

May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019

Randy Scherzer, BES, MCIP, RPP  
Director of Planning & Development  
County of Grey  
595 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue East

Dear Mr. Scherzer:

**RE: Responses to Comments Received on Draft Plan/ZBA/OPA Submission made on  
September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018  
COUNTY FILE 42t-2018-12**

---

This letter is intended to address all comments received from commenting authorities and members of the public on the submission of the Draft Plan, Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment applications associated with the Flato Glenelg subdivision. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you have any questions or concerns.

Canada Post – November 5, 2018			
Comment Section/Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	Canada Post has reviewed the proposal for the above noted Development Application and has determined that the completed project will be serviced by centralized mail delivery provided through Canada Post Community Mail Boxes. Our centralized delivery policy will apply for any buildings of 3 or more self-contained units with a common indoor area. For these units the owner/developer will be required to install a mail panel and provide access to Canada Post.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	In order to provide mail service to this development, Canada Post requests that the owner/developer comply with the following conditions:	MHBC	Acknowledged
	⇒ The owner/developer will consult with Canada Post to determine	MHBC	Acknowledged

**Canada Post – November 5, 2018**

<b>Comment Section/ Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	suitable permanent locations for the placement of Community Mailboxes and to indicate these locations on appropriate servicing plans.		
	⇒ The Builder/ Owner/ Developer will confirm to Canada Post that the final secured permanent locations for the Community Mailboxes will not be in conflict with any other utility; including hydro transformers, bell pedestals, cable pedestals, flush to grade communication vaults, landscaping enhancements (tree planting) and bus pads.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	⇒ The owner/ developer will install concrete pads at each of the Community Mailbox locations as well as any required walkways across the boulevard and any required curb depressions for wheelchair access as per Canada Post's concrete pad specification drawings.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	⇒ The owner/ developer will agree to prepare and maintain an area of compacted gravel to Canada Post's specifications to serve as a temporary Community Mailbox location. This location will be in a safe area away from construction activity in order that Community Mailboxes may be installed to service addresses that have occupied prior to the pouring of the permanent mailbox pads. This area will be required to be prepared a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of first occupancy.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	⇒ The owner/ developer will communicate to Canada Post the excavation date for the first foundation (or first phase) as well	MHBC	Acknowledged

**Canada Post – November 5, 2018**

Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	as the expected date of first occupancy.		
	⇒ The owner/ developer agrees, prior to offering any of the residential units for sale, to place a "Display Map" on the wall of the sales office in a place readily available to the public which indicates the location of all Canada Post Community Mailbox site locations, as approved by Canada Post and the Township of Southgate.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	⇒ The owner/ developer agrees to include in all offers of purchase and sale a statement, which advises the prospective new home purchaser that mail delivery will be from a designated Community Mailbox, and to include the exact locations (list of lot #s) of each of these Community Mailbox locations; and further, advise any affected homeowners of any established easements granted to Canada Post.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	⇒ The owner/ developer will be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Community Mailbox locations prior to the closing of any home sales with specific clauses in the Purchase offer, on which the homeowners do a sign off.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	Canada Post further requests the owner/ developer be notified of the following:		
1.	The owner/developer of any condominiums will be required to provide signature for a License to Occupy Land agreement and provide winter snow clearance at the Community Mailbox locations	MHBC	Acknowledged
2.	Enhanced Community Mailbox Sites with roof structures will require	MHBC	Acknowledged

**Canada Post – November 5, 2018**

<b>Comment Section/ Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	additional documentation as per Canada Post Policy		
3.	There will be no more than one mail delivery point to each unique address assigned by the Municipality	MHBC	Acknowledged
4.	Any existing postal coding may not apply, the owner/developer should contact Canada Post to verify postal codes for the project	MHBC	Acknowledged
5.	The complete guide to Canada Post's Delivery Standards can be found at: <a href="https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf">https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf</a>	MHBC	Acknowledged

**Enbridge – November 26, 2018**

<b>Comment Section/ Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	Enbridge Gas Distribution does not object to the proposed application(s).	MHBC	Acknowledged
	This response does not constitute a pipe locate or clearance for construction.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	The applicant shall contact Enbridge Gas Distribution's Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea20@enbridge.com for service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping (including, but not limited to: tree planting, silva cells, and/or soil trenches) and/or asphalt paving.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	If the gas main needs to be relocated as a result of changes in the alignment or grade of the future road allowances or for temporary gas pipe installations pertaining to phase construction, all costs are the responsibility of the applicant.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas Distribution at no cost.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
	The applicant will grade all road	Crozier	Acknowledged.

