

General responses to Pre-consultation notes vs 1st Submission (Nov 12 2025)		Town comments on First Submission (Nov 12 2025)	Second Submission - Response (July 2026)
Pre-application Review Notes: February 12, 2025 Owner: Rhemm Properties Agent: Kristine Loft Location: 372 Grey Rd 21 (Rhemm) Project: 53 Single detached homes/lots Applications: Official Plan Amendment Zoning By-law Amendment Draft Plan of Subdivision			
Fees (charged as applicable at the time of the application): OPA \$30,406 ZBA \$17477.25 (Large scale fee discounted by 25% for combined OPA/ZBA SUB \$21532 Security deposit \$5000 – to be maintained and replenished at that level as draw downs occur.			
	Comments	Responder	Response
1	These pre-application review comments are provided in response to a request for a pre-review of a draft submission supplied by the applicant. In addition to requested studies and study updates comments are provided on studies that formed part of the pre-application review submission (on file and available for reference).		Nil.
2	Follow-up meeting requested Due to the complexity of the proposed realignment of the trunk sewer and additional questions regarding the water, wastewater and stormwater servicing approach the Town's Operations and Development Engineering Divisions have requested a meeting prior to formal submission.	Understood. The Town and Developer met to discuss servicing options. The Functional Servicing Report reflects the proposed servicing approach.	Understood. Meeting with Town was held on Nov. 26, 2025. It was resolved the preferred sewer alignment behind Lots 32 through 53 within the Open Space block is acceptable to the Town subject to providing a maintenance access road and resolving a few other minor comments at final design.
3	Adjacent Lands Please note that the OLT decisions with respect to the adjacent Eden Oak subdivision include Tribunal approved draft plan of subdivision and zoning by-laws. The proposed road network relies on a road connection over the Eden Oak lands that is currently Zoned Open Space and demarcated as an open space block on the draft plan. While the Zoning By-law 2018-65 permits public uses including, among other things, public streets within any zone, a redline revision by Eden Oak to the draft plan of subdivision Open Space block would be required. Please see attached OLT decision. Note also Development Engineering comment: “unless provision is made in the subdivision agreement with Eden Oak, it will be at least 2028/2029 before Eden Oak’s Infrastructure is Assumed and Rhemm would be able to connect”	Understood. The subject lands are proposed to gain access via Eden Oak as contemplated. Access will rely on Eden Oak proceeding.	Please provide details of implementation, agreements, off site works etc
4	Official Plan policies A full review of the proposal relative to the Official Plan is required. Some noteworthy Official Plan policies are contained within the following sections and provide a policy basis for requests: A1.1 Guiding Principles A3.3 Growth and Settlement A3.4 Community Character A 3.9 Infrastructure A3.10 Housing B3.7 Residential Recreation Area B3.7.4.1 Density and Open Space Requirements B3.7.4.3 Landscape Analysis B3.7.4.4 Open Space-Other Policies D5.2 Design Policies b)f) and general provisions D6.3.1 Parkland siting and design D8.2 Tree Canopy D8.4 Energy Conservation and Efficiency Measures E1.7 Engineering Standards E2 Phasing E7 Amendments to the Plan E10 Complete Application Requirements	Noted. Planning Justification Report provided.	See comments below and in summary
5	Resources Eden Oak OLT decision https://www.thebluemountains.ca/planning-building-construction/current-projects/planning-development-projects/eden-oak-trail/head Community Design Guidelines https://www.thebluemountains.ca/sites/default/files/2021-09/Approved%20Community%20Design%20Guidelines%20-%20June%2020121.pdf Housing Needs Assessment Nov, 2023 https://www.thebluemountains.ca/sites/default/files/2023-11/%282023-11-17%29%20Housing%20Needs%20Assessment.pdf	Noted.	Please also see Town of The Blue Mountains Trail Development Standards https://www.thebluemountains.ca/sites/default/files/2023-05/Trail%20Development%20Standards%20AODA.pdf
			Acknowledged. New Community Design Guidelines reviewed by John G. Williams Architect and Loft Planning. John G. Williams has prepared an Urban Design Report and Architectural Design Guidelines.

6	Agency comments: Please see the following comments attached separately · County of Grey – please note that County of Grey ecologist conducts natural heritage reviews for the Town · Saugeen Metis · Hydro One Other comments to be confirmed · GSCA · MTO – please engage MTO directly and advise Town of MTO comments	Noted. Response to natural heritage matters from the County of Grey are provided in the appropriate sections of this comment matrix. Birks NHC has completed a Tree Inventory and Protection Plan (Birks NHC, 2025) as a requirement of the Town. An EIS Update has also been completed, which identifies a preliminary compensation plan for the loss of significant woodland. Tatham are engaged with MTO.	Please see GSCA comments	See GSCA in full below for response.
7	Additional studies requested: · Tree Inventory Preservation Plan including compensation and restoration plan* · Hydrogeological Study* (Geotech advises that this will be provided under separate cover but is not included in the package). · Water balance study* · Thermal regime analysis* · Urban Design Report** Including: - o Landscape concept - o Trails/connectivity plan - o Park concept - o Architectural Control Guidelines - o Streetscape Design - o Review against Community Design Guidelines - o Fencing - o See attached TOR · Housing Needs Report** - o See attached TOR · Updates required to studies and dwgs as applicable in notes below. *denotes - confirm detailed requirements with County ecologist **denotes – see attached suggested study contents Please also provide: · a Zoning By-law matrix · Comment/response matrix	As noted the following reports have been provided as part of this submission: Tree Inventory Preservation Plan (Compensation Plan in concert with County of Grey staff) Hydrogeological Study Water Balance/Thermal regime analysis Urban Design Report Landscape Analysis Report Architectural Guidelines A Landscape Concept has been provided as a part of the Landscape Analysis to demonstrate trail connections throughout the development and a general concept for the park block. Bench seating and a shade structure have been proposed along a 3.0m granular trail that connects the development to the Georgian Trail. A Landscape Concept has been provided as a part of the Landscape Analysis to demonstrate trail connections throughout the development and a general concept for the park block. Bench seating and a shade structure have been proposed along a 3.0m granular trail that connects the development to the Georgian Trail. Housing Needs Study Zoning review within PJR. Comment Matrix	Please see summary comments and those below Note hydrogeological study does not appear to have been consulted in the preparation of the engineering studies/repoert or EIS	Hydrogeology report included in resubmission package. Reports and drawing coordination completed. Urban Design Report and Architectural Guidelines have been completed and are submitted with this submission. Accordingly, all other reports provided have been updated or addendums provided as per comments received.
8	Note Peer reviews as applicable. Community design · Please see requested study contents above and additional proposed TOR attached · Draft plan should also be reviewed against community design guidelines Incomplete · Confirm lot layout and development design based on urban design concept · Configuration of lots 18-26 (in the centre island) should be reviewed. Not reviewed · Consideration should be given to additional built forms (semis, towns, multi units) · Proposal will be subject to urban design peer review · Architectural control required · Note that the proposed R1-3 zone allows for increased site coverage, reduced lot width and reduced rear yards to 6 m. Not reviewed - o Please consider related guidelines and how the streetscape will be impacted by building facades of this massing - o Landscape buffering to screen rear yards from adjacent lands - o Some oversized lots may result in more massive structures Outstanding · Numerous lots are over 15 m – confirm that R1-3 is appropriate on those lots. Those will be larger lots where the 40% coverage provision applies under R1-3 which will mean a larger more massive unit. Is this is what is intended? Perhaps ADUs could form a part of the design strategy for those lots? Alternately consider R1-2 Not reviewed · Note that the proposed units along street A Lots 31-53 should receive special design attention to avoid repetitive designs and dominant garage doors along that streetscape. Please apply design techniques to address i.e. limit percentage of front façade dedicated to garage, apply built form techniques to reduce prominence etc. Not reviewed or conflicts with Guidelines · Additional attention to parkland design relative to associated OP direction – consider increasing visibility and frontage · Note additional comments below re: parkland, trail design, landscape analysis, road network · Please provide a landscape concept	See response above regarding the parkland, trail design, and landscape concept.	No summary response provided on many of these items 1. See comments below re: park - please provide a response to comment on increasing park visibility and frontage. 2. Review against guidelines not undertaken to demonstrate how project addresses them (provide in a checklist format with a brief description indicating how each is met or not met and why not). 3. Please address provisions of the R1-3 zone, how nthis contributes to massing and repetition of built form and impact on the streetscape. The concept plan does not demonstrate that on some lots, higher lot coverage will result in much larger building massing. 4. Currently the amount of fill required for this development to achieve basements in the high water table and bedrock conditions is not addressed an unknown. This informaiton is required to assess the visual impact of the devleopment and also impacts the effect of any screening vegetation. Greater height impact may require lower maximum heights to address the impact of the possible raised elevations of the development areas. 5. Provide information that demonstrates the effect of altered grades. Show a cross section of the proposed grades and the grade of the adjacent lands and demonstrate how view impacts will be mitigated. 6. Confirm how lots 31-53 will be designed to mitigate teh effect of repetitive buiilding designs, lot sizes and massing. 7. Comments advising of requirement for cul de sac on Street A not addressed. Please revise hammerhead to cul de sac, include easement lands and demonstrate which lots are impacted by removing building foot prints and flagging them. 8.Comments requesting assessment of the increased massing and uniformity of the proposed R1-3 zone not provided.	1. Park size and shape has been updated. Landscape Analysis speaks to visibility and frontage. 2. PJR and UDR include checklist format response from new Community Design Guidelines. 3. See UDR by Williams Architect. 4. Tatham - Grading plans, sections, and plan and profile drawings are included in resubmission package and show existing grades versus proposed grades, estimated seasonal high groundwater elevations, and bedrock elevations for each lot. The proposed site grading has been designed such that all basements will be above estimated bedrock elevation and at least 0.5 m above the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation. The proposed site grading was designed with the intent to reduce the amount of imported fill required for the development to the extent possible while ensuring the minimum Town engineering standard requirements have been met. It is our opinion the site can not be lowered further. 5. Tatham. Cross-sections have been provided. 6. See UDR by Williams Architect. 7. Hammerhead revised to cul-de-sac. Blocks will be dedicated to the Town for the temporary cul-de-sac until such time as road is extended to lands south and the cul-de-sac is removed. Ownership of the block to be transfered back to the developer for the creation of the lots once the temporary cul-de-sac is no longer required. 8. The site will be developed by way of Archtectural Guidelines and further, the builder has indicated that hte site will be developed as a single development with a set number of house models being available. The models are offered to fit onto the maximum number of lots and to provide as much flexibility to a potential purchaser. See Urban Design Report by Williams with regard to massing and uniformity.

