

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
Town Planning -Tanjot Bal, Senior Planner		
•Draft By-law be revised to require +B4:B9solid wood privacy fence to be installed along north property line adjacent to 5418 and 5422 Second Line.	updated	Comment is addressed.
•Revise drawings to show proposed community mailbox location	updated	Comment is addressed.
•Planning Justification Report: oSection 5.2, report should refer to PPS 2020 document (please provide a PJR Addendum to confirm PPS 2020 policies are addressed)	updated	Comment is addressed.
•Planning Justification Report: oSection 5.3, Growth Plan; report should refer to “A Place To Grow, Growth Plan”, Office Consolidation 2020 version (please include in PJR Addendum to confirm 2020 policies are addressed)	updated	Comment is addressed.
• Concerns were raised at the Public Meeting by the Knox Ospringle Community & Presbyterian Church with respect to current use of the subject site for overflow parking. Please advise what, if any, agreements have been reached for possible alternative arrangements.	Owner had discussions with the Church and offered the opportunity to purchase the lot next to the Church.	Comment is addressed.
• Planning has identified concerns with respect to the proposed retaining wall(s) at the south end of the SWM facility, proposed planting, long-term maintenance; and, the adjacent private properties to the south. These concerns have been more specifically identified within the Peer Review Engineer comments provided.	updated	Comment is addressed.
• Please indicate how these concerns have been addressed; and, if any maintenance easements will be required.	no maintenance easements are required	Comment is addressed.
Peer Review Comments - GWS Ecological & Forestry Services		
As requested, I have reviewed the revised Vegetation Management Plan submitted in support of the proposed Spirit of Pentecost Draft Plan of Subdivision along with the proposed Landscape Compensation Plan. The Vegetation Management Plan, dated June 22, 2021, indicates that many trees will be retained around the perimeter of the subject property and no trees will be impacted on adjacent lands. This is a significant improvement from the previously proposed Plan. There are, however some minor recommended revisions that should be made to this Plan, as well as some items which require clarification. These matters are outlined as follows:		
1.0 Dead trees located along the property boundary now identified for preservation should be removed, subject to approval from the adjacent landowner, as they will be a future hazard to new home owners. Trees in poor condition that are competing with adjacent healthy trees should also be removed at this time, as well as an ash tree that will likely soon be killed by Emerald Ash Borer. Additional trees recommended for removal include tree number 603, 604, 612, 1052 and 1060.	updated	Comment is addressed.

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
2.0 The need for removal of tree 572 to 589 along the north property boundary needs to be justified. The proposed future grades have not been superimposed over the existing grades, as requested, and I have not received a grading plan, so it is not apparent why these trees have to be removed. An explanation is therefore required.	572-582 to be preserved, 583 is in poor condition and is proposed for removal, 585 is dead and is proposed for removal, 585-589 to be preserved	Comment is addressed.
3.0 The proposed locations for installation of paige wire farm fence to be used for tree protection are satisfactory.	acknowledged	Comment is addressed.
4.0 The proposed Landscape Compensation Plan utilizes a good mix of native trees and shrubs. The proposed size and quantity of plant material seems reasonable for this site, as well as the arrangement of them. I therefore have no concerns with this compensation Plan. However, there appears to be an error in the quantity of common ninebark as the plant list identifies 22 shrubs to be planted but there are 40 shrubs shown on the Plan. This typo should be corrected.	updated	Comment is addressed.
Infrastructure Services – Nick Colucci, Director, Infrastructure		
	•Please refer to Peer Review Comments by Ainley & Associates Limited	
Engineering Peer Review – Leonard Borgdorff, P.Eng., Ainley &		
	• See attached comments dated August 26, 2021	
Building Department – Becky Montyro, Director,		
	• No comments at this time	
Fire Services - Jim Sawkins, Fire Chief (jim.sawkins@erin.ca)		
	• No comments at this time	
Wellington County Zach Prince, Senior Planner		
	• Comments provided under separate cover	
Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA), Fred Natolochny		
	•No additional comments at this time	
Ainley's Proposed Terrell Heard Subdivision Ospringle Part of Lot 13 Concession 2 Erin County Road 124-County Road 125/Second Line Intersection 2nd Submission Review		
August 26, 2021		
Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
1.0 General Comments		
1.1 County Road 124 is oriented in a southwest- northeast direction and the subdivision is in the west corner of this intersection. The orientation wording for the subdivision location should be revised.	Done - in the FSR we note that County Road 124 is assumed to run in a north-south direction.	Comment is addressed.
