



# INNOVATIVE PLANNING SOLUTIONS

planners • project managers • land development

October 28, 2020

County of Grey  
Planning Department  
595 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue East  
Owen Sound, ON  
N4K 3E3

Attention: Randy Scherzer, Director of Planning, County of Grey

Town of The Blue Mountains  
32 Mill Street  
PO Box 310  
Thornbury, ON  
N0H 2P0

Attention: Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning & Development Services  
Denise Whaley, Planner

**Re: Comment Response Matrix**  
Part of Lot 26, Concession 6 (former Township of Collingwood)  
In the Town of the Blue Mountains, County of Grey

---

RE: Rompsen – 2<sup>nd</sup> Report Submission Town File P2655  
From: Town of the Blue Mountains, Planning and Development Services  
Dated: August 10, 2020

#	Description of Condition	Action & Consultant	Status/Notes
<i>General Comments on the Draft Plan (Land-use Planning)</i>			
1.	It should be noted that the Nipissing Ridge (within Block 2) is an environmental feature that is a high property for Town acquisition through development applications based on OP		Acknowledged.

	Section D6.3.7. The conveyance of Block 2 to the Town will be a condition of any proposed Draft Plan Approval.		
2.	<p>In our opinion proposed Block 2 has insufficient road frontage for future municipal trail and maintenance access. We note that the area of Block 2 proposed road frontage is also mapped as “wetland” and adjacent to a watercourse. The addition a proposed swale means that even less land area is available to create a suitable access point for the Town’s future public use and maintenance access (per Town OP Section D6.3.5 (b)).</p> <p>Based on GSCA comments the proposed “Lot 19” area could become a wetland feature, and that may provide an opportunity for better access design for Block 2.</p>	IPS	<p>As per GSCA comments, the draft plan has been updated to reflect a portion of Lot 19 remaining a wetland. This new Block (Block 4) will be transferred to the Town along with Block 3 (original Block 2). Block 4 has frontage along Old Lakeshore Road that can be used to access Block 3 to create a suitable future access point for the Town’s future public use and maintenance access.</p> <p>An easement can be provided over the swale (Block 2), giving access to the Town to cross. In addition, if access is provided in the future, a culvert can be installed in place of the swale.</p>
3.	<p>The Nipissing Ridge is intended to be accessed by the public for trails and passive purposes. Section D6.3.5 of the Town OP identified the priority for public trail system to be established along the Nipissing Ridge with potential linkages noted in Schedule B1 of the Town OP. While we note that the locations are conceptual, the Draft Plan drawing does not show a trail or future trail linkages to adjacent lands. We note also that the current “draft” Old Lakeshore Neighbourhood Plan places a further priority on active transportation networks.</p> <p>The Draft Plan is to be revised showing a future Town trail that takes into consideration existing contours, that includes north-south-east-west connectivity points (see sketch below) and all other policies of Section D6.3.5.</p>	Dillon IPS	Acknowledged. Conceptual trail connections to be added to the draft plan as proposed by the Town.

<p>4.</p>	<p>The provided comments matrix dated April 2020 speaks to the Town concern about lack of connection to the adjacent parcels, specifically the western parcel. The applicant's comment is that the land abutting is a small parcel not suitable for development under a plan of subdivision. We disagree as providing for such connections to adjacent parcels is a common practice in subdivision design considerations.</p> <p>The resubmission has proposed "Lane A" as a private condominium road as opposed to prior submissions that proposed a public road allowance of substandard width. Given that "Lane A" is now proposed as a private road (owned, operated and maintained by owners within the development for their exclusive use) the desire for a Town block for future public road access/connection to the west lands has lessened. Should "Lane A" again be proposed to be a public road allowance, this connectivity piece will need to be provided.</p>		<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>The lands to the west are identified as additional lands owned by the applicant. We don't believe this to be the case, and if the lands are not owned by the applicant, this notation ought to be deleted from the Draft Plan drawing.</p>	<p>IPS</p>	<p>Draft plan has been revised.</p>

