

1st Submission Comments  
Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
5916 Trafalgar Road  
Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Firm	Response
<b>CREDIT VALLEY CONSERVATION - Comments from Elizabeth Paudel</b>			
<b>Site Characteristics</b>			
	The property is located in close proximity to a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and a significant woodland and is located within a significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) and Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA). The property is located outside of CVC's Regulated Area and a CVC permit is not required for the proposed development.		Noted
	Please note that the area identified as "other lands owned by applicant" on the Draft Plan is located outside of the Settlement Area boundary and within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside and partially within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System (NHS). CVC staff have not surveyed the limits of features on those lands as they are outside the current Draft Plan.		Noted
<b>Ecology Comments - EIS</b>			
1	The woodlands adjacent to the subject property meet criteria as significant woodlands and are mapped within the Erin Core Greenlands and Greenbelt Plan NHS area (outside of the Settlement Area). Although there are no anticipated direct impacts on this feature, there is strong potential for indirect impacts and encroachment and mitigations should be planned accordingly.	Birks	Indirect impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in Section 5 and 6 of the EIS, including: delineation of the development area and installation of sediment and erosion controls prior to all construction activities and equipment maintenance away from the retained natural areas. As noted in comment 1a) and 1b) mitigation is recommended which is intended to ensure the continued function of the adjacent woodlands.
1a)	a. As per the EIS, a barrier is strongly recommended between the rear lots that are adjacent to this feature. The barrier should be designed to eliminate potential of encroachment (e.g., chain link with curved back top to prevent climbing over).	Birks	Acknowledged.
1b)	b. As per the EIS, light pollution is a concern. All recommendations made in the EIS should be incorporated into the detailed design of the development (e.g., shields, downcast lights, no floodlamps).	Birks	Acknowledged.
2	As per the EIS, the site has potential to contain suitable habitat for Grasshopper Sparrow (and other open country species), however given the lack of breeding bird survey data their presence cannot be confirmed or denied. Using the precautionary principle, the subject property should be considered habitat for Special Concern species and mitigations for minimizing loss of this feature should be proposed.	Birks	As noted in the EIS, Cultural meadow is present on the property. While this habitat was considered, the area measures approximately 4 ha which falls well below the habitat criteria of >30ha. While the Cultural Meadow vegetation community present on the property may provide limited habitat function for Savannah Sparrow, Vesper Sparrow or potentially Grasshopper Sparrow it was not recommended as a candidate to be considered as Significant Wildlife Habitat. While we do not disagree that it is important to consider features as potential without appropriate evidence, we recommend caution in attempting to maintain natural function centrally within the matrix of residential development. Given the small size grasslands area on the property retention of the feature would require birds to nest close to the edges of the feature. Using Bobolink for example, research shows that those individuals nesting close to edges are often inexperienced pairs and they experience higher nestling mortality as a result. Abundant caution would be required to ensure that the feature did not turn into a population sink. On the contrary, ample habitat for grassland breeding birds is present in lands surrounding the Hillsburgh Urban Area. In our opinion, it would be better to focus on the retention of larger natural areas away from the urban matrix. The removal of the Cultural Meadow on the property is not expected to reduce the long-term health and survival of the bird species that depend on this function in the Town. If it would be of assistance, we could perform migratory breeding bird surveys in a future breeding season to demonstrate species use of the area.
2a)	The current draft plan does not show any retention of this species suitable habitat within the lot framework.	Birks	This is correct. As outlined in the response to Question 2, we recommended that the feature should be considered for retention within the development plan area. From a policy perspective Section 2.1.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement require that development site alteration shall not be permitted in significant wildlife habitat unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts to the natural features or their ecological functions. The Ecoregion 6E Criteria Schedules (MNR, 2015) were used to assess the potential for Significant Wildlife Habitat to be present in the study area. Open Country Bird Breeding Habitat was considered as a potential function within the CUM1 habitat present on the property. Beyond ELC Ecosite Codes, the criteria within that document the primary criterion is grassland area. Given that the feature was well below 30 hectares this function was not carried for protection with the lot framework.
2b)	b. Ideally, the goal would be to avoid isolation and complete encompassing of the feature within the lot framework, which increases edge impacts.	Birks	Acknowledged.
2c)	c. If the feature cannot be retained and restored to improve quality of the meadow, which is said to be low, then replacement of this feature should be considered. The lands labeled as "other owned by the applicant" are of suitable size that if restored to native grassland communities has potential to attract and support breeding Grasshopper Sparrow and contribute to open country habitat within the Town. As per the EIS, due to the proximity to increased anthropogenic disturbance, this feature would need to be protected through barriers to both human and predator encroachment (e.g., unscalable fencing).	Birks	Acknowledged. Although we still believe that it would be better to focus protection of grasslands away from the residential network, given the nature of the lands labeled as 'other owned by the applicant' these could feasibility be enhanced to provide habitat for grassland breeding birds.
3	As per the EIS, as part of the proposed mitigation, it is strongly recommended that timing windows be implemented for the removal of potential bird and bat habitat (trees, meadows, structures). If permitted, these features should be removed outside of the window of April 1 – October 1 of any given year. This should be factored into project scheduling and phasing.	Birks	Acknowledged
<b>Ecology - NHS/Trails</b>			
4	Please confirm any plans for incorporating a trail system that may impact natural heritage features. All trails should be planned to be within the feature's buffers and not the feature itself. Where trails are located within buffers, the buffer is to be maximized to accommodate for the encroachment.	Candevcon/ Birks	We are currently unaware of any proposed trail systems within the adjacent natural heritage features. Should any trail systems be considered we agree that it is important to consider the potential impacts that may arise from the trail system prior to construction. Appropriate consideration would be considered through lands on adjacent properties where any trail system are proposed for this development to ensure that it is appropriate from a natural heritage perspective and that no accidental contraventions of the Endangered Species Act results.
<b>Ecology -Species at Risk</b>			
5	As per the provided vegetation species list, there appears to be two species observed that are both regionally and locally rare, Lactuca biennis and Physalis heterophylla. Ideally the location of these species would be provided on constraints mapping and avoidance demonstrated. Where the species will be at risk if left in situ, mitigation options including transplantedation should be explored.	Birks	As you are aware Birks NHC staff generally work with provincial and national rarity within our species evaluation. We appreciate the review and identification of these two species of regional and local concern. Generally speaking both species of concern were identified in proximity of the natural lands south/west. Birks NHC staff are available to map the location of the species in future field seasons as applicable. We agree that the species should be moved if they are not able to be avoided by future development.

1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments		Response
6	Given the confirmed presence of Species at Risk habitat, the applicant is encouraged to contact the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) to discuss potential permitting requirements under the Act. Any required avoidance and mitigations are to be incorporated into the design of the Draft Plan. Ideally correspondence would be provided.	Birks	As outlined within the EIS, Barn Swallow is a Threatened species which is commonly identified within rural areas. Because of its prevalence Ontario Regulation 242 allows for removal of the habitat through the streamlined registry submission to allow for development of an area without the requirement to confer with the MECP. Ontario Regulation 242/08 outlines appropriate habitat compensation based on the identified habitat for Barn Swallow on the property. Confirmation is provided once the Notice of Activity is registered with the MECP; this document can be provided upon receipt to demonstrate correspondence and compliance. Avoidance and mitigations (such as timing windows) are to be incorporated into the Plan.
<b>Ecology- Stormwater Management</b>			
7	The stormwater management ponds are proposed within the Draft Plan. Please refer to the CVC SWM Guide Appendix D1 SWM Pond Plantings Guidelines ( <a href="https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/REVISED-SWM-Criteria-Appendix-D-Planting-Guidelines_FINAL-DRAFT-July-2014.pdf">https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/REVISED-SWM-Criteria-Appendix-D-Planting-Guidelines_FINAL-DRAFT-July-2014.pdf</a> ) and develop a suitable planting plan for the ponds during detailed design.	Candevcon	Planting plan will be prepared at detailed design
<b>Engineering Comments - FSR/ SWM</b>			
8	The existing drainage plan (Dwg EX-DR-1) shows a runoff coefficient of 0.50 throughout the site, which appears to be generally agricultural land. Please provide supporting calculations and/or reference documents for the selection of runoff coefficient for the pre-development condition. Also, please refer to the list of runoff coefficients that can be found on page 10, section B.4 (Storm sewers) of the Municipal Servicing Standards for the Town of Erin.	Candevcon	Runoff "c" Fixed for Pre-Development Drainage Area Plan
9	Drawing EX-DR-1 shows that the vacant area on the west ("other lands owned by applicant") drains towards the tributary on the west. Please clarify any future SWM plan for this vacant land.	Candevcon	Area is included as "EXT-1"
10	Please confirm if Block 5 ("Residential Reserve") is included in the subdivision plan for SWM.	Candevcon	These lands are not included in the SWm plans for the subdivision. If these lands develop they will be subject to their own SWM design
11	The Visual Otthymo (VO) model schematic of the west pond for the post-development scenario provided on page 201 shows a total of 24.083ha while the pre-development scenario schematic on page 164 shows a total of 25.370ha. Please clarify the discrepancy in drainage area.	Candevcon	Drainage Areas are made consistent between Plans, Reports and Calcs
12	The storm drainage area plan (Dwg ST-1 on page 406) has external drainage areas labelled from EXT-1 to EXT-10 with the total area of 8.79ha, while the VO model considered 4.23ha as external drainage area for the west pond (Pond 2). Where would the balance of 4.56ha be directed? Please confirm and show the relevant calculations.	Candevcon	Approximately 4.28 Ha of external drainage from North is directed to West Pond and 1.97 Ha towards East Pond
13	Please include a figure in the SWM Report showing the drainage areas to the respective ponds (1 and 2), including the external drainage area.	Candevcon	Figure has been added to the FSR. Refer to Figure 1 and 2 for drainage towards each pond.
14	The "Pond details SWM-1" drawing listed in the FSR was not submitted for our review. Detailed drawings of Ponds 1 and 2 along with outfall details will be required with the detailed design submission.	Candevcon	The plan has been added to the FSR and detailed designs for the outfalls will be prepared at detailed design
15	Included in Appendix E (Stormwater Management Calculations), on pages 135 and 160, were tables of Storage Calculations for Ponds 1 and 2. Some discrepancies were noted on the drainage areas from the Draft Plan of Subdivision prepared by Candevcon to these tables. For example, the park area is noted on the Draft Plan as 2.03 ha where the table shows 2.18ha. Please also include Road Right of Way in the land use columns in calculating the composite runoff coefficient. As per the Draft Plan, a total of 9.79ha area is allocated for roads, which is not considered in the composite runoff calculations.	Candevcon	Drainage Areas are made consistent between Plans, Reports and Calcs ; Drainage Areas breakdown is provided in Appendix as per Landuse
16	To help expedite review, please include a summary table in the FSR with the required/provided pond storage, flow rates from the VO model, design calculations, etc.	Candevcon	Summary Table included as Tables IV and VII
<b>Engineering - ESC</b>			
17	Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) drawings are to be signed and sealed by a qualified professional.	Candevcon	Drawing has been signed
18	Temporary swale slope percentages are not marked on drawing ESC-1. Please show the slopes of the temporary swales on the ESC drawing. Please refer to the ESC guidelines for Urban Construction ( <a href="https://cvc.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2021/06/rpt_ESCguideforUrbanConstruction_f_2019.pdf">https://cvc.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2021/06/rpt_ESCguideforUrbanConstruction_f_2019.pdf</a> ) in designing the temporary swales for sediment ponds.	Candevcon	Plan ESC-1 is a preliminary plan to show where sediment controls will be placed. A detailed ESC plan will be prepared at detailed design showing actual pond sizes, swale slopes, etc in accordance with ESC guidelines for Urban construction
19	Sediment Pond 1 and 2 on drawing ESC-1 is proposed to outlet into a Greenbelt NHS area. Outlets from the ponds are preferred to be directed towards a watercourse instead of a wetland. Please provide effective erosion protection measures at the pond outlet.	Candevcon	As there is no watercourse immediately adjacent to the site erosion protection in the form of a spreader swale will be provided at the pond outlets at detailed design to reduce erosion potential
20	General comments for ESC: a. Please provide the phasing plan. b. Clearing should be minimized. c. During site servicing, catchbasin inlet protection should be provided.	Candevcon	A phasing plan will be determined at the detailed design stage, it is anticipated that the entire site will be graded as part of the first stage due to the anticipated distribution of cut and fill. Areas outside of the stage 1 lands will be revegetated. Catchbasin protection will be provided during servicing.
21	Detailed ESC plan and supporting calculation are to be submitted with the detailed design.	Candevcon	Detailed ESC plans will be prepared at detailed design
<b>Engineering - Grading Plan</b>			
22	Supporting calculations are to be submitted at detailed design to confirm the overland flow path capacity of the streets and flow path towards the SWM ponds.	Candevcon	Calculations will be provided at detailed design
23	Please provide an overall drainage area plan drawing that includes the external drainage areas as well. For example, storm drainage area plan drawing ST-1 has external drainage areas labelled from EXT-1 to EXT-10 with the total area of 8.79ha. Please include these areas in the overall drainage area plan to show the full extent of the external drainage area.	Candevcon	The overall drainage plan has been revised
24	Please label the structure provided on the Grading Plan, between lots 260 and 261, west of Pond Block 3.	Candevcon	The structure is a proposed outlet swale and plunge pool outlet for the pond
25	Grading and outfall protection details for the outfall structure will be required at detail design.	Candevcon	Details will be provided at detailed design
26	Grading along the east limits of the property is not provided on the Grading Plan (GR-1). Please provide grading along the east limit and ensure the runoff is captured within the development and no spill is allowed outside of the property limits.	Candevcon	A rear lot swale is proposed along the east property line with the intent that rear yard catchbasins will be installed where required to capture drainage from the site. The grading of the swale and the location of catchbasins will be determined at detailed design
<b>Engineering -Hydrogeological Report</b>			
27	As per the Hydrogeological Report, groundwater was not encountered in any of the monitoring wells for the expected excavation depth. However, the contractor is required to be ready to deal with any perched water or rainfall events for dewatering during construction.	HLV2K Engineering	Noted;

