

TOWN OF THE BLUE MOUNTAINS: LONG POINT ROAD		
April 26, 2019		
COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
GENERAL DESIGN COMMENTS		
1.1	An access block of 8-10 m wide is needed to access the municipal drain. Town will construct access road but dedicated access to the drain is required. Suggest this be in an area between Blocks 10-11 or 12-13.	Town can describe easement through block 25 (DP8) based on their preference. Suggested route is a direct extension of the road through the cul-de-sac to the drain.
1.2	Additional 2.0m needed to increase the area allotted for municipal drain (10 m) on Block 27.	Municipal Drain easement can be increased by 2m (from 8 m to 10 m) within proposed block 25.
1.3	Location of Blocks 25& 26 are not ideally suited for future road connections – consider refinement with those connections as 20 m blocks outside of the turning bulb area. The Town can discuss options with applicant and team.	Future connection blocks to north and south have merged with potential connection block to the west.
1.4	Consider Lot 9 and 14 frontages in the event that Block 25 and 26 are opened up as improved road allowance in the future (will become corner lots).	Comment is no longer applicable.
WATER/WASTEWATER		
2.1	Water service for this property is located on Long Point road and owned /operated by the Town of the Blue Mountains, not the Town of Collingwood.	Acknowledged, Report to be revised.
2.2	Sanitary MH is on south side of Hwy 26, the MTO will need to be contacted if the proposed works are feasible on their end.	Acknowledged, direct drilling we be required. Comment from MTO is still outstanding.
2.3	Town does not support change of use easement for the purpose of a sanitary outlet, please keep as currently proposed to outlet via Long Point Road.	Acknowledged, servicing will be via Longpoint Road.
SWM/DRAINAGE		
3.1	Stormwater cannot be released uncontrolled until receiving water has capacity. Further Stormwater discussion and calculations are required.	Per discussions with TOBM staff, the in line pool was to be reviewed by staff to confirm it is not a sanitary lagoon. Discussions on quantity control requirements are ongoing. 2021.08.23 Update - quality and quantity controls have been implemented to the site's stormwater strategy/design
3.2	At this time, the Town has no planned projected to improve the capacity of the Drainage channel.	Further discussion required. 2021.08.23 Update - based on this, we have implemented quantity controls so that the post-development flows do not exceed the pre-development flows draining to the municipal drain
3.3	Storm Drainage block would be required between lots 11 and 12 as designed.	Acknowledged. The access route to the drain will be designed as an overland flow route to the drain as well, located in Block 25.
GEOTECHNICAL		
4.1	Please complete wet season water level measurements.	See May 10, 2019 Wilson & Associates report.
4.2	Land is not conducive to excavation for basements. Town prefers slab on grade at this point, unless another solution to high water table has been devised.	Acknowledged. Slab on grade design will be required.
4.3	Town requires confirmation of proper compaction with engineered fill required prior to construction.	Acknowledged.
TRANSPORTATION		
5.1	Comments are needed from MTO to confirm if intersection upgrades will be required.	Acknowledged.
PLANNING COMMENTS		
6.1	Has there been any consideration of the potential Terrasan proposal when working through this subdivision design? (i.e. where road connection leads to, uses of adjacent lands etc.)	Previous owner met with Royalton homes a number of times. Roylaton is focused on the west porton of their Draft Plan and is in the process of working with MTO and TOBM on setbacks. As they are Draft Plan Approved a redline to the east lands is not an immediate focus. In an effort to facilitate a possible future connection, should Royalton decide to redline their draft plan. The Longpoint plan has been revised to allow for a pontential connection should this happen in the furture, while not holding up this development at the current stage. DP8 also addresses a number of other features requested by the Town at the curent stage, including a maintenance access to the drain for the Town and an overland flow route to the drain for Stormwater management.
6.2	Road connections cannot be counted as Open Space under the 40% open space policy.	25% of Open Space requirement is provided in Block 25. Additional 15% to be provide as part of Cash in Lieu of Open Space
6.3	Has the proposal been reviewed in light of the new zoning by-law? (i.e. R1-3 etc).	Yes. The lots can conform to the proposed R1-3 zone. Requesting to increase the height from 8.0 m to 9.5 m and 2.0 storeys to 2.5 storeys.
