MATTAMY & COSCORP - 5520 & 5552 Eighth Line Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning - 1st Submission Comment Response Matrix (Z22-06, Z22-07, 23T-22003, 23T-22004)

Town of Erin Comments

Department / Category	Document / Sub Category	Item No.	Comment No.	Comments	Response By	Response
	Preliminary Comments	1	1	Avoid rear lotting along Eighth Line. This condition creates an adverse pedestrian condition and is contrary to the Town's vision for attractive and pedestrian oriented/scaled streetscapes. Instead, it is recommended that these lots be replaced by 1) rear-lane accessed units, 2) thru-lot units or 3) window street units, listed in order of preference. Alternatively, medium density uses / massing forms along this frontage may also be appropriate (the separation distance to the existing residential lots on the east side of Eighth Line appears to be approximately 25m which would generally allow new buildings in the range of 6 - 8 storeys in height to 'fit' within this context.	DSEL/Q4	DSEL - The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as **Attachment 1**. As presented in FSR drawing 6, vertical transitions from streets H and G are made up either through lotting, 3:1 transition sloping or use of retaining walls. Therefore, a window street cannot be provided without significant vertical transitions. Implementation of higher density product eliminates flexibility in making up vertical grades along road, through lots and will result in increased use of retaining walls. Furthermore, 6-8 storey buildings were never contemplated for this plan. Proposed increase in density would require additional capacity within downstream infrastructure which is limited (SWM Ponds, sanitary trunks designed by WSP/Town). Buildings around 6-8 storeys in height will clash significantly with the existing single detached product located on the east side of 8th Line, and doing so would be counter intuitive to community aesthetic objectives. NAK - section prepared in UDB to show rear lotting Eighth Line condition
		2	2	Provide more public frontage along the NHS / windows to the open space by shifting the primary access road in key locations.	DSEL	DSEL - The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. As presented in FSR drawing 6, vertical transitions from internal roads to the NHS streets are made up either through lotting, 3:1 transition sloping or use of retaining walls. Providing roads adjacent to the NHS would require larger grading blocks which would impact lotting and increase the requirement for public retaining walls and therefore, additional public frontage along the NHS will not be provided.
		3	3	Typically, the campusing of parks, NHS and SWMs would be a desirable scenario in new neighbourhoods (with obvious benefits) however, in this context, swapping the park and medium density block (Blks 15 & 16) would place the park on the west side of the primary road where the majority of residents are located. This location would achieve other objectives for the public space such as 1) a more central/accessible location 2) road frontage on all sides 3) views and vistas from the surrounding residential fabric and 4) an overall broader dispersion of public open space in the new community.	DSEL/NAK	Swapping the park block with the medium density block as requested in the comment has been discussed with Town staff. It is understood the current park block located on the west side of the Spine Road is acceptable to the Town and as such comment no longer applies. NAK - through discussions with the Town, the proposed park location has been agreed upon with staff
		4	4	Provide shorter / more connected blocks that are also more easily connected to the park. Ensure that blocks to the west of Street A do not exceed the maximum 180m recommended block length. This would improve permeability / enhance walkability.	Mattamy /Korsiak	As discussed with Town staff, due to topographical constraints these pedestrian connections would require sloping significantly greater than 10% and would therefore not be accessible. Adjacent lot grading and the grade differential from street to street do not allow additional pedestrian connections to be feasible.
		5	5	Provide a direct pedestrian connection to the 'central' park from the walkway block at the southwest.	DSEL	Site grading constraints are restrictive in providing opportunities for walkway connections. Conceptual trails/walkways have been incorporated into the preliminary design where feasible and appropriate. Additional refinements can be explored at detailed design. Swapping the park block with the medium density block as requested in the comment above has been discussed with Town staff. It is understood the current park block located on the west side of the Spine Road is acceptable to the Town and as such comment no longer applies.
				1.5 Opportunities & Constraints		
		6	6	In the legend, identify both proposed types of roads within the community (re: dashed purple (20m ROW) and blue (18m ROW)).	NAK	NAK - Updated
		7	7	On the plan, identify opportunities for pedestrian connections through blocks, where appropriate (ie. Blocks in excess of 180m in length).	DSEL/NAK	DSEL - These pedestrian connections would not be accessible at 10% slope, additional streets (from shorter blocks) create worse grading conditions and transition slope requirements. Additionally, for the proposed sidewalk and pedestrian connectivity plan, please refer to FSR Figure 13. NAK - through discussions with the Town, it has been agreed upon that mid-block connections would not be accessible
		8	8	On the plan, identify pedestrian trails/linkages within vista blocks.	NAK/Mattamy/Korsiak/Coscorp	DSEL - As the subject lands are heavily constrained by the existing topography, pedestrian connections from vista blocks are limited. The proposed sidewalk and pedestrian connectivity plan, please refer to FSR Figure 13. NAK - through discussions with the Town, it has been agreed upon that grading conditions do not allow for accessible vista block linkages
				2.2 Street Network & Heirarchy		
		9	9	Identify on plan the views/vistas created throughout the community.	NAK	NAK - shown in Figure 12: Proposed Views & Vistas Plan
		10	10	As mentioned, blocks to the west of Street 'A' are overly long. This is contrary to the statement "They are designed to achieve short block lengths thereby creating terminating views, vistas, and other focal points."	NAK	NAK - reference removed in UDB

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Urban Design Peer Review, Wai Ying Di Giorgio		11	11	As stated in the 'Public Realm" section of the Town's Urban Design Guidelines (UDG), sidewalks are encouraged on both sides of the street.	DSEL/NAK	DSEL - Sidewalks are proposed per Town of Erin standard 18m, 20m and 23m ROW drawings. The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. As discussed with Town staff on April 27, 2023, it was generally accepted 18m ROWs could be implemented for the local roads throughout the proposed Draft Plan. Additionally, DSEL noted a 23m ROW could be provided for the spine road, with exception to the stretch adjacent to SWM Pond 1. Please refer to J. Krubnik & T. Bal Comment 1 response for discussion the Spine Road adjacent to SWM Pond 1. NAK - sections updated through discussions with the Town
		12	12	It is not clear how the front integrated garages (and potential rooms above) shown on all preliminary elevations, would work in relation to the minimum setbacks shown for the garages on pages 12 and 13; clarification is required.	Q4	The sections have been updated through discussions with the Town. The product is currently under development. Elevations and architectural cross sections will be provided under a seperate cover. NAK - sections updated through discussions with the Town Q4 to provide elevations and cross sections at a later date
		13	13	As per the sections on pages 12 and 13, the proposed minimum setbacks to porches/unit's front wall are between 1m and 2m. The 'Built Form' section for new Neighbourhoods (UDG – page 47) requests that, in these conditions, the unit entry should be raise between 0.9 to 1.2m above the sidewalk grade to allow for proper privacy. Ensure either models reflect this, or adjust sections to allow for a minimum setback of 3m from the property line to the front wall of the house.	Q4	Q4: To force 5R to 7R to Front Porches means the ground floor elevation will be forced up and the overall buulding height will be taller. This would also force rear decks to walk-out basements where they otherwise would not be required. Grading will ultimately determine the number of risers to Porch Front Walk-out Lots designs with raised split entry Foyers will likely have 7R minimum to front walk-up porch porch. (See Building Height Section) Front Walk-out Lots designed with Front Foyer leading direcly into slab on grade Walk-out Basement level will likely have 1R minimum to porch. For standard grade lots and Rear Walk-out Basement lots, the foyer Leading directly into the Ground floor Level will likely have 2R to porch. This is to avoid Decks to access a walk-out basement and to keep building height down. (See Building Height Section)
				2.3 Pedestrian Circulation		
		14	14	UDG – Public Realm section (page 44) recommend that "At a minimum, include sidewalks and large canopy deciduous trees on both sides of all streets". The statement on section 2.3 of the briefs contradicts this guideline.	NAK	NAK - sections updated through discussions with the Town
		15	15	UDG (page 29) recommend that "Design all sidewalks to have a minimum width of 1.8m on local streets and 2.1 on major streets (in compliance with AODA standards)."	NAK/DSEL	DSEL - Further to response to Comment 11 above, proposed sidewalk widths are consistent with Town of Erin standard ROW sections. Therefore, the proposed 1.5m sidewalk width has not been increased and remains at 1.5m.
		16	16	As mentioned previously, identify on plan opportunities for pedestrian connections through blocks, where appropriate (re: long blocks), as well as trails/linkages within vista blocks.	DSEL	NAK - through discussions with the Town, it has been agreed upon that mid-block connections would not be accessible DSEL - Please refer to response to Comment 4 above. Korsiak - As discussed with Town staff, due to grading constraints mid-block connections would be undesireable and would not be accessible.
				3.1.2 Fencing		
		17	17	Since this is a design brief, it's recommended that conceptual designs for the various contemplated fencing elements be provided.	NAK	NAK - subsection added to UDB including plan showing fencing locations
				3.1.4 Street Furniture		
		18	18	Since vista blocks are open space amenities, recommend that site furniture be provided in these locations.	NAK/DSEL	NAK - Through discussions with the Town, it has been agreed upon that grading conditions do not allow for accessible vista blocks. Further, proposed street furniture design will be prepared and submitted during detailed design.
				3.4.1 Neighborhood Park		
		19	19	The UDG "Encourage street frontages on 3 sides (preferable configuration), and provide a minimum of 2 sides fronting onto streets". As proposed, the neighbourhood park only has one side fronting a street (see comment #3)	NAK	NAK - by combining the park with the open space blocks, a longer street frontage is achieved with ample views from the public ROW into the park. This location also allows for pedestrian connectivity from 8th Line through the SWM, which would not be possible if the park was internalized for the sole purpose of allowing for more street frontages.
		20	20	As it is proposed that pedestrians and cyclists share this space, consider a wider walkway (suggest 4.5m).	NAK	NAK - will adjust park plan to show 4.5m pathway
				3.5 Views and Viewsheds		
		21	21	Provide more opportunities for public access / views to the NHS (see comment #2).	NAK	Refer to response to Comment 2 and 4 above. NAK - ample view opportunities are provided from within the community through the park and vista blocks, as well as outside of the community from the SWM pond interface along 8th Line DSEL - Views to the NHS are not possible given the orientation of the Draft Plan. Lotting is required on the NHS side of the spine road to accommodate transition grading through the unit rather.
		22	22	Views and vistas are stablished from public spaces; adjust plan accordingly.		As presented in FSR drawing 6, vertical transitions from internal roads to the NHS streets are made up either through lotting, 3:1 transition sloping or use of retaining walls. Providing roads adjacent to the NHS would require larger grading blocks which would impact lotting and increase the requirement for public retaining walls and therefore, additional public frontage along the NHS will not be provided.
				4.2 Residential Architectural Guidelines		
		23	23	It's unknown what form of buildings are planned for the medium density blocks. A section should be included that specifically addresses these blocks and, in particular how the interface to NHS / OS and transition to low-rise forms will be dealt with.	Q4/DSEL	Based on the revisions to the draft plan limits of the mixed use blocks have been adjusted. Concept plans for these blocks have not been designed.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
	Urban Design Brief	24	24	Add a bullet before #5, stating that units with projecting garages should be discouraged or minimized to prioritize streetscapes that are framed by active spaces.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				4.2.1 Elevation Variety		
		25	25	Single-detached dwellings, bullet #3, add "….are integrated, as long as appropriate height transition is provided."	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		26	26	The UDG recommend '3 distinct elevations' per model.	Q4	Noted
		27	27	Last bullet for single detached dwellings; recommend same colour packages for units/townhouse blocks at gateway conditions or other priority locations that frame entrances to the community or community spaces.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly Q4 - Open to discussing with design of exterior colours
		28	28	Design guidelines, bullet #2, add "….unless at gateway conditions or other priority locations that frame entrances to the community or community spaces".	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		29	29	Design guidelines, bullet #4, "..porches or entry feature as the dominant element of…."	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		30	30	Design guidelines, add bullets:		
		30a	30a	Locate and prioritize active spaces along the public realm (streets or open spaces).	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		30b	30b	The length of townhouse blocks should be limited to 8 units.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		30c	30c	The design of townhouse block elevations should delineate the individual units through wall and roof articulation.	Q4/NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly Q4A - Has designed conceptual 6.5m wide Townhouse block elevation, sample unit floor plans and section from street to street for freehold towns with WOB backing onto back to front freehold towns with up to 7R to front porch
				4.2.3 Exterior Colour Selection		
		31	31	Design guidelines bullet #3, add "….unless at gateway conditions or other priority locations that frame entrances to the community or community spaces".	NAK/Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				4.2.4 Driveways		
		32	32	Design guidelines, bullet #1, add "for a minimum 5.5m setback…."	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		33	33	Complement #2 by adding that driveways should be maximum 6m at the property line/curb; and that driveway width should not exceed the width of the garage door.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated to state driveways will not exceed exterior width of garage. Q4 - Driveway not to exceed width of front wall of garage. Driveway will in fact be wider than 8' garage door and wider than 16' garage door. But will not exceed the smaller of overall garage width or 6m.
		34	34	Bullet #3, add "where paired driveways are not possible…."	Q4	NAK - updated UDB to state: "To create opportunities for on-street parking on one side of the street, a 5.5m separation between driveways shall be encouraged where paired driveways are not possible."
				4.2.5 Variable Grading Condition		
		35	35	Design guidelines, bullet #2, UDG request no more than 250mm of concrete foundations on exposed elevations and 300mm for interior ones.	Q4	NAK - updated to state: "Grading shall be coordinated with dwelling foundation design and constructed so that generally no more than 250 mm of the foundation wall above finished grade is exposed on street facing elevations."
		36	36	Design guidelines, bullet #5, revise to state that architectural detailing to mitigate dropped-garage conditions should be provided when the wall above the garage door is greater than 400-600mm.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated to state: "Architectural detailing shall be employed to mitigate dropped-garage conditions to reduce the visual impact of a taller attached garage wall, including:..."
		37	37	It is not clear what the term 'garage under product' refers to; does this only apply to walk-up models?. Please clarify and, if possible, include examples of it (images or drawings).	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				4.3 Priority Lotting		
		38	38	Missing 'T' lots at the end of Street 'G'.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		39	39	Ensure elbow lots ('E') include all units that part of the 'bending' of the road. If possible, mark them individually to avoid confusions.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		40	40	All lots adjacent/abutting to the open spaces (vista blocks) along Street 'E' and 'G' will required upgrades. Identify them as 'Lots adjacent to park/open space' with the pink line symbol.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		41	41	All lots along the south that backing onto the NHS should have upgraded rear elevations (pink line).	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				4.3.1 Gateway Lots		
		42	42	Design guidelines, bullet #2, add "….prominent gables, articulated walls and roofs and projecting bays shall be featured."	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		43	43	Add a guideline requesting that garages be located as far away from the intersections/corner.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				4.3.2 Corner Lots		
		44	44	Add 'wall's articulation' to the list of elements listed on the design guidelines, bullet #3.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		45	45	Design guideline, bullet #4. Ensure any upgrade on the flankage elevation, including architectural details and materials, are wrap around to the rear elevation.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		46	46	Encourage main entrances be located on the flankage elevation.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		47	47	Request active uses to be located along the flankage elevation, and garages away from it.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				4.3.5 Lots Requiring Rear/Side Upgrades		
		48	48	Clarify which lots are these ones on the Priority Lot Plan.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		49	49	First bullet, add 'wall and roof articulation' after "….in terms of…".	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		50	50	Last bullet, revise to say 'wall and roof articulation'.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		51	51	Encourage full porches on side elevations and second level balconies on side/rear elevations.	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				4.3.6 Dwellings Adjacent to Parks and Ponds		

