

Comment Response Matrix – Armstrong Estates (rev. Jan, 2024)

Please note: All comments requiring a response are provided here, as well as comments which were provided for knowledge or reference for the application.

AGENCY COMMENTS

RE: Complete Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision

From: Tracey Atkinson  
Dated: December 9, 2021  
Subject: Complete Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
General Comments			
1.	This letter is to acknowledge receipt of the information dated November 10, 2021and to advise that the above-noted application for draft plan of subdivision and zoning by-law amendment has been determined to be complete having met the requirements of subsections 51(17) and (18) and 34 of the Planning Act.	IPS	Acknowledged.

RE: Armstrong Lands, Mansfield

From: R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited  
Dated: March 29, 2022  
Subject: Sub02-2021 Armstrong Lands, Mansfield  
Project No.: 300052761.0000

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
Functional Servicing Report, Pinestone Engineering Ltd.			
1.	<b>5.1 Existing Water Servicing</b> - The report indicates " the maximum permitted flowrate is 661 L/min, and the average operating flowrate is 330 L/min, therefore the Mansfield Water System is operating at approximately 50% capacity". This statement is erroneous and misleading. Water systems are designed to provide peak demands and it is not expected for them to run at full capacity 24/7. As the report indicates the Maximum Day factor should be approximately 2.75, meaning that the average operating flowrate is expected to be about one third of the maximum permitted rate. Accordingly, the system is not operating at 50% capacity.	Pinestone	Comment addressed in August 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 resubmission. Updated FSR provided in this re-submission for review.
2.	<b>5.2 Proposed Water Servicing</b> - The reported modelling of fire flows indicates that water volumes can be delivered through the pipe network and hydrant testing results have been provided. However the availability of water over the required duration of flow was not discussed. The volume or storage available is unlikely to provide adequate volumes over the required duration. The required fire flow of 38 L/s should be adjusted to the interpolated volume required for the population in between the rate of 38 L/s for a population of 500 and the rate of 64 L/s for a population of 1000.	Pinestone	Comment addressed in August 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 resubmission. Updated FSR provided in this re-submission for review.
3.	<b>General Comment</b> - The Township should develop a servicing plan for the Marsville Water System, assessing how this development and all others in the Hamlet will provide an integrated system.	Pinestone	Acknowledged – additional discussions are ongoing with the Township in this regard, and it is understood capacity exists to service this proposed development. Efforts to increase supply

			underway with applicant and Township, including execution of a front ending agreement between the Township and applicant.
<b>Sewage Impact Study and Conceptual Design Brief, Azimuth Environmental Consulting Inc.</b>			
4.	<b>2.0 Background</b> - The report uses the term “communal” to describe the shared sewage disposal facilities that are being proposed. There is sensitivity to this term, because it is defined in the PPS and Ontario Water Resources Act, possibly with a different meaning from what it being intended. We note that MOE Policy D-5-2 recommends the entering of a Responsibility Agreement for proposals for communal servicing and that the Township has serious concerns with doing so. This is discussed further in the following paragraph.	Azimuth	The phrase "communal" is related to the sewage system constructed on a single block containing more than one residential dwelling. However, the sewage system represents a sewage works for a single lot. As a result, no Responsibility Agreement with the Township will be required for the development. The property owners of the block will be responsible for the sewage system present on their lands.
5.	<b>4.0 Preliminary Sewage Design Concepts</b> - Some typical drawings should be provided showing the layout of a house, garage, amenity area and sewage disposal area. For the purpose of subdivision planning, reserve beds can be considered as means of ensuring that the lots are sized such that the entire lot area is not consumed with a house, driveway and septic bed.	Azimuth	Conceptual sewage system layout areas have been shown on figures presented in the January 31, 2024 D-5-4 Report (Appendix A - Figures F & G).
6.	<b>4.2 Communal Septic Systems with Tertiary Treatment</b> - Each of the three shared sewage systems are estimated to have capacities slightly below 10,000 litres per day (9,800, 9800 & 9,900). Accordingly, they fall under the jurisdiction of the Ontario Building Code, not the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks which would mean they are not defined as “sewage works” in the Ontario Water Resources Act so a Responsibility Agreement would not be required. It is therefore important that the County of Dufferin confirm that the system capacities have been properly assessed and that the proposed disposal systems are adequate.	Azimuth	<p>The updated shared septic units now reside on four (4) Blocks being Blocks 44 to 47 inclusive. The design sewage flow for three of these four blocks is 8,800 L/day. This represents eight (8) two-bedroom semi-detached bungalows (OBC Table 8.2.1.3.A). The fourth block contains four (4) two-bedroom semi detached bungalows.</p> <p>Approval of septic systems having a capacity below 10,000 L/day occurs under the Ontario Building Code and is adjudicated by the Chief Building Official for the municipality. How the municipality proceeds with the review is specific to the municipality; but should be subject to O.Reg. 332/12 (as amended) requirements.</p>
7.	<b>6.3 Treated Effluent Nitrate Concentration</b> -The report relies on mechanical treatment in each sewage disposal system to reduce nitrate levels by 50%. This is a reasonable assumption. However, it should be noted that some municipalities have not accepted mechanical treatment as a means of increasing lot density. There are two reasons:	Azimuth	
7a.	The creation of lot layout has perpetual implications. Going forward many decades to the time that sewage systems need to be replaced, there needs to be a mechanism to ensure that homeowners choose the more expensive option of nitrate reduction. There have been concerns that a future municipality may lose the corporate memory of such requirements.	Azimuth	The septic system requirements could be registered on title so that the requirement always exists within a legal document associated with the parcel.
7b.	Tertiary sewage treatment can be held in reserve as a tool to be used if there are site constraints or difficulties with soils etc. (We note that the estimate of T-time provided for the site soils could arguably be higher). Sometimes they are used to reduce the footprint of a disposal system in order to preserve trees. If they are brought forward and relied upon for the planning of the subdivision then there is no backup plan.	Azimuth	The OBC presents the requirements necessary for a septic system approval. The definition of a primary and reserve disposal bed is considered to be a conservative approach to septic design. There exists innovative ways to construct disposal beds that can avoid landscaping challenges (ex., shallow buried trench). It is felt these safeguards are sufficient to address such concerns.
8.	<b>6.5 Background Nitrate</b> - Existing background nitrate levels ranging from 1.6 to 14 mg/l are reduced down to 0.2 mg/l on the assumption that existing levels are caused by historic agricultural practices. However, some communities (like Mansfield) have been documented to develop nitrate plumes, which is why nitrate studies are now required. The assumption that the existing nitrates are sourced from agriculture should be supported with additional consideration.	Azimuth	The supplemental Site investigations have established that the elevated background nitrate concentrations are attributable to the existing agricultural practices on the subject property. This evidence has been presented and accepted by the Township's reviewers. This information is presented in the January 31, 2024 D-5-4 Report (Section 3.4.4).
<b>Geotechnical/ Hydrogeological Investigation, Peto MacCallum Ltd.</b>			
9.	<b>5.6 Culvert</b> - While the report anticipates a closed bottom culvert, this assumption is subject to review of the ecological conditions of the watercourse.	IPS/GEI Consultants	The report did not specifically recommend a closed bottom culvert, only assumed as such given that details were not available at time of report submission. Based on comments received to date, an open bottom culvert is requested and will be further addressed through detailed design/draft plan conditions.

**RE: SUB02-2021 Armstrong Lands (Mansfield)**

From: John Millmetts, Director of Public Works  
Dated: April 22, 2022  
Subject: SUB02-2021 Armstrong Lands (Mnsfield)

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
With regards to this application the following will be required by the Township of Mulmur Public Works Department.			
a)	All streets to be constructed to an urban design to the satisfaction of the Township's Engineer.	IPS	Noted – to be addressed through detailed design.
b)	Parking Plan for the following lots as well as driveway layout. Lot 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50.	IPS	Updated plan revises the lot layouts, however 2 parking spaces per unit are provided for the proposed semi detached dwellings. This is implemented in the draft zoning bylaw.

**RE: Armstrong (Mansfield) subdivision**

From: Mike Hooper, County of Dufferin Public Works  
Dated: July 15, 2022  
Subject: Township File # SUB02-2021  
Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin.