9	Landscape Analysis - Does not correctly address the Official Plan Residential Recreation designation and related policies with respect to the landscape analysis requirement and the open space, parkland requirements (see cited sections of B3.7.4 above). Outstanding - Review of RRA policies should be undertaken. Outstanding - EIS recommendations should be included specifically for mitigating impact on specimen trees and remaining adjacent stands of trees. Note also requested TIPP, compensation and restoration plan. Note also requested revisions to the EIS and the implications for landscape analysis. Please also coordinate the content of the Landscape Analysis with the content of the Tree Inventory and Protection Plan. - Documentation references a 30 m hazard/watercourse setback whereas the 30 m setback appears to be a watercourse setback. Confirm the implications for landscape analysis opportunities - Flood assessment identifies significant portion of open space as flood hazard. Does this have any impact on the landscape analysis? Outstanding - Landscape analysis points out that the site can be viewed through the Georgian Trail. This was not identified as a planting opportunity. We suggest on and off-site plantings to establish and enhance the trail buffer on town lands to preserve the trail user experience. This could also include consideration of plantings in concert with any trail linkage design. - Town standards also require inventory of trees 6.0m onto adjacent properties to undertake required tree removals. The intent is to avoid property damage due to deadfall originating on adjacent lands. Outstanding - Note proposed relocation of trunk sewer main into Hazard and over proposed open space lands. Work with Ecologists to review restoration planting and management Outstanding	Is parkland dedication proposed in this development? If so, the park block has not been defined and needs to be to confirm and establish the 5% parkland decication amount. If no parkland is being proposed, insufficient lands are being made available then cash in lieu is required for the remaining amount. Please review D6.3.3 Local Parkland to further inform proposed parkland design. A block needs to be defined on the Draft Plan of Subdivision. Parkland needs to address Official Plan criteria and is distinguished from Open Space requirements under the RRA designation. Please review the policies of Official Plan D6.2.8 Lands not accepted for parkland dedication which include <i>a) lands designated as Hazard Lands; b) lands, which comprise part of any required open space component; c) walkways which are provided as part of the overall subdivision or site plan approval; d) lands which are required for other municipal infrastructure purposes, including roads, service lines and stormwater management facilities; and, e) lands which are otherwise conveyed to the Town, whether used for recreation purposes or not.</i> Note also D6.3.5 Public Walkway policeis which excludes walkway from fulfilling parkland dedication requirements. Parkland dedication is separate from the required 40% open space requirement in the Residential Recreation Area. Please review the policies of The proposed parkland design does not appear to be consistent with the requirements of the Official Plan Section B3.7.4.1 Density and Open Space Requirements <i>The calculation of the open space component shall be based on the whole of the proponent's holdings included in any draft plan of subdivision. Lands designated Wetland or Hazard Lands may be included within the required open space</i> 1. Any drainage works to address flooding or otherwise shall be on private property – see the flood risk assessment, stormwater management and grading plans which show works on proposed public property adjacent to proposed lots. 2. Discrepancy between flood works identified under the flood risk assessment (more rear lot grading) and the SWM and FSR works (less rear lot gradiong). Please reconcile differences 3. Unclear how park area is disnguished from hazard and open space areas in landscape concept. If the area shown as park in a solid colour is what is intended (no legend provided for this colour), this is not acceptable to the Town. Clear delineation needs to be made. Open Space and Parkland policy requiriements respectively need to be addressed. 4. Proposed relocation of trunk main impacts watercourse and wetland setbacks. No significant naturalization of these areas appears to be contemplated. Consider relocation of the truynk main into Street A. Pla nt the buffer areas appropriately.	ETi: Parkland dedication is proposed for the development. The park block has been defined on the draft plan as Block 56. Please refer to the Landscape Analysis for how the proposed parkland addresses sections D6.3.3, D6.2.8, D6.3.5 and D 6.3.1 of the Official Plan. ETi: The development Concept Plan and Draft Plan have been updated to seperate the "parkland dedication" from the "additional open space" categories for clarity of these zones. ETi: Extents of fencing have been depicted on the Landscape Concept and Engineering Drawings. Fencing is further discussed in the EIS and Landscape Analysis. ETi: As per discussions between Tatham Engineering and the Town, the trunk main will not be re-routed within Street A. The trunk main will re-routed through open space and the 30m wetland setback. Updated calculations are located on Landscape Concept Plan and PJR Addendum which reflect discussions with Town on "parkland dedication" lands.
10	Hazard lands identification All applicable studies, dwgs, proposed approval documents - The draft plan and studies referring to the 30m Hazard lands setback appear to have incorrectly referenced the setback as a hazard land setback whereas it is cited in the EIS as a 30 m watercourse setback. - It appears from the Floodplain assessment and SWM report that a significant portion of the proposed open space and park block lands outside of the currently designated hazard and wetlands is hazard within the Regional (Timmins) Flood Hazard and the lands may need to carry the Hazard OP designation and Hazard Zoning.		

11	Environmental Impact Study & relationships between EIS and other studies Please see the separately appended February 4 2025 comments of the County and provide a response. Please note that the County ecologist provides expert review with regard to natural heritage matters for the Town. Note that some comments below address relationships between content of the EIS and other submission documents such as landscape analysis, natural hazards/flood report, urban design, PJR, OPA, ZBA, Draft Plan etc. Additional commentary throughout these notes cross reference or provide additional comment. Note in particular that: · the significant woodland mapping is not based on the County’s significant woodland mapping and requires further assessment; · required tree inventory and protection plan including compensation as part of the complete application; · required water balance assessment, thermal regime analysis on the receiving watercourse as part of complete application. Please note the following comments provided by Town planning staff: · Excerpt from EIS: The MECP is currently working towards a recovery and protection plan for Black Ash and has temporarily suspended ESA protections for a period of two years from the time this species was listed under O.Reg. 230/08. Protections for the species will be enforced starting on January 26, 2024. Study deferred Black Ash review pending beginning of enforcement. Please advise on any updates. · EIS is recommending fencing lots to limit impact from residential development on the wetland and buffer but the proposed Open Space block includes an area between the lots and those lands. It’s not clear what is happening in there but the design seems to contemplate some sort of through access by virtue of what appears to be an access at the south end of Street A and that approx. 3 metre space between lots and the buffer and the access at the north west. · Fencing of rear yards as recommended by Ecologist may conflict with some of the content of the RRA designation regarding open space access. Please review and confirm. · Please consider whether a prohibition on gates into the Open Space/Hazard Land areas may be or may not be required in concert with the RRA policies and the EIS recommendations regarding access restrictions. · Drawings throughout the submission other than the EIS include a note that states “30 m setback from hazard lands”, this doesn’t appear to be what was intended. Birks treats it differently and refers to it as:	1. See County comments 2. See comments above re- fencing naturalized areas and also encroachment of existing and proposed sewer trunk line into 30 m watercourse and 30 m wetland setbacks. 3. Demonstrate how compensation for removal of signifant woodlands on site in proposed locations creates a no net impact effect. Address the encroachment of the proposed and existing sanitary trunk line routing on wetland and watercourse setbacks vs the alternative of routing through street A. Note requirements for service road and impact on buffers, restoration etc.	1. Noted. Please see response to County comments below. 2. The Ecological Compensation Plan (Birks NHC, 2026) addresses fencing requirements for the retained natural lands, particularly the lands where compensation measures will be undertaken. A page-wire fence along the northern servicing corridor will be installed permanently and a chain-link fence will be installed along the rear lots. The EIS Update (Birks NHC, 2026) provides additional justification for the proposed re-alignment of the sanitary truck line within the 30m wetland setback. 3. Please refer to the Ecological Compensation Plan (Birks NHC, 2026) regarding proposed compensation measures, including plantings within the watercourse and wetland setbacks to increase setback functionality. An area of 2.72 ha has been identified for planting and an area of 2.6 ha has been identified for invasive species management. These compensation measures represent more than 4:1 offsetting ratio for the loss of 0.58 ha of Significant Woodland. Also note the revisions to the development plan which minimizes the loss of Significant Woodland within the southwest corner of the property.
12	Street network/Transportation/Fire · Confirm that the egress at Lakeshore to HWY 26 can accommodate the additional growth presented by this proposal and future development on the lands immediately to the south or if a second access is required · Review the proposed street network to confirm if an additional road connecting to development lands to the west is required. · Provide a turning radius analysis to demonstrate that the proposed street network can accommodate large vehicle movements (snowplows, fire trucks, garbage trucks etc.) · Cul de sac required at the southern terminus of Street A or revision to lots zoning and lot layout to reflect land requirements Not addressed · Lands to be held in tenure satisfactory to the Town for turn around until such time as development continues to the south. Not addressed · Parking should be only on one side of the street for fire access Not addressed	1. Awaiting MTO comments 2. Cul de sac and appropriate land holding provisions required at the terminus of Street A to allow turn arounds for fire vehicles, snow removal and garbage collection 3. Provide detailed information on how the proposed road network will connect through Eden Oak to this proposed development 4. Note TIS p 15 & 16 summary - please confirm MTO will accept the conclusions and recommendations of the TIS 5. Parking plan	1. Tatham. Comments from MTO received and TIS has been updated accordingly and resubmitted. 2. Reference Plan provided for terminus of Street A. 3. We have noted above that the developers are currently in discussions with regard to a MOU regarding access, cost sharing related to the Regional SWM Pond as well as the necessary secondary water connection that Eden Oak requires. As soon as an MOU is available this will be forwarded to the Town. We would anticipate that draft conditions can be provided that requires this agreement to be in place prior to registration. See Section 5.5 in PJR Addendum. 4. Tatham. TIS updated and resubmitted to MTO, their response is pending. 5. Tatham. Town standard 4.8.2.A is proposed which illustrates parking on both sides of the road. Addition of no parking signs can be resolved with development engineering at the time of final design to support a development agreement. Tatham - The lands adjacent to Lot 31 (now Lot 32) are being dedicated to the Town as a servicing block for watermain loop, and maintenance access road for trunk sanitary sewer. ETi: Extents of fencing have been depicted on the Landscape Concept and Engineering Drawings. The open space behind lots 32 to 53 is intended for additional compensation planting with larger plant. material for faster screening.
13	Vacant land adjacent to Lot 31 · Please clarify the intent of the lands adjacent to lot 31 – they show as R1-3 in the draft zoning by-law, RRA in the draft OPA and show as open space block in the Draft Plan of Subdivision		
14	Explanation of drawing detail · Please clarify intent of thin strip of open space between rear yards and 30 m buffer to wetland relative to recommended fencing to limit access into buffer and wetland areas Not addressed · Additional details from EIS and Design submission may clarify this issue	No explanation provided - please provide. Please see comments above re: landscape analysis.	
15	Georgian Trail · Provide enhancement planting within and adjacent to the Georgian Trail lands to increase the visual buffer and preserve and enhance the trail user experience. · The gap in screening was identified in the Landscape Analysis but not pursued as an opportunity · Confirm additional naturalization plantings · Show proposed trail design and blocks	1. Proposed connection to the Georgian Trail should be removed and replaced with a connection to the trail on the SWM pond parcel to the west which connects to the Georgian Trail. The purpose is to rationalize and limit connections to the Georgian Trail. 2. Proposed trail block south on the western side of the subject lands should be expanded to 6m. This is a trail width consistent with the trail guidelines of the municipality allowing for vehicular and maintenance access, a 3 m travel surface and drainage on 1.5 m on either side. 3. Drainage swayle should be moved off the trail lands and onto private property with provisions to protect the trail against wash outs and drainage impacts. Any drainage works to address flooding or otherwise shall be on private property – see the flood risk assessment, stormwater management and grading plans which show works on proposed public property adjacent to proposed lots. 4. Landscape plantings to reduce visual impact of the development on the Georgian Trail user experience should be applied regardless of compensation plantings and compensation plantings for loss of significant woodland should be primarily for ecological purposes and not be applied solely for visual/aesthetic purposes.	ETi: The proposed trail connection from the development to the Georgian Trail has been removed and replaced with a trail connection to the adjacent SWM facility, as requested by the Town. ETi: Through discussions with the Town the proposed trail block on the western side of the property has been omitted. ETi: Drainage easements have been accomodated on lots 1 , 4 to 19, and 31. ETi: Landscape plantings have been provided between the maintenance access corridor and proposed development in order to reduce views of the development from the Georgian Trail. The intent is to use larger supply size of trees, as well as coniferous trees to enhance this location. Refer to the Lanscape Analysis for additional information.