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
		52	52	Clarify which lots are these ones on the Priority Lot Plan. Do these include dwellings facing parks, ponds and open space?	NAK/Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		53	53	Design guidelines, bullet #1, revise "……articulated wall/roof treatment and….."	NAK/Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		54	54	For dwellings facing parks, ponds and open space, encourage:		
		54a	54a	Full porches on the elevation facing such space	Q4	Q4A - Some designs may have full porches in front of the habitable portion of the ground floor. There will not be a porch in front of the garage. NAK - added "For dwellings facing parks, ponds, and open space, full porches in front of the habitable portion of the ground floor on the elevation facing such space shall be encouraged."
		54b	54b	Second level balconies	Q4	Q4A - Few elevations are typically designed with second floor balcony. The question should be asked to Marketing whether each model should be designed with one elevation having a second floor balcony or whether only elevations with second floor balconies can be sold on certain priority lots. Korsiak - Second level balconies are currently being considered. Elevations are currently in the design stage.
				5.2 Sustainability and Low-Impact Approaches		
		55	55	Lighting. Consider LED and solar powered light poles.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		56	56	Materials. Encourage the use of recycled materials.	NAK	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
				6.2 Architectural Design Review Process		
		57	57	Exterior colour/material packages to be submitted prior to final site plans (sitings).	Q4	NAK - UDB updated accordingly
		58	58	Materials. Encourage the use of recycled materials.	Q4	NAK - incorporated into Section 5.2
	General Comments	59	59	Provide transitions in materials at logical points (e.g., changes in planes, aligned to architectural elements and openings, etc.).	Q4	NAK - incorporated into Section 4.2
		60	60	Reconsider roof forms / lines with respect to 'Modern' models, specially for narrow lots. See comments master sheet (SEPARATE DOCUMENT)	Q4	Noted
		61	61	Simplify material palettes to better relate to the model designs (i.e. 'Modern' models use smooth brick or clean square cut stone vs. 'Manor' models use more random, rougher cut stone...).	Q4	Noted
		1	1	The description and mapping of ELC vegetation communities generally seems to accurately portray existing conditions on the subject properties and adjacent lands. However, in Table 10 two different descriptions are provided for the dry-moist old field meadow communities but the same code (CUM 1-1) is used to identify their locations on the map given in Figure 6. This data inconsistency should be clarified. Furthermore, one or more of these communities contains 5 locally rare plants and all of these cultural meadows will be eradicated in order to accommodate the proposed development, except for portions of them which occur in wetland/woodland buffers. Although these locally rare plants are considered common to uncommon in Ontario an attempt should be made to protect and retain them on the landscape where feasible. If specimens of these rare plants do not occur in protected buffer areas, I recommend that specimens should be transplanted into these protected open areas. Also in Table 10 a description of a naturalized deciduous hedgerow (FODMII) is provided but its location is not shown on Figure 6. This omission should be corrected.	Burnside	The EIS report Table 10 and Figure 8 (rare flora was moved to this figure) has been updated to clarify the inconsistency. There are 3 locations where Strict Blue-eyed Grass will be impacted by the development and/or preliminary grading: 1 location for Necklace Sedge, and 1 location for Hanging Bulrush. Populations of each of these species are also contained within the NHS that will not be impacted. Strict Blue-eyed Grass is found in SWTM2-1, CUM1-1(a) and CUM1-1(b); Necklace Sedge is found in CUM1-1(a) and SWDM4-1; and Hanging Bulrush is found in SWDM4-1 and CUM1-1(a). Transplanting these 5 specimens is not necessary given the presence of these species in the protected NHS that will ensure populations will persist on the subject lands. Clammy Ground-cherry may be impacted by the 15 m sanitary sewer easement where crossing the NHS is required on Mr. Langen's property on adjacent lands. Clammy Ground-cherry is found in CUM1-1(a); during detailed design, the final location of the NHS crossing will be assessed to confirm if impacts will occur to this species and whether transplanting is necessary.
		2	2	The botanical inventory of vascular plants found on the subject lands appears quite comprehensive and reflects what I would expect for a site 156 acres in size with a diverse assemblage of vegetation communities. The plant list indicates a relatively high level of disturbance (i.e. only 63% native species) due to past agricultural activities. All provincially and locally significant plants will be protected from development disturbance, except for a retainable butternut tree which will be removed, subject to compensation for its loss, and possibly some locally rare plants established in cultural meadows as discussed above.	Burnside	See comment above re: locally significant plants. There are 3 Butternut that will be removed (2 Cat 1, 1 Cat 2), please refer to the EIS report, Section 6.6.2 and Figure 8.
		3	3	The breeding bird surveys confirmed the presence of 7 area-sensitive species and 4 Species at Risk (SAR). The breeding habitat of the area-sensitive birds will be protected for all species except the Savannah Sparrow which was only observed in marginally suitable habitat. With respect to the SAR birds, woodland habitat required by the Wood Thrush and Eastern Wood-pewee will be protected, while breeding evidence for the Eastern Meadowlark is inconclusive and the available habitat is marginal at best. The man-made structural habitat utilized by Barn Swallows for nesting purposes will be destroyed and appropriate compensation will be required as per the ESA regulations. I have no concerns with the avian data collected by Burnside's or their assessment of available nesting habitats.	Burnside	Refer to EIS Section 4.2.2. Barn Swallow was reclassified as Special Concern on January 25, 2023 on the Species at Risk in Ontario List (Ontario Regulation 230/08). The change in classification means that the prohibitions in subsections 9 (1) and 10 (1) of the ESA that apply in respect of Endangered and Threatened species and their habitats no longer apply to Barn Swallow. As a result, the conditional exemptions for Barn Swallow set out in Part III of Ontario Regulation 830/21 no longer apply to this project. However, habitat for Barn Swallow is now considered SWH as discussed in Section 6.5 and Section 10.0. Barn Swallow structure S7 will be removed (1 nest). However, S3 (3 nests) and S4 (10 nests) that were confirmed Barn Swallow nesting habitat will remain on the "lands to be retained."
		4	4	The amphibian calling surveys and turtle surveys were properly carried out and they indicated the presence of Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) for amphibian breeding at pond 2 (SAS 1-1) while turtle wintering habitat is provided at pond 1 (AQ) and pond 2. These wetland areas that provide SWH will be protected with adequate buffer zones.	Burnside	No comment required.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Ecology/Forestry Peer Reviewer, Greg Scheifele	EIS Comments	5	5	The subject lands provide SWH for the monarch butterfly which is proposed for removal so appropriate compensation is required for the loss of critical habitat.	Burnside	Acknowledged. See EIS report Table 25 SWH - Monarch: "Milkweed should be included in all seed mixes, where applicable", to enhance Monarch breeding habitat on the subject lands. Most of the land in the buffers are currently agricultural fields or degraded communities; these have not been included within the lot framework and will be established as non-mowing areas with native self-sustaining vegetation that will provide a net benefit to these features (and indirectly to Monarch).
		6	6	SAR bats were recorded on the subject lands and bat maternity roosting habitat will be removed as a result of the proposed development. A mitigation/compensation plan will therefore be required to the satisfaction of MECP.	Burnside	Acknowledged - Overall Benefit Permit is currently in process with MECP. A copy of the Overall Benefit Permit will be provided once it has been received from MECP.
		7	7	Wetland 3, which includes pond 2, is apparently not considered part of the PSW even though it provides SWH for turtles and amphibians. It is only to be protected by a 10m buffer and is to be connected to the woodland/wetland complex to the south by a tunnel that runs underneath a required road. It appears the sumac deciduous shrub thicket (THD 2-1) that lies adjacent to the wetland and the adjacent hedgerow (TAGM5) that contains several good quality deciduous trees will be largely removed in order to accommodate road and house construction. In my opinion, more effort should be made to retain these existing natural connections to the natural heritage system to the south in addition to the use of a wildlife tunnel under the road. I appreciate the problems created by the steeply sloping terrain found in this area. It is, nonetheless, important to ensure a strong long-term ecological linkage to the south in order maintain viable wildlife populations in wetland 3. This may mean the loss of some house lots.	Burnside	The PSW complex decision rationale has been approved by MNRF. This wetland is <ha 2 and is not hydrologically connected to the other wetlands, it is a dug pond. Acknowledged; recently, Mattamy finalized (by end of October) the purchase of 0.2ha from the lot directly behind this pond near the other dug pond; there may be an opportunity to explore additional measures related to the wildlife tunnel/connection to ensure a strong long-term linkage in this location.
		8	8	On page 83 Burnside claims that a proposed stormwater management pond and a park located between the north and central woodland/wetland areas will serve as a linkage enhancement as shown in Figure 10. I agree that this area has the potential to be an ecological benefit but more details are required on possible naturalization work that could be done in this area.	Burnside	More details have been provided for this linkage enhancement in the EIS report Section 8.0. Landscape plans will be provided during the detailed design stage that will enhance these features through native plantings and seed mixes and will outline the species, size, quantity, and arrangement.
		9	9	On page 89 there is a discussion of grading requirements that are proposed to encroach up to 15m into the 30m buffer of the PSW at the north end of the site and also encroach into the 10m buffer around the significant woodland at the south end of the site. The sloping topography has resulted in a need for 3:1 and 2:1 slopes being created in these buffer intrusion areas. No justification is provided to support these buffer intrusions other than the desire to maximize development yield. Development alternatives and their consequences should be discussed in the EIS so the merits of the proposed setback intrusions can be better understood and evaluated. In any event, the roots of woodland edge trees must be adequately protected but it will be up to CVC staff to decide if these intrusions are acceptable.	Burnside	Per the EIS report, Section 9.2 Grading is limited within the natural heritage features and has been minimized to only what is required to facilitate the proposed development; however, there are specific locations where encroachments are proposed to meet the challenging existing grades. While grading is permanent, the impacts are temporary and will be an improvement from existing conditions where the land has been historically disturbed due to intensive farming practices and is significantly degraded. Therefore, no long-term net effects are anticipated; the restoration of the buffers in these locations represents a net benefit and will be enhanced with a native seed mix and conveyed into public use. As per comment 12, temporary tree protection fencing during construction will be installed 1m from the dripline, where possible. This will aid in the protection of tree roots.
		10	10	A 15m wide sanitary servicing easement is proposed to traverse a meadow marsh community (MAMM 1-3 and MAMM 2-2) in the northern portion of the site. The sanitary sewer alignment will generally follow an existing laneway through the wetland. Sewer installation is to be completed using open cut construction instead of directional tunneling. Based on my site inspection this wetland area represents an early successional community that can be easily restored to its original condition following disturbance. No significant plants or wildlife were reported inhabiting this area. I therefore have no concerns with this proposed temporary wetland intrusion. However, a detailed rehabilitation plan must be prepared for this area and it must be effectively implemented.	Burnside	Acknowledged. More details re: rehabilitation plans will be provided during the detailed design stage as stated in the EIS report Section 9.3 and Table 25 - Vegetation Communities.
		11	11	Stormwater treatment will be provided by two end of pipe constructed wetland facilities identified as SWM Pond 1 and SWM Pond 2. Thermal mitigation measures will be provided at both pond locations (e.g., discharge via a buried outlet pipe and vegetation shading of surface water) in order to ensure that cool water is discharged to the West Credit River. I support the proposed stormwater management plan but recommend that the discharge leaving the outlet pipe should be cooled to 20° C or lower so there are no thermal impacts to the river. A detailed landscape plan will be required for each stormwater management facility. Consideration should also be given to retaining some healthy, good quality native trees in stormwater management blocks, particularly around the perimeter of these areas. The EIS indicates that all of WOCM 1-3, a white pine woodland, will be removed but no details are provided on the size, shape or depth of the pond. The Arborist Report also indicates extensive tree removals in these areas without giving any justification for their removal.	Burnside	Per Section 9.4 of the EIS report, the Upper Reaches of the Credit River are managed as cold water Brook trout habitat. Therefore, thermal mitigation measures will be applied where feasible to limit potential thermal impacts of the West Credit River, which has a cold water thermal regime (Credit River Fisheries Management Plan, CVC, 2002). The application of specific thermal mitigation measures will be further investigated at the detailed design stage and are summarized in Section 8.9 of the FSR (2023). These measures may include ponds discharging through a buried outlet pipe, vegetative shading of surface water with landscape material, increasing riparian vegetation via detailed landscape plans of the SWM blocks, and ensuring ponds outlet via a reverse graded pipe provided in a deep pool below the pond bottom. Tree removals are required to accomodate the proposed SWM development footprint and associated grading. Detailed landscape plans for the SWM blocks will be provided during the detailed design stage.
		12	12	In Table 25 on page 99 it states that construction fencing should be installed prior to the commencement of construction activities and it should be installed at the dripline of any trees to be retained., This approach is reasonable for treed areas where there is no need to remove unhealthy or conflicting trees but makes little sense in areas where there is a mix of retainable and non-retainable trees. In these situations the required tree removals should be done first and then the tree protection fence installed. No details are provided in the EIS or the Arborist Report on the type of fencing to be installed. I recommend that paige wire farm fence should be employed with silt screen attached to this fence. Furthermore, I recommend that it should be erected at least 1m beyond the dripline of retained trees wherever possible to better protect tree roots and low limbs from construction damage.	Burnside/Jackson Arborculture	Acknowledged. The EIS report has been updated to include this recommendation. Please see Table 25 - Vegetation Communities.
		13	13	In Table 25 on page 100 long-term monitoring of vegetation communities is recommended to identify possible changes in plant species arising from development activities. I support this recommendation in principle but require more details on how, where and when monitoring will be implemented.	Burnside	As stated in the EIS report Table 25 - Wetlands and Provincially Significant Wetlands, a long-term monitoring plan will be provided with future submissions once detailed designs are finalized.
		14	14	On page 83 and 118 the EIS states that the proposed SWM pond and park which are to be located between the northern PSW Complex and the central woodland/PSW will represent a significant enhancement to current conditions and ensure that a vegetated linkage is maintained between these features. Conceptually this sounds very desirable but once again no details are provided on how and where this area will be naturalized. Detailed landscaping plans are therefore needed to support this proposal and I suggest that several buffer zones would also benefit from ecological enhancement plantings. Details should be provided on the species, size, quantity and arrangement of plant materials to be utilized in these areas and this requirement should be a condition of Draft Plan approval.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Please see the EIS report Table 25 - Significant Wildlife Habitat. Detailed landscape plans will be provided during the detailed design stage. Some areas of the buffer zones may be considered for ecological enhancement plantings, where feasible.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
		15	15	Common buckthorn is frequently found in most vegetation communities. This exotic shrub is one of the most aggressive invasive species in southern Ontario. If left unchecked it will spread into the proposed ecological enhancement plantings and compete with desirable native vegetation. To reduce its spread and hopefully minimize its impact I recommend that sapling sized shrubs (i.e., 1 to 9cm dbh) capable of producing fruit that are found along woodland/wetland edges should be cut and/or sprayed with an appropriate contact kill herbicide prior to the installation of buffer plantings.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Verbiage has been added to the EIS report Table 25 - Vegetation Communities that supports this recommendation, where feasible. It should be noted that in most cases, the NHS buffers are to be established as a non-mowing area, with native self-sustaining vegetation. Grading encroachments into NHS buffers are to be enhanced with a native seed mix and conveyed into public use.
	Arborist Report Comments	16	1	A total of 241 individual trees and 32 tree polygons or clusters were inventoried and 199 trees and 24 tree clusters were recommended for removal. Given the topography on this site and the type of residential development that is proposed, I am not surprised that all trees located to the interior of the property are proposed for removal.	Jackson Arboriculture	Given the grading plans some additional trees adjacent to SWM Pond 2 have been identified for preservation. A total of 185 trees and 24 tree polygons are now identified for removal.
		17	2	Polygon P67 indicates that 1 butternut in poor health is to be removed but Figure 7 of the EIS shows 2 non-retainable butternut in the hedgerow. Polygon 66 indicates there are no butternut present in the polygon but the EIS says there is 1 retainable butternut in this hedgerow. These discrepancies need to be clarified.	Jackson Arboriculture	RJB: The locations and details of the 3 Butternut in our report were submitted to Jackson Arboriculture on November 2, 2022. Jackson: This has been revised in the body and Appendix A of the TIPP report
		18	3	On Sheet #3 tree #215 and 216 are identified as green ash trees that are infested with Emerald Ash Borer (EAB). They will die shortly but are not recommended for removal. Although they occur off-site they are located very close to the property line and will therefore become a future hazard to new homeowners. I recommend these trees should be removed subject to the approval of the adjacent landowner. I can see no reason why he would object to the free removal of his dead trees.	Jackson Arboriculture	Both trees have been identified for removal. Mattamy acquired the parcel where Tree 215 resides and permission from the neighbour to remove Tree 216 has been provided.
		19	4	With respect to the tree management recommendations in the report, no explanation or justification is provided for the removal of trees in fair to good condition. I suspect the reason is grading requirements or conflicts with roads or other essential infrastructure but if so I suggest it would be helpful to clearly state the reason for proposed removals.	Jackson Arboriculture	A scentence has been added to the Tree Removal section of the report to indicate that grading is the cause of the tree removal. In addition, the grading plan has been added to Sheet 1 which also provides justification for the tree removals.
Valcoustics (Peer Reviewer) - Kathryn Katsiroumpas	Noise Feasibility Study	1		Comments		
			1	Overall, the study is thorough and well prepared. We are in agreement with the overall conclusions and have the following minor comments on the assessment:	Acoustic	Noted.
			1a	The Town of Erin has indicated that rear lotted homes are not desirable along 8th Line. Thus, revisions to the site plan configuration in the vicinity of Block 11 on Street 'G' should be considered. The noise impact and resulting mitigation due to any revisions to the site plan can be addressed in the detailed noise study.	Acoustic	Noted, the accoustic assesment report will be updated at detailed design.
			1b	Section 4.1 of the feasibility study indicates that commercial vehicle percentages of 5% for medium trucks and 8% for heavy trucks were used in the analysis as a conservative estimate based on standard MTO splits. This seems overly conservative for 8th Line given the current conditions and truck restrictions for the roadway (see Figure 1). As indicated in the feasibility study, the analysis should be updated once commercial vehicle percentages are known, which can be done when a detailed noise study is prepared.	Acoustic	Noted. Traffic study will be updated at detailed design.
			1c	The feasibility study indicates that a detailed noise study should be prepared when grading information is available. When reviewing the street view on Google Earth (see Figure 1), it appears that 8th Line is not flat in the vicinity of the project. Thus, any updates to the analysis as part of the detailed noise study, should be sure to include an appropriate road gradient for 8th Line, in addition to the site topography.	Acoustic	Noted. Yes, a grading review should include the grades in the rear yards and for the roadway.
		2		Conclusions		
			1	Review of the noise feasibility study confirms that the proposed development is considered feasible with respect to noise and that the proposed development can be compliant with the requirements of MECP Publication NPC-300. However, as indicated in the study, a detailed noise study should be prepared when grading information, refined traffic data and updated site plan(s) are available. The minor comments provided above can also be addressed at that point of the approvals process.	Acoustic	Noted. Agreed.
	Draft Plans - 5520 & 5552 Eighth Line & Legal Survey	1	1	The minimum width of a right-of-way is 20 m for local streets and 23 m for minor collector streets as per the Engineering Standards. Eighteen metre (18 m) right-of-way widths and Standard Drawing, ERIN SD. 101, are not in the adopted Town of Erin Engineering Standards	DSEL	DSEL - Sidewalks are proposed per Town of Erin standard 18m, 20m and 23m ROW drawings. The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. As discussed with Town staff on April 27, 2023, it was generally accepted 18m ROWs could be implemented for the local roads throughout the proposed Draft Plan. Additionally, DSEL noted a 23m ROW could be provided for the spine road, with exception to the stretch adjacent to SWM Pond 1. Please refer to J. Krubnik & T. Bal Comment 1 response for discussion the Spine Road adjacent to SWM Pond 1.
		2	2	The minimum width of a right-of-way is 20 m for local streets and 23 m for minor collector streets as per the Engineering Standards. Eighteen metre (18 m) right-of-way widths and Standard Drawing, ERIN SD. 101, are not in the adopted Town of Erin Engineering Standards	DSEL	
			2.1	Street 'E' from the Eighth Line to Street 'A'	DSEL	
			2.2	Street 'A' from Street 'E' to Street 'C'	DSEL	
			2.3	Street 'C' from Street 'A' to Sidreoad 17'	DSEL	
		3	3	The draft plan should include dimensions for radii internal intersection rights-of-way (e.g., right-of-way radii at the internal intersection of Street 'A' and Street 'B') to ensure the radii conform to the Engineering Standards.	Korsiak/RVA	Proposed radii have been revised accordingly.
		4	4	The centreline radii on collector streets (i.e., Street 'A' and Street 'E' from Eighth Line to Street 'A') should be a minimum of 190 m.	Korsiak/RVA	DSEL - WE WOULD ARGUE THIS IS NOT A COLLECTOR ROAD BUT RATHER LOCAL. PER TOWN STD TABLE 23 (PG 125 OF PDF). THEREFORE MINIMUM CURVATURE IS 60m.
		5	5	Street 'E' at Block 1 on the Draft Plan for 5520 Eighth Line should intersect Street 'A' at a right angle.	Korsiak/RVA	DSEL - INTERSECITON ADJUSTED WITHIN 80-100 DEGREES AND IS CONSIDERED A RIGHT ANGLE ACCORDING TO RVA
		6	6	Street 'F' should intersect Street 'A' at a right angle.	Korsiak/RVA	DSEL - INTERSECITON ADJUSTED WITHIN 80-100 DEGREES AND IS CONSIDERED A RIGHT ANGLE ACCORDING TO RVA
		7	7	Street 'A' at Blocks 4 and 6 on the Draft Plan for 5520 Eighth Line should intersect Street 'E' at a right angle.	Korsiak/RVA	DSEL - INTERSECITON ADJUSTED WITHIN 80-100 DEGREES AND IS CONSIDERED A RIGHT ANGLE ACCORDING TO RVA
		8	8	The alignment of Street 'E' fronting Block 9 on the Draft Plan for 5552 Eighth Line should have a smoother alignment around Block 9 and eliminate the reversing curved alignment.	Korsiak	The alignment has been revised accordingly.
		9	9	The radii for the cul-de-sac bulbs on Streets 'D', 'G', and 'H' should be 20.75 m minimum as per Erin Engineering Standard Drawing 109 in the Engineering Standards. The right-of-way radii leading into the bulbs should also be dimensioned and conform to the Engineering Standards.	Korsiak	DSEL - cul-de-sacs updated