1.2 The proposed road right-of-way should be increased from 18m to 20m in accordance with Town Municipal Servicing Standards.	Done - road ROW width increased to 20m.	Comment is addressed.
1.3 The proposed width of the asphalt on the 50±m of urban road adjacent to the Second Line should be increased from 7.0m to 8.0m in accordance with Town Municipal Servicing Standards.	Done - asphalt width is 8m.	Comment is addressed.
1.4 Ensure that the Cul-De-Sac has a 22.0m property line radius and a 19.0m asphalt radius, in accordance with Town Municipal Servicing Standards.	Done	Comment is addressed.
2.0 Wastewater Servicing Assessment (September 5, 2019) – FlowSpec Engineering		

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment		Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
2.1	The design flow calculations, required nitrogen removal, and proposed Class 4 Wastewater Treatment Systems of this report are expected to be reviewed by the Building Department.	updated	Comment is addressed.
2.2	The proposed lot sizes appear to accommodate the proposed Class 4 Wastewater Treatment Systems and their spatial separation from other features (e.g., private wells, driveways, sheds, decks, pools).	updated	Comment is addressed.
2.3	Page 2, Section 3.1, Percolation Time, 3rd paragraph mentions that the geotechnical report prepared by Chung & Vander Doelen Engineering (CVDE) provides recommendations for filling procedures, equipment and soil-type in the proposed leaching bed areas. Given that adherence to those recommendations is critical, those recommendations with sufficient context of the CVDE report should be quoted in the main body of this Wastewater Servicing Assessment report and should appear on the detail design drawings.	updated	The Wastewater Servicing Assessment prepared by FlowSpec should be read in conjunction with the Geotechnical Investigation report prepared by CVDE. Further, the recommended filling procedures, equipment and soil-type in the proposed leaching bed areas provided in those reports should appear on the detail design drawings, and should be a condition in the Subdivision Agreement as noted in the FlowSpec Engineering response. This can be addressed during detail design.
2.4	In Appendix B, Figure 2, Interpreted Water Table Configuration, is borehole data from the CVDE Geotechnical Investigation. The borehole identification numbers should be added to Figure 2	updated	Comment is addressed.
3.0 Functional Servicing Report (November 8, 2018) – IBI Group			
3.1	Section 4, Septic Design, references the FlowSpec Engineering Ltd. septic design report dated September 5, 2019. This Functional Servicing Report is dated November 8, 2018 but has obviously been revised since it was originally dated. The report should be re-issued with a date reflecting the most recent revisions.	Dates revised to reflect current reports.	Comment is addressed.
3.2	The Salvini development on the east side of Wellington County Road 124 has recently been constructed. This report should be expanded to confirm there are no impacts of one development on the other with respect to private wells and/or septic systems.	Revisions made	The groundwater receiving the wastewater from septic systems has a sufficiently thick aquitard between it and the deeper aquifer from where private wells draw their water. Pumping well tests indicate the aquifer from which private wells draw their water has sufficient water supply to support wells in this subdivision and the adjacent Salvini subdivision without cross-interference.
3.3	Page 1, Section 2.1, Site Description, characterizes the existing ground surface topography saying, “. . . the site ascends gently at about 2 to 4 percent grade in a southwesterly direction, crests in a knoll near the west corner of the site, and then descends moderately to the west and south . . .”. In the Functional Servicing Report (November 8, 2018) the same existing topography is described as, “. . . moderate to steep topography with drainage directed northeast . . .” The two descriptions of the topography should be more aligned with each other.	Revisions made.	Comment is addressed.
3.4	Page 2, Section 3, Proposed Area Grading, 2nd paragraph says that the general maximum slope on travelled portions by vehicles and pedestrians is approximately 4%. On the Plan & Profile drawing for Street A, the steepest slope for the road centreline profile is approximately 110 m at 5%. This discrepancy should be corrected.	Revisions made.	Comment is addressed.