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	A Dufferin County issued Road Occupancy Permit is required prior to completing any work within the County right of way.	IPS	Acknowledged.
2.	Waste Collection (Comments Previously Circulated) From the perspective of waste collection by the County of Dufferin, the following are the general parameters that are required to be adhered to: a. No backing up within the site by waste collection vehicles. A turn around must be in place (hammerhead, or otherwise). Please provide the dimensions of the turnaround b. Turning radii of 5 meters c. Minimum road width of 6.0 metres d. Access to collect on both side of the road e. For corner radii and turnaround dimensions, we default to that of the standards for Fire Services vehicles f. Sections 2 - 13 of our Waste Collection By-law spell out some further details that you should be aware of	IPS	Acknowledged. The noted parameters have been adhered to at this stage and will be implemented at detailed design stage.
3.	(Draft Plan of Subdivision) Include sight triangles at the intersections of Street 'A' and Street 'C'. Refer to Dufferin County Entrance Policy 5-3-17 for applicable sight triangle dimensions. A copy of our entrance policy can be accessed from the County's website at <a href="http://www.dufferincounty.ca/sites/default/files/roads/Entrance-Policy.pdf">www.dufferincounty.ca/sites/default/files/roads/Entrance-Policy.pdf</a>	JD Engineering / IPS	Daylight triangles shown to the extent feasible on the revised draft plan.
4.	(Draft Plan of Subdivision) The location of Street 'A' must satisfy the comments provided below as part of County's review of the Traffic Impact Study prepared by JD Engineering Inc.	IPS / JD Engineering	Noted – see comments below.
5.	(Draft Plan of Subdivision) Road widening blocks have been illustrated along the property frontage on Dufferin County Road 18 and Dufferin County Road 17. Please provide additional dimensions further clarifying the width of the blocks. The County requires a 5.0 metre widening at these	IPS	Dimensions provided on the road widening blocks on the revised draft plan.

	locations.		
6.	(Traffic Impact Study) North sightlines at Street 'A' are deficient when compared next to Dufferin County's Entrance Policy 5-3-17. Sightlines requirements for a Commercial Entrance should be applied at a minimum. Additionally, the intersection of Street 'A' must satisfy recommendations outlined within the most recent edition of the TAC Geometric Design Guide for Canadian Roads. The above comment may significantly alter the TIS. Further review will be completed following the submission of an updated study addressing these requirements.	JD Engineering	Upon additional review, including on site meetings with County Staff and multiple iterations of design concepts for road reconstructions and to facilitate the proposed Street A intersection on County Road 18, it has been confirmed that the preferred location for Street A is at the south side of the frontage on County Road 18. This location aligns with the existing driveway for the baseball diamond on the west side of County Road 18. A section of County Road 18 will need to be reconstructed to ensure that the sight distance for the Street A / County Road 18 intersection will meet the County's Sight Distance requirements (160 metres for a posted speed of 50km/h). The re-construction will be addressed through Draft Pan conditions.
7.	(Functional Servicing Report & Construction Mitigation Plan) An investigation of the Dufferin County Road 17 drainage system is required. The investigation must confirm that the existing ditch and infrastructure downstream of the proposed stormwater management facilities can accommodate flows generated by the development, and that no ponding the will occur within the County ditch, or adjacent properties. Limits of the investigation should extend from the proposed SWM facilities up to the ultimate outlet location. Further review of the Functional Servicing Report will be completed following resubmission of the application.	WatersEdge	We modelled up to the next crossing east of the property which is about 275 m downstream of the property line and it is a private driveway. The modelling shows that there is no significant difference in the Regional storm elevation from existing to proposed at the end of 'our' property line and same at the private crossing downstream. Based on this there is no need to assess further downstream given there is no significant increase at the first crossing.

**RE:   Armstrong Draft Plan of Subdivision**  
From: Joanne Rogers, Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board  
Dated: May 2, 2022  
Subject:     Plan of Subdivision  
              SUB02-2021 and Z11-2021  
              Armstrong Estates of Mansfield  
              Part of Lot 11, Concession 7 East of Hurontario Street  
              Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response															
General Comments																		
1.	The applicant proposes the development of 67 residential units which are anticipated to yield: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 6 Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8 Students; and</li><li>• 3 Grade 9 to Grade 12 Students</li></ul>	IPS	Acknowledged.															
2.	<div>The proposed development is located within the following school catchment areas which currently operate under the following student accommodation conditions</div> <table><tr><td>Catchment Area</td><td>School</td><td>Enrolment</td><td>Capacity</td><td># of Portables / Temporary Classrooms</td></tr><tr><td>Elementary School</td><td>St. Benedict</td><td>540</td><td>478</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>Secondary School</td><td>Robert F. Hall</td><td>1227</td><td>1293</td><td>0</td></tr></table>	Catchment Area	School	Enrolment	Capacity	# of Portables / Temporary Classrooms	Elementary School	St. Benedict	540	478	3	Secondary School	Robert F. Hall	1227	1293	0	IPS	Acknowledged.
Catchment Area	School	Enrolment	Capacity	# of Portables / Temporary Classrooms														
Elementary School	St. Benedict	540	478	3														
Secondary School	Robert F. Hall	1227	1293	0														
3.	That the applicant shall agree in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to include the following warning clauses in all offers of purchase and sale of residential lots. (a) "Whereas, despite the best efforts of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school	IPS	Acknowledged. Subdivision agreement clause/condition.															

	outside of the neighbourhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighbourhood school."  (b) "That the purchasers agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, the residents of the subdivision shall agree that children will meet the bus on roads presently in existence or at another place designated by the Board."		
4.	The Board will be reviewing the accommodation conditions in each Education Service Area on a regular basis and will provide updated comments if necessary.	IPS	Acknowledged.

**RE: Upper Grand District School Board**  
From: Adam Laranjeiro, Planning Technician - UGDSB  
Dated: March 21, 2022  
Subject: Z11-2021/SUB02-2021, Armstrong (Mansfield)

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
<b>General Comments</b>			
1.	That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged.
2.	That the developer shall agree to provide the Upper Grand District School Board with a digital file of the plan of subdivision in either ARC/INFO export or DWG format containing parcel fabric and street network.	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged.
3.	That the developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement that adequate sidewalks, lighting and snow removal (on sidewalks and walkways) will be provided to allow children to walk safely to school or to a designated bus pickup point.	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged. Implemented through detailed design/conditions of approval.
4.	That the developer and the Upper Grand District School Board reach an agreement regarding the supply and erection of a sign (at the developer's expense and according to the Board's specifications) affixed to the permanent development sign advising prospective residents that students may be directed to schools outside the neighbourhood.	Application / IPS	Acknowledged. DP Condition
5.	That the developer agrees in the subdivision agreement to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease, until such time as a permanent school is assigned: "Whereas the Upper Grand District School Board has designated this subdivision as a Development Area for the purposes of school accommodation, and despite the best efforts of the Upper Grand District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may in future have to be transferred to another school."	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged. DP Condition

**RE: 937045 Airport Road WSP Comments (Dufferin County Planning)**  
From: Matt Alexander, Project Manager – WSP  
Dated: January 25, 2022  
Subject: Application for Zoning By-law Amendment (File No. Z11-2021) and  
Draft Plan of Subdivision (File No. SUB02-2021) -937045 Airport Road, Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
<b>Recommendation</b>			



1.	The Township is satisfied that the proposed development is considered infill or minor rounding out of existing development in the context of servicing policies of the PPS and Dufferin County Official Plan;	IPS	Acknowledged. Township to confirm satisfied.
2.	The Township confirm the significance of the Mineral Aggregate Resource area;	IPS	Acknowledged. Township to confirm.
3.	Consultation occur with the NVCA for requirements pertaining to development in their regulatory limit and for input pertaining to impacts to the watercourse;	IPS	Acknowledged. NVCA consultation ongoing.
4.	Consultation occur with the NVCA related to the potential impacts to source water because the subject property is located within a source water protection area (Low Aquifer Vulnerability, Medium Aquifer Vulnerability, and Wellhead Protection Zone).	IPS	Acknowledged. NVCA consultation ongoing.

**RE: Armstrong Lands, Mansfield**

From: County of Dufferin Building Services  
Dated: June 14, 2022  
Subject: Files # Z11-2021 and SUB02-2021  
Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin.

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	<p>This letter serves to confirm that I have commenced a preliminary review of the applications Z11-2021 and SUB02 and request for comment.</p> <p>After review of the application, the Building Division would like to note that we have no concerns with the Re-Zoning of the property or the Draft Plan of Subdivision.</p> <p>It should be noted that the applicant is required to submit an application for building permit to our office with respect to the above property before any type of construction begins.</p>	IPS	Acknowledged.