16	SWM · Confirm stormwater works are adequate for the site · Confirm that adequate capacity has been built into SWM conveyance to accommodate expected development in lands to the south including future stormwater pond and to convey Stormwater to the bay · Confirm if storm laterals will be part of design.	See engineering comments below Confirm water being managed on site and no off site impacts Swayle shown on drawings not referenced in Draft Plan	Tatham. The Stormwater Management Report confirms the proposed Stormwater Management Plan for the site is adequate. The Eden Oak Regional SWMF was not designed to receive drainage from lands to the south of this development and therefore conveyance of drainage from those lands is not required.
17	Master Drainage Plan · Confirm that the proposed works comply with the Master Drainage Plan. Note that this includes the watercourse within the Georgian Trail		Storm laterals are proposed. Tatham. The proposed works comply with the Master Drainage Plan and the regional stormwater management plan outlined in the Eden Oak SWM Report.
18	Water and Sewer works & capacity + fire flow · Project contemplates relocation of the main trunk sewer and lifting and relocation of the related easement in favour of the Town. Further discussion on how this undertaking is proposed is required, · Craigleith wastewater treatment plant with upgrades is nearing or at capacity. Confirmation of timing and availability of capacity required. · Fire flow pressure needs to be confirmed – Eden Oak work is demonstrating some challenges and concerns these could impact water supply for this property	See water and wastewater comments below.	Tatham - responses provided below.
19	Park Design · Please consider removing lots 52 & 53 to create a more accessible park entrance - No or inadequate response · Please provide a park design including landscaping, trail connections and have appropriate consideration for related Parkland siting and design policies in the Official Plan - Not reviewed · Parkland calculation needs to be updated based on extent of hazard lands identified in Natural Hazards Assessment · Include trail design concept, planting, programming details etc.	See landscape analysis and parks comments above No or limited response provided to these comments or the related policies of D6.3.1 regarding park design, suitability of lands etc.	ETi: Since the last submission the park frontage was increased by approximately 4.5m. Refer to the comments above and Landscape Analysis regarding the parkland siting criteria.
20	OPA, ZBA and SUB · Please review the OPA, ZBA and SUB to ensure consistency and accuracy in the requested approvals across these documents and relative to the supporting studies. · The documents are not currently matching · Hazard lands to be reviewed and detailed · Public park/Open space to be reviewed and detailed · Revise density calculations and development areas	Documents continue to be uncoordinated Apparent swayle on the south side (lots 11-30) not referenced on subdivision plan. Confirm its status as an easement or separate block. Parkland block not delineated and calculated separately from Open Space Block	Draft Plan updated and Park Block identified. Drainage swale by way of easement. Reference Plan provided.
21	High water table & Bedrock conditions 1. The Geotech advises of high water table conditions. The town requires that the basements be at least 1 m above highest groundwater level or no basements at all. It is observed also that there are bedrock conditions. Please confirm the implications of these conditions on other parts of this applications and address any issues or implications through related engineering studies and also on urban design, relative to increased height perception, environmental impacts etc. Outstanding 2. Dewatering may be required which may have impacts on the adjacent wetland and natural features and functions and requires more study. Outstanding 3. Perpetual pumping of water through sump pumps is energy intensive and not supported by the Town Outstanding 4. A hydrogeology study was identified as required by the Geotechnical study but not provided.	These items were not addressed See comments above re: fill throughout	See Geotechnical Report and Hydrogeological Report.
22	PJR · Needs to be updated throughout based on comments. Please see suggested content updates below and also please cross reference with content above · OPA, ZBA and SUB need to be made consistent between the documents and also revised to address additional application content · Confirm extent of Hazard lands and status and implications of watercourse setback · Planning Act Section 2 - Sustainability and conservation commentary is not responsive to that directive – consider measures like addressing high water table conditions with avoidance of perpetual pumping, solar orientation, and profiling other measures more aligned with that criterion · Please correct references that are suggestive of a condo approach to development of these lands · Address housing mix, supply and need by referencing the Town’s Housing Needs Assessment · Note dependency on Eden Oak and related draft plan revision requirement to establish access to public road and also with respect to timing · Reference trail connection information as requested above · Provide additional development context including lands to the south and indicate implications on development planning i.e. SWM servicing, sanitary capacities, water flows, street network, cul de sac · Reference urban design analysis/brief and community design review as noted above to inform development design and streetscape (public/private interface) · Confirm parkland status (amount) and design – block location, size, programming, trail connections	1. See comments above and new comments below re: parkland, urban design, natural heritage 2. Explain specifically how the new road construction connecting over Eden Oak lands to Street A will occur 3. Demonstrate and confirm how stormwater is being managed, retained and conveyed on-site and does not negatively impact the surrounding lands or properties	1. Landscape Analysis has been updated and Urban Design report has been provided by G. Williams. Further, an updated EIS, TPP and Compensation Plan has been provided. 2. An agreement to allow for construction of the road in advance of Trailhead is being resolved between Rhemm Properties and Eden Oak. A draft condition is anticipated to include this to be provided by the Town. The agreement is underway, but includes cost sharing - so is taking further time to finalize. 3. Tatham - Refer to SWM report.

23	New Comments	
24	ZBA proposes D27:D37to lift the H on lands wihtin 120 m whereas the H is only lifted on permit issuance from GSCA see 10.2.1 Holding provision h1 - Lands Adjacent to Wetland Zone	Second Submission - Response (March 2026) Understood. Application has been made and Town can consider when appropriate.
25	Looks like swayle on the trail lands Swayle needs to be on private land Confirm that grading at the rear of lots 1 & 5-11 does not impact the trail What is the mechansim for making improvement to the existing interceptor ditch at the south limit of the Eden Oak development?	Tatham - The swale along the western site limit is within the development lands within an easement dedicated to the lot owners. A trail at this location is no longer a requirement of the Town. An Agreement to allow for the construction of the ditch improvements is being resolved between Rhemm Properties and Eden Oak.
26	Draft OPA OPA is incomplete as the Wetland and Hazard boundaries are being revised. This needs to be referenced. Significant woodlands are being removed and compensated for on-site Percentage calculation of Open space relative to requirements of the RRA is 41.1% not 48.13% - Additional non-useable lands over the 40% currently shown as parkland (eastern portion and non-useable additinoal open space should be added to RRA open space dedication and parkland provided separately.	OPA Updated to include language of Wetland Boundary being re-defined as per technical work. Open Space calculations and parkland dedication updated.
27	Draft Plan 1. Park Block is not clearly delineated on the plan. Proposed park shown on concept drawing shows portion of park with no apparent usefulness or programming at east end of development. Proposed parkland also conflicts with recommendations in EIS for access limitations in this areas. 2. Block 54 Open Space and Wetland do not address the RRA policy re: Open Space and Parkland policy re: Open Space and Hazard Lands 3. Show park block, show open space (40%) separately 4. Walkway Block needs to be expanded to 6 m 5. What is the land holding mechanism to secure the cul de sac at the end of Street A - How are the adjacent proeprties impacted. Please advise of any applicable easement s 6. What is the purpose of the Open Space area south of Block 31? Is it a walkway block? 7. Proposed trail appaers to conflict with proposed swale 8. 1 ft reserves not properly labeled - should be 57&58 not 56 & 57 - 56 is the walkway block 9. Schedule indicates 53 single detached residential - understand the proposal is 47 singles and 6 semi detached lots. Correct schedule to show what proposed lots are intended for each type	1. Park Block is a Part on the Draft Plan. 2. The Landsapce Concept seperates the Wetland, Hazard and Open Space areas. 3. Open Space and Parkland Calculations shown on Landscape Concept and Landscape Analysis. 4. Walkway deleted. 5. Reference Plan provided for Cul de sac lands. Easement provided to Town. 6. Area used for servicing. 7. Trail identified as per discussions with Town. 8. Updated. 9. Updated.
28	Reference Plan Need one that identifies the easements and their purpose	Reference plan provided for easement.
29	Water and Wastewater This development may require an additional gateway installation to allow for remote water meter reading. They may have to consider a propagation study to see if our existing gateway can read in that area	Tatham - acknowledged. To be addressed at detailed engineering in support of development agreement.
30	Urban Design Report Park block is not defined and a request to increase the width of the access by removing one lot has not been addressed. The project analysisi indicates that not more than 50% of the façade is dedicated to garages whereas the renderings show in excess of 50% of the facade dedicated to garage	See UDR prepared by Williams Architect.
31	Please provide a grahic and commentary demonstrating the driveway locations and how these are grouped & designed these to maximize viability of onstreet parking i.e, create viable on street spaces that don't overhang or block driveways.	Tatham - Driveway locations are shown on the engineering drawings and have been "paired" where possible to maximize potential areas for on-street parking.
32	PJR p.2 Removal of the H1 appears to be premature pending issuance of a permit by GSCA which is the established threshold 10.2.1 SITE-SPECIFIC OR AREA-SPECIFIC HOLDING PROVISIONS Holding Provision (h1) – Lands Adjacent to Wetland Zone The Holding (h1) provision applying to lands within 120.0 metres of the Wetland (W) Zone and those lands within 30 metres of Locally Significant Wetlands. The Holding (h1) may be lifted if a Development Permit and/or exemption has been obtained from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, an approval has been obtained from the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority or Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, and provided the proposed development will not have a negative impact on the wetland and its associated ecological functions. Any development application that requires a building permit within the area shown as subject to this Hold shall be required to submit this assessment, with the following exceptions: 1. Reconstruction or replacement of existing dwellings; and, 2. Additions and alterations to existing dwellings provided that the additions or alterations are not located closer to the feature than the existing dwelling.	Acknowledged. The application can be processed when appropriate.
33	PJR p.6 Proposed draft plan does not demarcate park block. Town requested revision to park block by increasing the entrance width which would require removal of one of the proposed lots. Area described on Envision Tatham concept plan and landscape plan appears to combine park space and opne space without defined a discrete park block. PLease define block and reference the applicable policies, increase the width by dropping one of the lots. Also nopte that parkland dedication is not to include hazard land. PLease review teh policies of teh RRA Open space requirements and the parkland dedication policies.	ETi: Refer to comments above regarding a defined park block and increased frontage width. The Landscape Analysis adresses the park block and future amenity options in consideration of the overall development, without the reduction in lot numbers.

