

TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS: LONG POINT ROAD		
December 14, 2021		
COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Town of Blue Mountains - Combined Staff Comments to Support a Draft Plan Approval and ZBA		
1.0	Please provide Professional Opinion from a qualified person to confirm if Drainage Act process is triggered for the proposed stormwater outlets to the Town drain.	Per the email from Brian Worsely (dated December 22, 2021), Crozier needs to show that peak flows and erosive flows are not increased. The SWM Report (January 20, 2022) shows that peak flows are not increased per the pre- to post-development controls. It is our opinion that erosive flows in the immediate receiving portion of the Municipal Drain are negligible, as the Drain is lined with rip-rap material that is meant to prevent erosion. In the downstream portion of the drain (Long Point Rd ditch) the flows in the ditch are the same as the pre-development drainage condition so there should be no additional erosive flows. If further support is required, we can inquire with a geomorphologist to conduct an investigation and provide a letter of opinion but this cannot be done until the spring or summer (after snow melt).
2.0	Please note, a 3 m granular maintenance access with connectivity for vehicular entrance/passage is required along any drainage swale proposed in Block 25. Planning has confirmed the access and swale can be located within the Open Space block and do not require dedicated stormwater block(s). The access can double as a trail to meet trail requirements from Planning. However, the tree clearing in Block 25 for these facilities will be part of the future council decision on this application.	A 3.0m wide granular maintenance access road has been proposed adjacent to the drainage swales on the north and south edges of Block 25, with connectivity along the Municipal Drain on the west side of Block 25.
3.0	The Town undertook a figure (attached) based on the information available at the present time related to the drainage proposed within Block 25. It was noted that tree removal may be extensive within Block 25.	Per the discussion between the Town and Crozier on December 16, 2021, the setbacks shown in the figure may be modified based on detailed cross-sections that will show the required width for stormwater management. See Figures 4 and 5 for revised setback dimensions.
4.0	A cross-section detail, previously requested by the Town (Comment Response Matrix item #14.11), was not provided. We recognize the proposed site grades are not established, the depth of the stormwater outlets and channels are not yet confirmed, and only swales and maintenance accesses are now proposed in Block 25 (jellyfish/piping/headwall now proposed in ROW). However, provide cross-sections with a reasonable estimate for depth and width of both channels in Block 25, such that the area to be tree cleared for these channels/maintenance accesses can be estimated for Council consideration. Otherwise, the Town will present the tree removal area shown on the attached figure to Council.	Detailed cross-sections have been provided on Figure 5. Based on calculations for required width and depth of the drainage swales, we have proposed smaller setbacks around the perimeter of Block 25 that will allow for the swales, the 3.0m maintenance access, and a buffer between them. The setbacks are: 10.0m along the northeast edge, 9.5m along the north edge, 4.0m along the west edge, and 9.0m along the south edge (plus additional space required for the hammerhead).
5.0	Provide written comments from the EIS author indicating they can support the proposed tree removal in Block 25 based on the attached figure. Previous letter from Neil Morris, dated Feb 12, 2021, does not note the significant tree removal that likely would occur due to construction of the proposed drainage features.	Ecologist has reviewed Figure 5 and supports the tree removal required in Block 25. See attached letter from Neil Morris (RE: Long Point Road - Reply to TOBM Comment)
6.0	Planning Services received the request for consideration with reasons, for the reduction of the required 40% Open Space. The request includes a proposal for the partial payment-in-lieu of Open Space and states reason #1: Staff previously advised in preconsultation (March 2017) that they did not want additional open space on the subject lands. There appears to be confusion between Parkland and Open Space. Note that the Policies required both <i>Parkland</i> and <i>Open Space</i> for RRA designation. Staff are not able to waive Open Space requirements - this is a Council decision. Please remove this reason from the Addendum PJR and provide a revised document. Staff are prepared to put this question before council for their Consideration once this revised PJR Addendum is received.	See revised Planning Addendum
7.0	The response in Comment Response Matrix item #14.12 does not satisfy the Town's concern. Please provide info requested (change in head required vs. estimate of available) to demonstrate feasibility of this water quality facility. The comment applies for a Jelly Fish unit.	We have revised the quality control for the site to a treatment train utilizing CB shields, an OGS unit, and an enhanced grass swale. Section C-C in Figure 5 illustrates the dimensions and layout of the proposed OGS and storm sewers. Further support for this design can be found in the updated FSR and SWM Report (Crozier, January 2022).
8.0	Please confirm if buoyancy provisions will be required for the SWM storage pipe due to the high groundwater table. If so, provide cross section of road demonstrating the storage facility (box culvert) with its associated maintenance holes and buoyancy provisions can be accommodated with adequate MECP separation distances to other proposed servicing/utilities.	Buoyancy calucations have been summarized in Section 5.3.1 and Appendix E of the updated FSR and SWM Report (Crozier, January 2022), which illustrate that the box culvert provides more downward force than the upward force of the seasonally high groundwater table. Therefore, no buoyancy provisions are required. Section B-B has been added to Figure 3 to illustrate the proposed layout of the box culvert within the right-of-way and the dimensions to adjacent utilities and services per the standard TOBM 20m ROW.

TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS: LONG POINT ROAD		
December 14, 2021		
COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
9.0	We understand Crozier is of the opinion traffic impacts from the site will be negligible and that this approach was per the MTO Traffic EA, however that EA has not been finalized. For that reason, please comment for our files on the existing level of service and changes anticipated due to the proposed subdivision at intersection of Long Point Rd and Highway 26. We are mostly concerned for traffic proceeding eastbound/turning left at Highway 26, in the interim until future intersection improvements are provided.	Acknowledged. Please reference the Traffic Opinion Letter (Crozier, January 2022) included in the submission for review of the existing and future level of service.
10.0	Road entrance location: a. Please confirm 60 m minimum intersection spacing per Town Engineering Standards can be achieved with consideration of draft approved re-alignment of Long Point Road in neighbouring Aquavil development. b. Please comment on adequacy of sight lines at proposed entrance.	Acknowledged. Please reference the Traffic Opinion Letter (Crozier, January 2022) included in the submission for a review of both intersection spacing and available sight distance.
11.0	Provide an updated draft ZBL with schedule for consideration.	See ZBLA exception submitted to Denise McCarl on January 6, 2022. Denise responded by email on Jnauary 11, 2022.