

December 22, 2021

Clinton Stredwick, BES, MCIP, RPP  
Township of Southgate

Dear Mr. Stredwick:

**RE: Responses to Comments Received on Flato Glenelg Phase 2 Applications  
OUR FILE 15184H**

---

This letter is intended to address all comments received from the County, Township and other commenting authorities on the submission of the ZBA and Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you have any questions or concerns.

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p><b>Ryan Courville – Manager – Planning and Development – Bell Canada</b> <b>November 24, 2020</b></p>		
	<p>We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval: Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada.</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged
	<p>The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged
	<p>The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at <a href="mailto:planninganddevelopment@bell.ca">planninganddevelopment@bell.ca</a> during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged

	<b>Ryan Courville – Manager – Planning and Development – Bell Canada November 24, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	infrastructure needed to service the development.		
	It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada’s existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	We note that WSP operates Bell Canada’s development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. However, <b>all responses to circulations and requests for information, such as requests for clearance, will come directly from Bell Canada, and not from WSP.</b> WSP is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses.	Crozier	Acknowledged

	<b>Sherry Anstett – Facility Records &amp; Dispatch – Bruce Telecom November 19, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Thank you for the information and at this time Bruce Telecom will have no concern or issue with the work being done at this location	Crozier	Acknowledged

<b>Ryan Sumler – Delivery Planning – Canada Post November 19, 2020</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Service Type and Location		
1.	Canada Post will provide mail delivery service to the development through centralized Community Mail Boxes (CMBs).	Crozier	Acknowledged
2.	If the development includes plans for (a) multi-unit building(s) with a common indoor entrance, the developer must supply, install and maintain the mail delivery equipment within these buildings to Canada Post's specifications.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Municipal Requirements		Acknowledged
1.	Please update our office if the project description changes so that we may determine the impact (if any).	Crozier	Acknowledged
2.	Should this development application be approved, please provide notification of the new civic addresses as soon as possible.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Developer timeline and installation		Acknowledged
1.	Please provide Canada Post with the excavation date for the first foundation/first phase as well as the date development work is scheduled to begin. Finally, please provide the expected installation date(s) for the CMB(s).	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Additional Developer Requirements		Acknowledged
	The developer will consult with Canada Post to determine suitable permanent locations for the Community Mail Boxes. The developer will then indicate these locations on the appropriate servicing plans.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	The developer agrees, prior to offering any units for sale, to display a map on the wall of the sales office in a place readily accessible to potential homeowners that indicates the location of all Community Mail Boxes within the development, as approved by Canada Post.	Flato	Acknowledged
	The developer agrees to include in all offers of purchase and sale a statement which advises the purchaser that mail will be delivered via Community Mail Box. The developer also agrees to note the locations of all Community Mail Boxes within the development, and to notify affected homeowners of any established easements granted to Canada	Flato	Acknowledged

<b>Ryan Sumler – Delivery Planning – Canada Post November 19, 2020</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Post to permit access to the Community Mail Box.		
	The developer will provide a suitable and safe temporary site for a Community Mail Box until curbs, sidewalks and final grading are completed at the permanent Community Mail Box locations. Canada Post will provide mail delivery to new residents as soon as the homes are occupied.	Flato	Acknowledged
	The developer agrees to provide the following for each Community Mail Box site and to include these requirements on the appropriate servicing plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any required walkway across the boulevard, per municipal standards</li> <li>• Any required curb depressions for wheelchair access, with an opening of at least two metres (consult Canada Post for detailed specifications)</li> <li>• A Community Mailbox concrete base pad per Canada Post specifications.</li> </ul>	Crozier	Acknowledged

<b>Michael MacDougall – Design Team Manager – Easlink Engineering November 20, 2020</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Thank you for the update on these projects. Once the subdivision is approved Eastlink will require the detailed Hydro plans for our planning.	Crozier	Acknowledged

<b>Kelly Buchanan – Analyst Land Services – Enbridge Gas inc. November 19, 2020</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	It is Enbridge Gas Inc.'s (operating as Union Gas) request that as a condition of final approval that the owner/developer provide to Union the necessary easements and/or agreements required by Union for the provision of gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge.	Crozier	Acknowledged