Item	Comments		Response
28	The mitigation plan/LID proposal is to be supported by its design components (engineering calculations and other specifics relating to the capacity/sizing of the respective LIDs). The calculation should demonstrate that the design can adequately accommodate the mitigation outlined in the post-development (with mitigation) water balance.	Candevcon / HLV2K Engineering	Calculations relating to infiltration trenches included in FSR report.
<b>CVC Review Fee</b>			
29	CVC subdivision review fees are typically staged as follows: 25% at submittal of the draft plan 50% at the submittal of supporting studies 25% at the draft plan approval Please note that the remaining 25% of the subdivision review fee will be due at draft plan approval. Additionally, CVC collects a fee to clear draft plan conditions	Hillsburgh Heights/ Candevcon	Noted;
<b>GWS Ecological &amp; Forestry Services -Comments from Greg Scheifele</b>			
<b>Environmental Impact Study Comments</b>			
	As requested, I reviewed the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) prepared by Birks Natural Heritage Consultants for the proposed Briarwood residential development which is located at 5916 Trafalgar Road North within the Hillsburgh Urban Area in the Town of Erin. I also reviewed the draft Terms of Reference for the EIS and related correspondence. Based upon this information I offer the following comments.		Noted
1	Vegetation communities were mapped and described using accepted ELC procedures and this information seems to accurately portray existing conditions provided on the air photo map of the property.	Birks	Acknowledged
2	Although a 3 season botanical inventory is typically required on development sites, the 2 season (summer and fall) inventory undertaken on the Briarwood property seems acceptable given the absence of naturally established woodland and wetland on this property and the lack of access to adjacent lands where provincially significant wetland and woodland are located. A list of plants observed on the property should have nonetheless been included in the EIS so that reviewers can confirm this work was undertaken and no plants of significance were found. I therefore feel Birks should supply their plant list to the Town for review but the species identified do not have to be linked to specific vegetation communities unless a particular species has some level of significance (i.e., provincially, regionally or locally significant).	Birks	Acknowledged. Birks NHC has provided the vascular plant list for the property that was compiled during site surveys as an attachment to his comment response table. Following receipt of this comment, the attached list was provided to representative reviewers from the CVCA which allowed them to provide comment 5 above which speaks to regionally rare species.  All plant species recorded are provincially and nationally common, no species at risk or rare species were recorded on site. Further, a number of plant species on site are considered non-native ('exotic').
3	Although breeding bird surveys were not undertaken, I agree with Birks assessment of bird habitat and the potential for significant wildlife habitat. Given the available agricultural, early successional and hedgerow habitats available on the subject property I only expect common grassland and forest edge nesting birds to utilize this area.	Birks	Acknowledged
4	A tree inventory was not carried out and consequently very little information is provided on hedgerow trees which occur around the perimeter of the property and in some internal locations, as well as scattered isolated trees and tree clusters. Information on tree cover is, however, provided in the Tree Inventory, Protection & Removal Plan prepared by the Urban Arborist and my comments on this document are provided in a separate email.	Birks	All vegetation inventory undertaken for the property incorporated species within the hedgerows. This information was also reviewed in the context of the Tree Inventory, Protection and Removal Plan prepared by the Urban Arborist.
5	Although the proposed stormwater management plan for the property is to include two wet ponds, as well as infiltration trenches, no details on these facilities are provided in the EIS. This makes it very difficult to assess whether the predevelopment water balance can actually be achieved or the potential for off-site discharges of stormwater may occur. More details are therefore required in order to more accurately assess potential impacts to adjacent significant natural heritage features and residential properties. The EIS must demonstrate compliance with Part 5-The Greenlands System in the Wellington County Official Plan.	Birks	A water balance is outlined in the Hydrogeological study prepared by NLV2K Engineering Limited where the modelling analysis demonstrated that the scenario with the combination of SWM Ponds and Low Impact Development would provide the best results to mitigate the potential for Hydrologic Study report for additional information.
6	I agree with the Birks survey findings for Species at Risk bats and the proposed limitation on tree removal during the bat active season (April 1-October 31) in order to protect roosting habitat. This timing restriction on vegetation removal exceeds the requirements for migratory birds.	Birks	Acknowledged
7	For the threatened barn swallows which are currently nesting in on-site buildings there will be a requirement for habitat compensation when these buildings are demolished in addition to the registration of this activity with MECP.	Birks	Acknowledged, As outlined within the EIS, Barn Swallow is a Threatened species which is commonly identified within rural areas. Because of its prevalence Ontario Regulation 242/08 allows for removal of the habitat through the streamlined registry submission to allow for development of an area without the requirement to confer with the MECP. Ontario regulation 242/08 outlines appropriate habitat compensation based on the identified habitat for Barn Swallow on the property. Confirmation is provided once the Notice of Activity is Registered with the MECP; this document can be provided upon receipt to demonstrate correspondence and compliance. Avoidance and mitigations (such as timing windows) are to be incorporated into the Plan. Please note that these have been a recent amendment (effective December 9, 2021) regarding the amount of habitat that must be provided by a building or structure that is constructed or modified to provide replacement nesting habitat for Barn Swallow. Additionally, an option will be available starting April 29, 2022 for proponents to pay a monetary amount to the Species at Risk Conservation Fund and be excluded from some of the conditions otherwise required under the ESA for Barn Swallow.
<b>Tree Inventory, Protection &amp; Removals Plan Comments</b>			
1	The arborist report indicated that 80 trees were individually inventoried along with 6 groupings of trees of unspecified numbers but only 27 trees were recommended for retention on the suite. In this report decisions to remove or retain trees were mainly based on a development concept that has not been approved by the municipality and to a lesser extent on tree health. At this stage in the approval process many good quality native trees located on or nearby the property boundaries may potentially be retained, as well as trees that are located internally in backyard settings (e.g., trees 1270 to 1278 and 1290 to 1295). It is therefore premature to say that trees located in these areas must be removed when they should instead be identified for further study after a Draft Plan of Subdivision has been submitted in conjunction with a Grading Plan. The tree location data should then be superimposed on these plans in order to make more informed decisions about tree preservation.	Candevcon / Urban Arborist	A further review will be carried out when the proposed grading has been established.
2	The arborist only measured trees 20 cm dbh and larger. Other tree inventories recently submitted to the Town of Erin recorded data on trees down to 10cm dbh and based on my consulting experience over the past 40 years this is typically the standard that has been followed when doing urban tree inventories and it has certainly been the case in Wellington County. Based on the air photography provided in the EIS and the data given in the arborist report there are many additional trees 10 to 20 cm dbh and larger that are located along or nearby the property boundaries and they should have been individually inventoried.	Urban Arborist	Including small insignificant trees that are in direct conflict of proposed development and tagging each one individually is not generally done and is not stated as a requirement by the Town of Erin. In other jurisdictions in Ontario, sample sizing is the preferred method. For trees located outside of landscaped settings, such as in meadows and woodlots a sampling procedure is typically used to estimate the tree inventory for trees less than 20cm DBH in the area of interest. A fixed area plot sampling procedure is recommended which samples at least 5% of the area of interest. The plots must be located in areas which are representative of the vegetation communities and their locations illustrated on a map.

1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments		Response
3	Although small groups or clusters of trees may be collectively inventoried, particularly if they consist of non-native invasive species or have no potential for preservation as is the case with tree groups 4,5 and 6 (i.e., clusters of Manitoba maple) other groupings of trees that have some potential for preservation should have been individually inventoried as is the case with Tree Groups 1 and 2 which consist of planted pine and spruce trees. Tree Group 1 occurs in the eastern portion of a proposed stormwater management facility and Tree Group 2 occurs along the southern property boundary. More details on proposed future grades and infrastructure requirements are needed to justify tree losses in these areas.	Candevcon / Urban Arborist	A further review will be carried out when the proposed grading has been established.  Sample sizing will be preferred method.
4	Tree #1303 is identified for removal in the table but is shown as being protected with tree protection fence in the drawing. This tree is a 60 cm dbh sugar maple in good condition along the northern property boundary and it should be retained in this backyard setting.	Urban Arborist	Acknowledged. Will confirm proposed action and will update accordingly.
5	Trees to be retained that would benefit from pruning should be identified for this work so it can be done in conjunction with required tree removals. Corrective pruning should be done to remove damaged or defective limbs that pose a potential hazard to people or property. Based on the information provided, pruning is warranted on tree #1241, 1246 and 1251. Additional trees will likely need their crowns raised to facilitate site grading.	Urban Arborist	Acknowledged. Will confirm proposed action and will update accordingly.
6	I suggest that tree protection hoarding may not be necessary in all areas where trees are to be retained as paige wire farm fence with silt screen attached may be sufficient in areas where the likelihood of intrusion into the tree protection zone is minimal.	Urban Arborist	Acknowledged.
	In conclusion, I recommend that the tree inventory should be expanded to include trees down to 10cm dbh in locations where tree preservation is potentially feasible, as outlined above, so that high quality trees of desirable species may be identified and hopefully retained in a forthcoming Tree Preservation/Compensation and Enhancement Plan.	Urban Arborist	Acknowledged. Further action to be discussed once Draft Plan of Subdivision is submitted and is reviewed.
<b>Ainley Consulting and Planners - Comments from Leonard H. Borgdorff</b>			
<b>Draft Plan of Subdivision</b>			
1	The draft plan should include dimensions for 1.1. right-of-way widths 1.2. sight triangles ensuring they conform with the Engineering Standards and the Zoning By-law (i.e., minimum distance of 6 metres) 1.3. radii on rights-of-way between internal intersections and at cul-de-sac bulbs 1.4. each lot line.	Candevcon	Requested dimensions have been included on the draft plan of subdivision. Dimensions at each Lot Line not provided; this information is premature for a Draft Plan. The revised draft plan of subdivision is included in the resubmission package.
2	Block 2 appears to have a residential lot fabric overlaid on it, but the Traffic Impact Study assumes it is a School Block. If the School Board does not require a school site, then this lot block can be redeveloped as residential (if there is capacity). Separate applications will be required for these lands. The residential lot fabric overlay should be removed from on top of the school block.	Candevcon	The draft plan of subdivision has been revised by removing the residential lot fabric overlay from on top of the school block.
3	Block 8, Walkway, should be a minimum of 6.0 m wide, and wider if the match lines for the backs of swale on each side of the walkway extend beyond 6.0 m width.	Candevcon	Noted;
4	The lot line dimensions should include metric (meters) units.	Candevcon	It is premature to provide Lot Line Dimensions; the Lot types which specify Minimum Dimensions are identified.
5	Please provide further clarifications of the existing right of way limits at the end of Upper Canada Drive and McMurphy Lane and in particular if the existing cul-de-sacs are within the municipal right of way or are on private property via easements.	Candevcon	This requirement has not bearing on the subject subdivision; the Town has this information in its records.
<b>Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation</b>			
6	The groundwater levels should be monitored year-round to determine the high groundwater level for detail design purposes.	Soil Engineers	Noted. A hydrogeological assessment has been completed by HLV2K Engineering. The scope of work included the installation of 5 monitoring wells within the property and groundwater level was observed in September 2021 and November 2021. Further monitoring will be carried out, notwithstanding that it is not warranted.
7	Borehole 6 indicates that it includes a topsoil fill material. The report indicates that the topsoil fill should be excavated, examined, and sorted free of topsoil and deleterious material before being reused as fill material, or removed and not re-used.	Soil Engineers	Noted.
8	As the detail engineering design evolves, the geotechnical bore holes should be advanced to be at least 1 m below the lowest servicing and excavation.	Soil Engineers	Noted.
9	The preliminary servicing drawings in the Functional Servicing Report indicate that some road sections (e.g. Street 'B') will have a profile and some sewer sections above existing grades. The geotechnical investigation should be advanced during the detail engineering phase to provide recommendations for placement of fill to support infrastructure.	Soil Engineers	Noted. Recommendation for placement of fill to support infrastructure has been provided in Section 6.1 of the geotechnical report.
<b>Hydrogeological Investigation</b>			
10	The sanitary sewer and stormwater management facilities should be designed as per Wellhead Protection policies SWG-13 and SWG-14 to protect the groundwater quality.	Candevcon	The storm water management ponds are located outside the zone of influence as per the Well Head Protection mapping included in the CTC Source Protection Plan. The sanitary sewer is also located outside the zone of influence but to ensure no impact it is proposed that the sanitary sewer located within Streets A and B be constructed to a higher standard with tighter joints per SWG-13 and plan is going through the subdivision planning process in accordance with SWG-14
<b>Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessment</b>			
11	The Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Report describes one soil sample had exceedances for petroleum hydrocarbons. The sample was from one of the two (2) hand sample locations, and near the barn near the northeast property boundary. The soil encountered in the area is considered to be loose soil comprising of sand and silty sand, which is conducive for the spread of contaminants in the subsurface soils. Recommendations in the Phase II ESA Report include: 11.1. further investigation around the hand sample location to define the limits of the contaminated soil. 11.2. removal of the contaminated soil and further testing to confirm the contamination is removed.	HLV2K Engineering	Noted. Removal of the contaminated soil will be completed prior to servicing.
12	The site was found to meet the MECP Table 2 Standards RPI in a Potable Ground Water Condition for soil from the boreholes.	HLV2K Engineering	Noted