6.4	We noted the EIS discusses protection of wetlands features where feasible. We request more information in this regard, and suggest a map of the wetlands that are recommended for retention with overlay of proposed lotting.	DP1 included Block areas 25 and 26 (connection blocks), each of which contained very small wetland features. Those wetland features had minimal ecological and hydrological function, so the fact that they are now part of Lots 9 and 14 in DP5 is not a significant concern. With the Block 25 now in the place of what was formally lots 10-13, the majority of the Birch-Poplar Forest area within the Property is now retained within that block. This forest area is the highest priority for preservation within the Property. On balance, in my view, DP5 represents an environmental gain relative to DP1. (Neil Morris) DP8 was further supported by the updated EIS.
6.5	Based on the aggregate of town comments, a minor revision to the lot lay out is recommended, to incorporate the requested drainage easement increase, access for maintenance, and better potential road connection locations. Town is available to discuss.	See DP8.

COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Canada Post November 26, 2018	1. Canada Post will provide mail delivery service to the development through centralized Community Mail Boxes (CMBs). 2. The development will be served by 2 CMBs located in front of Block 25Municipal requirements 3. Please update our office if the project description changes so that we may determine the impact (if any). 4. Should this subdivision application be approved, please provide notification of the new civic addresses as soon as possible. 5. Please provide Canada Post with the excavation date for the first foundation/first phase as well as the date development work is scheduled to begin. Finally, please provide the expected installation date(s) for the CMB(s).	Acknowledged
Historic Saugeen Metis Novembner 3, 2018	HSM has no objection or opposition to the proposed SubdivisionA pplication and Zoning By-law Amendment as related to this proposed development.	Acknowledged
April 2021	Updated Public and Agency Comments prior to Public Meeting on April 19, 2021	
GSCA Comments April 19, 2021		
	GSCA generally has no objection to the draft plan of subdivision as it is currently proposed. However, it is GSCA's recommendation that Block 25 be zoned Open Space with the H1 Holding provision to continue to account for the adjacent lands to the PSW. We would have no objection to the zoning of the remaining lands to R1-3 with an exception to allow for increased height. Additionally, we offer the following preliminary draft plan conditions for your consideration: 1.That the final stormwater management plan be prepared and implemented through the Subdivision Agreement to the satisfaction of the GSCA. 2. Should the downstream capacity assessment confirm that uncontrolled flows would not have an adverse impact to downstream properties. A condition should be included that the municipal drain be sized appropriately to accomodate post development flows prior to any work proceeding within the subject lands. 3. A vegetation management and Tree Protection Plan is to be prepared for the development and implemented through the Subdivision Agreement to the satisfaction of the GSCA. 4. A Zoning Bylaw Amendment should be passed to recognize the tree retention areas to the satisfaction of the GSCA. 5. Further, the Subdivision Agreement is to include a clause indicating that portions of the subject lands are subject to Ontario Regulation 151/06 administered by the GSCA and a permit is required from the GSCA prior to site alteration or devlopement in the affected areas.	Include recommendations in Draft Plan Conditions.
Grey County Peer Review Comments April 19, 2021 - Ecologist from NRSI Inc.		
