

#	Circulation Comment	Applicant Comment/Response	Town of Blue Mountains Comment/Response	Applicant Comment/Response
	Town of the Blue Mountains –			
	Design Policies and Community Gateways			
	Conditions/Policies			
	D5.3 Community Gateways			
1	Community Gateways , as identified on the Community Structure Plan and Schedules B-1 and B-2 of this Plan, are intended to achieve a sense of entrance and arrival to the Town and neighbourhoods through built form, building design and landscaping. It is a policy of this Plan to plan and design Community Gateways to:			
1a	encourage a high quality design in the built form which is distinctive and which contributes to the identity of the particular Gateway	The building façades that face the gateway corner at Clark Street and Hwy 26 (Building A) have a high quality of architectural design achieved through architectural detailing. Material changes have been used to break up the long façade of Building A and provide texture. High-quality and low maintenance building materials (stone, architectural block, metal panels, and aluminum framed glazing) have been used to elevate the design and articulate the building's street facing entrances. Subtle variations in the building's roofline have again broken up the long façade and provide a strong presence at the gateway corner (southeast corner) of the building.	Note exposure of north end of buidlings c,d,e,f,g, particularly from east bound HWY 26 traffic. Please describe how these areas will be addressed. Note also north end of building h, where proposed swayle is loacated but unclear on landscape planting and building detail On SPA 02 provide notations and references on drawing materials (i.e., concrete block, decorative stone, eifs, brick) colours and description of glazing i.e.,transparent, spandrel glass etc. metal planes, aluminum frame Is there an opportunity to create greater variation in the roofline?	JMA Response - Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes, and colour palette. Buildings A & H do have variations in both roof height and overhang projections. Note that Building A has less height variations as it's up against the maximum allowable height (11m).
1b	orient the most active and architecturally detailed building façade to the public street by use of main entrances and a large percentage of fenestration addressing the streetscape	<u>Building A</u> (2-storey industrial)		
		The most detailed building façade and the majority of the fenestrations have been oriented towards Clark St. and Hwy 26.	Provide details on materials, colours, glazing, spandrel glass, etc.	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes and colour palette.
		<u>Building G</u> (1-storey self-storage)		
		This building has a long low profile to shield the rest of the 1-storey self-storage building from view along Hwy 26. As such, Building G's east façade facing Hwy 26 is architecturally unadorned and visual appeal will be added through the landscaping, not architectural details.	Provide clarity on tree inventory list which trees out of each numbered reference are being retained or removed. Currently the number appears to reference the existing number of trees but does not identify the extent of removals and/or retention so it is not possible to assess whether there is a screening effect at specific locations. Provide additional detail or renderings indicating how the visual appeal of building G will be achieved with landscaping especially with respect to plant inventory group 7and any retained plantings to effect visual screening. Note also plant groupings 51 and 52 which do not have replacement plantings and is unclear what will remain and what screening effect will remain. Confirm if replacement plantings are required to effect screening.	For clarity, the intermitent vegetation hatch has been removed; only the trees are shown. Tree list has been updated with recommended action. A row of conifers has been proposed East of building G. Group #7 will have a minimum screening effect. Screening will be provided mostly by group 8. Additional restoration has been provided. More conifers have been added for increased screening. Group 52 will be mostly preserved; group 51 will be mostly removed; as result a group of conifers have been proposed for screening effect.
		<u>Building H</u> (1-storey industrial)		
		For the east façade that faces Hwy 26, architectural detailing and material changes have been used to break up the long façade and add visual interest. The most active elevation must remain on the west side of the building as it is most convenient and realistic to keep the tenant main entrances adjacent to the parking area.	What is the proposed use of Building H? Please confirm the extent of retention of plant inventory 51 & 52 and the relationship of screening to views of the building	Building H contains 8 tenanted industrial units. Please see revised landscape / TIPP re: screening.

1c	locate parking facilities at the rear and/or side of buildings instead of between the front of the building and the public street	Owing to the unique shape of the property (triangular), and the buildable area restrictions from the watercourse that wraps the site, we've kept parking to the rear and side yards everywhere, except in front of Building A along Clark Street. The parking strip to the south of Building A is unavoidable as the tenanted spaces will have their storefronts/main entrances on the south elevation facing Clark St. To provide the best access for the end users, the parking should be kept adjacent to the storefronts, and the access aisle for these parking spaces doubles as the required fire access route needed around this side of the building.		
1d	use one style of <i>gateway</i> feature for the overall system in commercial areas that allows all to read as Town-wide system, but which accommodates the uniqueness of each commercial area through special design elements	The materials, massing, and architectural details throughout the site have been kept consistent to project a cohesive design for the site and reflect a local aesthetic.	Confirm materials, colour palette, archetctural details, and how proposal addressed Official Plan Policy D5.3. This is the first development at a designated gateway location	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to idenitfy the proposed material finishes and colour palette. The materials selected are high quality finishes that echo the design aesthetic of the surrounding region.
1e	use local materials for <i>gateway</i> features that reflect the <i>character</i> of the area	Local materials and aesthetics have been incorporated into the design (stone and aluminum soffits with a woodgrain appearance).	Provide reference to and description of materials, colours, etc. on drawing SP 02	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to idenitfy the proposed material finishes and colour palette.
1f	emphasize <i>gateway</i> features with surrounding planting material that is native, non-invasive, low maintenance, salt tolerant, and suited to the soil conditions	There is minimum disturbance of the existing woodlot at the frontage of the lot on Clark street and on the North side adjacent to Highway 26.	Provide detail of the extent of existing vegetation that is removed and retained and provide additional compensation plantings relative to removals to enhance and/or replace screening effect at key locations (see related comments above and throughout this document)	Provided within this submission.
		Native trees and shrubs have been proposed along the proposed driveway to match the existing adjacent vegetation.		
		All the proposed buildings are screened from the main roads by preserving mature trees and shrubs of the existing woodlot.		
1g	design <i>gateway</i> features with materials and elements that ensure they are durable and easily maintained	High-quality and low maintenance building materials - stone, architectural block, metal panels, and aluminum framed glazing - have been used in this design.	Provide reference to and description of materials, colours, etc. on drawing SP 02	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to idenitfy the proposed material finishes and colour palette.
1h	use simple and universally readable lettering for any signage that is part of a <i>gateway</i> feature; and	Noted.	Provide additional detail on signage. Confirm that signage complies with sign by-law 2016-71. Note section 7.8 Site Plan Control: Section 7.8 – Site Plan Control Where development is subject to Site Plan Control under Section 41 of the Planning Act, site plan approval shall include consideration of the proposed signs. However, the granting of site plan approval does not exempt the signs from compliance with this By-law. For a sign to be approved through the Site Plan Approval process, the full details of the sign would have to be submitted and confirmation of compliance with this By- law provided prior to Site Plan Approval being granted.	Signage has been removed from all facades and will be addressed by future tenants.
1i	consider energy-efficient forms of lighting to highlight the <i>gateway</i> features at night	The entire site is illuminated with LED luminaries. Typically, the local municipalities will not allow light spillage from the subject lands to the municipally owned lands. This makes any gateway illumination extremely difficult to achieve.		
	D5.4 Highway 26 Cooridor			

2	Highway 26 is recognized as a significant scenic corridor through the municipality with views and vistas of Georgian Bay and the Niagara Escarpment. As such it is a policy of this Plan that the scenic values of this corridor be protected and enhanced. Buffer strips shall generally be required for new development along Highway 26 excluding the Thornbury connecting link and Craigleith Village Area. Buffers shall generally be 10 metres in width and subject to an approved landscape plan to ensure adequate visual screening. The Town shall also undertake to complete a Highway 26 Corridor Streetscape Study to further refine the development policies along Highway 26.	The proposed buffer adjacent to Highway 26 is usually more than 20m and consist of few group of trees. The gaps between them have been enhanced with new native deciduous and conifer trees.	See comments above regarding better describing what vegetation is being retained or remeoved. Provide compensations plantings in key areas to enhance visual screening. Could be additional to decorative landscaping regenerating to enhance or replace existing. provide a brief summary of landscape plan in written text that highlights what is being retianed, removed, enhances, and how.	The vegetation to be retained has been described in TP-1 more clear, by eliminating the hatch of the intermittent vegetation; however imature trees in those areas are expected to grow in the future, providing additional natural screening to the site; A Group of conifers have been provided for screening the buildings visible from Highway 26.
		A Restoration planting is proposed for minor disturbances of the 10m buffer, mainly required by proposed grading, sanitary and storm water pipe connections.	Will the Northwest corner of the site which doesn't appear to have any proposed landscaping be visible from HWY 26? How will that area be treated? Note Group 51. Note also apparent swayle being constructed in that area.	Additional conifers have been proposed to screen the NW corner of the building.
	Design Guidelines			
	Industrial Design Objectives			
1	1. Encouragement of high quality industrial developments that strengthen the local economy.	1. High-quality architectural design has been implemented for all street facing and gateway buildings.	See comments above re: Gateway, materials, design aesthetic, etc.	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to idenitfy the proposed material finishes and colour palette. The materials selected are high quality finishes that echo the design aesthetic of the surrounding region.
	2. Compatibility between activities through appropriate site design and treatments.	2. The material selections for the buildings reflects the local aesthetic and meets the Town's Industrial Design guidelines.	See comments above re: landscape plan and TIPP	Native trees have been proposed to meet Town guidelines
	3. A low-rise profile form of development characteristic of a main street environment;	3. The majority of buildings on site are 1 storey, with the exception of Building A which is 2-storey. All buildings have been designed to break up large facades and appeal to the human scale.		
	4. Articulated and visually interesting façades for new industrial buildings that provide a strong image to the street.	4. This is has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-02 – Proposed Elevations.		
	5. A safe environment for vehicular movements on the site, particularly concerning large vehicles associated with industrial activities	5. Vehicular movement has been safely facilitated throughout the site. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
	6. A safe, secure and comfortable pedestrian environment for all users	6. Pedestrians have been provided safe access from the parking areas to the storefronts.		
	7. Green treatments that provide visual interest along the streetscape.	7. Refer to landscaping plan prepared by JDB.		
	8. Provision of appropriate transitions to adjacent properties, particularly nonindustrial properties.	8. Achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
	9. Minimization of the extent, visual appearance and impacts of parking and service areas	9. Wherever possible, parking and service areas are located in the rear and side yards, and block from the street by building masses, fenced enclosures, and/or plantings.		
	10. Limited nuisances and impacts on surrounding properties, particularly nonindustrial properties	10. Achieved		
	Industrial Design			