34	PJR p6 Existing Sanitary trunk main is located within the 30 m wetland buffer and impacts restoration opportunities. Proposed new alignment of the sanitary trunk main falls wihtin both the wetland buffer and the watercourse buffer also limiting restoaration options. The total impact of the site excavation and development doesnt appear to be coordinated across documents No detail is provided on the amount of fill required to provide for basements and the proposed grading does not appaer to address the variation in grade between lots and the existing grade on town owned land.	Excavation limits are shown on the engineering drawings. Imported fill is required to raise the site to provide separation of basement slabs from the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation. Raising of the site was not governed by being able to provide a gravity sanitary sewer connection to basements. Sufficient grading information is provided on the engineering drawings to demonstrate the variation in grade between the lots and the existing grade on town owned land.
35	PJR p.7 the preference of the Town is for the relocation of the water and wastewater servicing into the road system	Tatham - Meeting with Town was held on Nov. 26, 2025. It was resolved the preferred sewer alignment behind Lots 32 through 53 within the Open Space block is acceptable to the Town subject to providing a maintenance access road and resolving a few other minor comments at final design.
36	PJR p. 7 Trail on western edge of proeprty should be 6 m. Georgian trail connection should be through to Eden Oak trail access over SWM pond. Drainage swayles and flood mitiagation works should be removed from the propsoed town lands and placed on private property. Park block has not been defined. Park is not distiguished from Open space under RRA. Open space area in the Landscae Analysis is not usable area. Landscape analysis should include landscaping opportunities on the Town owned lands in the Georgian Trail ROW. Landscaping for visual barrier should be distiongished from and be secondary to compensation plantings for ecological/natural heritage purposes. Additional plantings should be provided to enhance the Georgian Trail visual buffer as appropriate.	ETi: The park block has been defined on the draft plan as Block 56. Refer to land-use schedule on the draft plan for additional information. ETi: The existing Georgian Trail corrdidor along the site is heavily vegetated. With the trail , the mown maintenance strip, existing vegetation, and the existing watercourse, there is little room for additional planting along the Georgian Trail. ETi: Modifications to the compensation planting that go above and beyond the requirements (i.e., supply size of plant material) have been incorporated to enhance the visual buffer of the development.
37	PJR p.8 the Local OPA is also required to alter the boundaries of the Hazard and Wetland designations	Acknowledged. Standard process that an amendment would update the natural heritage mapping to reflect the EIS mapping.
38	PJR p.8 the ZBA also revises the wetland zoning boundary and introduces a hazard land zone PJR p. 9-12 a) additional information is required regarding the design and implementation of the subdivision, specifically around the hydrogeological impact, long term dewatering, the amount of fill required and impact on the wetlands. The EIS does not appear to have included review of the hydrogeopological study. Note also question of whether the compensation provides equivalent natural heritage fundtion to that of teh proposed signficiant woodlands to be removed, encroachment into wetland and watercourse buffers by existing and propsoed services c/e) note potential perpetual pumping requirements due to proposed construction within the high watertable d) no clearances or engagement with indigenous communities has been documented f) further detail is required on how the road network connection will be made from Eden Oak to this devleopment, who will be responsible, what are teh mechanisms and agreements h) the landscape analysis doesnt delineate parkland clearly, a response to the request to increase the visibility of the opening to the park was not responded to, there are areas of open space that appear to be of limited use and conflict with hazard land and wetland setbacks j) ADUs are contingent on basements being viable. requested information on the extent of fill and implications for project design not provided. i) the project contemplates duplication of sanitary and water services through connection to the services that run through the easement and replication of services in the street network whereas the Town prefers that the services be relocated to the street network and the lands subject to the current easement which include wetland buffer be remediated m) the Town is awaiting GSCA comments p) note issues above r) note concerns about parkland, open space, servicing location, community design, coordination of technical submission content	Birks did review the hydrogeological report. c/e) See updated FSR. d) Engagement was completed. SON clearance obtained. New Stage 1-2 underway for West End. Loft Planning has had discussions with Town staff on this item. Expected that the Stage 1-2 MCM Clearance will be required as a condition of Draft Approval. f) See PJR and FSR/TIS. h) ETi. Refer to responses above and the Landscape Analysis for parkland delination and open space requirements. j) See FSR. l) See FSR. m) Received. Comments included in this Chart. p) See above. r) Understood.
39	PJR p 13 by Loft indicates proposed pricing of 1,050,000 for singles and \$850,000 for semis whereas Housing needs assessment by Parcel indicates proposed pricing of 1,300,000 for singles and 1,000,000 for semis. Please confirm the proposed pricing and provide an inidcation of how this pricing addresses financial capacity for housing	Terrabrooke Building Response: The proposed pricing for this project is \$1,050,000 for single-detached units and \$850,000 for semis. The Housing Needs Assessment states that the \$1,300,000 for single-detached units and \$1,000,000 for semis, is the average owner-estimated value in the TBM. The proposed pricing for this project is well below the average pricing in the TBM (approximtely 15-20% lower), which makes this project more accessible than the average comparable home in TBM.

The majority of single-detached units will be designed to accommodate an ADU. ADU's will be promoted and encouraged at the pre-construction stage. Purchasers will be shown that an ADU will be more cost-effective when purchased before construction, rather than after closing.

The option to accommodate an ADU on the single-detached lots enhances housing options available, by creating smaller unit sizes. ADU's will also increase the affordable rental housing stock, which is a local need. The estimate to rough-in for a future ADU is \$2,000 on a walk-out lot (Lots 32-53) and \$4,500 on a non-walk-out lot. The estimate for a finished ADU is \$86,000. With a rental income of \$2,400/month for an ADU, the cost recovery/payback will be approximately 36 months. The Housing Needs Study states "Based on an analysis by Parcel an additional \$2,400 per month in rental income is equivalent to reducing the income required to carry a mortgage by \$96,000 per year, assuming that 30% of income goes towards housing (including mortgage, utilities and property taxes). This shows that additional revenue from ADUs makes home ownership viable to a wider range of incomes in the town."

40	PJR p 13 Are the ADUs viable given site conditions? Is the amount of fill that would be required to contain basements appropriate? In the event that the proposed fill is imported and the site raised, would the lotting and home design change to increase lot size and propose a lower building?	Proposed site conditions make ADUs viable. The total amount of fill required to raise the site is considered to be typical of a residential development. Earth modeling has been completed and the amount of fill required to raise the site for grading purposes is estimated to be about 27,000 cubic meters, which averages about 1 m across the residential lots and internal roads.
41	PJR p 13 - proposed permanent dewatering required permanent pumping which consumes energy and is not a sustainable feature	It is not possible to lower the site further given the Town standards for minimum required separation of 0.5 m between the underside of basement floor slabs and the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation. Refer to responses above regarding perpetual pumping. Refer to responses above regarding the amount of fill required for the development.
42	PJR p13 The proposed subdivision design appears to require significant amounts of fill that have not been studied as part of the related impacts in order to provide basements. It is not clear that the lands are suitable for basements or that the related constraints have been fully assessed	
43	PJR p 15 reference to NEC policy re: energy consumption being met whereas the proposal appears to contemplate perpetual pumping of groundwater. Conclusions re: EIS need to be assessed relative to any relevant findings of hydrogeology study and the requirement to assess alternatives before concluding removal of the significant feature and compensation is appropriate.	
44	PJR p 16 re: NEC policy re: compatibility d) The Town is not in possession of any clearance from SON regarding archaeological assessment of these lands. Please see SON comments b) Note GSCA comments re: flood plain filling e) note perpetual pumping is not advisable f) see GSCA comments	
45	PJR p 17 re: ADUs - confirm the viability of basement construction and also confirm the relative accessibility and target markets of the proposed price points with the housing needs assessment of the Town of The Blue Mountains	Refer to responses above regarding perpetual pumping. The Birks NHC EIS Update (Birks NHC, 2026) provides a review of the technical conclusions regarding hydrogeology and potential groundwater impacts including any hydrogeology impacts to the adjacent wetland and watercourse. See above notes on Archaeology. A Stage 1-2 Archaeology is currently underway and this is anticipated to be required as a Draft Condition. SON was contacted and provided comments, and will be contacted again as part of this second report. GSCA comments responded to below. Terrabrooke Building Response: The proposed pricing for this project is \$1,050,000 for single-detached units and \$850,000 for semis. The Housing Needs Assessment states that the \$1,300,000 for single-detached units and \$1,000,000 for semis, is the average owner-estimated value in the TBM. The proposed pricing for this project is well below the average pricing in the TBM (approximately 15-20% lower), which makes this project more accessible than the average comparable home in TBM.
		The majority of single-detached units will be designed to accommodate an ADU. ADU's will be promoted and encouraged at the pre-construction stage. Purchasers will be shown that an ADU will be more cost-effective when purchased before construction, rather than after closing.
		The option to accommodate an ADU on the single-detached lots enhances housing options available, by creating smaller unit sizes. ADU's will also increase the affordable rental housing stock, which is a local need. The estimate to rough-in for a future ADU is \$2,000 on a walk-out lot (Lots 32-53) and \$4,500 on a non-walk-out lot. The estimate for a finished ADU is \$86,000. With a rental income of \$2,400/month for an ADU, the cost recovery/payback will be approximately 36 months. The Housing Needs Study states "Based on an analysis by Parcel an additional \$2,400 per month in rental income is equivalent to reducing the income required to carry a mortgage by \$96,000 per year, assuming that 30% of income goes towards housing (including mortgage, utilities and property taxes). This shows that additional revenue from ADUs makes home ownership viable to a wider range of incomes in the town."
46	PJR p. 18 see previous comments re: EIS, flood plain, hydrogeology etc.	See updated EIS. Trail deleted as per discussions with Town. No. Please disregard. This was referencing any peer reviews by County or Town.
47	PJR p 18 Note re: width of trail - preferred per town trail standards at 6 m	
48	PJR p 19 - #6reference is made to peer review of the technical reports - the Town is not in possession of peer reviews of the technical reports. Are there submissions that are intended but haven't been made?	
49	PJR p 19 #7 no parkland block is indicated	
50	PJR p 19 #8 Are basements viable given implications of extent of fill required, high water table, high surface bedrock etc	ETI: The park block has been defined on the draft plan as Block 56. Refer to land-use schedule on the draft plan for additional information. Refer to responses above regarding the amount of fill required for the development. The Trailshead development is a residential development located immediately to the west of the subject site and through which the subject site will have access to Lakeshore Road. This was contemplated as part of the OLT hearing for the Trailshead development. The developer's agents are now negotiating a Memorandum of Understanding. These discussions include access, cost sharing related to the Shared Regional SW facility and the Rhemm development providing a secondary water supply to Trailshead (via Street A). Further, Rhemm has indicated that it will install the necessary water system on Trailshead lands that will provide connection from MacCleod Drive to Street A. This will be provided to the Town as soon as available. We would note that Engineering is aware of these discussions on secondary water supply connectivity as it was a suggesting of Town staff. We expect that access connection will be a requirement of the Draft Plan Conditions as each of the developments move forward through the planning approvals and registration processes.
51	PJR p.19 # 11 Please confirm how the road connection between Eden Oak and subject lands will be constructed and coordinated.	
52	PJR p.20 #6 bullet 4 - proposal appears to require perpetual pumping which is not consistent with good energy conservation practices	Refer to responses above regarding perpetual pumping.