	The Draft Plan of Subdivision (DP8) has been revised to protect vegetation communities FOD3-2 (Dry-Fresh White Birch – Poplar Deciduous Forest) and FOD7 (Fresh-Moist Lowland Deciduous Forest), as recommended in the peer review (NRSI 2020). Based on DP8 and the earlier peer review comments (NRSI 2019, 2020), I make the following recommendations: 1. The Endangered Species Act applies at all times. The Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) has been contacted numerous times by Mr. Morris throughout the assessment process, and as far as I know, a response has not been received. I reviewed the EIS in relation to Species at Risk (SAR) and found the assessment reasonable. However, I suggest another email be sent to the MECP to ensure the proposal is not in contravention to the Endangered Species Act with regards to Blanding’s Turtle (Emydoidea blandingii) and SAR bats. No tree removal should be undertaken during the bat active season, which is between May 1 and September 30, as identified in the EIS (Morris 2020).	Include recommendation in a Draft Plan Condition
	8.2The development area should be clearly identified and delineated using silt fence to control sediment and erosion, as well as intrusion into protected areas.	To be included in AFC drawings
	8.3As per the EIS, Tree Preservation Plans (TPP) should be prepared for the development of each lot, including the road. Black Ash (Fraxinus nigra) should be protected. If Black Ash need to be removed, the specimen should be transplanted (if small enough to do so) and tended, or compensated for.	Include Tree Preservation Plan as a Draft Plan Condition.
	8.4As per my last review, January 24, 2020: a. I concur with the assessment that there are no wetland communities within the subject site and there are no impacts on the adjacent provincially significant wetland (PSW) as the proposed development is more than 30m from the PSW boundary and due to the intervening municipal drain. b. The Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA) should be contacted so that they can confirm compliance with their policy and Ontario Regulation 151/06, specifically with regards to distance from the municipal drain. c. The recommendations made in the revised EIS (Morris 2020) in Sections 6.3 (Mitigation Recommendations), 6.4 (Enhancement Opportunities), 6.5 (Monitoring Recommendations), and 6.6 (Implementation and Management Plan) should be followed. In addition, landowners who buy the lots should be educated about the natural environment including the following recommendations about each lot: - Avoid pesticides and excessive fertilizers - Naturalize yards to the greatest extent possible using native species - Plant Milkweed species and native wildflowers in gardens and yards to benefit Monarch and other pollinators - Keep house cats indoors and dogs leashed or enclosed within fenced yards	Indclude in Draft Plan Conditions
	8.5Consider a vegetation salvage prior to development. Local residents or naturalist groups may be interested in digging out native plants for their home gardens	Concerned with liability
	8.6Consider putting up one or more bat boxes to mitigate for potential bat habitat being removed, especially in the adsence of any other guidance from the MECP	Block 25 to be dedicated to Town
Written Comments from neighbors (objections)		
	9.1Marcin Chyb - noise, environmental concerns, intersection improvements, only permit one single dwelling on each lot	Noise Bylaw

COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
9.2	Heather Hopps - smell from sewage treatment facility, capacity of municipal infrastructure, will municipal sanitary sewers be constructed, drainage concerns, light and noise pollution, construction vehicles, environmental concerns, traffic concerns	Existing Vegetation will prevent light pollution
9.3	Lorraine Leslie - clarification on Township of Collingwood, high ground water/sump pumps, smell from wastewater treatment plant, environmental concerns, traffic concerns (speeding)	No basements proposed
9.4	Maurice and Catharine Pepper - Enviornmental, Traffic, Sewage, Sump Pumps	Sanitary solution will be to the satisfaction of the Town
9.5	Jamie and Vanessa Morrison - Environmental concerns, traffic concerns, construction, sewer connection	See updated EIS, GSCA comments and NRSI comments
9.6	Garion Sparks - Austin - Will owners have access to beach on Brophy's Lane, will developer clean up the beach, high water table, septic	
9.71	Pamela Spence - letter dated May 19, 2021 1) Municipal Drain should have a 10 m setback zoned hazard . . .	It's worth noting that Mrs. Spence lives approximately 2 km from the subject lands. 1) A 10 m setback to the municipal drain is included in Block 25. The entirety of Block 25 to be dedicated to the Town and will become public land. The Town will include the appropriate zoning of the 10 m setback of the municipal drain when they approve the ZBLA.
9.72	2) The OP requires a minimum of 40% open space and a maximum density of 10 units per ha	2) Section D6.2.5 of the OP states that The Town may accept cash in lieu of land as an alternative for any dedication required by this Plan. With regard to the density calculation it the professional planning opinion of Andrew Pascuzzo MCIP RPP that the 22 units proposed conforms to the 10 unit/ha maximum density policies of the OP.