2	Site Design			Please provide black vinyl coated chain link fence for perimeter security fencing. There is significant view exposure of the fencing especially at the north end of buildings C-G. Please advise how this is being treated otherwise. Also note the exposed areas between the northern point of the site north of Building H and along the eastern property perimeter - please confirm design exposure and mitigating measures. This fence design may require additional treatment to safeguard the gateway design character. Black vinyl chain link at a minimum. Confirm no barbed wire	Black vinyl chain link fence is now proposed as per the comments. No barb wire is proposed. Trees and shrubs are proposed adjacent to the fence on the SWM area.
2a	Incorporate any existing natural features of a site such as existing trees, contours and water courses, where appropriate and feasible	The existing watercourse has been respected for siting all buildings, roads, and parking areas. Refer to landscaping plan for information on the retention of existing trees.		see comments above re: tree retention/removal	The ex. watercourse and associated vegetation will be preserved; all the trees beyond the limit of grading are to be preserved.
2b	Site buildings close to the street edge as much as possible to frame the street	The buildings have been situated as close as allowable to the street faces (Clark St. and Hwy 26) to help frame the street and the site.		Please note there is a different standard for the gateway vs non-gateway side especially adjacent to HWY 26 - please review and confirm related policy direction in the proposed design rationale	The Elevations have taken into account the Gateway design standards for all facades facing HWY 26. The design of the facades provide visual interest through roof line variations, both in height fluctuations and overhang projections, a variety of high quality material selections that echo the regional aesthetic and break up the long facades, and a cohesive colour palette for the site as a whole.
2c	Set building back from existing natural features to create buffer areas	The existing watercourse has been respected for siting all buildings, roads, and parking areas.		Some existing natural buffer areas appear to have been removed and will require enhancement or replacement plantings. See comments re: landscape plane and vegetation inventory. Please confirm what is being retained, removed, enhanced, and what the visual effect of the buffer is.	The ex. watercourse and associated vegetation will be preserved; all the trees beyond the limit of grading are to be preserved.
2d	Site buildings to ensure that adjacent properties are protected from the new development's site illumination, noise, odour, and outdoor service areas	Buildings have been situated as far as possible from the neighbouring properties.			
2e	Incorporate outdoor amenity areas into the overall site design, defined by building facades, fencing or landscaping	Amenities have been provided in accordance with this being an industrial site.		This comment appears to be in conflict with comment 9i below which states no amenities have been provided whereas the Community Design Guidelines speak to site design 3.1e) Incorporate outdoor amenity areas into the overall site design, defined by building facades, fencing, or landscaping. Outdoor amenity areas for staff and visitors is a feature in some industrial areas	Outdoor sitting area is provided near the Office entrance
3	Building Design				
3a	Use architectural features and materials to emphasize main building entrances, particularly those facing a public street	The storefronts are articulated with aluminium framed glazing on the public street to invite people in.		provide detail on materials, colours, etc. as noted above in elevation drawing dwg SP2	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes and colour palette.
3b	Use architectural detailing to break up long wall elevations, including the use of windows, projections and recessions, and changes in building material or colour	Architectural detailing and material changes have been used to break up the long façades of Buildings A & H and provide texture. Subtle variations in the buildings' rooflines have also aided in breaking up the long façades.		Building H Provides greater variation in height than building A. Are there opportunities to enhance the height variation of Building A? Similarity, are there opportunities to increase articulation in the façade?	Unfortunately with Building A being 2-stories, it is up against the maximum allowable height (11.0m) and does not allow for further variation of the roof line. The facades provide ample articulation as the masonry columns sit proud of the of the metal siding, the higher sections of roof have overhang projections, and there are canopy projections above the entrance doors to each unit.
3c	Design roof forms to be compatible with the style and massing of the building, and use roof materials and colours that complement the overall design	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-02 – Proposed Elevations.		Please provide additional details as noted above	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes and colour palette.
3d	Use cornices or similar treatments to articulate and define the building top	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-02 – Proposed Elevations.		The drawings don't demonstrate an articulation. Please provide related detail as call out note on the drawing	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify façade articulations and projections.
3e	Use changes in the building materials at wall projections or recessions to define the wall elevation	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-02 – Proposed Elevations.		Please see comments above	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify façade articulations, material changes, and projections.

3f	Use high quality exterior cladding materials such as brick, stone, steel, glass, and metal paneling, particularly on publicly facing wall elevations	High-quality and low maintenance building materials - stone, architectural block, metal panels, and aluminum framed glazing - have been used in this design	Please see comment above re: labeling the drawing with material and colour references	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes and colour palette.
3g	Coordinate all materials, colours and finishes on all exterior elevations to achieve a continuity and comprehensiveness of application	The materials, massing, and architectural details throughout the site have been kept consistent to project a cohesive design for the site and reflect a local aesthetic.	See comment above re: materials, colours, glass, etc.	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes and colour palette, which are cohesive for the entire site.
3h	Enclose or screen rooftop mechanical equipment from view from streets	Noted.	Please advise what "noted" means. Is there roof top mechanical and has it been screened?	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have a new note that all rooftop mechanical units shall be shielded. The mechanical system is unknown at this time and therefore precise rooftop unit locations cannot be shown.
3i	Ensure that the architectural style of buildings accommodating multiple tenants is cohesive over the entire building	The materials, massing, and architectural details of each building articulate individual tenant spaces, but keep a cohesive look and feel for the buildings and site as a whole.	Please see comments above re: materials, colours, glass, and related labeling of SP2	Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes and colour palette, which are cohesive for the entire site.
3j	Include individual entry points of multiple tenant buildings that are identifiable without detracting from the overall appearance of the building	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-02 – Proposed Elevations.		
4	Signage		ALL SECTION 4 provide details regarding signage and demonstrate they are in compliance with Sign By-law 2016-71. Provide a signage plan	Signage has been removed from all facades and will be addressed by future tenants.
4a	Ensure signs complement the architecture and landscape design and not detract from or overpower the building and site	Noted.	Provide additional detail on signage. Confirm that signage complies with sign by-law 2016-71. Note section 7.8 Site Plan Control: Section 7.8 – Site Plan Control Where development is subject to Site Plan Control under Section 41 of the Planning Act, site plan approval shall include consideration of the proposed signs. However, the granting of site plan approval does not exempt the signs from compliance with this By-law. For a sign to be approved through the Site Plan Approval process, the full details of the sign would have to be submitted and confirmation of compliance with this By-law provided prior to Site Plan Approval being granted.	Signage has been removed from all facades and will be addressed by future tenants.
4b	Use ground signs in the front yard to identify the project and its street number	Noted.		
4c	Incorporate building identification signage as an integral, coordinated element of the principal building facade that is compatible with the building design	Noted.		
4d	Multiple tenant developments should use a thematic sign design to contribute to a unified building presence. A sign uniformity plan should be prepared to establish the framework for visual coherence and compatibility across the building	Noted.		
4e	Use directional signage, as necessary, to assist in the orientation of pedestrians and traffic to the street, parking, service and open space systems	Noted.		
4f	Locate signs where they will not obstruct sight lines, driveways and intersections or interfere with pedestrian or motorist safety	Noted.		
4g	Select landscaping around the base of the sign that takes into consideration the continued visibility of signage in the future as the landscaping matures	Noted. Refer to landscaping plan prepared by JDB.		
5	Vehicular Circulation and Parking			
5a	Minimize the number of driveway connections to the public street, and consider common driveways to further minimize the number of driveways on public roadways	Only one main driveway is proposed to connect the site to Clark Street.		
5b	Locate driveways to provide easy access and egress for staff, visitors, delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.	Review loading space locations and viability especially loading space 4 which does not appear accessible and loading spaces 1 & 2 that impede the garbage area and is not clear how the two loading spaces directly adjacent to one another can be navigated. Note that loading spaces 1 & 2 appear to be divided by a 10 ft security fence.	Drawing SPA-01 has been updated to indicate revised locations for the required number of loading spaces. The line previously separating loading spaces 1 & 2 is the underground water service, not a fence.
5c	Locate driveways opposite existing or proposed driveways and streets to avoid offset intersections and traffic difficulties	Noted.	Please note MTO comments are forthcoming	Noted.
5d	Locate driveways for corner lots away from the street intersection	The one main driveway has been located as far as possible from the main intersection of Clark St. and Hwy 26.	Please note MTO comments are forthcoming	Noted.
5e	Provide sufficient area on the site for truck movements	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.	It is unclear how some vehicular movements will be achieved - a vehicle swept path analysis would identify any key constraints	A swept path assessment has been prepared and is included in the submission.
6	Pedestrian Circulation			

6a	Incorporate a well-defined and continuous pedestrian system on the site with connections to the public street, parking areas, and outdoor amenity areas	Each parking area has been located adjacent to the storefronts that it serves. Please note that this is an industrial site and the provision of sidewalks from Clark St. to the various buildings seems incongruent with the proposed uses.		
6b	Ensure pedestrian connections are barrier-free, and are provided directly from the public street sidewalk to the principal building entrance and parking areas	Barrier-free access has been accommodated from each barrier-free parking space to the storefronts. There is no sidewalk at Clark St. and therefore no sidewalk connecting the buildings on this site to the street.		
6c	Sidewalks should be provided between transit stops and building entrances. Building entrances should be coordinated with transit stops to minimize walking distance and provide weather protection	There is no public transit stop within a reasonable distance of this site.		
6d	For larger developments, incorporate major pedestrian routes that are easily identifiable through the use bollards, trees, continuous paving materials, signage and lighting	Each parking area has been located adjacent to the storefronts that it serves. Please note that this is an industrial site and the provision of sidewalks from Clark St. to the various buildings seems incongruent with the proposed uses.		
7	Parking		How are parking spots 331&36, which are located directly adjacent to vehicle movement paths protected without curbing? Pakring spots 1-15 in front of Building H do not appear to be delineated correctly. There are oversized unlabeled spaces and some spaces numbered but not delineated. Parking calculations don't appear to be correct and summary is confusing. Please review and advise accordingly.	Drawing SPA-01 has been updated to more clearly identify the parking spaces. Parking calculations are correct and states the applicable zoning bylaw references.
7a	Locate parking areas close to building entrances and provide an easily identifiable pathway to the building entrance	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
7b	Locate primary parking areas to the side and/or rear of the building preferably, with visitor parking, barrier-free parking, and drop off areas possibly located between the building and street	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
7c	Limit parking areas in the front yard to a single or double loaded row, with a landscaped strip between the street and parking	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
7d	Use planted parking islands and planting areas to break up large parking lots, that are raised and at least 2.5 metres in width	This site does not have any large parking areas that require planted islands.		
7e	Align rows of parking perpendicular to the building for larger parking areas to minimize the number of crossings of drive aisles for pedestrians	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
7f	Locate well-drained snow storage areas adjacent to parking areas and away from catch basins, if possible, if snow will not be trucked off site	Acknowledged. Snow will be trucked off site.	Show how snow will be trucked offsite. Will there be temporary storage locations, and in so where are they? Show temprary storage location and provide a note that indicates that snow will be removed within 24 hours or sooner and will not impede site circulation or parking	Temporary snow storage locations are indicated on Capes Engineering drawings, not the Architectural Site Plan.
7g	Provide bicycle racks or indoor bicycle storage should be provided near the entrances to buildings, ensuring the racks and bicycles do not impede pedestrian circulation	Bicycle racks have been provided adjacent to Buildings A & H. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
8	Loading and Service Areas			
8a	Orient loading bays and other service areas away from public street views and preferably screened from the street by building mass, fencing or screen walls compatible with the building architecture	The loading areas are screened from the public streets via the building masses.		
8b	Locate waste storage areas inside buildings, wherever possible. Where necessary, locate outdoor storage in the rear and interior side yard of the building, although not in rear yards that face major roads	The garbage enclosure is away from the street and fenced.	Provide board on board or similar or a formal garbage enclosure area. Access to garbage area appears to be impeaded by east west chain link fence	Garbage enclosure fence details are on the Landscape Archtiect's drawings (JDB)
8c	Use building design, siting, landscaping and planting or fencing to screen views from the public street to outdoor waste storage areas	The garbage enclosure is away from the street and fenced.		