Enbridge – November 26, 2018			
Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	allowances to as close to final elevation as possible, provide necessary field survey information and all approved municipal road cross sections, identifying all utility locations prior to the installation of the gas piping.		
	Enbridge Gas Distribution reserves the right to amend or remove development conditions.	Crozier	Acknowledged.

Hydro One – November 30, 2018			
Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	We are in receipt of your Plan of Subdivision application, 42T-2018-12 dated November 21, 2018. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. <b><u>Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One's 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only.</u></b>	MHBC	Acknowledged
	For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities' the Owner/ Applicant should consult their local area Distribution Supplier. Where Hydro One is the local supplier the Owner/ Applicant must contact the Hydro subdivision group at <a href="mailto:subdivision@Hydroone.com">subdivision@Hydroone.com</a> or 1-866-272-3330.	Crozier	Acknowledged.

Transportation Services – December 6, 2018			
Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	Transportation Services has reviewed this file further and accepts the results of the Traffic Impact Study and has no further concerns for this development.	Crozier	Acknowledged.

Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
<b>Engineering</b>			
1.	The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report reference a Geotechnical Investigation/Soils Report which were not included in the submission. Please provide this report for review.	Crozier	Acknowledged. The September 2017 Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Sirati & Partners Consultants Ltd. has been included with this package for review.
2.	<p>It is understood that the Hydrogeological Report will be submitted at a later date. Comments regarding detailed SWM design, LID and infiltration measures (if applicable) and water balance will be reserved until the Hydrogeological Report is available for review. The water balance should be broken down into month intervals comparing pre vs. post development. Each natural heritage feature or catchment area should be addressed individually.</p> <p>a) The feature-based water balance should be reviewed by the project Ecologist and an analysis provided detailing how the proposed water balance and the Stormwater Management Plan will not negatively impact the hydrology and ecology of the natural heritage features.</p> <p>b) Figures should be provided showing the pre vs. post development catchment areas and outlets into the natural features.</p> <p>c) The Drainage pattern of the adjacent wetland should be further described.</p>	SLR/Crozier	<p>a) The October 4, 2018 Letter of Hydrogeological Opinion is presently available. It too recommended a groundwater balance for the site, although not on a catchment basis. It also recommended field testing for hydraulic conductivity to properly calibrate the water balance. The feature based water balance is a hydrological analysis, and would be calibrated against the monthly findings of the groundwater balance as a cross check.</p> <p>b) Pre and Post development drainage areas for the subject area of development were provided under the 1<sup>st</sup> Submission. A supplementary set of figures (Figure 5A and 7A) has been attached to show the drainage areas to the natural heritage feature from the overall property. Note that these figures have also refined the drainage area to account for split drainage on certain lots as discussed during a previous meeting with the GRCA. Under the Pre-Development Plan (Fig 5A) Catchment 101 drains to the Glenelg Street Culvert, and Catchment 102 to the wetland area. Under the Post Development Plan (Fig 7A) Catchments 201 and SWMF drain to the culvert, and Catchments 203 and 202 drain to the Wetland.</p> <p>c) As described in the previous issued</p>

Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			<p>FSRSWM report (Crozier, Aug 2018) the wetland exhibits poorly defined flow patterns. The area is topographically defined by various depressions, as well as a series of interconnected “channels”. These “channels” do not demonstrate clear flow patterns based on channel invert elevations. Runoff to the wetland will largely stagnate and infiltrate within the wetland area. However due to the gradual sloping of the wetland area towards to Northwest; in the event that a very large volume of water exceeded the intrinsic natural storage/ infiltration capacity of the wetland, runoff would drain to roadside ditches along Ida St. A culvert exists near Glenelg Street in the area of the wetland, however the culvert invert is higher than the majority of the wetland area and as such minimal drainage from the wetland area enters this culvert.</p>
3.	Please provide drawdown time calculations for the SWM facility.	Crozier	Calculations were included within Appendix D of the 1st Submission to size an appropriate SWMF orifice, and were based on providing a drawdown time of 24 hours.
4.	The seasonally high groundwater elevations need to be depicted on the site plan and the profile drawings for the SWM facilities.	Crozier	<p>Acknowledged. The Plan and Profile Drawings will be produced as part of the detailed design process, and will include the seasonally high groundwater level. It is noted that through interpolation of the SLR Groundwater contouring of the preliminary Hydrogeological report; the high groundwater level at the pond is approximately 516.3m, corresponding to the current permanent pool elevation . The results of a full year of groundwater monitoring are forthcoming, and upon availability, pond levels will be revised if required.</p>

Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
5.	Please provide discussion of erosion and sediment control.	Crozier	<p>Acknowledged. Appropriate erosion and sediment control will be implemented prior to any construction. These measures will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of stone mud mat at site access to reduce mud tracking</li> <li>• Use of dust suppression measures during earthwork activities, such as the application of water or lime.</li> <li>• Use of silt fencing surrounding the limits of the disturbed area to intercept flows and prevent migration of sediments offsite.</li> <li>• Use of straw bale check dams to reduce erosion potential and sediment transport.</li> </ul> <p>The erosion and sediment control plan will be developed through the detailed design process.</p>
6.	Please submit an electronic copy of the hydrologic modelling files.	Crozier	<p>Acknowledged. Electronic copies of the SWMHYMO files have been included as .txt files.</p> <p>It is noted that per the attached supplementary figures (Figure 5A and 7A), the drainage areas have been slightly refined from those in the previous modelling. These changes do not materially impact the results and conclusions of the previous modelling.</p>
<b>Natural Heritage</b>			
7.	Based on the findings of the EIS and the proposed subdivision development, the proposed 10m buffer from the wetland is not adequate or supported by GRCA staff. A 30m buffer from the wetland is more substantive and should be applied. Minor encroachments or modifications to the 30m buffer may be permitted where appropriate and where justification can be provided.	MHBC	<p>Further to the meeting with GRCA Staff on February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019 attended by MHBC, Crozier and SLR and correspondence from GRCA staff dated March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 an “averaged buffer” has been agreed to from Block 143 on the revised draft plan dated May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019 to the rear of Lots 001-023. This “averaged buffer” ranges from 13.3m at its narrowest point to 26m at its widest point.</p>

Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
8.	The draft site plan shows a proposed walkway between lots 16 and 17, leading to the wetland feature and buffer. Walkways or trails should not be directed towards natural heritage features unless they are part of a formal trail plan. If trails are proposed within the buffer to the natural heritage feature a trail plan should be provided	MHBC	The walkway block has been removed on the revised draft plan dated May 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2019.
9.	The downstream receiving watercourse south of Glenelg Street, (Foley Drain) is a Coolwater system with known Northern Pike Spawning. As such, thermal mitigation should be considered as part of the Stormwater Management Plan.	SLR	Water appears intermittently in the feature downstream from the proposed storm water outfall. Thus aquatic habitat represents low value for fish or spawning northern pike at this location. Further examination indicates that the feature would not support spawning habitat as far downstream as the intersection of Ida Street and Ecoparkway, more than 1.5 km from the proposed stormwater discharge location. Effects associated with temperature mitigation of storm water are not expected to extend 1.5 km downstream.
<b>Advisory Comments for Detailed Design</b>			
10.	The proposed 4:1 internal side slopes of the Stormwater Management (SWM) facilities are too steep. To satisfy the Ministry of Environmental, Conservation and Parks (MECP) safety guideline for wet SWM facility side slopes please revise these to 5:1, or gentler, for 3m on each side of the permanent pool elevation.	Crozier	Acknowledged. The stormwater management pond design which was presented in the previously issued FSRSWM report shows 5:1 slopes for 10m above the Permanent Pool, and for 3m below the Permanent Pool in accordance with MECP guidelines. Beyond the 3m below the Permanent Pool, the slope transitions to 4:1.
11.	Please submit a detailed lot grading plan showing existing and proposed grades.	Crozier	Acknowledged. This will be addressed during Detailed Design.
12.	Please provide an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan in accordance with the Grand River Conservation Authority's Guidelines for sediment and erosion control. This plan should indicate the means whereby erosion	Crozier	Acknowledged. A detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be provided upon detailed design, and will identify mitigative measures for erosion and sediment control.

Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	will be minimized and sediment maintained on-site throughout all phases of grading and construction.		Please refer to our office's response to Comment 5 for preliminary discussion of the erosion and sediment control measures.
13.	When available the following information or plans should be provided: d) Monitoring proposal, as recommended in the EIS; e) Buffer Restoration Proposal, as recommended in the EIS; f) If dewatering is required for construction then a Dewatering Plan should be provided.	SLR	Monitoring, restoration plans and dewatering plans will be provided as may be required during the detailed design phase of the proposed development.
	<b>Advisory Comments to the Municipality</b>		
14.	The woodlot feature was identified as Significant Wildlife Habitat for Eastern Wood- pewee, a species of Special Concern. As per the Provincial Policy Statement and Southgate Official Plan, removal or disturbance of the woodlot feature should be avoided unless it can be demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts to the identified Significant Wildlife Habitat.	SLR	The woodland will be enhanced with a naturalized buffer and no removal of habitat for SWH will occur.
15.	If removal of candidate Species at Risk Bat maternity habitat trees is proposed, then the MNRF should be contacted for further guidance regarding and mitigation measures and protection under the Endangers Species Act (2007).	SLR	MNRF will be contacted if removal of candidate Species at Risk Bat maternity habitat is proposed.
16.	The proposed removal of the Grasshopper Sparrow habitat should be discussed with MNRF to confirm if any mitigation measures or permits are required under the ESA.	SLR	SLR will discuss Grasshopper Sparrow habitat with MNRF as the project proceeds.
17.	It should be noted that only two anuran surveys were completed rather than the 3 surveys prescribed in the Marsh Monitoring protocol. However, this may be sufficient as the main	SLR	Anuran surveys identified Significant Wildlife Habitat, thus no additional surveys are necessary.

GRCA – January 11, 2019			
Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	features were confirmed as Significant Wildlife Habitat based on the two completed surveys.		
18.	Section 5.3 of the EIS states in part that three types of wetlands are located in the larger wetland unit in the western portion of the property. The wetland is not identified as other identified Wetlands in Appendix B-Constraints of the Grey County Official Plan (OP), but perhaps should be included in the next update to the OP.	SLR	This comment appears directed to Grey County.

Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority – January 11, 2019			
Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) staff has received the request for agency comments for the above referenced <i>Planning Act</i> Applications. The subject property is located partially within the SVCA watershed and partially within the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) watershed. The GRCA has agreed to be the lead conservation authority regarding the proposed development for the property. As such, SVCA staff will not be providing detailed comments regarding the above referenced <i>Planning Act</i> applications. Please see GRCA comments as available.	MHBC	Acknowledged
	The SVCA would appreciate to continue to receive notices, decisions, reports, etc. regarding development for the above referenced property.	MHBC	Acknowledged

Maxine Copeland – December 12, 2018			
Comment Section/ Number	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	I have no objections to this subdivision so long as it doesn't have a negative	MHBC	A variety of housing types have been provided within the proposed

**Maxine Copeland** – December 12, 2018

<b>Comment Section/ Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	impact on water or sewer facilities. I would like to see some of the residential lots used for one storey bungalows of 1000 to 1200 square feet. Many first-time homebuyers and seniors would be interested in this type of home as opposed to large two-storey homes.		development.