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
		10	10	The right-angle elbow on Street 'C' fronting Blocks 1 and 23 on the Draft Plan for 5552 Eighth Line should have dimensions that conform to Erin Engineering Standard Drawing 111B, Minor Collector Road 'Elbow' Design, including a 4.5 m x 4.5 m sight triangle with a 0.3 m reserve on the inside of the elbow bend.	Korsiak	DSEL - Elbow does not appear to have been added see town std 111B (PDF page 212 of Town standards). This will be treated as an intersection with stop controls rather than a continous street and therefore the elbow is not required.
		11	11	Sanitary Servicing Block 23 and the 15 m Sanitary Servicing Easement should be realigned to avoid placing infrastructure in the Natural Heritage System.	DSEL	Further to comment 10 above, staff have confirmed they have no concerns with the current alignment and location of the 15m servicing easement through the NHS. Therefore servicing easement remains consistent with previous plan.
		12	12	All internal lot lines should be dimensioned (i.e., lengths and radii).	Korsiak	All Blocks on the updated draft plans have been dimensioned.
		13	13	A significant retaining wall (2 to 3m high) and an areas with a 2 to 3m 3:1 slope is proposed along Block 35 and Street C, that will be a liability for the Town and should be avoided.	DSEL	Retaining walls in the north portion of the plan within Block 35 and SWM Pond 1 are required in order to tie in to existing road elevations on 17 Sideroad and provide adequate storage within the Pond block. Following discussions with Town of Erin staff it has been understood this approach is generally accepted. A plan highlighting public or private ownership of retaining walls has been provided as Attachment 2.
	Test Pit Investigations & Geotechnical Borehole Information & Hydrogeological Assessment	14	14	The Geotechnical Investigation should be extended to include the proposed development on 5552 Eighth Line and expanded to include recommendations for detail design purposes such as pavement structure, building footings, dewatering concerns, and environmental analyses of the soil and groundwater. This can be addressed during the detail design stage of the project.	Geotech	Noted.
	Phase 1 ESA	15	15	The Phase One Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) identified two Potentially Contaminating Activities (PCA's) on the property. As per Pinchin recommendation, a Phase Two ESA should be conducted prior to filing a Record of Site Condition for the property.	Pinchin/Mattamy/Coscorp	Noted.
				Water Supply Servicing		
		16	16	Pending the finalization of the Town's Water Model, which is anticipated in the next couple of months, further details will be provided regarding the need for:	DSEL / MES	
			16.1	External watermain upgrades on the Eighth Line, Sideroad 17 and/or Dundas Street West to accommodate the proposed development.	DSEL / MES	Noted, Town to advise on external watermains required. All external watermains are Development Charge eligible. Proposed watermain servicing is provided on FSR Figure 3.
			16.2	The development of a new Municipal well and/or an additional Fire Storage Reservoir in Erin to accommodate the proposed development.	DSEL / MES	Requirement for additional municipal well and fire storage reservoir are dependant on the conclusions of the Town's comprehensive water model network. It is our understanding any external watermains are Development Charge eligible. Proposed watermain servicing is provided on FSR Figure 3.
			16.3	Any trunk watermains within the internal road network of the proposed subdivisions.	DSEL / MES	Proposed watermain servicing is provided on FSR Figure 3.
			16.4	To provide a looped watermain distribution system we recommend that a service corridor and watermain be provided from:	DSEL / MES	
			16.4.1	the cul-de-sac bulb of Street D to either the bend of Street C or to the intersection of Streets E and F.	DSEL / MES	A servicing easement has been added from Street D to Street C to achieve water service looping objectives. Please refer to watermain servicing plan on FSR Figure 3.
			16.4.2	the cul-de-sac bulb of Street H to the Eight Line.	DSEL / MES	The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. An easement to provide water looping cannot be provided between lots due to the proposed retaining wall along Eighth Line. Additionally, Street H cul-de-sac has less than 20 units, and is ~100m in length, which is less than 300m per Town standards 9.3.4 for single detached product. A 50mm copper loop will be provided within the cul-de-sac to mitigate the potential for stagnant water.
			16.4.3	the cul-de-sac bulb of Street G to the Eight Line.	DSEL / MES	DSEL - The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. An easement to provide water looping cannot be provided between lots as there is no existing watermain along the units Eighth Line frontage. Additionally, Street G cul-de-sac has less than 40 units, and is ~250m in length, which is less than 300m per Town standards 9.3.4 for single detached product. A 50mm copper loop will be provided within the cul-de-sac to mitigate the potential for stagnant water.
			16.5	It would be beneficial if Figure 3 or a new figure showed the general position of the watermain projects listed in Table 3-4.	DSEL / MES	Details regarding Development Charge water projects identified in FSR Table 3-4 have been provided in FSR Appendix M.
				Wastewater Servicing		
		17	17	The Town has considered the sanitary servicing options presented in the reports submitted, for both Mattamy Homes and Empire Communities, and are not in favour of the gravity sewer and siphon option. Therefore, the Town requires the design and construction of a Sewage Pumping Station (that will service both developments) with the forcemain discharging to the new trunk sewer on the Elora Cataract Trailway at the intersection with Sideroad 17. Please provide further details to confirm that Block 22 is adequately sized to accommodate the proposed Sewage Pumping Station.	DSEL	Further design coordination between the development community and Town of Erin staff has occurred in support of a gravity sanitary option. It is in the best interest of both the development community and Town staff to eliminate the need for a sanitary pump station. Therefore, details regarding the proposed sanitary servicing approach is presented in FSR Section 4.
		18	18	In Table 4-1 Wastewater Design Criteria the value for inflow and infiltration should be provided as 0.29 l/s/ha rather than units of l/capita/day.	DSEL	Noted, FSR Table 4-1 has been revised to match Town of Erin standards.
		19	19	The data in the Sanitary Sewer Design sheets has a few discrepancies compared to the data on the Conceptual Sanitary Servicing Plan. The discrepancies can be resolved in preparing the detail design documents.	DSEL	Noted, sanitary design sheets and supporting tributary plans have been updated to ensure consistency.
		20	20	The populations and infiltration catchment areas for Medium Density Blocks on Street A and Street C should be included in the design sheets.	DSEL	Medium density block estimated population density has been added to design sheets.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
		21	21	The design sheet should account for the infiltration flow collected by the sanitary main in the Sanitary Easement and the Park Block. The discrepancy can be resolved during the detail design phase.	DSEL	Noted. Sanitary easement area has been added to the design sheet.
				Storm Drainage		
		22	22	Storm Sewer Design Sheets		
			22.1	A column should be added that provides “Actual Flow Velocity”	DSEL	Noted, actual velocity column has been added to the design sheet
			22.2	It appears that maximum flow velocity of 4.5 m/sec is exceeded between MH 116 and 118, between MH 205 and 206 and, between MH 206 and 207.	DSEL	Sewers has been revised such that velocity criteria is met.
			22.3	It appears that the maximum spacing between catch basins for the road grade provided is exceeded between MH 230 and 231, between MH 102 and 105, between MH 116 and 118.	DSEL	Noted. Catch basin and manhole spacing will be provided at detailed design in conformance with Town standards.
			22.4	On sheet 2 the catchment area for MH 114 to 115 should be 0.53 ha not 0.78 ha.	DSEL	Design sheet has been updated.
			22.5	On Sheet 9 the proponent should provide calculations to support the assumption of C=0.52 for the clean water storm sewer pipe MH 1000 to 1007 and to support the assumption of C=0.6 for MH 2001 to 2006	DSEL	Supporting RC calculations will be provided at detailed design.
			22.6	On Sheet 9 the accumulated area for MH 2006 to HW2102 is 0.58 ha not 0.46 ha.	DSEL	Design sheet has been updated.
			22.7	On Sheet 10 of 10 under Easement Sizing it appears they intend to show the 1 in 100-year flows from the various double catch basins and have adjusted the run-off coefficient upwards by 1.25 but they apply the rainfall intensity of the 1 in 5-year storm. They should apply the intensity of the 1 in 100-year storm.	DSEL	Proposed local storm sewers have been sized to convey the 5-year event per Town of Erin standards. Cleanwater sewers have been designed to convey the 100-year storm event to ensure drainage is contained within the intended system. The design sheet has been revised to reflect respective storm event.
			22.8	On Sheet 10, assuming 50% blockage the inlet capacity of the DICB may be exceeded for DICB 2103 and DICB 10.	DSEL	Noted. Grate inlet capacity will be verified at detailed design to ensure flow can enter the minor system as intended.
				Stormwater Management		
		23	23	An infiltration gallery is proposed within the park block which, based on Table 19 of the Town Standards must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Town. While Section 8.10.1 of the Standards indicates that the Town supports the integration of SWM facilities with passive recreational opportunities, it is on the condition that the intended function of either is not impaired. Further details are to be provided to confirm that the infiltration gallery will not impact the use of the Park Block.	DSEL	The function of the park would not be impacted by the infiltration facility. The infiltration facility is a subsurface feature with only maintenance holes visible from the surface. The infiltration facility is required to in an effort to meet 5mm on site retention target.
		24	24	The Town is not in favour of third-pipe clean water collectors and encourages the use of other ways of infiltrating the clean water closer to the source, such as infiltration galleries on private lots to achieve water balance objectives. If other alternatives cannot be found, the Town will be looking to the Developer to contribute funds to the future life cycle costs of the clean water collector, including the operation, maintenance, and repair costs.	DSEL/ Mattamy /Coscorp	Cleanwater pipes are proposed to meet water balance requirements for the nine (9) wetlands located with the development. To mitigate against reduce runoff volumes to wetlands as compared to pre-development conditions, DSEL's first approach was to allow areas adjacent to the wetlands to drain directly overland. It was determined that drainage in addition to the rear yards would be required to meet wetland water balance targets and as such a cleanwater pipe is required. Additionally, a clean water pipe is required to convey storm runoff from the central medium density block to the infiltration facility located with the park to infiltrate the 5mm event. As cleanwater pipes are required to meet feature and site wide water balance, maintenance of infrastructure is the responsibility of the municipality. Please note this is common practice across the Province.
		25	25	In accordance with Section 8.10.9 of the Engineering Design Standards sediment drying areas must be incorporated into the design of the facilities and the Pond Blocks modified as necessary.	DSEL	Town has aggreged sediment drying area is not required for SWM Pond 1. Opportunities will be investigated to incorporate sediment drying areas for SWM Pond 2 at detailed design.
		26	26	Retaining walls are located along the Stormwater Pond Blocks and will be the responsibility of the Town to maintain. However, within the Engineering Standards retaining walls greater than 1.0m in height are not permitted within SWM facilities. The Standards further state that retaining walls greater that 1.0m may be accepted at the discretion the Town, but they will not be accepted if their sole purpose is to minimize the area required for the SWM facility. It appears the sole purpose of these retaining walls is to make use of areas with steep topography for the SWM facility.	DSEL	The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. Retaining walls are located outside the functional area of the pond and are within the grading transition zone. They are required in the vicinity of the SWM block to match existing boundary conditions. Without the use of retaining walls, the pond block would significantly increase in size as illustrated on Figure 1. It is not possible to provide vertical sloping within the pond block in accordance with Town standards. Therefore, retaining walls have been implemented to achieve required pond storage volumes given the heavily constrained road layout and boundary conditions.
	FSR & SWM Report	27	27	Section 5.6 of the FSR indicates that cut-off swales at the base of the southern slope are shown on Drawing 6. However, the centreline appears to be covered by the drainage boundary and the line type is not included in the Legend for this element. Confirmation should be provided by the geotechnical consultant to ensure suitable setbacks and protection measures are maintained or provide recommendations to improve the stability of the southern slope. In addition, an easement and a maintenance access point should be provided for this swale with the limits clearly shown on the drawing.	DSEL / Shad	The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. The Draft Plan will be amended to provide standard 28m lot depths. The swale and proposed sloping are to be within an open space block and ultimately to the Town's ownership. Easements are provided for RLCBs and access to the open space block will be provided from Street E. Additionally, a slope stability assessment has been completed by Shad and Associates to asses proposed grading conditions, please refer to FSR Appendix J. The restoration planting of the slope will be selected to ensure vegetation can withstand erosive forces at detailed design.
		28	28	Section 5.7, Easements, indicates a number of easements are required. The easements should be shown to assist in reviewing the proposed concept. In addition, the width of the easement should conform to the Engineering Design Standards.	DSEL	Servicing easements have been identified on the Draft Plan and have been identified on the Grading Plan. Easements required for local RLCB leads have not been shown as lotting and subsequently RLCB locations is subject to change at detailed design.
		29	29	Drawing 3 (Conceptual Storm Servicing Plan) should include the Street Names (letters), and the MH numbers should be in a larger and darker font. They are difficult to read where they overlap the blue boundary lines and green arrow symbols.	DSEL	Noted, Drawings have been revised to increase legibility.
		30	30	The Town has updated their rainfall-intensity-duration-frequency (IDF) curves as part of the May 2022 Engineering Design Standards and incorporated considerations for climate change. The SWMHYMO models and storm sewer design sheets should be updated accordingly based on the revised IDF information and the design of the sewers and ponds modified accordingly, as necessary.	JFSA / DSEL	Noted. Town of Erin IDF curves have been used to size stormwater management infrastructure.
			31	In accordance with Erin SD 502 the following grading elements are required for Pond 1		