8d	Design truck access to service and loading areas with sufficient space so that truck movements will not disrupt vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site or the public street	The loading spaces have been located as not to block regular vehicular and pedestrian traffic on the site.	Loading spaces 1&2 are directly next to one another and apparently divided by a chain link security fence. The design does not appear viable. Space 4 does not appear to be navigable relative to surrounding parking	Drawing SPA-01 has been updated to indicate revised locations for the required number of loading spaces. The line previously separating loading spaces 1 & 2 is the underground water service, not a fence.
8e	Locate utilities underground, wherever possible, to improve the appearance of the development. Where aboveground utilities are necessary, ensure their design is integrated and compatible with other site elements and screened from public view having regard for maintenance and	Noted.		
9	Landscape Design		Please see comments above regarding plantings identified in the inventory. It is unclear what is being retained and what is being removed. Please review generally and also note what appears to be a discrepancy in the site plan and landscape plan re: Planting group 51. The site plan shows what appears to be greater penetration into the feature of a grading element (swale?). Please be more clear about what is happening here and what is the impact. Where trees are being removed a replanting program should be included here as this end of the building and site appears to be exposed. Also please review group 7 and indicate the extent of removals and the sufficiency of proposed replanting in effecting screening of this portion of the site. Will replanting or enhancement planting occur between retained trees 9 & 10? Please consider additional screening through naturalized planting in this area.	A swale is required by engineer North of building H; Restoration proposed a mix of conifers and deciduous trees as compensation. A small group of cedars (part of group 51) is also to be preserved. Additional planting provided as per comments.
9a	Incorporate existing site features into the landscape design, where practical, taking advantage of on-site conditions such as view corridors or existing trees	Existing trees have been preserved on all sides of the site.	see comments above	See response above
9b	Select native and non-invasive plant species, as much as possible, with regard to their characteristics of soil type, sun, root spread, growth rate, density of canopy, and salt tolerance	Native species have been selected		
9c	Group plant materials to frame building elevations, add visual interest to blank building facades, and accentuate building entrances	All buildings are screened by the existing trees to be preserved; additional trees have been included.	Please see comment above and provide clearer indication of the screening effect of the retained vegetation and clearer indication of what vegetation is being retained or removed based on the inventory	Provided within this submission.
9d	Use landscape plantings and elements to assist in visually breaking up longer building wall elevations, coordinated with architectural elements and details on the wall elevation	A row of trees has been proposed at the South side of building A.	Note comment provided by applicant earlier about Building G and how it relies on landscaping rather than building design elements, please review landscape plan and indicate how this criterion has been satisfied. Note also for Building H including the north end	Additional planting has been provided. See response above.
9e	Locate plant materials so that they will not interfere with sight lines at driveway intersections, lighting and emergency apparatus such as fire hydrants	No planting is proposed at the driveway entrance. A clearance of 3.5m is provided to the fire hydrant.		
9f	Plant parking islands with plant material that is salt and drought tolerant, is easily maintained, and is hardy and strongly branched. Also, use hardy ground covers, stone mulch or similar materials, in parking lot landscape islands	Two salt tolerant species of trees are proposed in the two parking areas.		
9g	Ensure landscape strips along the outside edges of parking areas abutting public streets or adjacent properties are at least 3.0 metres wide, and planted with tree, shrubs and appropriate bed materials	Confirmed.	Please provide additional detail regarding the northwest end of the site which does not appear to meet the 3 m strip width and also appears to be unlandscaped	Additional planting has been provided in this area.
9h	Use landscape materials to screen and buffer service areas on the site, such as waste disposal, loading areas, or open storage areas. This could consist of a wall or fence, a landscaped screen, dense landscaping planting, a landscaped berm, or a combination of these features	Garbage enclosure to be fenced.	it is unclear how well screened the garbage enclosure is relative to the landscape plan. Please provide fencing and/or design details of the garbage enclosure.	Detail provided on LP-3
9i	Consider outdoor furniture and fixtures such as special lighting, trellises, arbours, raised planters, benches and fencing for outdoor amenity areas on the site	No amenity area is proposed for this site.	Please provide some amenity area	Picnic table provided near the office entrance.
10	Lighting		Given intensity of lighting within the site please ensure fixtures are downward facing and dark sky compliant. Please exercise diligence in implementation to ensure lighting remains targeted on site. Please provide commentary and drawings if applicable that demonstrates the view of the site and addresses concerns around the built effect of high fencing, heavily lit areas and concrete parapet buildings that could create negative visual effect of a security facility.	As per fixture specifications and note, luminaires are dark sky compliant.
10a	Design site lighting as an integrated system that considers all pedestrian, motorist and building needs	Acknowledged		
10b	Design lighting systems that carefully consider the areas to be lit, only illuminating areas which need to be illuminated given necessary activities and routes	Acknowledged		
10c	Avoid over-lighting a site, preferably using more fixtures with low wattage than few fixtures with higher wattage	Acknowledged		
10d	Focus lighting on pedestrian areas, clearly identifying pedestrian walkways and building entrances, at a general height of approximately 3.5 to 4.0 metres	Acknowledged		
10e	Direct lighting onto the site to avoid spill-over to adjacent development and natural areas	Acknowledged	Please provide a comment confirming the suitability of lighting relative to dwg E101 and comments above Re: Lighting	As per photometric drawings, lighting design ensures satisfactory mitigation of light spill over property line and adjacent areas using full cut off fixtures.
10f	Integrate lighting fixtures and poles with the overall architecture and landscape design of the project	Acknowledged	Please provide a comment confirming the suitability of lighting relative to dwg E101 and comments above Re: Lighting	Noted, please refer to architect.
10g	Use lighting to accent and highlight building, signage and landscape features where appropriate	Acknowledged		

11	Safety and Security		Fencing isn't mentioned here and no detailed discussion has been provided supporting propsoed security fence: its height, design, how views may be mitigated. Is it a barb wire fence, wood etc. and how can related view/design impacts be mitigated. Black Vinyl coated galvanized at a minimum Also - please confirm location of the western boundary and location relative to the existing fence. If situated on the Town property a separate fence may be required on the owners land. Provide a survey to confirm location of lot boundary	The storage facility portion will be fully fenced while the Block H portion is not proposed to be fenced. Existing survey shows the SWM fence on the Town property.
11a	Create clear sight lines to allow people to see and be seen and avoid blind corners, bends, grade changes and other elements which may obscure clear views	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.	Are there any additional safety measures that can be applied with regard to the concentration of storage buildings in the interior of the site?	It's the client's intent to have video surveillance throughout the site.
11b	Site buildings and locate windows to maximize informal surveillance opportunities by building users	The majority of fenestrations on Building A face Clark St. to provide informal surveillance. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-02 – Proposed Elevations.	Given its location in the interior of the site north of the main storage area, how does Bldg H function to achieve surveillance and site securit objectives?	For Building H, each unit's entrance door (man door) and overhead door have glazing so that tenants can informally surveil the adjacent parking area.
11c	Locate all parking areas and open spaces to maximize natural surveillance from buildings, public roads and walkways	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
11d	Design walkways to be direct, follow natural desire lines and avoid unobstructed sight lines	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.		
11e	Design buildings and sites to avoid creating potential areas of entrapment	This has been achieved. Refer to architectural drawing SPA-01 – Proposed Site Plan.	See comment above re: buildings B-G and Bldg H which is situated deep in interior of the site.	For self-storage Buildings B-G, users always have line of sight back to one of the main access aisles which will lead them to the exit gate. For Building H, there is only one, 2-way access road that leads to this far building. Users will have no other option than to follow the same access road back to exit the site.
11f	Clearly identify buildings with street address numbers that are well lit at night	Noted. Refer to EME's lighting plan.		
11g	Provide lighting levels that are appropriate for nighttime visibility, illuminating only those areas which need to be illuminated, preferably with metal halide lighting or similar	Acknowledged		
11h	Balance landscape screening objectives with the need with views into spaces and buildings so as to not create potential hiding areas	Confirmed		
11i	Landscape parking lots so that users may be seen from different vantage points such as building entrances, windows and sidewalks	Confirmed	Please see comments above.	Noted.
	Town of The Blue Mountains, Planning			
	(Adam Fraser, Intermediate Planner)			
	General Comments			
1	A Natural Heritage peer review will not be required	Acknowledged.		
2	In consultation with Development Engineering it has been determined that bringing the sanitary services up to the Grey Road 2 and Clark Street intersection is required for future potential servicing along Clark Street	Noted. The sanitary sewer has been extended as requested.		
	Grey Sauble Conservation			
	(Alex Maxwell, GSCA Director)			
	Comments			
	GSCA Regulations			
1.1	A portion of the subject property is regulated under Ontario Regulation 15/100: Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses. The regulated areas are associated with the watercourses present on the subject lands. We recognize that one of the features that our office originally had mapped as bisecting the property was incorrectly identified as such, and this will be reflected in our mapping once updates are made. That being said, we did not have the most middle of the channels mapped that flows north	Noted; A permit is required from the GSCA for any works within a regulated area.		
1.2	Under this regulation a permit is required from this office prior to the construction, reconstruction, erection or placing of a building or structure of any kind; any change to a building or structure that would have the effect of altering the use or potential use of the building or structures, increasing the size of the building or structure, or increasing the number of dwelling units in the building or structure; site grading; or, the temporary or permanent placing, dumping or removal of any material originating on the site or elsewhere, if occurring within the regulated area.	Noted; A permit is required from the GSCA for any works within a regulated area.		
1.3	Permits will be needed for the works located within the regulated areas on the subject lands. We respectfully request for future site plans to include the 30-metre setback from the watercourses on the site within the provided plans.	Noted. The 30 m setback for the regulated area has been superseded by the EIS which recommended a 10 m development setback which is what we have adhered to for the development limits. The limits of the GSCA regulated area for the site has been provided on the drawings.	Require confirmation of acceptance of EIS. Please see County Comments Re: natural heritage/ ecology. GSCA comments requested	The EIS has been accepted by the Grey County (see Grey County Ecology Staff comments)
	Provincial Policy Statements			
	Natural Hazards			
2.1	The natural hazards present on the subject lands include the flood and erosion potential associated with the drainage features that traverse the site.	No response required.		

