MHBC | PLANNING URBAN DESIGN & LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

October 11, 2024

Max Kerrigan, BES, MLA, MCIP, RPP
Integrated Planning & Public Works
City of Waterloo
100 Regina Street South
Waterloo, ON N2J 4A8

Dear Mr. Kerrigan:

RE: 177 – 179 Albert Street, Waterloo
Official Plan Amendment No. 52 & Zoning By-law Amendment (Z-24-03)
Response to Post-Circulation Comments
OUR FILE: 15200F

On behalf of our client, 14688210 Canada Inc., and together with Masri O Architects and other members of the project team, we have prepared the following summary of the changes to the development (and related amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law) and a table that includes responses to the Post-Circulation Comments for the Official Plan (No. 52) and Zoning By-law Amendment (Z-24-03) applications for 177-179 Albert Street.

Summary of Revised Plans and Amendments

As you are aware, the owner has engaged Masri O Architects to design the development. This has resulted in revisions to the overall design, though the building remains a point tower, situated on a podium. The following provides a summary of the changes – the full set of plans are included with this resubmission:

1. The height of the building has increased from 25 to 30 storeys, consistent with the draft Official Plan released in June 2024.
2. The ground floor now contains commercial floor space oriented to the corner of Seagram Drive and Albert Street, complete with outdoor patio areas along the south and west facades.
3. The road widenings have been incorporated into the development, including 3.0 metres along Seagram Drive and 0.7 metres along Albert Street.
4. The height of the podium varies, including a single storey along the west side, 4 storeys along the north side and 6 storeys along the east side.
5. The building contains a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. Previously, the building contained the following mix:
    a. 120 one-bedroom units

b. 26 two-bedroom units

6. The revised building design includes the following mix:
    a. 94 studio and one-bedroom units
    b. 132 two-bedroom units
    c. 4 three-bedroom units
7. This results in an increase in the total number of units from 146 to 230 and an increase in the total number of bedrooms from 166 to 370. As a result of the increase in the total number of units and two and three bedroom units, as well as the reduction in the lot area due to the widening conveyances, the density has increased to 2,511 bedrooms per hectare.
8. The podium and tower have been shifted to accommodate the road widening along Seagram Drive, with more soft landscaping opportunities in both the west and north side yards.
9. The owner proposes to provide affordable housing units, whereas previously, none were proposed. The owner proposes to provide 4% of the units as affordable housing units.

Revised Official Plan Amendment

1. That a new Specific Policy Area be added to the lands to permit a maximum height of 30 storeys and a maximum density of 2,511 bedrooms per hectare and to require a minimum of 4% of the units as affordable housing units.

Revised Zoning By-law Amendment

1. That the following site specific provisions apply to the lands, notwithstanding the regulations in the Zoning By-law:
    a. Maximum Building Height – 30 storeys and 102 metres
    b. Maximum Density – 2,511 bedrooms per hectare
    c. Minimum % of affordable housing units – 4%
    d. Minimum Landscape Open Space – 24%
    e. Street Line Setback – Seagram Drive – 3.0 metres
    f. Side Yard – 2.0 metres
    g. Rear Yard – 1.0 metres (hydro transformer room) and 1.6 metres (parking structure)
    h. Podium stepback – varies
    i. Tower separation – 6.5 metres (north lot line) and 8.9 metres (west lot line)

#	Comment	Response
City of Waterloo – Post Circulation Comments		
1.0 Planning Comments		
1.1.2 Specific Provision Area		
	Planning staff are of the opinion that Schedule A6a (SPA 20I) shall remain on the subject lands because the intent that these lands can also be used for academic purposes is still relevant. This SPA enables the incorporation of academic-related uses over time as the community evolves or market needs desire.	The owner does not object, though notes that academic uses are not proposed at this time.

	For example, the building could evolve in the future to accommodate formal student residences owned/operated by a post-secondary institution. Furthermore, the subject lands are very much still connected to the surrounding academic lands from a spatial/geographic perspective, and the demographic of future residents may largely be comprised of students (as suggested by the Applicant).	
	It is Planning staff's preference that the lands be dually designated SPA 20/20I (existing) and SPA XX (proposed) to accommodate the increased density. Maintaining the Academic designation does not preclude the construction of multi-residential in line with the Mixed-Use High Density Residential designation.	Noted
1.1.3 Height & Density		
	Section 12.3.1 (Height/Density Bonusing) of the Official Plan provides a framework for Council to authorize increases in height and/or density beyond what is currently permitted in exchange for facilities, services or matters, in accordance with the former Section 37 (Bonusing) of the Planning Act. While Section 37 is no longer in effect, Planning staff are of the opinion that requests for additional height and/or density in exceedance of the Official Plan should still be reviewed against the bonusing criteria set out in the Official Plan. As such, staff requested that the Applicant demonstrate compliance with the criteria in section 12.3.1, as well as demonstrate how the proposed increase provides a benefit to the surrounding neighbourhood or broader community (e.g., providing affordable housing or larger family-size units). The Applicant submitted rationale in their PJR that addresses the policies of 12.3.1 of the Official Plan, and staff offer further comments in Table 1 below.	Acknowledged
	Planning staff do not object to the increased residential density in this instance, to permit an additional 51 bedrooms.	Please refer to the revised plans. We acknowledge staff support. The owner has revised the plans in consideration of a number of factors, including efficiency of the original design, the size of the units, the road widening requirement and revisions to how