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
		31	31.1	A 6m buffer from the Medium Density Block to the top of bank slope,	DSEL	The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. The required 6m buffer block from the top of slope is provided along the south limit of the pond. As discussed with Town staff on April 27, 2023 the 10m sanitary easement located along the southern pond limit is sufficient to achieve the requirement of the 6m buffer.
			31.2	The maintenance access road must be extended around the perimeter of the facility,	DSEL	The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. It is not possible to implement a maintenance access road around the perimeter of the pond, as storage volumes would not be able to be met within the pond block. It is important to note, while maintenance access is 'preferred' around the perimeter of the pond, it is not required from a practical perspective to complete pond maintenance. Sufficient to access the pond forebay, and main cell is achieved by the proposed access road configuration.
			31.3	Maximum 7:1 side slopes are required in the vicinity of the permanent pool and maximum 4:1 side slopes elsewhere.	DSEL	SWM Ponds 1 and 2 have been designed in accordance Town of Erin standards unless otherwise noted. Please refer to FSR Figures 7 and 8 and FSR Section 8.
			31.4	It would be helpful if Figure 9 of the FSR included the clean water pipe locations.	DSEL	Noted, CWP locations have been added to FSR Figure 9.
		32	32	Considering the steep side-slopes provided, lack of 7:1 shelf above permanent pool level, required fill within the floodplain, lack of drying area and use of retaining walls it is likely that the size and position of Pond 1 Block and Pond 2 Block will require significant adjustment.	DSEL	The orientation and block sizes of both SWM Ponds 1 and 2 have generally been accepted by Town of Erin staff.
		33	33	Grading in the vicinity of the sediment forebays for both facilities must include a minimum 5m 7:1 safety shelf extending downward from the permanent pool elevation in accordance with Erin SD 503.	DSEL	SWM Ponds 1 and 2 have been designed in accordance Town of Erin standards unless otherwise noted. Please refer to FSR Figures 7 and 8 and FSR Section 8.
		34	34	Some minor discrepancies occur between the catchment areas depicted on Figure 6 in the body of the FSR, and Figure 5 included in Appendix G as the basis of the SWMHYMO models. A summary table should be provided to show that the areas used for both depictions are correlated and consistent.	DSEL / JFSA	Drainage area characteristics have been revised to match across FSR, SWM model and drainage plans. Note these will be further refined at detailed design.
				Pond Components		
		35	35	Figure 7 and 8 of the FSR shows a cross-section of the SWM Ponds. It shows pond wall slopes of 3:1 that according to the Erin Standards should be 4:1 to 6:1 and the sections should also provide a 7:1 slope between the permanent pond level and the active storage level (see Erin Standard Drawing 501).	DSEL	SWM Ponds 1 and 2 have been designed in accordance Town of Erin standards unless otherwise noted. Please refer to FSR Figures 7 and 8 and FSR Section 8.
				Water Balance		
		36	36	The strategy applied requires the addition of a clean water collection pipe and as noted earlier the Town is not in favour of a third-pipe clean water pipe and encourages the use of other ways of infiltrating the clean water closer to the source, such as infiltration galleries on private lots to achieve water balance objectives.	DSEL	Cleanwater pipes are proposed to meet water balance requirements for the nine (9) wetlands located with the development. To mitigate against reduce runoff volumes to wetlands as compared to pre-development conditions, DSEL's first approach was to allow areas adjacent to the wetlands to drain directly overland. It was determined that drainage in addition to the rear yards would be required to meet wetland water balance targets and as such a cleanwater pipe is required. Additionally, a clean water pipe is required to convey storm runoff from the central medium density block to the infiltration facility located with the park to infiltrate the 5mm event.
		37	37	In Section 9.1, Site Wide Water Balance, the proposed increase in topsoil depth and the total depth of topsoil should be provided.	DSEL	Noted. Topsoil depth has been added to FSR Section 9.1.
				Roads		
		38	38	The Eighth Line (Sideroad 17 to Dundas St West) and Dundas St West (Eighth Line to Main St) will require full reconstruction to an urban standard with watermains, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, curbs, sidewalks, streetlights, etc. in conjunction with the proposed development. This will include the replacement of single lane bridge on the Eighth Line.	Korsiak/Mattamy/Coscorp/DSEL	The scope of external road improvements requires further discussion with the Town. These works do not impact the draft plan. Any external works are understood to be DC eligible.
		39	39	The sight lines at Eighth Line & Sideroad 17 intersection are limited and should be reviewed and if necessary, adjustments to the vertical curve on Sideroad 17 made in conjunction with the development.	Korsiak/Mattamy/Coscorp/DSEL	This is beyond the scope of the draft plan application and improviements to this existing intersection is the responsibility of the Town.
		40	40	The close proximity of the Sideroad 17 & Street “C” to Sideroad 17 & Eight Line should be investigated.	Korsiak/Mattamy/Coscorp/DSEL	Street C is located as far west as possible and cannot be relocated due to constraints of the adjacent SWM pond.
		41	41	Given the 15-tonne weight restriction on the existing Eighth Line bridge, it is recommended that the Eighth Line bridge be replaced before the subdivision construction begins, otherwise the construction traffic will have to access the site through the existing community of Main Street and Dundas Street West.	Korsiak/Mattamy/Coscorp	The subject lands have frontage on Sideroad 17 that can be utilized for site construction access and avoid crossing of the bridge. As such, timing of the bridge works can be concurrent with subdivision works.
		42	42	Street C from SR 17 to Street A and Street A to Street E and Street E to Eight Line should be designed as a Minor Collector road with ROW width, grades and horizontal curves conforming to the municipality’s standards. Maximum grades on collector roads should not exceed 6%. See Erin Standards Section 9.3.	RVA	The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. Grades greater than 6% are only proposed at the flank of SWM Pond 1 in order to meet existing road grades at 17th Sideroad. As there are no lots or additional access through this section of road, we are requesting the Town consider 7% for this localized section. Lowering grades to 6% would further exacerbate vertical constraints throughout the plan. Additionally, Table 23 of the Town standards (Section 9.3) states a maximum road grade of 8% for local roads. While we understand the Town is considering the spine road as a collector road, 70km/hr speed limit will not be provided. Therefore, vertical grading criteria tailored towards a local road with a corresponding 50km/hr is seemingly more appropriate, and therefore maximum 8% should apply. Please refer to Figure 3 for markup of grading conditions.
		43	43	Street D serves 49 residential units with a cul-de-sac and it should be investigated connecting with either Street C or Street E/F to eliminate the dead end.	DSEL / RVA	The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. As illustrated on the grading plan there is ~5.5m between both Street D/E and Street D/C as presented in Figure 4. Adding a connection street is not possible as much of the grade transition is made up through the depth of the unit. Adding a road connection would requiring significant areas of 100yr capture and increasing requirement for retaining walls in rear yards of lots. Furthermore, Street D is ~260m which is less than 300m per Town standards 9.3.4 for single detached product.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Engineering (Peer Reviewer) - Leonard H. Borgdorff		44	44	The road class designation for Sideroad 17 and Eight Line needs to be defined as Collector Road and the appropriate ROW width provided for.	RVA	It is understood the Town is considering the spine road as a collector road, however a 70km/hr speed limit will not be provided. Therefore, road design criteria tailored to local road with a corresponding 50km/hr is seemingly more appropriate. Report has been updated to include existing road classification.
				Preliminary Grading Plan		
		45	45	Section 11.1 of the FSR describes grading transition areas that extend into the outer portion of the 30-metre wetland buffer or the 10-metre drip line buffer in order to reduce the required height and extent of retaining walls. This strategy needs to be reviewed with the CVC before being carried further into the design process. The localized filling in the floodplain for the construction of Pond 1 needs to be quantified and accepted by CVC.	DSEL	Noted.
			45.1	Park grading is described as varying between 2 and 5%. This should be in conformance with the Erin Design Standards Section 12.15 which describes the range as 2 to 4%.	DSEL	Noted. Park grading has been revised, however trail/pond access road has been sloped at a maximum of 5% consistent with Town standards 8.14.7.
			45.1	As noted in Appendix J, the Slope Stability Investigation prepared by SHAD and Associates Ltd., Section 3.0, Discussions and Recommendations, says, "before final design, the assumed subsurface conditions to be confirmed by drilling representative number of the boreholes as well as carrying out supplementary detailed slope stability modelling and analysis". This should be tracked and addressed during the detail design stage.	Shad	Noted.
				Pond Maintenance		
		46	46	An access road to SWM Pond 2 should be provided from Eight Line, not by a route through the Park Block.	DSEL	Noted, Pond maintenance access has been provided from both the park and 8th Line.
				Erosion and Sediment Control]		
		47	47	Confirm that the ditches of SR 17 and Eight Line to receive the emergency overflow from the SWM ponds can accommodate the flows and resist erosion from the concentrated flows or provide the necessary cross-section and channel armoring.	DSEL / RPE	Please note the spillway is only intended to function during an emergency scenario, or for storms greater that the 100 year as required by the Town. Under an emergency scenario safe conveyance away from residents and public infrastructure is to be provided. Given the location of SWM Pond 2, it will spill to the rural roadside ditch before discharging to the NHS. Further details of emergency conveyance will be provided at detailed design and be considered in the reconstruction of 8th Line as required.
	Environmental Impact Study	48	48	The study revealed three (3) butternut trees on site. Two (2) of the butternut trees are Category 1 and their habitat are not protected from removal. The one (1) Category 2 butternut tree was registered for removal on March 11, 2022 and can be removed.	Burnside	Noted.
		49	49	The study revealed the site has Species at Risk (SAR) bat habitat. A mitigation and monitoring plan is being developed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). A copy of MECP's acceptance of the plan should be provided.	Burnside	Noted. A copy of the Overall Benefit Permit will be provided once it has been received from MECP.
		50	50	The study revealed the site has Barn Swallows and Barn Swallow nesting habitat. Prior to removing the wooden barn and lean-to across the Eighth Line from Erin Heights Drive, the conditions under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Regulations must be met in the form of either compensation or "cash-in-lieu" for Barn Swallow as briefly outlined in the report.	Burnside	The EIS report Section 4.2.2 has been updated to reflect the re-classification of Barn Swallow under the Endangered Species Act to Special Concern. Conditions outlined under OReg 830/21 no longer apply. However, Barn Swallow impacts/mitigation are now discussed in Table 25 - Significant Wildlife Habitat.
		51	51	When the legal survey establishes the limits of the buffers recommended in the report, an environmental consultant should be on site to confirm the limits.	Burnside	As stated in the EIS report Section 4.1.1 and 6.1, the setbacks were staked and surveyed in the field with CVC on July 5 and 19, 2021.
		52	52	During the detail design phase of this development, an environmental consultant should review the design to confirm the recommended mitigation efforts are implemented in the design.	Burnside	Noted.
		53	53	More literature on the proposed amphibian road crossing should be provided including required maintenance for removing winter sand and if the CVC has experience with that type of system.	Burnside	According to email correspondence with CVC (Sarah Labrie) on February 7, 2023, CVC does not yet have this open slotted tunnel design type in their jurisdiction. According to CVC, a water truck with a powerful enough hose on it could be used to flush the system out and can checked by roads staff mostly likely. The tunnels should be flushed in the spring annually to eliminate the salt which amphibians are highly sensitive to. According to the ACO Maintenance manual, the ACO Climate Tunnel is made from polymer concrete, a homogenous material resistant to various chemicals and salts. Regular checks should be made to ensure that the system continues to function efficiently. At minimum this should include a visual inspection prior to spring migration periods. A maintenance plan should be developed to keep the system free of accumulations of vegetation and leaves. The EIS report, Table 25 Wildlife Linkages and Corridors has been updated with additional information on required maintenance recommendations.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
	Erosion Mitigation Assessment	54	54	In Section 7, Summary, the report should clarify how the proposed 5 mm on-site retention target is established for erosion mitigation. used to establish the erosion control targets for the facilities? Does CVC concur with results? Why would GeoM specify a target, indicate that is conservative, not achieve it, then say it is acceptable if 48-hour extended detention and 5mm retention is sufficient?	GeoMorphix	The June 8, 2022 Erosion Mitigation report suggested working toward a 5 mm on-site retention target . The 5 mm target is the best-efforts target for erosion mitigation referenced from the CVC stormwater guidelines. For the following reasons the provided 3 mm of on-site retention is sufficient to mitigate against the potential of excess erosion within reach WC-1: i) Reach WC-1 is a stable reach not particularly sensitive to erosion. As detailed in the Erosion Mitigation report, Reach WC-1 is a low gradient, relatively wide stream channel that is very well connected to the extensive wetland system bordering the channel. No significant active erosion was observed within or downstream of the subject lands, and a survey of historical images of the reach indicated no significant changes in channel planform. These site characteristics suggest that reach WC-1 is stable and not particularly sensitive to erosion. ii) The relatively small development footprint relative to the reach WC-1 drainage area. The drainage area of WC-1 is approximately 3,570 ha (as defined using the OWIT assessment tool). The drainage area to WC-1 via the site is approximately 55 ha of which 46 ha is on the subject lands. The drainage area of the subject lands accounts for approximately 1.3% of the total drainage area to reach WC-1. Developments with such relatively small development footprints are not likely to have any meaningful impact on the rates of erosion within the receiving watercourses. iii) All the site's existing wetland and forested areas will be retained which includes approximately 12.3 ha of forests, wetlands, and wetland buffer areas which account for approximately 27% of the drainage area from the subject lands. A Feature-based Water Balance for the wetlands conveying runoff from the site to the wetland complex adjacent to reach WC-1 indicates that annual runoff volumes to the wetland complex will increase by 8% but that peak monthly runoff volumes which occur during the month of April will be reduced by approximately 12%. All individual wetlands on site are within +/- 5% of pre-development targets. We therefore expect there to be a slight reduction in erosion potential related to reduced spring runoff volumes from the site. Within this context, the provided 3mm in on-site retention is expected to be sufficient to reduce the risk of excess erosion at reach WC-1 as the assimilative capacity of the receiving channel is adequate given the expected hydrological changes associated with the development. Given the size of the receiving watercourse, it is understood the planned LIDs and wetland water balance requirements mitigates potential erosion risk at this location.
		55	55	The concrete bridge on the Eight Line is undersized relative to the West Credit River - Erin Branch channel dimensions and should be replaced as part of the external works for this development. The concrete bridge is also a traffic constraint and should be replaced prior to development of this site, and in coordination with the development of the Empire Homes site on the east side of Eight Line.	Mattamy/Coscorp	Existing Bridge 9 is located on a municipal road and outside of the subject lands road frontage. Due to its current poor condition and narrow width, Bridge 9 is proposed to be upgraded to better service existing and future residents. It is noted these works do not impact the Draft Plan . It is understood bridge replacement works are Development Charge eligible.
		56	56	Based on a similar concrete bridge structure crossing West Credit River - Erin Branch on the Eight Line upstream of the subject site with a span of approximately 9.14 m, the new concrete bridge structure for the Eight Line at this site should be at greater than 9.14 m to assist in maintaining the existing channel form and function.	DSEL/RJB	Noted. Please refer to response to Erosion Mitigation Assessment Comment 55 above.
	Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment	57	57	The Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) received the Archaeological Assessment Phase 1 and Phase 2 report. A copy of the letter from MHSTCI should be provided stating they accept the report and have registered the report.	Mattamy/Coscorp	Noted
	Drinking Water Threats Disclosure Report and Salt Management Plan	58	58	The recommendations provided in the report for mitigating the stormwater managementand sewer threats on drinking water should be implemented in the detail design.	RJB - Hydro G Team	Recommendations from the Threats Disclosure Report will be incorporated into the SWM design where appropriate.
		59	59	The subdivision design should incorporate elements to reduce the need for applying salt during winter seasons, including, for example, directing roof downspouts to grass (pervious) areas and grading to prevent ponding and ice.	RJB - Hydro G Team	Similar recommendations are included in the Threats Disclosure Report. The recommendtions will eb incorporated into the final design as appropriate
		60	60	The residents who live in this development should receive education and outreach materials targeted to educate on proper salt application practices and alert them on the proximity of the drinking water source to their subdivision.	RJB - Hydro G Team	This information is most effective when coming from the municiplaity. The RMO will have acces to resources that can provide this information in user friendly format.
		61	61	Snow removed from the site should be hauled to a site certified for snow disposal.	RJB - Hydro G Team	Snow removal will be a function of the municipality
		62	62	For Section 2.1 Existing Road Network:		
			62.1	The assumed speed limit of 50 km/h for the Eight Line in all sections in the report should be reviewed. The posted speed varies within the limits of the study. The Eight Line has a posted speed limit of 50 km/h between Sideroad 17 and the north of the bend at Dundas Street W; a posted speed limit of 40 km/h between the two gravel sections just south of Dundas Street W and just north of Delarmbro Drive; and, a 60 km/h posted speed just north of Wellington Road 124.	RVA	Report has been amended to reflect the posted speed limit on all roads within the study area.
			62.2	The single lane bridge located on Eight Line south of Sideroad 17 should be reconstructed and widened to two lanes including active transportation.		Noted
			62.3	A "5 tonnes per axle from March 1 to May 15" sign posted on Eight Line just south of Sideroad 17 for southbound traffic should be noted in the study.	RVA	Report has been updated to include discussion about weight restrictions on Eighth Line.
			62.4	The posted speed for Main Street within the study area should be reviewed. The posted speed varies within the study limits. Main Street has a posted speed limit of 40 km/h from Wellington Road 52-Wellington Road 124 Intersection northerly to just north of Erinville Drive, and 50 km/h from the north side of Erinville Drive northerly to beyond the study area limits in the report.	RVA	Report has been updated to note the different speed limits along Main Street.
			62.5	The posted speed for Wellington Road 124 within the study area should be reviewed. The posted speed limit is 80 km/h from the west limits of the study area to just east of Eight Line, 60 km/h between just east of Eight Line and just east of Delarmbro Drive, and 40 km/h from just east of Delarmbro Drive to easterly of the Wellington Road 52-Wellington Road 124 Intersection.	RVA	The report has been updated to reflect the posted speed limits along Wellington Road 124.
		63	63	For Section 2.4 Existing Traffic Data:		
			63.1	Traffic data was collected on September 1, 2021 during the Province COVID Step 3 reopening with capacity restrictions. Therefore, the traffic volumes are lower and should be factored to the normal conditions.	RVA	Following discussion with the Town a 10% growth rate has been utilized to adjust the 2021 traffic data in the revised report.
			63.2	A growth rate should be included with the factored 2021 traffic data to reflect the 2022 condition.	RVA	Please see response to comment 63.1 above.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
	Traffic Report		63.3	Figure 2.1, 2022 Existing Traffic Volumes, should be expanded to show the golf course access and its generated traffic.	RVA	Given the low traffic volumes generated by the golf course, for the revised TIS provided we have left these trips with the network as their impacts to intersection operations would be negligble.
		64	64	In Section 3.1, Study Horizon Year, as per our comments provided for the TIS Terms of Reference during the pre-consultation, a 10 year after build out year (2034) should be included.	RVA	A 10 year analysis horizon has been added to the revised TIS provided.
		65	65	For Section 3.2, Future Background Developments:	RVA	
			65.1	In Table 3-2, "Wellington Road 124 (N/W)" should read "Wellington Road 124 (N/E)" and "Wellington Road 124 (S/E)" should read "Wellington Road 124 (S/W)". As a result, the distribution percentages may need to be revised.	RVA	Table 3-2 has been revised to read "Wellington Road 124 (N/E)" and "Wellington Road 124 (S/W)". Distribution percentages have also been reviewed and revised if necessary.
			65.2	Figure 2-1, 2022 Existing Traffic Volumes, should include the traffic generated by the Golf Course. Figure 2-1 should include the Golf Course access and turning traffic from Figure 3-2, Existing Golf Course Traffic Volumes.	RVA	Please see response to comment 63.3 above.
			65.3	Figure 3-2, Existing Golf Course Traffic Volumes, indicates that virtually all of the traffic it generates goes to/comes from Sideroad 17 (i.e., in the PM Peak Hour, 13 of 14 vehicles enter from the north and 12 of 12 exit to the north). The distribution of golf course traffic should be reviewed and explained.	RVA	Please see response to comment 63.3 above.
			65.4	In Figure 2-1 the full existing traffic turning southbound on the Eight Line from Sideroad 17 totals 33 vehicles and includes the golf course traffic. In Figure 3-2, the total golf course traffic turning southbound on the Eight Line from Sideroad 17 totals 13 vehicles, meaning that 20 vehicles from Figure 2-1 pass by the golf course. Figure 2-1 indicates that 32 southbound vehicles pass by the golf course (i.e., 17 3turn left onto Erin Heights and 15 continue south to Dundas Street West). The unbalanced traffic volumes on Line 8 in both directions and during the AM and PM peak hours between the two figures should be reviewed and become balanced.	RVA	Please see response to comment 63.3 above.
			65.5	The proposed Solmar Subdivision located at the east side of Main Street between Dundas Street and Wellington Road 124 should also be considered. The Solmar Subdivision traffic impact study area overlaps the study area for this and the Empire Subdivision traffic impact studies.	RVA	Site generated traffic from the proposed Solmar development has been included as part of background traffic in the revised report.
		66	66	For Section, 3.3 Future Background Growth, rationale to support the 1% growth rate should be provided. The 1% growth rate was not included in the Terms of Reference for review during pre-consultation.	RVA	The 1% growth rate was utilized given that the surrounding area is mainly rural and all forseeable development in the area (Solmar, Empire and 5520 & 5552) has been included in the analysis of future conditions.
		67	67	For Section, 4.1 Draft Plan Layout:		
			67.1	The distance between Street "C" and Eight Line westerly intersection on Sideroad 17 should be specified, and shown to comply with TAC Standards.	RVA	Discussions on intersection spacing and their compliance with TAC standards has been added to the updated report.
			67.2	For cross-section design consistency purposes, the section of Eight Line between Sideroad 17 and the bridge over the West Credit River should also be urbanized to the same cross-section as the section between the bridge and Dundas Street.	RVA/Mattamy/Coscorp	Further discussion with the Town is required to confirm the scope of improvements within this segment. There may be restrictions due to the current overtopping of the roadway in frequent flooding events. External road improvements are understood to be DC eligible and do not impact the draft plan.
			67.3	The adequacy of the width for the servicing easements through the NHS should be reviewed considering the size and depth of the service.	DSEL	Comment addressed under site serving comments.
		68	68	For Section 4.3, Trip Distribution:		
			68.1	in Table 4-2 and Appendix B, "Wellington Road 124 (N/W)" should read "Wellington Road 124 (N/E)' and "Wellington Road 124 (S/E)" should read "Wellington Road 124 (S/W)". As a result, the distribution percentages should be reviewed.	RVA	Table 4-2 has been revised to read "Wellington Road 124 (N/E)" and "Wellington Road 124 (S/W)". Distribution percentages have also been reviewed and revised if necessary.
			68.2	In Table 4-2, "Highway 52" and "Highway 23" should read "Wellington Road 52" and "Wellington Road 23".	RVA	Table 4-2 has been revised to read "Wellington Road 52" and "Wellington Road 23".
		69	69	For Section 4.4, Trip Assignment, the distribution shown in Figure 4-3 is not consistent with the distribution in Table 4-2. For example, Figure 4-3 shows site traffic was evenly distributed to (i) Wellington Road 52, (ii) Wellington Road 124 NE, (iii) Wellington Road 124 SW, and (iv) Trafalgar Road (i.e., each direction had 25% of the total traffic development generated traffic). This discrepancy should be resolved.	RVA	Site-generated trip distribution has been revised in the updated report.
		70	70	For Section 6.2, Capacity Analysis Results:		
			70.1	A statement should be included that the timing of the single lane bridge replacement on the Eight Line will be advance of the development of these proposed subdivisions on the Eight Line such that the link capacity of the Eight Line will not be a critical factor for analysing the road network capacity within the study area.	Mattamy/Coscorp/RVA	It is acknowledged that replacement of the bridge will be undertaken concurrent with the development of the subject lands. As such, the existing bridge has not been considered a contraint to the network capacity. It is understood the bridge replacement works will be DC eligible.
			70.2	The 2029 future background scenario should also be included in the analysis.	RVA	The 2029 future background scenario has been addedd to the revised report.
			70.3	Table 6-9 indicates that the eastbound left turn queue lengths on Shamrock Road (Wellington Road 23) at Wellington Road 124 (Main Street) are longer due to the site traffic.	RVA	The eastbound queue length exceeds the storage available under existing traffic conditions and continues to grow with the addition of future background traffic growth. Based on the analysis in the revised report, the site generated traffic has only increased the the queue length for this movement by 7 to 8 metres or 1 vehicle.
				For Section 7.0, Left Turn Lane Warrants:		
			70.4	The Left Turn Warrants for Trafalgar Road should be based on a design speed of 100 km/hr.	RVA	Design speed used for Left-Turn Lane Warrants have been revised in the update report.
			70.5	The 15 m southbound Left turn lane on Trafalgar Road at Sideroad 17 is warranted based on both the 2024 and 2029 total traffic volumes and a design speed of 100 km/h on Trafalgar Road. This left turn lane is marginally warranted based on the 2024 background traffic volume. Therefore, this left turn lane is mostly triggered by both the developments of Mattamy Homes and Empire Residential.	RVA	Based on the revised warrant analysis as part of the updated report, this left lane is warranted under future background 2024 traffic conditions based on the p.m. peak hour volumes.
			70.6	A 25 m eastbound left turn Lane is warranted on Wellington Road 124 at Eight Line based on the 2024 and 2029 total traffic volumes. Whereas, a 15 m eastbound left turn lane is warranted at the intersection based on the 2024 and 2029 background traffic volumes.	RVA	Based on the redistrution of site-generated traffic volumes through this intersection as part of the revised study, a dedicated left-turn lane is not warranted.
		71	71	For Appendix E, Synchro Software Output Reports:		
			71.1	At the intersection of Main Street with Dundas Street, the vehicle extension should be 5.0 seconds for phases 2 and 6 as per the signal timing plan vs 3.0 seconds in the report. In addition, the 8 seconds minimum green for phases 4 and 8, 24 seconds minimum green for phases 2 and 6, 10 seconds pedestrian "Walk" time and 8 seconds pedestrian clearance time should be included in the input.	RVA	Signal timing settings in synchro have been amended as part of the revised study.
			71.2	At the intersection of Main Street with Shamrock Road, the 10 seconds minimum green, 10 seconds pedestrian "Walk" time and 10 seconds pedestrian clearance time for phases 4 and 8, and 35 seconds minimum green, 16 seconds pedestrian "Walk" time and 19 seconds pedestrian clearance time for phases 2 and 6, should also be included in the input.	RVA	Signal timing settings in synchro have been amended as part of the revised study.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
			71.3	A later version the Highway Capacity Manual such as 2010, 6th or 7th Edition should be used vs 2000 version.	RVA	Based on our knowledge in differences between the HCM versions is that later iterations have mainly consisted of incorporating multi-modal analysis methods and new methods for ramp terminal and roundabout analysis. In our experience, HCM 2000 is still widely used within the industry and that analysis results from newer versions dont always properly reflect conditions within the field.
		72	72	For Appendix F, Auxiliary Left-Turn Lane Warrants:	RVA	
			72.1	A design speed of 100 km/h should be used on Wellington Road 124 at Eight Line and on Trafalgar Road at Sideroad 17 vs 90 km/h in the report.	RVA	Design speed used for Left-Turn Lane Warrnats have been revised in the updated report.
			72.2	The 2029 future background scenario should also be included.	RVA	Please see response to comment 70.2 above.
	Tree Preservation Plan & Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan Report	73	73	The recommendations for tree preservation in Section 6.3, Tree Protection Recommendations, should be carried forward into the Draft Plan Conditions and Site Alteration Agreement.	Arborist	Noted.
		74	74	The Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan should include a Legend identifying the line type used for tree preservation fencing.	Arborist	Jackson - There has been a legend in the top right hand corner of Sheets 1-4 identifying the tree protection fence line and all other pertinent tree protection plan linework since the 1st submission.
		75	75	In the northeast corner of SWM Pond Block 20 is a 10 m setback consistent with the line work on the Draft Plan. This should, at a minimum, have tree preservation fencing along the 10 m setback line.	Arborist	Jackson - Tree protection fence has been added to the 10 m setback on the east site of SWM Pond Block 1 on Sheet 2 of the TPP.
	Urban Design Brief	76	76	The proposed setbacks illustrated in Figure 6 and Figure 7 should be reviewed with respect to the required setbacks in the Zoning By-law. Figure 7 shows an 18.0 m right-of-way width, which is not compliant with the Engineering Standards. The minimum width of right-of-way should be 20 m.	DSEL	DSEL - Sidewalks are proposed per Town of Erin standard 18m, 20m and 23m ROW drawings. The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as Attachment 1. As discussed with Town staff on April 27, 2023, it was generally accepted 18m ROWs could be implemented for the local roads throughout the proposed Draft Plan. Additionally, DSEL noted a 23m ROW could be provided for the spine road, with exception to the stretch adjacent to SWM Pond 1. Please refer to J. Krubnik & T. Bal Comment 1 response for discussion the Spine Road adjacent to SWM Pond 1.
		77	77	In Section 3.1.3, Street Lighting, the Design Guidelines:		
			77.1	in the second bulleted item, the light poles and luminaires should conform to the Engineering Standards.	NAK	Noted.
			77.2	In the third bulleted item, the Engineering Standards apply to more than just the placement and selection of lighting fixtures.	NAK	Noted.
		78	78	In Section 4.2, Residential Architectural Guidelines, the design guidelines discuss garage projections and bay window encroachments. The actual building for a particular lot will should be checked that it conforms to the required setbacks from the lot lines defined in the Zoning By-law during the Building Permit Application stage.	NAK	Noted.
		79	79	In Section 4.2.5, Variable Grading Conditions,	NAK	
			79.1	for “garage under product” scenarios, the setbacks may be governed by the living space or balcony over the garage, especially if it cantilevers over and beyond the garage front door.	NAK/Q4	The setback to garage is greater than the setback to the living space or balcony above which may extend over the driveway. NAK - updated UDB to state: For garage under product, the overall width of the garage door(s) may exceed 50% of the overall width of the house, however, care shall be taken to ensure the impact of the garage is minimized through articulation of the main entrance and two upper storeys, and by providing two garage doors or designing a single door to create the appearance of two separate doors. Designs shall conform to the approved Zoning By-law.
			79.2	For garages that exceed 50% of the overall width of the house, they should be reviewed that they conform to the zoning bylaw.	NAK/Q4	Designs will be reviewed with Approved Zoning NAK - updated UDB to state: For garage under product, the overall width of the garage door(s) may exceed 50% of the overall width of the house, however, care shall be taken to ensure the impact of the garage is minimized through articulation of the main entrance and two upper storeys, and by providing two garage doors or designing a single door to create the appearance of two separate doors. Designs shall conform to the approved Zoning By-law.
	Noise Feasibility Study	80	80	Peer Review comments from Valcoustics dated Sept 7, 2022, are attached.	Acoustic	Defer to detailed design.
	Density and Affordable Housing	1	1	5552 Eighth Line has been allocated 365 Single Detached Equivalent (SDEs). The application currently proposed 379 SDEs. Please revised the proposed draft plan accordingly to remain in the allocated SDEs.	Mattamy/Coscorp	SDE will be balanced among owners as necessary.
		2	2	5520 Eighth Line has been allocated 210 SDEs. The application currently proposes 182 SDEs. Staff acknowledge that the number of SDEs will increase once Wellington Land Division Application B98-22 is complete.	Mattamy/Coscorp	SDE will be balanced among owners as necessary.
		3	3	Provincial and County policy seeks to establish a full range of housing, including affordable housing. To help achieve this intent, staff are seeking for the applicant to include secondary dwelling units within a portion of the proposed housing stock. The County has set a target of 25% of new housing will be affordable. Secondary dwelling units will also improve the efficient use of the proposed infrastructure.	Mattamy/Coscorp	Noted.
			1	The Town has initiated a Technical Amendment of Zoning By-law 07-67, as amended (Z21-05). Please revise the draft by-law to be consistent with the Technical Amendment. Please see our notes below:	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Draft Zoning By-law has been updated accordingly.
			1.1	Rezone the residential lands to Urban Residential One (UR1) or Urban Residential Two (UR2), with a site-specific amendment	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Draft Zoning By-law has been updated accordingly.
			1.2	Remove day nursery, group home as a permitted use.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
	Zoning	1	1.3	Concerned with the requested height of 14.5 metres and exterior side yard setback of 2.4 metres for single detached dwellings. Please align these provisions with the Town's Zoning By-law with 11 metres heights and 4.5 metre exterior side yard setback. Note: please align other setbacks such as lot frontage, front yard, etc as well.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Q4 - See provided Street to Street Building Sections. According to the by-law, Building height is measured from average grade around all sides of the building to midpoint of highest roof measured between bottom of eave and ridge. It is difficult to know at this time what the average grade will be for each lot, what the roof pitch will be and what the ceiling height will be. Therefore tollerance needs to be built into the maximum building height. Based on the Building Sections provided and based on the current method of determining building height, most buildings will be less than 11m in building height. However it is strongly recommended that atleast 12m be provided unless the definition of building height is changed.
			1.4	Please provide justification for the proposed townhouse height of 14.5 metres, whereas the Town's Zoning By-law permits a height of 12.5 metres for stacked townhouses and 11 metres for all other types of townhouses.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Q4A - Based on current proposed 2 Strorey Street townhouses with Walk-out Basement, and based on current method of determining building height, the Maximum townhouse Height can be 11m. Mattamy to confirm if 3 Storey towns will be contemplated and what building form is contemplated for the Medium density block.
			1.5	Please increase the lot frontage for Townhomes from 5.6 metres to 6 metres, front yard from 2 metres to 3 metres, side yard from 2.4 metres to 3 metres, rear yard for non-laneways from 6 metres to 7 metres, and rear yard for laneways from 0.6 of a metre to 4.5 metres.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Q4A - Current plan desinged for 6.5m towns. 6.0m minimum will suffice for 2 storey towns.
			1.6	Please revise the draft by-law to include a holding symbol for the entire site (see Kensington's Site Specific Provisions for details).	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	A holding symbol has been applied to all residential zone categories.
			1.7	Please provide a draft schedule for the By-law.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Draft Zoning schedules are included with the resubmission.
		2	2	Please note that the Town Initiated Zoning By-law Amendment Z21-05 to implement 6 metre daylight triangles has yet to be approved by Council.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Town Engineering has deemed the corner roundings to be acceptable.
	Commercial/Mixed-Use Zoning	1	1	The Town would like the applicants to evaluate the introduction of a mixed-use block, to introduce small scale commercial uses to the local area (see small scale uses permitted within the Mixed Use (MU) Zone and Commercial Zones in the Town's Zoning By-law 07-67, as amended). This will add to the notion of a complete community, in which local services are provided within a community itself and are within walking distance.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Noted.
	Open Space, Parkland and Trails	1	1	Please note that the Town has a new Parkland Dedication By-law# 22-41. Staff acknowledge that a combination of parkland and cash-in-lieu will be required to satisfy parkland dedication.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Noted.
		2	2	Evaluate options to retain tree cover along the perimeter of the subject site, especially adjacent to existing residential properties.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Q4/Korsiak	Noted.
		3	3	Staff request the applicant re-evaluate plans for the storm water management ponds, to retain much of the existing grouping of trees along the north & south perimeters of the 1.53 ha Stormwater Management (SWM) pond, as well as along the north & east perimeters of the 1.77 ha SWM pond.	Arborist	SWM Pond blocks to remain as is per discussions with Town staff.
		4	4	Design SWM as amenities with ecological function. Provide walking trails, seating nodes and low-maintenance naturalized plantings within the SWM Blocks.	NAK	To be included in future landscape drawings at detailed design.
		5	5	Provide a 1.8 metre high privacy fence along the subdivision perimeters, as well as at the end of street blocks.	NAK	Noted.
		6	6	Please confirm most residents are within a 5 to 10 minute walking distance to a park (400 to 800 metre radius) and 3 to 5 minutes for any parkette (200 metres radius).	NAK	Updated on UDB figure 9.
		1	1	As per Upper Grand District School Board's comments, please revise the Draft Plan to include a school block that meets the School Board's requirements/standards.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	The UGDSB has agreed that due to grading challenges a school block is not feasible.
		2	2	Please add a notation to the Draft Plan that shows fencing along the shared property lines with existing residential properties. Staff would request landscaping buffers be provided as well.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	A landscape buffer has been provided adjacent to the portion of Street C that connects to 17 Sideroad. Extra depth has been provided for lots backing onto all other adjacent residential properties.
		3	3	Despite the justification for non-compliance, Town staff is seeking a minimum of 6.0 metre separation between driveways to accommodate the potential for vehicular parking. Also, where two driveways are adjacent to one another, they should be paired.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	addressed in UDB.
		4	4	Staff may consider garage doors exceeding 50% of the overall width of the house, if the applicant is able to illustrate that the garage doors are situated behind the front door and the residence's primary front elevation, and are not prominent features.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Elevations will be designed to ensure that garages will not be the prominent feature of the dwelling.
		5	5	Despite the justification for non-compliance, staff continue to request a main or secondary door on exterior side elevations with access to sidewalks.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	addressed in UDB.
		6	6	Staff would like to see more information pertaining to the medium density blocks, to demonstrate the feasibility of these blocks, from a built form perspective, to accommodate the units proposed within each.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Concepts for medium density blocks will be provided under a separate cover when product type has been refined.
		7	7	The preliminary elevation drawings have not illustrated a sufficient variety of designs, models and elevations along a street. They also do not represent a built form true to a defined architectural style, and appear to present an eclectic mix of unrelated design elements. Ensure façade details throughout all building's elevations are consistent with their intended architectural expression.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Elevation drawings that were submitted are preliminary. Final elevations are currently in the design process.
		8	8	Corner lots are to provide two highly articulated elevations that include changes of plane, substantial window openings and upgraded architectural detailing and materials, such as wrap around corner windows, porches and other architectural treatments at corner conditions.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Upgraded elevations will be provided on corner lots.
		9	9	All material expression is to be high quality, durable and easily maintained.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	noted.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Town Planning - Jack Krubnik & Tanjot Bal	Site Layout and Design	10	10	The Town of Erin would like to see medium density residential housing fronting onto Eighth Line. Having housing units back onto Eighth Line is not a desirable urban design condition. The backlot conditions on the east side of Eighth Line are not to be repeated within the design of this subdivision. Therefore a 2.2 metre noise wall/fence is also not an acceptable condition along Eighth Line.	Acoustic	Acoustic to comment on Noise Mitigation The following response was submitted and generally accepted by Town staff in the June 8, 2023 "Scoped FSR Comment Response Letter" prepared by DSEL. The response is recopied below for ease of reference and letter has been provided as **Attachment 1**. As presented in FSR drawing 6, vertical transitions from streets H and G are made up either through lotting, 3:1 transition sloping or use of retaining walls. Therefore, a window street cannot be provided without significant vertical transitions. Implementation of higher density product eliminates flexibility in making up vertical grades along road, through lots and will result in increased use of retaining walls. Furthermore, 6-8 storey buildings were never contemplated for this plan. Proposed increase in density would require additional capacity within downstream infrastructure which is limited (SWM Ponds, sanitary trunks designed by WSP/Town). Buildings around 6-8 storeys in height will clash significantly with the existing single detached product located on the east side of 8th Line, and doing so would be counter intuitive to community aesthetic objectives. The comment is understood. We can only prepare a noise study based on the site plan. Design of the site plan is beyond our scope.
		11	11	Provide more evidence and attention to the topic of sustainability. Make clear how pedestrian movement and cycling will be encouraged and planned for. What type of luminaire and lighting poles are proposed? What type of sustainable hardscaping and softscaping initiatives are proposed within this initiative? What material are proposed that have been sustainably harvested? Also, be clearer with regards to water conservation and management without a reliance on future private home owners. These are questions and concerns that are top of mind for the Town of Erin and its residents. Please clarify how sustainability can be addressed and executed within this subdivision application process. The Towns engineering standards can be updated, if necessary, to reflect sustainable solutions brought forth by the applicant.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted, see UDB.
		12	12	The Town of Erin will seek a Control Architect within the draft subdivision conditions, to assist staff in the review and execution of the subdivision built form.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted.
	Road Network	1	1	Please shift Street C further to the east, to allow for a larger landscape buffer between the street and the adjacent residential property along Sideroad 17.	Korsiak /DSEL	Street C ROW has been increased to a 20m ROW, although general road alignment is maintained to provide sufficient storage volume in the SWM Pond. This approach is understood to be acceptable to Town engineering staff. An appropriate landscape buffer has been provided adjacent to the existing residential property.
		2	2	It's not explicitly clear from the Traffic Impact Study that the future background study included all the planned subdivisions in the Erin Urban Area. The Town of Erin is in a unique position of having the majority of its future growth already known and forecasted by the Town. Therefore, all identified subdivision growth within the Erin Urban Area should be utilized in the formulation of the Traffic Impact Study findings.	RVA	The revised TIS includes all know background developments (Solmar, Empire etc.) at the time of completion. Corresponding studies or information regarding these developments was provided by the Town.
		3	3	Staff would like to include the evaluation of a traffic signal at Eighth Line, as the Traffic Impact Study does not appear to consider the accommodation of the requested school site on the subject lands, or the desire for the community on the east side of Eighth Line to access the school lands or their desire to cross Eighth Line to access parkland or other.	RVA	As confirmed with Town staff review of this intersection due to the proposed school is no longer required as part of the revised TIS provided.
		4	4	To include all the necessary elements of a right-of-way, staff request that all proposed 18.0 metre local roads be increased to 20.0 metre, and all proposed 20.0 metre local roads be increased to 23.0 metre. The segment of Street 'C', west of Street 'A', should also be designed as a 23.0 metre ROW. Vehicular roadways can be reduced to a 9.0m width.	Korsiak	Part of external works - a sidewalk will be included where ROW width and grading permits.
		5	5	Provide sidewalks along both sides of all streets to increase safety, walkability, and street life.	Korsiak	Sidewalks are proposed on both sides.
		6	6	Staff would like to see a sidewalk proposed along the length of Eighth Line.	Korsiak	Part of external works - a sidewalk will be included where ROW width and grading permits.
		7	7	Staff request that entrance features be provided along Eighth Line, to signal the arrival into this new community.	Mattamy	To be addressed during detailed design.
		8	8	There are several factors that warrant the consideration of significant right-of-way improvements along both Eighth Line and Dundas Street West. Please see comments from the Town's Engineering Department.	Mattamy/RVA/DSEL	The scope of external road improvements requires further discussion with the Town.
		9	9	It's not explicitly clear from the Traffic Impact Study that the future background study included all the planned subdivisions in the Erin Urban Area. The Town of Erin is in a unique position of having the majority of its future growth already known and forecasted by the Town. Therefore, all identified subdivision growth within the Erin Urban Area should be utilized in the formulation of the Traffic Impact Study findings.	RVA	See TIS.
		10	10	This application must also plan for safe pedestrian movement across Eighth Line including anticipated pedestrian desires to access trails, parkland, natural heritage lands, and for the potential school which is being requested on this site.	NAK	Noted, see UDB and TIS.
		11	11	Staff would like the applicants Traffic Impact Study (TIS) to include the evaluation of a traffic signal at Eighth Line, as the TIS does not appear to consider the accommodation of the requested school site. There will be a desire for the community on the east side of Eighth Line to access the school lands and safely cross Eighth Line.	RVA	Please see response to comment 3 above.