**RE: Comments for Armstrong Estates**

From: Mike Blacklaws  
Dated: April 19, 2022  
Subject: Comments for Armstrong Subdivision Mansfield

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
<b>General Comments</b>			
1.	capabilities of the existing water tower, water mains and fire pump to serve the additional homes and still have adequate reserves for firefighting purposes especially during times of drought and be able to provide the required flow rate for fire operations	Pinestone	Addressed in August 5 2022 submission (by Pinestone) and through additional discussions with the Township.
2.	at the time of construction, additional hydrants to be added to the area of Dufferin County Road 18 and Dufferin County Road 17/10 Sideroad in order to service an area of the village of Mansfield that is underserved at this time	Pinestone	To be discussed further with Township.
3.	that house numbers be lit so that they are easily visible at night to aid in locating in times of emergency	IPS	Acknowledged – draft plan condition

4.	that water mains and hydrants within the development area be in place and in service prior to building construction begins for the purpose of firefighting operations should the need arise	Pinestone	Acknowledged – DP condition and implemented through detailed design.
5.	that roads in and out of the development be kept clear of obstruction at all times for the purpose of fire department access. This should be the case for all seasons	IPS	Acknowledged – DP condition/subdivision agreement clause.

**RE: Comments for Armstrong Estates**

From: Township Planning  
Dated: July 18, 2022  
Subject: Comments for Armstrong Subdivision Mansfield

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
<b>General Comments</b>			
1.	Side yard for semi should be zero on one side	IPS	Draft Plan drawing has been updated, and draft zoning bylaw has been revised for consideration, including setback requirements.
2.	Satisfaction of OP density, unit type, and lot area (see page 50-51 of IPS Planning Report)	IPS	Acknowledged.
3.	Septic based on 4 bedroom, 350m2 dwelling size. Minimum lot area required 2000m2 – discussion required re zoning implementation	IPS	Acknowledged, servicing related concerns have been discussed at great lengths with Township staff/engineering. Further details are provided in the updated materials provided with this re-submission, including D-5-4 Guideline Assessment, prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting.
4.	Septic design based on 111.5m2 semis, 2 bedroom plus den.	IPS	The draft plan has been revised and considered in the submission materials, including D-5-4 Guideline Assessment, prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting.
5.	Please provide a road plan and possible lotting for the retained lands north of the proposed Plan of Subdivision including future road connections	IPS	The Draft Plan illustrates a conceptual road plan/extension for lands to the north; future/potential lotting is not contemplated at this time. Any future lot creation would be subject to the applicable policies of the day however the draft plan demonstrates a conceptual and feasible road extension which could be configured in a number of ways in the future should these lands be considered appropriate for development.
6.	Please add the following to the plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setback to rogers utility tower</li> <li>Hydrant locations</li> <li>Warning lights south of Mansfield on Airport Road (as per Traffic Study)</li> </ul>	IPS	These items are not typically shown on a draft plan drawing and would be better illustrated on detailed design drawings should the applications be approved.
7.	Requested Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscaping Plan</li> <li>Trail Plan</li> <li>Fencing Plan</li> <li>Utility Plan</li> <li>Easement Plan</li> <li>Road widenings and 1' reserves</li> <li>Cost estimates</li> <li>Parking plan for multi-res</li> <li>Sidewalk plan</li> <li>Culvert crossing design</li> <li>Wildlife passage</li> </ul>	IPS	It is understood these plans are being considered as being required through the detailed design process (ie as draft plan conditions) and not at this time.

**RE: NVCA Comments for Armstrong Estates**

From: Any Knapp, Supervisor – NVCA  
Dated: March 31, 2022  
Subject: NVCA Comments for a Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning Amendment  
Armstrong Estates of Mansfield  
937045 Airport Road  
Township of Mulmur, Dufferin County  
Town File No. Z11-2021/ SUB 02- 2021  
NVCA ID # 38983

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
<b>Ontario Regulation 172/06</b>			
1.	The property falls partially within an area affected by Ontario Regulation 172/06 (the Authority’s Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation) where a permit is required from the NVCA under the <u>Conservation Authorities Act</u> prior to any development or site alteration.	IPS	Acknowledged.
<b>Natural Hazard Limits – Development Constraints</b>			
2.	Please reference an overall existing conditions constraints map which present the applicable regulated natural hazard limits and any separate allowances in support of the development limits used for this Site.	GEI Consultants	A PDF of the requested drawing is included in the re-submission package, prepared by GEI Consultants which shows the existing regulated area limit.
<b>Draft Plan of Subdivision Plan</b>			
3.	Please clarify that the slope erosion hazard limit shown on the Draft Plan includes the top of slope plus a 6 m access allowance. Please update the drawing as applicable.	IPS	The slope erosion hazard limit includes the top of slope plus a 6.0 metre setback from top of bank. Please see revised Draft Plan included in this submission.
<b>Geotechnical/ Hydrogeological Investigation</b>			
4.	Please provide an existing conditions erosion hazard limit drawing that is signed and sealed by the qualified professional. Please include with a legend that clearly identifies the separate components of the slope erosion hazard limit assessment, including a clearly defined long-term stable top of slope limit line from the assessment, plus a separate 6 m access allowance limit line. This separate information is not clear in several locations on the proposed conditions Draft Plan, considering the text provided with the line types.	GEI Consultants	A PDF of the requested drawing is included in the re-submission package, prepared by GEI Consultants
5.	Please confirm that the report references the preliminary design of the SWM measures including enhanced roadside swales and dry ponds has been reviewed and determined to be suitable considering soils and groundwater.	GEI Consultants	See letter included within this re-submission, prepared by GEI Consultants.
<b>Fluvial Geomorphological and Hazard Assessment Report</b>			
6.	Section 2.2, Application, page 5 of 9: Please clarify if the 1 m referenced off-set to account for toe erosion was accounted for, in addition to the top of slope assessment and 6 m access allowance in the slope erosion hazard limit.	Water’s Edge	The 1 m toe erosion offset is to be added onto the slope assessment and the 6 m access allowance. Wording changed in Section 2.2.
7.	Section 2.4, Crossing Discussion, page 6 of 9: Please confirm an overbank velocity assessment in support of the culvert upgrade in support of any mitigation measures that will be required at detailed design.	Water’s Edge	Modelling has been upgraded using 2022 LiDAR. Flow rates, culvert sizing and road crossing elevations have changed such that there is not overtopping of crossing during regional flood.
8.	Section 3.1.2, Results, page 7 of 9: Please document and support the flow rate validation applied to development of the headwater hydrology model. Please also comment on a comparison of the model flows at key points using the headwater linear regression referenced in Section 3.2.8 of the NVCA Natural Hazards Technical Guide, 2013.	Water’s Edge	Modelling has been upgraded using 2022 LiDAR. Flow rates are relatable to NVCA Natural Hazards Technical Guide.



9.	Section 3.1.1, Methodology, page 7 of 9: Please confirm that AMC II parameters were modelled for the Timmins storm.	Water's Edge	Report states AMC III parameters were used for Timmins Storm, AMC II parameters were also modelled with lowered peak discharge results. Matching to Pinestone Model, AMC III were also used for 100 yr storm. Model CN values were since calibrated to match Pinestone model.
10.	Section 3.2.2, Results, page 7 of 9: Please confirm if a sensitivity analysis such as 50% blockage scenarios were considered in the culvert sizing assessment, as referenced in Section 3.2.6 of the NVCA Natural Hazards Technical Guide, 2013.	Water's Edge	The 50% blockage scenario was modelled. Results provided in paragraph in 3.2.2 of Water's Edge report. The culvert is sized large enough such that 50% blockage plus 10% embedment still allows flows to pass through the culvert.
11.	Section 3.2.2, Results, page 7 of 9: Please confirm in determining the regulatory floodplain limit if the Timmins event was modelled controlled or uncontrolled. Please clarify this in reference to the discussion in reference to the impact of flows from the proposed SWM pond.	Water's Edge	Flows are uncontrolled as stated in Water's Edge report. 3.1.1 SWM pond flows were not reduced in for modelling 100yr or Timmins storm.
12.	Figure 5, page 8 of 9: Please also provide a cross-section location plan in support of the floodplain hazard study. Please document and support the assessment with a signed and sealed floodplain delineation figure. Please include also the 15 m allowance line to the regulatory floodplain hazard limit.	Water's Edge	See Appendix C (Floodplain Map) in Water's Edge report
13.	HEC-HMS Results page 17 of 21: Please also provide a schematic layout or figure which also identifies key hydrologic features referenced in the output table.	Water's Edge	See Figure 4 in Water's Edge report, or attached HEC-HMS model.
14.	HEC-HMS Results page 17 of 21: Please also include reference to the 1:100-year storms referenced in Section 3.2.1 the NVCA Natural Hazard Technical Guideline, 2013. This is requested to support the selection of the most conservative storm distribution used in the floodplain hazard assessment.	Water's Edge	Changed 100y6hr storm to 100yr24h storm based on NVCA guideline.
15.	HEC-RAS Results page 18 of 21: Please confirm if components of the NVCA generic regulations estimated hydraulic model were used in the assessment, and if a corresponding datum adjustment was applied. Please comment on the observed different in regulatory floodplain elevation between the generic regulations estimated hydraulic model and the results of this assessment.	Water's Edge	Regulations were reviewed when creating HEC-RAS model. Mannings n based on site data. NAD83 CSRS/UTM Zone 17N . Vertical Datum is same as GeoHUB LiDAR.
16.	General: Please provide an explanation for the selection of HEC-HMS software, as compared to Visual Otthymo software that is commonly used for watershed hydrology assessments within the NVCA.	Water's Edge	HEC-HMS is public domain software not proprietary similar to HEC-RAS and supported by USA gov. Constantly being upgraded, and recently includes GAWSER subroutines. It has been tested and approved by 3 local CAs for use in Ontario. It is commonly used for hydrologic modelling across North America.
17.	General: Please provide a digital copy of the HEC-HMS hydrologic model and HEC-RAS hydraulic model in support of the floodplain study results.	Water's Edge	Models are provided with this submission, including data outputs for HEC-RAS (before & after).
18.	General: Please document and support with calculations the key input parameters used to generate the hydrologic model.	Water's Edge	See- HEC-HMS model, See HEC-RAS models. T <sub>c</sub> equation added to report.
19.	Please document the support information used to general the storms modelled including the parameters used and tabulate the storm rainfall depths which result.	Water's Edge	Excel spreadsheet added to submission folder of Rainfall depths.
<b>Natural Heritage and Ecology Comments</b>			
20.	Comments will be provided in a separate letter at a later date.		Noted – Natural heritage comments received and listed further below.
<b>Functional Servicing Report and Construction Mitigation Report</b>			
21.	Section 4.0, Proposed Development, page 4 of 20: The referenced reports for the assessment of on-Site private septic systems were not noted with the submission. Please provide a copy of the two referenced reports.	Pinestone/IPS	All reports have been submitted to the Township.
22.	Section 6.1, Design Criteria, page 7 of 20: Please include the erosion control criteria for the Site area infiltration of 5 mm using infiltration measures such as LIDs. Please document and support that the criteria for LIDs can be met with the Site design.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
23.	Section 7.1, Quantity Control, page 11 of 20: Please confirm that proposed grades are sufficient for the conveyance of runoff from catchment 201 to reach the Block 55 SWM dry facility as only one inlet was noted receiving overland flow from the south-west.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.

