidelines. This section should then refer to the respective section in the ADG document. 	<p>4.2 Garage Door Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - verbiage should be added on the enhanced treatment of garage doors for Prominent Lots. - acceptable materials for garage doors should be discussed here. - unique garage door treatments should be considered for Prominent Lots. - verbiage on garage door lighting should be added here. This should include type of lighting, style of lighting, and should ensure design coherence with the architectural style of the house.
<p>SECTION 7.0 Landscape Requirements</p> <p>7.4 Trails</p> <p>A trail cross section has been provided demarcating both existing and proposed built form. The buffer to the left of the diagram's trail (north of the trail in plan), has been shown to be a chain link fence with low planting. We feel that to continue the rural hamlet natural landscape look of the hamlet, it is important to propose taller denser landscaping on both sides of the trail. While we understand the use of hedges with the chain link fence, the addition of taller trees will add to the hamlet character as well.</p>	<p>Section 4.0 Landscape Requirements</p> <p>4.4 Trails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trail cross section has been removed. Should be placed back in. - Refer to previous comments (left column) - Bullet 7 states that the pedestrian walkway for emergency access should be paved. We recommend the walkway to be crushed stone as well in order to achieve a pedestrian friendly look. 	<p>No landscape related guidelines in the ADG document</p>

<p>It is important that the landscape design look less “manufactured” and be designed to blend in with the existing rural hamlet character.</p>		
<p>7.6 Storm Water Wetland</p>	<p>4.6 Storm Water Wetland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On Figure 19 It appears that there is onlot grading adjacent to the SWM pond where there was previously proposed split zoning with planting and monitoring prescribed by the geotech engineer. Please clarify/verify. - Change language to “shall” throughout. 	
<p>7.7 Planting and Landscaping</p>	<p>4.7 Planting and Landscaping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the last bullet, replace “may” with “shall”. 	
<p>7.9 Exterior Lighting</p>	<p>4.9 Exterior Lighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - add verbiage about specialty lighting at the Gateway site/ entrance from Gamble Street into the development. 	
		<p>APPENDIX Provide qualification on tree inventory drawing</p>

PLEASE NOTE:

On all drawings depicting the Wildwood Trail, Figures 1, 2,3, 4, 6, 13, 14, 18, drawing on Page 23 the words “Wildwood Trail” should be amended to read “Wildwood Trail and Buffer – Town Owned Lands”

Clarify the purpose of the drawings showing building sitings throughout all Guidelines documents.

If any further clarification of these comments is required, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Bogdan Newman Caranci Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Elie Newman', followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Elie Newman, OAA, MRAIC