2.2	Based on the information provided through this application, and a site visit completed by staff, it is evident that the current hazard mapping for the site is not accurate to some extent. The drainage feature that borders the property on the west, is accurately mapped and a minimum 15-metre setback from this feature should be adhered to. The drainage feature that crosses through the property was not previously mapped by our office, however the associated hazard is a minimum 15-metre setback from this feature. The drainage feature that borders the property to the east should have a 15-metre minimum setback for development. Our office also reviewed the available draft mapping for the Town Wide Master	The EIS has recommended a 10 m setback from the watercourse feature which has been adhered to in the design.	Require confirmation of acceptance of EIS. Please see County Comments Re: natural heritage/ ecology. GSCA comments requested	The EIS has been accepted by the Grey County (see Grey County Ecology Staff comments)
2.3	Based on our review of the current site plan, the minimum setbacks from the watercourse features are not being maintained. We recognize that an Environment Impact Study (EIS) was completed for the site, and the demonstrated 10-metre setback in the provided site plan was to accommodate the findings of that study, however an EIS is not an appropriate study to reduce setbacks related to flood and erosion hazards. In the absence of an engineered flood and erosion study for the watercourses on the site, the minimum setback for development on the site must be a minimum of 15-metres from the top of bank of the watercourses.	A flood study has been completed for the site which demonstrates that all development is outside of the flooding. The 10 m setback is appropriate in the vast majority of locations with the exception of a few areas where the flood limit may extend a maximum of 2.72 m beyond the 10 m setback line. In these locations there is a minor amount of regrading proposed and the regraded area to be revegetated. No work is proposed beyond the 10 m setback and as such we do not believe that a wider buffer is not required.	Landscape plan is not showing replanting in all graded areas. Note Group 51, 52. also please see County comments Awaiting GSCA comments	All graded areas outside the tree preservation zone have been replanted.
2.4	Moving forward, the site plan can either be updated to remove all development and site alteration out of the 15-metre setback from the watercourse feature on the site or development can be done prior to development on basis related to determine if this setback can be reduced	See response to 2.3		
2.5	stormwater management report confirms that flows are being contained to pre-development levels.	No response required.		
2.6	In its current iteration, GSCA is of the opinion that this application is not consistent with the Section 3.1 policies of the PPS	A flood study has been prepared and submitted which demonstrates the flood extent on the site and that a 10 m setback is appropriate. Considering the findings of this flood study have been incorporated into the development plan, subject to GSCA review & concurrence, the application and development proposal is now consistent with Section 3.1 of the PPS.		
	Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Plan			
3	The subject property is not located within an area that is subject to the Source Protection Plan	Acknowledged.		
	Recommendations			
4	As noted above, GSCA is of the opinion that the current site plan is not consistent with the Section 3.1 policies of the PPS or GSCA policies. Moving forward we believe there are two potential courses of action:			
4.1	The applicant can reconfigure the plans to ensure that no site alteration or development is located within the identified hazardous areas that are intended to be captured as a 15-metre setback from the top of banks from each of the watercourses on the site. Or	See response to 4.2	Confirm GSCA acceptance	Ongoing engagement with GSCA is occurring.
4.2	The applicant can undertake an engineered flood and erosion assessment for the watercourses on-site to determine the site-specific limits of the associated flood and erosion concerns to refine the extent of the hazardous areas on the site.	A flood study has been prepared and submitted which demonstrates the flood extent on the site and that a 10 m setback is appropriate.		
	Town of The Blue Mountains, Water and Wastewater Services		Water – Ensure there is adequate capacity of both the distribution system and the treatment plant to support this development Wastewater – Ensure there is adequate capacity of the wastewater collection system and at the treatment plant.	We previously provided an analysis of the collection system (Appendix I) which demonstrated there is capacity in the collection system. We have been provided information regarding the WWTP capacity and believe there is sufficient capacity (see supporting information submitted with this response matrix), however considering it is the Town's plant we feel the Town is in the best position to determine the available capacity of the plant.
	(Allison Kershaw, Manager of Water and Wastewater Services)		Water/Wastewater is unable to find any drawings for how the water and wastewater connections and extensions are to be made. Ensure that the water and wastewater laterals and mains are in the correct location as per the Town's Engineering Standards.	The drawings were included in both the report at the end of the text and in a separate drawing package. The relevant drawings are C2 and C12 with details and notes on C16
	Concerns with proposal to be addressed:			
1	Is there adequate depth in existing maintenance hole to provide 1.00% slope for first lag of sanitary sewer?	1% slope has been provided on the first leg of the sanitary sewer		
2	Will the minimum sewer velocity of 0.75m/s be achieved?	Yes		

3	The sewer on Grey Road 2 should be in the center of the road. The lateral should be at 90° to the sewer.	Locating the sanitary sewer in the "middle" of Grey Rd. 2 is problematic due to the curve on the roadway. We were provided two options by the Engineering Department for the sanitary sewer and the extension to Clark Street and we followed the 2 nd of the two options in our design.		
4	When the sewer changes direction a maintenance hole is required.	Noted. We had already provided a manhole at every change in pipe direction and have continued to do so in the 2 nd Submission.		
5	Maintenance holes to have moisture barrier installed.	A note has been added to this effect.		
6	Adequate downstream capacity of all sewers and treatment plant must be confirmed.	An assessment of the downstream sanitary system has been completed and included in the updated FSR.	Please cross-reference your design with Development Engineering Standards.	We have been provided information from the Town on your system and plant and from what we have been provided it appears that there is capacity. We again reiterate that itthis request should be something the Town should be confirming to us and not the other way around. See supplemental materials provided with this submission.
7	Adequate upstream water distribution and treatment plant capacity must be confirmed.	The Town Engineering Department requested information (which was provided Feb. 2023) and they indicated they would arrange for a water model and assessment would be completed. We have not received any costing for this external analysis or results.	outstanding requirement, please provide updated response	We have been provided information from the Town on your system and plant and from what we have been provided it appears that there is capacity. We again reiterate that itthis request should be something the Town should be confirming to us and not the other way around. See supplemental materials provided with this submission.
8	The proponent will be responsible for all off site works to connect to existing system.	Noted.		
9	All off site water & wastewater works to be fully commissioned	Noted.		
10	Water isolation valve required at property line.	Noted. An isolation valve was already provided at the property line.		
11	A Backflow assessment will be required.	Noted.		
12	Site may require a flowmeter/backflow device at property line, this will need to be assessed.	Noted.	Please provide assessment	Our previous submission already indicated that backflow prevention would be provided.
13	Sanitary flow monitoring may be required.	Noted.	Please provide monitoring	We have added a note regarding the requirement for flow monitoring to the engineering drawings as requested.
	Town of The Blue Mountains, Environmental			
	(Jim, Town of the Blue Mountains)			
	General Comments			
1	Need to ensure their proposed works comply with the recommendations of the Hwy 26/ Grey Rd 2 EA.	Noted. If there are any specific recommendations that the Town believes are not being adhered to please forward these recommendations so they can be incorporated into the design.		
2	Need to adhere to the Town engineering standards.	Noted. If there are any specific recommendations that the Town believes are not being adhered to please forward these recommendations so they can be incorporated into the design.	Please review applicable standards	The design does comply with Town standards.
	Town of The Blue Mountains			
	(Adam Fraser, Intermediate Planner)			
	Grey County Comments Summary			
1	No concerns with regard to County Official Plan Primary Settlement Area designation.	Acknowledged.		

2	Acknowledgement that written approval or a permit from the Conservation Authority is required before development can occur within the Hazard Lands.	Acknowledged.	please provide written approval	The GSCA has provided comments directly to our office regarding the floodplain analysis and we have provided a formal submission to their office addressing those comments. The comments are minor in nature. We believe the GSCA will provide written confirmation they are satisfied with the submission documents when they are satisfied and that will be forwarded to the Town. A permit from the GSCA is only required once construction is proposed not at Site Plan Agreement stage.
3	The proposed development is industrial in nature with potential impacts including, but not limited to fuel and/or chemical storage. I provided that all necessary concerns to limit any potential impacts to the Intake Protection Zone 2. County Planning staff have no concerns.	Acknowledged.		
4	Proposed development would not be considered a sensitive land use by County Planning staff with regard to D-2 Guidelines.	Acknowledged.		
5	Based on provided stormwater management study and peak flow analysis, County Planning staff have no concerns.	Acknowledged.		
6	EIS and proposed setbacks to protect watercourse poses no concerns to County Planning staff.	Acknowledged.		
7	County Transportation Services is seeking a portion of land in the southeast corner of the subject property to achieve the County's 100' or 30.480m road allowance and 50' daylight corner. Please see full County comments.	Acknowledged. Draft Reference Plan provided with 2 nd submission.		
8	No concerns from County Paramedic Services.	Acknowledged.		
	The Blue Mountains' Comments			
	Planning Services, General Comments			
1	It is the Town's understanding that the Ministry of Transportation's setback and entrance comments are unchanged from what was received from pre-consultation, which appear to be reflected in this first submission.	Acknowledged.	MTO comments are included in file correspondence	Acknowledged.
2	The proponent and any future owner or developer should be made aware that there is the potential that the Town may close the intersection of Clark Street and Grey Road 2. If this does occur, Clark St. will likely end in a cul-de-sac, and may not be located as suggested in the submitted TIS Brief. Alternative access to Grey Rd 2 may occur elsewhere.	Acknowledged.	A warning clause, save harmless and other provisions may be required as appropriate in the event of issuance of an approval to address this matter. Confirmation of any MTO infrastructure planning constraints has not yet been received. Town staff have advised of related potential concerns based on information available to date	Acknowledged.
3	As noted in the pre-consultation comments, development inside the h5 area must be accompanied by a required study. The proposed uses do not appear to be sensitive in nature as per D-1-3 Land Use Compatibility Definition, however the Town requires a D-2 study or justification for why a D-2 study is not required. Planning staff will accept the latter option.	A D-2 Compatibility between Sewage Treatment and Sensitive Land Use Study represents a guide for land use planning authorities on what type of land uses are appropriate near sewage treatment plants.	to be addressed though warning clause requirements to Owner and 3rd parties	Acknowledged.
		The framework of the D-2 study applies only to sensitive land uses, advising that such sensitive land uses not be placed adjacent to treatment facilities where practical, while also measuring separation distances, advising on acquisition of buffer areas, and providing alternatives to buffer area acquisitions.		
		The D-2 study advises when commenting on sensitive land use applications, the Ministry will examine compliance with the guidelines described herein, as well as any noise and/or odour complaints attributed to the facility.		
		Given the above, such a D-2 study is not required for the proposed development as it does not propose / represent a sensitive land use, but rather an industrial use.		
4	An Archeological Assessment Stage 1 will be required, and potential further study if recommended by the Stage 1 assessment. A portion of the site was subject to an Archeological Assessment with the Grey Road 2 and Highway 26 Intersection Improvements Class EA completed in 2016, which recommended conducting Stage 2 with respect to that study's scope. The Class EA can be made available upon request.	Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment provided within 2 nd submission. This study has been circulated to Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and response received advising no concerns or	Please provide SON comments	Provided within this submission.