	<b>Laura Warner – Resource Planner – Grand River Conservation Authority November 27, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Since the proposed Phase 2 lands were not reviewed through the draft plan of subdivision application #42T-2018-12 for Phase 1, and the Phase 2 lands are located entirely within the jurisdiction of the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA), the GRCA will not be providing comments on the subject application and will defer this review to SVCA.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	Consequently, GRCA will also not be commenting on the official plan amendment or zoning by-law amendment and will defer the review of both applications to SVCA staff.	MHBC	Acknowledged

	<b>Chris Hachey – Coordinator, Lands, Resources and Consultation – Historic Saugeen Metis November 27, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	The Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) Lands, Resources and Consultation Department has reviewed the relevant documents including the Environmental Impact Study and Archaeological Assessment and have no objection or opposition to the proposed Southgate Meadows Glenelg Phase 2 Plan of Subdivision Application as presented.	MHBC	Acknowledged

	<b>Dolly Shetty – Real Estate Assistant, Land Use Planning – Hyrdo One Networks Inc. November 27, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	We are in receipt of Application 42T-2020-09 dated November 23, 2020. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. <b>Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One's 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only.</b>	Crozier	Acknowledged

	<b>Dolly Shetty – Real Estate Assistant, Land Use Planning – Hyrdo One Networks Inc. November 27, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities' please consult your local area Distribution Supplier.	Crozier	Acknowledged

	<b>Shan Elliot – 356 Glenelg St. November 24, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	She received a notice today for the proposed Glenelg phase two subdivision and wanted to voice her support of the entire project phases one and two. She is hopeful that sewer services will be extended all the way down Glenelg street at some point so that she can switch from a septic system to township sewer services.	Crozier	Acknowledged

	<b>Jim Ellis – Public Works Manager – Township of Southgate November 20, 2020</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Required to be on municipal water and sanitary sewer and storm water service connections.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Property is located in a Well Head Protection Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WHPA "A"</li> <li>• WHPA *8"</li> <li>• WHPA *C"</li> <li>✓ WHPA *D'</li> <li>• Not Applicable</li> </ul>	SLR	Acknowledged and will be identified and addressed in the Hydrogeological Report
	Southerly portion of lands in Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) watershed, northerly portion of lands in Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) watershed.	MHBC	GRCA advised in their comments that SVCA will be reviewing the Phase 2 lands.
	Well Head Protection Area "D" - Applicable to Dense Non- Aqueous Phase Liquid (DNAPL's) products managed by education and outreach programs.	SLR	Acknowledged and will be addressed in the Hydrogeological Report

<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
1.	<p>That prior to any grading or construction on site, and prior to Final Approval of the subdivision by the County of Grey, the owner shall prepare the following studies/reports/documents, completed to the satisfaction of the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Final Lot Grading and Drainage Plan;</li> <li>b. Final Functional Servicing &amp; Stormwater Management Report;</li> <li>c. Final Hydrologic/Hydrogeologic Assessment (water balance) demonstrating no net loss of surface and groundwater to the receiving wetland feature;</li> <li>d. Final Sediment and Erosion Control Plan;</li> <li>e. A letter provided to SVCA from the applicant’s ecologist advising that proposed stormwater management and grading plans are in conformance with the recommendations of the EIS; and</li> <li>f. Landscaping Plan for the 10 metre wetland buffer, and Stormwater Management Pond.</li> </ul>	Crozer/SLR	<p>Acknowledged</p> <p>c. At the detail design phase it will be demonstrated that there will be no net loss of surface and groundwater to the receiving wetland feature (refer to sections 5.0, 6.0. 6.2 and Table 5 of the revised EIS).</p> <p>e. At the detail design phase a letter will be provided that advises the proposed stormwater management and grading plans conform to the recommendations provided in the EIS.</p>
2.	<p>That the Subdivision Agreement between the Owner and the Municipality contain provisions with wording acceptable to the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority relating to the Final Lot Grading and Drainage Plan, Final Functional Servicing &amp; Stormwater Management Report; Hydrologic/Hydrogeologic Assessment detailing water balance to the receiving wetland feature; Final Sediment and Erosion Control Plan; and Landscaping Plan. We note that the above plans shall include all recommendations of the Environmental Impact Study, including recommendations found in the EIS Section 8.0.</p>	Flato	Acknowledged
Delegated Responsibility and Advisory Comments			