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
3.5 3.5 Page 3, Section 7, Erosion and Sediment Control, describes the proposed erosion and sedimentation controls during area grading and, presumably, the whole construction phase. This section should also describe the proposed erosion and sedimentation controls that will be in place after construction (e.g., sod, staked sod, hard surfacing, permanent flow check dams, means of capturing sand from winter roadway clearing operations).	Additional E&S control description added. Note, Final Design will fully address E&S controls.	Agreed, the erosion and sedimentation control concerns can be addressed during detail design.
3.6 Page 3, Section 7, Erosion and Sediment Control, 2nd paragraph, should indicate what the contingency plan is in the case erosion and sediment controls fail.	Additional E&S control description added. Note, Final Design will fully address E&S controls.	Agreed, the erosion and sedimentation control concerns can be addressed during detail design.
3.7 Page 3, Section 8, Utilities, describes the existing utility facilities (i.e., hydro, gas, cable and telephone) surrounding the site. Letters of understanding from each utility company (e.g., Hydro One, Bell Canada, Rogers Cable TV and Enbridge) should be provided to confirm that adequate utilities can be provided to service the proposed development.	A circulation has been made to the various utilities. Note, if sufficient telecom is unavailable, there are a variety of wireless options that can be utilized.	Confirmation from utility companies can be provided during detail design.
3.8 Pages 3-4, the section numbering progresses from Section 8, Utilities to Section 10, Summary and appears to skip Section 9. In addition, on Page I, Table of Contents, Sections 9 and 10 are not listed. These discrepancies should be resolved.	Revised.	Comment is addressed.
4.0 Stormwater Management Report (November 9, 2018) – IBI Group		
4.1 Confirmation should be obtained from the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) that the proposed stormwater controls are acceptable.	Refer to GRCA email correspondence dated November 8, 2019 (included as Appendix C in the FSR.	GRCA notes in their correspondence that the limits of their regulated area do not include any portion of this Subdivision Property. The comment is addressed.
4.2 Confirmation should be obtained from Wellington County that the existing 375mm storm sewer and any overland flow to County Roads 124 or 125 collectively form a sufficient outlet for the proposed development, including the proposed drainage to the existing DICB east of the church.	The flow from the development is being controlled and released at pre-development rates and thus should not have an adverse impact on down gradient storm conveyance capacity.	Acknowledged, but the Town still requires confirmation from Wellington County that the County is satisfied with the proposed storm conveyance being discharged to the County's infrastructure.
4.3 We have significant concerns with the proposed drainage along the rear of the lots 7 through 13. In particular, the filling of these lots will push a portion the lot drainage back onto the neighboring property north-east of these lots, which changes the existing flow route. We also have concerns that the drainage along the rear of these lots will have a negative impact on the existing lot north-east of Lot 13 that fronts onto the Second Line. Therefore, additional topographical survey information should be provided on the adjacent properties, along with specifics of the trees along the property line. In addition, more design details on the proposed drainage path through this area should be provided.	The proposed subdivision area grading has been revised and the toe of slope/match existing limit is now located within the subdivision. A swale is proposed along the toe of slope and will direct drainage to DIMH 7.	The proposed swale appears feasible, and the detail design will need to confirm the invert of the swale remains within the Subdivision Property.

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
4.4 Capacity calculations should be provided for all overland flow routes and intercept swales to demonstrate that runoff generated during major events can be conveyed to an appropriate location. Particular consideration should be provided for the area along the rear Lots 7 through 13 continuing to the proposed pond, as well as along the west boundary of Lot 4 to convey drainage to County Road 124.	The major flow for the area draining from Catchments 102 and 203 to DIMH7 is 0.241cms. A 2% rear and sideyard swale is proposed for Lots 7 to 13 at a minimum slope of 2%. At a depth of 0.3m this swale will convey the major storm. A swale is proposed at the rear of Lot 4 and will outlet to the County Road 124 ditch.	This comment is addressed.
4.5 In accordance with the Town's Municipal Servicing Standards fencing will be required where the dry pond abuts private lands.	Will be shown on landscape plans	This comment is addressed. See comments regarding the Landscaping Drawings for further concerns.