		parking is regulated in Major Transit Station Areas. The Lot Area has been reduced as a result of the two road widening conveyances – one on Albert St and one on Seagram Dr. The building's height has been increased from 25 to 30 storeys and the number fo 2 bedrooms units has increased. The development now also includes 3 bedroom units. As a result, the total number of units has increase from 146 to 230 and the total number of bedrooms has increases from 172 to 370. The resulting density is now 2,511 bedrooms per hectare. The size of the tower has increased from 463 square metres to 578 square metres, which is still well below the permitted maximum (1,000 square metres). We also note that the development includes ground floor commercial oriented to both streets, including a spill out terrace. There have been only minor adjustments to the overall massing, while the articulation of the ground floor, the defined podium and the narrow tower all contribute to a strong public realm and pedestrian experience.
	Table 1: Assessment of Section 12.3.1 Criteria **12.3.1 Height/Density Bonusing** / **Community Planning comments** *(2) Authorized increases in height and/or density will be used as a tool to support the City's policy objectives within the Official Plan. The potential for authorized increases in height and/or density will apply to lands which, at the time of application, satisfy the following criteria:* *(a) Is located within a designated Node or Corridor;* — Yes, located in a Major Corridor (Schedule 'B') *(b) Is well served by existing or planned transit.* — Yes, located in the Laurier-Waterloo Park Station Area (Schedule 'J5') *(6) In all cases, appropriate development review processes will be utilized to ensure:* *(a) The site is suitable for the proposed density and/or height in terms of parking, landscaping, and other site-specific requirements;* — A number of variances to the zoning requirements are being requested: minimum parking, landscaped open space and tower separation. Development Planning staff will need to satisfy themselves that the requested relief is suitable for the site and increased density. Refer to 1.5 Parking comments below. *(b) Any increase in density and/or height is compatible with the planned scale and character of the surrounding neighbourhood and has a minimal impact on neighbouring land uses; and* — The proposed increased residential density is contained within the permitted building height. The lands to the north and east are also designated for high density and have seen considerable growth through multi-storey buildings. Lands to the south are designated for low-rise residential and within the MacGregor-Albert Heritage Conservation District – refer to 1.6 Urban Design and 3.0 Heritage Planning comments below. *(c) That community services, infrastructure and transportation impact issues are adequately addressed, if applicable. A Transportation Impact Study, Servicing Report, and any other relevant supporting information may also be required. All relevant supporting information may require, at the City's request, examination of off-site impacts.* — A Transportation & Parking Study and Functional Servicing Report have been submitted in support of the application. Development Planning, Engineering Services and Transportation Services staff will need to satisfy themselves that the proposal is appropriate for the subject lands and surrounding lands.	As you are aware, as a result of changes to the Planning Act, minimum parking regulations no longer apply. While the building height increased by 5 storeys, the massing remains a point tower situated on a defined podium. Particular emphasis has been placed on the street facing facades. The development has also been revised to include ground floor commercial, which will serve surrounding residents, students going to and from WLU and those using the nearby ION LRT Station. In our opinion, the inclusion of the commercial use is a benefit to the community. Further, the broadening of the unit types, including three-bedroom units are also a benefit to the community and will provide a range of unit sizes for residents looking to live

		close to transit, Waterloo Park and the two universities.
1.1.5 Parking		
	In conjunction with the general urban design policies of the Official Plan, parking within Station Areas shall be designed and organized to not detract from the public realm or mobility and hould feature a high level of building design for parking structures in public view (policy 3.11.4(9)). As mentioned above, the proposed vehicular parking is mostly screened / hidden at the rear or underground. Similarly, the proposed locations of the amenity space, bicycle parking and landscape areas promote actives uses on the ground floor and help enhance the pedestrian realm (notwithstanding the proposed reduction in the landscaped open space zoning requirement, which is discouraged by Planning staff).	Per above, there are no minimum parking requirements. Furthermore, the development locates all of the proposed parking within a structure to hide it from view to the extent possible.
1.1.6 Urban Design		
	All residential developments shall be consistent with the City's urban design objectives and policies as set out in the Official Plan and supporting implementation documents. Planning staff are generally satisfied that the Applicant has demonstrated compliance with the urban design polices as outlined in sections 3.11.1 (General Urban Design Policies), 3.11.2 (Urban Design within Nodes and Corridors), and 3.11.4 (Urban Design within Station Areas) of the Official Plan, via the submitted Urban Design Brief (prepared by MHBC, dated November 2023). Planning staff encourage the Applicant to continue to refer to these importance policies at the detailed design phase.	Acknowledged. While the design has been refined since the initial submission, the refinements all represent positive design measures, including activation of the ground floor.
1.1.7 Road Widenings		
	As per Schedule 'G' (Road Allowances) of the Official Plan, Albert Street has a designated road allowance of 23.0 metres and Seagram Drive has a designated road allowance of 26.0 metres. The Applicant was advised at the pre-consultation stage that a road widening may be required to be dedicated to the City of Waterloo, and Transportation staff has	The road widening along both streets is shown on the site plan. There is sufficient space between the building and new lot line for landscaping, including trees. Further, the potential future redesign of Seagram Dr, as provided by City staff, will still allow for trees between the relocated sidewalk and building.

	indicated that widenings will be required (detailed in Section 3.0).	
	As such, associated zoning relief will be required. Please provide a draft reference plan to reflect this requirement, and update drawings and data charts accordingly for consideration.	A Draft Reference Plan will be provided through the site plan approval process. The widenings have been reflected on the updated site plan. A reduced setback is not proposed along Albert St, even with the widening. A reduced setback along Seagram Dr is required as the conveyance is substantial. As the site plan indicated, there is a minimum of 3 metres from the post-widening lot line and the nearest point of the building, while the majority of the building is set back a further 3 metres. The articulated façade facing Seagram, the ability to provide landscaping and active spaces and the greater setback afforded for the majority of the façade all contribute to a pedestrian oriented public/private realm interface.
1.1.8 Environemental Policy Comments		
	The Energy Strategy presents various measures that could be incorporated into the proposed development to improve its energy and carbon performance. The applicant is encouraged to continue to pursue these and other measures in order to optimize energy efficiency, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and increase climate resilience. This could include enhancing the energy performance of the proposed building, striving towards a near-zero emissions level of performance, incorporating low carbon heating and cooling systems and on-site renewables, identifying embodied carbon reduction strategies, and improving building resilience through increased thermal resistance, adaptable building systems, and back-up power systems that could provide 72 hours of support for hot and cold water, elevator service, space heating, lighting, and receptacle power.	Noted – the details will be considered through the site plan and building permit processes.
	The properties are located within the area covered by the Grand River Source Protection Plan. A Section 59 Notice will be required at each stage of the development process. The	An updated Risk Management Plan was prepared and completed with the Region.