24.	Section 7.1, Quantity Control, page 11 of 20: Please reference a proposed section and detail for the roadside enhanced swales and comment on the provided dimensions, capacity and provided clearance to seasonally high groundwater for this measure.	Pinestone	Roadside ditching has been removed as the Township requires the roads to be urbanized (curb, storm sewers).
25.	Section 7.2, Quality Control, page 15 of 20: Please document and support the in-Situ testing by a qualified professional referenced for the infiltration measures, as this information was not noted in the submission.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
26.	Section 7.2, Quality Control, page 15 of 20: Please confirm that the municipality is in support of a Street A and Street B road cross-section with enhanced infiltration swales in the roadway and is not expecting an urban curb and gutter system with sidewalks.	Pinestone	Roadway has been revised to an urban section.
27.	Section 7.2, Quality Control, page 15 of 20: Please discuss the mitigation measures for outlet flow dispersion for both SWM facility outlets considering the outlets are located within an area subject to slope erosion.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
28.	Section 7.2, Table 11, page 17 of 20: Please separate the Catchment 201 calculations for TSS removal between the enhanced swales and the dry pond for clarity. Please document and support the TSS removal for the enhanced swales by providing preliminary design details.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
29.	Section 7.2, Table 11, page 17 of 20: Please document and support the referenced TSS removal rates reported as being provided by building rooftops.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
30.	Section 7.3, page 18 of 20: Please confirm that the NVCA P-Tool is the basis for the phosphorus budget analysis as it is noted there is reference to the LSRCA-TTT. Please update submission as applicable.	Pinestone	The NVCA P-Tool was used for the phosphorus budget analysis.
31.	Appendix D, page 163 of 406, SWM Facility A, SWM Facility B: Please reference a profile section to support the stage/storage rating tables noted. Please provide supporting calculation for the draw down time mentioned in the report text for both facilities. Please include section detail information for the control orifice, overflow orifice and emergency overflow weir.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
32.	Appendix D, page 154 of 406: Please document and support the design elements for the dry SWM facilities to meet the MOE 2003 SWM Planning and Design Manual. It is noted that the design does not yet reference forebay or energy dissipation measures at the inlet into each dry SWM facility.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
33.	Appendix D, page 154 of 406: Please provide the supporting calculations for the sizing of the roadside enhanced swales, supporting that there is sufficient space available to meet the targeted TSS quality reduction and the design elements recommended in the MOE 2003 SWM Planning and Design Manual.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
34.	Appendix D, page 154 of 406: Please document and support that a water budget which assesses the proposed conditions considering the impact of the proposed LID measures has been completed following the Thornthwaite methodology.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
35.	Appendix D, page 154 of 406: Please confirm that in the event of blockage in the conveyance system, that there is sufficient emergency overland flow capacity to safely convey the greater of the uncontrolled 100-year and Regional flow through the site. Please confirm that there is no more than 0.3 m depth of flooding expected along the roadway and that overland flow can still be conveyed to the SWM facility in the event of storm sewer blockage.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
36.	Appendix D, Page 369: Please support the contributing area and % imperviousness used in the selection tool for the sizing of the OGS.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
37.	Drawing POST-1: It appears that there are design components not clearly identified on the provided drawings such as inlet for Block 54 SWM dry facility or the location of emergency overflow weirs. Please update drawings as applicable in support of the design information provided in Appendix D.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
38.	At detailed design, please submit an erosion and sediment control (ESC) plan and please include acceptable ESC measures and the applicable design details from the most recent guideline.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.

39.	At detailed design, please provide a standalone Operation and Maintenance Manual to identify the future maintenance and monitoring activities required for any SWM facilities, enhanced infiltration swales, other LID measures and OGS units.	Pinestone	Technical Comment - To be addressed at the detailed design stage.
-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

**RE: NVCA Comments for Armstrong Estates**

From: Amy Knapp  
Dated: April 29, 2022 (updated September 26, 2022)  
Subject: NVCA Comments for Armstrong Estates (Natural Heritage/Ecology ONLY)

#	Comments Received April 29 <sup>th</sup>	Response to April 29 Comments	Comments Received September 26 <sup>th</sup>	Action / Consultant	Response to September 26 Comments & Correspondence received January 18, 2024
<b>Ontario Regulation 172/06</b>					
1.	The property falls partially within an area affected by Ontario Regulation 172/06 (the Authority's Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation) where a permit is required from the NVCA under the Conservation Authorities Act prior to any development or site alteration.	Acknowledged.		Azimuth	
<b>Natural Heritage and Ecology Comments</b>					
2.	The EIS has identified an unevaluated wetland, watercourse, Significant Wildlife Habitat and Habitat of species of conservation concern on and adjacent to the subject site of development. NVCA staff accepts the delineation and classification of these natural features as presented in the report.	Acknowledged.		Azimuth	
3.	The EIS proposes a 6m setback from the top of bank of the watercourse and wetland for lots 7, 8 and 55. Blocks 50 and 51 also appear to have setbacks calculated from the top of bank and reduced. The applicant is advised that NVCA Planning and Regulations guidelines state in Section 5.3: "In general, lots created through plan of subdivision or consent and/or development and site alteration, is to be set back a minimum of the following:  a. 30 metres from the bankfull flow location of watercourses;	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	(2) The EIS proposes a 6m setback from the top of bank of the watercourse and less than 30m setback for the wetland on lots 7, 8 and 55. Blocks 50 and 51 also appear to have setbacks calculated from the top of bank and wetland setbacks reduced from minimum 30m. The proposed lots appear to extend right up to the top-of-bank (ToB), past the minimum 6m ToB setback. Required setbacks (wetland and ToB) as proposed are still not in conformity with the NVCA Planning and Regulations Guidelines and must be revised.	IPS	It is clarified that the incorrect draft plan was used in the July 19, 2022 submission and we regret the error. The draft plan submitted with the application does not propose any lots extending into the 6m TOB setback. Please see updated draft plan.  Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this comment has been addressed. The draft Zoning bylaw proposes the appropriate zoning.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. 6 metres access allowance from natural hazards and valleylands top of bank;</li> <li>c. 30 metres from a wetland;</li> <li>d. 30 metres from a seepage area and springs;</li> <li>e. 30 metres from a significant woodland”</li> </ul> <p>The lot fabric on the proposed draft plan of subdivision, as well as the proposed zoning schedule should be revised to reflect the minimum required lot setbacks.</p>				
4.	<p>An updated graphic “constraints map” is required in order to set the appropriate limits of development with regards to natural heritage features. The updated graphic should depict the following along with the lot fabric on high-quality, recent air photo imagery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Delineated extent of MAMM3-1 wetland; area of proposed removal and calculation of the area of wetland loss for Street C crossing;</li> <li>b. Watercourse top-of-bank, plus the 30m setback;</li> <li>c. Required 30m setback from the wetland;</li> <li>d. Proposed setback from the wetland, plus a calculation of the area of required wetland setback loss.</li> </ul>	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19, 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	(3) Lots must be removed from the minimum 6m watercourse setback in accordance with NVCA Planning and Regulations Guidelines in order to protect this area from further encroachment of the future use. The applicant is mistaken that the minimum 6m allowance can be further reduced. The previous comment referred to a reduction to the 15m regulatory setback, to a minimum of 6m. The plans should be revised accordingly.	IPS	<p>As above.</p> <p>Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this comment has been addressed.</p>
5.	With respect to the minimum 30m required setback to the MAMM3-1 wetland feature, NVCA staff may support a reduction in the required setback for this feature in accordance with the NVCA’s Net Gains for Ecological Offsetting guidelines. If the required setback is not provided, a Wetland Offsetting Plan must be submitted for NVCA review prior to setting the limits of development and issuance of Draft Plan Conditions.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	<p>(4)The updated constraints map is noted.</p> <p>a. The extent of removal of a portion of the MAMM3-1 wetland feature is displayed on the updated constraints map. 0.046ha of the feature is proposed to be removed to accommodate Street C. Comment resolved.</p> <p>b. Please include the watercourse ToB to the constraints mapping.</p>	Azimuth	Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes these comments have been addressed.