6.	The Section 51(17) data box ought to be updated with respect to subsection (j) as contours are not shown on the Draft Plan drawing (but are available as contours are shown on submitted civil engineering drawings) and therefore can be superimposed onto the Draft Plan drawing, and subsection (l) as proposed Block 4 is labeled as a proposed easement.	IPS	Draft plan has been revised.
<b>General Comments on the Draft Plan (Civil Engineering)</b>			
7.	<b>Geotechnical Report:</b>		
7.a	Based on data included in Geotech Report & FSR please comment if Rock will need to be broken or removed to implement servicing?	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Yes, rock will be required to be broken/removed.
7.b	Regarding Section 4.6.1, note that the Town requires a Proof roll of all road subgrades.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
7.c	Note that the subgrade will be disturbed during site servicing. Have the Geotech author comment if the subgrade will be suitable for road base once it has been disturbed?  Discussion within the report would appear not to support it has bearing capacity once disturbed.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Geotechnical consultant will be on site during construction and will review/certify all works.  Any unsuitable native subgrade material will be replaced with appropriate materials.
8	Is the proposal for a standard condo or common element?	IPS	The proposed development is to be freehold common elements condominium.
8.a	If common element condo, the water system will become public infrastructure per Town Bylaw 2008-02, Section 4.07 and to be designed to Town standards.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
8.b	If standard condo, the water system would be privately-owned and may require a flow meter/backflow preventor assembly at property line.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
9.	The Sanitary section of the FSR should reference the annual capacity reports the Town issues on a yearly basis when commenting on local capacity.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	FSR has been updated.
10.	As previously stated in the Memo dated May 14, 2020, Sanitary servicing must be extended to the furthest property line projection. Understanding that gravity sewer is not practical the Town would accept a LPSS extension.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Plans have been updated.
11.	Please provide fire flow calculations for the development.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Fire flow calculations to be added.
12.	<b>FSR Drawing comments:</b>		Comments within #12 are addressed with revised plans.
12.a	General Note 5, revised to Hydro One.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.

12.b	General Note 16, notice requirements are 72hrs during COVID-19.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.c	General Note 18, sewer separation to meet MECP Guidelines.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.d	All watermain materials to meet NSF 60, 61 and 372.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.e	Tracer wire to be tested by contractor, and with connectivity confirmed by the Town.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.f	Cathodic Protection to Town Standard and to include zinc caps on all fasteners.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.g	All watermain and related material to meet the Town's new material list.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.h	Watermain Commissioning to conform to the Town's Watermain Commissioning Protocol.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.i	Applicable Conservation Authority is GSCA, please revise.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Acknowledged.
12.j	The cross section may need to be revised to be suitable for the watermain depending on the chosen form of condominium tenure, there may not be enough separation distances from utilities.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Appropriate separation has been provided.
13.	Provide conveyance capacity for described box culverts.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Drawings have been updated.
14.	Now as the design will use storm sewers outline the how 80% removal of TSS is achieved?	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Provided within Site Servicing Plan and SWM Report (Section 4.4).
15.	Verify how the grading around the pond, Lot 1 and the interceptor swale works? Grading, Flow arrow and matching existing grades does not appear to align.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Drawings have been updated.
16.	How is mail delivery being accommodated? Consultation with Canada Post is required. Please show mail super-box on drawings (if applicable), as well as location vehicles could park/stand while obtaining mail. If the internal street becomes a designated Fire Route no parking will be permitted on the private road.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	To be addressed through detailed design.  Acknowledged.
17.	What is the proposed strategy for solid waste management (garbage/recycling)? The Town's preference is curbside collection as we achieve a greater diversion rate.	Tatham Engineering Ltd.	Town curbside collection is proposed.

RE: 42T-2018-06 Romspen Camperdown Second Submission  
From: Grey Sauble Conservation  
Dated: May 29, 2020

#	Description of Condition	Action & Consultant	Status/Notes
---	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------

