

# Craighleith Ridge Development - Parkbridge Lifestyle Communities - Comment Response Matrix

Town of The Blue Mountains - September 19, 2017

30-Apr-18

No.	Comment	Response	Proposed Draft Plan Condition(s)
<b>1. Roads and Traffic</b>			
1.1	A public road must be considered at the through road connecting Grey Road 19 to Lakeshore Road as well as a public road from the through road to future development lands below the ridge at the HomeFarm and Eden Oak properties.	This was considered through supplemental Traffic Assessment completed by Crozier February 2018. This study concluded that private roadways can still be supported.	see condition 4
1.2	Town and County will require a peer review of the Traffic Impact Study. The peer review will consider the Traffic Impact Study, neighbourhood connectivity, MTO, Grey County Transportation and public comments received at the public meeting, the status of the current Highway 26 EA, and the potential for any or some roads to change from private to public.	Acknowledged. Updated Traffic Assessment was submitted in February of 2018.	see condition 4
1.3	Water/sanitary/stormwater infrastructure as well as stormwater management ponds that that receive drainage from public lands will also become public.	Water and sanitary can be located under blanket easement in favour of the Town. No Stormwater from public lands is incorporated into the rpoposed SWM Facilities.	see condition 7 and 12
1.4	Lakeshore Road from Grey Road 19 to Highway 26 is an identified Development Charges Road so improvements will not be required. Specific improvements at entrance connections will be the responsibility of the Developer.	No connection to Lakeshore is proposed in the current concept.	see condition 7
1.5	Ministry of Transportation comments request additional information on the TIS and SWM reports.	MTO comments are addressed in this response.	
1.6	Ministry of Transportation comments that development cannot proceed until completion of Highway 26 EA and resolution of the Lakeshore Road intersection.	Per MTO comments, no connection to Lakeshore Road is proposed. As such, EA decision does not delay the proposed development.	see condition 4
<b>2. Stormwater Management</b>			
2.1	Further Erosion and Flood Plain analysis is required.	Refer to supplemental Regional SWm Plan for Watercourses 7, 8, 9, &10 (Crozier, Draft April 2018.)	see condtion 12
2.2	Additional information needed to address Grey Sauble Conservation Authority Comments, Ministry of Transportation Comments, Public Comments.	Refer to Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report Addendum (Crozier, April 2018) which addresses GSCA, MTO, and Public Comments.	see condtion 12
2.3	A Regional Plan that works with adjacent developments to be implemented across Parkbridge and Home Farm development lands and to outlet to the Bay.	Regional Stormwater Plan has been completed by Crozier to address the existing watercourses (7, 8, 9, and 10) and the proposed Parkbridge and Home Farm developments.	see condtion 12
2.4	Terry Bunting with Burnside Engineering Review and Crozier Response.	The current site plan does not propose any development areas to discharge to Watercourse 10.	
<b>3. Water and Sewer Servicing</b>			
3.1	Water distribution system is to be Town owned and located under a Town ROW or within a blanket easement to be able to access and maintain the system	Water distribution system is proposed to be located within blanket easement over infrastructure in favour of the Town.	see condition 7 and 8
3.2	The property crosses pressure zone boundaries Zone 1 and Zone 4. Design to consider impacts.	Acknowledged. To be confirmed at detailed design.	see condition 7
3.3	External water system must demonstrate that there is capacity to provide required fire flows.	Acknowledged. To be confirmed at detailed design.	see condition 7