9.73	3) Excess building envelopes on DWG 892-17-DP8+ (exceed maximum lot coverage)	3) The intent of the building envelopes drawn on DWG 892-17-DP8+ was not to indicate the proposed dwelling footprints, as they would not conform to the Max lot coverage provisions, highlighted by Ms. Spence. Instead, the intent of the drawing is to indicate the potential building envelopes based on the proposed zoning provisions in the R1-3 zone. At building permit stage the building and planning departments will review individual lot plan conformity with the maximum lot coverage provision before issuing a permit.
9.74	4) Building height - request fo add a storey and 3 m in height. A VIA has not been submitted	4) The requested height amendment is not for an additional storey, nor is it for a 3 m height increase. The request is to increase the height from the R1-3 standard of 8 m and 2 storeys to 9.5 m and 2.5 storeys. This is an increase of 0.5 storeys and 1.5 m. A similar height increase was recently supported by staff and approved by council for another project in the Town based on the fact the character of the surrounding neighborhood would be maintained. The zoning of the lands surrounding the longpoint lands would currently allow for dwellings to be constructed to 3 storeys and 11 m in height. A Visual Impact Assessment was not requested by the NEC, alternatively a Tree Preservation/Landscape Plan is being considered as a Draft Plan Condition. The NEC indicated in its letter from April 27 that they can support the proposed Plan of Subdiivision based on the above noted Draft Plan Condition.
9.75	5) Address agency concerns. GSCA letter of April 19, 2021 - drainage and SWM	As For Construction drawings will need to be submitted and approved by the G\$CA prior to final approval of the Plan of Subdivision. 2021.08.23 Update - see comment 7.0 and response above
9.76	5) Address agency concerns. NEC letter of April 27, 2021 - downstream drainage	The proposed drainage plan is to send stormwater to a massive municipal drain (ditch) which will then flow into the Town owned lands. Crozier to add 2021.08.23 - the FSR & SWM Report and associated figures and appendices provide further information on the proposed drainage plan
9.77	Planning Addendum 2(h) and (s)	see response to comment 9.77
9.78	Conformity to Town OP Section D8	With all due respect, Mrs. Spence has a history of quoting NEC, County and Town OP policies that she feels are not being conformed to, but she provides no reasoning as to how/why a specific development project does not conform to the policy she references. For example, with the Parkbridge Craigleith applications she took the position that there was lack of conformity to more than 100 policies. LPAT disagreed with her on all of them. In this specific circumstance Section D8 of the Town OP is not applicable as there are currently no green development standards at the Town. The policy she is referencing D8 simply provides direction to the Town to prepare Green Development Standards.
Written Comments from neighbors (support)		
10.1	Jane Barrett - previously purchased in Crestview Estates, Terra Brook Homes	
10.2	Michael and Jennifer Capone - previously purchased in Crestview Estates, Terra Brook Homes	
10.3	Ken Dale - previously purchased in Crestview Estates, third Terra Brook Home	
10.4	Kathleen Elliot - previously purchased in Crestview Estates Terra Brook Homes	
10.5	Arnie Fierro - previouslsy purchased in Crestview Estates, Terra Brook Homes	
10.6	Michelle and Grant Sloane - previously purchased in Crestview Estates	
10.7	Monika Stramaglia - previously purchased in Crestview Estates	
Verbal Comments at public meeting		
11.1	Glenn Blaylock - Environmental concerns, Intersection Improvements	See response to comments 9.5 and 14.16

COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
11.2	Pamela Spence - Environmental concerns, NEC concerns in 2019 letter, water table very close to service, height increase from 2 stories and 8 m to 2.5 stories and 9.5 m, County OP 2.h and s (Construction Phase, Sustainable features, construction waster management)	See responses to comment 9.7
NEC Comments April 27 2021		
12.1	NEC can support the proposed plan of Subdivision with the inclusion of the following conditions:	
12.2	A detailed Stormwater Management Report including a downstream capacity assessment that demonstrates no negative impact on downstream properties (suggested condition #7)	Acknowledged
12.3	A tree/vegetation protection plan to the satisfaction of the NEC (suggested condition #17)	Acknowledged