	applicant can continue to go to taps.regionofwaterloo.ca to complete a questionnaire to confirm what source protection-related activities are regulated on the properties through the Grand River Source Protection Plan and to obtain the required Section 59 Notices.	
1.1.9 Heritage Planning Comments		
	Planning staff do not object to the Z-24-03 and OPA 52 application from a heritage perspective.	Noted.
2.0 Landscape & Public Realm		
1	Please note that all current Site Plan, Subdivision and Capital Project applications and development processes have been compiled into the recently implemented City of Waterloo Comprehensive Engineering and Landscape Manual (CELM). Please visit the CELM for all standard guidance, standards and requirements. All forthcoming development applications shall meet the requirements/follow the processes set out in the CELM.	Noted. Manual to be considered through future site plan application.
2	Prior to Site Plan Approval, all existing shared boundary trees and trees on adjacent properties proposed to be removed shall have documented approval in the form of a Letter of Consent which indicates that the adjacent property owner(s) are aware of the proposal and the potential harm to existing vegetation.	Noted. The required Letters of Consent will be provided prior to Site Plan Approval.
3	All impacts to/removal of City-owned trees or trees with shared ownership with the City shall be in accordance with the City Tree Bylaw (No. 2014-078). Trees are noted to be city-owned within the right-of-way of Albert Street and Seagram Drive.	Noted.
4	Provide a landscape design that will enhance and strengthen the streetscape quality along Albert Street and Seagram Drive including but not limited to street trees,	Noted. Potential conflicts between trees and the overhead hydro lines along both street frontages will be reviewed as part of Site Plan Approval.

	enhanced planting and paving, site furnishings, etc. It appears that overhead hydro along Albert Street and Seagram Drive will restrict the provision of landscaping and street trees. Potential conflicts should be reviewed in order to maximize tree planting across the site and help promote a pedestrian scale of the building. Ensure trees will be possible that meet Enova Power's acceptance for location and size.	The building and landscape design do represent a pedestrian friendly design. Where possible, trees will be included. We note that a Landscape Plan is required through the future Site Plan application and will be provided.
5	Tree canopy coverage to break up the impervious space with soft landscaping, and increasing tree canopy coverage over the site to reduce urban heat island effect must be incorporated into the site design early on.	We understand this to be a general comment. The public interface appropriately balances soft and hardscaping.
6	The City recommends replacement rate of trees to be removed is at a ratio of 2:1. The applicant is encouraged to maximize tree planting wherever possible on site. Per the objectives outlined in Section 8.2.9 (2) of the City's Official Plan, compensation should consider tree replacements with the intent of maintaining/increasing canopy coverage across the City. Staff are concerned that with reduced Landscaped Open Space and reduced landscape buffer, tree canopy coverage will decrease.	The Conceptual Landscape Plan illustrates where trees are proposed. There is no required landscape buffer, as the lands do not abut low-rise residential lands. The design plans for new trees along the public realm, recognizing that a high-rise building is a different built form than the existing detached low-rise buildings.
7	The applicant is seeking a reduction in the required Landscaped Open Space (LOS) from 30% to 24%. We understand from the submission material that the proposed landscaping is focused primarily on areas that will contribute to an enhanced public realm, which is appreciated. Please clarify which areas have been included in the LOS calculation, as it appears that 24% has not been provided. For example, it appears that the space above underground parking with steep slopes on the project north portion part of the site has been included (it is hatched green) and this area is not permitted to count toward LOS. It also appears that areas outside of the property boundary into the public right-of-way have been included. Clear and accurate calculations will be required before LOS reduction is considered by staff.	The development includes 358 square metres of landscaped area, which represents 24% of the lot area, after widening. Much of the hardscaped proposed is intended as outdoor space for the residents, and contributes to the landscape area. It has not been included in the 'amenity area' calculation. The percentage of landscape area would have been higher if the widenings were not required – though it is noted that if Seagram Drive is reconstructed in the future, the additional 3 metres provided through this development can be used towards additional landscaping in the boulevard.

8	We understand from the submission material that the requested LOS reduction is due to grading constraints on site that would limit landscaping opportunities along the west side of the site. Can the adjacent retaining wall be removed and replaced to make the most of the space between the two properties? The narrow strip of approximately 0.22m between parking and existing adjacent retaining wall is very limited. Is there opportunity to aquire and incorporate 80 Seagram Drive into the development plans? Buffering of headlight glare from vehicles in surface parking shall be considered.	This would require cooperation from the adjacent landowner and the regrading of their lands abutting their driveway. It is not clear that this would increase the landscaped area given the location of their driveway. It could be explored through the site plan process, but we do not believe this area should be included in the minimum required landscape open space %.
9	Fencing should be decorative wood fence, 1.8m height and using 150mm x 150mm posts. Provide location information of all fences proposed on site and where required, information on how existing trees will be protected during fence installation.	This is a site plan detail. This information will be provided as part of the site plan application.
10	The grading plan indicates 3:1 slopes within north portion of the property. As per Table V5-1, Lot Grading & Drainage Criteria in Volume 5 of the City's Comprehensive Engineering and Landscape Manual (CELM), the maximum embankment slope is 4:1. The City may consider some small areas at a maximum of 3:1. Please explore including a retaining wall that would reduce the steep grades and potentially allow for tree planting within this area.	This will be explored further through the site plan approval process.
11	Although final detail of the rooftop area are noted to be advanced through the Site Plan Approval Landscape Plans, a structural engineer should be involved with site plan development to ensure the podium is designed to provide structural support for adequate soil volumes for long term tree and shrub growth. As shown in the Urban Design guidelines, landscaping such as trees, shrubs, perennials, etc., are expected and will greatly enhance this rooftop amenity space.	This will be considered through more detailed building design, including whether planters will be used on the rooftop amenity area.
12	Incorporate recommendations from the wind study through design, including for the roof terrace amenity space.	The recommendations of the wind study will be incorporated into the plans that form part of the site plan application. The wind study