	<b>4. Archaeological</b>		
4.1	Confirmation needed on additional reporting requirements requested by SON.	See list of Archaeological Reports submitted to date as well as MTCS letters	see condition 22
	<b>5. Environmental</b>		
5.1	Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry requesting additional information on the Environmental Impact Study from Azimuth. Butternut tree setbacks should be increased from 25 metres to 50 metres. The central watercourse is identified as a coldwater stream and setbacks should be increased from 15 metres to 30 metres. Additional information required on significant wildlife habitat and species at risk.	See updated Site Plan an average 30 m buffer from watercourse 7, 9 and 10 has been included. See updated EIS butternut figure the 25 and 50 m setback has been included. (Figure 3a, October 2017, Azimuth report.  Letter from MNRF dated Feb 28, 2018. <i>No further development can occur other than described in Azimuth Environmental Consulting Inc, Butternut Setbacks, Figure 3a, Project No, 15-2 89, October 2017</i>	see condition 21
5.2	Grey Sauble Conservation Authority is supportive of a number of recommendations and conclusions of the EIS. The three main watercourses contain fish habitat, advocate for minimum 30 metre setback, note presence of Butternut Trees, recommend that a vegetation management plan, and natural heritage mitigation plan be developed, requires additional information on watercourse 7 and 9 for stormwater review, permits are required prior to any works occurring in regulated areas (see map submitted with GSCA letter). Recommendations include updated hazard boundaries, preparation of a slope stability study, final stormwater management plan, vegetation management plan and natural heritage mitigation plan be prepared, that the subdivision agreement contain appropriate provisions to implement above plans and permit requirements.	Acknowledged.	see condition 12, 13 and 21
	<b>6. Part Lot Control ByLaw</b>		
6.1	Part Lot Control By-law appears appropriate. Confirmation required on appropriate length of lease agreements.	See Parkbridge information letter on Land leasing.	see condition 20
	<b>7. Zoning ByLaw</b>		
7.1	Appropriate zoning is required to permit or prohibit STA uses where appropriate.	Short Term Accomodation will not be a permitted use on the property	
	<b>8. Parkland Dedication</b>		
8.1	The Town has not identified a need for a public park on the subject lands. A 5% cash-in-lieu of parkland payment will be required.	Private Park, Public Trail, 5% parkland dedication	see condition 3
	<b>9. Open Space Dedication</b>		
9.1	The Town Official Plan recognizes the Nippissing Ridge as a priority to be acquired by the Town for protection and the provision of an east-west public trail.	Town doesn't want Nipissing Ridge dedicated, requested easement. See Draft wording of easement	see condition 10
9.2	A north-south public trail between the Georgian Trail and Grey Road 19 should also be incorporated into the design.	Neither the Bannerman subdivision nor the Eden Oak subdivision were required to provide a north south public trail	
	<b>10. Public Comments</b>		

10.1	Erosion concerns	see slope stability report completed by Peto MacCallum. Recommended setbacks have been adhered to.	see condition 13
10.2	stormwater management controls for 10 lots on upper lands	The 10 lots are no longer included.	
10.3	Support for MNRF 30 metre setback requirements from watercourses	A 30 m average buffer for residents has been included in updated site plan	
10.4	usability of public lands	east west public trail easement	see condition 10
10.5	no access to seniors amenities and care facilities	Not part of the proposed development	
10.6	concerns regarding increased traffic and reported traffic analysis	See updated Crozier Traffic Assessment (February 2018).	see condition 4
10.7	concerns regarding land lease ownership model	See Parkbridge letter	see condition 20
10.8	impact on surrounding property values		
10.9	state of watercourse 9 and that it is already at capacity	See Crozier Regional SWM report (April 2018)	see condition 12
10.10	existing dwellings rely on sump pumps and do not want to see increase in water at their homes	See Crozier Regional SWM report (April 2018)	see condition 12
10.11	roads plan is required for the area to determine current and future traffic patterns	See Crozier Traffic Assessment (February 2018)	see condition 4
10.12	two existing Plan 529 blocks provides water access (Fraser Cres and Blue Mountain Rd) Parkbridge should not have access to these blocks, concern of over-intensification of lands	Currently plan to maintain the right to deeded access	
10.13	disagree with traffic report indicating Lakeshore Road will be the secondary access to the lands	Eliminated access to Lakeshore	
10.14	Lakeshore Road access should consider location of existing dwellings on Lakeshore Road	Eliminated access to Lakeshore	
10.15	concerns that this application is premature until the current Highway 26 EA is completed	Eliminated access to Lakeshore	
10.16	road intersection and georgian trail safety to be considered	Eliminated access to Lakeshore	