12.4	A Landscape Plan to the satisfaction of the NEC (suggested condition #17)	Acknowledged
12.5	Subdivision Agreement (suggested condition #3)	Acknowledged
Town Engineering Comments in email from Mason Bellamy - April 30, 2021		
13.1	Based on the recommendation of the EIS peer reviewer the Town is unclear if the Municipal Drain is an appropriate Stormwater outlet. At a minimum 6m wide stormwater block would be required to allow maintenance of the system and may not be appropriate through the hazard area.	2021.08.23 - stormwater quantity controls will be implemented such that the post-development drainage does not exceed the pre-development drainage to the Municipal Drain
13.2	It appears the only Stormwater Treatment proposed is a OGS unit. The MECP does not typically grant greater than 50% TSS removal credit for these units and 80% is required for this site. Adequate treatment solution of site stormwater will have to be further investigated.	2021.08.23 - quality control has been increased through the use of a Jellyfish unit rather than an OGS unit
13.3	The last major item from our preliminary review is the Low-Pressure Sewer System, we will require sign off from the MTO as well as some investigation as to whether the design will negatively affect the Town future plans to Service Long Point Road with a gravity system to the Wastewater Treatment Plant.	2021.08.23 - ECA application will be made during detailed design. The design will account for a future connection to the gravity system on Long Point Rd and decommission of the forcemain.
COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Town of Blue Mountains - Development Engineering Comments - Deanna - May 19, 2021		
FSR Water		
14.1	Section 3.2 – Please remove this sentence “Consultation with the Town was undertaken to confirm that there is sufficient capacity to provide the required water pressures and flows to meet the calculated water demand.” The consultant is to demonstrate feasibility using preliminary info and calculations. (ie: What existing pressures are present in Long Point Rd watermain in that vicinity? How are you certain adequate fire flow can be provided at west end of watermain?)	Sentence has been removed from Section 3.2 and replaced with, "A tee connection will be provided from the existing main with a loop in the cul-de-sac to prevent a dead end." The following has been added to Section 3.4 to address the available flow, "The subdivision currently meets the OBC fire flow requirements but does not meet the fire flow requirements calculated using the FUS. If the Town requires that available fire flows meet the FUS requirements we will work with the developer/builder to revise the unit layout and/or provide fire protection measures on the interior and exterior of the units to lower the fire flow demands to the available flow in the existing system."
14.2	We advise you review the 2020 Town Water/Wastewater Capacity Report for verification of servicing capacity, which should be released soon. Further discussion may be warranted if the Town of Collingwood reduces their current water supply agreement to Town of Blue Mountains. A draft condition is required to capture the uncertainty in servicing at this time.	Any draft condition imposed, regarding the available water or wastewater capacity, will be addressed and satisfied during detailed design.
14.3	The Town is initiating a Class EA to evaluate water supply and storage in the east side of the Town. The developer may wish to partake in that study.	At 22 units, it is our opinion that this development will not materially impact any conclusions in the Towns future EA. As we hope to be Draft Approved by the time the Town is proceeding with analysis on these lands, a population based on the Draft Plan could be included with the existing units on Long Point Road in the Town's analysis.
FSR Wastewater		
14.4	Low-pressure sanitary system to include provisions to facilitate its connection to future gravity sewers proposed to be installed by the Town in approx. 5 years. The ECA for the low-pressure system with the MECP should also include the future connection to gravity sewers, to avoid requiring amendment in the future.	A structure will be provided at the 90 degree bend from the development onto Long Point Road that will allow for the downstream portion of the forcemain (Long Point Rd and Highway 26) to be decommissioned and removed, with a new connection made to the gravity sewer flowing north. The detailed design and ECA application will be addressed in the future.