1.	<p><b>GSCA has reviewed the application through our delegated responsibility from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement.</b></p> <p>The natural hazards identified on the property include flood and erosion prone areas associated with the watercourse to the east of the property boundary and the steep slope along the south side of the property associated with the Nipissing Ridge. As previously stated, these areas have been appropriately designated as hazard in the Township Zoning By-law and are captured within the open space zone allowing for an appropriate buffer from flooding, erosion and slope concerns.</p> <p><u>There is still a portion of the wetland on Lot 19 that is considered hazard and should be zoned as such under the Town's Zoning By-law. The proposed swale would also be included in the Open Space area and/or hazard zone.</u></p>	IPS	<p>The draft plan has been updated to reflect a portion of Lot 19 remaining as a wetland, now Block 4. If required, updated zoning can take place by the Town through house keeping amendment.</p>
2.	<p><b>GSCA has reviewed the application as per our responsibilities as a regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 151/06. This regulation, made under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act, enables conservation authorities to regulate development in or adjacent to river or stream valleys, Great Lakes and inland lake shorelines, watercourses, hazardous lands and wetlands. Development taking place on these lands may require permission from the conservation authority to confirm that the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or the conservation of land are not affected. GSCA also regulates the alteration to or interference in any way with a watercourse or wetland.</b></p> <p>A portion of the subject site is regulated under Ontario Regulation 151/06: Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses administered by the GSCA. The regulated areas are associated with the watercourse to the east side of the property, the outlet of the intermittent watercourse towards the middle of the north end of the property and the glacial Lake Nipissing shoreline ridge.</p> <p>Our previous comments identified a regulated area that would be associated with the previously unevaluated wetland identified through the EIS process (vegetation community SWDM2-2) which would be subject to the regulation. We recognize that through the later phases of the archaeological studies, a large portion of this wetland was removed,</p>	Dillon	<p>We understand that a permit will be required under O. Reg. 151/06 for works within the GSCA Regulated Area.</p> <p>Through discussions with agencies it has been decided that the remaining wetland feature within Lot 19, now Block 4, will be retained. See revised Draft Plan.</p>

	<p>and as such where the wetland has been removed within the area proposed for development, regulations associated with the wetland feature will need to be adjusted. <u>However, there is a large portion of wetland on lot 19 that was not removed and should be excluded from development.</u></p> <p><u>Under this regulation, a permit is required from this office prior to the construction and/or re-construction of buildings or structures, the temporary or permanent placement of fill within the affected area, interference with a wetland, and/or the straightening, changing, diverting or in any way interfering with an existing channel of a river, lake, creek, stream or watercourse.</u></p>		
3.	<p><b>GSCA has reviewed the application through our responsibilities as a service provider to the Town of the Blue Mountains in that we provide comment on natural heritage features under Section 2.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement and on water under Section 2.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement through a MOA.</b></p> <p><b>2.1 Natural Heritage</b></p> <p>As an update to our original comments on natural heritage, we recognize the loss of 0.33 ha of previously unevaluated wetland through the archaeological study process. Of this 0.33 hectares of lost wetland, 0.04 ha of loss was outside of the area proposed for development. As per the recommendations from Dillon Consulting, this area is proposed to be replanted with appropriate native wetland vegetation to restore its original function. <u>The replanting of this area should be incorporated into a detailed Restoration Plan for the overall wetland compensation.</u></p> <p>We note that in the Technical Memo provided by Dillon Consulting, it appears as though the wording does not accurately represent the proposal. We agree that approximately 0.29 hectares of wetland was removed though the archaeological study within the development boundaries, and approximately an additional 0.04 hectares was removed outside of the development boundaries for a total of 0.33 hectares of wetland that has been already removed. With the proposed replanting of the 0.04 hectares outside of the development boundaries, this should place the area of wetland that has been already removed and to be compensated at 0.29 hectares. However, the conclusion reached through the report was that 0.33 hectares remained to be compensated. Nowhere in the report does it clarify that this 0.33 hectares to be compensated also incorporates 0.04 hectares of wetland</p>	Dillon	<p>Through consultation with agencies it has been decided that the wetlands within Lot 19 (now Block 4) will be retained. The remainder of Lot 19 that had previously been cleared can be replanted with suitable wetland species. This can be detailed in the landscaping and planting/ restoration plan at Detailed Design, as a condition of approval.</p> <p>While we acknowledge that a Butternut was noted outside of the Study Area, we have previously requested the location of this tree and are not aware of its exact location. If the tree is located along the Nippissing Ridge, potential impacts would not be anticipated based on the difference in slope (root zone not likely impacted). Should the location of the tree be provided, mitigation measures specific to the tree can be incorporated into the construction plan through Detailed Design.</p> <p>As the ESA is a proponent driven process, notification to the MECP is not required, unless it is determined that there will be impacts; in which case this can likely be dealt with through the Registry process. We agree that, should additional Butternuts or SAR be identified within the construction area, appropriate steps will be taken to avoid negative impacts and contravention of the ESA.</p>