10.17	how will Parkbridge be incorporated into Highway 26 road improvements required for Eden Oak lands (left turn lane/other)	Eliminated access to Lakeshore	
10.18	increased setbacks should be considered from existing dwellings adjacent to proposed 10 lots on upper lands	10 lots are no longer included in the site plan	
10.19	Eden Oak requires a second access and will it be provided through the Parkbridge lands	See Crozier Traffic Assessment (April 2018). Potential for trail connectivity. Eden Oak has potential second access through Tyrolean lowlands or east of SWM pond north to 26.	see condition 4

<b>Grey Sauble Conservation Authority - September 19, 2017</b>	<b>19-Apr-18</b>
--	------------------

No.	Comment	Response	Proposed Draft Plan Condition
<b>Natural Hazards</b>			
11.1	Natural Hazards noted on the property include flood and erosion hazards associated with watercourses 7, 8, 9, and 10 as referenced by the Craigeleith Camperdown Subwatershed Study (Gore and Storrie Limited , 1993 for the GSCA). The Stormwater Management plan references flood plain mapping that was completed for watercourse 9 and also provides general comments on watercourse 7. This flood plain mapping is not included in the circulated reports. The GSCA takes a one zone approach to flood plain mapping in this area and development within the regional flood plain is prohibited. This mapping and supporting documentation should be supplied to the GSCA for further review. It appears that proposed block 18 may not cover the entire area subject to erosion and flood hazards associated with watercourse 9. We will require further review in this regard.	See updated Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (April 2018) and Regional Stormwater Management Plan for Watercourses 7, 8, 9 & 10 (April 2018). Floodplain modeling previously provided for Watercourses 7 & 9 has been integrated into these reports. It is also noted that a number of spills between watershed currently occur. It is proposed to formalize spill flow conveyance infrastructure to improve the general flood conditions of the area.	see condition 12
11.2	Additional natural hazards are associated with the Nipissing Ridge slopes. These hazard areas are in general conformity with the Official Plan hazard designation. The PML Slope Stability Assessment indicates that further study is being carried out by others to determine appropriate setback from top of slope for houses. This report does not appear to have been included in the application package. A portion of block 17 associated with watercourse 9 has roads and/or units proposed in close proximity of the slope. There has been no assessment of the erosion hazard on the watercourses. While, watercourses 7 and 10 have significant buffers to cover potential erosion, watercourse 9 has active erosion and a minimal buffer. Additional information on the erosion hazard of this watercourse is required and additional buffer area may be warranted. Flood plain mapping reports for watercourse 7 should also be provided.	See Slope Stability report - Peto MacCallum. Buffers have been increased to 30 m on average. Floodplain mapping included in updated SWM reporting.	see condition 13
<b>Natural Heritage</b>			
12.1	The majority of the natural features on the site are proposed for some form of protection through the Open space allowance and hazard zoning. Some disruption would occur due to road network.	Acknowledged	

12.2	The majority of the development proposed maintains connectivity to the larger woodland in the area and watercourse corridors leading to Georgian Bay. The open space areas maintains the majority of the significant diversity on the site. The man made pond has naturalized and is being utilized by a number species of wildlife. This feature is proposed to remain and potentially being enhanced. The internal road is a reduced width and will hopefully minimize disruption to existing travel corridors for wildlife.	Acknowledged	
12.3	As noted in the EIS, the area is part of a significant woodland that is being protected for the most part	Acknowledged	
12.4	<p>Significant woodlands —The EIS has discussed the woodland on the site and correctly deems it to be significant within the local landscape. The majority of the woodland feature is being maintained to the greatest extent. Open space areas associated with the Nipissing ridge, the manmade pond and archeological sites provide ecological functioning areas within its adjacent lands for protection</p> <p>Significant wildlife Habitat —The EIS has provided a comprehensive review of the policies related to significant wildlife. The manmade pond has naturalized and provides habitat for various species. The more eastern part which provides for breeding amphibians is proposed to be enhanced and incorporated into one of the proposed Stormwater treatment facility. Based on our knowledge of the site over the number of years, we generally concur with the habitat assessments contained within tables 6.1 to 6.6 of the EIS. It will be important provide design for amphibian movement along the Nipissing Ridge Corridor as noted in section 7.2.8. Additionally, it will be necessary to have a clear plan for enhancement and wildlife salvage during potential stormwater pond construction. The south part of the Georgian Bay Shoreline is stopover area and it is very important to limit clearing activities as noted in section 8.5 of the EIS. (Migratory Birds Convention Act)</p>	See updated site plan	
12.5	Based on available information, the three main watercourses across the site all contain fish habitat either on the site or immediately downstream. The major impact on these watercourses is development adjacent to its banks and the construction water course crossings for roads, services and trails. The EIS (Section 9.4) indicates conformity with Official Plan Policy 135.4.2 that a 15 metre setback is being respected from the hazard designation. This is not the case for watercourse 9. As noted under the natural hazard section, we are asking for clarification of the regional flood plain for this watercourse and recommended setback for erosion. We advocate a minimum setback of 30 metres on all watercourses to provide a buffer for fish habitat, wildlife and water quality as a natural Heritage feature. The fish species observed in our records for Watercourse 9 includes blacknose dace and Brook stickleback.	See updated site plan - 30 m average buffers have been provided for Watercourse 9.	See condition 12