4.6 The proposed SWM pond should include landscaping around the proposed facility to provide buffering and to soften the appearance. The "Design Principles of Stormwater Management Facilities" August 1996 by the GRCA, referenced in Section B8 of the Town's Municipal Servicing Standards for facility configuration and landscaping shall be used as the guidance document.	will be shown on landscape plans (SWM)	This comment is addressed. See comments regarding the Landscaping Drawings for further concerns.
4.7 Page 2, Section 4, Stormwater Management, the Regional design storm should be included in the storm water management modeling to, for example, support the designs of the various overland flow routes and confirm the 100-year storm is governing the design of the overland flow routes.	updated	The Regional design storm modeling details are provided only in Appendix B. The findings in Appendix B should be brought into the main body of the report, and the results should confirm if the Regional storm or the 100-year storm are governing the design of the overland flow routes.
4.8 Additional information should be included in Appendix B as supporting calculations for the MIDUSS Modelling Variables as well as relevant reference material. For example, Area 201 which represents practically all the proposed development on site has an imperviousness of 48% and impervious area calculations for estate residential lots should be based on a maximum lot coverage for main buildings in accordance with the Zoning By-Law to verify the impervious areas utilized in the hydrologic model for the post-development condition	The SWM calculations have been revised to assume 50% impervious surface. The maximum building coverage is 30%, leaving 20% for other hard surfaces. The zoning bylaw for the property will need to reflect the maximum 50% impervious cover.	This comment is addressed.
5.0 Geotechnical Investigation (November 16, 2018) – Chung & Vander Doelen		
5.1 5.1 Page 7, Site Grading for Wastewater Treatment Leaching Bed Envelopes, 1st paragraph, re-word the phrase "percolation rate higher than expected" to read, "percolation rate slower than expected."	Please refer to CVD letter dated March 18, 2021	This comment is addressed.
5.2 Page 9, Pavement Design, provides in a table the Granular Base Equivalency (GBE) for the recommended roadway structure. Discuss in the report the minimum required GBE and confirming the Town standard is adequate. In addition, spell out "CBR" in full when the acronym is first presented in the text of the report to confirm its meaning.	Please refer to CVD letter dated March 18, 2021	This comment is addressed.

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
5.3 Page 9, Pavement Design, 4th paragraph references OPSS Form 310. Should this reference OPSS.MUNI 310? Is the label "OPSS Form 310" referring to a specific inspection form or is it referring to the Ontario Provincial Standard Specification (OPSS) for Municipalities (.MUNI)? Please clarify these questions.	Please refer to CVD letter dated March 18, 2021	This comment is addressed.
6.0 Plan & Profile Drawings		
6.1 The Town's Municipal Servicing Standards require a 20 m road right-of-way; therefore the road right-of-way should be increased from 18m to 20m.	Done	This comment is addressed.
6.2 The Town's Municipal Servicing Standards require urban roads to have an 8.0m width of asphalt; therefore, the width of asphalt on the 50±m of urban road adjacent to the Second Line needs to be increased from 7.0m to 8.0m.	Done - asphalt width is 8m.	This comment is addressed.
6.3 Ensure that the Cul-De-Sac has a 22.0m property line radius and a 19.0m asphalt radius, in accordance with Town Municipal Servicing Standards.	Done - culdesac is 22m ROW radius and 19m asphalt radius.	This comment is addressed.
Functional Servicing Grading Plan Drawing and Landscaping Drawings (provided with 2nd Submission)		
6.4 The Grading Plan is showing elevations for the SWM Pond that are more than 2 m below the groundwater elevation. The Hydrogeological report from CVDE comments on the SWM pond elevations being above the observed groundwater elevation as shown on their (CVDE Report) Figure 7, but Figure 7 elevations for the SWM Pond do not match the elevations shown on the Grading Plan. The proposed SWM pond elevations should be reviewed with respect to the groundwater elevations and confirm that the SWM Pond will not be partially filled with groundwater.	SWM pond removed. SWM tank now proposed.	This comment is addressed.
6.5 The lot grading for Lots 1, 3 and 7 do not provide for reasonable side yard and/or back yard grading between the building envelope and tops of 3:1 side slopes. In addition, Lot 1 has a 1.8 m high retaining wall at the bottom of a 3:1 side slope, which is not acceptable. Lot grading on these lots needs to be revised.	Lot grading revised to have min 3.0m side yard.	This comment is addressed.