	<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Natural Hazards:			
	A wetland is located in the western portion of the property. Section 7.2 of the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report, prepared by C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc., dated September 2020, states in part that no natural hazard constraints exist on the property as the wetland feature does not meet the minimum drainage area of 125 hectares for floodplain hazards according to the MNRF. However, wetlands feature organic soils and are flood prone lands and are therefore considered hazardous lands as defined in the PPS, 2020. Due to these inherent wetland characteristics, SVCA staff consider wetlands to be hazardous lands.	Crozier	Section 7.2 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report has been updated to acknowledge the wetland as a flood hazard. It is noted that lots will require flood-proofing from the high-water level in the wetland. This will be established during the wetland water balance investigation.  The wetland also has been noted as a natural hazard in the revised EIS (Section 1.1 and 4.3).
	Furthermore, it is SVCA staff's opinion that the Hazard Land designation as shown in the Grey County OP and Township of Southgate OP, and the Environmental Protection (EP) Zone as shown in the Township of Southgate Zoning By-law 19-2002, as amended, should be revised to reflect site conditions and information, including mapping submitted with the applications, specifically the Environmental Impact Study. Revising the Hazard Land designations and EP zone as proposed on Schedule 'A1' for both the Grey County OPA, and Zoning By-law Amendment as shown in the Planning Justification Report, prepared by MHBC, dated October 2020, is acceptable to the SVCA.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	SVCA staff note that Draft Plan of Subdivision Drawing No. 1 of 1 prepared by MHBC, dated September 30, 2020, labels Block 101 as Open Space. We note that for clarification that Block 101 may be labeled Open Space, but it is not part of the lands proposed to have its designation or zoning changed, nor should it be, as it contains part of the wetland feature.	MHBC	Acknowledged
Provincial Policy Statement – Section 3.1			



<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Section 3.1.1 of the PPS, 2020 states in part that development shall generally be directed to areas outside of: b) hazardous lands adjacent to river, stream and small inland lake systems which are impacted by flooding and erosion hazards; and c) hazardous sites. It is the opinion of SVCA staff that Section 3.1.1 of the PPS 2020 has been addressed, based on the proposal. Residential development will generally be directed to areas outside of natural hazards.	MHBC	Acknowledged
Township of Southgate OP and Grey County OP			
	It is SVCA staff's interpretation that Section 6.2 of the Southgate OP and Section 7.2.3 of the Grey County OP states in part that buildings and structures are generally not permitted in the Hazard Lands land use type designation. It is the opinion of SVCA staff that the applications appear to be consistent with the natural hazard policies of the Southgate OP and the Grey County OP as based on the plans submitted, no new buildings or structures are proposed within the proposed Hazard Lands designation.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	Natural Heritage: SVCA staff's desktop review of the property identified wetlands as the only natural heritage feature affecting the property. Subsequently, an EIS was prepared to address natural heritage features.	SLR	Acknowledged.
Provincial Policy Statement – Section 2.1			
	Section 2.1 of the PPS, 2020 states in part that development shall not be permitted in significant natural heritage features and the adjacent lands to significant natural heritage features, except as in accordance with the Section 2.1 policies.	MHBC	Acknowledged
Township of Southgate OP and County of Grey OP			
	Section 7 of the Grey County OP generally prohibits development within the natural heritage features and their adjacent lands, as stated above, unless it has been demonstrated through an acceptable EIS that there will be	MHBC	Acknowledged