12.6	The provincial and federal agencies have responsibility administer activities associated with threatened and endangered species. Through our site inspections we noted the identi-fied Endangered butternut trees on the property	MNRF has provided comments. See letter from MNRF. See updated EIS butternut figure the 25 and 50 m setback has been included. (Figure 3a, October 2017, Azimuth report.  Letter from MNRF dated Feb 28, 2018. No further development can occur other than described in Azimuth Environmental Consulting Inc, Butternut Setbacks, Figure 3a, Project No, 15-2 89 , October 2017	see condition 21
12.7	Apart from a potential enlargement of the buffer area associated with water-course 9, the adjacent lands to the noted significant features are generally acceptable assuming the proposed mitigation and isolation of works can be completed appropriately  In order to ensure natural heritage features are conserved, we recommend that a vegetation management plan and a natural heritage mitigation plan be developed for the proposal as a draft condition	Acknowledged - 30 m buffer included.	see condition 21
<b>Stormwater Management</b>			
13.1	In general, the storm water management concept and approach is generally consistent with the GSCA Policies and the Craigeleith Camperdown Subwatershed study. As noted above, we will require additional documentation on the flood plain of watercourse 7 and 9. We will provide detailed comments through the draft approval process. As noted below, we will require a draft plan condition for the approval of the GSCA	See Crozier Regional SWM report	see condition 12
<b>Recomendations</b>			
14.1	That a zoning By-law amendment <b>be passed to</b> include natural hazard areas associated with the Nipissing Ridge, the flood and erosion hazards associated with watercourses 7, 8, 9, and 10 and any other areas identified through technical reports to the satisfaction of the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA)	see proposed zoning bylaw amendment figure	see conditon 6
14.2	That a slope stability study be <b>prepared</b> for the development of any structures that back on to the Nipissing ridge slopes to the satisfaction of the GSCA	Agreed	See condition 13
14.3	That a final stormwater management plan be prepared to the satisfaction of the <b>GSCA</b>	Agreed	see condition 12
14.4	That a vegetation management plan and natural heritage feature mitigation plan be prepared for the development to the satisfaction of the GSCA	Agreed	see condition 21
14.5	That the stormwater management plan and vegetation management plan be incorporated in the Subdivision Agreement, Site Plan Agreement, and/or Part Lot Control Agreement in acceptable wording to the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority. Further, the subdivision Agreement <b>is</b> to include a clause indicating 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 <b>prior</b> to site alterations in the affected	Reg 151/06 doesn't apply to all the lands	See condition 2
<b>Ministry of Transportation - March 31, 2017</b>			<b>19-Apr-18</b>