5	Variance(s) to the Zoning by-law will be required.	Acknowledged. Minor Variance application will be submitted and justified at such time as the Site Plan Control process is nearing completion.		
	The Blue Mountains Official Plan (OP)			
1	Lands are partially designated Urban Employment Area (UEA) subject to Section B3.2	Acknowledged.	a) Confirm viability of loading spaces or relocate b) Confirm, as noted in comments above, the extent to which landscaping is retained or replaced to effect buffer screening of potentially exposed portions of the site. Use black vinyl coated galvanized chain link which is known for its design and blending qualities for security fencing. Provide building materials and colour notations on dwg SP02. Be cautious of the combination effect of parapet design, beiges and galvanized chain link which is suggestive of a security facility, in particular given the location with exposure on HWY 26 at a Community Gateway c) See comments throughout re: landscaping, removals and replacement/enhancement planting e)Confirmation of water and wastewater treatment and conveyance capacity is required Confirm any specific provisions applicable to Building H based on its use status when confirmed. Note also D - please confirm that no outdoor storage is proposed on this site. If none - please provide a notation that indicates "No Accessory Outdoor Storage"	JMA Response - Drawing SPA-01 has been updated to indicate revised locations for the required number of loading spaces.
	· B.3.2.3 b and c permit uses consistent with the development proposal			
	· Town will need to be satisfied with B3.2.4 Development Policies, specifically a, b, c and e.			
2	Lands are partially designated Hazard subject to Section B5.4, in relation to a watercourse that traverses the subject property	Acknowledged.		
	· Town comments to be refined pending the receipt of GSCA comments			
3	A portion of the lands are identified in Schedule B2 of the OP and subject to Section D5.3 Community Gateways	JMA has reviewed and incorporated the Town of Blue Mountains Community Design Guidelines for all buildings on site, especially those facing Clark St. and Hwy 26, which form a Community Gateway. Through architectural details and massing that provide visual interest, and the selection of material finishes consistent with the local aesthetic, the buildings forming the Community Gateway will provide a strong and aesthetically pleasing façade from the highway/street. Please refer to architectural drawing SPA-02 – Proposed	See comments throughout. Staff comment in the 1st submission is reflective of concerns articulated throughout these comments in particular related to confirmation of materials, colours, retained, removed replaced or enhanced landscaping. Concerns regarding proposed 10 ft galvanized steel chain link fence and related urban design impacts (see comments above).	JMA Response - Drawing SPA-02 Elevations have been updated to identify the proposed material finishes and colour palette. The materials selected are high quality finishes that echo the design aesthetic of the surrounding region.
	· Please provide further detail on how the proposal has considered this section of the OP		Provide additional detail demonstrating the mitigation measures and special measures adopted at this community gateway. Where plantings are proposed as enhancement or replacement plantings please provide a 3,5,10 yr visual depiction of how the plantings will effect screening overtime.	Estimated tree canopy size provided on LP-1
	Additional visual aid or detail indicating visual impact of passers-by, particularly on Highway 26 and Grey Road 2, would be beneficial. This may be complementary to the tree preservation plan.			
1	The Blue Mountains Zoning By-law 2018-65, as amended		provide a zoning by-law matrix demonstrating how the development complies and does not comply with applicable zones (here M1 and H).	Zoning analysis provided within this submission. Through multiple previous discussions with, and submissions to, Municipal Staff it was concluded that this project did not require an Official Plan Amendment or Zoning Bylaw Amendment. The Hazard designation / zoning bisecting the property approximately coincides with the stormwater management pond. A future Minor Variance application will capture required relief from zoning, most pertinently parking.
	The lands are zoned General Industrial (M1) and Hazard (H)			

2	Zoning (and OP) designations in relation to site plan proposal have not been provided to indicate if proposal is in compliance with Hazard Zone.	Acknowledged.	Provide a drawing that, through the use of shading, demonstrates the extent of the OP and Zoning Hazard designations on the property.	Overlay sketch provided with this submission. Through multiple previous discussions with, and submissions to, Municipal Staff it was concluded that this project did not require an Official Plan Amendment or Zoning Bylaw Amendment. The Hazard designation / zoning bisecting the property approximately coincides with the stormwater management pond. A future Minor Variance application will capture required relief from zoning, most pertinently parking.
3	Portion of the lands are within the holding h5 provision buffer related to the sewage	A D-2 Compatibility between Sewage Treatment and Sensitive Land Use Study represents a guide for land use planning authorities on what type of land uses are appropriate near sewage treatment plants.	A separate submission will be required to lift the Holding 5 provision: Holding Provision (h5) – Lands Adjacent to a Municipal Waste Water Facility The Holding (h5) provision applies to land uses and development which may be sensitive to the odours, noise and other contaminants within 100 metres of a municipal wastewater facility (sewage treatment plant). The Holding Provision (h5) may be lifted once it is determined through relevant study to address the current and future impacts and to assess appropriate design, buffering and separation distances in conformity with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change guidelines to the satisfaction of the County of Grey and Town of The Blue Mountains.	Acknowledged that a separate holding provision removal application process will be required. It is our opinion that a D-2 study is only required where sensitive land uses are being introduced. A D-2 study is not required for the proposed development as it does not represent a sensitive land use, but rather an industrial use.
	treatment facility. See general comments regarding D-2 study.	The framework of the D-2 study applies only to sensitive land uses, advising that such sensitive land uses not be placed adjacent to treatment facilities where practical, while also measuring separation distances, advising on acquisition of buffer areas, and providing alternatives to buffer area acquisitions.		
		The D-2 study advises when commenting on sensitive land use applications, the Ministry will examine compliance with the guidelines described herein, as well as any noise and/or odour complaints attributed to the facility.		
		Given the above, such a D-2 study is not required for the proposed development as it does not propose / represent a sensitive land use, but rather an industrial use.		

4	Based on first submission material, variances to the zoning by-law will be required for relief of:				Acknowledged. Minor Variance application will be submitted and justified at such time as the Site Plan Control process is nearing completion.	Supporting information will be required to demonstrate through the mitigating measures and design features the basis for any requested relief. Those measures should be highlighted in a specific submission corresponding to where relief is required. Provide detail of zoning conflicts with the Hazard land zoning. As noted above show the boundaries of the respective zones. Note ZBL 4.21 4.21 MULTIPLE USES AND ZONES ON ONE LOT a) Where any building, structure or lot is used for more than one purpose as provided by this By-law, the said building, structure or lot must comply with the provisions of this Bylaw relating to each use. b) Where a lot is divided into more than one zone, each portion of the lot must be used for a purpose that is permitted within each applicable zone. Accessory buildings or structures must be located in the same zone as the main building. In no case shall the zone boundary function as a lot line for the purposes of determining required setbacks and minimum yards. Notwithstanding the above, the maximum permitted lot coverage shall apply only to the portion of the lot that is within each respective zone, as required. Further review of the site plan requires an assessment of the required relief and how it is being addressed within the site plan. Note 5.1.10 More than one use on a lot 5.1.10 More Than One Use on a Lot The parking requirements for more than one use on a single lot or for a building containing more than one use, shall be the sum total of the parking requirements for each of the component uses, unless otherwise noted.	JMA Response - the Hazard land zoning has been identified on SPA-01 - Site Plan, and the parking calculations are in accordance with Note 5.1.10.
	· required Parking						
	· required Bicycle Parking, unless otherwise provided						
	· Subject to confirming height calculation method, Building A height						
	· Subject to further detail, potentially development within Hazard Zone						
	Table 1: Zoning By-Law 2018-65 & Other Provisions					Note issues regarding location of Hazard zone and applicability of zoning standards. Please identify zoning by-law conflicts	Zoning analysis provided within this submission. Through multiple previous discussions with, and submissions to, Municipal Staff it was concluded that this project did not require an Official Plan Amendment or Zoning Bylaw Amendment. The Hazard zoning bisecting the property approximately coincides with the stormwater management pond. A future Minor Variance application will capture required relief from zoning, most pertinently parking.
	Provision	Required	Proposed	Conformity?			
	M1 Permitted Uses:	n/a	Commercial Self-Storage with Office; Industrial Use	Yes			
	Min Front Yard	15m	>20m	Yes			
	Min Exterior Side Yard	5m	Building A minimum is 14m Building G: 18m Building H: 24m	Yes, however setback of Building A may be subject to change based on County ROW needs.	Required setbacks adhered to.		
	Min Interior Side Yard	5m	>=7.5m	Yes			
	Min Rear Yard	7.5m	N/A	N/A			