	<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	no negative impacts to the natural features or their ecological functions.		
	Furthermore, as part of the Grey County OP amendment, the wetlands identified and mapped on the property as part of the Environmental Impact Study should be included in Appendix B – Constraints, of the Grey County OP as other identified wetlands, as currently the wetlands on the property are not mapped in the Grey County OP.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	Environmental Impact Study (EIS)		
	As mentioned above, an EIS prepared by SLR, dated September 2020 was submitted with the applications to support development proposed for the property. It is the opinion of SVCA staff that the EIS, in general, has addressed Section 2.1 of the PPS, 2020. The study is also in accordance with SVCA policies. The EIS is acceptable to SVCA staff; however, we require that the hydrologic/hydrogeologic study demonstrate no net loss of surface and groundwater balance in order for SVCA to be satisfied both the County and PPS policies for identified natural heritage features have been addressed. This includes the above-noted letter from the applicant’s ecologist. SVCA staff will require that the recommendations and requirements found in the EIS including Section 8.0 Conclusions and Recommendations of the EIS are implemented as part of the development proposal.	SLR	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Details regarding water balance will be addressed by Crozier as well as in the SLR hydrogeological assessment under separate cover and provided in the detail design phase of the project.</p> <p>The EIS was revised to address all applicable comments. Minor changes have been made through the report and can be found in Sections 1.1, 4.3, 5.0, 6.0, 6.2 and Table 5.</p>
	Section 6.2 of the EIS states in part that it is expected that the hydrogeology report will demonstrate a minimal drawdown effect with respect to the groundwater table associated with the wetland. It does not appear that a hydrogeology report was included with the applications. SVCA staff await the submission of hydrogeology report.	SLR	<p>Hydrogeology report included in 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission</p> <p>The detailed design phase of the project will address how the water balance will be maintained post development. A preliminary water balance will be provided in the Hydrogeological Report to indicate that maintenance of the water table for the wetland is achievable.</p>
	Provided SVCA’s recommendations for conditions for draft plan approval are implemented, it is staff’s opinion the proposed	MHBC	Acknowledged

	<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	will be in compliance with the natural heritage policies of both the County OP and PPS, 2020.		
	Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report		
	SVCA staff have reviewed the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report, prepared by C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc., dated September 2020; to ensure no impact on the control of flooding, erosion, pollution or the conservation of land in accordance with our mandate under the <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i> and as per our MOA with the Township of Southgate. This includes a general review of lot grading and erosion control, water quantity and quality, and impacts to receiving natural heritage feature. Please note that SVCA staff's review does not include a detailed technical clearance of engineering methodology or modelling. SVCA staff note the following which shall be addressed:	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Section 7.3 states in part that water that currently reaches the wetland through sheet flow is proposed to be diverted through the subdivision to the SWM Facility at the north portion of Phase 2, with limited amounts directed to the wetland to the west; and that it will be necessary to complete a post-development water balance. It does not appear that a water balance or discussion to the water balance results have been included. Preparation of water balance report is required to ensure the wetland feature receives sufficient water for functionality of the wetland post-development compared to pre-development.	Crozier/SLR	Section 7.3.3 has been added to the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report to indicate the requirement for a wetland water balance assessment as well as the proposed mitigation strategy under post-development conditions. The wetland water balance assessment will be completed at detailed design.
	Subdivision Drawings:		
	SVCA staff have reviewed the Draft Plan of Subdivision Drawing No. 1 of 1 prepared by MHBC, dated September 30, 2020. Once available, SVCA request circulation of the Final Lot Grading and Drainage Plan; the Final Sediment and Erosion Control Plan; and the Final Landscaping Plan for the 10 metre	SLR	Acknowledged. To be addressed during detailed design. From EIS: Restoration of the buffer is proposed. This is to be seeded with native species meadow mix (suitable for this growing region and soils). Native Milkweed ( <i>Asclepias</i> sp.)

	<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	wetland buffer, and Stormwater Management Pond for review and comment.		should be incorporated into any buffer planting seed mix and where possible other natural areas on Phase 2. The area is to be maintained as a maintenance free area for pollinators and edge bird species using SVCA specification and guidelines.
	Statutory Comments:		
	<b>SVCA staff has reviewed the application as per our responsibilities as a regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 169/06 (SVCA’s Development, Interference with Wetlands, and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation). This regulation, made under Section 28 of the <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i>, enables SVCA to regulate development in or adjacent to river or stream valleys, Great Lakes and inland lake shorelines, watercourses, hazardous lands and wetlands. Subject to the CA Act, development taking place on or adjacent to these lands may require permission from SVCA to confirm that the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or the conservation of land are not affected. SVCA also regulates the alteration to or interference in any way with a watercourse or wetland.</b>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	The western portion of the property is within the SVCA Approximate Screening Area associated with Ontario Regulation 169/06. As such, development and/or site alteration within the SVCA Approximate Screening Area requires the permission from SVCA, prior to work commencing.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	“Development” as defined under the <i>Conservation Authorities Act</i> means:  a) the construction, reconstruction, erection or placing of a building or structure of any kind; b) any change to a building or structure that would have the effect of altering the use or potential use of the building or structure,	Crozier	Acknowledged.