14.5	Provide cross-section of Long Point Road 1) in general and 2) at proposed Aquavil Brophy’s Lane realignment to Long Point Road showing proposed location of low-pressure forcemain and servicing, utilities etc in boulevard to demonstrate feasibility of low-pressure forcemain alignment.	As discussed during meeting with the Town, a typical/conceptual cross-section along Long Point Road has been provided in Figure 3. The forcemain has vertical and horizontal flexibility compared to a gravity sewer, which will allow it to avoid conflicts with ex. services / utilities. Further investigation is required to confirm the design and layout of the forcemain, which will be undertaken at detailed design.

COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
14.6	This sentence is to be removed "The Town has indicated that there is available residual capacity within the Highway 26 sewer to service the site". The consultant is required to verify capacity of downstream gravity sewers on Highway 26 to the Craigleith Main Lift Station on Lakeshore road. Per the draft 2020 Town Water/Wastewater Capacity Report, the Craigleith Main Lift Station (Lakeshore Rd) is currently exceeding capacity during wet weather. We will investigate the extent of this situation further and follow up.	Sentence has been removed and replaced with, "According to the January 27, 2020 Highway 26 Flow Monitoring Study by Tatham Engineering there is currently residual capacity within the existing 300mm diameter sanitary gravity sewer on Highway 26 based on actual flow studies. It is understood that based on theoretical flow values (considering the full buildout of all developments draining to the ex. 300mm sewer) the sewer will reach capacity. Alternative arrangements such as upsizing the sewer or preparing an ECA application based on actual rather than theoretical flows will be investigated further at detailed design to ensure the subject development does not contribute to the sewer reaching capacity." The subject development contributes approximately 3.7% to the overall capacity of the ex. 300mm pipe under conservative calculations for I&I (not expected with a low pressure system). Further investigation into the Tatham Study indicates there is capacity for 884 additional units to come online to the sanitary system. It is possible the subject development would be constructed well ahead of this limit being reached and in the future the design and construction of the gravity system on Long Point Road could be advanced based on the timing of the full build out of Windfall, Plateau, and Blue Vista developments such that the ex. 300mm sewer does not reach capacity. Note the Tatham Study does not address capacity of the Craigleith Man Lift Station; capacity issues related to the Station could be addressed as part of issuing Building Permits for the development (when more information related to the capacity is available).
FSR Stormwater / Drainage		
14.7	Section 5.3 - "It was found that the increase in flows generated from the site for the 5, 25 and 100-year storm events were between 170 L/sec to 270 L/sec. Future upgrades to the municipal drain should account for these flows." a.Is this a municipal drain with status recognized through the Drainage Act? If so, please add commentary to FSR. In that case, any modifications, and possibly any increase in flows, require a process defined in the Drainage Act to be followed. A draft condition may be required to make draft approval contingent upon successful outcome of Drainage Act process (or other applicable public process such as Class EA). b.The Town has commenced a Town-wide Drainage study that may be relevant for this municipal drain. Please see its webpage (https://www.thebluemountains.ca/drainage-master-plan.cfm?is=171) for more details. c.A downstream drainage analysis is required for external drainage system to Georgian Bay to confirm 1) uncontrolled flows can be adequately conveyed for all design storms, 2) ponding on Craigleith WWTP property is not negatively impacted, and 3) identify the future upgrades referenced in section 5.3. This analysis must be completed before Draft Approval is granted, otherwise: d.Provide SWM storage onsite, with preliminary sizing/layout and geotechnical recommendations to ensure feasibility, including downstream analysis to verify frequency, depth and duration are not increased within the drainage system.	The approach identified in Section 5.3 of the previous version of the FSR has been revised to reflect the implementation of quantity controls. Our responses reflect this revised approach: a. Commentary will be added to Section 5.1 about the status of the municipal drain. Flows will be controlled such that there is no increase in the flow rate. b. If available during detailed design the results of the Drainage Master Plan will be addressed. c. The stormwater management strategy for the development will ensure that 1) post-development flows to the municipal drain do not exceed pre-development flows; 2) drainage swales are utilized such that there is no impact to nearby water course(s); and 3) upgrades are no longer required to the municipal drain as a result of the controlled flows from subject development. d. Section 5.3 has been revised to address quantity control.