No.	Comment	Response	Proposed Draft Plan Condition
<b>Traffic Impact Study</b>			
15.1	The report uses LUC 260 Recreational Homes for trip generation estimation. Based on the proposed plan, the development consists of residential townhouses and single family homes and not a resort setting. For reasonable assessment of traffic generation, LUC 210 Single Family Detached Housing and LUC 230 Residential Condominium/Townhouse should be used for trip generation estimation	A Letter has been prepared in response to this comment. The analysis in the letter demonstrates that the additional traffic generated by LUC 210 and LUC 230 is anticipated to have a negligible impact to the boundary road network, in comparison to the original assumption.  It is noted that given the additional site traffic, a southbound left-turn lane is warranted at the intersection of Grey Road 19 and Craigleith Road. However, the revised land uses do not align with the travel patterns and behaviours anticipated for this development. Accordingly, it has been recommended that turning movements be monitored after the development has occupancy, in order to establish peak hour traffic patterns and determine if a left-turn lane is justified	See condition 4
15.2	Regarding the left turn lane that is warranted on Highway 26 at the intersection with Lakeshore Road/Fraser Crescent (identified as being required as per the 2012 traffic Impact study completed for the Eden Oaks development):  MTO is not in support of left turn lane geometrics that continue through an adjacent intersection. The WB left turn lane geometrics for the warranted turning lane will continue through the East Junction of the Fraser Crescent intersection (with Highway 26). Until there is a solution for the Lakeshore Road intersection (and warranted highway improvements), MTO is not supportive of assigning additional development traffic to this intersection (intensification)	The revised site plan does not provide an access to Lakeshore Road. Access to the site will be provided by a singular entrance, which forms the fourth (east) leg of the intersection of Grey Road 19 and Craigleith Road. Accordingly, all trips destined towards Collingwood will access Highway 26 at the intersection of Grey Road 19 and Highway 26	
15.3	The traffic impact study needs to assess the features present at all locations where traffic is being assigned. Features such as pedestrian crossings/trails, existing private and commercial entrance locations, road geometry/site lines should be evaluated (and addressed) to ensure the traffic assignment (intensification) is being done in a manner that preserves and promotes public safety	The attached site plan outlines the internal pedestrian and trail network as well as the connection to the external system.  Furthermore, due to the removal of the access to Lakeshore Road, all vehicles utilizing Highway 26 will have to do so via the signalized intersection of Highway 26 and Grey Road 19. This signalized condition is existing and will continue to enable vehicles to safely transition onto Highway 26	See condition 4
15.4	For the above noted reasons (and consistent with our past correspondence dated December 13, 2016), MTO is not supportive of additional traffic being assigned to the Lakeshore Road/Fraser Crescent intersection with Highway 26	As noted above, access to the site will only be provided on Grey Road 19, eliminating the need for additional traffic to be assigned to the intersection of Lakeshore Road/Fraser Crescent and Highway 26	
15.5	As a note, there is a current transportation study underway at this location, the above noted intersection (and access issue for Eden Oaks) is part of the assessment of the transportation study	Acknowledged	
15.6	Ministry of Transportation comments that development cannot proceed until completion of Highway 26 EA and resolution of the Lakeshore Road intersection	Development access to Lakeshore Road has been removed to allow the development to proceed in advance of Highway 26 EA finalization.	See condition 4
<b>Site Servicing and Stormwater Management Report</b>			

15.7	The Ministry requires analysis for the 2, 5,10,25,50 and 100-year storm events for both the pre-development and post development conditions showing no increase in flows for all storm events	Hydrologic analysis of the 2, 5, 10, 25, 50, and 100-year storm events have been completed using 24 SCS Type II and 4 Hour Chicago Storms and has been included in the Servicing and Stormwater Managment Report Addendum (April 2018).	See condition 12
15.8	The rainfall data and IDF curve information should be taken from the MTO drainage website (see below)	The rainfall data used in the Hydrologic analysis was retrieved from the MTO IDF Curve Lookup Tool and included in the report.	See condition 12
15.9	How is the discharge from the SWM ponds being handled? There is mention of an "extended detention orifice" but we do not see it indicated on any drawings	A preliminary stage-storage-discharge table has been computed for each of the proposed stormwater management facility to determine storage vs. outflow relationship used in the ROUTE RESERVOIR command in the post development hydrologic models. At this preliminary stage the SWM ponds have been sized with a single extended detention orifice and spillway. Details of outlet structure will be completed during detailed design.	See condition 12