	<p>that has not yet been removed within the development area. However, in our assessment, this area would be closer to 0.06 hectares of wetland that is still present on the site that is proposed to be removed by the development and therefore the required area for compensation would come to a total of approximately 0.35 hectares. With 0.29 hectares having already been removed in the proposed development area, and 0.06 hectares of existing wetland to be further removed within the development boundaries.</p> <p><u>We recommend that further wetland not be removed, and to facilitate this lot 19 could be removed from the proposal and instead that area would be included in the Open Space and Hazard zones and included in the restoration plan.</u> That being said, we note that minor portions of the remaining wetland would require removal to facilitate the construction of the proposed road and associated services for the development, and that a minor area would be removed on Lot 16.</p> <p>Overall, we request that a detailed <u>Restoration Plan be provided to address this compensation. We will be looking for this plan to incorporate details around native plantings, as well as a monitoring component.</u></p> <p>Finally, as per our previous comments, we acknowledge that the consultants conducted a thorough review of the property as it relates to the presence of Butternut, and we generally support this assessment. We would reiterate that a mature butternut tree was found just outside of the subject lands. The typical setbacks applied to this species range from 25-metres to 50-metres, our review outlines that these setbacks extend onto the subject property and into areas that are proposed for development. The provincial and federal agencies have a responsibility to administer activities associated with threatened and endangered species and <u>we recommend that they are notified of the presence of this species in close proximity to the proposed development. We also add that should any species be discovered on site once site alteration and development begin, the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks should be consulted.</u></p>		
4	<p><b>2.2 Water</b></p> <p>GSCA is generally supportive of the approach to stormwater management on the property, and we <u>look forward to reviewing the detailed plans for stormwater management on the subject lands moving</u></p>	Tatham Dillon	We would like to note that, while the function of the swale is to replicate hydrological (surface water functions) within the site, this has been designed as an engineered feature, and not an LID (bioswale). It has been made clear that this is not to be considered as compensation of lost



<p><u>forward</u>. We note that potential thermal impacts on receiving waterbodies should also be addressed in detail design.</p> <p>As it relates to the proposal for the construction of an engineered swale to compensate for lost hydrological wetland function, we are generally supportive of this approach. Based on our review of the preliminary concept for the swale, we have some comments for your consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The MECP Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) says that the best width for a wet swale should be between 4- 6 metres, as they are to be generally wider than a standard dry swale, the current proposal is recommending a total width of 3.5 metres. <u>We will require more detail be provided to determine if this is a suitable width.</u> We note that ideally the bottom width would be no less than 0.75 metres. In addition to the MECP guidance, there is material provided by Credit Valley Conservation Authority and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority that outlines best management practices for enhanced grass swales that can be used for reference.</li> <li>- As it stands there is no buffer between the proposed swale and the proposed lot lines for the development. <u>We recommend that to ensure the swale is maintained in good working order and can adequately serve as compensatory wetland, that a buffer of 6-metres is maintained wherein no development/structures would be allowed to occur.</u> Based on our review of the current proposed building envelopes for the lots there is an approximately 9-metre existing setback to the rear lot lines where the swale is located. This would allow for a 3-metre area where accessory structures or site alteration could still occur outside of the identified building envelope without interfering in any way with the vegetation or function of the engineered feature.</li> <li>- As this proposal progresses to detail design, <u>we would recommend that in the design of the swale that if possible, the grades are altered to incorporate a harder berm along the side of the proposed swale that meets with the property boundaries, with a softer slope on the side of the swale that meets with the bottom of the ridge and the existing wetland and watercourse feature.</u> This would be particularly helpful for the most eastern section of the swale, where a gradual slope towards the creek would be beneficial.</li> </ul>	<p>wetland (correspondence with NEC), and therefore, naturalization and enhancement measures (including buffers) do not apply. In addition, the swale will be maintained by the condo corporation.</p>
---	--

	<p>- <u>As more detailed designs for the proposed swale are provided, we will be looking to review the placement of the proposed check dams and how they are to be constructed.</u></p> <p>- <u>Potential thermal impacts of the swale to receiving waterbodies should be evaluated.</u></p>		
5	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>		
	<p>Based on our review of this second revised submission, <u>the proposed residential development is generally acceptable provided the recommendations as noted above through the comments and summarized below are addressed:</u></p> <p>As noted above, we recommend <u>the removal of the lot 19 and add these lands to the open space and hazard zone on the property.</u> Provided this is completed, we recommend the following draft conditions.</p> <p>1. That a detailed stormwater management plan be prepared for the site to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. Consideration being given to the following:</p> <p>a. The hydrogeological conditions found through the hydrogeological study should be accounted for in the design of the stormwater management controls.</p> <p>b. Enhanced treatment is required, and a more detailed analysis should be included to assess sediment, contaminants and thermal impacts on adjacent/downstream watercourses.</p> <p>c. The inclusion of final grading and drainage plans.</p> <p>2. That a sediment and erosion control plan be prepared and implemented to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</p> <p>3. That a vegetation management/ tree retention plan be prepared and implemented through the subdivision agreement to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</p>	<p>Tatham Dillon</p>	<p>Landscaping and planting measures will be addressed through the LA consultant.</p> <p>Lot 19 (now Block 4) – addressed above</p> <p>1.Acknowledged.</p> <p>a. Acknowledged.</p> <p>b. Acknowledged.</p> <p>c. Acknowledged.</p> <p>2. Acknowledged.</p> <p>3.Vegetation management/tree retention plan to be prepared through detailed design.</p>