		has been updated to reflect the revised design.
13	Further details will be required during the Site Plan Application process for review and acceptance from Development Engineering landscape staff.	Noted.
3.0 Transportaiton Impact Study		
1	If the scope of the application changes an updated transportation impact study may be required.	Noted. The number of units/bedrooms has increased, but the number of parking spaces has remained effectively the same (45 now versus 44 previously).
2	Staff have reviewed the transportation impact study provided. There are no warranted improvements as a result of this development.	Noted.
3	The official plan designates Seagram Drive as 26 metres. The current right-of-way along Seagram Drive is 20 metres. A widening is required and should be confirmed by an Ontario Land Surveyor.	Noted – the site plan has been revised to show the required 3 m road widening.
4	The official plan designates Albert Street as 23 metres. The current right-of-way along Albert Street is 22.3 metres. A widening is required and should be confirmed by an Ontario Land Surveyor.	The widening will be confirmed by a surveyor when they prepare the Reference Plan through the site plan approval process. The approximate 0.7 m widening is shown on the Plan.
5	The daylight triangle at the intersection of Albert Street and Seagram Drive shall be conveyed to the City.	We understand, based on subsequent discussions that a daylight triangle conveyance is not required.
4.0 Engineering Comments		
Development Engineering		
1	City of Waterloo's Development Engineering Manual has been superseded by the Council approved Comprehensive Engineering and Landscape Manual (CELM) located: https://www.waterloo.ca/en/government/development-engineering-manual.aspx	Noted.
2	Terms of Reference for documents required to be submitted must be followed. Please refer to the City's Terms of reference for development applications page found at: LINK Checklists for these documents found within the Terms of Reference (i.e. FSR, SWM Report) should be submitted with each submission. If a combined Functional Servicing Report and Stormwater Management Report is submitted, the combined report must meet the	Noted.

	requirements of each separate report as indicated by the respective Terms of Reference Documents.	
3	Section 5.2 of the Stormwater Volume Criteria and Targets in the SWM-MP, the site must target Enhanced-Level 1 protection which equates to the reduction of average long-term annual load of suspended sediment by 80% or greater.	Noted
4	A sanitary flow rate of 3.35 l/sec has been presented as an anticipated flow rate for the proposed development. It was also assumed in the report that the sanitary sewer on Albert Street has sufficient capacity to support the proposed development. The City of Waterloo does not guarantee capacity within the receiving municipal infrastructure. A capacity analysis should be completed to confirm the receiving system can convey the demand from the development. The City of Waterloo considers any pipe capacity that exceeds 80%, as overcapacity. The developer may request the City to complete the modelling. A fee of $500.00 will apply.	Please see revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by MTE.
5	Chung and Vander Doelen Engineering Ltd. Geotechnical Investigation indicates groundwater levels were measured at depths ranging from 3.75m and 5.22m below the surface, and that the underground parking will be below the groundwater table. The applicant must satisfy Development Engineering demonstrate through the design how groundwater will be protected post construction. It's also been indicated a MECP permit to take water will be require. The City of Waterloo will require a dewatering plan to thesatisfaction of the Director of Engineering.	Noted – a dewatering plan can be provided through the future site plan application process.
6	The Geotechnical Report also indicates a shoring system will be required to support the excavation and protect the adjacent properties. An Encroachment Agreement may be required if a tie back system is proposed that would extend into the municipal road.	Noted.
Engineering Infrastructure		

	The Functional Servicing and SWM Report (Report) for the application notes that the proposed development will have a sanitary discharge of 3.35 L/s. As per the provided Report, the proposed sanitary flow rates are as summarized in Table 1. Peak Flow = 3.35 L/s Peak Flow = 0.00335 m3/s	Please see the revised Report prepared by MTE.
	2029 Modelling Scenario The future conditions PCSWMM sanitary sewer model includes loading rates that are projected to reflect 2029 conditions. The projected 2029 model estimated flows do not account for flows from the proposed development. To be conservative, the flows resulting from the proposed development were added to the sanitary sewer model flows to determine the effects of the proposed development on the sanitary sewer system. The analysis was carried out for the wet weather modelling scenario as it is more conservative, using the Sanitary Hydraulic model developed for the Sanitary Master Plan completed in 2015.	Noted.
	Laurel Creek Trunk System The proposed flow of 3.35 L/s was accounted for in the MH L31-27 flows, the downstream receiving manhole. The 2029 projected 'post-development' modelling results indicate that the sanitary sewer on Albert Street downstream of the proposed development appears to have available capacity under wet weather modelling scenarios, reaching a depth of 25% full, as shown on the figure below.	Noted.
7.0 Building Commnets		
1	Please ensure the proposed development complies with the Ontario Building Code and building best practices.	Noted.
8.0 Agency Comments		
8.1 Region of Waterloo		
1. General Comments and Next Steps Include:		
a	Staff encourage the developer to consider including three bedroom units, as directed by Sections 2.2.1.4 c) and 2.2.6.3 of the Growth Plan.	The Growth Plan does not direct for 3-bedroom units and we note the Region has not opined in this regard for other high-rise residential buildings. Even though 3-bedroom units are not required, the revised design includes 3-bedroom units.

