

March 29, 2017 Open House, Back to Back and Stacked Townhouses

List of comments, questions and issues identified during the open house.

1. As the population ages consider **accessible unit entrances**.
2. The minimum **5 m unit width** may be too restrictive given the potential variety of unit designs.
3. The **maximum length of 41 m for a building block** may be too restrictive and should be determined on a site by site basis or via a guideline only.
4. Consideration should be given to Fire and OBC requirements on building block length and placement.
5. The new '**Context Grade**' definition will need to be tested by the building industry and designers to see if it meets the intended objective.
6. Consider using a 45⁰ angular plane for:
 - a. the 15m minimum **separation distance between buildings** as this appears excessive compared to other jurisdictions. Less separation may still meet the same objective.
 - b. the **rear yard setback** of three storey buildings could be reduced, as less height would mean less impact.
7. Reducing the heights of **retaining walls** may be a challenge as not all sites are flat.
8. The **grading of a site and the access** to the units will be a challenge and should be determined on each individual site.
9. It is important that this type of built form remain **affordable**.
10. It is unclear where this type of building could be **located** in the Mississauga. Indicate where they should and should not be permitted (e.g. not in neighbourhoods).
11. Consider **reducing setbacks** to amenity areas.
12. The minimum 1.8 m wide **walkways** and 2 m wide **sidewalks** are excessive.
13. Consider **4 storey back to back townhouses**.
14. The **7.5 m minimum front yard setback** is excessive. A 4.5 m front setback was suggested as the industry standard.
15. Consider reducing the **outdoor common amenity area** requirement where the site is near an existing park or open space.