53	PJR p25 trails and services would not require an exception to the Hazard land designation				We have left this Section in the Amendment. Recent OLT hearing for Blue Blrch did require this site speciic exception. Should Staff continue to opine it is not necessary we can provide an updated Amendment. Please just let K. Loft know and she can provide ASAP. Noting the site works are anticipated to be completed prior to the lands being conveyed to Town.
54	PJR p. 25 the landscape analysis did not address the policy content of 6.3 with respect to park design - the elongated park design if it is understood that the park is to contemplate all the green open space area is of limited use as parkland - generating more housing units does not constitute a sufficient analysis to satisfy parkland design criteria				ETi: Refer to the Landscape Anaysis regarding the parkland siting criteria. The Landscape Analysis also adresses the park block and future amenity options in consideration of the overall development, without the reduction in lot numbers.
55	PJR p.25 trail width and conflict with grading and drainage plans				Refer to responses above related to trail block and drainage. This trail has been removed as per discussions with staff and relocated to a east west trail connection.
56	PJR p.25 significant woodland removal has to be demonstrated relative to alternatives and the proposed compensation planting has to demonstrate no net loss.				See EIS and Compensation Plan. Birks has been in discussions with County.
57	PJR p.26 project appaers to contemplate perpetual pumping which runs counter to energy conservation and efficeincy measures				Refer to responses above regarding perpetual pumping.
58	PJR p 27 note various comments within the pre-consultation that have not been addressed				Noted. Please see updated reports and comment matrix.
59	PJR p 29 re: 2025 OP - landscape analysis does not distinguish between ecological planting and visual buffer planting - the primary purpose of compensation planting should be for an ecological purpose				ETi: Modifications to the compensation planting that go above and beyond the requirements (i.e., supply size of plant material) have been incorporated to enhance the visual buffer of the development.
60	PJR p 29 trail connection should be rationalized with the access from Eden Oak to limit access points to the Georgian Trail				ETi: as requested by the Town, the trail connection from the development to the Georgian Trail has been removed. The Georgian Trail will be accessed through the Eden Oak development and regional SWM pond facility.
61	PJR p29 Please see Natural Heritage, Landscape Analysis, Landscaping, Housing comments throughout Note re: tree canopy that landscape plantings within the subdivision also contribute to tree canopy and landscape standards should be referenced				ETi: Refer to responses above.
62	PJR - please include reference to lighting and mitigation of impacts on natural areas.				
63	PJR 32 - Note comments re: proposed H site specific and removal of H1 provision				Please refer to the EIS Update (Birks NHC, 2026). Further, Engineering Standards outline requirements for street lighting and dark sky compliance. Acknowledged.
69	p 35 of EIS (no reference to the hydrogeological study as a source)No assessment of the related impacts/risks. p 5,7 FSR (no reference to the hydrogeological study as a source) No assessment of the related impacts. Unclear conclusion as to how construction will be undertaken p. 14 Excavation of bedrock will presumably be required for proposed relocation of the sanitary and water services, (either in whole to the street network or in part through relocation within the Hazard lands) and for utilities and infrtastructure within the proposed ROW. SWM (no reference to hydrogeological study as a source) All these documents appear to have overlooked or not incorporated the findings of the hydrogeological study which identifies required excavation for services, basements (p7), dewatering and a zone of influence with potential risks. Please note the potential impacts of construction activity on wetlands, wells, woodlands and address this in advance of approval The Town does not support the perpetual pumping of groundwater. The full extent of fill placement, any site excavation and the related implications have not been assesed. p. 18 Note also hydrogeology study indicates that subsurface rock may be limestone but that no tests had been completed to determine whether or not it that is the case. p7 of hydrogeological report identifies risk of basement and services excavation to wells and residences. Please confirm the ri woodlands, watercourse and wetlands within the zone of influence and that there are no impacts	10. The zone of influence for any conceptual temporary dewatering wells or dewatering array used during construction for the proposed housing basement structure construction could reach a maximum of 22.3 m away from the dewatering array or sump pit wells. Based on the records review, there are two (2) records (MECP Well Id: 2507059 and 2507060) for private water supply wells, wooded areas, watercourses or wetlands which are present within the conceptual zone of influence for any temporary construction dewatering. Also, the subject site is located in partially developed area, which is bordered by existing residential buildings and Georgian Trail which could potentially be affected by ground settlement associated with the conceptual zone of influence for any temporary construction dewatering. 11. Due to the presence underlying saturated sand and gravel deposit, some long-term permanent foundation drainage is anticipated for the housing basement structures pronosed below the groundwater table. The permanent drainage rates will be	The zone of influence for any conceptual temporary dewatering wells or dewatering array used during construction for the proposed housing basement structure construction and or underground services installation could reach a maximum of 22.3 m away from the dewatering array or sump pit wells. Based on the records review, there are two (2) records (MECP Well Id: 2507059 and 2507060) for private water supply wells, wooded areas, watercourses or wetlands which are present within the conceptual zone of influence for any temporary construction dewatering. Also, the subject site is located in partially developed area, which is bordered by existing residential buildings and the Georgian Trail which could	Tatham: See enclosed FSR and Hydrogeological reports.	
70	TIS p 10 Town does not support a hammerhead. Please redesign with cul de sac.				Tatham - the proposed temporary hammerhead has been substituted with a temporary cut-de-sac, refer to updated TIS.
71	TIS p 11 Study does not address on-street parking permission on one side only for fire access purposes and parking spaces should be optimized through the design and location of driveways to create viable on street spaces that do not block driveways				Tatham - Town standard drawing 4.8.2.A provides for parking on both sides of the roads. Refer to responses above regarding driveways.
72					A Stage 1-2 Archaeological Report was prepared by Amick Archaeological Consultants in October 10, 2022. W. Fitzgerald on behalf of SON provided comments on November 16, 2022 to MCM, which did include comments but did provide a clearance on the report. Following that, sometime passed prior to Rhemm receiving notification that MCM was requiring further information from Amick. Following discussions with Amick, Rhemm has retained a new archaeological consultant to complete a completely new Stage 1-2 Archaeological Study on the West End. We are now awaiting this work to be completed. The consultant has been retained to also complete additional contact with Indigenous communities. We have discussed this situation with planning staff and understand that the requirement for the Stage 1-2 Archaeological Study and MCM Clearance will be a required Draft Condition.
	Archaeological Study - no reference to consultation with indigenous communities is provided. Please confirm contact with indigenous communities.				