			<p>c. The 30m setback to the MAMM3-1 wetland feature is noted on the constraints map. Comment resolved.</p> <p>d. The proposed reduced setback from the MAMM3-1 wetland feature is noted on the constraints map. The setback must be revised. An updated constraints map will be required pending resolution of current comments.</p>		
6.	Removal of 0.046ha of the MAMM3-1 wetland feature is proposed in order to accommodate the proposed watercourse crossing along Street C. in accordance with the NVCA's Net Gains for Ecological Offsetting guideline, offsetting for the loss of a portion of this wetland feature must be demonstrated. A Wetland Offsetting Plan which addresses the proposed wetland removal must be submitted for NVCA review prior to setting the limits of development and issuance of Draft Plan Conditions.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July ## 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	(5) A Wetland Offsetting Plan which addresses the proposed wetland removal is noted. NVCA staff confirm the wetland and regulatory setback are eligible for offsetting under the NVCA's Net Gains for Ecological Offsetting Guidelines. The previous comment #5 is resolved and comments on the Wetland Offsetting Plan submitted have been added as new comments #16-21 below.	Azimuth	Acknowledged. Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this comment requires no action.
7.	The report recommends a detailed Sediment and Erosion Control Plan identifying natural heritage protection measures for all stages of construction will be required in future design stages. A condition of Draft Plan Approval to the satisfaction of the NVCA is requested for detailed Sediment and Erosion Control Plans.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.		Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged as a draft plan condition.
8.	Timing of site build-out and installation of the watercourse crossing was not addressed in the EIS. Based on previous experience with similar sites, NVCA staff note that the installation of the road crossing will be necessary prior to accessing the north portion of the site. As such, a phasing plan for construction of the watercourse and site alteration of the larger development sites will be required to address erosion and sediment controls during pre-construction (including watercourse crossing installation), earthworks, servicing, construction and final stabilization. This item may be addressed through detailed design review; a condition of Draft Plan approval is requested for a Construction Phasing Plan to the satisfaction of the NVCA.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.		Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged as a draft plan condition.

9.	An NVCA permit will be required to be obtained by the applicant for the watercourse crossing and final design of the crossing and erosion and sediment control plans will be required as part of a complete permit application should the applicant seek an NVCA permit prior to Draft Plan Approval. Should the applicant choose to install the watercourse crossing following Draft Plan Approval, a condition will be requested for an NVCA permit.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	(6) Comment was marked as "acknowledged" by the applicant. The applicant is advised that temporary crossings to facilitate earthworks or preliminary servicing will not be authorized by the NVCA, that the final design of the crossing must be installed at the time of permit issuance.	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged. Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this is addressed.
10.	The EIS recommends use of appropriate wetland and riparian woodland plantings (i.e., native plants and trees, respectively, known to occur in the MAMM3-1 and WODM5-3 polygons) proximal to post-construction wetland and woodland edges. NVCA staff concur with this recommendation. A detailed Restoration and Planting Plan for disturbed areas within the Open Space, Septic System and SWM blocks will be required as a condition of Draft Plan Approval to the satisfaction of the NVCA.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	(7) This plan must include natural vegetation blocks incorporated into retained wetland buffers, Open Space, Septic System and Stormwater Management blocks, and utilize plant species native to the region and appropriate to the landscape context.	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged. Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this is addressed.
11.	The EIS recommends integration of a wildlife passage into the new Street 'C' culvert crossing designs to help restore and maintain habitat connectivity in the wetland/woodland corridor post-development. NVCA staff concur with this recommendation and advise that future plans for the watercourse crossing should incorporate appropriate BMPs for wildlife passage (e.g., openness ratio, dry ledges for passage) as recommended in the EIS. Due to the presence of fish habitat within the watercourse, NVCA staff will require an open bottom culvert to minimize impact on the aquatic substrate.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	(8) This comment was marked as "acknowledged" by the applicant and has not been addressed. Please address in the next submission.	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged. Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this is addressed.
12.	NVCA staff note concerns with the width of the crossing, and recommend that the applicant explore options with the Township of Mulmur Transportation staff to reduce the width of the crossing, via reducing required pedestrian	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	(9) The width of the watercourse crossing should be finalized prior to Draft Plan Approval (#12 in applicant's response). Please provide a response as to how the applicant has addressed the request to reduce the width of the watercourse	Applicant / IPS	Acknowledged. Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this is addressed.



	sidewalks and increasing slope grades on the sides of the crossing.		crossing through preliminary design considerations and consultation with the Township of Mulmur		
13.	The use of fencing to deter encroachment from residential lots is noted and supported. Locations and materials for fencing should be submitted for review as part of the Landscape Plans at detailed design, demonstrating exclusion of pedestrian and residential lot access to natural heritage features within the larger plan of subdivision. A condition of Draft Plan Approval for a Fencing Plan is requested to the satisfaction of the NVCA.	Noted			Acknowledged as a draft plan condition.
Review Comments – Advisory					
14.	Habitat for Species of Conservation Concern was identified on the subject site for the following species: Eastern Wood-Pewee, Grasshopper Sparrow, Snapping Turtle. Habitat for Grasshopper Sparrow was noted to be outside the development envelope. Habitat for Species at Risk birds (Eastern Meadowlark and Least Bittern) was found within the study area but not within the subject site. No impacts to Grasshopper Sparrow, Snapping Turtle, Eastern Meadowlark or Least Bittern are anticipated as a result of the proposed development. NVCA staff concur with this evaluation.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	All previous comments have been addressed.	Azimuth	Noted
15.	The woodlands on the subject site (ELC ecosite vegetation types WODM5-3 and WOMM3 polygons) provide habitat for the Eastern Wood-Pewee, a bird species of conservation concern. Removal of 0.15ha of the woodland feature habitat on the subject site was assessed to have a negligible impact on the species. NVCA staff concur with the assessment that the remaining 1.35ha of woodland on the property will continue to provide habitat functionality for the species, given that the Eastern Wood-Pewee uses a range of forest habitats and patch sizes for breeding, migration and wintering (COSEWIC 2012; NatureServe 2012). However, the proposed retained woodland area is smaller than the average territory patch size for Eastern Wood-Pewee, which is generally 1.76	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	All previous comments have been addressed.	Applicant / IPS	Noted

	± 0.24 ha (COSEWIC 2012). As such, opportunities for re-planting woodland areas should be explored within the Open Space and SWM Blocks (blocks 51, 53, 54, 55, 56) to enhance the remaining woodland habitat for Eastern Wood-Pewee. Enhancement plantings should be provided through Restoration and Planting Plans at detailed design.				
16.	The location of SWM outlets is noted in the EIS to be determined at detailed design. The EIS recommends that all proposed stormwater elements within or next to the two-year flood elevation of the watercourse are reviewed by a fisheries ecologist in future design stages in accordance with DFO's projects near water review process. NVCA staff recommend that the location of SWM outlets are determined and reviewed by a fisheries ecologist prior to Draft Plan Approval in order to ensure PPS consistency through no negative impact to fish habitat. The applicant should provide a record of consultation with DFO or completed checklist determining no consultation is required.	See detailed response letter prepared by Azimuth Environmental Consulting, dated July 19 2022 relating to NVCA Natural Heritage/Ecology comments.	All previous comments have been addressed.	Applicant / IPS	Resolved
New Comments Issued September 26, 2022					
18			(11) The Wetland Offsetting Plan is comprised of three components noted as a, b and c below (#5 & 6 in applicant's response). Some aspects of the proposed offsetting are satisfactory to NVCA staff, others require revision to demonstrate conformity with the NVCA Guidelines.  a. Offsetting for wetland removal to accommodate required infrastructure (Street C):  19The Wetland Offsetting Plan for 0.046ha of wetland removal to accommodate Street C is proposed as cash-in-lieu for 0.092ha of ecological offsetting in the amount of \$11,040.00 is consistent with NVCA Guidelines		Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this comment and associated sub comments are addressed.