6.6 The grading within the SWM Pond indicates the retaining walls will be in excess of 2 m. The height of the wall in the SWM Pond is not acceptable.	SWM pond removed. SWM tank now proposed.	This comment is addressed.
6.7 The Landscaping drawings indicate that shrubs will be planted between the top of the retaining walls in the SWM Pond and the chain link fence that is placed along the perimeter of the SWM Pond Block. The shrubs will be inaccessible for maintenance activities. This arrangement for inaccessible shrubs is not acceptable.		

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
<p>6.8 The Landscaping drawings LP-1 and LP-2 show a 2.0 m high tight board fence to be installed on a neighboring private property in the existing chain link fence location. Given that this fence is on property not owned by the Developer, the Town will require a copy of the signed agreement between the Developer and the neighboring property owner for the fence replacement. The agreement should include terms for removing the trees on the neighboring property, accepting the new type of fence and its alignment which does not follow the property line alignment.</p>	Updated	
<p>6.9 The Landscaping drawings show a 2.0 m high tight board fence to be installed on a neighboring private property, and drawing LD-4 shows a detail for a 1.8 m high tight board fence. This discrepancy can be resolved during the detail design stage.</p>	Updated	
7.0 Transportation Impact Study - (October 19, 2017) – IBI Group		
<p>7.1 Page 1, Section 1.1 Proposed Development, 3rd paragraph, assumes the development will be fully occupied by 2023. Given that construction on the subdivision has not begun and it is early 2021, the horizon year should be re- evaluated and updated if necessary.</p>	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
<p>7.2 Page 5, Exhibit 2-1: Existing Lane Configuration, the east leg is shown to have a right turning lane and a thru+left turning lane. That leg of the intersection is painted today similar to the other 3 legs with a right+thru turning lane and a left turning lane. The Synchro modeling in Appendix D and Appendix E appear to model this leg consistent with the current pavement marking. Exhibit 2-1 should be edited.</p>	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
<p>7.3 Page 7, Exhibit 2-3: Existing Traffic Volumes, include in the title the year it represents. The text on page 6 that references this exhibit indicates the turning movement counts are representing 2017.</p>	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
<p>7.4 Page 8, Exhibit 2-4: Existing Traffic Operations – Signalized Intersections, in the Movement column is the abbreviation “EBT”. For clarification, this should read, “EBTR” for the Eastbound Thru+Right turning movements in that lane. The abbreviations for the Thru+Right lanes in the other 3 directions should have a similar abbreviation. This comment applies to the exhibits that are similar to this exhibit and follow this exhibit (e.g., Exhibit 3-3).</p>	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
<p>7.5 Page 10, Section 3.1, Other Developments within Study Area, 2nd paragraph, discusses the Salvini Traffic Impact Study (TIS) report. The paragraph should be expanded to comment on if that report has been accepted by the Town of Erin and County of Wellington.</p>	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment	Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
7.6 Page 11, Exhibit 3-2: 2023 Future Background Traffic Volumes, combines the traffic volumes from the neighbouring Ospringe Residential Subdivision documented in the Salvini TIS for that development with the projected growth of traffic at the County Road 124-County Road 125/Second Line Intersection. For Exhibit 3-2, include in the report appendix two (2) future background traffic turning movement charts that were used to derive Exhibit 3-2. The one chart would show only the growth in background traffic that is illustrated in Exhibit 2.3: Existing Traffic Volumes, and the other chart would show only the projected traffic generated by the Ospringe Residential Subdivision.	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
7.7 Page 20, 5.1 Scenario 1 Traffic Operations, 1st paragraph, says in the second line, “. . . the unsignalized intersections . . .”. The proposed development will have only one (1) intersection on the Second Line in Scenario 1, and the phrase can be edited to read “. . . the unsignalized intersection . . .”.	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
7.8 In Sections 5.1 and 5.2 confirm that left turn lanes and right turn lanes are not warranted for the access road into the proposed development in each scenario. The materials referenced for the warrants should be appended in the report.	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
7.9 Confirm that the available sight distances at the proposed development access for both scenarios meet or exceed the required minimum sight distance for the respective design speeds on the Second Line (i.e., Scenario 1) and on County Road 124 (i.e., Scenario 2). The materials referenced for sight distances should be appended in the report.	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
7.10 Consideration should be given to the 85% speed of vehicles recorded during the background traffic data collection and the records of accidents involving vehicles on the segments of County Road 124 and the Second Line within at least the study limits of this report. If concerns are raised in that data, the traffic impact study may provide recommendations for addressing those concerns.	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
7.11 The TIS should include a section on collision analysis, presenting collision information, based upon information from the Town and County, over the last three (3) years on vehicular accidents at the intersection of County Road 124 and the Second Line.	updated	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
7.12 A revised “stand-alone” Traffic Impact Study should be submitted that can be referenced in the future. That is, a complete report with all its supporting figures, graphs, and referenced material such that future readers do not need to search beyond the report document to find the resources referenced.	T.I.S is a stand alone report	For the Draft Plan stage, this comment is addressed.