73	Concept Plan - does not define park block - please define park block and address comments regarding location, frontage, usability. Please review Town policies regarding parkland and Open Space requiriements in the Residential Recreational Designation, replace mhammerhead with cul de sac, Town's preference is to relocate servicing corridor into road network whereas current proposal shows servicing in hazard lands, within watercoiurse setback and existing services are located within wetland setback	Acknowledged. See updated Draft Plan, PJR and Landscape Analysis and Landscape Concept Plan.
74	Draft Plan - please revise to show park block that meets Town policies and responds to Town comments, revise land descriptions in schedule to reflect additional detail, revise blocks to references related policies, revise walkway block width to 6 m	Acknowledged. See updated Draft Plan, PJR and Landscape Analysis and Landscape Concept Plan.
75	Housing needs report: Please provide greater detail on the certainty and pricing of proposed ADU units to demonstrate how their take-up by prospective purchasers might be increased. How do price points at 1.3 million and 1.0 million PJR p 13 by Loft indicates proposed pricing of 1,050,000 for singles and \$850,000 for semis whereas Housing needs assessment by Parcel indicates proposed pricing of 1,300,000 for singles and 1,000,000 for semis. Please confirm the proposed pricing and provide an inidcation of how this pricing addresses financial capacity for housing. Please explain the 24% and 18% increases respectively. Other than diversification of housing stock to include the semis please advise how the project addresses attainability. Please be specific and provide additional information that explains how housing in the 1-1.3 million dollar range addresses local needs. Same comment regarding projected rents. Please provide estimates of the additional charges for finished and roughed in ADUs and indicate cost recovery/payback to overall purchase price along with demonstration oh how the home itself becomes more financially viable. Please demonstrate how proposed pricing will increase availability of housing to workers in the hospitality sector.	Terrabrooke Building Response: The proposed pricing for this project is \$1,050,000 for single-detached units and \$850,000 for semis. The Housing Needs Assessment states that the \$1,300,000 for single-detached units and \$1,000,000 for semis, is the average owner-estimated value in the TBM. The proposed pricing for this project is well below the average pricing in the TBM (approximtely 15-20% lower), which makes this project more accessible than the average comparable home in TBM. The majority of single-detached units will be designed to accommodate an ADU. ADU's will be promoted and encouraged at the pre-construction stage. Purchasers will be shown that an ADU will be more cost-effective when purchased before construction, rather than after closing. The option to accommodate an ADU on the single-detached lots enhances housing options available, by creating smaller unit sizes. ADU's will also increase the affordable rental housing stock, which is a local need. The estimate to rough-in for a future ADU is \$2,000 on a walk-out lot (Lots 32-53) and \$4,500 on a non-walk-out lot. The estimate for a finished ADU is \$86,000. With a rental income of \$2,400/month for an ADU, the cost recovery/payback will be approximately 36 months. The Housing Needs Study states "Based on an analysis by Parcel an additional \$2,400 per month in rental income is equivalent to reducing the income required to carry a mortgage by \$96,000 per year, assuming that 30% of income goes towards housing (including mortgage, utilities and property taxes). This shows that additional revenue from ADUs makes home ownership viable to a wider range of incomes in the town."
76	p.8 landscape analysis. Please correct walkway block to demosntrate 6m width in accordance with Town trail guidelines,	ETi: as per discussions with the Town and Tatham Engineering, the walkway and drainage block have been omitted. Drainage measures are proposed on private property through a drainage easement.
77	p. 8 landscape analysis Please correct drawing to distinguish between park block and Open Space requirements both relative to the applicable Official plan policies	ETi: The park block has been defined on the draft plan as Block 56, which is also reflected in the Landscape Concept.
78	p.6 landscape analysis indicates a park block - no park block has been described in the concept plan on p.8, in the draft plan or concept plan. Park land is described as including hazard land. Policy D6.2.8 Lands not accepted excludes hazard land s from parkland dedication and lands which are part of any open space. Please review these and related policies and revise. Please also review policy D6.3.1 and consider all the criteria (criteria cited in report do not appear to reference criteria in D6.3.1) including but not limited to increased street frontage also per town comments and note the lack of usefulness and visibility of much of the proposed open space areas. Proposed structures are in open space area and would be permitted but those lands are not classified as parkland for dedication purposes or part of a parkland block.	ETi: Refer to responses above.
79	p.7 landscape analysis compensation planting would be primarily for ecological purposes and only secondarily for visual and aesthetic buffer. Please consider additional plantings within the Georgian Trail where opporunities exist to further enhance the buffer and the trail user experience.	ETi: Refer to responses above.
80	p.8 landscape analysis. Appears to show park that includes hazard and open space lands and is not a dedicated block. Please revise and note comments above.	ETi: Refer to responses above.
81	p.10 landscape analysis makes note of confomrity with hydrogeological features	ETi: Refer to responses above.
82	note peer reviewer comments on offsetting and the related policies of the County plan.	ETi: Refer to responses above.
83	p.11 landscape analysis fails to mention that the proposed realignment of the sewer and water service would encroach on the 30 m watercourse setback. Also the creation of a trail in this area appears to conflict with the remediation objectives of the EIS. It would be preferable to relocate the services into the street network, fully rehabilitate the area and remove proposed and existing encroachments into the watercourse and wetland setbacks respectively	ETi: Refer to responses above.
84	p.11 landscape analysis -Any plantings for compensation should serve a primary ecological purpose if it can be demonstrated that removal of the significant woodalnds is justified - additional non-compensation planting should be specified where applicable to reduce the visual impact of the development on the Georgian Trail including within the Georgian Trail where there are planting opportunities. Enhancement measures should include landscape plantings to effect visual buffers where compensation plantings are not necessarily appropriate for such objectives	ETi: Refer to responses above.
85	p. 11 landscape analysis - trail connections does not reference the proposed north south trail connection. That trail does not meet the Town's minimum width requirement and conflicts with a proposed drainage swayle which should be relocated to private property. Similarly flood works proposed in lands proposed to be conveyed to the Town should be relocated to private property.	ETi: Refer to mitigation measures in the landscape analysis.
86	p.12 landscape analysis Explain how plantings will function as a physical barrier to watercourse and wetland setbacks and explain how remediation given the encroachments of the services both existing and proposed are managed where the service corridor would be open. The encroachments shown are significant and impact the buffer area. Also, the report indicates the intent to retain trail access in this area.	See updated Engineering Plans and Compensation Plan.
87	p 11 UDR the proposed and existing servicing encroach into the 30 m watercourse setback and the 30 m wetland buffer with the latter being a signifcant encroachment and both presenting a constraint on the restoration, naturalization options and represetnign a significant disturbance in these areas. Town prefers relocation of services into street network which would facilitatew	Hammerhead replaced with cul-de-sac.
88	p11 UDR Town does not support a hammerhead. Please replace with a cul de sac p11 UDR please provide on street parking plan (one side only) and show driveways oriented to optimize on street parking spaces	Driveways are shown on the engineering drawings.

105					Refer to enclosed (revised) hydrogeological study.
	p 8 Hydrogeoplogical Study Town policy does not support permanent de-watering and construction of basements in the watertable The extent of proposed fill appears significant and not accounted for in the overall analysis of related environmental and visual impacts		Due to the presence underlying saturated sand and gravel deposits, some long-term permanent foundation drainage system is anticipated for the proposed housing basement structures that are being proposed below the groundwater table. The permanent dewatering flow rates will be calculated once the final design drawings become available for our review.		
			BH/MW locations were considered as the FFE. Also, as confirmed by the client the proposed housing basement structures will not extend into the bedrock. The construction dewatering flows were estimated and completed for the proposed underground, housing basement structures, with the details presented as follows:		
106	Hydrogeology study and supplemental test pits Have a sufficiently wide range of boreholes been drilled and tested to address proximity of the proposed lots 31-53 to the wetland?				Refer to enclosed (revised) geotechnical investigation and hydrogeological reports.
107	p7 Flood Assessment Proposed southern swale appears to be located off the subject property on the lands to the south. Swale to the west appears to be located on adjacent lands and it also on lands proposed to be dedicated to the Town.				The west and south swales have been graded within the subject property.
108	p4 Flood Assessment proposed fill in the Regional flood assessment area - Are the lots of 31-53 not being raised significantly How is the variation in grade going to be handled with what appears to be 5 m of fill?		The grade along the rear of lots 52-46 will be raised to a minimum of 182.20 m to prevent flood inundation from encroaching onto these properties and provide freeboard from the rear of these lots to the maximum flood elevation. This raised grading will result in a total of approximately 8 m³ of fill being placed below the Regional flood elevation.		Raised grading of lots 52-46 will result in a total of approximately 0.11 m3 of fill being placed below the Regional flood elevation. To support this minor regularization, additional floodplain storage volume will be provided by the ditch which will be graded at the outlet of the 900 mm storm sewer. Lots will be raised as shown on the grading plans included in the engineering drawing set. Refer to drawings SG.1 and SG.2 for details of proposed grading.
109	p5 Flood Assessment Are the cited works on Eden Oak interceptor ditch part of an agreement with Eden Oak?		inundation at the rear of proposed lots 50 and 49. To address local drainage and protect the proposed development from flooding, improvements should be made to the existing interceptor ditch at the south limit of the Eden Oak Development and proposed 900 mm Ø culverts will be installed to convey flow to the SWMF. Site grading will be raised and swales will be provided along the bottom of slope 0.5 m within		To be included in Agreement with Eden Oak.
110	GSCA Comments dated Oct 21 2025				
111	As we have demonstrated above, the current plan is not consistent with the PPS and requires some additional justification and or modification.				Noted. All comments below responded to.
112	Below are the technical comments provided by our engineering services.				
113					
114	Technical Comments				
115	- The Flood Assessment Brief – East Parcel provides the existing flood inundation on the subject property during a Regional Storm event. It indicates that the northerly portion of the property would be flooded by Watercourse 6 and is proposed to remain untouched. However, a decent portion of the southerly portion of the property is inundated from flows spilling from Watercourse 6 or from the tributary of Watercourse 6. It is proposed to raise the portion of the property so that it is no longer inundated. We have the following questions regarding this approach;				See the updated Flood Assessment and Flood Hazard Plan (FH-1), which distinguishes spill areas from floodplain areas. A meeting was held with the GSCA to present how spill area was distinguished from floodplain proper based on water surface profiles.
116	o GSCA Policy does not allow for filling land to create Developable area, which seems to be the proposed approach to allow for Development. However, we acknowledge spills are treated differently. How does the model differentiate between inundation on the property that is from the spill flows versus from Watercourse 6?				See the updated Flood Assessment and Flood Hazard Plan (FH-1), which distinguishes spill areas from floodplain areas. A meeting was held with the GSCA to present how spill area was distinguished from floodplain proper based on water surface profiles.
117	o At minimum, the proposed raising of the grades along rear of Lots 46-52 appears to be in conflict with GSCA Policy regarding raising the grade to allow for Development as it is based on the water level from Watercourse 6, despite only being 8 m3 of fill. Please provide comment on why the filling should be allowed.				Raised grading of lots 52-46 will result in a total of approximately 0.11 m3 of fill being placed below the Regional flood elevation. To support this minor regularization, additional floodplain storage volume (10.6 m3) will be provided by the ditch which will be graded at the outlet of the 900 mm storm sewer.
118	o The Brief indicates that proposed swales on the south and west sides will be proposed to redirect flow around the subject property, once the property is raised. Swales are proposed 0.5m from the property line on the subject property. Please comment on whether a drainage easement will be provided to ensure that the flows can be maintained in the future, and how the Town can ensure the swales will not be blocked by landowners.				Several meetings, discussions, and correspondence with Town staff were had to resolve the preferred arrangement for the proposed drainage swales. The approach presented in this submission (south and west swales within proposed drainage easements), was agreed upon.
119	- The Functional Servicing Report indicates that minor and major flows are to be directed to the Eden Oak SWM Facility. Written permission should be provided to confirm acceptance of the flows by the Eden Oak property owner.				Written permission will be obtained along with permission for other works which require coordination.
120					The proposed swales along the west and south property lines intercept external drainage including a potential flood spill from Watercourse 6. The external drainage and flood spill by-passes the SWMF under existing conditions and the proposed drainage design maintains this condition. The twin 600mm culverts have been revised to a single 900 mm culvert which has sufficient capacity to convey the spill flow. During the Regional Storm event, approximately 0.01 m3/s will overtop the road and be directed to the Eden Oak SWMF. As the SWMF does not provide quantity control, this additional minor inflow is not expected to affect the SWMF performance.
121	Recommendations				