Town of Erin Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
	Compatibility Study	1	1	The applicants Noise Compatibility Study has a recommendation that a detailed noise study be prepared when grading information and refined traffic data is available, including commercial vehicle percentages proposed for the roadways along with lot numbering to refine the acoustic requirements. It is staff's expectation that the applicant will update their Noise Compatibility Study to address this item.	Korsiak	Noise Impact Study will be updated accordingly when grading and updated traffic data is avialable.
		2	2	The recommendations under the Implementation section of the Noise Compatibility Study will need to be further considered. These may need to be conditions of draft approval, or require sign off by a control architect.	Korsiak	Agreed.
	Other	1	1	The applicants Salt Management Plan places the emphasis on Town salt management practices as well as the Wellington Source Water Protection. Given the potential for salt impacts to the local Town well, a more robust plan for public/private salt use should be proposed by the applicant to limit salt impacts to the local well and the Town's ground water supply.	Korsiak / RJB Hydro G	As residences will be individually owned, it is difficult for a plan to be implemented by a body that has no municipal function. In the post sale scenario the developers have very little leverage on salt use practices by individual owners. This request can be communicated to purchasers.
Heritage Impact Assessment Peer Review Comments		1	1	To be provided at a later date		Noted
Building Services		1	1	No comments		Noted
Fire Services - Jim Sawkins		1	1	Maximize access into the subdivision from both major arteries; 8th Line and 17th Sideroad	Korsiak	Noted
		2	2	Confirm that the turning radius on the crescents is sufficient to accommodate our fire apparatus	Korsiak	Noted. RVA has confirmed

MATTAMY & COSCORP - 5520 & 5552 Eighth Line Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning - 1st Submission Comment Response Matrix (Z22-06, Z22-07, 23T-22003, 23T-22004)						
Town of Erin - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Canada Post		1	1	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. Please note the Canada Post multi-unit policy may also apply depending on building type.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
		2	2	Multi-unit buildings and complexes (residential and commercial) with a common lobby, common indoor or sheltered space, require a centralized lock box assembly which is to be provided by, installed by, and maintained by the developer/owner at the owner's expense. Buildings with 100 units or more MUST have a rear loading Lock Box Assembly with dedicated secure mail room.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
		3	3	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
		4	4	In order to provide mail service to this development, Canada Post requests that the owner/developer comply with the following conditions:	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.1	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.2	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.3	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.4	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.5	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.6	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.7	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			4.8	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.	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
		5	5	Canada Post further requests the owner/developer be notified of the following:	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			5.1	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	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			5.2	Enhanced Community Mailbox Sites with roof structures will require additional documentation as per Canada Post Policy	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			5.3	There will be no more than one mail delivery point to each unique address assigned by the Municipality	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			5.4	Any existing postal coding may not apply, the owner/developer should contact Canada Post to verify postal codes for the project	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
			5.5	The complete guide to Canada Post's Delivery Standards can be found at: https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf	Mattamy/Coscorp/Korsiak	Noted
Wellington Source Water Protection - Danielle		1	1	Clean Water Act Part IV Requirements	RJB - Hydro G	
			1.1	Please note that a Section 59 notice is not required as this development is proposed to be solely residential. It should be noted that if the nature of the development changed to include mixed residential and/or commercial use, Section 59 Notices will likely apply.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, no response required
		2	2	Conditions and Recommendations	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, no response required
				Wellington Source Water Protection recommends approval of these applications subject to the applicant fulfilling the following conditions and recommendations to the satisfaction of the Town's Risk Management Official.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, no response required
			2.1	Conditions	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, no response required
			2.1 a)	That the applicant provide a liquid fuel handling / storage and spill response procedure, to the satisfaction of the Town Risk Management Official, for liquid fuel handling and storage during construction.	RJB - Hydro G	Please see "Fuel Handling Letter" by RJ Burnside.
			2.1 b)	That a salt management plan be required during construction.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, salt management plan can be prepared in consultation with builders
			2.1 c)	That SWM Pond 2 be constructed with an impermeable liner to ensure that stormwater does not infiltrate into the groundwater, given the proximity of the municipal well.	RJB - Hydro G / DSEL	Noted, SWM Pond 2 will be designed with an impermeable liner as per recommendations of the hydro geological and geotechnical consultants.
			2.1 d)	That stormwater management facilities, including spillways, are prohibited within 100 metres of the municipal well.	RJB - Hydro G	Measures to mitigate potential impacts are proposed in Threats Disclosure Report. Threat from spill will be similar to nearby river that also crosses the WHPA-A
			2.1 e)	That the higher construction standards for sanitary and storm sewer pipes crossing the wellhead protection area, as outlined in the RJ Burnside report entitled 'Drinking Water Threats Disclosure Report and Salt Management Plan' dated June 2022, be implemented during construction.	RJB - Hydro G	Recommendations from the Threats Disclosure Report will be implemented as appropriate
			2.1 f)	That all private water wells within the subdivision be decommissioned in accordance with Ontario Regulation 903 and that documentation be submitted to the Town Risk Management Official.	RJB - Hydro G	Available records indicate that no private water wells are present within the subject lands. Hydrogeologist will confirm and ensure that any wells that are unused will be decommissioned.
			2.1 g)	That a Record of Site Condition be required as recommended in the Pinchin report entitled 'Phase One Environmental Site Assessment' dated June 24, 2021.	PINCHIN	Noted.
			2.2	It is we recommended that the Town Hydrogeologist review and comment on the water balance assessment that was completed for this development to ensure that the pre and post development recharge of -3% is appropriate.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, no response required