1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Response	
13	The boreholes were advanced between 6.2 and 9.8 m below the ground surface and did not find any groundwater. No groundwater was sampled.	HLV2K Engineering	Noted;
14	Based upon the results of the parameters tested across all boreholes for soil during the Phase II ESA investigation, the soil from the boreholes and hand samples met the applicable MECP Table 2 Residential Parkland Institutional (RPI) Use Site Conditions Standards except for one of the hand samples taken from the site which had an exceedance for Petroleum Hydrocarbons F4 Fraction.	HLV2K Engineering	Noted;
15	After the contaminated soil is removed and further samples in the same area are analyzed to confirm no contamination is present by a professional qualified to perform this work, the report should be filed as a Record of Site Condition (RSC) with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Climate Control.	HLV2K Engineering	Noted;
<b>Functional Servicing Report</b>			
16	As the development proceeds, please ensure that the latest version of the Town of Erin Development Engineering Manual (Town Standards) is utilized.	Candevcon	Design will be in accordance with the Town of Erin Development Engineering Manual
17	The north leg of Street 'B' and the Street 'A'-Street 'B'/Street 'G' Intersection indicate significant fill depth is required. For example, on Preliminary Servicing Plan, PS-1, at the Street 'A'-Street 'B'/Street 'G' Intersection (i) the existing grade is 463.0; (ii) the proposed sanitary sewer obvert is 466.60; (iii) the proposed storm sewer obvert is 466.56; and (iv) the proposed road grade is 470.0 (i.e., the sanitary sewer and storm sewer are shown to be above the existing grade, and the proposed road grade is approximately 7 m above the existing grade). Detailed geotechnical recommendations for engineered fill should be required where proposed grades are above existing grades.	Candevcon/Soil Engineers	Detailed geotechnical recommendations will be provided at the detailed design stage.
<b>Sanitary Servicing</b>			
18	Adequate wastewater treatment capacity is available to accommodate the proposed development.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
19	The sanitary sewer outlet from the development is proposed through Block 4, which contains SWM Pond 1, to McMurchy Drive (MH 70A to MH 74A). The route of this sewer through Block 4 will need a dedicated 6m access road for maintenance purposes.	Candevcon	Access will be provided
19.1	The Town is proceeding with the engineering design for a trunk sanitary collection system in Erin and Hillsburgh. The Town's trunk sewer in Hillsburgh will be extended north on Trafalgar Road and terminate at Upper Canada Drive; therefore, the sanitary sewer from this development will have to be extended to the intersection of Trafalgar Road & Upper Canada Drive.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
19.2	The extending of the sanitary sewer to the intersection of Trafalgar Road & Upper Canada Drive, will require a sewer to be constructed on Upper Canada Dr (from McMurchy Ln to Trafalgar Rd) and on McMurchy Ln. The sewer on Upper Canada Dr will need to be deep enough to accommodate the servicing of the existing homes, further west on Upper Canada Dr, in the future.	Candevcon	The sewer on McMurchy and Upper Canada Drive will be designed to accommodate the existing homes
19.3	Given that the proposed Draft Plan includes the lot layout, the sanitary drainage design sheet should be based on population per dwelling unit (e.g., 3 people per single detached, semi-detached, townhouse) rather than population per hectare. This can be addressed during the detail design phase.	Candevcon	Sanitary design sheets have been revised based on unit count
19.4	Regarding the Sanitary Drainage Design Sheet, 25.1. Given the relatively small design flows, the spreadsheet calculating the design flows and sewer flow capacities should use units of "l/s" rather than "m <sup>3</sup> /s". This can be addressed during the detail design phase. 25.2. For each pipe section, the upstream and downstream structure numbers should match those on the Sanitary Drainage Plan (e.g., for Area 4, the downstream structure number should read MH10A). 25.3. All the pipe sections shown on the Sanitary Drainage Plan should be represented in the Design Sheet (e.g., sanitary pipe from structure MH15A to MH 16A should be included). 25.4. In structures with more than 1 inlet, the outlet pipe should include the design flow from each inlet plus the area to the next structure downstream. The accumulated population appears to omit a few sub-area populations at structures with more than 1 inlet. 25.5. The area for Park Block 1 should be included to account for infiltration, even if no facility building is included. 25.6. The accumulated area for infiltration should be accounted from MH70A through MH74A (i.e., through SWM Pond Block 4).	Candevcon	The sanitary design sheets have been updated
<b>Water Servicing</b>			
20	The Town should confirm that adequate water treatment capacity and storage is available to accommodate the proposed development.	Candevcon	Noted
21	The Town is proceeding with the development of a new water model for the existing and future water system(s). Subsequent to the completion of the water model the proposed water distribution network will need to be reviewed to confirm that it can supply the necessary flows and pressures as per the Town Standards, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), and Fire Underwriters Survey with respect to maximum day flows, peak hour flows, and maximum day plus fire flows.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
<b>Storm Drainage and Stormwater Management</b>			
22	The Existing Drainage Parameters in Table 1 should correspond to the catchment areas outlined on Drawing EX-DR-1, Existing Drainage Plan. Discrepancies that should be resolved include, but not limited to: 26.1. Drawing EX-DR-1 shows Area A-1 flowing through the northwest corner of the site, but TABLE 1 indicates Area A-1 directs runoff to McMurchy Lane just south of the southeast corner of the site. 26.2. TABLE 1 indicates only 2 external areas direct runoff through the subject site, but Drawing EX-DR-1 show the area on the north directing runoff from 3 sub-areas. 26.3. The sum of the areas in TABLE 1 does not equal the sum of the areas on Drawing EX-DR-1	Candevcon	Drainage Areas are made consistent between Plans, Reports and Calcs; Table 1 is fixed with correct corresponding areas. Table 1 revised in updated Report.
23	The Preliminary Grading Plan PG-1 or the Preliminary Servicing Plan PS-1 should include existing and proposed grades at all property corners to confirm that the proposed lot layout is feasible.	Candevcon	Grading at all corners will be provided at the detailed design stage
24	Drawing EX-DR-1 should show be extended to show the upper limits of the external catchment areas, or the report should have a supplementary drawing showing the limits of the external catchment areas. In addition, the size of each external area should be provided.	Candevcon	External catchment areas from North is added to the EX-DR-1 Plan.

Item	Comments		Response
25	The catchment areas for each pond used in the Visual Otthymo (VO) modelling should match the catchment areas contributing runoff to each pond summed in the storm sewer design sheets. The design sheets show a total of 18.52 ha contributing runoff through the storm sewers to Pond 1, and 29.12 ha contributing runoff through the storm sewers to Pond 2. The total area contributing runoff through storm sewers is 47.64 ha, and excludes the Pond Block areas.  The VO modelling indicates that the total area (including the pond block areas) is 21.8 ha (for Pond 1, Table III, page 10) and 24.08 ha (for Pond 2, Table VI, page 12), summing to 45.88 ha, which is less than the areas shown on the storm design sheets. This discrepancy should be resolved.	Candevcon	Drainage Areas are made consistent between Plans, Reports and SWM Calculations. VO Model data coordinated with Storm Drainage Plans.
26	The information on the Storm Drainage Plan should be reflected in the Storm Drainage Design Sheets, including, for example, all pipe sections, pipe percent grades, using runoff coefficients as per the Town Standards.	Candevcon	Storm Drainage Plan and Design Sheets have been revised
27	Several pipe flow velocities in the Storm Drainage Design Sheets exceed 4.5 m/s. Pipe flow velocities for design flows and flows when the sewer is flowing full should be as per the Town Standards. This can be addressed during the detail design phase.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
28	The Stormwater Management System should consider the peak flows from Hurricane Hazel to determine what event has the critical design flows (i.e., 100-year or Hurricane Hazel). The critical design flows should be used to demonstrate that overland flow conditions will not cause unacceptable flooding damage to private property and not exceed flood storage depths per the Town Standards.	Candevcon	Refer to VO Results appended for Regional Storm run. In this case peak flows from 100-year is higher than Regional flows.
29	The side slopes in both ponds should not be steeper than 5:1.	Candevcon	Pond slopes have been updated
30	Stormwater Management (SWM) Pond emergency spillways should be shown on the drawings, located a minimum of 3.0 m horizontal clearance from the outlet control structures. The spillways should have a minimum of 0.30 m freeboard over the design flow depth.	Candevcon	Weirs will be designed at the detailed design stage
31	SWM Pond maintenance access roads should be shown to confirm the block size is satisfactory. The turning radii for the maintenance access should be confirmed with a swept path analysis, and the access road extending from the public road rights-of-way to the bottom of the ponds, to the inlets and outlet controls points should not exceed 6%. These maintenance access roads should be independent from any proposed walking trails around the facilities.	Candevcon	Access roads will be detailed as part of the Final Design.
32	Provide further details regarding the outlet from SWM Pond No 2, at the western limit of the development, as the flows from the pond will traverse a parcel of property which is not owned by the applicant before reaching the creek and ultimately the wetland area to the south.	Candevcon	This item was discussed during the site walk with the CVC on July 16, 2021; the low point in the field was identified at the south west corner of the SWM Pond...this is where the surface runoff from the westerly part of the subdivision exits the property and drains overland [no swale] through the treed area to a clearing that runs north south from the Additional Lands west of the subdivision towards a wetland located west of Upper Canada Drive; ... the clearing has a slightly defined grass swale. Since, the treed area and the clearing evidently receive runoff from the subdivision land, it was agreed that the post development runoff from the subdivision should mimic the pre-development condition and continue to drain overland [i.e. riparian rights]. Accordingly, the outlet from the SWM Pond will be designed to mimic pre-development conditions ... flow controlled to pre-development levels, a plunge pool/stilling basin to dissipate energy, and a spreader swale.
<b>Traffic Impact Study</b>			
33	In Section 5.1, Other Background Traffic, for trip distribution and assignment, there should be development traffic traveling to/from Orangeville (the northeast) via Trafalgar Road North, and travelling to/from Guelph or Fergus (the northwest and southwest). The 47% to/from the east via Wellington Road 22 appears too high compared to the existing background traffic and the split between northbound and southbound traffic counts on Trafalgar Road fronting the proposed subdivision.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
34	In Section 6.3, Trip Distribution and Assignment, the distribution of trips generated by the school should be a different distribution than the trips generated by the residences, and the distributions should be shown on two (2) different turning movement diagrams.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
35	In Section 6.3, Trip Distribution and Assignment, the number of trips generated by the school from within the subdivision during the AM peak hour is assumed to be 22 (i.e., 10% internal capture).	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
36	Based on the 2031 PM total traffic volumes and MTO Design Supplement for TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads, a 25 m northbound left turn lane on Trafalgar Road North at Street 'E' is warranted.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
37	Based on the 2031 PM total traffic volumes and MTO Design Supplement for TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads, a 25 m northbound left turn lane on Trafalgar Road North at Street 'A' is warranted. A 15 m southbound left turn lane should also be considered at that intersection to assist with sight lines for southbound left turning drivers.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
38	Street 'A' will function as a minor collector from Street 'B'/Street 'G' westerly to Street 'D' and should have a 23 m wide right-of-way per the Engineering Standards.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
39	The Street 'A'-Street 'B'/Street 'G' Intersection should operate with a reasonable level of service under stop sign control on Street 'B' and Street 'G'. A roundabout is usually considered where a traffic signal is required. In addition, a stop sign controlled intersection is easier for pedestrians to cross, especially with the proximity to a school (proposed to be located at the northwest quadrant of the intersection).	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
40	Signalized pedestrian crossings should be considered near the school for crossing Street 'A' and for crossing Trafalgar Road North at the Street 'A'/Howe Street Intersection.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
41	Street 'J' and Street 'B' should be aligned directly across from each other at Street 'A'.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
42	The Preliminary Development Plan, Figure 2, indicates that Block 6 and Block 7 are the only 2 accesses to "Other Lands Owned by Applicant" (Grey Area) abutting the west end of the development plan. The traffic generated by the Grey Area may significantly affect the operations of traffic through the Street 'A'-Street 'B'/Street 'G' Intersection. A sensitivity analysis should be completed to determine the quantity of traffic that could be generated by the Grey Area and if that quantity will conceivably warrant traffic signals at the Street 'A'-Street 'B'/Street 'G' Intersection.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package