14.8	It appears minor and major runoff from eastern portion of new road (0.15 ha estimate) will flow towards Long Point Rd. This runoff will discharge uncontrolled the Long Point Road ditch system and require a similar downstream drainage system analysis as noted in #7 above, and the minor flows will require water quality treatment (since not entering the OGS) or justification. Otherwise, direct these flow west to the municipal drain.	The flows draining uncontrolled from the right-of-way have been reduced to ~0.05 ha and are accounted for in the overall stormwater management of the site (over controlling the western portion). A drainage ditch design will be incorporated along the frontage of Long Point Road (including culvert at the site entrance) to ensure the post-development drainage pattern matches the pre-development condition (flows travelling south to north) and there will be no ponding of stormwater. Drainage from the ROW will not be redirected through the development, therefore not requiring an easement/Block.
14.9	OGS outlet piping, headwall, drainage ditch and maintenance access on Block 25 will require sign off from EIS author to ensure consistency with recommendations of revised EIS.	Noted.
14.10	OGS outlet piping, headwall, drainage ditch and maintenance access to be located in designated SWM block separate from Block 25. My understanding is that SWM features may be included in an open space block if they provide benefit to users of the open space, which I do not think is the case here. However, I am not a planner and defer to Planning for confirmation.	The storm outlet (headwall) can be contained within the right-of-way, with discharge into a ditch within Block 25. Planning to advise if a separate SWM Block is required to account for the ditch and/or storm infrastructure.
14.11	Provide a cross-section detail to illustrate width of SWM Block required for OGS outlet piping, headwall, drainage ditch and maintenance access to provide sufficient size for the swale and maintenance thereof.	Note the OGS has been revised to a Jellyfish unit to provide better quality control. It is our opinion that any cross-sections would be a detailed design requirement. Further investigation is required to confirm the design and layout of the Jellyfish and storm configuration.
14.12	Provide calcs/details to demonstrate sufficient change in head will be available across OGS unit for adequate performance, considering elevation of incoming proposed storm sewers and proposed outfall elevation.	Note the OGS has been revised to a Jellyfish unit to provide better quality control. It is our opinion that any cross-sections would be a detailed design requirement. Further investigation is required to confirm the design and layout of the Jellyfish and storm configuration.
14.13	Figure 4 currently shows lots with private rear yard swale conveying drainage from multiple lots west to municipal drain. A private easement in common for a swale of adequate depth to prevent encumbrances would be required at the back of the lots in favour of all lots utilizing the swale.	Noted. A revised draft plan will incorporate the required easement for the drainage swales.
14.14	How does runoff from the rear yard swale of the lots south of the new road enter the municipal drain? Is an additional ditch required along south side of Block 25?	The proposed drainage swale will tie into the existing municipal drain at the southwest corner of Block 25.

COMMENT #	COMMENT	RESPONSE
14.15	Will either of the rear yard swales pick up and convey drainage from Long Point Road ditch? The Town does not prefer to have municipal road drainage from Long Point Road being conveyed through private lots (even with an easement). Town block would be required.	A drainage ditch along the Long Point Road frontage will be required such that flows from Long Point Road and Lots 1 and 22 are directed to the north side of the development; they will not connect with the proposed drainage swales within the site limits. A flow spreader may be required at detailed design to prevent erosion.
Traffic		
14.16	The FSR did not include commentary on traffic assessment or feasibility of road geometrics with consideration to change of site grades for fill. Has a TIS been prepared separately/previously?	A TIS was not required for this site due to the smaller unit count and the ongoing MTO EA assessing traffic impacts along the MTO corridor in this area. These lands were included in that assessment and impacts from this site were agreed to be negligible given the draft approved future growth in the area (2018).
Draft Conditions		
14.17	The comment matrix identified several comments that are proposed to be addressed by being added as draft conditions. However, these conditions were not listed in the latest draft of the conditions and will require incorporation. (ie: uncontrolled stormwater flows and downstream capacity report, County peer reviewer comments)	Noted.
14.18	Would need to add a draft condition regarding servicing capacity for water and wastewater.	Noted.