8.0 County of Wellington Comments (Memorandum dated July 30, 2020)		

**Town of Erin Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision –
2nd Submission Circulation Comments, Files Z19-04 (ZBA) & 23T-19001 (DPS) 9537 Wellington Road 124 – Spirit of Pentecost (Heard)**

Comment		Response	Ainley Comments/Response on 2nd Submission Documents
8.1	No Objections with the supplied conclusions from the Transportation Impact Assessment.	info	
8.2	Require a conveyance of a one foot reserve along Wellington Road 124 in the favor of the County of Wellington.	understood	
8.3	With the change of land use, from agricultural into residential subdivision a Petition for Municipal Drain shall be implemented for this development. This is to ensure that the proposed storm water pond, stormceptor and outlet that will flow into existing the County of Wellington infrastructure will be properly maintained under the Drainage Act.	The subject development under existing conditions drains to the municipal ditches and storm sewer system. Under proposed conditions, we are implementing SWM controls to ensure peak flows match pre-development conditions, and we are outletting to the pre-development outlet locations. As such there is no impact on the down gradient storm conveyance system.	
9 Vegetation Management/Landscape Plans			
9.1	Yoga centre asked for a wood fence. Did we discuss this with the client? For the sake of time it has been added	Every attempt has been made to preserve the vegetation along the property line of the development to maintain	
9.2	Although there is an abundance of trees in certain portions of the site The Vegetation Management Plan indicates that no trees will be retained, including trees that are located at or near the property boundaries where grades must match existing grades. The landscape architect is also proposing to remove trees on adjacent lands. This is unacceptable because trees established along the property line or off-site cannot be removed without the neighbouring landowner's approval.	The site has been redesigned to preserve as many trees as possible. Dead trees or trees in poor condition that may not survive the stress of construction have been removed to provide opportunity for new plantings and a healthier canopy. Vegetated strips of 3-10m have been provided at the property line of adjacent neighbours.	
9.3	The Vegetation Management Plan indicates that all the trees must be removed to accommodate grading requirements. The tree data is not, however, superimposed over a grading plan which would confirm the feasibility of tree preservation. Furthermore, it appears that a grading plan was not submitted in conjunction with the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision. I recommend that the Vegetation Management Plan should be overlaid on the proposed grading plan and re-submitted for review. In my experience, grading requirements can usually be adjusted in some portions of the site to facilitate tree preservation, particularly near the property boundaries.	The Grading information has been identified clearly in the plans	
9.4	A report which outlines the tree inventory methodology, summarizes the inventory results, explains any constraints on tree preservation and provides final tree management recommendations was not provided. This kind of report would help to support the proposed tree management decisions and I suggest it would be beneficial in this case.	The plan has been revised to preserve a significant portion of the trees on the site and the trees on adjacent properties. The tree inventory was conducted by an arborist with individual trees located by a surveyor over the course of three (3) separate site visits. Tree Management, as noted on the plans, requires supervision by a qualified professional where	
9.5	Given the abundance of trees along some property boundaries there is likely a need for some corrective pruning on trees that are worthy of retention. At present, no trees are recommended for pruning or any other beneficial treatment that would enhance their long-term survival.	The contractor/developer has been advised to exercise care during the tree removal and construction process. Corrective pruning should only be performed, as necessary during the appropriate season. It is advised that this take place after site servicing is completed to minimize the number of time pruning may be required.	