		We also note that the 2024 PPS replaces the Growth Plan.
b	Development applications proposing residential uses will be required to indicate if and how they are contributing to meeting the affordable housing target set out in ROPA 6 Policy 3.A. 2, and include an assessment of mix and range of types, bedroom mix, unit sizes, tenures and accessibility requirements.	ROPA 6 policy states that 'area municipalities, in collaboration with the Region, will plan to provide a diverse range and mix of housing options with an overall target of a minimum of 30 percent of new ownership and rental housing being affordable to low and moderate income households.' The Policy does not require individual projects to demonstrate how they are meeting the target.
c	Staff recommend that the developer meet with Housing Services to discuss the proposal in more detail and to explore opportunities for partnerships or programs and mechanisms to support a defined level of affordability. Please contact Judy Maan-Miedema, Principal Planner (Housing) by e-mail JMaanMiedema@regionofwaterloo.ca or by phone at 226-753-9593.	Noted.
d	Regional staff require that a valid Section 59 Notice be obtained prior to OPA 52 and the corresponding Zoning By-law Amendment being considered by City Council.	A Section 59 Notice is included with this resubmission.
e	Regional staff require that the applicant submit a model request to the Region or perform a hydrant flow test to confirm the boundary conditions, and that an updated Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report be provided prior to OPA 52 and the corresponding Zoning By-law Amendment being considered by City Council. For further information regarding this requirement, please contact WaterServicesDistributionDevelopment@regionofwaterloo.ca	Please see the Revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by MTE, wherein they recommend the fire flow test be completed at the detailed design stage.
f	Staff require a revised Environmental Noise Assessment study be revised to address the peer review comments to the satisfaction of RWDI and Regional staff.	Please see responses to peer reviewer comments prepared by SLR.
	To discuss any of the Regional comments, please contact those listed staff within the attached comment document or Susanna Reid,	Noted.

	Senior Planner, Community Planning at 519-502-8298 or sreid@regionofwaterloo.ca	
8.2 Waterloo Catholic District School Board		
	The Waterloo Catholic District School Board (WCDSB) request the following condition(s): 1. That any Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s). If further information is required, please contact Jordan Neale, Planning Technician, WCDSB, at Jordan.Neale@wcdsb.ca.	Noted.
8.3 Waterloo Region District School Board		
1	Student Accommodation: At this time, the subject lands are within the boundaries of the following WRDSB schools: • Keatsway Public School (Junior Kindergarten to Grade 6); • MacGregor Public School (Grade 7 to Grade 8); and • Waterloo CI (Grade 9 to Grade 12). The WRDSB's 2020-2030 Long-Term Accommodation Plan projects long-term overutilization at all of the above schools. Interim student accommodation measures, including portable classrooms, are on-site and may be required until an alternative accommodation solution is in place. The WRDSB may conduct a boundary study or designate this property as a "Development Area" and assign it to Holding Schools before occupancy or sales.	Noted.
2	Student Transportation: The WRDSB supports active transportation, and we ask that pedestrians be considered in the review of all development applications to ensure the enhancement of safety and connectivity.	Noted.
3	The WRDSB supports active transportation, and we ask that pedestrians be considered in the review of all development applications to ensure the enhancement of safety and connectivity. WRDSB staff are interested in engaging in a conversation with the City and applicant to review the optimization of pedestrian access to municipal sidewalks and	Noted.

	public transit so students may access school bus pick-up points. Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR)'s school buses will not travel privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up/drop off students. Transported students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point. STSWR may have additional comments about student pick-up point(s) placement on municipal right-ofways.	
WRDSB Draft Conditions		
	Concerning any future declaration or agreement, the WRDSB requests the following inclusions in the conditions:	Noted.
1	That the Owner/Developer shall include the following wording in the condominium declaration to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same: a. "Despite the best efforts of the Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB), accommodation in nearby facilities may not be available for all anticipated students. You are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may, in future, be transferred to another school." b. "For information on which schools are currently serving this area, contact the WRDSB Planning Department at 519-570-0003 ext. 4419, or email planning@wrdsb.ca. Information provided by any other source cannot be guaranteed to reflect current school assignment information." c. "To limit liability, public school buses operated by the Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be	Noted.

	required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point."	
2	That the Owner/Developer enters into an agreement with the City to be registered on the title to the Property that provides: a. "All agreements of purchase and sale or leases for the sale or lease of a completed home or a home to be completed on the Property must contain the wording set out below to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same." i. "Despite the best efforts of the Waterloo Region District School Board (WRDSB), accommodation in nearby facilities may not be available for all anticipated students. You are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may, in future, be transferred to another school." ii. "For information on which schools are currently serving this area, contact the WRDSB Planning Department at 519-570-0003 ext. 4419, or email planning@wrdsb.ca. Information provided by any other source cannot be guaranteed to reflect current school assignment information." iii. "In order to limit risks, public school buses contracted by Student Transportation Services of Waterloo Region (STSWR), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up and drop off students, and so bussed students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick up point."	Noted.

3	That in cases where Agreements of Purchase and Sale have already been executed, the Owner/Developer sends a letter to all purchasers which includes the above statements [conditions 2 a. i., ii., and iii.].	Noted.
4	That the Owner/Developer supply, erect and maintain a sign (at the Owner/Developer's expense and according to the WRDSB's specifications), near or affixed to the development sign, advising prospective residents about schools in the area and that prior to final approval, the Owner/Developer shall submit a photo of the sign for review and approval of the WRDSB.	Noted.
5	Prior to final approval, the WRDSB advises in writing to the Approval Authority how the above conditions have been satisfied.	Noted.
6	Education Development Charges: Development on the subject lands is subject to the WRDSB's Education Development Charges By-law, 2021, as amended or any successor thereof and may require the payment of Education Development Charges for these developments before issuance of a building permit.	Noted.
7	The WRDSB requests to be circulated on any subsequent submissions and reserves the right to comment further on development proposals for the subject lands.	Noted.
	If you require further clarification, please contact Emily Bumbaco, Senior Planner, at emily_bumbaco@wrdsb.ca.	Noted.
8.4 Enova Power		
	Existing System: Enova has overhead distribution lines on Albert Street and Seagram Drive. Enova intends to maintain the overhead distribution system on all abutting streets.	Acknowledged
	Load Information: Customer's load information such as a P.Eng stamped single line diagram and load calculation must be submitted to Enova in order to determine the service size and supply method. For more information refer to the Conditions of Service available at enovapower.com.	Noted.