1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments		Response
43	The TIS should discuss sight line distances at the proposed Street 'A'-Trafalgar Road North Intersection, and at the Street 'E'- Trafalgar Road North Intersection. The discussion should reference the required sight line distance for stop-sign controlled intersections based on TAC design standards. This can be addressed during the detail design phase.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
<b>Archaeological Research Associates Ltd - Heritage Impact Assessment Comments</b>			
<b>ARA Summary Comments</b>			
	ARA provides the following comments on the Heritage Impact Assessment, 5916 Trafalgar Road North, Town of Erin, part of Lot 26, Concession 7, former Township of Erin, Wellington County, Ontario report dated November 17, 2021, produced by Golder and the conclusions reached. In review, Briarwood Development Group is proposing to develop the property as a plan of subdivision development application. The preferred alternative for this development application is to retain the farmhouse and remove the outbuildings associated with the farm property which include a large barn, small barn, driveshed and grain silo (Option 3).	Golder	Noted
1	The HIA report addresses the required elements for an HIA, and its methodology is sound. However, ARA notes that the following areas have not been adequately addressed within the HIA to enable Town staff to make an informed decision, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The description, discussion, and photographs of the entire property are needed. The report did not include written or photographic documentation of the agricultural fields, circulation laneways, low-lying areas and/or any wooded areas;</li> <li>Details of the full development plan are needed;</li> <li>Mitigation measures for each conservation alternative/option explored should be more fully detailed and clearly presented; and</li> <li>Recommendations to update key wording in the Statement of CHVI are needed</li> </ul>	Golder	Additional description of the property had been added to Section 5.1 of the HIA with photographs of the agricultural fields and landways where visible. Additional details including the number of residential units, types of units, layout of the subdivision and additional uses in the proposed subdivisions have been added to Section 7.1 as well as a description of the vloc where the farmhouse is proposed to be kept. Golder has included details of each mitigation measure and conservation action a new (Section 7.3.2). Recommendations have been revised to include that the Statement of CHVI should be modified in accordance with whichever development option is pursued.
2	The section outlining the results of the analysis of the options and recommendations lacks important and explicit details of what should be included when undertaking recommended heritage conservation measure/studies. High-level lists are associated with the heritage conservation studies like a Heritage Building Protection Plan (HBPP) and a Documentation and Salvage Plan, but ARA respectfully submits that these provide little guidance as to the required contents of these plans. To provide further details and definitions of heritage mitigation/conservation actions ARA has included Appendix A. A revision of the HIA should address these gaps. Below ARA will provide suggested next steps/information and wording that could be used in a revised HIA or an addendum to the HIA. This additional information may also be used to inform wording and heritage conditions for the approval of the draft plan of subdivision. Also, provided are a list of recommendations for Options 2 and 3 (see Section 6.0).	Golder	Golder has provided a table (Table 5, Section 7.4) in the HIA that outlines a timeline and construction phases with appropriate mitigation and conservation options for Options 2 and 3. Additionally, instead of adding additional details about each mitigation and conservation action under Section 7.4, Golder has included these details in a new section (Section 7.3.2).
<b>Next Steps/ARA Proposed Options</b>			
3	The Town of Erin may conclude that the HIA is incomplete and request additions or an addendum in order to ensure the best outcomes for the property during the development of the property as a plan of subdivision	Golder	Noted;
4	Based on the information presented in the HIA, and in this peer review, this property meets the multiple criteria of the Ontario Heritage Act O. Reg. 9/06 as a cultural heritage landscape. As the proponent is supportive of retaining the farmhouse and in order to ensure its long-term protection (Preferred Development Option), the Town of Erin can choose to proceed with the designation of the property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act as a condition of subdivision plan of approval. This offers the strongest long-term protection for the farmhouse and its associated heritage attributes. Alternatively, the Town may choose to leave it listed on its Municipal Heritage Register which will enable a heritage review if a future demolition application is submitted.	Golder	Noted;
5	The Town of Erin could allow the plan of subdivision to proceed without requiring any further work beyond choosing to have the report updated and approve the plan of subdivision.	Golder	Noted;
6	The Town of Erin could allow the plan of subdivision to proceed without requiring any further work on the Golder report and approve the plan of subdivision with certain conditions.	Golder	Noted;
<b>Report Options Recommendations</b>			
7	Option 2 (Rehabilitate the farmhouse, the large barn, small, barn, drive shed and grain silo) is the most appropriate option from a cultural heritage and conservation standpoint, however it is not supported by the proponent and was not determined to be the preferred option. Nonetheless, should this option be pursued by the Town, minimal mitigation/conservation actions are required as all the buildings are to be retained. The following conservation actions are recommended for Option 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Temporary Protection Plan (TPP) (or a modified Heritage Building Protection Plan (HBPP)) to ensure the resources are protected from accidental damage during the construction of the subdivision;</li> <li>Design conditions (i.e. vegetative screening, buffer between new development) to minimize impacts;</li> <li>Conservation Plan/Heritage Conservation Plan (HCP);</li> <li>Vibration monitoring, requirements identified through a Zone of Influence (ZOI) study;</li> <li>Dust management requirements; and/or</li> <li>Update Municipal Register listing with current information and/or if Part IV designation is pursued.</li> </ul>	Golder	Noted;
8	Option 3 (Rehabilitate the farmhouse on a lot within the new development and salvage heritage attributes from the large barn, small barn, and drive shed) allows for some of the cultural heritage resource to be retained and additional symbolic conservation efforts. The HIA determined that this is the preferred option since the owner is in agreement. Should this Option be pursued by the town, the following conservation actions are recommended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Temporary Protection Plan (TPP) or a modified Heritage Building Protection Plan (HBPP);</li> <li>Design Conditions (i.e. vegetative screening, buffer between new development) to minimize impacts;</li> <li>Conservation Plan or Heritage Conservation Plan (HCP);</li> <li>Vibration monitoring, requirements identified through a ZOI study;</li> <li>Dust management;</li> <li>Documentation and Salvage Plan;</li> <li>Rehabilitation of the farmhouse;</li> <li>Symbolic conservation; and</li> <li>Update Municipal Register listing with current information and/or if Part IV designation is pursued.</li> </ul>	Golder	Noted;
<b>Enbridge Gas Inc - Comments from Barbara Baranow</b>			

1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments		Response
	It is Enbridge Gas Inc.'s request that as a condition of final approval that the owner/developer provide to Union the necessary easements and/or agreements required by Union for the provision of gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge.		Noted;
<b>Canada Post - Comments from Neil Mazey</b>			
	Canada Post has reviewed the proposal for the above noted Development and has determined that the completed project will be serviced by centralized mail delivery provided through Canada Post Community Mail Boxes. Our centralized delivery policy will apply for any buildings of 3 or more self-contained units with a common indoor area. For these units the owner/developer will be required to install a mail panel and provide access to Canada Post. In order to provide mail service to this development, Canada Post requests that the owner/developer comply with the following conditions:		Noted
1	The owner/developer will consult with Canada Post to determine suitable permanent locations for the placement of Community Mailboxes and to indicate these locations on appropriate servicing plans.	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
2	The Builder/Owner/Developer will confirm to Canada Post that the final secured permanent locations for the Community Mailboxes will not be in conflict with any other utility; including hydro transformers, bell pedestals, cable pedestals, flush to grade communication vaults, landscaping enhancements (tree planting) and bus pads.	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
3	The owner/developer will install concrete pads at each of the Community Mailbox locations as well as any required walkways across the boulevard and any required curb depressions for wheelchair access as per Canada Post's concrete pad specification drawings.	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
4	The owner/developer will agree to prepare and maintain an area of compacted gravel to Canada Post's specifications to serve as a temporary Community Mailbox location. This location will be in a safe area away from construction activity in order that Community Mailboxes may be installed to service addresses that have occupied prior to the pouring of the permanent mailbox pads. This area will be required to be prepared a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of first occupancy.	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
5	The owner/developer will communicate to Canada Post the excavation date for the first foundation (or first phase) as well as the expected date of first occupancy.	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
6	The owner/developer agrees, prior to offering any of the residential units for sale, to place a "Display Map" on the wall of the sales office in a place readily available to the public which indicates the location of all Canada Post Community Mailbox site locations, as approved by Canada Post and the Town of Erin	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
7	The owner/developer agrees to include in all offers of purchase and sale a statement, which advises the prospective new home purchaser that mail delivery will be from a designated Community Mailbox, and to include the exact locations (list of lot #s) of each of these Community Mailbox locations; and further, advise any affected homeowners of any established easements granted to Canada Post.	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
8	The owner/developer will be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Community Mailbox locations prior to the closing of any home sales with specific clauses in the Purchase offer, on which the homeowners do a sign off.	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
9	Canada Post further requests the owner/developer be notified of the following: 1 The owner/developer of any condominiums will be required to provide signature for a License to Occupy Land agreement and provide winter snow clearance at the Community Mailbox locations 2 Enhanced Community Mailbox Sites with roof structures will require additional documentation as per Canada Post Policy 3 There will be no more than one mail delivery point to each unique address assigned by the Municipality 4 Any existing postal coding may not apply, the owner/developer should contact Canada Post to verify postal codes for the project 5 The complete guide to Canada Post's Delivery Standards can be found at: <a href="https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf">https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf</a>	Hillsburgh Heights	To be completed at detailed design stage
<b>Town of Erin Fire Services - Comments from Jim Sawkins</b>			
1	The turning radius for the roundabout (Street A) and the crescent (street C) will accommodate our fire apparatus,	Candevcon	
2	The provision of water for firefighting operations; if this is to be hydrant protected then I'm fine, if not then I would suggest utilizing the swim ponds as water reservoirs. This option would require the installation of dry hydrants at each pond and ensuring they are accessible for fire apparatus.	Candevcon	The site is proposed to be hydrant protected
<b>Upper Grand District School Board - Comments from Ruchika Angrish</b>			
	Planning staff at the Upper Grand District School Board have received and reviewed the above noted applications for an Official Plan Amendment and a Zoning Bylaw Amendment to permit a residential subdivision development consisting of 284 single detached lots and 2 townhouse blocks containing 48 dwelling units.		Noted
	Board staff previously submitted comments on this proposal in July 2021 at the pre-consultation stage. Planning staff requested the inclusion of a 5 to 6-acre Elementary School Block within the proposed residential subdivision. Staff has noted that the Draft Plan of Subdivision dated November 12, 2021 includes an elementary school site.		Noted
1	Board staff note the presence of a roundabout at the intersection of Street A and Street B adjacent to the Elementary School Block. Safety measures for pedestrian movements and vehicular traffic should be considered in the design of the roundabout.	Candevcon	Noted
	Please note that Hillsburgh Heights Inc. will be designated as a Development Area (DA). A DA is a geographically distinct area within the Board, which does not form part of a school attendance area. Temporary accommodation of students is managed using holding schools that have space available when local schools are full. The Board considers DA school assignments each year.		Noted
	Furthermore, please be advised that the Planning Department does not object to the application, subject to addressing the enclosed engineering comments and subject to the following conditions:		Noted
1	That prior to final approval of the first phase of the subdivision, the Developer shall enter into an option agreement with the Upper Grand District School Board for the purchase and sale of the public elementary school site shown as Block 2 on the Draft Plan of Subdivision.	Candevcon	Acknowledged



1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Response	
2	That the Developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement to install municipal services including, without limitation, storm and sanitary sewers, hydro, water, telephone, natural gas, and cable television; such services are to be of sufficient capacity and suitable to serve a school of the size to be constructed by the Upper Grand District School Board. Such services shall be installed, to the Board's satisfaction and at no cost to Upper Grand District School Board and at the boundary line, between the school site and the abutting public roadway at the most efficient location for the development of the school site.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
3	That prior to the final approval of the first phase of the subdivision, the Developer shall confirm that the School Block 2 is graded with a maximum cross fall of 2% across 90% of the school site.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
4	That prior to the final approval of the first phase of the subdivision, the Developer shall provide identification/location of the natural gas pipeline in reference to School Block 2.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
5	That prior to the final approval of the first phase of the subdivision, the Developer shall provide confirmation of the location of hydro transmission lines in reference to School Block 2.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
6	That prior to the final approval of the first phase of the subdivision, the Developer shall complete on-site permeameter testing on the proposed School Block 2 to confirm the infiltration capacity of the soils and that the proposed infiltration volume of 200mm/year can be achieved based on the results of the permeameter testing.	Soil Engineers	Noted;
7	That the Developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement to include wording satisfactory to the Upper Grand District School Board: a) To grade the school site, including clearing, grubbing, engineered filling, where required, at the Developer's expense, prior to the completion date of the option agreement, in accordance with grading plans approved by the applicable municipality. b) Not to stockpile soil on the school site and obtain written permission of the Board prior to making any physical changes to the school site, including, without limitation, prior to placing or removal of fill, grading, stripping, storage or access to the school site. c) To install a paved roadway along each of the two sides of the school site that are to be flanked by a roadway, complete with street lighting, curbs, gutters, walkways, sidewalks and all other servicing works required by the Town so as to permit the issuance of a building permit for the construction of a school on the site. d) To install a 1.8 m galvanized chain link fence along the entire perimeter of the school site. e) That any community mailboxes, temporary or permanent, will not be located on any boulevards adjacent to proposed school Block 2. f) To provide the foregoing at no cost to the Board.	Hillsburgh Heights	Acknowledged
8	That the Developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement to submit to the Upper Grand District School Board, at no cost to the Board, a report from qualified consultants concerning the suitability of Block 2 for school construction purposes, relating to soil bearing capacity and composition, surface drainage, topography and environmental contaminants, including a Phase 1 Environmental Report.	Hillsburgh Heights	Acknowledged
9	That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Hillsburgh Heights	Acknowledged
10	That the Developer shall agree to provide the Upper Grand District School Board with a digital file of the plan of subdivision in either ARC/INFO export or DWG format containing parcel fabric and street network.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
11	That the Developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement that adequate sidewalks, lighting and snow removal (on sidewalks and walkways) will be provided to allow children to walk safely to school or to a designated bus pickup point.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
12	That the Developer and the Upper Grand District School Board reach an agreement regarding the supply and erection of a sign (at the developer's expense and according to the Board's specifications) affixed to the permanent development sign advising prospective residents that students may be directed to schools outside the area.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
13	That the Developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease: <i>"In order to limit liability, public school buses operated by the Service de transport de Wellington-Dufferin Student Transportation Services (STWDSTS), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point."</i>	Hillsburgh Heights	Acknowledged
14	That the Developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement to advise all purchasers of the residential units and/or renters adjoining the school block, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease: <i>"The Purchasers/Occupants agree and understand that there is an elementary school proposed in this area along with outdoor playing and study areas and parking lot and that there may be noise during and outside of the normal school hours throughout the year. Additionally, there may be increased traffic during the pick-up and drop-off times and during school events, outside of normal school hours. By purchasing this real estate, you acknowledge and accept any/all potential conflicts."</i>	Hillsburgh Heights	Acknowledged
15	That the Developer agrees in the subdivision agreement to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease, until such a time as a permanent school is assigned: <i>"Whereas the Upper Grand District School Board has designated this subdivision as a Development Area for the purposes of school accommodation, and despite the best efforts of the Upper Grand District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all students anticipated from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may in future have to be transferred to another school."</i>	Hillsburgh Heights	Acknowledged
16	That the Developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease: <i>"Block 2 represents a potential school site. The construction of a public school in the community is not guaranteed. Attendance at a school yet to be constructed in the area is also not guaranteed."</i>	Hillsburgh Heights	Acknowledged
<b>Walterfedy -Engineering Consultant for UGDSB - Comments from R. Barnett</b>			