	<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p><i>increasing the size of the building or structure or increasing the number of dwelling units in the building or structure;</i>  <i>c) site grading; or,</i>  <i>d) the temporary or permanent placing, dumping or removal of any material, originating on the site or elsewhere.</i></p> <p>And;  “Alteration” as per Section 5 of Ontario Regulation 169/06 generally includes the straightening, diverting or interference in any way with a river, creek, stream or watercourse, or the changing or interfering in any way with a wetland.</p>		
	<p>To determine the SVCA Approximate Screening Area on the property, please refer to the SVCA’s online mapping program, available via the SVCA’s website at <a href="http://eprweb.svca.on.ca">http://eprweb.svca.on.ca</a>. Should you require assistance, please contact our office directly. For the property, the SVCA Approximate Screening Area includes the wetland feature as well as a 30 metre distance measured outward from the wetland edge.</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	SVCA Permission for Development or Alteration		
	<p>Development or alteration including construction, reconstruction, conversion, grading, filling or excavation, including the work required for site grading/siting to prepare the property for development within the SVCA Approximate Screening Area will require permission (SVCA Permit) prior to those works commencing. SVCA permission should be obtained once the SVCA is satisfied with the above referenced reports.</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	<p>Based on the plans as submitted with the applications, some of the proposed development will be located within the SVCA Approximate Screening Area. SVCA staff will require more details of the proposals, once available, to determine what works will require an SVCA permit.</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	<p>As a point of information, on October 19, 2020, SVCA issued SVCA permit 20-299 for site</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged.

	<b>Michael Oberle – Environmental Planning Technician – Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority January 8, 2021</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	alteration required for Glenelg Residential Development (Phase One).		

	<b>Dustin Lyttle &amp; Ray Kirtz, Triton Engineering Services Ltd November 5, 2021</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
<b>Draft Plan &amp; Preliminary Design Review</b>			
	Draft Plan Comments  The following comments are to be addressed <b>prior to Draft Plan</b> approval and/or are to be included within the Draft Plan Conditions.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	<b>General Design:</b> Please see under separate cover: a. Municipal Servicing Assessment. b. Traffic Impact Study Review Memo.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	He future lots within Phase 1 that are to be developed as part of Phase 2 (currently Phase 1 Blocks 131 and 132) are to be labelled appropriately within the Drawing Set and Draft Plan.	Crozier	Lot labels have been updated accordingly.
Stormwater Management Comments:			
	Forebay design parameters/calculations are to be included in the FSR.	Crozier	Forebay design calculations have been included in Appendix F.
	Post development drainage catchments are to be indicative of the areas conveyed to the pond (i.e., the rearyard of Lots 1-20 would be expected to drain uncontrolled into the wetland).	Crozier	Post development drainage catchments and hydrologic modeling have been revised to consider the contribution of uncontrolled drainage. Tables 1 and 2 in the report have been updated accordingly.
	Confirm the intention of the “two-outlet” system from the SWM facility.  a. Is the “first outlet” into the wetland intended to ensure that the wetland receives adequate runoff volume? If so, how is this quantified (i.e., what events are directed to the first outlet)?	Crozier	a. A wetland water balance will be completed at the detailed design stage of this project. This water balance will assess 'pre-development', 'post-development' and 'post-development with mitigation' scenarios, modeling surface runoff volume and infiltration contributing to the wetland. The design criteria of the feature-based water balance assessment will be to maintain the hydrologic function of the wetland under the post-development conditions.