	Technical Requirements: The applicant shall consult with Enova throughout the site plan review and design phases to ensure that all Enova servicing requirements are met. Enova will generally supply an overhead transformer if the service size is 400A or less. If a larger service size is required, the developer must make provisions for the installation of a pad mounted transformer or a transformer vault room and primary duct bank on private property. This requirement is evaluated on individual project basis. Refer to the Enova (formerly Waterloo North Hydro) Technical Guidelines document for details.	The owner and their team will consult with Enova through the future site plan submission.
	Transformer Location: The transformer shall be installed such that any part of the transformer when mounted is a minimum 6.0 m from any openings, doors or windows, and a minimum 3.0m from any combustible surfaces or materials including neighbouring buildings and fences.	As shown on Plan, a transformer room is proposed.
	Transformer Grounding: The transformer vault grounding will be installed within a grassed area. The grounding grid cannot be installed under asphalt, curbs, etc.	As shown on Plan, a transformer room is proposed.
	Easement: Enova will require an easement at no cost to Enova within the proposed development site for supporting, repair, restoration and maintenance of Enova owned above-ground and underground facilities. For example, a 6.2m x 6.8m easement for an Enova owned pad mount transformer; a 3m wide easement for any duct bank structures. Refer to the Enova (formerly Waterloo North Hydro) Technical Guidelines document for details.	Noted
	Vault Room: If a transformer vault room is required for the service it must be constructed according to Enova (formerly Waterloo North Hydro) vault room standards. Additionally the vault room must meet all applicable requirements under the Ontario Building Code.	As shown on Plan, a transformer room is proposed.
	Metering Room: The customer must provide a convenient and safe location satisfactory to Enova for the installation of meters, wires and ancillary equipment. The location allocated by	Noted.

	the customer for Enova metering shall provide direct access from outside for Enova staff unless otherwise agreed to by Enova. Enova will not accept new meter locations in basements.	
	Set Back: The proposed building(s) must be set back a minimum of 5.0m from the pole line to allow for conductor swing as per requirements of Ontario Building Code Section 3.1.19.	On both streets, the poles are located between the sidewalk and the travelled portion of the road. The building is located at least 5 m from the sidewalk.
	Clearance: Any objects (crane, similar hoisting device, backhoe, power shovel or other vehicle equipment) shall not be brought closer than 5 metres to an energized overhead conductor owned by Enova.	Noted.
	Road Widening: _____ should review the pole locations in relation to any planned road widening. A larger building set back may be required to facilitate relocation of Enova's poles.	Road widenings are required however if the poles are moved, they could only be moved for a portion of Seagram Drive as the City does not have the road allowance to reconstruct and further widen the road. Bringing the poles closer to this property would also impact adjacent properties.
	Grading: Any grading changes by the developer which will affect existing Enova facilities either on private property or municipal right of way shall be reviewed and approved by Enova prior to any site grading.	Noted.
	Relocation of Facility: Any relocation of Enova facilities will be at the expense of the requesting party.	Noted.
	Landscaping: The customer is to ensure any landscaping that will be within the vicinity of Enova infrastructure complies with the ESA Planting Under or Around Powerlines & Electrical Equipment guideline.	Noted.
	Next Steps: A minimum of 8 months prior to the desired in-service date the Developer must submit a Service Request Form (available at enovapower.com) and provide the required information listed in Section 3 of the Service Connection Process to Enova. Please note Enova requires a signed Offer to Connect (OTC) and the receipt of payment for the service prior to procuring equipment.	Noted.
8.5 Canada Post		

	Canada Post has reviewed the proposal for the above noted Development Application and has determined that the project adheres to the multi-unit policy and will be serviced by developer/owner installed Lock Box Assembly. Multi-unit buildings and complexes (residential and commercial) with a common lobby, common indoor or sheltered space, require a centralized lock box assembly which is to be provided by, installed by, and maintained by the developer/owner at the owner's expense. Buildings with 100 units or more MUST have a rear loading Lock Box Assembly with dedicated secure mail room. Should the description of the project change, please provide an updated plan in order for us to assess the impact of the change on mail service. The complete guide to Canada Post's Delivery Standards can be found at: https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf	Noted.
Region of Waterloo – Post Circulation Comments		
Community Planning		
Provincial Policy		
	Regional staff note that the proposed apartment building includes 1 and 2 bedroom units. In order to accommodate a range of household sizes, staff encourage the developer to consider including three bedroom units, as directed by Sections 2.2.1.4 c) and 2.2.6.3 of the Growth Plan.	See previous response.
Regional Official Plan		
	Regional staff require that the applicant provide an assessment of mix and range of types, bedroom mix, unit sizes, tenures and accessibility requirements.	Please clarify what this 'assessment' means and refer to the related requirement. The development includes a mix of one, two and three bedroom units.
	Region staff note that the development does not include affordable units. More detailed housing comments are provided below.	Please see previous response.
	Region staff note that the reducing parking spaces is supported by ROPA 6 Policy 2.D.2.2 e).	A minimum supply of parking is no longer required
Housing Services		
	The Region supports the provision of a full range of housing options, including affordable	Noted.