1st Submission Comments  
Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
5916 Trafalgar Road  
Town of Erin

Item	Comments		Response
1	<p><u>Grading</u></p> <p>1. Road grades along Street B appear to transition quite rapidly from just west of the intersection with Street C. Confirm that road grades and adjacent lot grading are in conformance with municipal standards such that grading impacts to the school block are minimized.</p> <p>2. Grading design should minimize the requirements for sloping onto the school block from adjacent lands to allow for maximum land usage. A maximum of 2% cross fall across the school block is required.</p> <p>3. Areas of structural fill should be clearly identified on the grading plans.</p> <p>4. Provide grading details for the school block demonstrating that a maximum of 2% of cross fall can be achieved on 90% of the school block.</p>	Candevcon	<p>Comments noted; Requested information will be provided as part of the Detailed engineering Design of the Subdivision</p> <p>C Value of 0.75</p>
2	<p><u>Stormwater Management</u></p> <p>Confirm that quantity and quality control for the school site have been accounted for in the proposed SWM facility and provide supporting calculations and drawings demonstrating that this can be achieved.</p>	Candevcon	Yes, the school site is included in the SWM ponds with a C value
3	<p><u>Water Balance</u></p> <p>Confirm the volume of infiltration required for the school block. The expectation is that infiltration galleries are being provided where feasible and that the infiltration requirement for the school block does not compensate for areas external to the school block. Provide calculations to confirm this.</p>	HLV2K Engineering	The infiltration required for the School Board will relate to the area of impermeable surface within the School Site.
4	<p><u>Water Distribution</u></p> <p>1. The FSR notes watermain diameters as being 150 mm and 200 mm within the development; however, Drawing WM-1 shows a 300-mm-diameter watermain. Confirm that a 300-mm-diameter watermain is proposed along Street A.</p> <p>2. Confirm that sufficient water pressures are available for the school block domestic use as well as fire flows.</p>	Candevcon	<p>300mm diameter watermain will be provided on Street 'A'</p> <p>It is assumed that the Town will provide an adequate water supply.</p>
5	<p><u>Pedestrian Connectivity</u></p> <p>1. Further details and confirmation of the internal sidewalk system will be required, including details of the crosswalks at the proposed intersections.</p> <p>2. Provide further details of the pedestrian crossing at the proposed roundabout. This may include details regarding pedestrian refuge within the splitter islands.</p> <p>3. Provide additional details regarding the pedestrian connection from McMurphy Lane to Street H. If the maintenance access for the SWM facility is to be used as part of the walkway connection, ensure that the walkway component of the access meets AODA requirements and ensure that it is understood what entity will be maintaining the walkway during winter months for pedestrian use.</p> <p>4. It is recommended that a review be completed for the intersection of Trafalgar Road and Street A regarding upgrades to facilitate safe pedestrian crossing.</p>	Candevcon	Pedestrian connectivity has been addressed in the Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package.
<b>TOWN OF ERIN COMMENTS - MAY 3, 2022</b>			
<b>Planning Comments - Jack Krubnik &amp; Tanjot Bal</b>			
1	The proposed development does not achieve the minimum density identified in the County of Wellington's Official Plan. Please increase the density on this property, to bring it into conformity with the County's Official Plan Policies. Note: it may not be possible to achieve the required density utilizing the entire area of the property within the Urban Boundary.	Candevcon	The draft plan of subdivision has been revised by reducing the building envelope by 19 acres and adding 48 additional units increasing the density to approximately 13 units per hectare. The revisions provide an appropriate interface of larger (21.3 metres frontage) lots adjacent the existing Estate Lots on Upper Canada Drive and an appropriate transition from the larger lots to smaller lots. The Heritage House is situated on a larger lot appropriate to retain its heritage feature but ultimately reduces the overall density on the site. Furthermore, the lots adjacent to Trafalgar Road are 34% larger than other lots within the subdivision in order to create a similar streetscape to the existing residential lots on the east side of Trafalgar Road. A density of 13.13 units per gross residential hectare has been achieved which is an increase from the original density of 8 units per gross residential hectare achieved in the original plan. Although the density does not achieve the 16 units per hectare target for the site, we submit that the density target for this subdivision should be lower allowing more appropriate considerations of greater intensification in infill subdivisions that are closer to and within the existing urbanized area. Furthermore, the proposed subdivision density allows for a mix of options in housing types comparable to, associated with and desired in a rural setting suitable to a variety of household sizes and lifestyles. Appendix 'A' in the revised Planning Justification Report outlines the density calculations.
	The Town's Heritage Peer Review comments generally agree with the recommendations of the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment. Staff recommend that the farmhouse be rehabilitated and to salvage heritage attributes from the large barn, small barn and driveway, in order to retain some of the cultural heritage resources and symbolic conservation efforts.		Acknowledged
	Within the PowerPoint Presentation at the Statuary Public Meeting, one of the plans showed two pedestrian connections. The formal submission only shows one pedestrian connection propose from this development to the subdivision to the south. Staff would like the applicant revise the plans to show the second pedestrian connection to McMurphy Lane, how the pedestrian connections connect to the existing trail network and to explore a road connection at to either McMurphy Lane or Upper Canada Drive.	Candevcon	A plan prepared by NAK Strategies has been included in the resubmission package outlining the pedestrian connections proposed for the development.
	The Zoning By-law has permissions for an accessory dwelling unit, therefore the site-specific by-law does not require permissions for a garden suite. Please remove this from the proposed draft by-law.	Candevcon	The zoning by-law has been revised, removing the garden suite permission. A copy of the revised draft proposed by-law has been included with the resubmission package.
	The applicant is proposing to allocate secondary units or accessory units to 5% of the single detached units. Staff would like to increase the percentage of residential units proposed to offer secondary units.	Candevcon	The revised subdivision has been revised to include smaller single detached lots and additional townhouse blocks. With the inclusion of more affordable housing types, the allocation of 5% of single detached unit for secondary unit or accessory units is in our opinion acceptable for this development.
	The Town will be requesting a qualified person peer review the submitted Urban Design Brief (UDB), at the expense of the applicant. All revisions to the UDG shall wait until the peer review comments are provided. Below are preliminary comments from the Town Planning Staff: o The UDB indicates that the dwellings are a walking distance to the proposed park. Please include an illustration with the radius (e.g. 5 minute walk, 10 minute walk, etc.). o It is requested that the UDB provide more clarity with regards to the variety of architectural style and built form within the proposed development. o The homes constructed adjacent to the heritage house should architecturally complement the heritage house. Please amend the UDB as necessary.	NAK	<p>5 min. walking radius added to Figure 2.7</p> <p>Architectural styles noted in the Town's Urban Design Guidelines added as a new section in 4.0 Residential Built Form Added text in Section 4.1.3: <i>Dwellings adjacent to the heritage house along Street 'F' shall architecturally complement the style to ensure the heritage house is well integrated within the community.</i></p>
	As a condition of draft plan approval, the Town will require a Master Landscape Plan that identifies the trees proposed to be removed and replacement planting.		To be completed at detailed design stage
	As a condition of draft plan approval, the Town will impose Architectural Control for the proposed dwellings, to be peer reviewed.		To be completed at detailed design stage

1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Response
	As a condition of draft plan approval, fencing will be required along the perimeter of the site.	To be completed at detailed design stage
	Please provide a Tree Preservation/Compensation and Enhancement Plan. On this plan, please add the proposed fencing details.	Urban Arborist To be completed at detailed design stage
	Please remove the lotting plan super imposed on the School Block 2.	Candevcon The proposed lotting plan superimposed over the School Block has been removed from the draft plan of subdivision.
	From an Urban Design perspective, it is preferred to have front elevations located along Trafalgar Road. If the County does not permit individual driveway connections to these lots, staff would like to better understand the relationship of these lots to Trafalgar Road.	NAK <p>Added text as new section in 3.1 Planting &amp; Streetscape Treatment: <i>As identified in Figure 2.3, Trafalgar Road is an arterial road that is expected to carry high volumes of truck traffic. In the current revised Draft Plan, there are a limited number of lots that are proposed to back onto Trafalgar Road. Where this rear lotting condition along this arterial road exists, there is an opportunity to provide enhance landscaping to ensure there is appropriate noise/vibration cancelling and separation measures. Within the lot depth of 47.0m, 12.0m shall be used to accommodate a berm and trees. The addition of enhances landscaping along Trafalgar Road will contribute to an attractive and safe pedestrian streetscape.</i></p> <p>To supplement the streetscape treatment, there is also opportunity to enhance the second floor level rear elevation of the units that are visible from Trafalgar Road.</p>
	Please correct the proposed right-of-way width of the streets within the Planning Justification Report	Candevcon The Planning Justification Report has been revised with the correct R.O.W. widths.
<b>Tree Inventory Protection &amp; Removal Plan Peer Review - GWS Ecological &amp; Forestry Services Inc.</b>		
	The arborist report indicated that 80 trees were individually inventoried along with 6 groupings of trees of unspecified numbers but only 27 trees were recommended for retention on the suite. In this report decisions to remove or retain trees were mainly based on a development concept that has not been approved by the municipality and to a lesser extent on tree health. At this stage in the approval process many good quality native trees located on or nearby the property boundaries may potentially be retained, as well as trees that are located internally in backyard settings (e.g., trees 1270 to 1278 and 1290 to 1295). It is therefore premature to say that trees located in these areas must be removed when they should instead be identified for further study after a Draft Plan of subdivision has been submitted in conjunction with a Grading Plan. The tree location data should then be superimposed on these plans in order to make more informed decisions about tree preservation.	Urban Arborist A further review will be carried out when the proposed grading has been established.
	The arborist only measured trees 20 cm dbh and larger. Other tree inventories recently submitted to the Town of Erin recorded data on trees down to 10cm dbh and based on my consulting experience over the past 40 years this is typically the standard that has been followed when doing urban tree inventories and it has certainly been the case in Wellington County. Based on the air photography provided in the EIS and the data given in the arborist report there are many additional trees 10 to 20 cm dbh and larger that are located along or nearby the property boundaries and they should have been individually inventoried.	Urban Arborist Including small insignificant trees that are in direct conflict of proposed development and tagging each one individually is not generally done and is not stated as a requirement by the Town of Erin. In other jurisdiction in Ontario, sample sizing is the preferred method. For trees located outside of landscaped setting, such as in meadows and woodlots a sampling procedure is typically used to estimate the tree inventory for trees less than 20cm DBH in the area of interest. A fixed area plot sampling procedure is recommended which samples at least 5% of the area of interest. The plots must be located in areas which are representative of the vegetation communities and their locations illustrated on the map.
	Although small groups or clusters of trees may be collectively inventoried, particularly if they consist of non-native invasive species or have no potential for preservation as is the case with tree groups 4,5 and 6 (i.e., clusters of Manitoba maple) other groupings of trees that have some potential for preservation should have been individually inventoried as is the case with Tree Groups 1 and 2 which consist of planted pine and spruce trees. Tree Group 1 occurs in the eastern portion of a proposed stormwater management facility and Tree Group 2 occurs along the southern property boundary. More details on proposed future grades and infrastructure requirements are needed to justify tree losses in these areas.	Urban Arborist A further review will be carried out when the proposed grading has been established.
	Tree #1303 is identified for removal in the table but is shown as being protected with tree protection fence in the drawing. This tree is a 60 cm dbh sugar maple in good condition along the northern property boundary and it should be retained in this backyard setting.	Urban Arborist Acknowledged. Will confirm proposed action and will update accordingly.
	Trees to be retained that would benefit from pruning should be identified for this work so it can be done in conjunction with required tree removals. Corrective pruning should be done to remove damaged or defective limbs that pose a potential hazard to people or property. Based on the information provided, pruning is warranted on tree #1241, 1246 and 1251. Additional trees will likely need their crowns raised to facilitate site grading	Urban Arborist Acknowledged. Will confirm proposed action and will update accordingly.
	I suggest that tree protection hoarding may not be necessary in all areas where trees are to be retained as a Paige wire farm fence with silt screen attached may be sufficient in areas where the likelihood of intrusion into the tree protection zone is minimal.	Urban Arborist Acknowledged.
	In conclusion, I recommend that the tree inventory should be expanded to include trees down to 10cm dbh in locations where tree preservation is potentially feasible, as outlined above, so that high quality trees of desirable species may be identified and hopefully retained in a forthcoming Tree Preservation/Compensation and Enhancement Plan.	Urban Arborist A further review will be carried out when the proposed grading has been established.
<b>Environmental Impact Study Peer Review Comments -GWS Ecological &amp; Forestry Services Inc.</b>		
	Vegetation communities were mapped and described using accepted ELC procedures and this information seems to accurately portray existing conditions provided on the air photo map of the property.	Noted
	Although a 3 season botanical inventory is typically required on development sites, the 2 season (summer and fall) inventory undertaken on the Briarwood property seems acceptable given the absence of naturally established woodland and wetland on this property and the lack of access to adjacent lands where provincially significant wetland and woodland are located. A list of plants observed on the property should have nonetheless been included in the EIS so that reviewers can confirm this work was undertaken and no plants of significance were found. I therefore feel Birks should supply their plant list to the Town for review but the species identified do not have to be linked to specific vegetation communities unless a particular species has some level of significance (i.e., provincially, regionally or locally significant).	Birks <p>Acknowledged. Thank you.</p> <p>Birks NHC has provided the vascular plant list for the property that was compiled during site surveys as an attachment to this comment response table. Following receipt of this comment, the attached list was provided to representative reviewers from the CVCA which allowed them to provide Comment #5 above which speaks to regionally rare species.</p> <p>All plant species recorded are provincially and nationally common, no species at risk or rare species were recorded on site. Further, a number of plant species on site are considered non-native ('exotic').</p>
	Although breeding bird surveys were not undertaken, I agree with Birks assessment of bird habitat and the potential for significant wildlife habitat. Given the available agricultural, early successional and hedgerow habitats available on the subject property I only expect common grassland and forest edge nesting birds to utilize this area.	Birks Acknowledged.