	Max Height (m)	11m	1 Storey building height: 9.87m	See Zoning definition of <i>height</i> and <i>finished grade</i> . Confirm if proposed height measurement method meets definition.	Yes, the proposed method meets the definition.	Please comment on the finished grade and to what extent this increases perceived height of the buildings relative to the surrounding land area.	The grade around Building A is very constant - the grade along the north side is 187.39, and the grade along the south is 187.44, which is a difference of 0.05m (2"). As such Building A, which is a 2-storey building, complies with the maximum permissible height of 11.0m.
			2 Storey building height: 11.0m				
	Road Setbacks & ROW	Provincial Highway 24m as per pre-consultation comments from the Ministry of Transportation dated Dec 1, 2021	24m	Yes	Noted	Please confirm and reference specific comments	Refer to SPA-01 - Site Plan. All buildings adhere to the 24.0m MTO setback, and the closest any building sits to the centreline of Grey Road 2 is 25.366m (Building A). These dimensions are shown on the Site Plan.
		County Road 22.86m from centreline of the road (County Official Plan 8.3.2)					
			Confirm building setback from Grey Road 2 centreline, see County comments	Likely, see County comments			
	Minimum Parking Spaces	Commercial Self Storage Facility: 1/5 m2 of office use plus 1/100 m2, of the building, except where the driveway access to the storage unit has a minimum width of 7 metres, in which case no additional parking shall be required	Storage Office & Storage: 12	No	Acknowledged. Minor Variance application will be submitted and justified at such time as the Site Plan Control process is nearing completion.	see comments above. Please provide details of Zoning By-law conflicts now and how the proposed design and mitigating measures and addressing these issues.	Zoning analysis provided within this submission.
		37.21m2 Office = 8					
		1817.22m2 applied for Remaining: 19	Industrial: 67, however confirm parking stall 28 for building H.				
		27 Required					
			Barrier-free: Site Statistics indicates 5 provided but Plan shows 6.				
		Industrial Use: 1/30m2 for the first 1,000 m2 1/100m2 for the floor area between 1,000 and 5,000 m2 plus 1/200 m2 in excess of 5,000 m2					
		4351.38m2 =					
		67 Required					
	Minimum Bicycle Parking Spaces	Industrial Uses: 2 parking spaces plus 0.25 parking spaces per 1000m2 GFA	None found in review. Confirm status of Bicycle	No	Bicycle racks have been added adjacent to Buildings A & H to accommodate the 4		

		4351.38m2=1.08 or 2 4 Required	Parking		required spaces.		
	Minimum Loading Space Requirements	See ZBL Table 5.7	2	Yes		this does not appear to match the review quoted on the Site Plan drawing. Also note concerns regarding the location and usability of the loading spaces	Drawing SPA-01 has been updated to indicate revised locations for the 2 required loading spaces.
		Total GFA: 8,598m2					
		2 Required					
	Other Site Plan Comments						
1	The two required loading zones are abutting Building A, and Building H has no loading zone. Please provide a rationale for how Building H is to manage loading needs.				The required loading spaces have been added near Building H. Please also note that along the west façade of Building H, overhead doors have been provided for each unit, as well as a clear access space in front of each overhead door. These access spaces can accommodate smaller loading vehicles such as cube vans, etc.	Please provide additional details of proposed use of BLDG H. Note also that the proposed loading zone is not navigable based on parking plan. Given the design reference to overhead doors it isnt clear what is proposed in building H	Building H is an industrial building comprised of 8 units, and each unit has it's own overhead door and adjacent access area as detailed on the revised SPA-01 - Site Plan. Upon further review of the Zoning By-Law, only 2 loading spaces are required for the site. The proposed locations should provide adequate space to maneuver.
2	Is the Building H building and parking envelope constrained to a degree that result in a 1.45m sidewalk?				The sidewalk along Building H has been increased to 1.83m (6'-0").		
3	Please show Holding Provision h5 buffer and existing zoning in future Site Plan drawing Submissions				Site plan drawing revised accordingly.	Site Plan does not appear to show the zoning boundaries - please show	Holding Provision h5 buffer and existing zoning is shown on SPA-01 - Site Plan
4	Thank you for incorporating much of the feedback provided through pre-consultation				Acknowledged.		
	Building Services						
1	Zoning:						
1.1	Property is zoned Commercial & Employment (M1) and Hazard (H)				Acknowledged.		
1.2	A self storage facility and industrial uses are permitted				Acknowledged.		
1.3	Holding Provision (h5) shall be lifted prior to development.				Acknowledged.		
2	OBC:						
2.1	Architect has revised building Matrix for OBC classification of Building A to 3.2.2.69.				Yes, refer to drawing SPA-03 – Building OBC Matrices		
2.2	Draft plan for site arrangement of buildings complies with OBC Provisions for Firefighting and Spatial Separation.				Noted.		
2.3	Washroom facilities are required to serve all buildings.				Yes. Washroom facilities for the self-storage facility will be housed in Building A. Otherwise, each tenant shall have the necessary washroom facilities within their unit.	Buidling H is an industrial building, not for use as a sel serve storage building, and therefore requires washrooms to be located within the building. Also note security fence seperating building A from C-G. How will those building users access washroom facilities in Building A	Industrial Building H contains 8 units and the tenants will be responsible for applying for building permits to provide the necessary washrooms within each of their units. Building A is NOT separated from Buildings C - G by a fence. I think you're confusing the water service line with a fenceline.
2.4	Building Permits required for each of eight building.				Noted.		
2.5	Permits only available upon the issuance of Basic Services from the Town's Development Engineering Department.				Noted.		
3	Lot Development:						
3.1	The property shall be serviced by municipal sanitary sewers and water.				Noted. It was already proposed to service the site as such.		
3.2	Site plan shall include a grading plan for the entire development.				A grading plan for the entire site was already provided.		
3.3	Site Servicing to be installed under the authority of the Town's Development Engineering Department.				Noted.		
3.4	Recommend that site services and rough grading be completed prior to the issuance of Basic Services.				Noted.		
3.5	Municipal Land Use Permit required for the property entrance.				Noted.		
4	Fire Protection:						
4.1	Fire Hydrants within the development appear to be adequate				No response required.		
4.2	Building sprinkler systems are not proposed.				No response required.		
5	On-Site Sewage:						
5.1	N/A						
6	Agencies & Authorities:						
6.1	GSCA and MTO approvals required				Acknowledged.	See related notes throughout. Awaiting GSCA comments	GSCA & MTO comments are being addressed as part of this resubmission.
	Operations Department						

	Water & Wastewater				
1	FSR references Appendix B for water and wastewater. Appendix B is empty of the FSR – missing information?	The submitted FSR had “as constructed” drawings in Appendix B and the pdf version submitted had all the required drawings appended.			
2	Potential for servicing challenges, especially for wastewater (sanitary) connection	A viable sanitary connection design has been presented.	Confirmation of availability and allocation of water & wastewater treatment and conveyance capacity is required. I think this comment is referencing off site dependencies and required demonstration of viable capacity	We have been provided information from the Town on your system and plant and from what we have been provided it appears that there is capacity. We again reiterate that itthis request should be something the Town should be confirming to us and not the other way around. See supplemental materials provided with this submission.	
3	Water:	The Town Engineering Department requested information (which was provided Feb. 2023) and they indicated they would arrange for a water model and assessment would be completed. We have not received any costing for this external analysis or results.	outstanding requirement, please contact Brain Worsely for additional information (bworsely@thebluemountains.ca)	We contacted Brian Worsely and received information which we have used to form our resubmission documents.	
	Please ensure there is adequate plant capacity and distribution capacity to meet the needs of this facility, including all watermain to the site and adequate water flow for firefighting.		confirmation of water and wastewater treatment and conveyance capacity required	We have been provided information from the Town on your system and plant and from what we have been provided it appears that there is capacity. We again reiterate that itthis request should be something the Town should be confirming to us and not the other way around. See supplemental materials provided with this submission.	
	Water model should be run.				
4	Wastewater: Please ensure there is adequate plant capacity and collection system capacity, including all sanitary sewers and pumping stations. Wastewater model should be run to confirm capacity.	We have reviewed the provided information regarding the sanitary system and have updated the FSR accordingly.			
Fire Services					
1	Document 3 OBC Matrix Comment 3.00 Fire Alarm System OBC reference is incorrectly referenced as OBC 3.2.3. as OBC 3.2.4. is the Fire Alarm Section	Updated.			
2	Building # 2 2 story building OBC 3.10.2.3. (2) first floor 500m2 compartmentation requirement is not mentioned in the Matrix	Updated.			
3	Building # 2 2 story building OBC 3.10.3.3. (2) (3) fire alarm requirement for building over 1 story	Updated.			
4	Medium Hazard Classification OBC Fire Extinguishers shall be distributed throughout the complex with a maximum distance of 15m between mounted extinguishers, visible signage required	Noted.			
5	This shall be a posted no smoking facility OFC 3.3.2.11. Smoking Prohibited	Noted.			
6	There is no identified snow storage area	Snow will be trucked off site.	See comments above regarding snow storage and management - detail should be depicted on the site plan confirming where snow storage is located temporarily and providing for it's removal within 24 hours. Snow storage sould not impede parking/loading/site circulation requirements	Snow storage areas have been shown on the CAPES Engineering drawings. Temporary snow storage locations are indicated on Capes Engineering drawings, not the Architectural Site Plan.	
7	Question: Is flammable/combustible liquids allowed or prohibited at this facility?	These substances will be restricted at the facility.			
8	Question: Will there be electric vehicle charging within the facility or storage pods?	At this time, no electric vehicle charging stations are envisioned for this project.			
9	Question: Is the facility secured at night?	Yes.			
10	Question: Are padlocks provided by facility, and would there be a Master key for a fire department Chubb Box?	The facility will provide the padlocks. This is for privacy purposes. Master key for the front gate and building access for CHUBB box will be provided.	What is the location of the front gate?	The front gate for the self-storage facility is located between the northwest corner of Building and the south end of Building C. Refer to SPA-01 - Site Plan.	
Finance					
1	Town DCs		Acknowledged.		
	Building	GFA		DC	
	A	2,601.28		\$245.52	\$638,666.27
	B	454.26		\$245.52	\$111,529.92
	C	681.36		\$245.52	\$167,287.51
	D	763.50		\$245.52	\$187,454.52
	E	1,053.72	\$245.52	\$258,709.33	
Indigenous Groups					
1	Huron Wendat Nation	Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment	Please follow up with the Huron Wendat Nation	Included within this submission.	

