

From: Denis Gagnon
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2025 11:26 AM
To: j.kircal@cityssm.on.ca>
Subject: Re: 22 MacDonald Avenue - supporting studies

Jonathan,

Thank you for the provided additional information.

I have a few questions regarding the attached files.

For the water service preliminary review it shows that the MacDonald line is the preferred option to Gladstone. The MacDonald line is on the south side and therefore will have to come across the whole road. Would this not have a higher risk of breakage in the future as opposed to the Gladstone line that is already on the west side of the road and therefore closer to the property? The pressure testing was done in 2017. How valid are these results from 8 years ago? I know that there was recent work completed on the water lines around Pim and MacDonald in 2022. What is the impact of this work?

For the Traffic Impact Statement there is no indication where the assessment was completed on the two roads. The traffic volumes seem reasonable for both but I question the average speeds on Gladstone. These speeds are very low and I anticipate that they reflect the speeds closer to the intersection where there is a stop sign. I can infer this but the statement isn't explicit and there is value in having that information. I question the assessment for the speed on MacDonald. I can confirm that people generally drive in excess of the speed limit of 50 km and I am struggling to understand how an increase in traffic will reduce the speed as is being suggested. In a rush hour condition with bumper to bumper traffic I can see this happening but on a residential street like this I have a hard time seeing this happen. Are there plans after the buildings are in place to re-evaluate the traffic?

The Traffic Impact Assessment identifies the property as being zoned as parks and recreation while the storm water report identifies the site as high density residential. Has the rezoning already taken place? I was under the assumption that this review is to determine if the rezoning should occur.

For the Stormwater Management Memo there is no indication of when the pre-development conditions were evaluated. The charts in the appendix say 2016 and the image SK1 says 2021 after the site had been ditched along Gladstone, which can be seen by the contour line on the site map. I believe that this altered the drainage pattern on the site and I doubt if section 102 would even exist if it wasn't for the ditching they did. These alterations to the site are technically pre-development but don't reflect what was there prior to the ditching. This is worth noting in the report in the event that it has any impact on the planning and proposed development. There were significant rain storms that caused flooding in the summer of 2013 and the fall of 2019 that did not fare well for many residents around this area because of the noted silty clay soils. What measures are in place to protect the two story underground parking from becoming an unwanted water feature for the tenants of these proposed buildings?

For the Sanitary Sewer Study I note that there is a difference in the number of proposed units. This document shows 220 while others are 216 or 230 (8 storey). The fact that these numbers aren't consistent throughout all of the studies and assessments is concerning if the calculations under represent what will be there at the end of construction. There doesn't appear to be any discussion on allowances for variance. This analysis in particular averages 1.6 persons per unit. Is this consistent with

the more recent housing trends such as the Legion building which is comparable. With the increased cost of living and a more diverse population where multi-generational housing is the norm, I am concerned that this may under-represent the average people per unit. This study was also completed in 2017 and 2018, 7 or 8 years ago, and I question the currency of this study. Have other developments or changes in populations and housing impacted this area that would change these results? Did the impacts of the pandemic affect this system in any way? Was there any other construction, maintenance or upgrades to the system in this area that would potentially impact these results?

For the Shadow Study I have to admit that I find the results very interesting. I think that the study doesn't capture the topography of the site. Being on a hill I anticipate the morning shadows will stretch much further west than is shown. Also this study doesn't appear to account for the mature forest that exists on the west and north side of the property and what impact that will have on the shadows including the shadows that they will cast. This study does identify one thing for me and that the parking lot between the buildings and the parking lot next to Gladstone will take significantly longer to become snow free and will be prone to having icy conditions for much longer than the south parking lots. Not to mention that the primarily westerly and northern winter winds and snow will likely funnel and swirl between the two buildings. Considering our climate I think this will be a challenge for the property manager and the tenants.

My primary concern is one that I haven't seen addressed in these studies and in particular the traffic impact study. The traffic impact was focused on the speed and volume of the vehicles traveling through the area. The part that is missing has to do with the safety and the current engineering of the intersection at Gladstone and MacDonald. When traveling south on Gladstone to the intersection at MacDonald you travel upwards out of the ravine to the stop sign. The concern is that the vehicle that you are travelling in is lower than the vehicles traveling on MacDonald. In any other condition I would say that this is not a problem. The challenge with this intersection is that on the northeast corner of Gladstone is a church. Despite there being a large parking lot off of Gladstone for the parishioners their preference is to park along the north side of MacDonald or on Gladstone. The vehicles on MacDonald are not isolated to Saturday evening or Sunday mass. There are various activities at the church throughout the week during the day and in the evening. Because of this it makes turning off of Gladstone onto MacDonald very dangerous, whether you are turning right or left. The long line of parked vehicles along the northside of MacDonald obstruct the view and it is compounded by being in a lower position on Gladstone. This only gets worse in the winter when there are snow banks and the vehicles are then parked further out into the street. During mass or other larger services it is not uncommon for vehicles to park along Gladstone as well which will be reduced considering the one entrance to the proposed south parking lot. I think that the solution to this is twofold. The church needs to communicate to its parishioners that they are to use the designated parking lot for any and all functions. The city can put no parking signs along the north of MacDonald leading away from Gladstone to an appropriate distance to ensure line of sight.

For the site plan my concern is with the proposed entrance on MacDonald opposite Fauquier Street. The proposed entrance is shown to be in the bend of MacDonald and this is also at the crest of the hill. I understand the point of having it at the crest of the hill since this gives the best line of sight for the drivers coming up the hill. My concern is that vehicles exiting the property will still have a hard time seeing the westbound vehicles on MacDonald due to the angle that they will be exiting the parking lot. The parked vehicles by the church might still pose a problem here along with the planned trees on the north side of MacDonald.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these plans and the associated studies. I look forward to your responses to my questions.

Denis Gagnon Jr. R.P.F.