1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Response
	A tree inventory was not carried out and consequently very little information is provided on hedgerow trees which occur around the perimeter of the property and in some internal locations, as well as scattered isolated trees and tree clusters. Information on tree cover is, however, provided in the Tree Inventory, Protection & Removal Plan prepared by the Urban Arborist and my comments on this document are provided in a separate email	Noted
	Although the proposed stormwater management plan for the property is to include two wet ponds, as well as infiltration trenches, no details on these facilities are provided in the EIS. This makes it very difficult to assess whether the predevelopment water balance can actually be achieved or the potential for off-site discharges of stormwater may occur. More details are therefore required in order to more accurately assess potential impacts to adjacent significant natural heritage features and residential properties. The EIS must demonstrate compliance with Part 5-The Greenlands System in the Wellington County Official Plan.	Birks A water balance is outlined in the Hydrogeological study prepared by NLV2K Engineering Limited where the modelling analysis demonstrated that the scenario with the combination of SWM Ponds and Low Impact Development would provide the best results to mitigate the potential for impacts to the wetland hydrology from the proposed development. Please refer to the Hydrologic Study report for additional information.
	I agree with the Birks survey findings for Species at Risk bats and the proposed limitation on tree removal during the bat active season (April 1-October 31) in order to protect roosting habitat. This timing restriction on vegetation removal exceeds the requirements for migratory birds.	Birks Acknowledged.
	For the threatened barn swallows which are currently nesting in on-site buildings there will be a requirement for habitat compensation when these buildings are demolished in addition to the registration of this activity with MECP.	Birks Acknowledged. As outlined within the EIS, Barn Swallow is a Threatened species which is commonly identified within rural areas. Because of its prevalence Ontario Regulation 242/08 allows for removal of the habitat through the streamlined registry submission to allow for development of an area without the requirement to confer with the MECP. Ontario Regulation 242/08 outlines appropriate habitat compensation based on the identified habitat for Barn Swallow on the property. Confirmation is provided once the Notice of Activity is Registered with the MECP; this document can be provided upon receipt to demonstrate correspondence and compliance. Avoidance and mitigations (such as timing windows) are to be incorporated into the Plan. Please note that these have been a recent amendment (effective December 9, 2021) regarding the amount of habitat that must be provided by a building or structure that is constructed or modified to provide replacement nesting habitat for Barn Swallow. Additionally, an option will be available starting April 29, 2022 for proponents to pay a monetary amount to the Species at Risk Conservation Fund and be excluded from some of the conditions otherwise required under the ESA for Barn Swallow
<b>Building Services</b>		
	Under Division B 9.34.4.1. of the Ontario Building Code, new homes are required to be fitted out with rough in EV outlets and a 200 AMP service. In order to handle the future demands of an EV station and to avoid conflict, it should be considered in the design of the services being provided for the development.	Noted
<b>Fire Services - Jim Sawkins</b>		
	The turning radius for the roundabout (Street A) and the crescent (Street C) will accommodate our fire apparatus	Candevcon Noted
	The provision of water for firefighting operations: hydrant protected is accepted. If not, then Staff suggest utilizing the swim ponds as water reservoirs. This option would require the installation of dry hydrants at each pond and ensuring they are accessible for fire apparatus.	Candevcon Hydrants will be provided
<b>Summary of Comments/Questions from the Public Meeting</b>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> All homes should be fitted for EV outlets <input type="checkbox"/> The existing heritage home should be preserved <input type="checkbox"/> Concerns with the Stormwater Management Pond location and drainage from this site to Upper Canada Drive <input type="checkbox"/> Questions regarding the proposed LIDs <input type="checkbox"/> Questions regarding the required upgrades to Trafalgar Road, to accommodate the traffic generated by this development	Noted
<b>Summary of Public Comments Received to Date</b>		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Request clarification on the location of the proposed stormwater management facility and if excess run-off will drain into the adjacent wooded area <input type="checkbox"/> Request fencing along the property boundary <input type="checkbox"/> Request that prime agricultural lands be preserved for agricultural uses <input type="checkbox"/> Concerns with the potential adverse impacts this development may cause to existing homeowners and how these homeowners' interests will be protected (i.e. trees, noise, encroachment) <input type="checkbox"/> Questioned how the proposed development will adhere to the Urban Design Guidelines, to ensure the proposed development is a similar built form to the adjacent subdivisions <input type="checkbox"/> Questions related to Waste Water Connection <input type="checkbox"/> Questions related to the Stormwater Management Report <input type="checkbox"/> Questioned the need for the proposed school site and park <input type="checkbox"/> Concerns with the traffic that will be generated by this development	Noted
	Please review all comments provided and provide a comprehensive resubmission, including a comment matrix outlining how each comment has been addressed. In addition, please provide the following: * Revised Draft Plan of Subdivision * Revised Planning Justification Report * Written confirmation with the HIA Peer Review recommendations * Plan with proposed trails and connections to sidewalks/existing trails * Revised Draft By-law * Tree Preservation/Compensation and Enhancement Plan * Revised Environmental Impact Study * Revised Functional Servicing Report and Preliminary Stormwater Management Study * Revised Traffic Impact Study * Revised Hydrogeological Investigation * Revised Erosion and Sediment Control Drawings * Revised Grading Plan * Road cross sectional	Candevcon The requested documents have been included in the resubmission package forward to the Town and County.
<b>COUNTY OF WELLINGTON COMMENTS from Meagan Ferris- MAY 16, 2022</b>		
<b>Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment</b>		
	Within the Town Official Plan, the subject lands are designated as 'Residential' and 'Future Development'. It is our understanding that the intent of the amendment to the Town Official Plan is to re-designate the portion of the subject lands that are within the 'Future Development' designation to 'Residential'. This would result in an approximate total area of 40 ha within the 'Residential' designation. With respect to the rezoning application, the intent is to rezone the subject lands from Agriculture (A) Zone to a site specific Residential Zone (R1). The proposed policy and zoning amendments are to support a subdivision application (County file # 23T-21001).	Noted
	Based on our understanding of the overall development proposal, we note several key details which will need to be considered and reviewed to ensure that the subject proposal represents appropriate and timely development. These items generally include the following:	Noted
<b>Density and Housing Mix</b>		



1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Response
	It is our understanding that the servicing allocation to the subject lands had been issued based on the development potential for the site at the time of allocation. This is understood to be based on the existing land use designation (i.e. approximately half of the subject lands designated as 'Residential'). Although servicing has been allocated, it appears that this was not based on the development of the entire site.	Candevcon Noted
	As per the County and Town Official Plans, the subject lands are within the Greenfield Area. The minimum density requirement for the Greenfield Area is 40 persons and jobs per hectare. In order to achieve this, a development will need to generate, at a minimum, 16 units per hectare. The subject proposal is achieving 8.7 units per hectare and the primary housing type is single detached dwellings, with approximately 48 townhouse units and the potential for approximately 17 additions residential units. It appears the density is significantly low primarily due to a spreading out of the servicing allocation across the entirety of the site rather than just the existing quantity of residentially designated lands.	Candevcon The draft plan of subdivision has been revised by reducing the building envelope by 19 acres and adding 48 additional units increasing the density to approximately 13 units per hectare. The revisions provide an appropriate interface of larger (21.3 metres frontage) lots adjacent the existing Estate Lots on Upper Canada Drive and an appropriate transition from the larger lots to smaller lots. The Heritage House is situated on a larger lot appropriate to retain its heritage feature but ultimately reduces the overall density on the site. Furthermore, the lots adjacent to Trafalgar Road are 34% larger than other lots within the subdivision in order to create a similar streetscape to the existing residential lots on the east side of Trafalgar Road. A density of 13.13 units per gross residential hectare has been achieved which is an increase from the original density of 8 units per gross residential hectare achieved in the original plan. Although the density does not achieve the 16 units per hectare target for the site, we submit that the density target for this subdivision should be lower allowing more appropriate considerations of greater intensification in infill subdivisions that are closer to and within the existing urbanized area. Furthermore, the proposed subdivision density allows for a mix of options in housing types comparable to, associated with and desired in a rural setting suitable to a variety of household sizes and lifestyles. Appendix 'A' in the revised Planning Justification Report outlines the density calculations.
	Planning staff are not supportive of the density proposed and require that the developer provide a larger mix of housing types and update the development plans to reflect a significantly higher density of development that aligns with provincial policy, and the County and Town Official Plan policies. In order to achieve the expected density requirements, this would not result in the full development of the entirety of the subject lands at this time	Candevcon The draft plan of subdivision has been revised by reducing the building envelope by 19 acres and adding 48 additional units increasing the density to approximately 13 units per hectare. The revisions provide an appropriate interface of larger (21.3 metres frontage) lots adjacent the existing Estate Lots on Upper Canada Drive and an appropriate transition from the larger lots to smaller lots. The Heritage House is situated on a larger lot appropriate to retain its heritage feature but ultimately reduces the overall density on the site. Furthermore, the lots adjacent to Trafalgar Road are 34% larger than other lots within the subdivision in order to create a similar streetscape to the existing residential lots on the east side of Trafalgar Road. A density of 13.13 units per gross residential hectare has been achieved which is an increase from the original density of 8 units per gross residential hectare achieved in the original plan. Although the density does not achieve the 16 units per hectare target for the site, we submit that the density target for this subdivision should be lower allowing more appropriate considerations of greater intensification in infill subdivisions that are closer to and within the existing urbanized area. Furthermore, the proposed subdivision density allows for a mix of options in housing types comparable to, associated with and desired in a rural setting suitable to a variety of household sizes and lifestyles. Appendix 'A' in the revised Planning Justification Report outlines the density calculations.
<b>Growth Allocation - County Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR)</b>		
	Through Phase 1 of the MCR process, it was identified that the municipality has a forecasted 2051 population of 26 300, which reflects a population increase of 14 500 between 2016-2051. Of this forecast growth, it is anticipated that a majority of the population will be in the Village of Erin with about 4 700 people forecasted for the Village of Hillsburgh. The County intends to allocate growth to the 2051 planning horizon to its member municipalities through the Phase 2 of the MCR process.	Candevcon Noted
	The County has completed a draft lands need assessment report, which is issued as part of the Phase 2 MCR. This aspect of review also looks at Future Development (FD) lands comprehensively to determine if the lands are needed for Community Areas (i.e. residential, commercial), Employment or if these lands are considered excess. The Town has over 40 ha of FD lands and it is understood that all of these lands within this designation will be needed to accommodate forecasted growth. It is also forecasted that Hillsburgh has a large need for commercial uses (i.e. 7 ha) and the future designation of FD lands to commercial lands will need to be strategically considered.	Candevcon Noted
	Consideration should be given by the Town as to whether it is appropriate to bring the Future Development (FD) lands into the 'Residential' designation, as proposed by the applicant, and at such a low density. Consideration may need to be given to re-positioning the existing amount of 'Residential' and 'Future Development' designated land on the subject lands	Candevcon Noted
<b>Growth Allocation - Town Initiated Official Plan Amendment (OPA #13)</b>		
	The Town's Official Plan currently has growth allocations up to 2031. It is our understanding that this proposal represents growth beyond the 2031 forecast. The Town has initiated an amendment to the Town Official Plan (OPA # 13) to implement growth allocations beyond the existing growth forecast that will accommodate this development.	Candevcon Noted
<b>Phasing of Servicing</b>		
	At this time, the construction of the sewage treatment plant is imminent; however, it is not clear when the subject lands will be provided with full municipal services (i.e. water and sanitary services). The timing/phasing of the services and infrastructure required to accommodate the development of this site, which is located at the most northern end of Hillsburgh, needs to be considered.	Candevcon Noted
<b>Land Use Compatibility (Noise)</b>		
	The subject lands front onto a County Road (Trafalgar Road) which functions as an arterial road and is a major haul route, locally and regionally, for aggregate truck traffic. The draft plan of subdivision indicates that there are 18 lots backing on-to or abutting the County Road. Development within proximity of this road should be evaluated from a noise/acoustic perspective. It is requested that an acoustic report be prepared by a qualified professional to support the subject proposals and outline mitigation requirements. It is suggested that this be completed prior to consideration of the Official Plan and Zoning amendments.	Candevcon A Noise Report has been prepared and included in this submission.
<b>Traffic &amp; Storm Water Management Review</b>		
	The County's Roads Division is reviewing the submitted Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and the Storm Water Management report. The TIS is being peer reviewed by Dillon Consulting on behalf of the County. These comments are pending and will be provided under separate cover.	Candevcon Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package