<p>a. This plan at a minimum should maintain a corridor in the open space block along the base of the Nipissing Ridge and along the eastern edge of the subject lands.</p> <p>4. That a detailed Restoration Plan be prepared and implemented through the subdivision agreement to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority to address the compensation of 0.33 ha of wetland.</p> <p>a. This plan should incorporate the planting of native species.</p> <p>b. The plan requires incorporation of monitoring practices to assess the outcome of the measures being taken to replace the intended functions of the lost wetland.</p> <p>c. As part of the restoration plan we will also be looking for a detailed Landscape Plan to be prepared and implemented through the subdivision agreement to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority.</p> <p>5. That the Town incorporate a 6-metre setback from the edge of the proposed lots to the proposed swale that prohibits development from occurring, to allow for an appropriate buffer from this feature.</p> <p>6. Further, the Subdivision Agreement is to include a clause indicating that portions of the lands are subject to Ontario Regulation 151/06 administered by the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority and a permit is required from the GSCA prior to site alterations in the affected areas.</p>		<p>a. Acknowledged.</p> <p>4. The compensation will not include the 0.33 ha, however a planting plan will be included as part of the vegetation management/tree retention plan.</p> <p>a. Acknowledged.</p> <p>b. Acknowledged.</p> <p>c. Acknowledged. To be provided through detailed design.</p> <p>5. Not required.</p> <p>6. Acknowledged.</p>
--	--	---

RE: Camperdown Development Revised Submission 42T-2018-06  
 From: Niagara Escarpment Commission  
 Dated: May 26, 2020

#	Description of Condition	Action & Consultant	Status/Notes
1.	A wetland vegetation community was identified in the EIS. The functions of the former wetland are described in the Technical Memo as providing habitat for general wildlife; prevention of erosion and runoff; facilitating hydrological and nutrient cycling; improving localized soil, water and air quality. Lots were proposed		No action required.

	in the area identified as wetland in the first submission draft and 34 lots are still planned in the revised submission.		
2.	Stage 3 & 4 Archaeological Assessments were undertaken resulting in the removal of 0.29 ha of wetland vegetation community from this area and it is the opinion of Dillon Consulting Limited that this wetland community no longer exists within the area <b>proposed</b> for development and 0.04 ha outside of the proposed development area for a total loss of 0.33 ha of wetland.		No action required.
3.	The technical memo mentions some restoration effort by replanting with native wetland tree and shrub species within the small 0.04 ha area. Restoration or replacement of the entire wetland area lost is not proposed. <u>A formal restoration plan should be prepared.</u>		Draft plan condition.
4.	<p>It was agreed between the approval authorities that some form of compensation should be expected.</p> <p>The following options were considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cash-in-lieu</li> <li>- Creation of a naturalized Stormwater Management pond</li> <li>- Creation of a naturalized drainage feature</li> <li>- Construction of an engineered drainage swale</li> </ul> <p>The first three options were not supported. The Town considered the naturalized SWM and drainage features difficult to maintain and therefore not practical.</p> <p>The preferred option offered by the consultant is replacement of the hydrological function of the wetland through construction of an engineered drainage swale, maintaining flows toward the braided channel to the east (off-site).</p> <p>NEC does not promote offsetting or compensation for wetland loss. We understand that in this case the loss has already occurred. The intent of the developer is to restore the primary hydrological function with an engineered solution.</p>	Dillon	No action required.

	As there is no evidence that the wetland community was providing a terrestrial ecological function, NEC staff can recommend the Commission support of the proposed drainage swale to restore the hydrologic function. Appropriate setbacks from the drainage feature and retention of existing vegetation along the eastern boundary will be important.		
5.	It is not clear from the additional information provided whether the swale will address the potential spill flooding hazard identified in earlier correspondence from GSCA. <b>Please confirm.</b>	Tatham	Yes.