	Dustin Lyttle & Ray Kirtz, Triton Engineering Services Ltd November 5, 2021		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>b. Is an infiltration feature required to ensure that this volume gets to the wetland as a groundwater source?</p> <p>c. What is the purpose of the second outlet?</p> <p>d. Could/should all the discharge from the SWM facility be directed to the wetland since it would appear that all pre-development runoff is directed there?</p> <p>e. Confirm with SVCA (or GRCA) this strategy is acceptable and provide a copy of correspondence for Township record. The hydrogeological study, environmental study and SWM design need to further discuss/justify the two-outlet strategy.</p>		<p>b. Design of infiltration facilities to promote water balance to the wetland feature will be provided at the detailed design stage. Sizing of infiltration facilities will depend on the results of the water balance assessment. Bioswales and/or infiltration trenches could be used to meet infiltration targets.</p> <p>c. The second outlet will allow runoff volumes in excess of pre-development targets to bypass the wetland. Volumes in excess of pre-development targets will be directed via swale to the ditch on Ida Street. For the purposes of preliminary design and to ensure conservative SWM Facility sizing, it is assumed that all flows will contribute to Ida Street. This will be revised to reflect flow contributions to the wetland at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>d. Unmitigated development of the site will increase uncontrolled runoff volumes directed to the wetland. As such, discharge to the wetland will be controlled under post development conditions.</p> <p>e. Acknowledged.</p>
	<p>Confirm that the second outlet to the Ida Street ditch (via a channel through the wetland) is an adequate receiver for the proposed discharges. There does not appear to be positive drainage available within the ditch on Ida Street.</p>	Crozier	<p>Outflow from the SWM Facility to the Ida Street ditch under 100 Year storm conditions has been overcontrolled to meet 5 year pre-development flows from the Site. Re-ditching will be required to convey flows from the SWM Facility to the Ida Street Culvert. Proposed ditch grade and alignment to achieve positive drainage has been shown on Figure 6.</p>
	<p>In Section 7.3.2, confirm the appropriate receiver. It would be expected for the Saugeen River is to be the ultimate receiver from the Subject Development, as opposed to the Grand River. As such, SVCA will be the approval authority, unless instructed otherwise.</p>	Crozier	<p>Section 7.3.2 has been updated to confirm Saugeen River as the ultimate receiver.</p>
	<p>Provide post and pre-development modelling schematics in the FSR.</p>	Crozier	<p>Schematics of the SWMHYMO models has been included within Appendix E.</p>

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	Revise the 2-year modelling input rainfall intensity to be consistent with the MTO IDF curve from the IDF Curve Fit Tool.	Crozier	The MTO IDF curve was used to generate the 2-year storm.
	The post development pervious curve number for the Hazel is to be for AMCIII Wet Conditions.	Crozier	The CN number has been revised from AMC II CN=74 to AMCIII CN = 88 using MTO design chart 1.10.
	Provide additional outlet add SWMF details in the Drawing Set, including inverts, structure detail, and SWMF cross section.	Crozier	Structure detail to be included as part of the detailed design submission documents.
	In the SSD, indicate Spillway (overflow) parameters and drawdown times. The spillway to be sized to safely convey the 100-year or Regional Event.	Crozier	The spillway has been designed to safely convey the flows generated in a Regional Storm event. Since no attenuation is anticipated, we do not believe draw down times for this spillway are required.
	In the SSD, a second stage should be used to improve control at outlet and mitigate the risk of overtopping the facility in the event the orifice plugs. The second stage v-notch weir invert appears to have been placed at the top of the pond in the SSD. We question if this is a configuration make efficient use of the storage volume and provides safe guards to overtopping.	Crozier	The proposed orifice diameter is 130mm which exceeds the MOE preferred minimum orifice diameter of 100mm. Measures to protect the orifice from obstructions will be evaluated further at the detailed design stage.
	Per 2003 MOE SWMPDM, pond side slopes are to be 5:1 for 3m above and below permanent pool, and max 3:1 elsewhere. Confirm this can be accommodated within the proposed SWMF Block.	Crozier	Pond grading has been revised accordingly.
	The wetland section of the SWM pond is to be increased from 0.20 m depth to 0.30 m to maintain permanent pool.	Crozier	Pond grading has been revised accordingly.
<b>Sanitary Servicing Comments:</b>			
	Note: As per the 2021 Sanitary RCC, Uncommitted Reserve Capacity has been reduced to 127 units and is exceeded by the number of units (375) proposed as part of the Uncommitted Developments which does not include Glenelg Subdivision Phase 2. Therefore, wastewater Reserve Capacity will not be available until the Dundalk Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) has been expanded. Holding provisions within the Draft Plan conditions will be required.	Crozier	Acknowledged, the report has been updated to reflect the Sanitary Treatment Plant upgrades.