1st Submission Comments  
 Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
 5916 Trafalgar Road  
 Town of Erin

Item	Comments		Response
	<b>Additional Comments</b> The public meeting for the draft plan subdivision was hosted by the Town on behalf of the County on April 14, 2022. The County looks forward to reviewing a copy of a response letter to all the comments received prior to, at and following the Public Meeting. County planning staff will continue to work with the Town and the application through the revisions to the design and layout of the draft plan of subdivision and the concerns raised.	Candevcon	Noted
<b>DILLON CONSULTING COMMENTS dated May 31, 2022</b>			
	This memorandum documents the findings from the peer review of the above-noted study. This peer review and associated comments are structured to align with the same section headings as found in the Traffic Impact Study	Candevcon	Noted
<b>PEER REVIEW SUMMARY</b>			
	The following represents a summary of the findings of this peer review exercise: · The associated analysis, findings for the existing and future total background conditions have been found to be accurate and appropriate	Candevcon	Noted
	· The associated analysis, findings for the trip generation and distribution of the proposed subdivision were not clear, especially in regard to: o Whether or not any internal capture rates were applied between the elementary school and the residential land uses within the subject subdivision o Whether or not trips generated by the residential land uses and elementary school were distributed and assigned separately	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· The associated analysis, findings for the future total conditions may need to be revised once the associated trip generation and distribution calculations are confirmed	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· The study makes several recommendations to geometric and signal timing improvements at the Wellington Road 22 and Wellington Road 26 but does not comment as to whether or not the additional improvements are triggered by the background traffic volume growth by other developments or the subject residential development. It is recommended that improvements be considered to accommodate forecast background traffic volumes	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· Should an elementary school be proposed along Street 'A', there may be a new desire line for pedestrians crossing Wellington Road 24 at the Howe Street/Street 'A' intersection, and there may need to be a change to traffic control at the intersection (such as a pedestrian crossover, pedestrian signal and/or a full traffic signal)	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· A traffic signal warrant should be undertaken for the George Street and Mill Street intersection. However, as separate transportation impact studies will be prepared to support some of the background developments closer to this intersection, this signal warrant could likely be completed by one or more of those studies.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	However, the submitted TIS is incomplete, noting that the following four matters that were explicitly scoped out with Candevcon were not included:	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· The report should include a discussion as to whether or not a local road connection to McMurchy Lane and Upper Canada Drive could be introduced rather than connecting Street 'E' to Wellington Road 24	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· Due to the vertical profile of Wellington Road 24, a safety assessment will need to be completed at both locations. As you can see across the corridor from where Street 'E' was constructed, Barbour Drive features a cul-de-sac and no direct connection	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· Due to the vertical profile along Wellington Road 24 fronting the proposed residential development, sightline analysis needs to be completed at the locations of the two intersections are being proposed to connect to Wellington Road 24 (future Street 'A' and future Street 'E'). Based on available speeds found along this portion of the corridor, a 70 km/h design speed (posted + 30 km/h) should be used	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	· The need for both a northbound left-turn lane and a southbound right-turn lane at the Howe Street/future Street 'A' intersection and the future Street 'E' intersection need to be explicitly assessed utilizing a 70 km/h design speed	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	A discussion regarding the need for Street 'E' to connect to Wellington Road 24 should occur as it may be feasible to revise the subdivision concept where a separate local road connection to the subdivision lands via Upper Canada Drive and McMurchy Lane could be established.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	Should this alternative connection be implemented, it would likely have an impact on how the site generated traffic would be assigned and distributed through the Study Area.	Candevcon	Please refer to Traffic Response to Comment Letter, dated July 21, 2022 which is included as part of this submission package
	Given the incomplete submission, a revised Transportation Impact Study or subsequent addendum should be ultimately prepared and submitted.	Candevcon	A revised Transportation Impact Study has been completed and is included as part of the submission package.
<b>COUNTY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT - Pasquale Cstanzo</b>			
	In review of the Storm Drainage and Stormwater Management provided within the Functional Servicing Report the Wellington Roads are in acceptance of the document and has no comments to provide. If there are any changes to the proposed subdivision that will affect the Stormwater Management of the site, we will request to review an updated report.	Candevcon	Acknowledged
	In addition the Wellington Roads have the following requirements, * A conveyance of a one-foot reserve along Trafalgar Road from the lands to be subdivided and placed in favour of the County of Wellington.	Candevcon	Shown on revised Draft Plan
	* A conveyance of 50' x 50' daylight corners at the approved Street(s) accessing Trafalgar Road and placed in favour of the County of Wellington	Candevcon	Shown on revised Draft Plan
<b>THE PLANNING PARTNERSHIP - URBAN DESIGN REVIEW</b>			
	We have reviewed the Urban Design Brief, November 2021, prepared by Nak Design Strategies which forms part of the Draft Plan of Subdivision application. The Urban Design Brief is well organized and include all the different elements required to describe the community. However, we would like to better understand how the proposed development conforms with the Town's Urban Design Guidelines and would ask that the applicant provide more details. Comments are organized based upon the submitted Urban Design Brief structure, including comments related to the proposed Neighbourhood Structure (Appendix A) and Priority Lot Plan (Appendix B), and are as follows:	NAK	Noted
<b>1.3 Opportunities &amp; Constraints</b>			
	The achievement of an attractive streetscape along Trafalgar Road North is an important objective for the Town. Street environments that are attractive and pedestrian-oriented/scaled, combine two essential components - buildings that frame and define the street edge, with doors and windows that open onto the public frontage, and landscape elements that include street trees and street furnishings which are arranged to enhance pedestrian activity	NAK	Trafalgar Road is non-urbanized with no sidewalks and with a high percentage of truck traffic. It is not appropriate to provide conventional streetscape with buildings that define the street edge. The Urban Design objective is to match the existing streetscape on the east side of Trafalgar Road with a landscaped berm and upgraded Architecture.

Item	Comments	Response
	The proposed rear lotting along Trafalgar Road will create a street environment that is the antithesis of this and should be avoided. Instead, it is recommended that units front onto Trafalgar Road by way of 1) rear-lane accessed units, 2) thru-lot units or 3) window street units, in order of preference.	NAK Please refer to response under first comment. Rear lotting is minimized along Trafalgar Road. Where it exists, there will be upgraded landscape buffer treatment to reduce appearance of the backyard and contribute to the attractive appearance of Trafalgar Road. Enhanced landscaping for these units are noted in 2.2, 3.1.1 and 4.4.5.
	This comment also applies to section 2.2 Land Use which describes residential units backing onto Trafalgar Road North.	NAK
<b>2.3 Street Hierarchy</b>		
	There are some very long blocks proposed; these should be shortened to improve walkability / permeability, either by way of streets (preferred) or by way of mid-block walkway blocks (acceptable).	NAK Please refer to response under first comment. Shorter blocks are proposed in the revised site plan design to improve walkability/permeability.
<b>2.3.1 Entrance Road</b>		
	Street A, west of the roundabout should be designed as a 'Green Street' with widened boulevards to allow for a double row of street trees (refer to Appendix A).	NAK Green Street (23.0m) added. New cross section drafted to show accommodations of double row of street trees.  Text update: <i>The Green Street makes up the western portion of Street 'A', the primary access road and community gateway. A double row of street trees can be accommodated within the boulevards of this right-of-way, framing both sidewalks. This street tree condition will create an enhanced boulevard and will complement the location of the neighbourhood park and school block which is central to the Green Street.</i>
	Vista blocks should include pedestrian pathways, plantings and site furnishings (benches, waste receptacles, bike lock-ups, etc.)	NAK New plan graphic added to address vista block, includes seating and pedestrian walkway.
<b>2.4 Pedestrian Circulation</b>		
	Pedestrian walkway connection should be 8m wide to allow for generous landscaping on either side of a walkway.	NAK Pedestrian Walkway (6.0m) added. New cross section drafted to show pedestrian connection and landscaping.  Text added: <i>To contribute to a pedestrian focused neighbourhood, 6.0m R.O.W. in the form of pedestrian walkways are proposed particularly for long blocks. These pedestrian walkways will have a 2.4m asphalt pathway and enhanced landscaping narrow columnar trees on both sides, as shown in Figure 2.8.</i>
	Enhanced treatment at pedestrian crossings along the primary roads, around the central school/park block, at gateways and open spaces.	NAK Text updated: <i>Pedestrian crossings along the primary roads, at gateways, around the central school/park block and open spaces will have enhanced treatment to contribute to safety and the character of the neighbourhood.</i>
<b>3.1 Planting &amp; Streetscape Treatment</b>		
<b>3.1.1 Street Trees</b>		
	Re: bullet #6, note that the same species should not extend on both sides of the street for the entire block length. At gateways / corners 3-5 trees of the same species may be planted on both sides of the street. In all other locations, no more than 3 trees of the same species should be planted in a row or be mirrored on the opposite side of the street.	NAK Text update: <i>With the objective to encourage diversity, trees of the same species should not be planted on both sides of the street along the full length of a block. In all other locations, no more than 3 trees of the same species should be planted in a row or be mirrored on the opposite side of the street. However, at gateways / corners, 3-5 trees of the same species may be planted on both sides of the street;</i>
<b>3.1.4 Fencing</b>		
	In lieu of stand-alone entrance feature walls, at gateway locations upgraded fencing and landscaping shall be required. Upgrades include stone and masonry components (i.e. walls and columns) as part of the corner lot fence design as well as additional plantings along the daylight triangle and side lot line.	NAK Text update: <i>Upgraded fencing and landscaping in lieu of stand-alone entrance feature walls at gateway locations</i>  <i>Upgraded fencing and landscaping may include stone and masonry components (i.e. walls and columns) as part of the corner lot fence design as well as additional plantings along the daylight triangle and side lot line .</i>
<b>3.2 Parks</b>		
	Consider an open space element as a focus for the area south of Street A (refer to Appendix A).	NAK SWM ponds will include an open space trail and seating. Together they will function as an open space element for the south of the development.
<b>Figure 3.16</b>		
	It would be helpful to identify the principles that should be achieved here, such as: * A centrally located play area * Screen plantings along interface with rear yards * No fencing between park and school blocks, instead a row of trees along the lot line * A hierarchy of pathways (main path 3.0m; secondary path 2.4m) * Pathways to connect to intersections (where controlled intersections are planned) * Ecological approach to landscaping (naturalized areas)	NAK Labels added
<b>3.4 Views and Viewsheds</b>		
	It is suggested that maintaining views to the adjacent Greenlands has influenced the configuration of the land use / block pattern however, this is not evident as approximately 70% of the frontage adjoining Greenlands is occupied by lots/buildings thereby limiting views to the open space. It is recommended that this area be re-configured with a minimum of 60% of the frontage open / accessible to public view.	NAK A vista is proposed at the end of Street 'A' to add views to the Greenlands.