	housing. If these applications are approved, staff recommend that the applicant consider providing a number of affordable housing units on the site, as defined in the Regional Official Plan. Rent levels and house prices that are considered affordable according to the Regional Official Plan are provided below.	
	Staff recommend that the developer meet with Housing Services to discuss the proposal in more detail and to explore opportunities for partnerships or programs and mechanisms to support a defined level of affordability. Please contact Judy Maan- Miedema, Principal Planner (Housing) by e-mail JMaanMiedema@regionofwaterloo.ca or by phone at 226-753-9593.	Noted.
Record of Site Condition (RSC)		
	A RSC is not required according to Region of Waterloo's Implementation Guideline for the Review of Development Applications On or Adjacent to Known and Potentially Contaminated Sites, as there are no threats in the Threat Inventory Database on or adjacent to 177-179 Albert Street.	Noted.
Hydrogeology and Water Programs (HWP)		
	Regional staff advise that the Region does not support permanent active or passive dewatering controls for below-grade infrastructure, including foundations, slabs, parking garages, footings, piles, elevator shafts, etc. Waterproof seals should be used in lieu of permanent dewatering controls for below-grade infrastructure requiring dry conditions.	Permanent dewatering is not proposed.
Notice of Source Protection Plan Compliance (Section 59 Notice)		
	Regional staff require that a valid Section 59 Notice be obtained prior to OPA 52 and the corresponding Zoning By-law Amendment being considered by City Council.	A Section 59 Notice is included.
Water Services		
	Region staff have reviewed the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report prepared by Walter Fedy (November 10, 2023). The applicant has not demonstrated	Please see revised Report prepared by MTE.

	their proposed development can be supported by the existing infrastructure.	
	Regional staff require that the applicant submit a model request to the Region or perform a hydrant flow test to confirm the boundary conditions, and that an updated Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report be provided prior to OPA 52 and the corresponding Zoning By-law Amendment being considered by City Council.	See previous response.
Environmental and Stationary Noise Study		
	RWDI has identified a number of actions required by the applicant. The Region of Waterloo seeks assurance that the sound levels and impacts are accurate and complete. As RWDI's comments have the potential to change the outcomes and conclusions of the study, revised analysis, additional information, clarification and supporting justification are required before City Council considers the applications.	Please see SLR peer review response.
	Regional staff require that the Environmental Noise Assessment study be revised to address the peer review comments to the satisfaction of RWDI and Regional staff prior to City Council considering the applications.	Please see SLR peer review response.
RWDI Peer Review - Noise		
Road Transportation Noise		
9	Traffic noise is evaluated for Albert Street and Seagram Drive. a. It is appropriate that Albert Street and Seagram Drive are included in the evaluation of traffic noise. b. Based on the zone of influence described in the Waterloo TOR, University Avenue West should be considered for this development or justification should be provided why its contribution is insignificant. c. It is reasonable that Lester Street is not considered.	Please see SLR peer review response.
10	Traffic data was obtained from the Region of Waterloo data portal. a. The traffic volumes were calculated to 2033, which is a 10-year future date from the date of the report. The data	Please see SLR peer review response.

	was valid at the time the report was prepared. b. The traffic data report indicates that the City of Waterloo should verify the forecast. Verification from the City of Waterloo should be confirmed by the consultant. If the City provides traffic volumes that are 10% or more higher, the results should be updated.	
11	The report describes modelling of road traffic using a hybrid of ORNAMENT source sound emissions, with Cadna/A for the sound propagation. A comparison point of this method with an ORNAMENT-based STAMSON calculation is provided for validation. a. The use of this modelling method, supported by a STAMSON validation, is suitable in this situation. b. Source sound emissions from ORNAMENT are provided in an appendix table. i. The input traffic volumes suitably reflect the data provided by the RMOW. ii. The road gradient for Seagram Drive is shown as 0%, while the slope calculated from publicly-available information is greater. Since the percentage of trucks on Seagram Drive is low, the influence will be small and no change to the modelling is required. iii. The road gradient for Albert Street is suitable. c. The Cadna/A modelling should be appropriately documented. i. Since the software includes several sound propagation algorithms, the consultant should clarify what algorithms were used for the transportation sound propagation. ii. Use of reflective ground is suitable.	Please see SLR peer review response.

	iii. The remaining model settings should be provided, such as temperature, relative humidity and order of reflections. iv. Documentation of the Cadna/A portion of the verification should be completed by providing a sample output file for the verification location. d. The STAMSON file for comparison is documented in the report. i. The traffic volumes used are appropriate. ii. The angles of exposure are as expected. iii. The use of reflective ground is suitable. iv. The source-receiver distances are reasonable. e. The results of the two methods are shown to be comparable. The modelling approach is reasonable for this application.	
15	The report summarizes the consequences of the modelled sound levels. a. The conclusion that façades do not need to be upgraded for sound level management is consistent with modelled results. b. Results of the modelling are reflected in a ventilation requirement, as is appropriate. However, the report indicates the freedom to select a system other than "provision for central air conditioning", without providing the supplementary requirements associated with alternatives. The report should provide the additional information (i.e., description, assurance, certification and feasibility demonstration) required in section 3.3.6 of the RMOW policy. c. The need for warning clauses is appropriately noted and should be refined or confirmed when the site plan is finalized.	Please see SLR peer review response.