			<p>and is accepted. Payment must be received in order to clear this comment and can not be deferred as a Condition of Draft Plan Approval.</p> <p>b. Offsetting for creation of lots within the minimum 30m wetland setback:</p> <p>The applicant at their discretion determined that compensation for wetland buffer loss to accommodate lots within the agricultural areas was inappropriate, citing the NVCA Guideline which stipulates that these areas may be subject to 1:1 offsetting ratio as determined <u>through consultation</u>. NVCA staff were not consulted and do not accept this offsetting proposal for wetland buffer removal to accommodate lots.</p> <p>All proposed lots must demonstrate a best efforts approach to maintaining and restoring the minimum 30m wetland buffer area in accordance with NVCA Guidelines Section 3.0 which state: <i>“Offsetting for removal of a regulated feature will not be permitted solely on the basis of convenience, increasing lot yield, or making an otherwise undevelopable property (or section of a property) into a developable property.”</i> Through offsetting, NVCA staff can support a minor reduction to the minimum 30m wetland buffer on Block 55, Lots 8, 41 and 42 for the purposes of regularizing the lot shape. Encroachment of lots into existing naturalized vegetation areas within the wetland buffer and the 6m ToB setback is not supported.</p> <p>The applicant is advised that the current area of wetland buffer proposed to be removed is beyond what is necessary for lot regularization and therefore not accepted.</p>		
--	--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

			<p>c. Offsetting for wetland buffer encroachment to accommodate Street C and SWM Block 55:</p> <p>The Wetland Offsetting Plan for wetland buffer encroachment for required infrastructure, including Street C and the SWM pond is accepted in concept. Cash-in-lieu can be considered appropriate compensation for these portions of the proposed development. NVCA staff will request that the retained buffers in these areas be naturalized to the extent possible through the Restoration and Naturalization Planting Plans required as a Condition of Draft Plan Approval referenced in comment #9 above and comments below.</p>		
19			(12) Encroachment into the ToB setback and wetland buffers to accommodate the proposed road crossing is acknowledged as necessary in order to construct the road.		Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes no action required.
20			(13) SWM Block 55 should be situated outside the ToB setback.		Acknowledged. Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this is addressed.
21			(14) Where agricultural vegetation is present within retained wetland buffers, these buffers must be enhanced through the required Restoration and Naturalization Planting Plans. On-site enhancement of buffer areas may be considered as partial compensation for wetland buffer loss in the areas which necessitate minor regularization.		Acknowledged. Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this is addressed.
22			(15) The depth of lots 7, 8, 40, 41 and 42 must be revised to incorporate more appropriate setbacks from natural features. Block 55 may be situated within the wetland buffer (but outside the ToB setback) as it is proposed to be naturalized and will provide buffering functions.		Please see NVCA correspondence dated January 18, 2024 which notes this is addressed.

23			(16) The proposed zoning schedule appears not to incorporate the wetland setback in the proposed EP zone. It appears as though the EP zone is based on the 6m ToB setback. This must be revised to include all retained buffers as determined through this preliminary review ad consultation process as part of the EP zone.		This comment is addressed in the proposed draft Zoning Bylaw and Schedule.

**RE:   Mulmur – 937045 Airport Road – Draft Plan of Subdivision**

From: Land Use Planning – Hydro One  
Dated: June 21, 2022  
Subject: Files # Z11-2021 and SUB02-2021  
Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin.

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	<p>We are in receipt of your Draft Plan of Subdivison Application received June 21, 2022. 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.</p> <p>For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities’ please consult your local area Distribution Supplier.</p> <p>To confirm if Hydro One is your local distributor please follow the following link: <a href="http://www.hydroone.com/StormCenter3/">http://www.hydroone.com/StormCenter3/</a></p> <p>Please select “ Search” and locate address in question by entering the address or by zooming in and out of the map</p> <p>If Hydro One is your local area Distribution Supplier, please contact Customer Service at 1-888-664-9376 or e-mail <a href="mailto:CustomerCommunications@HydroOne.com">CustomerCommunications@HydroOne.com</a> to be connected to your Local Operations Centre</p> <p>Thank you, Kitty Luk Real Estate Assistant   Land Use Planning</p> <p>Hydro One Networks Inc. 185 Clegg Road Markham, ON   L6G 1B7</p>	IPS	Acknowledged.

	Email: landuseplanning@hydroone.com		
--	-------------------------------------	--	--

**RE: Mulmur – 937045 Airport Road – Draft Plan of Subdivision**

From: Enbridge Gas Inc.  
Dated: January 16, 2022  
Subject: Files # Z11-2021 and SUB02-2021  
Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin.

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	Enbridge Gas Inc. does not currently have gas piping within the immediate area. To arrange for natural gas servicing to this development please contact Enbridge Gas Inc.'s Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea20@Enbridge.com. Alice Coleman Municipal Planning Analyst Long Range Distribution Planning — ENBRIDGE TEL: 416-495-5386   Alice.Coleman@Enbridge.com 500 Consumers Road, North York, Ontario M2J 1P8 enbridge.com Safety. Integrity. Respect. Inclusion.	IPS	Acknowledged. We will contact Enbridge to discuss future opportunities for servicing connections within the immediate area through detailed design. Applicant has had preliminary discussions with enbridge and at this time, it is expected that individual propane tanks will be utilized for service.

**RE: Mulmur – 937045 Airport Road – Draft Plan of Subdivision**

From: Bell Services  
Dated: December 3, 2021  
Subject: Files # Z11-2021 and SUB02-2021  
Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin.

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	Attention: Planning Department Re: Draft Plan of Subdivision (SUB02-2021), Armstrong Subdivision, Mansfield.; Your File No. SUB02-2021 Our File No. 92031 Dear Sir/Madam, We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval: “  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.	IPS	Acknowledged – DP conditions to be satisfied through detailed design/agreement stage.



	<p>The Owner agrees that 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.”</p> <p>The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at <a href="mailto:planninganddevelopment@bell.ca">planninganddevelopment@bell.ca</a> during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.</p> <p>To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations. Please note that WSP operates Bell’s development tracking system, which includes the intake of municipal circulations. WSP is mandated to notify Bell when a municipal request for comments or for information, such as a request for clearance, has been received. All responses to these municipal circulations are generated by Bell, but submitted by WSP on Bell’s behalf. WSP is not responsible for Bell’s responses and for any of the content herein. If you believe that these comments have been sent to you in error or have questions regarding Bell’s protocols for responding to municipal circulations and enquiries, please contact <a href="mailto:planninganddevelopment@bell.ca">planninganddevelopment@bell.ca</a></p> <p>Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.</p> <p>Yours truly, Ryan Courville Manager - Planning and Development Network Provisioning Email: <a href="mailto:planninganddevelopment@bell.ca">planninganddevelopment@bell.ca</a></p>		
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

**RE: Armstrong (Mansfield) subdivision**  
From: Chris Fast (County of Dufferin, Waste Services)  
Dated: June 22, 2022  
Subject: Files # Z11-2021 and SUB02-2021  
Township of Mulmur, County of Dufferin.

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
<b>From the perspective of waste collection by the County of Dufferin, the following are the general parameters that are required to be adhered to:</b>			
1.	No backing up within the site by waste collection vehicles. A turn around must be in place (hammerhead, or otherwise).	JD Engineering	Noted – turn arounds are provided where necessary, no backing up within the development would be required.
2.	Turning radii of 5 meters.	JD Engineering	Noted – minimum 9m inside corner radius is proposed (per fire standard, see comment 5 below).
3.	Minimum road width of 6m.	JD Engineering	Minimum road width is greater than 6m.
4.	Access to collect on both side of the road.	JD Engineering	Noted

5.	For corner radii and turnaround dimensions, we default to that of the standards for Fire Services vehicles.	JD Engineering	See response to comment # 2 above.
6.	Sections 2 - 13 of our Waste Collection By-law spell out some further details that you should be aware of (as attached).	JD Engineering	Noted
7.	Can you please confirm that the proposed development meets these requirements? Can you also provide me with the dimensions of the turnaround?	JD Engineering	See confirmation above and updated plan showing turning radius of the turnaround.