Item	Comments	Response
<b>Built Form</b>		
<b>4.1 General Design Principles</b>		
	Mixing architectural styles is strongly discouraged. Although the intention is clear, consider revising text to avoid conflicts with the Town-wide UDG.	<p>Text update: <i>As expressed in the Town's Urban Design Guidelines, there is a strong desire to maintain the general built form look and feel in the Village of Hillsburgh. Although architectural expression varies, common traditional styles include Craftsman, Georgian, Colonial Revival, Folk Victorian, Italianate, Second Empire, and Prairie. As a new development, it is recommended by the Town's Urban Design Guidelines that an inventory/survey of the existing building stock surrounding Hillsburgh Heights be completed. Mixing architectural styles is strongly discouraged, but rather residential built form should appropriately reflect and/or be compatible with the characteristics of the traditional style.</i></p> <p>New section 4.1.1 Architectural Styles as per Town's Urban Design Guidelines has been added to provide examples.</p>
<b>4.1.2 Building Materials</b>		
	Revise 1st bullet as follows: All elevations exposed to public view shall include ample fenestration and articulated designs (i.e., changes in plane, architectural details and complementary high-quality materials)	Updated.
	Add the following guidelines: * Materials and architectural details shall be consistent and complement the dwelling's style/design. * Roof articulation should relate to that of the wall below. * Transition in materials shall be provided at changes in plane. * On interior lots, materials used for the front or upgraded rear elevations shall wrap around the building side elevation a minimum of 1200mm (4'- 0"), to a change of wall plane or a rain water leader.	Updated.
<b>4.1.3 Transition to Adjacent Neighbourhoods</b>		
	Elaborate on how the 2nd bullet is to be accomplished, taking into account the surrounding context (built and natural) as well as transitions to/from proposed institutional uses.	Text update: <i>Pedestrian linkages through open space areas such as SWM ponds shall lead to walkways of adjacent blocks/neighbourhoods to provide seamless transition to/from institutional uses and provide connectivity with the surrounding built and natural context.</i>
<b>4.1.4 Setbacks</b>		
	Add the following guidelines: * Locate the habitable portions of the buildings closer to the street edge * Minimize the presence of garages on the streetscape by recessing them from the unit's main wall or porch.	Updated.
<b>4.2.1 Single Detached Houses</b>		
	Re: Bullet#5 - as per the UDG, projecting garages are NOT allowed for units on lots greater than 15m. All proposed/described lots are greater than 50ft (15.24m). The guideline should be revised to reflect this.	Bullet number 5 is removed.
<b>4.3.1 Street Townhouses</b>		
	Add: 'Individual units should be emphasize through the articulation of walls and roof lines (e.g. variations in roof slopes at end units, dormers, differing roof pitches, etc.).'	Updated.
	Re: Bullet #11, add the following at the end of the last sentence '....and only if the width of garage doors do not exceed 50% of the overall width of the unit.'	Updated.
<b>4.4 Priority Lotting – Figure 4.8</b>		
	Revise symbol for the lot on the south side of Street E, at Trafalgar Road Side to require and rear and side upgrades.	Updated
	With respect to rear lotting along Trafalgar Road North, this condition should be avoided (refer to comments provide under 1.3).	Upgraded landscape buffer treatment is proposed for units with rear lotting along Trafalgar Road. This is noted in section 2.2, 3.1.1, and 4.4.5.
<b>4.4.1 Gateway Lots</b>		
	Add: 'Garages and driveways shall be located as far as possible from the gateway/flankage elevation.'	Updated.
<b>4.4.2 Corner Lots</b>		
	Re: bullet #2, add: ....and corner treatments such as wrapping porches/windows, turrets, greater massing, etc.	Updated.
	Move bullet #9 to 'Gateway Lots'	Updated.
	Add the following guidelines: * Elevations of rear garages on corner lots should be of the same quality of the main unit (architectural style/detailing and materials). * Elbow lots should be sited as a group to create a transitional view-line and to avoid driveway overlapping.	First bullet added in 4.4.2 Corner Lots, second bullet added in 4.4.3 View Terminus & Elbow Lots.
<b>4.4.4 Lot Fronting or Flanking onto Parks &amp; Open Space</b>		
	Re: bullets #1 and #6, note that wall and roof articulation, and enhanced fenestration are required for elevations facing parks and open spaces.	<p>Updated bullet 1: <i>... Wall and roof articulation, and enhanced fenestration are required for elevations facing parks and open spaces. Other treatments may include prominent front porches, well-proportioned windows, projecting bays etc.</i></p> <p>Updated bullet 6: <i>Exposed elevations shall have wall and roof articulation, and enhanced fenestration. Other applicable enhancements may be considered:</i> - Bay windows or other additional fenestration; - Enhancement of windows with shutters, muntin bars, frieze board, precast, or brick detailing; and - Gables and dormers.</p>
<b>4.4.5 Lots Requiring Rear &amp; Side Upgrades</b>		
	Re: bullet #2 - How is this to be assessed?	Bullet removed.
	Re: bullet #3 - Wall and roof articulation, and enhanced fenestration are a required for rear/side elevations facing parks and open spaces.	Text update: <i>Exposed elevations shall have wall and roof articulation, and enhanced fenestration. Other applicable enhancements may be considered:</i> - Bay windows or other additional fenestration; - Enhancement of windows with shutters, muntin bars, frieze board, precast, or brick detailing; and - Gables and dormers.



1st Submission Comments  
Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
5916 Trafalgar Road  
Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Response
	<b>5.1 Institutional</b>	
	Re: Other, add the following guideline: * Locate school main building close to the street edge (preferably Street A) with its longest side along it.	NAK The same bullet is noted in the Place / Orientation section, thus not duplicated in the Other section.
	Re: Built Form, add the following guideline: * Design school elevations to incorporate breaks or wall articulation to avoid long, unanimated walls, and coordinate them with the roof and massing design (e.g., higher elements).	NAK Updated.
	Re: Look and Feel, add the following guideline: * Enhanced fenestration and clear glazing shall be encouraged on all elevations facing the public realm.	NAK Updated.
	Re: Placement / Orientation, add the following guidelines: * Locate school main building close to the street edge (preferably Street A) with its longest side along it. * Encourage main entrance to be located at the intersection of Streets A and B, and secondary entrance(s) to the west, close to the park. * Encourage the location of play areas closer to the park edge to promote sharing of amenities and design them to seamlessly blend. * Encourage locating pick-up/drop-off areas internal to the site, away from street frontages and providing an alternative entrance related to them. If they are located along the street edge as the only option, they should be integrated into the design of the streetscape (i.e. enhanced landscaping, safe, clearly marked pedestrian walkways, etc.).	NAK Updated.
<b>April 14th Public Meeting Comments</b>		
<b>Marilyn Cresswell and Stephen Brown (58 Upper Canada Dr)</b>		
	First let us state that we support planned new building and welcome measured growth with purpose in both Hillsburgh and Erin. At the council meeting today we would like to express three concerns and look forward to having them addressed:	
	1) The Building process itself: The first concern is that the proposed subdivision OP21-01, Z21-09 may negatively impact existing properties backing onto it during the building process and would like to know what will be done to protect homeowners existing interest? e.g. protecting existing trees, avoiding encroachment, avoiding excess noise etc. For example our septic system is positioned at the far back of our property and we have grave concerns about it being interfered with.	Existing trees on the property line will be retained and protected during construction; Contractors will be required to adhere to the Town's Noise By-law; No significant grading will be conducted out near the property line
	2) Buffer zone: The criteria to arrive at "similar build" does not seem have been adhered to with this new subdivision. The planning documents from past years indicated that the properties abutting or adjoining existing properties would be built to blend in similar style, size, quality etc. The lot sizes proposed alone are significantly different e.g. specifically the depth of the backyards which will be connecting to the existing Upper Canada homes. To what extent did the planners consider the new subdivision blending with the existing houses they are abutting? The current proposal has rather modern designs, smaller lots sizes etc. and despite prior assurances from the town to maintain its existing look and feel. Perhaps a small buffer zone (tall hedge) or privacy fence between existing homes and the new subdivision might be in order if the proposed abutting properties will not be of similar size, design etc.	The draft plan of subdivision has been designed to provide an appropriate interface of larger (21.3 metres frontage) lots adjacent to the existing Estate Lots on Upper Canada Drive. The Heritage House is situated on a larger lot appropriate to retain its heritage feature. Furthermore, the lots adjacent to Trafalgar Road are 34% larger than other lots within the subdivision in order to create a similar streetscape to the existing residential lots on the east side of Trafalgar Road.
	3) Confirmation of waste water connection: The builder informed us that houses on Upper Canada would be first in line to connect to the new system yet this week we received a letter formally indicating that the earliest we would be connecting would be 4 years. Can we assume that this build will not be happening until the wastewater plant is in?	The conditions of the sanitary sewers and wastewater plant is being undertaken by the Town. The subject subdivision is reliant on the wastewater connection being made available.
<b>Linda Campbell (34 Upper Canada Dr)</b>		
	My concern with this subdivision plan is three fold and I urge you to consider these points during the approval process:	
	1. The subdivision plan has a provision for a school which is completely unnecessary. Ross R Mackay Public School has been under utilized for years and lies on a beautiful piece of property in the heart of Hillsburgh. This school can easily accommodate more children and could be expanded and refurbished to accommodate more grades and more students. Please do not let this beautiful school property lie derelict in the middle of Hillsburgh while yet another school is built in our community! Ross R is a mere 5 minute drive from this proposed subdivision.	The school site was requested by the School Board. The decision to utilize the site for school resides with the School Board.
	2. The subdivision has a provision for a park. Again, completely unnecessary. Money was recently spent to refurbish Victoria Park and it should be used as a hub of the community. We don't need to allocate land for resources that our village does not need	The Town has a Parkland By-law that dictate the amount of park land is required per development. The park provided meets the required Town's parkland calculation requirements. Changes to the inclusion of park land is a decision for the Town not the landowner/developer.
	3. Lack of infrastructure for a subdivision of this size. Erin/Hillsburgh are commuter communities now and Hillsburgh has one main artery for commuter traffic – Trafalgar Road. Adding a subdivision of this size would bottleneck all travel on Trafalgar Road, through the village, and further, as we all commute toward Mississauga.	A Traffic Impact Study was prepared to address the impact of the subject subdivision as well as other planned development on the road network. No significant impacts were identified. The Study is subject to the Town's and County's review and approval.
	Most residents of Hillsburgh want to see our Town grow and prosper. We want more amenities, we want a school that has more than 90 students and we welcome growth. However, growth has to be properly planned, gradual and should benefit and beautify a community. Please consider a revised plan from this developer that would see phased construction, less houses and a plan that does not include amenities that we already have.	The proposed subdivision is being planned in conformity with the Town and County Official Plans and the number of residential units allowed to the property. The provision for schools and park sites are determined by the Town and School Board.
<b>Dan Haydoe (Neighbour)</b>		
	1. The proposed subdivision would drain to a SWM pond on the south east side of the site but the new development is significantly higher than the pond and the new pond will need significant size and depth to keep storm water away from the much lower existing homes. There is also now an extremely large hard surface area that will be drained into the pond from the entire new development. Over the past decade, what used to be described as "100 year storm events" that most systems are designed for have become much more frequent and often exceeded these design requirements. How will the existing homes be protected from water damage in the event of large storms?	Two (2) storm management ponds are proposed with the drainage area matching the existing conditions. The stormwater management ponds have been sized so that the post-development flow matches the the pre-development flows. The stormwater management pond at the south east corner will be at a lower level that is consistent with the elevation of McMurphy Lane.
	2. Buffer zone: The criteria to arrive at "similar build" does not seem to have been adhered to with this new subdivision. The planning documents from past years indicated that the properties abutting or adjoining existing properties would be built to blend in similar style, size, quality etc. The lot sizes proposed alone are significantly different e.g. specifically the depth of the backyards which will be connecting to the existing Upper Canada homes. The density of this development is much greater than any other areas in Hillsburgh.	The County and Town Official Plans dictate the density required for new development. The lot adjacent to Upper Canada Drive are larger lots (70 ft) frontages to provide an appropriate interface at a density that is sufficiently lower than what the official plan requires. The Heritage House is situated on a larger lot appropriate to retain its heritage features. Furthermore, the lots adjacent to Trafalgar Road are 34% larger than other lots within the subdivision in order to create a similar streetscape to the existing residential lots on the east side of Trafalgar Road.

1st Submission Comments  
Hillsburgh Heights Inc.  
5916 Trafalgar Road  
Town of Erin

Item	Comments	Response
	3) Sanitary Connection: when this proposed development is completed it has been discussed that existing homeowners connect to the new sanitary system but why are the existing home owners required to pay for that connection. Existing homes did not request the sanitary connection or need or want it.	This is not a question that can be answered by the developer. This question should be directed to the Town of Erin for an answer.
	4) Construction may negatively impact existing properties backing onto it during the building process and I would like to know what will be done to protect homeowners existing interest. e.g. protecting existing trees, avoiding encroachment, avoiding excess noise, dust, vibration etc. This area is very windy and dust and debris from construction will negatively impact existing properties and this dust will not be captured by a construction silt fence.	Existing trees on the property line will be retained and protected during construction; Contractors will be required to adhere to the Town's Noise By-law; No significant grading will be conducted out near the property line
<b>Wellington Federation of Agriculture</b>		
	Wellington County is the hub of agricultural innovation, research, and leadership in the province. Protecting and preserving Ontario's agricultural land for the purpose of growing, harvesting, and producing food is a high priority for the Wellington Federation of Agriculture (WFA). The local agricultural system that hinges on food production and processing is extremely vital to our economy. Agri-business will always require arable land and an environment that supports the growth of Ontario's more than 200 diverse commodities. Recent global events have highlighted the importance of a domestic, reliable food system. Wellington County has some of the most fertile, productive land in Ontario, which is vital to ensuring sufficient land resources for food production, processing, and related agri-business. WFA recognizes that the proposed Residential development north of Hillsburgh is land already identified as future development and within the current urban boundary, so although WFA will always object to farmland that is converted to growing houses from growing food, we see the current housing boom in Erin as a precipice.	The County of Wellington and Town of Erin have completed a Comprehensive review of their Official Plan policies over the last few years. The current changes to their respective Plans outline the County and Town policies relating to prime agricultural lands.
	The current planning environment that will determine additional agricultural land for future development is now. Many municipalities and Counties across the province have recognized the value of agricultural land and have held their urban boundary expansion to zero – deciding to grow up vs. grow out. Some of those municipalities that have the foresight and political will to hold their urban boundary are immediate neighbours of Wellington County. While WFA completely opposes the loss of farmland to houses, an effective method of preserving farmland is by intensification. As such, WFA supports methods that will achieve this higher standard such as the townhouses and the accessory & secondary units.	The County of Wellington and Town of Erin have completed a Comprehensive review of their Official Plan policies over the last few years. The current changes to their respective Plans outline the County and Town policies relating to prime agricultural lands.
	Land within Erin Township is Class 1, 2 or 3 – all very suitable for varying prime agricultural use. Farmland preservation and the Agricultural System fragmentation should be a lens for all agricultural land zoning requests. The intended use of agricultural land as large lots or full subdivision development is not sustainable from a resourcing, environmental, ecological and serving perspective	The County of Wellington and Town of Erin have completed a Comprehensive review of their Official Plan policies over the last few years. The current changes to their respective Plans outline the County and Town policies relating to prime agricultural lands.
	We need to take pause and consider prime agricultural land rezoning in our planning priorities. As Wellington County and the Town of Erin navigate the current Comprehensive Policy Review and identify future land needs, the WFA ask for your consideration of preserving agricultural land as the finite resource that it is.	The County of Wellington and Town of Erin have completed a Comprehensive review of their Official Plan policies over the last few years. The current changes to their respective Plans outline the County and Town policies relating to prime agricultural lands.