	Inquiry if any archeological studies or field work will be necessary as part of the development.	provided within 2 nd submission. This		
	Grey County Planning and Development			
	(February 6, 2023)			
	County Comments			
1	The proposed development would create growth within the primary settlement area by developing vacant land into a business. Further, the proposed development would add to the full range of industrial uses within the Primary Settlement Area. Therefore, County Planning staff have	Acknowledged.		
2	Schedule A of the County OP indicates the subject lands contain 'Hazard Lands'. Section 7.2(9) states, <i>In the Hazard Lands land use type development and site alterations will only be considered if all of the following can be satisfied:</i>			
2a	<i>The hazards can be safely addressed and new hazards are not created or existing ones aggravated;</i>	A floodplain analysis has been completed to address the hazard and development is located outside of the hazard areas.	clearance required	The GSCA has provided comments directly to our office regarding the floodplain analysis and we have provided a formal submission to their office addressing those comments. The comments are minor in nature. We believe the GSCA will provide written confirmation of acceptance in due course.
2b	<i>No adverse environmental impacts will result. The County, in consultation with the conservation authority, may require an environmental impact study to be prepared at the proponent's expense, in accordance with this Plan;</i>	An EIS has been completed and submitted with the application.	County is now the reviewer. Clearance required- see County comments.	The EIS has been accepted by the Grey County (see Grey County Ecology Staff comments)
2c	<i>Vehicles and people have a way of safely entering and exiting at all times;</i>	Safe access and egress to the site as defined by the GSCA is being provided.		
2d	<i>The advice or approval where required, of the appropriate conservation authority shall be obtained. The County and the conservation authority will consider the mitigation of effects on vegetation, wildlife and fishery resources, and the natural features of the site.</i>	Acknowledged.		
2e	<i>There is no feasible location for the development outside of the Hazard Lands land use type.</i>	Noted; A permit is required from the GSCA for any works within a regulated area.	Awaiting GSCA comments confirmation of clearance status required	The GSCA has provided comments directly to our office regarding the floodplain analysis and we have provided a formal submission to their office addressing those comments. The comments are minor in nature. We believe the GSCA will provide written confirmation of acceptance in due course.
3	An EIS was submitted with the application stating that written approval or a permit from the Conservation Authority is required before development can occur within the Hazard Lands. County Planning staff have no concerns.	Noted.		
4	Appendix A of the County OP designates areas of the subject lands as 'Intake Protection Zone 2'. Section 8.11.2(1) states, <i>a) Intake protection zones (IPZ's) are areas of land and water, where run-off from streams or drainage systems, in conjunction with currents in lakes and rivers, could directly impact on the source water at the municipal drinking water intakes. Within the context of Grey County, vulnerability scores for IPZ's range from 4 to 7. IPZ's are shown in Appendix A of this Plan and further information can be found in the local source protection plans.</i> The IPZ mapping designation is intended to protect the groundwater table. Potential impacts associated with industrial uses including, but not limited to, fuel and/or chemical storage. The proposed development is industrial in nature. Provided that all necessary measures to limit any	All applicable guidelines are being followed on the site for stormwater management to protect groundwater. The site will also require an ECA for all stormwater controls which will be obtained concurrently with all other approvals. Design and operations of the buildings will adhere to OBC and will also obtain an ECA if needed for the intended operations.		
5	Appendix A of the County OP indicates the subject lands are near 'Wastewater'. Section 8.9.1(16) states, <i>Local municipalities must comply with recommended buffer separation guidelines as presented in the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks D-2 Guideline or its successor document, for compatibility between wastewater treatment facilities/sewage treatment works as shown on Appendix A [...] and sensitive land uses.</i> The proposed development would not be considered a sensitive land use; therefore, County Planning staff have no concerns.	Acknowledged.		
6	Section 8.9.2(2) of the County OP states, <i>Applicants may be required to submit studies or information relating to:</i>			
6a	<i>Analysis of pre- and post-development storm runoff and water source flows, erosion, groundwater levels and infiltration;</i>	All of this information has already been submitted within the FSR.		

6b	Proposed storm water drainage and retention facilities;	All of this information has already been submitted within the FSR.		
6c	Ways to control erosion and sedimentation;	All of this information has already been submitted within the FSR.		
6d	Considering climate change and the increase of intensive storm events on the impact and design of the storm water management facilities;	We followed the Town engineering standards which dictated which IDF curves to be used for the site (Owen		
6e	A grading plan for the proposed development;	This has already been prepared and previously submitted.		
6f	An assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the water quality, water temperature, and water balance, and the ways to mitigate any potential	The discharge from the SWMF for the site is to the Hwy 26 ditch system and the SWMF follows the recommendations in the Town standards and generally conforms to the recommendations of the MECP for an enhanced level of quality control (as described in the FSR).		
	decreases in water quality.			
6.2	A stormwater management study was submitted with the application and provides analysis and mitigation measures in order to lessen and address any potential impacts from the proposed stormwater management pond. Further, the study determines that peak flow draining from the subject property would be less than the existing peak flow during all design storm	Acknowledged.		
7	Appendix B of the County OP indicates the subject lands contains 'Streams'. Section 7.9(2) states, No development will be permitted within 30 metres of the banks of a stream, river, or lake unless an environmental impact study prepared in accordance with Section 7.11 of this Plan concludes setbacks may be reduced and/or where it has been determined by the appropriate conservation authority these setbacks may be reduced. Landowners are encouraged to forest the areas within 30 metres of any stream to maintain and improve fish habitat, ecological function of the stream, and to increase natural connections.	Noted.		
	The EIS submitted with the application states that the watercourse is from drainage and that there is not any proposed development within the watercourse. A 10 m setback is also provided to protect the watercourse on the property and on the property. Therefore, County Planning staff have no concerns.			
8	County Transportation Services have reviewed the subject application and have a comment stating Grey County's mission is to attain widening to garner a 100' or 50-100 m road allowance width. Currently this does not exist at the southeast corner of this property. Therefore, the County is requesting the small sliver of property to accomplish this along with a 50' daylight	Reference Plan has been created to demonstrate Parts for the widening, daylight triangle and 0.3 reserve.		
9	County Paramedic Services have reviewed the subject application and have no concerns.	Acknowledged.		
10	Provided that the recommendations of the EIS are implemented and County Transportation Services requirements are fulfilled, County Planning staff have no concerns with the subject application.	Acknowledged.		
11	The County requests notice of any decision rendered with respect to this file.	Acknowledged.		
	Town of the Blue Mountains, Review Comments			
	(Dylan Stoneman, C.E.T. January 12, 2023)			
	General Comments			
1	Building Permits required for each building.	Noted.		
2	Please provide grading plans for the entire development.	Plans were already submitted previously.		
3	Please note that capacity for storm, water, and sanitary isn't reserved until a Subdivision agreement is in place.	Noted.	See comments above regarding requirement for confirmation of availability of water and wastewater treatment and conveyance capacity	See responses above regarding the same.
4	Please provide the Right of Way Cross Sections of all roads on all public and condo roads.	A cross section of the internal road has been provided.		
5	Please provide details and notes on roads, storm sewers, sanitary sewer, watermains, and all proposed materials to be used.	The materials for all proposed servicing was already provided either in labelling on the drawings or through notes on the drawings.		
6	Please provide the composite utility plan, lighting layout, pavement marking and signage plan.	Composite Utility Plan in the process of being created. Anticipated submission to the Town in January 2024.	Signage plan not provided and is required - see comment above	Plans revised to not included any signage. Signage will be at the discretion of future tenants.
7	Please note that all hazardous trees adjacent to any Right of Way, property line, trail alignment or prevent an immediate or future hazard to property or public must be removed.	Noted.		
8	Please provide a clearing and grubbing plan at your earliest convenience.	A clearing and grubbing plan (Removals Plan) has been prepared.		
9	GSCA and MTO approval required for all building permits unless each authority issues a blanket approval.	Noted.	Please see MTO comments. Awaiting GSCA comments	Acknowledged.
10	Please note that Site Alteration/ Fill Permit Application must be completed and approved for any site alterations. No person shall place or dump fill, or alter the existing grade of any land, except in accordance with the provisions of By-law 2002-78 As Amended. Please show any proposed fill pile locations on drawings.	Temporary fill storage locations have been added to the ESC Plans		

11	Please provide heavy duty silt fence along the proposed storm water management pond. Please note that all silt fence must be maintained and remain installed during construction until the site is fully vegetated and established.	A double row of Heavy Duty Silt fence is already shown for the perimeter of the site. We do not believe that additional silt fence specific to the SWMF is required.	Storm pond is situated in between what is anticipated will be two active or phased construction sites. Provisions need to be in place to manage siltation and erosion impacts. For example, note temporary stockpile locations adjacent to Building H	The SWMF is proposed to be built as part of the initial works on the site and will act during construction to manage sediment runoff. We have added more ESC fencing around the stockpiles to add more protection.
12	Please provide thickness of proposed entrance culvert. Our minimum standard is for the lifespan of CS-culverts are 75-100 years.	The entrance culvert has been replaced with a concrete box culvert.		
13	Please confirm if a guardrail or fence is proposed the Storm Water Management Pond.	Neither a guardrail nor a fence is proposed for the SWMF		
14	Please provide Operational and Maintenance manuals for the OGS units, and the SWMP.	O&M information has been prepared.		
15	Please consider our Community Design Guidelines design purposes. Items to consider as per our Community Design Guidelines are Greenfield Design, Plantings and lighting.	Guidelines have been considered and supported in all pertinent respects.		
16	Please note that all tees, joints, and bells located within the calculated restraint length must be restrained with approved bell and joint restraints.	Noted.		
17	Please provide a construction access plan. To reduce the tracking of mud onto paved streets, please construct the proposed construction access to our Town Standards – Section - 4.12.3 Stone Mud Pad Construction Entrance	The ESC plans already show the requested information.		
18	Please provide substantial more detail on the stormwater management pond.	Substantial detail has already been provided for the facility.		
19	Please note that in the instance of a fourth or subsequent engineering/technical submission, an additional fee of \$50 per lot and/or block for water supply cannot be guaranteed due to potential supply reductions from the County of. The Town's East End Water EA will address this issue	Noted.		
20	It is not yet completed.	Noted.		
21	Please note that the Engineering Submission Requirements – Checklist, attached. An applicable documentation is required for an engineering	Noted.		
22	Please note that the County's transportation services require a permit to construct, in permitting, any proposed road works within the County Road allowance.	Noted.		
23	Please note that a Grey County Occupancy Permit is required for works within the County Road.	Noted.		
24	Please provide digital copies of the Appendices. - Appendix E – Existing Condition Stormwater - Appendix F – Post-Development Stormwater - Appendix G – Water Demand	Digital (pdf) versions of the requested appendices were already provided.		
25	Please provide digital copies of the following Drawings. - Drawing C1 – Existing Conditions and Removal Plan - Drawing C2-C4 – Grading and Servicing Plans - Drawing C5 – Post Development Drainage Area Plan - Drawing C6 – Stormwater Management Facility Plan - Drawing C7 – Stormwater Management Facility Profile - Drawing C8-C10 – Erosion and Sediment Control Plans - Drawing C11-C13 – Plan and Profile - Drawing C14 – External Erosion and Sediment Control Plan - Drawing C15 – C18 - Standard Details	Digital (pdf) versions of the requested appendices were already provided.		
	Bell Canada			
	(Juan Corvalan, Senior Manager, January 19, 2023)			
	General Comments			
1	We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application and have no objections to the application as this time.	Acknowledged		
2	We hereby advise the Owner to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during detailed design to confirm the provisioning of communication infrastructure needed to service the development. We would also ask that the following paragraph be included as a condition of approval: "The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject parcel, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."	Noted and understood		
3	It shall also be noted that the responsibility of when to provide entrance service to (s) from Bell Canada's existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the	Noted and understood		
4	If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.	Noted and understood		
5	To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations.	Acknowledged. Municipality will provide consolidated 2 nd submission to Bell Canada.		
6	We would note that WSP operates Bell Canada's development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. However, all responses to circulations and requests for information, such as requests for clearance, will come directly from Bell Canada, and not from WSP. WSP is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses.	Acknowledged.		
	Enbridge Gas Inc.			
	(Barbara M.J. Baranow, Analyst Land Support, January 16, 2023)			
	General Comments			
1	Thank you for your correspondence with regard to the proposed One Plan Application. Enbridge Gas Inc. does have service lines running within the area which pose a safety hazard to the public. It is necessary to terminate the gas service and relocate the line according to the new property boundaries. As underground infrastructure would be at the end of the property easement and on/near any of our existing facilities, please contact us as early as possible (1 month in advance at least) so we can exercise engineering assessment of your work. The purpose is to Confirmation of the location of our natural gas pipeline should be made through Ontario One Call 1-800-400-2255 for locates prior to any activity.	Noted and understood.		
2		Noted and understood.		
	National Huronne-Wendat			
	(Naomi Leduc, January 16, 2023)			
	General Comments			