Town of Erin - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Walker		3	3	Rationale	RJB - Hydro G	No Response required
			3.1	Salt Management Plan	RJB - Hydro G	
			3.1.1	Given this proposal is for single family homes, what has been suggested by RJ Burnside is acceptable for this development, once the subdivision is complete. As per CTC Source Protection Plan Policy SAL-10, however, a Salt Management Plan should be submitted and adhered to during the construction phase, until road maintenance is assumed by the Town. Further detail is required for the construction phase of the development.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, salt management plan can be prepared in consultation with builders
			3.2	Stormwater Management	RJB - Hydro G	
			3.2.1	We acknowledge that the design of SWN pond 2 is acceptable as the pond is located outside of the WHPA-A, however, we recommend that the conditions above be required to ensure that no infrastructure is proposed in the prohibited zone (within 100m of the municipal well) including emergency spillways.	RJB - Hydro G	Measures to mitigate potential impacts are proposed in Threats Disclosure Report. Threat from spill will be similar to nearby river that also crosses the WHPA-A
			3.2.2	We agree with the conclusion that the clean water pipe from the NHS south of SWM Pond 2 to the pond feature within the retained parcel, is not a drinking water threat.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, no response required
			3.3	Consolidated Linear Environmental Compliance Approvals (CLI-ECA)	RJB - Hydro G	
			3.3.1	Sanitary - We note that the applicant has outlined some enhanced design measures (higher construction for the sanitary sewer collection pipes that cross the WHPA A). This complies with the intent of the applicable policy SWG-14. It is noted that the MECP will be responsible for implementing policy SWG-13 through the Consolidated Linear Infrastructure – ECA for sanitary sewers, once issued.	DSEL	Noted
			3.3.2	Stormwater – MECP approval has been issued to the Town and the proposed pipes will be addressed through the proposed alterations process outlined in the CLI-ECA (stormwater).	DSEL	Noted.
			3.4	Private Wells and Record of Site Condition	RJB - Hydro G	
			3.4.1	Existing private wells are present and to ensure that no preferential pathways are left, there should be a condition to ensure these wells are decommissioned by a licensed well driller in accordance with Ontario Regulation 903.	RJB - Hydro G	Available records indicate that no privte water wells are present within the subject lands. Hydrogeologist will confirm and ensure that any wells that are unused will be decommissioned.
			3.4.2	The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment noted two areas of potential environmental concern on the subject property and recommended a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment be completed prior to filing of a Record of Site Condition. Neither a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment or Record of Site Condition were submitted as part of this application and should be required prior to occupancy.	PINCHIN	Noted.
	General	1	1	A CVC permit is required for the development as proposed.		Noted.
		2	2	Please include in the next submission a response matrix outlining how each of the following comments have been addressed.	Korsiak / Q4	Noted.
		3	3	Please include a draft schedule along with the draft text for the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.	Korsiak / Q4	Draft Zoning Schedule is included with the resubmission.
		4	4	The limit of all hazardous and natural features (i.e. floodplain, meander belt, Provincially Significant Wetland, top of stable slope, significant woodland) and their associated minimum buffers should be placed under an appropriate environmental/hazard protection zone and dedicated to the municipality.	Korsiak	The Village Environmental Protection (EP1) Zone category has been applied to all hazardous and natural features.
		5	5	Prior to draft plan approval, the constraint limit of the natural and hazardous features and limit of development must be established. In this regard, the following hazard limits have not been delineated on the current submission drawings and must be included on the future submission/updated drawings:	DSEL	No comment required
			5a	Top of Stable Slope (Long Term stable slope line) and top of bank associated with the tributary to the West Credit River on the southern parcel	DSEL/RJB	DSEL: The top of bank of this feature is well beyond the impacts of the development in the NHS. Furthermore, a grading block with a width between 20-50m is provided along the southern limit and provides additional setback to residential lots. RJB: All applicable ecological constraints are mapped on Figure 8 of the EIS.
			5b	The floodplain associated with the West Credit River main branch on the northern parcel	DSEL/RJB	DSEL: The floodplain is largely contained to lands external to the development. Some minor filling of the floodplain associated with the overtopping of 17 Sideroad may be required to facilite the construction of Pond 1 but is not considered a constraint to development. Given the ongoing replacement by the Town of the 17 Sideroad culverts with a bridge, as well as the proposed replacement of the 8th Line bridge, the final floodline will be coordinated during detailed design. RJB: The floodline delineation is not an ecological feature and is not depicted on Figure 8 of the EIS.
			5c	The meander belt associated with the West Credit River main branch on the northern parcel (may be located on lands adjacent to the subdivision lands)	Geomorphix/RJB	RJB: The meander belt associated with the West Credit River does not overlap with the limits of the subject property. All applicable ecological constraints are mapped on Figure 8 of the EIS.
		6	6	Further to Comment 5, a drawing should be provided which shows the limit of all natural and hazardous features, their associated buffers and the proposed limit of development and the proposed development. Further to the features on the subject properties outlined in Comment 5, additional features include: Significant Woodland, Provincially Significant West Credit River Wetland Complex, West Credit River main branch (located adjacent to the northern parcel/subdivision lands).	DSEL/RJB	RJB: All relevant ecological features, constraints and associated buffers are depicted on Figure 8 of the EIS.
	Hydrogeology - Geological Characterization and Groundwater Conditions	7	7	Note: The assessment, as undertaken has allowed for a reasonable understanding of the surficial geology, and overall groundwater movement across the site. The findings and interpretation at the site-level are satisfactory, being consistent with the accepted regional understanding of the geology, and groundwater conditions, flow direction, etc.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, no response required
		8	8	Note: Regarding the groundwater conditions, the available data reflects a spring to fall time-window and would allow for a reasonable analysis of flow direction, average groundwater elevation and high seasonal groundwater conditions.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, these items were included in the Hydrogeology Report
		9	9	Note: Since portions of the Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA-B & C) of the Town of Erin's Supply Well 8 enter the site, it would appear that policy requirements in the CTC Source Protection Plan (SPP) would apply. However, any requirements in this respect is deferred to the appropriate planning approval authority (County or Town) to review/implement, as appropriate. Any interests related to the maintenance of water balance from the CTC SPP and the CVC interest in the maintenance of water balance should be appropriately coordinated by the proponent.	RJB - Hydro G	Threats Disclosure Report has been prepared to address these issues

Town of Erin - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
	Hydrogeology - Site Level Water Balance	10	10	Based on our review, the water balance assessment and conclusions satisfactorily represents the pre- to post- alteration of pervious surfaces associated with the proposed development of the site and the analyses have been completed in an appropriate manner, applying the relevant guidance material, data sources and logical assumptions. The water balance components and results are also comparable with those obtained for other areas in the vicinity of Erin and in the West Credit Subwatershed in general.	RJB - Hydro G	Acknowledged, these items were included in the Hydrogeology Report
	Hydrogeology - Feature Based Water Balance	11	11	Given the existence of the natural features in and around the subject site (including wooded areas and Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW), a feature based water balance would be required in addition to the site-based one. The hydrogeological study suggests that groundwater flow to the PSWs is seasonal/cyclical, so a feature-specific analysis is to be completed in order to assess the hydroperiods and to ensure their maintenance during and after the development process as best as possible. This work should be undertaken using the methodology prescribed by the wetland water balance guideline developed by Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 2017 (https://trca.ca/app/uploads/2017/12/WetlandWaterBalanceRiskEvaluation_Nov2017.pdf)	DSEL / RJB - Hydro G	Noted. Please refer to Feature Based Water Balance analysis, prepared by Geo Morphix provided in Appendix H of the FSR.
	Hydrogeology - Mitigation	12	12	The pre- to post-development water balance analyses concludes that there will likely be a reduction in infiltration of 32% (47,900 m3/yr) cross the subject site in the post-development condition. To mitigate for this significant drop, the water balance analyses proposes Low Impact Development (LID) measures. The analyses and proposed mitigation is satisfactory for the site water balance; the assumptions informing the mitigation strategy have appropriately followed the guidelines and the post-development water balance with mitigation was applied/completed in accordance with the prescribed methodology. However, as provided in the comment above, the hydrogeology report should be updated to include a FBWB and its associated mitigation measures.	DSEL / RJB - Hydro G	Noted. Please refer to Feature Based Water Balance analysis, prepared by Geo Morphix is provided in Appendix H of the FSR. Hydrogeology Report will reference the FSR Appendix that includes the feature based water balance
		13	13	In the FSR, the proposed mitigation plan must be supported by design components (engineering calculations on the chosen LIDs). The FSR should contain the specific detail pertaining to the sizing and capacity of the LID measures and must reflect/match dimensions (depths, volumes, etc.) presented in the post-development (with mitigation) table.	DSEL / RJB - Hydro G	Noted. LID storage volume calculations is provided in Appendix E of the FSR. Additionally, please refer to Figure 9 of the FSR for proposed LID opportunities. Hydrogeology Report to be updated to reflect these considerations
		14	14	It is important to demonstrate that the proposed mitigation measures are practically applicable and implementable. For LID submissions, the following considerations are generally required:	DSEL / RJB - Hydro G	
			14a	LID implementation must comply with guidance issued by MECP/CVC;	DSEL / RJB - Hydro G	Noted.
			14b	The specific LID measure must be compatible with site conditions i.e. geology, soil type, groundwater elevation, etc.; and	DSEL / RJB - Hydro G	Noted.
			14c	Design specifications for the infiltration measure must meet the LID Guideline to be considered a practical solution.	DSEL / RJB - Hydro G	Noted.
	Hydrogeology - Dewatering Plan	15	15	The study has reasonably outlined a plan to ensure that construction activities and dewatering requirements are met, and that there is a reasonable consideration for MECP's guideline and separation criteria as applicable. Such a plan should identify the volume to be extracted, nature of the extraction (short term vis-à-vis long term), potential impact to the ecological features/receptors on the site, and associated monitoring and category of permit anticipated. Prior to the development of this plan, measurements should be obtained from all on-site wells to assess the water levels and verity the seasonal high groundwater elevation.	RJB - Hydro G	Hydrogeology report completed indicates groundwater is generally over 5 m deep with occasional layers with some perched water. Dewatering may only be required in areas with perched water. A dewatering study is recommended when servicing plans are available.
		16	16	It must be demonstrated that construction activities can occur without creating significant impact to the groundwater environment, and that proposed works would not result in significant alteration of the natural groundwater movement in the vicinity of a site. In respect of this, an overview of the measures to be implemented in order to meet this requirement should be provided and included in the updated report.	RJB - Hydro G	Section 6.1 of the existing report outlines standard construction measures that will mitigate potential groundwater impacts
	Engineering - Flood Hazard	17	17	Page 26 of the FSR indicates that the pond 1 is maintained above the floodplain elevation of 398.08 m. Please delineate the regulatory flood line on the drawings.	DSEL	Noted. Please refer to revised FSR Drawings and Figures.
	Engineering - Erosion Hazard	18	18	The Functional Servicing (FSR) and Stormwater Management (SWM) Report (DSEL, June 2022) appears to be proposing an increase to the erosion discharge rate above the established erosion control criteria and decreases the onsite retention volume (5mm to 3mm). The Erosion Mitigation Assessment (June 8, 2022) prepared by Geomorphix confirmed the need for 5 mm onsite retention. Please provide the required minimum 5 mm onsite retention to protect the channel downstream from erosion. Please refer to the following link: https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads//2021/06/CVC-Fluvial-G-Guide_April-2015.pdf	DSEL	The June 8, 2022 Erosion Mitigation report suggested working toward a 5 mm on-site retention target . The 5 mm target is the best-efforts target for erosion mitigation referenced from the CVC stormwater guidelines. For the following reasons the provided 3 mm of on-site retention is sufficient to mitigate against the potential of excess erosion within reach WC-1: i) Reach WC-1 is a stable reach not particularly sensitive to erosion. As detailed in the Erosion Mitigation report, Reach WC-1 is a low gradient, relatively wide stream channel that is very well connected to the extensive wetland system bordering the channel. No significant active erosion was observed within or downstream of the subject lands, and a survey of historical images of the reach indicated no significant changes in channel planform. These site characteristics suggest that reach WC-1 is stable and not particularly sensitive to erosion. ii) The relatively small development footprint relative to the reach WC-1 drainage area. The drainage area of WC-1 is approximately 3,570 ha (as defined using the OWIT assessment tool). The drainage area to WC-1 via the site is approximately 55 ha of which 46 ha is on the subject lands. The drainage area of the subject lands accounts for approximately 1.3% of the total drainage area to reach WC-1. Developments with such relatively small development footprints are not likely to have any meaningful impact on the rates of erosion within the receiving watercourses. iii) All the site's existing wetland and forested areas will be retained which includes approximately 12.3 ha of forests, wetlands, and wetland buffer areas which account for approximately 27% of the drainage area from the subject lands. A Feature-based Water Balance for the wetlands conveying runoff from the site to the wetland complex adjacent to reach WC-1 indicates that annual runoff volumes to the wetland complex will increase by 8% but that peak monthly runoff volumes which occur during the month of April will be reduced by approximately 12%. All individual wetlands on site are within +/- 5% of pre-development targets. We therefore expect there to be a slight reduction in erosion potential related to reduced spring runoff volumes from the site. Within this context, the provided 3mm in on-site retention is expected to be sufficient to reduce the risk of excess erosion at reach WC-1 as the assimilative capacity of the receiving channel is adequate given the expected hydrological changes associated with the development. Given the size of the receiving watercourse, it

Town of Erin - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
	Engineering - Meander Belt Study	19	19	The portion of the West Credit River that traverses adjacent to the north-east side of the site (adjacent to Block 20 – SWM Block) is unconfined in nature and it requires to complete a meander belt study. Please retain a qualified fluvial geomorphologist to provide an erosion hazard/meander belt assessment for the proposed development.	Geo Morphix	In January 2020, GEO Morphix completed a geomorphological assessment and meander belt width delineation for the portion of the Credit River immediately downstream of the subject property. Based on site observations, a review of aerial imagery, and the Technical Guidelines outlined by the MNR (2002) for delineating the meander belt width within unconfined systems, a meander belt width of 44.6 m was recommended for the West Credit River (Reach CR1) immediately downstream of 8th Line. This recommended meander belt width includes a 20% factor of safety. Extension of the previously delineated meander belt width upstream of 8th line indicates that the limits of the meander belt would with lie entirely within the boundaries of the wetland located adjacent to the site and at the corner of 8th line and Sideroad 17. Please refer to letter justifying the applicability of the previously defined meander belt width for the portion of the Credit River upstream of 8th line and relevance of studies in support of lands adjacent to the proposed development prepared by GEO Morphix.
	Engineering - Long Term Slope Line (LTSSL) and Top of Bank delineation (Slope Hazard)	20	20			
			20a	Groundwater is to be considered within the geotechnical assessment assuming groundwater to be 1-2 m below grade (elevated conditions) unless groundwater monitoring is completed.	Shad / RJB Hydro G	Groundwater monitoring has been completed and data provided in previous report, subsequent measurements in 2023 have confirmed the previous records
			20b	In accordance with CVC's Slope Stability Definition & Determination Guideline, a minimum factor of safety of 1.5 is to be used within the analysis for normal conditions. A factor of safety of 1.3 is to be used for elevated groundwater conditions (temporary or seasonal conditions presented on site after heavy rainfall event).	Shad / RJB Hydro G	Noted.
			20c	Geotechnical engineer is to confirm additional design considerations for the proposed development, if any.	Shad / RJB Hydro G	Noted. The geotechnical engineering will be engaged throughout the detailed design and construction process to provide input to design considerations as necessary.
			20d	Delineate the LTSSL and the stable top of bank on a drawing. This limit is to be included on other submission drawings as well.	Shad / RJB Hydro G	There is no top of bank within the development limits of the lands. The top of bank of the southern feature is well beyond the impacts of the development in the NHS. Furthermore, a grading block with a width between 20-50m is provided along the southern limit and provides additional setback to residential lots. All applicable environmental constraints are mapped on Figure 8 of the EIS.
	Engineering - Stormwater Management Facility - Constructed Wetland Design	21	21	The following are comments related to the design of the stormwater management (SWM) Facility 1 & 2:	DSEL	
			21a	Please confirm whether partial blockage of the outlet was considered within the design assuming 50% blockage.	DSEL	Under 50% blockage of the outlet controls, the Regional pond levels are below the top of berm elevation. The 20 m long emergency overflow weir in Pond 2 was sized to achieve this outcome; however, note that the Regional water level in Pond 1 is below the elevation of the emergency overflow weir, even under these emergency conditions. This is because the elevations of the emergency spillways are set by the adjacent road elevations. Instead, the top of the outlet control structure, even under 50% blockage as assumed above, provides emergency conveyance. Nonetheless, in order to provide emergency overflow conveyance separate from the outlet control structure, a 20 m long emergency overflow weir is also proposed for Ponds 1 and 2.
			21b	Outfall design: In accordance with CVC's stormwater management criteria, the outlet invert should be located above the 25-year water level in the channel. Otherwise, a tailwater influence must be accounted for in the sizing of the SWM facility. Please confirm that proposed SWM facility design considered this design criterion.	DSEL	The Pond 1 and Pond 2 outfalls to the West Credit River are located at HEC-RAS cross-sections 12075.12 and 11808.34, respectively, per the April 2020 WestCreditRiver model by R.J. Burnside and Associates Ltd. Based on the channel hydraulics prepared by R.J. Burnside, the respective Pond 1 outlet 25-year flood level is 396.30 m, and the Regional flood level is 396.99 m. Pond 1 has been designed to consider the restrictive downstream Regional flood level. At the Pond 2 outfall, the 25-year flood level is 395.76 m, and the Regional flood level is 396.55 m. As the permanent pool of the pond is above the Regional flood level, it does not impact the performance of the pond.
			21c	Please provide details of the quality/quantity control outlet structures on the drawings.	DSEL	Details regarding pond structures will be provided at detailed design.
		22	22	Based on design criteria established within the FSR, both SWM ponds are considered constructed wetlands. For wetlands, MOE manual 2003 requires permanent pool depth of 150 mm to 300 mm (Table 4.7). As per Figure 8 in FSR, SWM Facility 2 shows the permanent pool depth of 1 m (403m-402m) while Facility 1 shows the depth of 300 mm (395.50m-395.20m. Please confirm the compliance of the permanent pool depth for constructed wetland facility 1 and 2. Also be consistent with labelling the facilities (constructed wetlands vs. SWM Ponds).	DSEL	Respective permanent pool depths are 0.3m for both Pond 1 and 2 as illustrated on FSR Figures 7 and 8. The FSR has been revised to refer to SWM facilities as constructed wetlands, however facilities are informally referred to as SWM Ponds on FSR Figures and the Draft Plan.
		23	23	Please provide the geotechnical analysis completed in support of the proposed SWM facilities and the LID measures. Confirm any recommendations provided regarding the groundwater level and the need for clary liner.	DSEL/Shad	Soils assessment will be completed at detailed design in support of proposed LIDs.
		24	24	Details of the outfall designs for SWM Facility 1 and 2 should be included with the detailed design submission including design drawings and the associated calculations.	DSEL	Noted.
		25	25	With the detailed design, please provide the cross-section view of the pond across the inflow and outflow locations.	DSEL	Noted.
		26	26	Please provide a summary table with peak flows analyses for various storm events through hydrologic analysis.	DSEL	Please refer to FSR Tables 8-3 and 8-4 for a summary pond operating characteristics. Additional information is provided within FSR Appendix G.
	Engineering - LID Strategy and Site Water Balance	27	27	The following are commends related to LID requirements within the proposed development:	DSEL	
			27a	Section 9.2 LID measures indicates that the onsite retention of minimum 5 mm cannot be achieved due to the site constraints. If 5 mm retention is not viable, 25 mm detention through SWM ponds can be coupled to achieve the required erosion threshold flow rate. Please satisfy the minimum required erosion mitigation as suggested by Geomorphologic study.	DSEL	Please refer to response to Engineering Erosion Hazard Comment 18 above.
			27b	Please provide engineering calculations in support of site based and feature based water balance.	DSEL	Noted. Site wide water balance and feature based water balance analysis is provided within FSR Appendix H and L respectively.
			27c	Please note that additional construction and design details will be required during the detailed design stage.	DSEL	Noted.