122	Based on the above, the plan requires further refinement to be compliant with PPS. The below recommendations will assist in bringing the Subdivision plan into conformity with the PPS.	See responses above to the recommendations and responses submitted directly to GSCA.
123	1. Revise the plan for lots 46-52 to remove them from the flood plain area to comply with PPS or justify how these lots meet Provincial Policy which prohibits development within a Flood plain.	
124	2. Define the areas of the site that are spill areas and those that are genuinely flood plain.	
125	3. Obtain written permission for acceptance of flows to the Eden Oak swim facility.	
126	4. Clarify why some flows are directed to Watercourse 6 instead of the swm pond.	
127	5. Payment of all outstanding GSCA Fees Respectfully,	Payment has been processed.
128	Clinton Stredwick Environmental Planner	
129	NVCA (September 24 2025)	
130	Thank you for circulating notice of the complete application and public meeting	
131	regarding 372 Grey Road 21. The noted property is outside of NVCA regulatory	
132	boundaries and are under the Grey Sauble Conservation Authority jurisdiction.	
133	Kindly,	
134	Nicole Vankooten BAS, MA (she/her)	
135	Development Review Assistant	
136	Planning Department	
137	County of Grey (September 19 2025)	
138	Staff acknowledge that the proposal has been revised to include an additional unit type (semidetached). The owners of the single detached units will also have an opportunity to establish Accessory Dwelling Units. Staff are satisfied that the proposal meets the intent of the Recreational Resort Settlement Area policies.	See above notes on ADU's and affordability.
	Staff note that the Urban Design Reports indicates that a two-bedroom, basement ADU will be incorporated into most house designs as an option. Is the intent that 23 of the houses (Lots 31-53) will be designed to include separate basement access, to accommodate an ADU? The ADU will be ‘roughed in’ for these 23 units and homeowners will have the option of purchasing an ADU design at time of construction or completing the unit later, if desired?	
139	It appears that the preliminary grading plan (drawing SG01) identifies a proposed swale 0.5m from the property line along the western and southern property boundaries. While the concept plan, EIS, Urban Design Report, and Landscape Analysis identify a 3m wide open space allocation/walkway block along the western property limit to provide future trail connections from the south. Additional clarification is requested from the applicant. Additional comments should also be received from Town staff regarding the proposed width of the trail, as well as the proposed connection to the south and to the Georgian Trail.	Refer to previous responses regarding swale along west property line and elimination of the requirement for a block dedication for future trail.
140	Staff Staff note that a 5.18 metre road widening was requested along the Grey Road 21 frontage by way of consent applications P3166, P3167, and P3168. Provisional consent was granted on April 15, 2024. These lands have not yet been conveyed to the County. Please ensure that a draft R-plan is prepared for staffs review at least 2 months prior to the lapsing date. The plan should be sent to the County’s Transportation Services staff (roads@grey.ca) and Clerks Staff (lacey.thompson@grey.ca). Transportation staff have no concerns with the proposed draft plan of subdivision application.	The East End consents have been registered including the road widenings and trail block conveyances. Receipted as GY285822 on 2026 04 16.
141	The property contains and/or is adjacent to provincially significant wetland, significant woodlands, significant wildlife habitat, potential habitat for threatened and/or endangered species, other wetlands, and fish habitat. It is staffs understanding that the proposed development will be located within and/or adjacent to the features. Staff have reviewed the updated Environmental Impact Study (EIS) submitted by Birks (2025) and find the report generally acceptable.	Noted.

142	Per previous Per previous comments, staff recommended an extension to the tree clearing timing windows per amendments to the Endangered Species Act regarding bat habitat (From Oct 31 to Nov 30), as well as required rehabilitation of the proposed easement areas within 30 meters from a wetland. Additional comments regarding the proposed easement and rehabilitation area is provided below. Please ensure these recommendations are reflected in any future plans/reports. To meet the test of no negative impacts to natural heritage features, the following recommendations per the EIS should be listed as conditions of draft plan approval: 1) Tree clearing shall not occur from April 1 to October 31 to November 1, of any given year, to avoid the migratory bird and bat breeding, nesting, and roosting timelines. 2) Development activities should be contained within the proposed development area. This area should be appropriately delineated prior to beginning grading and construction to ensure that no accidental deviation from the intended removals will occur.	Noted. Please refer to the EIS Update (Birks NHC, 2026), prepared for this submission.
143	3) Equipment maintenance during and post construction should be undertaken in an appropriate area. Tool and vehicle maintenance and cleaning should be done away from the retained natural areas in a manner that does not encourage the movement of cleaning or maintenance products including cleaners, oils or fuel into the neighboring forested and wetland areas. Fuel and chemical storage should follow appropriate legislation to ensure that it is maintained and stored in a way that will not result in accidental release or spills to the neighbouring forested areas, wetland or watercourse.	Noted. Please refer to the EIS Update (Birks NHC, 2026), prepared for this submission.
144	4) Control of potentially contaminated materials (i.e., fill, soil, gravel, excavated materials) moved by equipment during construction is recommended to prevent the spread of invasive plants. This would include inspection and cleaning of all equipment including vehicles, boots, clothing etc. prior to allowing access to the property and prior to leaving the site to prevent the spread of invasive plant species. Given the presence of invasive species on site, particularly populations of European Buckthorn, reutilizing the soils from the site for regrading is not recommended. Removal of the Buckthorn thicket community will serve as an overall benefit to the retained woodland and wetland habitats and significantly reduce introduction pressures within the retained habitats by removing a significant localized seed source.	Noted.

145	5) All development activities shall comply with minimizing erosion and sedimentation and be contained within the proposed development area. It is recommended that sediment and erosion controls along the limits of the development envelope be installed prior to all construction activities. A sediment fence along the development limits will aid in prevention of inadvertent encroachment into areas to be protected. This fence should be kept intact throughout the entire development and monitored to ensure that the barrier remains in good working condition. No development activities (i.e., material and equipment storage, grading, equipment activity) are permitted within the adjacent retained natural areas.	Tatham - Erosion and sediment control plans and details are provided on the engineering plans.
146	6) A fulsome rehabilitation/compensation plan shall be submitted that highlights the proposed tree compensation (969 stems) and invasive species management (1 hectare), mitigation measures, and monitoring requirements. Rehabilitation of the easement area (within 30 meters from wetlands) shall be provided. Please contact ecology@grey.ca to develop a terms of reference for this plan. Additional comments regarding the TIPP are provided below.	Noted. Please refer to the Ecological Compensation Plan (Birks NHC, 2026) prepared for this submission for details pertaining to tree compensation and invasive species management including mitigation and monitoring requirements.
147	Please see comments 7 and 8 above regarding the EIS, and the new comment below regarding the TIPP. Staff have reviewed the wetland delineation and find it acceptable. Please note that any updates to the Provincially Significant Wetland designation on Schedule A of the county Official Plan would occur by way of a future housekeeping amendment.	Noted.
148	Stormwater Stormwater Management: Staff have reviewed the stormwater management reports for both 371 Grey Road 21 (Tatham, 2025) and the adjacent Eden Oak Development to the west (Crozier, 2020) and find the proposed mitigation measures acceptable. The following recommendations derived from the stormwater management report should be listed as conditions of draft plan approval: 1) A detailed sediment and erosion control plan shall be submitted per Section 4 of the report.	Acknowledged.
149	have reviewed the TIPP submitted by Birks (2025) and find the report acceptable. Staff recommend the following conditions be listed as condition of approval: 1) Sediment and erosion control fencing surrounding the perimeter of the development is to remain in place until all site works have been completed and the risk of damage is no longer a concern. 2) Fencing shall be provided in a continuous manner at the edge of the development limit. 3) Sediment and erosion controls along the limits of the protection zone are be installed prior to all construction activities. 4) All fencing is to remain in good condition throughout construction and until vegetation is established post-construction. 5) Signs are to be mounted on the construction side of the tree protection fencing for the duration of the project to identify the development limits and vegetation protection areas. 6) Where the roots of retained trees are exposed within the grade alteration areas, root cuts should be completed quickly and efficiently, completed under the supervision of a qualified professional as per recommendations in Figure 2 of the report. 7) Root cutting, canopy trimming, limb pruning, tree structure enhancement of retained trees is to be	Noted. Please also refer to the Tree Inventory and Protection Plan Update (Birks NHC, 2026) prepared for this submission.

150	Water Water Balance: Staff have reviewed the water balance report provided by Tatham (2025) and find the report generally acceptable. Per the report, two mitigative strategies are proposed to address the annual infiltration and runoff deficit. As such, staff recommend that these strategies are incorporated into the proposal, Page 10 of 13 reflected in the supporting plans, and listed as conditions of draft plan approval: 1) A revised grading plan shall be submitted that further redirects runoff to the wetland complex. 2) Topsoil depths shall be increased to allow for additional infiltration potential.	Tatham 1) The grading has been revised to further re-direct runoff to the wetland complex. The revised grading is illustrated on the grading plans included in the engineering drawing set. 2) The proposed topsoil depth within the wetland infiltration catchment has been further increased in the water balance calculations to increase infiltration potential. The Water Balance letter has been updated considering the above measures and a net surplus of 44 m³ per year is now achieved.
151	Staff note that the Common Buckthorn currently occupies the majority of the site and, as such, the property contains approximately 2.56 hectares of significant woodland. The proportion of Significant Woodland that exists within the proposed development area (~.67 ha) is relatively small compared to the extent of the larger Significant Woodlands area. Staff support that the removal and management of the common buckthorn on the property will have an overall positive impact on the ecological integrity of the area, allowing for native species to re-establish without competition or degradation from invasive species. Additional benefits include wildlife habitat improvement, soil improvement, and an increase in biodiversity. The EIS identifies an invasive species management area of 1 ha. A tree planting area of 0.75 ha has also been identified on site, as compensation for loss of 0.67 ha of significant woodland. It appears that both the tree planting area and the invasive species management area are within the tree protection area identified in the TIPP. The EIS recommends that access to maintained natural lands and the natural features setback areas be limited with permanent fencing along the lot boundaries.	Noted. Please also refer to the EIS Update (Birks NHC, 2026) and Ecological Compensation Plan (Birks NHC, 2026), prepared for this submission, relating to the offsetting measures for the loss of Significant Woodland.
152	The TIPP further states that any activity that could result in injury or destruction of a protected tree or natural feature, or alteration of grade is prohibited within protected areas. However, the protection considerations in the TIPP only reference fencing during site works. Additional clarification is requested.	Please refer to the TIPP Update (Birks NHC, 2026) prepared for this application that addresses the mitigation of trees within the retained natural areas.
153	Section 7 of the County's Official Plan - Natural Grey, states that "the County, local municipalities and/or conservation authorities having jurisdiction within Grey, may choose to develop and use ecological/ecosystem offsetting (also called biodiversity offsetting) policies or procedures for private land development proposals and/or public infrastructure undertakings..." Offsetting must follow the mitigation hierarchy of Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate, and then Offset. Offsetting should only be applied after a detailed analysis has determined that avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of loss is not possible or feasible. Staff understand that compensation for the loss of 0.67 ha, but it is unclear if other alternatives were considered when developing the proposed offsetting. Further clarification is requested.	As per discussions with County staff, the site plan has been modified in order to further minimize the loss of Significant Woodland. The revised site plan proposes the loss of 0.58 ha of Significant Woodland, which meets the Avoid/Minimize offsetting step. The loss of 0.58 ha is further mitigated through the completion of the TIPP (Birks NHC, 2026) to ensure retained trees are protected from the development and the Ecological Compensation Plan (Birks NHC, 2026) that will enhance the retained natural areas including plantings and invasive species management area. The total area for ecological compensation is 2.7ha which represents an offsetting ratio of higher than 4:1. Please refer to the Ecological Compensation Plan (Birks NHC, 2026) prepared for this submission for a detailed plan.