**RE: 937045 Airport Road WSP Comments (County Planning)**

From: Silva Yousif, Senior Planner  
Dated: August 26, 2022  
Subject: Application for Zoning By-law Amendment (File No. Z11-2021) and  
Draft Plan of Subdivision (File No. SUB02-2021) -937045 Airport Road, Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
<b>Recommendation</b>			
1.	The applicant consults with the Township to confirm development requirements.	IPS	Noted – applicant has consulted with Township.
2.	The applicant consults with County GIS Staff for development requirements in regards to NG 911 addressing guidelines for public safety and CRTC mandates	IPS	Acknowledged. To be addressed at detailed design.
3.	The applicant to submit a trail network in regards to OS & EP blocks and overall site connectivity for the proposed subdivision review.	IPS	Acknowledged. To be provided at detailed design/DP condition.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Re: Open House Comments**

From: Tiziano Zaghi – Planning Consultant  
Dated: June 23, 2022  
Subject: Zoning Amendment & Plan of Subdivision  
Z11-2021/SUB02-2021 Armstrong (Mansfield)  
Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	<p>I have been retained by Mr. Dave Langstone (Client) to provide planning assistance. Mr. Langstone owns three parcels of land in the community of Mansfield. The properties are located immediately north of the Armstrong lands that are subject to Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications.</p> <p>My Client is concerned that that the proposed residential development represented by the Draft Plan of Subdivision (copy attached) included with the Open House Notice may negatively impact the orderly and future development potential of his lands.</p>		Draft plan has been revised to illustrate a potential future road connection to lands to the north.

	<p>Mr. Langstone is seeking written assurance from the Township and the Applicant that future municipal road access and servicing through the Armstrong lands to the southern boundary of Langstone Parcel 'A' will be provided.</p> <p>We therefore recommend the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Draft Plan of Subdivision be revised to show the future road extension to the north as identified on the attached Draft Plan of Subdivision, last revised on April 4, 2022 (copy attached).</li><li>• That BLOCK 62 be clearly delineated and labelled as a FUTURE ROW, consistent with BLOCK 63.</li><li>• That the provision of the future road extension be included as a 'Notes to Draft Approval' on the Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval Conditions.</li></ul>		
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

**Re: Armstrong Estates of Mansfield**

From: Ian Dalbec  
Dated: June 12 & 18  
Subject: Zoning Amendment & Plan of Subdivision  
Z11-2021/SUB02-2021 Armstrong (Mansfield)  
Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	We were interested in information on your upcoming development in Mansfield. Are we able to get on a list to find out about timelines and possible construction dates. We are very interested in the Mansfield area.		<p>Email response provided to resident:</p> <p>Thank you for reaching out on below and the proposed development in Mansfield.</p> <p>We are at the very early stages of the approvals process; we have not yet had a public meeting scheduled however we are hoping for a date in August.</p> <p>With respect to construction we are still a ways out at this time. In a best case scenario we are looking at 2023 though that may be aggressive.</p> <p>Moving forward I would suggest contacting the Township to request you are notified of any updates/progress of this proposed development. You can contact their Planner/CAO/Clerk - Tracey Atkinson &lt;<a href="mailto:tatkinson@mulmur.ca">tatkinson@mulmur.ca</a>&gt;.</p> <p>If you are supportive of the development I would also encourage you to provide written correspondence to the Township as well; alternatively if you are not supportive or if you have any questions/concerns, please feel free to let me or the Township know so we can make every effort to address them.</p> <p>Thanks again for your interest Ian. If there is anything more I can do please let me know.</p>

2.	Thanks for your response. It went to my spam folder originally, hence the delay in getting back to you. I was just wondering if you guys (IPS) are the builders also? Or will builders be selected at a later date?		<p>Good Morning Ian,</p> <p>Thanks for following up. We (IPS) are the planning consultants on behalf of the property owners and not the builders. We have many approvals to secure before we are considering builders which you are correct, will be selected at a future date and pending approvals.</p> <p>I hope this helps - anything more please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>If it is ok with you, may I forward this correspondence to the Township for their record?</p> <p>Thank you</p>
----	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Re: Armstrong Estates**

From: Doug Sawyer  
Dated: June 21, 2022  
Subject: Zoning Amendment & Plan of Subdivision  
Z11-2021/SUB02-2021 Armstrong (Mansfield)  
Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	<p>2 objections to the changes proposed</p> <p>1---town houses should not be permitted close to the estate lots of Thompson trail area.....the existing homes will be devalued by this action.</p> <p>2 --town house blocks show communal septic systems for each block----this practice is ill advised because septic systems need maintenance. Who is going to pay for the service when required ?? each individual owner?? That will be difficult because there will always be a nonconformist. then the Township will have to get involved &amp; add the cost to tax bills...I object to any thought of large septic tanks in my township &amp; the cost involved to original ratepayers.</p> <p>forgot to mention freshwater Township has us on water restrictions due to limited supply ...</p> <p>how is the proposed subdivision going to get water &amp; are we all going to run short as a result??</p>	IPS	<p>Townhouse Dwelling Units have been removed from the proposal in place of semi detached dwellings. This type of built form represents a more efficient use of land and in our opinion remains compatible with the area. Further, they are proposed based on a number of considerations, including but not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provincial planning policies that encourage residential intensification within settlement areas to provide for a range of housing types and mix of housing densities that will meet current and future resident needs.</li><li>• County planning policies that encourage growth within settlement areas that reflects a range of housing opportunities of varying densities.</li><li>• Township directives for the development of complete communities, that can accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including opportunities to accommodate ageing in place.</li></ul> <p>The proposed shared septic systems for the semi-detached have been design in accordance with current engineering standards. The proposed design is currently under review with Township and County Staff.</p> <p>The proposed shared septic systems will be maintained under an agreement with the applicable property owners, and as such the costs of maintaining these systems will fall upon the property owner and not the municipality.</p> <p>A Functional Servicing Report (FSR) has been submitted in support of these applications. The FSR concludes that proposed connection into the municipal water system can sufficiently support the proposed development, with no adverse impact to the municipal water supply and flows. The proposed water servicing plan has been submitted to the Township and County for review.</p>

**Re: Question for Armstrong Development Meeting**

From:  
Dated: June 29, 2022  
Subject: Zoning Amendment & Plan of Subdivision  
Z11-2021/SUB02-2021 Armstrong (Mansfield)  
Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	<p>Question for Open House</p> <p>I am wondering in the developers are considering any of the following options for the homes:</p> <p>1) visitable housing - making houses accessible to those with mobility issues</p> <p>2) geothermal heating - using vertical installation for all homes</p> <p>3) solar panels on roofs</p> <p>4) building materials that are environmentally friendly</p> <p>With the state of climate change in the world, this is an opportunity for the developer and Mulmur to show their commitment to making a better, environmentally friendly community and locally addressing climate change. The public wants these options in their homes, and the slight increase in costs to provide them is minimal when purchasing a new home. These features also provide an excellent marketing opportunity that would attract buyers to these homes.</p> <p>If the developer is not planning to include any of these options in their homes, I would like to know the rationale for their decision, and if that is the case is there still room to negotiate these options.</p>	IPS	<p>We are at the very early stages of the approvals process, where the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are not the appropriate tools to address accessible design, geothermal heating, solar panels, or environmentally friendly building materials. However the applicant has made a note of these options for potential future inclusion into the homes during the construction stage, should the applications be approved. It is noted that all homes will be made accessible in accordance with OBC and AODA requirements. Should the applications be approved, individual home owners would have the ability to purchase a wide range of features, including energy efficient options, including but not limited to those listed. It should be noted that the developer and the home builders may not be the same entity.</p>