Town of Erin - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Credit Valley Conservation - Annie Li			27d	The calculations should include details of infiltration rates and drawdown time analysis in accordance with MECP requirements.	DSEL	Noted. Infiltration facility detailed parameters will be provided at detailed at detailed design.
			27e	The calculations should include groundwater level within the proposed gallery locations.	DSEL	Noted. Infiltration facility detailed parameters will be provided at detailed at detailed design.
			27f	A factor of safety must be considered within the LID calculations.	DSEL	Noted. Infiltration facility detailed parameters will be provided at detailed at detailed design.
			27g	Loss factor for the LIDs at the backyard must also be considered in calculations.	DSEL	Noted. Infiltration facility detailed parameters will be provided at detailed at detailed design.
		28	28	Approval from the municipality is required for the LID locations.	DSEL	Noted.
	Engineering - Feature Based Water Balance	29	29	It looks like Feature Based Water Balance for wetlands C, D, E and F will end up in cascading effect on these wetlands. When flows are directed through one wetland to the other, the following wetlands may not receive the same volume of flows. Pre-development drainage areas for wetland C, E, E and F is 20.77 ha (Figure 10, FSR) while the post development drainage area ads up to 8.55ha (Figure 11, FSR) only. We understand that there is a third pipe system (Roof Drainage Collection) involved in replenishing wetlands. Please provide detailed calculations to show the pre-development flows to each wetland is maintained at the post development conditions too.	DSEL/Geo Morphix	Pre to post development feature based water balance results are presented in the Feature Based Water Balance Assessment prepared by Geo Morphix provided in FSR Appendix H. As summarized with the Feature Based Water Balance Assessment wetlands A-F are within +/-5% pre development annual volumes. Similarly off-site pond features are within +/-10% pre development annual volumes.
	Engineering - Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC)	30	30	Please note that the stage ESC plans, temporary flow diversion plan and construction staging plans will be required during the detailed design stage of the proposed development.	DSEL	Noted.
		31	31	The following are the general requirements for the ESC plan during detailed design:		
			31a	The detailed design should include an ESC monitoring program specific to the subject property as specified in the EIS.	DSEL/Geo Morphix	Noted.
			31b	Please confirm who will be responsibility for monitoring ESC measures during active construction. The Qualified Environmental Inspector shall inspect, suggest and confirm the ESC repairs.	DSEL/Geo Morphix	Noted.
			31c	There are a number of LID measures being proposed within the subject development. Please include additional details/discussion within the ESC report as to how these areas will be protected during active construction.	DSEL/Geo Morphix	Noted.
	Engineering - Conceptual Grading Plan	32	32	The following are commends related to the Conceptual Grading Plan completed by DSEL dated June 2022:		
			32a	Drawing 5: Section 1A-1A shows grade changes adjacent to the West Credit River on the east side of Eighth Line. Please confirm if there will be any change in grading within the CVC Regulated Area. Please show the location of the creek on this cross section.	DSEL	The existing Bridge 9 culvert is proposed to be replaced and widened on behalf of the Town, however Bridge 9 works are separate to those associated to the Draft Plan. Due to the road widening, there will be minor adjustments to the grading adjacent to Eighth Line, however CVC approval will be obtained prior to the commencement of works. This comment is acknowledged, however details will be provided at detailed design of the culvert upgrade.
			32b	Drawing 6: It illustrates cut and fill activities closer to the regulated slope. Please show the long-term stable slope line (LTSSL) determined by a geotechnical professional and the top of bank on the drawing.	SHAD / DSEL	There is no top of bank within the development limits of the lands. The top of bank of the southern feature is well beyond the impacts of the development in the NHS. Furthermore, a grading block with a width between 20-50m is provided along the southern limit and provides additional setback to residential lots.
	Engineering - Outfall and 17th Side Road Crossing Design	33	33	The following comments are to be addressed:		
			33a	As per section 10.1 of the FSR, 8th Line is proposed to be widened and urbanized. Please provide further details on the existing culvert on 8th Line, whether it will be replaced to accommodate widening.	DSEL	The existing Bridge 9 culvert is proposed to be replaced and widened on behalf of the Town, however Bridge 9 works are separate to those associated to the Draft Plan. This comment is acknowledged, however details will be provided at detailed design of the culvert upgrade.
			33b	Outfall design at the watercourse should also be submitted for our review.	DSEL	Details regarding the outfall will be provided at detailed design in tandem with the Bridge 9 structural details and restoration works. Details will be provided at detailed design of the culvert upgrade.
			33c	Erosion protection for the outfall and grading within the CVC Regulated Area should also be confirmed.	DSEL	Details regarding the outfall will be provided at detailed design in tandem with the Bridge 9 structural details and restoration works. Details will be provided at detailed design of the culvert upgrade.
	Engineering - Operational and Maintenance of SWM Features and LID Measures	34	34	Operation and maintenance manuals (OMMs) were not included within the circulation package. It is unclear whether OMMs were completed in support of the pond and LID features being proposed within the development.	DSEL	Operations and Maintenance Manuals (OMM) will be provided at detailed design.
	Engineering - Hydrologic Analysis	35	35	Please include schematic for existing and proposed scenarios of hydrologic modelling.	DSEL	SWM modelling files in support of the FSR have been provided in FSR Appendix G.
		36	36	Provide a summary table that includes the hydrologic parameters used.	DSEL	Modelling parameters are provided in model output files in FSR Appendix G.
	Engineering - Hydraulic Model Update	37	37	It is mentioned in the FSR that there was a bridge 11 hydraulic report done. Was there a hydraulic model update prepared for this development that includes crossings on 17th Side Road and 8th Line? Please provide details of the associated crossings for this subdivision.	DSEL	Noted. The current Bridge 11 hydraulic model has been used to verify water levels within West Credit. In support of future Bridge 9 improvements, the hydraulic model will be updated respectively. Note the bridge crossing is outside the draft plan and will be addressed separately.
		38	38	The proposed development will have an impact on the hydrologic function of the wetlands on site and as such mitigations have been proposed to address site water balance and feature based water balance (FBWB). Ideally the draft plan would be updated to ensure a low risk scenario that relies on minimal mitigation. Mitigation for any minor and unavoidable impacts should be proposed and it should be demonstrated that the mitigations are feasible given the site constraints.	Burnside/DSEL	RJB: Acknowledged. The water balance analysis demonstrates that hydrological regimes and hydroperiods will be maintained in the post-development scenario. Please see Section 9.5 of the EIS and Section 9.3 of the FSR (2023).

Town of Erin - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
			38a	Note that any infrastructure approved to achieve FBWB may have direct impacts on the wetlands (e.g. outfalls). Please ensure impacts are assessed and follow the mitigation hierarchy.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Per Section 9.5 of the EIS, determination of wetland sensitivity referenced TRCA's Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation (2017). TRCA's criteria was used to evaluate the sensitivity of the wetland to hydrological change and the overall risk assignment (magnitude of hydrological change and sensitivity of the wetlands) for each of the three wetland locations as shown in Table 23 of the EIS. GEO Morphix's FBWB Assessment (October 2023) outlines measures for minor and unavoidable impacts to achieve a low risk scenario for post-development water balances to the features According to Section 9.0 of the FSR (2023), several low impact development strategies (LIDs) are recommended to promote additional infiltration and to reduce runoff volumes under post-development conditions. Impacts will be assessed further when we have details on outfalls during DD, etc.
		39	39	Results of the CVC landscape connectively research supports the identification in the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) regarding priority linkage areas on site in the northern and southern portions of the subject lands. Ideally these areas would be enhanced relative to existing condition and be a sufficient width to promote a linkage function (e.g. 50 m).	Burnside	Per Section 8.0 of the EIS and Section 11.6 of the FSR (2023), the Open Space Block that serves as the southern linkage from the pond to the tunnel will be 15 m wide; an increase from previous lot width of 10 m. Research suggests that a corridor width of 15 m will provide adequate habitat for amphibians (target species) using corridors as a travel lane or for food, nesting or escape cover. While several locations in this area were considered, the tunnel was ultimately shifted to its current location to accommodate the slotted, shorter tunnel design, while maintaining a direct linkage to the NHS and minimizing crossing length and retaining walls. This location is most suitable, as alternative locations (i.e., further east) would require extensive retaining walls.
			39a	The matrix of softer land use changes within the northern linkage is supported (i.e. open space and SWM). It would be beneficial to have defined pathways for dispersal (e.g. swales) within the northern linkage areas as mown park can still represent barriers to species dispersal and SWM ponds can result in ecological traps.	Burnside/DSEL	RJB: Per Section 8.0 and Table 25 - Wildlife Linkages and Corridors, the SWM ponds will be designed to meet the Town and MECP's criteria. Connectivity between the ponds and suitable natural habitats in the surroundings can be enhanced by vegetation management and by following CVC's guidelines: - SWM Guideline (2022) - SWM Planting Guidelines (2014) - Plant Selection Guideline (2018) Additionally, SWM Ponds and park will be landscaped with native species. Proposed plantings within the SWM Pond will not be maintained by Town staff with exception to around the maintenance access road. The proposed park block will be maintained by the Town, however detailed design of the park will be provided at detailed design.
			39ai	A park management plan should be developed to identify no mowing areas, etc. that will enhance connectivity	Burnside	Acknowledged. This verbiage has been added to the EIS Table 25 - Wildlife Linkages and Corridors; it will be addressed in detailed design.
			39aii	A SWM pond maintenance plan should be developed to ensure impacts to any wildlife that use the feature are avoided. Please see the following guidance document: https://sustainabletechnologies.ca/app/uploads/2016/05/MNRF-2016-Guidance-for-SWMF-cleanouts.pdf	Burnside	Citation of document has been added to the EIS report, Table 25 - Significant Wildlife Habitat, Wildlife Linkages and Corridors
			39b	Regarding the southern linkage the proposed mitigation of wildlife crossing appears feasible to address some concerns regarding Street E. However, the lot matrix still appears to represent a significant barrier relative to existing conditions and does not appear to address the constraints on site (e.g. Significant Wildlife Habitat). As with the northern linkage it should be demonstrated that connectively is enhanced and that dispersal will not be impacted, including beyond the road crossing itself (e.g. ensure there is a designated green space/stewardship linkage area that will permit and funnel dispersal and will not result in barriers to species movement). Please update the Draft Plan to ensure landscape connectivity is maintained and enhanced.	Burnside	Per Section 8.0 of the EIS and Section 11.6 of the FSR (2023), the Open Space Block that serves as the southern linkage from the pond to the tunnel has been shifted to its current location so that it connects directly with the NHS (and pond) and reduces the distance amphibians will need to travel from the pond to the tunnel to ensure landscape connectivity is maintained and enhanced. See also comment 39 and 39bi, and updated Draft Plan.
			39bi	Note that wildlife crossings are generally only successful when used as a system complete with exclusion fencing to guide wildlife to the crossing. Please see the CVC Fish and Wildlife Crossing Guideline: https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads//2021/06/CVC-Fish-and-Wildlife-Crossing-Guidelines-final-web.pdf	Burnside	Acknowledged. Exclusion fencing will be used to guide wildlife to the crossing following the principles in CVC's Fish and Wildlife Crossing Guidelines This document was referenced in the EIS but the report has been updated to highlight the need for fencing (see Table 25 - Wildlife Linkages and Corridors).
	Ecology	40	40	The West Credit River contains an important ecological and recreational coldwater fishery. Discharge of SWM from the development has potential to impact the quality of the watercourse. Please confirm that all attempts at mitigation (e.g. bottom draws for thermal mitigation) have been considered for implementation.	DSEL	RJB: The EIS report recognizes that the Upper Reaches of the Credit River are managed as cold water Brook Trout habitat. Therefore, thermal mitigation measures will be applied (where feasible) to limit potential thermal impacts to the West Credit River. Per Section 9.4 of the EIS and Section 8.9 of the FSR (2023), the application of thermal mitigation measures will be further investigated at the detailed design stage and may include ponds discharging through a buried outlet pipe, vegetative shading of surface water with landscape material, increasing riparian vegetation via detailed landscape plans of the SWM blocks, and ensuring ponds outlet via a reverse graded pipe provided in a deep pool below the pond bottom.
		41	41	Significant amounts of grading are proposed within the buffer to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) which has potential to both directly and indirectly impact these features. Please ensure all attempts at minimizing encroachment has been made. All grades within buffer areas are to be returned to existing.	Burnside	The EIS report Section 9.2 and Section 10.0 Table 25 states that grading into the NHS has been minimized to only what is required to facilitate the proposed development; however, there are specific locations where encroachments are proposed in order to meet the challenging existing grades. While grading is permanent, impacts are temporary and will be an improvement from existing conditions where the land has been historically disturbed due to intensive farming practices and is significantly degraded. Therefore, no long-term net effects are anticipated; the restoration of the buffers in these locations represents a net benefit and will be enhanced with a native seed mix and conveyed into public use.
			41a	Phased timing is strongly encouraged as another method of mitigation for buffer encroachment. Grading around the NHS should be completed in the dormant season (e.g. November – February).	Burnside	Noted. Currently the existing buffers to NHS features are either agricultural fields or degraded communities featuring many invasive non-native species and even discarded farm equipment and debris. Verbiage has been added to the EIS report - Table 25 - Vegetation Communities that grading in the NHS during the dormant season is encouraged where feasible.

Town of Erin - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
			41b	A qualified arborist should be on site during grading activities adjacent to the NHS to ensure that mitigations (e.g. root cutting, pruning) are done correctly and without injury to the NHS.	Burnside	Note that tree protection fencing will be erected prior to grading activities; verbiage has been added to the EIS report Table 25 - Vegetation Communities that for dates when root cutting/pruning are occurring a qualified arborist should be on site to advise and supervise. Weekly inspections of the protection fencing may be recommended adjacent to the woodland features during grading works.
			41c	A soil management plan should be developed to restore the buffer to conditions that will support vegetation growth. Please see the CVC Healthy Soils Guideline: https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads//2021/06/CVC-Healthy-Soils-Guidelines-NHS-Web-V5.pdf for recommendations.	Burnside	Citation of document has been added to the EIS report, Table 25 - Vegetation Communities
			41d	An environmental professional should be on site to help relocate any species encountered while conducting works within buffer areas.	Burnside	Note this is found in EIS Table 25 - Wildlife and General Wildlife Habitat and Significant Wildlife Habitat
			41e	All grading impacts are to be returned to existing conditions or better.	Burnside	Per EIS report Section 9.2: - while grading is permanent, impacts are temporary and will be an improvement from existing conditions where the land has been historically disturbed due to intensive farming practices and is significantly degraded. - Section 10.0, Table 25: Grading encroachments into NHS buffers are to be enhanced with a native seed mix and conveyed into public use. They are not to be incorporated into the back of residential lots or ROWs. Per Town standards, lots adjacent to open space require fencing.
		42	42	The NHS buffers are currently in a degraded state and should be enhanced through the proposed development. Please provide high level design targets (species assemblages, soils, densities) to help inform the detailed design process. Plantings should be designed to create a defined layered edge that will discourage encroachment (e.g. living fencing, cedar rail, etc.).	Burnside	Per EIS report Table 25 - Vegetation Communities, the NHS buffers are to be established as a non-mowing area, with native self-sustaining vegetation. Grading encroachments into NHS buffers are to be enhanced with a native seed mix and conveyed into public use. These locations will be restored to existing or better conditions. Common Buckthorn is present in some of the vegetation communities. To reduce its spread and minimize its impact, the report recommends removing sapling sized Buckthorn shrubs (i.e., 1 to 9 cm dbh) capable of producing fruit that are found along woodland/wetland edges, where feasible.
			42a	As per the EIS the buffers are to remain off lot and outside of the municipal right of way. It is recommended that the rear lots adjacent to the NHS buffer also be fenced to deter encroachment.	Burnside	This is addressed in the EIS report Table 25 - Vegetation Communities, Wetlands and Provincially Significant Wetlands states “Rear yards that abut the NHS will be fenced to limit encroachments.” And “Per Town standards, lots adjacent to open space require fencing.”
		43	43	There is a proposed open cut of the NHS to accommodate linear infrastructure. Please confirm whether directional drilling is feasible at this location instead.	Burnside	While directional drilling is technically feasible, open cut is the preferred method in this location. The Town’s peer reviewer, Greg Scheifele from GWS Ecological & Forestry Services Inc, conducted a site walk on August 24th 2022. During that time, he inspected the area where the open cut is proposed and agreed that no significant habitat or natural features would be damaged. Town's peer reviewer comment #10 states: “Based on my site inspection this wetland area represents an early successional community that can be easily restored to its original condition following disturbance. No significant plants or wildlife were reported inhabiting this area. I therefore have no concerns with this proposed temporary wetland intrusion. However, a detailed rehabilitation plan must be prepared for this area and it must be effectively implemented.”
			43a	The EIS indicated the alignment will generally follow and existing laneway; if open cut methods are approved this area should be restored to return hydrologic connectively between wetland units.	Burnside	Per the EIS report Table 25 - Vegetation Communities, a seed mix and rehabilitation plan will be prepared for the area impacted by the open cut during the detailed design stage. Hydrologic connectivity between wetland units will be restored to existing conditions.
		44	44	EIS lot lines through the mapped NHS including Provincially Significant Wetland to retain some of the land. The proposed ‘land to be retained’ are highly constrained. Please discuss whether there is an opportunity for these lands to be used as a restoration/stewardship block.	Burnside	Please clarify the first sentence, some words appear to be missing. The "lands to be retained" are being used (and will continue to be used) as a principal residence for Mr. Langen; they are not available for use as a restoration/stewardship block. RJB has provided additional clarity in the EIS report/figures.
		45	45	Considerations for community trails should ensure that trails avoid encroachment into the NHS; where trails are considered adjacent to the NHS buffer should be expanded to accommodate the trail encroachment.	Burnside	Trails were not reviewed as part of the EIS (details were not available). Buffers will not be expanded to accommodate trail encroachment at this site as any proposed trails will likely be routed in existing agricultural lands, which make up the bulk of the setbacks. Native seed mix can be used adjacent to the trail to promote revegetation in these areas.
	CVC Review Fee	1	1	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.		Noted