1	Thank you for your email. Could you please let us know if any archaeological studies or fieldwork will be necessary as part of this project?	Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment provided within 2 nd submission. This study has been circulated to Saugeen Ojibway Nation (SON) and response received advising no concerns or comments with the report / analysis.	Please provide a response to Huron Wendat. Saugeen Ojibway Nation is a different First Nation.	Provided within this submission.
	Engineering Comments			
	(Summarized by Capes, March 31, 2023)			
	Engineering Comments			
1	Please provide Plan and Profile drawings for the site servicing including the internal works.	The Town Guidelines do not require plan and profiles for internal site plan roads, and we do not believe that the P&P sheets would convey any information that is not already being provided by the submitted drawings.		
2	Pipe embedment to be compacted to a dry density of at least 95% of the materials SPMD. Backfill and Embedment to OPSD 802.010, 802.031.	Noted.		
3	All disturbed areas to be reinstated to previous condition or better.	Noted.	Please see comments throughout on landscaping questions	Noted.
4	All signage to comply with the Towns sign By-Law.	Noted.	Please provide signage package and confirm in compliance with Town Sign By-law	Signage has been removed from all facades and will be addressed by future tenants.
5	Minimum cover on culverts is 0.3m	Noted.		
6	Where existing asphalt is thicker than 10mm, a 500mm wide lap joint shall be ground into existing asphalt prior to placement of surface course asphalt.	Noted.		
7	Can you please send an excerpt of the required FUS (2020) fire flows and water demands. Once received we will then provide all your information to our external Town water modeler to obtain a quote and timeline.	This information was provided to the Town February 24, 2023. We have not received any further information from the Town on this.		
8	Please conduct a downstream sanitary capacity assessment and provide sanitary sewer design calculation sheets for the development.	An assessment has been completed and included in the FSR.		
9	Sanitary Capacity Assessments Reports will be sent in a separate email. Please provide an assessment to the Pump Station on Lakeshore Rd. and confirm the pump station has sufficient capacity.	Noted and completed.		
10	The Town now has review authority for ECA's. Stormwater and Wastewater CLI ECA's requirements will be provided in a separate email.	No further information on this has been received from the Town.	Outstanding requirement - please contact bworsely@thebluemountains.ca	Information was provided and a response has been provided with this submission.
11	Please update the asphalt specification to be 40mm HL3 surface course, 50mm HL4 base course asphalt.	Updated as requested.		
12	As per our engineering standards roof leaders are not permitted to be installed directly to storm system.	Updated as requested.		
13	Please update the water demand calculations to reflect the 2022 updated FUS document.	The water demand was updated, and confirmation sent to the Town that no changes resulted in the update.		
14	The sanitary sewer is to be installed along the frontage of the site on Grey Rd. 2 for future use.	Updated as requested.		
	MTO comments		See additional MTO comments attached	
1	MTO require that a table indicating stage-storage-discharge relationships for various storm events be included in the report.	A stage-storage table was already included in Appendix F of the FSR	MTO comments forthcoming	A stage-storage table was already included in Appendix F of the FSR
2	The proponent must demonstrate that the post-development flow rates into the Highway 26 drainage system are equal to or less than the pre-development flow rates for all storm events. A chart that compares the pre to post for all storm events must be included in the report. Furthermore, a statement that confirms this shall be included in the report method of calculation is not included.	A table was already included in the FSR (Table 2) and a statement indicating that the post dev peak flows were less than pre dev was also included.		
3	MTO require that an IDF chart be included in the report.	The IDF chart used in the 1 st submission was noted (Owen Sound MTO Chart as per Town standards). The Town standards have now changed and the new IDF curves from the Town have been used. These curves are readily available in the Town Engineering Standards but we have also appended them in the 2 nd submission.		
		This information was already included		

4	MTO require that MTO Identification of percentage of pervious impervious areas be included in the report.				in the text of the FSR and noted on Drawing C5		
5	There are no types of mitigating measures such as silt fences, check flows or sediment traps proposed in the report. MTO require that the consultant provide recommendations				This information was already included in the report (page 13) and three		
6	MTO require a detail drawing for sediment and erosion control.				This information was already included in the report (page 13) and three		
	Grey County Comments						
	Grey County Transportation Services						
1						The previous comments are still applicable, and a Road Widening is applicable in southeast corner of the lot. A setback of 75ft from proposed building to the centreline of the County RoW. The proposed entrance is to be onto a lower tier Municipal RoW	Road widening has been confirmed and provided through this submission. The proposed entrance is onto a lower tier Municipal Road, and not onto the County Road or MTO highway.
	Grey County Ecology Staff						
2						The property contains and/or is adjacent to fish habitat. It is Grey County staffs understanding that the proposed development will be located within and/or adjacent to the feature on previously disturbed and developed lands. Grey County Staff have reviewed the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) submitted by Roots Environmental and the tree preservation plan and find them both acceptable. Recommended mitigation measures are as follows: 1) To ensure protection of the watercourse on and off the property, a 10-metre vegetated setback from the watercourse shall be implemented. This setback will maintain this drainage through the property, which contributes to fish habitat downstream. Minor grading will be required in the setback during construction. 2) Silt fencing shall be installed at the limit of grading until construction and landscaping is completed. Any disturbed areas within the setback shall be restored with native plantings per the Landscape Plan completed for the development. 3) Clearing of vegetation shall not occur between April 1 – August 31st per Environment Canada’s general nesting periods of migratory birds.	Acknowledged.
3						Grey County Staff have reviewed the stormwater management report and plan and associated erosion and sediment control plan and find them acceptable. The property also lies within an area designated as a significant groundwater recharge area that may influence highly vulnerable aquifers, as such, low-impact development/infrastructure is recommended. It is Grey County Staffs understanding that the property contains protection areas that are subject to policies of the Source Water Protection Act. As such, the Risk Management Official of Drinking Water Source Protection should be tagged for comments on this application, please contact rmo@greysauble.on.ca.	The Risk Management Official has been contacted and the response included with the resubmission documents.
	MTO Comments						
1						Page 13, Stormwater Approval Criteria... the document "MTO Stormwater Management Requirements for Land Development Proposals 2009 (References Updated April 2022)" was not referenced as a design standard or guideline that was referred to as part of the report. Proponent to confirm that all requirements of the MTO guideline have been considered.	The noted reference manual does not seem to be available from any online source. We have adhered to the recommendations of the 2003 MOE Manual, GSCA Guidelines, TBM Engineering Standards as well as the 1997 MTO Drainage Management Manual and the most recent available stormwater recommendations available at https://www.ontario.ca/page/ministry-transportation . We believe that we have adhered to as many of the required and varied guidelines as possible.

2						Page 13, Stormwater Modelling - Proposed Development...The report states that "The SWMF will discharge via an outlet structure consisting of a small diameter orifice (75 mm) with a trapezoidal weir (0.40 m opening) set above that to control less frequent events." The orifice is referenced on pages 17 and 18. MTO's concern is that the continued functioning of such a control device cannot be guaranteed. If proposed, an orifice plate must be permanently bolted in place so that it can not be removed. Alternatively, a section of reducer pipe with a inside diameter equivalent to the inside diameter of the orifice design may be acceptable.	We have been using this specific design for an outlet structure for two decades with no issues. The potential disadvantage of an orifice plate is the ability to remove the plate following construction despite how "permanently" it is bolted to the structure. The use of a reducer pipe is more difficult to integrate into the overall midwall outlet design. There is nothing within any of the guidelines that specifically says our proposed design can not be used and as such it is my professional opinion that it can and does work and the suggested modifications are the opinion of the MTO reviewer. If the MTO has specific evidence that points to why they believe this design does not work or can't be "guranteed" (which overrides the 20 years of experience we have using this type of design) please present it, otherwise our choice would be to continue to use our proposed design.
3						Page 13, Stormwater Modelling - Proposed Development... the imperviousness of the proposed condition is shown as being 43% in the report but the December 2023 site plan shows building coverage as 19.4% and asphalt coverage as 26.1% for a total of 45.5%	This was a typo in the report text. The modelled overall impervious level was actually 45.5%. No changes to the modelling results are required.
4						Page 16, Stormwater Quantity Control... The report says that "All of the storms (with the exception of the 25 mm and Timmins events which are not required to be attenuated) are attenuated to below pre- development levels by the implementation of the SWMF." This statement does not comply with MTO guidelines.	The requirement for stormwater modelling is to provide peak flow attenuation for the 2-100 year storm events (inclusive). The 25 mm storm is generally considered by the MRCP to be the quality control storm event and is modelled as a 4 hr Chicago Storm. This event is considered the quality control event as it occurs more frequently than the 2 year event (generally 100% chance a storm of this magnitude will occur in a given year). MTO and other Guidelines do not require that this strom be controlled to pre-development levels. The Regional Storm event is also not required to be attenuated, only safely conveyed through the site to the outlet.
5						General comment, Stormwater Quantity Control... While plans show a granular maintenance access adjacent to the SWM facility, the report does not document responsibility of maintaining the SWM facility or make recommendations on maintenance frequency for the SWM facility. MTO require that the report identify details regarding how the storm water management facility will be maintained and who will maintain the facility. Once approved, this information will be required to be included in the site plan agreement.	An entire stand-alone Operation and Maintenance Manual was prepared and provided for the site including the SWMF. This was provided to the MTO for review.
6						MTO anticipate receiving a revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report along with updated drawings for review.	A revised report and set of drawings have been prepared and submitted.