	<b>Dustin Lyttle &amp; Ray Kirtz, Triton Engineering Services Ltd</b> <b>November 5, 2021</b>		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	The above comments are to be addressed <b>prior to Draft Plan</b> approval and/or are to be included within the Draft Plan Conditions.	Crozier	Acknowledged
Detailed Design Comments:			
	Items to be submitted as part of the detail design submission include: a. A detailed cost estimate for onsite and offsite works (if applicable). b. Utility Plans, including Hydro Plan(s), Street Lighting Layout, Photometric Design, complete with individual utility supplier drawings and a Composite Utility Plan (CUP). c. Hydrogeological study, detailing dewatering requirements and groundwater monitoring results taken over the course of <i>at least</i> one year to establish the seasonally high groundwater level throughout the site. d. Storm and Sanitary Sewer Design Sheets. e. Current Reserve Capacity Calculations within FSR.	SLR and Crozier	Hydrogeology comments acknowledged and to be addressed in Detailed Design  Engineering comments acknowledged and to be addressed in Detailed Design
	Drawings to be submitted include: a. Plan and Profiles b. Grading Plan(s) c. Servicing Plan d. Details Plan(s) e. Sediment and Erosion Control Plan f. Signage, Parking and Pavement Markings Plan g. Landscaping Plan(s) (SWM block, parks, trails, areas to be naturalized and street boulevards) h. Phasing Plan, or equivalent thereof, if applicable i. Side yard storm sewer cross sections. Cross section is to indicate lowest possible storm sewer invert at building, horizontal clearance of sewer from building, footing elevations, etc.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Lot numbers are to be indicated on all applicable plans.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Typical ROW cross section(s) are to be provided, including applicable offsets/cover	Crozier	Acknowledged

<b>Dustin Lyttle &amp; Ray Kirtz, Triton Engineering Services Ltd</b>			
<b>November 5, 2021</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Typical road surface treatment and depths are to be indicated (e.g., concrete, asphalt, granulars)	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Proposed/existing fencing is to be indicated in the Drawing Set.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Walkway and pond maintenance road details are to be indicated, including fencing, bollards, surface treatment (e.g. concrete, asphalt, granulars) and applicable widths.	Crozier	Acknowledged
	Mailbox locations and details are to be indicated.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
<b>Storm Sewer Comments</b>			
	The Phase 1 Rear yard Storm Sewer System (between McKenzie and Aitchison) will need to be shown on all applicable servicing and grading plans. Ensure that all surcharged sewer ponding in these rear yards can be accommodated.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
<b>Stormwater Management Comments</b>			
	SWM pond required details include a cross section, outlet details/sizing/inverts, overflow weir, side slopes, contours, maintenance path access and details, permanent pool, etc.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	200 mm Diameter Sanitary Sewers are to be at a minimum 0.4%, revise accordingly.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	Increase all first runs of sewer to be minimum 1.0% (preferably 2.0%).	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	In the Servicing Report Sections 5.1 and 5.1.2, the Aitchison sewer stub should be 250mm diameter as opposed to 200mm.	Crozier	Acknowledged, revised accordingly
<b>Grading Comments</b>			
	Note that the Grading plan will need to show existing and proposed grades along the external edges of the Subject Development to ensure adequate conveyance of external drainage (i.e., ensure external ponding is not created).	Crozier	Proposed grading will match existing grading at the perimeter of the developable area. Existing grades have been added to the grading plan to illustrate. The drainage north of the pond block will sheet drain south of the pond to the proposed ditch. A culvert is provided under the proposed ditch to convey this drainage to the wetland facility.

