

December 17, 2021

GSCA File: P5117

Grey County
595 9th Ave E
Owen Sound, ON
N4K 3E3

Attn: Scott Taylor
Manager of Planning Services
Scott.Taylor@grey.ca

Dear Scott Taylor

Re: Plan of Subdivision – Technical Submission
Tabera – Alta Phase II
Applicant: Tabera Ltd.
Roll No. 42-42-000-006-273-00
Town of Blue Mountains

Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) has reviewed this submission as per our delegated responsibility from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2020) and as a regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 151/06. GSCA has also provided comments as per our Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Town of Blue Mountains representing their interests regarding natural heritage and water identified in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, respectively, of the Provincial Policy Statement. Finally, GSCA has provided advisory comments related to policy applicability and to assist with implementation of the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Plan under the Clean Water Act.

GSCA staff have reviewed the above noted submission in consideration of a draft plan of subdivision consisting of 63 single-family residential units. We offer the following comments:

Documents Reviewed

- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared Crozier Consulting Engineers, dated July 2021
- Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Neil Morris, Consulting Ecologist, dated October 6, 2021
- Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by GEI Consultants Inc., dated July 23, 2021

Member Municipalities

Municipality of Arran-Elderslie, Town of the Blue Mountains, Township of Chatsworth, Township of Georgian Bluffs, Municipality of Grey Highlands, Municipality of Meaford, City of Owen Sound, Town of South Bruce Peninsula

Stormwater Management Report

- Proposed swale at rear yards from lots 56 – 59 is partially shown beyond subject lands and on adjacent private property. Also, there is concern the distance and number of bends may not be feasible without issues on the subject lands or neighbouring properties.
- Lot grading from lots 56 – 58 may be challenging given the existing grades and lot layout with narrow frontages transecting the topography. May need to reduce lots at this location to accommodate drainage and development.
- The Outlet B watercourse appears to flow between several residential dwellings north of Hidden Lake Road. Does increasing post-development flow rates for the regional event at Outlet B result in any negative impacts to these properties?
- Location of stable slope from final Geotech study line should be shown on stormwater plans. Additional comments related to this are included within the geotechnical study comments.
- Detailed design plans are required for further review.
- A permit is required from our office for any of the alterations within the area regulated by our office under Ontario Regulation 151/06.
- The “man-made agricultural ditch” may be a regulated watercourse and therefore subject to Ontario Regulation 151/06 along with incised watercourse features originating within the escarpment slope.
- Post Development Drainage Plan (Fig. 8) identifies Block 64 north of watercourse 21A as Block 65.
- EIS recommends “Measures should be adopted to minimize disruption of groundwater recharge within the area of development”. Doesn’t appear to be addressed in SWM report.
- Detailed grading plans and erosion and sediment control plans are needed.

Geotechnical Study

- Nipissing ridge regulated by GSCA as a post-glacial shoreline.
- No technical information provided to support the findings of the 2.5:1 stable slope. We understand this is estimated but more review is required to confirm final location of stable slope and factor of safety.
- EIS identified seeps within the Nipissing ridge feature. This isn’t mentioned within the geotechnical report and could be a factor of instability.
- Should include topographic survey with contours at 0.5 m intervals.
- Stormwater management block appears to be within the slope hazard. GSCA policies prohibit stormwater management facilities within the other slope hazard (GSCA Policy 8.4.15 c). It is unclear to what degree the current proposed facility falls within the slope hazard. Outlet within hazard may be acceptable subject to detailed design and support from Geotech engineer.
- Geotech engineer will need to review stormwater plans and verify facility is beyond the stable slope.
- Plans should account for a 6 metre erosion access allowance from Nipissing ridge stable slope.
- Study doesn’t comment on the valley slope associated with watercourse 21A. Typical hazard allowance for valleys is 3:1 plus 15 metres to for toe erosion with the presence of a watercourse. This may have been determined in previous development proposal, file history was not reviewed for these comments.

Environmental Impact Study

- Mapping should indicate location of seep features within Nipissing Ridge.

- Identifies seeps within Nipissing Ridge, were seeps present within the escarpment feature to the south of the property? (Perhaps not necessary with the identification of incised watercourse features to the south of Street C. If seeps present likely they are likely further south within undeveloped section of the escarpment)
- Detailed tree preservation plan to be completed following priority areas in outlined in EIS.
 - Plan should establish tree inventory
 - Identify tree protection areas/zones
 - Requirements to achieve tree protection
 - Discussion on methodology
 - Any other requirements from the Town and County
 - If completed by a different consultant, EIS consultant should review and accept the report to confirm if consistent with EIS recommendations
- Must ensure mitigation measures and implementation is at appropriate stages for development (e.g. Draft Plan Conditions, Subdivision Agreement, etc.)

We note, a regulation and hazard map is not enclosed with this letter as it is subject to change pending further information, such as final verification of stable slope, detailed contours, and truthing of onsite watercourse features. The text of Ontario Regulation 151/06 details the features to be regulated. Any conflicts between the text and mapping, the text prevails. A site visit was not completed as part of this review. A springtime site visit is recommended.

Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Mac Plewes
Manager of Environmental Planning