MATTAMY & COSCORP - 5520 & 5552 Eighth Line Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning - 1st Submission Comment Response Matrix (Z22-06, Z22-07, 23T-22003, 23T-22004)						
County of Wellington Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Response By**	**Response**
Wellington Road Division Peer Reviewer - Dillon Consulting , Shahram Almasi	TIS - Introduction and Subject Development Study Area	1	1.1	The proposed development is situated on the west side of 8th Line between Sideroad 17 and Dundas Street West. The lands are proposed to be redeveloped into a residential subdivision featuring 392 single family homes and 116 townhomes. A new local road connection at 8th Line as well as on Sideroad Seventeen are being proposed.	RVA	Comment noted.
			1.2	Both subdivisions are anticipated to be complete in 2024, and the traffic forecasts considered traffic volumes immediately following build-out (2024) as well as five-years following build-out (2029).	RVA	Comment noted.
			1.3	The study assessed traffic operations during the weekday AM and weekday PM peak hour periods, which would correspond to a commuter traffic pattern. This is an appropriate assumption given the proposed land use and the surrounding context.	RVA	Comment noted.
			1.4	Operational analysis was completed at nine existing/proposed intersections within the Study Area as follows: - Sideroad 17 at Future Street "C" (Site Access); - 8th Line at Future Street "E" (Site Access); - 8th Line and Sideroad 17; - 8th Line and Erin Heights; - 8th Line and Dundas Street West; - 8th Line and Wellington County Road 124; - Dundas Street West and Main Street (WR 124); - Shamrock Road (WR 23) and Main Street (WR 124); and, - Sideroad 17 and Trafalgar Road (WR 24).	RVA	Comment noted.
			1.5	These existing and future intersections as identified in the Study Area are appropriate in the context of this study as it considers all collector roadways leading to the arterial roadway (Main Street (WR 124)).	RVA	Comment noted.
	TIS - Existing Traffic Conditions	2	2.1	Turning movement volumes were collected in September 2021. Traffic volumes were not grown due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which is acceptable based on the time frame of the data collection. Peak hours were determined to be at 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM in the morning and 4:00 PM to 5:00 PM in the afternoon, which is typical of a commuter travel pattern.	RVA	Comment noted.
			2.2	When comparing the traffic count turning movement data to Figures 2-1 as well as to the Synchro files, it appears that the traffic volumes have been entered correctly, including heavy vehicle percentages. The data provided was insufficient to verify peak hour factors or whether signal timings were entered correctly. However, it is assumed they are entered correctly and that the results are valid.	RVA	Comment noted.
			2.3	The existing conditions analysis indicates that all movements operated acceptably (at LOS A through LOS C) during both the AM and PM peak hours and that the signalized intersection operates at LOS B overall.	RVA	Comment noted.
	TIS - Future Background Traffic Conditions	3	3.1	A proposed residential subdivision development is planned within the Study Area, which will replace the existing golf course. The planned development will consist of 197 detached homes and 91 townhomes and will be fully built by the 2024 horizon year. Two proposed local road accesses will be provided along 8th Line.	RVA	Comment noted.
			3.2	The report indicates that the trips generated by the existing Golf Course were subtracted from the future background volumes, since any trips generated by the Golf Course would be captured in the existing traffic counts. It is understood that traffic volumes were collected at the Golf Course driveways and these current volumes to/from the driveway were removed from the future background traffic volumes.	RVA	Given the low traffic volumes generated by the golf course, for the revised TIS provided we have left these trips with the network as their impacts to intersection operations would be negligble.
			3.3	The study also applied an annual growth rate of 1% to all turning movements to forecast future 2024 and 2029 background growth volumes. The growth rate was determined in consultation with Town and County staff.	RVA	Comment noted.
	TIS - Trip Generation and Distribution	4	4.1	The study used the ITE Trip Generation Manual (11th Edition) to determine the number of trips generated by the development to be included as part of the future background analysis. There were 330 trips generated during the AM peak period and 434 trips generated during the PM Peak period. The number of generated trips is correct.	RVA	Comment noted.
			4.2	The trips were then distributed and assigned to the network based on the Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) data. This methodology is appropriate; however, based on Table 3-2 and Table 4-2 of the report, 38% of trips are indicated to the south. It is recommended that the consultant review the two tables noted above and update the street names, i.e., Highway 52 and Highway 23 to reflect the street names used in the remainder of the report. Although the assigned volumes appear reasonable in the figures, the consultant should review the distribution tables to ensure they are aligned. It should be noted that 8th Line between Dundas Street and WR 124 is unpaved. Based on the existing volumes on the roadway it is unlikely that a large percentage of motorists would take an unpaved roadway. A portion of these trips should be routed to the Main Street (WR 124) corridor southbound.	RVA	Table 4-2 has been revised within the updated TIS. The assignment of site generated traffic has also been revised as to not utilize the unpaved section of Eighth line.
	TIS - Future Total Traffic Conditions	5	5.1	The future total traffic conditions were calculated by summing the future background volumes and the future site generated traffic volumes. This was verified to be calculated correctly.	RVA	Comment noted.
	TIS - Capacity Analysis	6	6.1	The results of the capacity analysis indicate that all Study Area intersections operate acceptably with no capacity, delay, or queuing concerns. The study did not find any deficiencies resulting from the development. The capacity analysis should be revised if trips are reassigned away from 8th Line between Dundas Street and WR 124.	RVA	Capacity analysis has been revised as part of the updated TIS to reflect the reassignment of site trips from the unpaved section of Eighth Line.
	TIS - Left-Turn Lane Warrants	7	7.1	The left-turn lane warrants were undertaken using the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) left-turn lane warrant criteria for unsignalized intersections. This is an acceptable methodology. The report states that, although left-turn lanes are warranted in 2029, the subject intersections will operate well without the left-turn lanes implemented based on the Synchro analysis. This is reasonable since the left-turn lanes are on the cusp of being warranted. The municipality should monitor the traffic operations and implement left-turn lanes when warranted.	RVA	Left turn warrant analysis has been revised for Wellington Road 124 at Eight Line and on Trafalgar Road at Sideroad 17 as part of the updated TIS to reflect a 100 km/hr. Design speed.
	TIS - Signal Warrants	8	8.1	The signal warrants were undertaken using the Ontario Traffic Manual (Book 12) methodology, which is acceptable. However, Justification 7 was not completed as part of the warrant analysis. It is recommended to use Justification 7 (projected volumes) for the warrant.	RVA	Signal warrant analysis has been revised in the updated report based on Justification 7.
	TIS - Additional Comments	9	9.1	The intersection of the Site Access and Sideroad 17 is located in close proximity to the intersection of Sideroad 17 and 8th Line, which runs north of Sideroad 17. The intersections are negatively off-set and may create future operational issues when eastbound and/or westbound left turn lanes are required to accommodate traffic volumes. The site access is close to warranting a westbound left turn lane at the future 2029 horizon year.	RVA	Comment noted.
			9.2	Potential solutions could include: - Realign Street C to align with 8th Line; - Consider a future realignment of 8th Line to align with Street C; and, - Consider future left-turn restrictions.	Korsiak/RVA	Site access as noted above is pushed as far away from intersection as possible. To align Street C and 8th Line Street C would need to punch through the pond and non participants.
			9.3	The issue of alignment between Street C and 8th Line should be considered within the traffic study. It should be noted that 8th Line may not carry significant traffic volumes today; however, future developments could impact its future operation, especially if and when paved. Our preference would be to provide a minimum of 100 metres (centreline to centreline) between the two roadways.	Korsiak/RVA	The distance from the edge of Street C and Eighth Line is 110m (CL to CL). This has been addressed in the TIS.
	TIS - Empire Subdivision	10	10.1	A high-level review of the Empire Subdivision TIS confirmed that the future total volumes are consistent with the Mattamy and Coscorp Subdivisions TIS. As noted previously, both studies included each other as a background development.	RVA	Comment noted.
			10.2	The proposed Empire Subdivision is located at the current Erin Heights Golf Course, which is a nine-hole golf course located on the east side of 8th Line. The associated traffic of the golf course was subtracted from the total traffic volumes to avoid double counting, which is appropriate. The trips being generated by the golf course were determined through ITE trip generation rates as opposed to undertaking counts at the site driveways and it was confirmed the trip generation calculations were completed correctly. Although it would have been preferred to obtain counts at the site driveways, the trip generation methodology is sufficient.	RVA	Comment noted.
			10.3	The comments provided above within the Mattamy and Coscorp Subdivisions TIS section would also apply to the Empire Subdivision TIS. No further comments are required.	RVA	Comment noted.
	TIS - Peer Review Summary	11	11.1	The following represents Dillon's summary of the findings of this peer review exercise, noting these comments would generally apply to both studies developed by RVA:	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.1a	The Study Area intersections chosen for the analysis was appropriate given the context of the study and land use;	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.1b	The study also applied an annual growth rate of 1% to all turning movements to forecast future 2024 and 2029 background growth volumes. The growth rate was determined in consultation with Town and County staff;	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.1c	The study used the ITE Trip Generation Manual (11th Edition) to determine the trips generated by the development to be included as part of the future background analysis. There were 330 trips generated during the AM peak period and 434 trips generated during the PM Peak period. This has been confirmed to be calculated correctly;	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.1d	Based on Table 3-2 and Table 4-2 of the report, 38% of trips were destined southbound on a roadway called Highway 52, noting that no provincial highways are in the Study Area. In addition, this corridor is not listed as an existing roadway in Section 2.1. The roadway names in the two tables should be updated and the distributions confirmed, noting that 8th Line is an unpaved roadway;	RVA	Please see response to comment no. 4.2
			11.1e	Based on the existing volumes on the roadway it is unlikely that a large percentage of motorists would travel along the unpaved 8th Line. A portion of these trips should be routed to Main Street (WR 124) through Erin;	RVA	Please see response to comment no. 4.2
			11.1f	The future total traffic conditions were calculated by summing the future background volumes and the future site generated traffic volumes. This is verified to be calculated correctly;	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.1g	The results of the capacity analysis discussion indicate that all Study Area intersections operate acceptably with no capacity, delay, or queuing concerns. The study does not identify any deficiencies resulting from the development. The capacity analysis may need to be revised should some trips heading south on the unpaved roadway (8th Line) be re-assigned to Main Street (WR 124) southbound;	RVA	Please see response to comment no. 6.1
			11.1h	The left-turn lane warrants were undertaken using the MTO left-turn lane warrant criteria for unsignalized intersections. This is an acceptable methodology;	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.1i	The report states that although left-turn lanes are warranted in 2029, the Synchro analysis indicates that the subject intersections will operate well without the left-turn lanes; implemented. This is reasonable since the left-turn lanes are on the cusp of being warranted or not warranted. The municipality should monitor traffic volumes and implement left-turn lanes when warranted;	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.1j	The consultant should comment on the Sideroad 17 intersection off-set between the Site Access and 8th Line. The municipality should consider the future impact of the off-set alignment. It is recommended that the site access be aligned with 8th Line or be off-set no less than 100 metres away;	RVA	See 9.2 above.
			11.1k	The signal warrants were undertaken using the Ontario Traffic Manual (Book 12) methodology, which is acceptable. However, Justification 7 was not completed as part of the warrant analysis. It is recommended to use Justification 7 (projected volumes) for the warrant; and,	RVA	Please see response to comment no. 8.1
			11.1l	The high-level review of the Empire Subdivision TIS confirmed that the future total volumes are consistent with the Mattamy and Empire Subdivisions TIS. Both studies included each other as a background development.	RVA	Comment noted.
			11.2	A revised Transportation Impact Study and/or subsequent addendum(s) addressing the noted comments may need to be prepared and submitted, although the overall findings and development of these two studies are found to be correct.	RVA	Comment noted.

County of Wellington, Meagan Ferris - Manager of Planning and Environment	Density and Mix of Housing	1	a	The subject lands are located within the Town's designated greenfield area, as such Section 4.4.4 of the County Official Plan has been reviewed. This section speaks to requiring new development to achieve densities that promote the overall greenfield density targets of 40 persons and jobs per hectare. This is specifically achieved by requiring a minimum 16 units per gross residential hectares for new subdivision developments. In reviewing both of these applications it is acknowledged that the subject developments achieve the following densities: 17.65 units/ha (for 23T-22004) and 16.04 units/ha (for 23T-22003). Collectively, the subdivisions achieve a density calculation of 17.24 units/ha. The density calculations will need to be reevaluated with the next submission of the draft plan to ensure the changes requested by the Town and the Upper Grand District School Board are considered.	Korsiak	Density calculations are included on revised plans.
			b	Section 4.4.4 further adds that the introduction of medium density housing types in new subdivisions and other Greenfield Areas are to be encouraged. With respects to the housing mix within the Mattamy development (23T-22003), planning staff note that the development proposes only single family dwelling types. Within the County Official Plan, medium density development includes townhouses and apartments. Planning staff requests that additional consideration of opportunities to diversify the housing mix be evaluated. This would also assist with meeting the County Official Plan direction with respects to affordable housing opportunities.	Korsiak	In terms of housing mix, both plans should be looked at collectively. Due to grading challenges all townhouse dwellings and future medium density blocks are located on 23T-22004.
			c	It is further acknowledged that a related lot line adjustment application (B98-22) is being sought to add a small portion of land to the Mattamy development (23T-22003). It is requested that this adjustment be identified within the Draft Plan prior to draft approval. It is noted that the density calculations completed by staff did not include the lands subject to the boundary adjustment.	Korsiak	The lot line adjustment is reflected on the revised draft plan.
	Growth Allocation - Town Initiated Official Plan Amendment (OPA #13)	2	a	The Town's Official Plan currently has growth allocations up to 2031. It is further understood that an update to the Town's Official Plan is required to implement additional growth forecasts as this will facilitate all of the development proposals within the Town. To address this, Town Council has adopted local Official Plan Amendment (OPA #13). This local amendment has been provided to the County and through our review of the Town's amendment, it has been identified that the County initiated Official Plan Amendment (OPA #120) will need to be approved prior to rendering a decision on OPA #13. The County initiated amendment will, in part, introduce growth allocations up until 2051.	Korsiak	Noted.
			b	The County will continue to work with the Town and each developer to review and process each subdivision application.	Korsiak	Noted.
	Phasing of Servicing	3	a	The timing/phasing of the services and infrastructure required to accommodate the development of these site will need to be considered prior to any approvals of the Draft Plan. The Town's initiated OPA #13 proposes to introduce standard conditions of draft approval and holding provision regarding servicing and that these are to be prepared by the Town. County planning staff look forward to reviewing these conditions.	Korsiak	Noted.
	Public Comments	4	a	Attached are all of the written comments (a total of 6 letters) received to date by the County. We ask that the applicant respond, in a formal response letter, to all of the comments received through the Public Meeting and provided to the Town and County. Please see the public letters attached to the accompanying email.	Korsiak	Public comments will be addressed with County staff.
	Review of Environmental Impact Study	5	a	The subject developments contain lands that are designated as Core Greenlands and Greenlands in both the County of Wellington Official Plan and the Town of Erin Official Plan. It is noted that these designation mapping in each Official Plan are not fully aligned with one another.	RJB - Enviro	The Official Plans and associated Schedules for the Town and County have since been updated (January 2023 and September 2023, respectively). We have now referred to the Town's Modified Schedules A-1 and A-2, and the County's Schedules A2, B2 and B2-1. These updates are reflected in the EIS report Section 2.8.
			b	The Town and County are jointly utilizing an ecological consultant (GWS Ecological & Forestry Services Inc.) for the review of the submitted Environmental Impact Study, which has been prepared to support both of the subject developments. In addition, the comments provided by the Ecologist, planning staff note the following:	RJB - Enviro	No comment required.
			b-i	Section 2.8.1 of the submitted studies identifies that the Natural Heritage System (NHS) does not apply within urban boundaries. For clarification purposes, Section 9.9.5 of the County Official Plan is referencing the NHS of the Greenbelt Plan. For further clarification, the EIS will need to address the policies within Part 5 The Greenlands System of the County Official Plan.	RJB - Enviro	Acknowledged. Based on recent updates to the County OP (2023), Part 7 of the OP now applies (Schedule B2). The EIS report Section 2.8.1. has been updated.
			b-ii	The Forest Conservation By-law is applicable throughout the County; however, any tree removal should not occur on-site until such time that the Town, County, Credit Valley Conservation Authority and where applicable the Ministry of Environment, Conservationand Parks are satisfied.	RJB - Enviro	Acknowledged. The EIS report Section 2.8.2 has now been updated.
	Zoning By-law Amendment	6	a	In reviewing the draft Zoning By-law Amendment submitted by the applicant, there does not appear to be a schedule provided that demonstrates that the significant woodlands (and other features) are to be placed within a protective zone. Planning staff would request that the significant woodlands (and other features) be rezoned to Village Environment Protection (EP1) Zone and this should also include any proposed buffers. Planning staff requests an opportunity to review the zoning schedule prior to consideration by Town Council.	Korsiak/Q4	The revised zoning schedule identifes all Environment Protection EP1 (Zones)
	Conditions of Draft Approval	7	a	When considering a lot less block subdivisions and subdivisions that propose "residential reserves", the introduction of unique conditions of Draft Plan of Approval may be required. Attached to this email is a letter provided by the applicants with examples from another municipality regarding conditions of approval with respects to the residential reserve blocks. Additional, internal discussion regarding residential reserves may be required.	Korsiak	Noted.
	Review of Traffic Impact Study (TIS)	8	a	The submitted TIS has been peer reviewed by the County's traffic consultant (Dillon Consulting Limited) and these peer review comments were provided on November 25th, 2022 (via email). It is noted that based on the comments received from the Upper Grand District School Board, that the TIS will also need to consider the impacts of a future school block.	RVA	The proposed school is no longer part of the development and is reflected in the revised TIS
	Next Steps	9	a	It is anticipated that a revised draft plan will be required to be submitted to the County for review and recirculation based on the comments provided. We also look forward to reviewing a detailed response comment matrix to all of the comments received from the technical consultants and agencies and a formal response from the applicant to the public comments received to date. The aforementioned items are all anticipated from the applicant in addition to the items identified by the Town in the November 7th, 2022 comment letter.	Korsiak	Noted.

MATTAMY & COSCORP - 5520 & 5552 Eighth Line Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning - 1st Submission Comment Response Matrix (Z22-06, Z22-07, 23T-22003, 23T-22004)						
County of Wellington - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Action Required By**	**Response**
Enbridge		1	1	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.		Acknowledged.
Hydro One		1	1	We are in receipt of your Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One's High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands only.		Acknowledged.
			2	For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities' please consult your local area Distribution Supplier. To confirm if Hydro One is your local distributor please follow the following link: hydroone.com		Acknowledged.
			3	If Hydro One is your local area Distribution Supplier, please contact Customer Service at 1-888-664-9376 or e-mail customercommunications@hydroone.com to be connected to your Local Operations Centre.		Acknowledged.
Bell		1	1	We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval:		Acknowledged.
			2	"The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada."		Acknowledged.
			3	"The Owner agrees should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."		Acknowledged.
			4	Upon receipt of this comment letter, the Owner is to provide Bell Canada with servicing plans/CUP at their earliest convenience to planninganddevelopment@bell.ca to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.		Acknowledged.
			5	It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada's existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.		Acknowledged.
			6	If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.		Acknowledged.
			7	To ensure we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municiaplity and/or recirculations.		Acknowledged.
			8	We note that WSP operates Bell Canada's development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. However, all responses to circulations and requests for information, such as requests for clearance, will come directly from Bell Canada, and not from WSP. WSP is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses.		Acknowledged.
Canada Post		1	1	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. Please note the Canada Post multi-unit policy may also apply depending on building type.		Acknowledged.
			2	Multi-unit buildings and complexes (residential and commercial) with a common lobby, common indoor or sheltered space, require a centralized lock box assembly which is to be provided by, installed by, and maintained by the developer/owner at the owner's expense. Buildings with 100 units or more MUST have a rear loading Lock Box Assembly with dedicated secure mail room.		Acknowledged.
			3	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.		Acknowledged.
			4	In order to provide mail service to this development, Canada Post requests that the owner/developer comply with the following conditions:		Acknowledged.
			4a	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.		Acknowledged.
			4b	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.		Acknowledged.
			4c	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.		Acknowledged.
			4d	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.		Acknowledged.
			4e	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.		Acknowledged.
			4f	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.		Acknowledged.
			4g	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.		Acknowledged.
			4h	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.		Acknowledged.

County of Wellington - Agency Comments						
Department / Category	**Document / Sub Category**	**Item No.**	**Comment No.**	**Comments**	**Action Required By**	**Response**
			5	Canada Post further requests the owner/developer be notified of the following:		Acknowledged.
			5a	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		Acknowledged.
			5b	Enhanced Community Mailbox Sites with roof structures will require additional documentation as per Canada Post Policy		Acknowledged.
			5c	There will be no more than one mail delivery point to each unique address assigned by the Municipality		Acknowledged.
			5d	Any existing postal coding may not apply, the owner/developer should contact Canada Post to verify postal codes for the project		Acknowledged.
			5e	The complete guide to Canada Post's Delivery Standards can be found at: https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf		Acknowledged.