	<b>Howard Wray, P. Eng – Triton Engineering Services Ltd November 5, 2021</b>		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Traffic Impact Study – Draft Plan Review			
	The analysis shows that the studied intersections will operate at Level of Service (LOS) C or better, which is considered to be a Good LOS. The Executive Summary incorrectly characterizes this as an Excellent Level of Service.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	Crozier did not consider the impact of the future construction of the Industrial Access Road (Eco Parkway connection to Highway 10). While the extent of development in that area is uncertain at this time, and it does not have a direct impact on this development, we note that once this connection is completed, southbound traffic may find it more convenient to use Glenelg and Ida Street to avoid the downtown area. This could lessen the potential impact on Dundalk Street, however may increase the potential impact on Ida Street. This should be considered within the TIS.	Crozier	Given the uncertainty of the timelines associated with the Eco Parkway connection, it did not seem appropriate to assess future scenarios on this basis. Rather, a future assessment should be completed to review the impacts of the Eco Parkway connection to Highway 10. The intersection of Main Street West and Ida Street is forecasted to operate at a LOS B under 2030 future total traffic volume conditions. Adding a larger portion of site generated traffic to this intersection is not expected to result in operational issues. The intersection of Main Street and Dundalk Street is forecasted to operate acceptably with a LOS "C" under 2030 future total traffic volume conditions. As noted, the removal of site generated traffic would improve the operations of this intersection. All future developments will also need to assess these changes are part of active development plans when they are ready to move forward.
	Township needs to consider if the area north of Phase 2 is likely to be developed in the future. If so, it is advisable to include provisions in this DP for a future extension of Corbett to allow access from the north with possible connection to Ida.	Crozier	Flato is currently working on a boundary expansion to the east of these lands that logically would connect to both Glenelg Phase 2 and the White Rose subdivision. This proposed expansion would include connections to the north for future expansion. At this time a connection north from Glenelg Phase 2 is not being proposed due to the narrow portion of developable land in this are (due to the wetland area) as well as the SWM pond location.
	It is not known what future development could take place north of this one, but if there is potential for this, a second access to Ida Street will be necessary at some point, and provision for connectivity to this development should be considered. Similar issues exist with	Crozier	A connection to Ida Street from the Glenelg Phase 2 lands is not feasible due to the existing wetland feature. Regarding the development to the northeast of the site, two future right-of-way blocks have been provided (Blocks 107 and 108) to allow for connectivity to lands to

	<b>Howard Wray, P. Eng – Triton Engineering Services Ltd November 5, 2021</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	the developments on the northeast side of the rail trail. The TIS should consider this issue and provisions included in this Draft Plan to accommodate a future connection.		the east of the rail trail. Transportation analysis would be completed at a future date to support development applications for any neighbouring lands.

	<b>Dustin Lyttle &amp; John Koolhaas – Triton Engineering Services Ltd November 5, 2021</b>														
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>												
	The following assessment has been completed for the expected future infrastructure system changes and future demands at the year 2035. This assumes complete build-out of all current Flato Developments within Flato North and East, White Rose Phase 3, and the Development of Eco Parkway and the extension thereof. The new Water Tower has been assumed to be in operation.	Crozier	Acknowledged.												
Sanitary Servicing Results															
	Based on the above, all downstream sewers are not expected to exceed 50% capacity. To further examine the potential effects of other properties being developed, and ultimate build-out scenario of Developments within and beyond the urban boundary was also assessed. Under this ultimate scenario (2045+), all downstream sewers are not expected to exceed 75% capacity.	Crozier	Acknowledged.												
	Note: As per the 2021 Sanitary RCC, Uncommitted Reserve Capacity has been reduced to 127 units and is exceeded by the number of units (approximately 375) proposed as part of the Uncommitted Developments which does not include Glenelg Subdivision Phase 2. Therefore, wastewater Reserve Capacity will not be available until the Dundalk Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) has been expanded.	Crozier	Acknowledged.												
Water Servicing Results															
	<i>Note: all pressures and flows modelled are at the proposed road centre line elevation. Watermain placement and sizing has been assumed for developments where detailed design is not available. Watermain sizing has been assumed to be 150 mm within both phases of the Glenelg Subdivision.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.												
	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Expected Available Water</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Operating Pressure (PSI)</th> <th>Fire Flow (L/s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Maximum</b></td> <td>68 SWM Block 102</td> <td>80 Street 'A' at Park Block 97</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Minimum</b></td> <td>65 Corbett-Aitchison</td> <td>73 SWM Block 102</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Expected Available Water				Operating Pressure (PSI)	Fire Flow (L/s)	<b>Maximum</b>	68 SWM Block 102	80 Street 'A' at Park Block 97	<b>Minimum</b>	65 Corbett-Aitchison	73 SWM Block 102		
Expected Available Water															
	Operating Pressure (PSI)	Fire Flow (L/s)													
<b>Maximum</b>	68 SWM Block 102	80 Street 'A' at Park Block 97													
<b>Minimum</b>	65 Corbett-Aitchison	73 SWM Block 102													