154	Further to the above, staff note that the proposal contemplates the partial relocation of services (a trunk main) on site and understand that there have been discussions with Town staff about the full relocation of this service within the proposed road allowance (Street 'A'). The proposed servicing corridor/easement location is within the 30-meter setback/buffer to the wetland. Should the corridor and partial relocation proceed as proposed, staff recommend that the corridor area be rehabilitated to a natural state that would not damage underground infrastructure or limit access for future maintenance purposes. The submitted Landscape Analysis further mentions that realignment of the serving will disturb part of the wetland buffer and recommends that the new sewer easement, as well as any other disturbed areas within the park block, be seeded with native species to enhance the meadow community. Should the services be fully relocated to the public ROW, staff recommend that the buffer area be planted/rehabilitated to further enhance and protect the ecological integrity of the wetlands and woodlands on the site and adjacent.	The re-alignment of the existing servicing corridor will occur in part within the 30m wetland setback. The EIS Update (Birks NHC, 2026) provides additional information on the rehabilitaiton requirements of this corridor, particularly where it occurs within the wetland setback area. However, it should be noted that the corridor shall remain in an accessible state to allow for maintenance. This will also involve the construction of an access route along the length of the corridor, as per the Town's requirement. Thus, this corrior was not included within the Ecological Compensation Plan (Birks NHC, 2026) as it cannot be restored in a manner that will contribute to ecological functionality of the retained lands.
155	MTO (September 24 2025)	
156	Was a Land Development Review submitted using MTO's Highway Corridor Management System? If yes, please provide the file number. If not, MTO require that new applications, inquires, or Pre-Consultations, be submitted through this system: https://www.hcms.mto.gov.on.ca. Any user has the ability to "View MTO Control Areas", "Submit an Inquiry", "Request a Pre-Consultation", "Apply for MTO Permit" and "Request a Land Development Review". The portal was created to better serve MTO stakeholders to track the status of all land development planning submission types. Once submitted, the file will be assigned to the appropriate MTO staff (with contact information being provided) to facilitate and provide MTO comments	Tatham - A land development review has been initiated (MTO-LD-2025-31L-000613). Comments have been received and a response has been submitted to the MTO via the MTO's project portal.
157	SON (October 20 2025)	
158		SON comments received and included in this submission.
159	SON will be submitting comments on the 372 Grey Rd 21 draft subdivision application after completing technical peer reviews. Miigwech, Natalie Kuipers SON Archaeology Resource & Infrastructure Department MHSM Metis (October 15 2025)	A Stage 1-2 Archaeological Report was prepared by Amick Archaeological Consultants in October 10, 2022. W. Fitzgerald on behalf of SON provided comments on November 16, 2022 to MCM, which did include comments but did provide a clearance on the report. Following that, sometime passed prior to Rhemm receiving notification that MCM was requiring further information from Amick. Following discussions with Amick, Rhemm has retained a new archaeological consultant to complete a completely new Stage 1-2 Archaeological Study on the West End. We are now awaiting this work to be completed. The consultant has been retained to also complete additional contact with Indigenous communities. We have discussed this situation with planning staff and understand that the requirement for the Stage 1-2 Archaeological Study and MCM Clearance will be a required Draft Condition.

160	The The Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) Lands, Waters and Consultation Department has reviewed the relevant documents and does not support the proposed development as presented. The previous comments submitted by HSM in relation to this file remain relevant and have been attached for reference. In summary, housing development is a huge threat to Ontario’s biodiversity and in order to maintain a livable environment we must ensure that development balances the need for housing with the need to maintain naturalized areas and protect existing ecosystems. All decision makers have a responsibility to ensure a healthy environment for future generations and the degradation of the environment impinges upon HSM’s asserted rights as a Métis community. Therefore, HSM strongly recommends that, at minimum, plots 9-13 are converted to a Significant Woodland protection zone. The project documents outline how the vast majority of the site is proposed to be cleared and the so called “Tree Inventory and Protection Plan” relies heavily on offsetting to justify the removal of trees. However, we must maintain established ecosystems including mature and mid-sized trees to ensure a healthy ecosystem in the future and planting new trees does not negate the impact of tree removal. Grey County’s Official Plan (2025) states that: Offsetting must follow the mitigation hierarchy of Avoid, Minimize, Mitigate, then Offset. It should only be applied after a detailed analysis has determined that avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of loss is not possible or feasible. This tool shall not replace or negate the requirements of other legislation applicable to impacts to species or ecosystems at the municipal, regional, provincial, or federal levels. Protection, and ideally restoration and improvements of existing natural systems remains the primary goal of natural heritage systems planning (as per Section 2.1 of the PPS). The proposed plans are not in line with this policy, as avoidance and minimization are in fact possible. Thank you for the opportunity to review this matter.	Acknowledged. Further work on Compensation has been provided.
161	Neala MacLeod Farley	
162	Coordinator, Lands, Waters & Consultation	
163	Historic Saugeen Métis	
164	204 High Street	
165	Southampton, ON	
166	saugeenmetis.com	
167	519-483-4000	
168	Enbridge (October 2 2025)	
169	Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development. The Owner agrees to provide Enbridge Gas Inc. (Enbridge Gas) the necessary easements at no cost and/or agreements required by Enbridge Gas for the provision of local gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge Gas.	The design of a gas distribution system to service the development will be initiated at final engineering in support of a development agreement.
170	Hydro One (September 3 2025)	
171		
172	We are in receipt of your Application for Subdivision, P3XXX dated 2025-08-08. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One's 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only.	
173		
174	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 subdivision@Hydroone.com or 1-866-272-3330.	
175		
176	To confirm if Hydro One is your local distributor please follow the following link: Stormcentre (hydroone.com)	
177		
178	Rogers (August 14 2025)	
		The design of a hydro distribution system to service the development will be initiated at final engineering in support of a development agreement.

179	Rogers Communications Canada Inc. (“Rogers”) has reviewed the application for the above Subdivision and has determined that it intends to offer its communications services to residents of the Subdivision. Accordingly, we request that municipal approval for the Subdivision be granted subject to the following conditions: (1) The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement to (a) permit all CRTC-licensed telecommunications companies intending to serve the Subdivision (the “Communications Service Providers”) to install their facilities within the Subdivision, and (b) provide joint trenches for such purpose. (2) The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement to grant, at its own cost, all easements required by the Communications Service Providers to serve the Subdivision, and will cause the registration of all such easements on title to the property. (3) The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement to coordinate construction activities with the Communications Service Providers and other utilities, and prepare an overall composite utility plan that shows the locations of all utility infrastructure for the Subdivision, as well as the timing and phasing of installation. (4) The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement that, if the Owner requires any existing Rogers facilities to be relocated, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities and provide where applicable, an easement to Rogers to accommodate the relocated facilities.	The design of a Rogers Cable distribution system to service the development will be initiated at final engineering in support of a development agreement.
180	In addition, we kindly request to, where possible, receive copies of the following documents: (1) the comments received from any of the Communications Service Providers during circulation; (2) the proposed conditions of draft approval as prepared by municipal planners prior to their consideration by Council or any of its committees; and (3) the municipal planners’ report recommending draft approval before it goes to Council or any of its committees. Should you require further information or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact simcoecirculations@rci.rogers.ca Yours truly, Johanna Gautreaux Simcoe Circulations 1 Sperling Drive Barrie, Ontario L4M 6K9	
181	MTO (November 19 2025)	
182	The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has completed its review of municipal files nos. OPA (P3523) and ZBA (P3524). The concept plan was reviewed in accordance with the requirements of MTO’s highway access control policies, and the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act. The following outlines our preliminary comments: MTO have no objection to the OPA and ZBA amendments; however, the applicant should be made aware of the following: The owner should be aware that the property falls within MTO’s Permit Control Area (PCA), and as such, MTO Permits are required before any demolition, grading, construction or alteration to the site commences. In accordance with the Ontario Building Code, municipal permits may not be issued until such time as all other applicable requirements (i.e.: MTO permits/approvals) are satisfied. As a condition of MTO permit(s) MTO will require the following for review approval. Traffic Impact Study The TIS has been circulated internally for review, MTO will provide comments at a later date. Storm Water Management Report (SWMR); The SWMR has been circulated internally for review, MTO will provide comments at a later date. MTO Permit Requirements The majority of the subdivision appears to be setback outside of the MTO Permit Control Area (jurisdiction). Highway 26 is a controlled access provincial highway, if there are any buildings or structures within 45m of the highway property limit or 395m from an intersection, an MTO building and land use permit will be required. Thank you, O’Neil Nembhard Corridor Management Planner	Acknowledged. TIS resubmitted through MTO project portal for review. Responses have been provided for all comments.
183	NEC (October 17 2025)	
184	Good day, Thank you for circulating the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC). The proposed development is designated as Escarpment Recreation in the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) but not within NEC Development Control Area. Although an NEC permit is not required, NEC staff will be providing input as a commenting agency and would like to review drawings and studies completed. Best regards, Susan Reimer, R.P.P. Senior Planner Niagara Escarpment Commission	Acknowledged.