Stationary Source		
16	The report describes the selection of stationary sources for evaluation using the D-series guidelines. All buildings at Wilfred Laurier University are described as Class I industries, having a zone of influence not greater than 70 m. Aerial photography for the university campus shows sources that are associated with zones of influence greater than 70 m. These include large air-cooled condensers, cooling towers, and emergency generators. The Class I description is not universally applicable and should be revised on a per-building basis in consideration of the sources present. The 10-fan air-cooled condenser at Martin Luther University College illustrates this based on the impacts which the report presents at 100+ m distance.	Please see SLR peer review response.
17	The evaluation is limited to an exhaust louvre at the Wilfred Laurier University Library and three air cooled chillers at Martin Luther University College. a. The pair of cooling towers, large generator and 12-fan air-cooled condenser located further to the northeast of the proposed development, on or south of the Dr. Alvin Woods Building should be considered. b. The 8-fan air-cooled condenser to the west of the proposed development, at 88 Seagram Drive, should also be considered. c. One near-grade exhaust louvre at the Wilfred Laurier University Library is considered. i. It should be clarified which of the four similar louvres on the building was considered. ii. The library has a mechanical penthouse with louvres and ventilation that have not been considered, but could have impact on the proposed development, and should therefore be addressed.	Please see SLR peer review response.

	iii. Supporting information should be provided that the remaining louvres were considered under their predictable worst-case operating condition. iv. The duty cycle that was applied is acceptable. d. One 10-fan air cooled chiller on Martin Luther University College was considered. i. SLR historical data was applied for the sound level. The sound power level is uncharacteristically quiet. Supporting sound level information for the predictable worst-case operation, such as manufacturer data, should be provided. ii. The duty cycle of 100% during a predictable worst-case daytime hour is acceptable. iii. The nighttime duty cycle of 25% or 15 minutes per hour is much lower than typical and must be supported by evidence from the University or sign-off from the designer of the system. As an alternative, a 50% nighttime duty cycle is acceptable. e. Two 2-fan air cooled chillers on Martin Luther University College are modelled. i. The sound power level data is reasonable. ii. The duty cycle of 100% during a predictable worst-case daytime hour is acceptable. iii. The nighttime duty cycle of 25% or 15 minutes per hour is much lower than typical and must be supported by evidence from the University or sign-off from the designer of the system. As an alternative, a 50% nighttime duty cycle is acceptable.	

20	The modelling was done using the Cadna/A software package. a. The ISO 9613 sound propagation algorithms are a suitable model. b. The temperature and relative humidity information provided describe standard settings. c. The use of 1 order of reflection is reasonable here. d. The wall absorption coefficients are acceptable in this situation. e. A global ground absorption of G=0 for reflective ground is acceptable. f. It should be clarified if local areas of non-reflective or less reflective ground are applied, and if so, where.	Please see SLR peer review response.
Impact of the Development		
25	The report defers the consideration of both noise impact from the development on itself and noise impact of the development on the surroundings until the mechanical systems have been designed. a. In this situation it is reasonable to defer the assessment since the necessary information is not yet available. b. The use of NPC-300 and/or NPC-216 for these assessments is appropriate. c. The acoustic specifications for a mechanical system should be provided to the mechanical designer at the beginning of the design process to ensure that a type of system is selected that is capable of meeting the acoustic requirements. d. A condition should be included in the application that, prior to Building Plan approval, the mechanical equipment noise impact be reviewed and signed-off that the sound level criteria will be met upon construction. The review and sign-off are to be completed by an individual on the Region's Pre-Qualified Consultants for Noise Studies List. e. A condition should be included in the application that sound impact on the development be verified to comply with	Please see SLR peer review response.

	the sound level criteria and signed-off prior to occupancy permits. The verification and sign-off are to be completed by an individual on the Region's Pre-Qualified Consultants for Noise Studies List.	
Conclusions and Recommendations		
26	The Transportation Noise conclusions reflect the building façade, ventilation and warning clause details of the report. The barrier requirements or the appropriate warning clause should be listed in this section.	Please see SLR peer review response.
27	The Stationary Source Noise conclusions regarding surrounding sources correctly reflect the analysis of the report. a. The barrier requirements for the outdoor amenity space are missing from this section and should be added. together with statements concerning review, verification and sign-off. b. If response to this review changes the analysis, the conclusions should be amended	Please see SLR peer review response.
29	The reviews, verification and sign-offs that are required to address the impact of the development on itself and the impact of the development on its surroundings must be added to the conclusion and recommendations.	Please see SLR peer review response.
Summary		
	The environmental noise study provided for 177-179 Albert Street, Waterloo presents an assessment for road traffic and on-site stationary source noise sources. The Region of Waterloo seeks assurance that the sound levels and impacts are accurate and complete. Comments provided in this review have the potential to change the outcomes and conclusions of the study. Revised analysis, additional information, clarification and supporting justification is required. Key items are: • Confirmation of road traffic volumes with the City of Waterloo should be provided; and	Please see SLR peer review response.

	• Additional offsite stationary source information is required and updated analysis as necessary	
	Without addressing these it is not possible to provide assurance that the values, results and conclusions are reasonable. Since a barrier is proposed, the following review, verification and sign-off are recommended: • Prior to Building Plan Approval, the barrier construction should be reviewed and confirmed to meet the barrier requirements specified. The review and sign-off are to be completed by an individual on the Region's Pre-Qualified Consultants for Noise Studies List. • Prior to Occupancy Permits, the barrier construction must be verified and signed-off as complying with the barrier requirements specified. The verification and sign-off are to be completed by an individual on the Region's Pre-Qualified Consultants for Noise Studies List.	Please see SLR peer review response.
	Since the impact of the develop on itself and the impact of the development on its surroundings are deferred, we recommend that the application be provided with the following conditions: • Prior to Building Plan Approval, the mechanical equipment noise impact must be reviewed and signed-off showing that the sound level criteria will be met upon construction. The review and sign-off are to be completed by an individual on the Region's Pre-Qualified Consultants for Noise Studies List. • Prior to Occupancy Permits, the mechanical equipment noise impact on the development and surroundings be verified and signed-off as complying with the sound level criteria. The verification and sign-off are to be completed by an individual on the Region's Pre-Qualified Consultants for Noise Studies List.	Please see SLR peer review response.

To assist with the City's review, we have enclosed the following:

- Site Plan
- Floor Plans
- Elevations
- Revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report
- Revised Pedestrian Wind Assessment
- Revised Noise Study and Response to Peer Review Comments
- Section 59 Notice

We look forward to continuing to work with staff on this project. Should you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

MHBC



Trevor Hawkins, M.PL, MCIP, RPP
Partner

cc. Reema Masri