**Re: SUB02-2021 Armstrong Lands (Mansfield) Comments**

From: Troy Stewart  
Dated: June 29, 2022  
Subject: Zoning Amendment & Plan of Subdivision  
Z11-2021/SUB02-2021 Armstrong (Mansfield)  
Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Will a video recording of the open house be available after tonight?</p> <p>As a resident on Airport Rd. I have a few comments and thoughts on the development.</p> <p>Overall I think the idea of density is good, but I feel like with Mansfield having stores / gas station access, as well as the current subdivision, that there is a really big opportunity for the Township to adopt a more children/people friendly approach to the subdivision. There will be a lot of families and kids in the area, so I think it would really help them as well as the economics of Mulmur.</p>	IPS	<p>It is our understanding that the Township will not be providing a video recording of the Open House.</p> <p>The proposal accommodates for two (2) walkway blocks to support active transportation. Designated trails within the Parkland Block and EP lands are to be explored further through detailed design should be proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications be approved; however there are environmental and hazard considerations when contemplating access through EP lands. Blocks 51-52 on the draft plan contain steep slopes which may not be appropriate for active transportation. The development is located in proximity to the ball diamonds and is supportive of walking/biking to this amenity.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. In their plans, there isn't really any infrastructure outside of sidewalks to support bikes or kids. Having designated trails within the plan would help.</li><li>2. Mansfield itself currently only has stone shoulders outside the immediate businesses. There should be infrastructure in place around the ball diamonds and these subdivisions to encourage walking and biking.</li><li>3. Street A directly goes onto Airport Road with only a stop sign. Given the amount of speed &amp; traffic, I don't see the need for Street A. Street C that exits onto County Rd. 17 is barely any more distance &amp; is far safer. Left hand turns onto Airport Rd. are highly dangerous, especially in the summer where traffic backs up due to the Mansfield light.<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a.This Street A could just be a pedestrian/bike access which would tie into my comments into 1 &amp; 2 above.</li></ol></li></ol> <p>Here are some good reasons to think about building more friendly subdivisions. There also is a consulting firm called Strong Towns which could be used to prove this in Mulmur's situation. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7IsMeKI-Sv0">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7IsMeKI-Sv0</a> <a href="https://youtu.be/Ds-v2-qyCc8">https://youtu.be/Ds-v2-qyCc8</a></p>		Street A has been reviewed through a Traffic Impact Study submitted in support of this application to ensure that it meets engineering standards for safe vehicular movement. The applicants Traffic Engineer has had considerable discussion with the County regarding the proposed access (which has been determined to be necessary for traffic flow and emergency services). It is understood additional comment from the County will be provided through this re-submission.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Re: Armstrong Open House**  
From: Chris McElhone and Janice Kwan  
Dated: June 27, 2022  
Subject: Zoning Amendment & Plan of Subdivision  
Z11-2021/SUB02-2021 Armstrong (Mansfield)  
Township of Mulmur

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>As farm owners and residents in the area, we are writing to express our opposition to the development of this subdivision. We are concerned that it will disrupt the natural ecosystem in our area and threaten the surrounding habitat and farmland - our township's most precious resource. While this proposed subdivision is not formally situated in the Greenbelt, it is just adjacent to its borders. As we all recognize, an imaginary line does not act as a physical barrier to the cascades of ecologic disruptions that this development and its associated density may introduce to our community. Therefore, we sincerely hope that you will not approve this application.</p> <p>Yours truly, Chris McElhone and Janice Kwan</p>	IPS	<p>We acknowledge that the Greenbelt boundary is approximately 4.0 kilometres west of the subject lands.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) has been submitted in support of this application, to ensure that the proposal will not have adverse impact to the ecological integrity of the lands or threaten Significant Wildlife Habitat. Further, through the EIS the proposed Environmental Protection lands were identified as warranting protection. The Environmental Protection zoning of the lands does not permit the development of new buildings and structures, with the exception of pump houses and buildings and structures for flood and erosion. It is understood that NVCA is supportive in principle based on the materials provided to date from an natural heritage/ecology perspective.</p>

**Re: Armstrong Open House**  
From: Members of Public



Subject: Zoning Amendment & Plan of Subdivision  
Z11-2021/SUB02-2021 Armstrong (Mansfield)  
Township of Mulmur

**\*\*VERBAL COMMENTS PROVIDED AT THE OPEN HOUSE WERE RESPONDED TO AT THE MEETING. WHERE SOME COMMENTS REQUIRED FOLLOW-UP, THIS WAS COMPLETED SHORTLY AFTER THE OPEN HOUSE WITH APPLICABLE PERSON(S). GIVEN THE ABOVE AND IN ORDER TO FACILITATE A CLEAR ANALYSIS OF THE COMMENTS PROVIDED, VERBAL COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE OPEN HOUSE HAVE BEEN SUMMARIZED BY THEME IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS\*\***

#	Comments Received	Action / Consultant	Response
1.	Inquiry into whether the lots are currently for sale or when they will be available for sale.	IPS	We are at the very early stages of the approvals process. With respect to construction, we are still a ways out at this time. In a best case scenario we are looking at 2023 though that may be aggressive.
2.	Inquiry into how the homes are proposed to be heated.	IPS	We are at the very early stages of the approvals process, where the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are not the appropriate tool to address home heating systems and design. Details regarding home heating systems will be determined at later detailed design/building stages, however it is expected that each home will have the provision for propane as a heating option; alternative options may be considered at time of construction based on individual preferences.
3.	Inquiry into why the Parkland Block has been situated in the proposed location. Concern that the Parkland Block is on the outskirts of Mansfield and outside of the settlement area boundary.	IPS	The Parkland Block has been situated outside of the settlement area boundary to make efficient use of the lands within the settlement area boundary. The proposed Parkland Block is a permitted use within the ‘Rural’ land use designation. While the Parkland Block is currently on the outskirts of the settlement area, pedestrian and vehicular access will be provided to this amenity. While the park block may currently be located on the outskirts, it is possible that Mansfield may continue to grow in this direction.
4.	Inquiry into the ownership of the subject lands and surrounding properties.	IPS	The applicant and property owner is 1000062217 Ontario Inc. The applicant/property owner does not own any of the surrounding properties.
5.	Inquiry into the scope/terms of reference of the Traffic Impact Study (TIS), including whether or not the TIS took into account peak weekday and weekend traffic and completed a review of sight line distances.	IPS	The TIS reviewed peak weekday traffic and completed a review of sight line distances. A copy of the TIS has been submitted for the Township and County review.
6.	Inquiry into the septic capacity of the proposed development.	IPS	Septic capacity has been reviewed and it has been demonstrated that the proposed development can be appropriately serviced. A detailed D-5-4 Guideline Assessment has been prepared to support these findings.
7.	Concern that the proposal will impact the Environmental Protection lands.	IPS	An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) has been completed in support of the application. Through this study, the proposed Environmental Protection lands were identified as warranting protection. The Environmental Protection zoning of the lands does not permit the development of new buildings and structures, with the exception of pump houses and buildings and structures for flood and erosion. It is understood that NVCA is supportive in principle of the proposed development based on the mitigation measures proposed to existing features.
8.	Inquiry into whether the Environmental Protection lands will be available for parkland/public use.	IPS	The Environmental Protection lands are not intended to be dedicated as Parkland. We will work with the Township and NVCA to explore opportunities for passive trails through these lands.
9.	Inquiry into whether sidewalk/pedestrian access will be provided to County Road 17 from the proposed development. Similarly, inquiry into whether sidewalks/pedestrian access will be contemplated from the subdivision to the south to the proposed development.	IPS	Walkway blocks are proposed to facilitate direct pedestrian connections from the proposed development to County Road 17. Should the proposed applications be approved, we can work with the Township and County to explore additional connections, including <u>connections to the subdivision south of County Road 17.</u>

10.	Inquiry into whether the homes will contemplate accessible design.	IPS	We are at the very early stages of the approvals process, where the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are not the appropriate tool to address accessible design. Details regarding accessible design will be determined at later detailed design/building stages and at a minimum will meet OBC and AODA requirements. Any additional accessibility needs can be considered as needed by individual purchasers.
11.	Inquiry into whether the homes will contemplate energy efficient design.	IPS	We are at the very early stages of the approvals process, where the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are not the appropriate tool to address energy efficient design. Details regarding energy efficient design will be determined at later detailed design/building stages.
12.	Inquiry into whether the semi-detached and townhouse units will be limited to single family occupancy.	IPS	Tenancy is not controlled by the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications.
13.	Inquiry into the history of the applicant and their expertise in land use development of rural communities.	IPS	The applications submitted are being considered on the planning merits and how the applications conform to and/or are consistent with applicable policy, independent of the history/expertise of the developer.
14.	Inquiry into the anticipated approval timelines.	IPS	It is the Applicant's intent, in their preferred and best case scenario, to proceed with the following timelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• August 2022 – Public Meeting</li> <li>• October 2022 – Draft Plan and ZBA Approvals</li> <li>• 2023 – Subdivision Registration</li> <li>• 2024 – Construction</li> </ul>
15.	Inquiry into the programming of the Parkland Block.	IPS	We are at the very early stages of the approvals process, where the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications are not the appropriate tool to address the programming of the Parkland Block. We will work in collaboration with the municipality through the detailed design stages to ensure that the programming of the Parkland Block reflects Township park and recreational needs.
16.	Inquiry into whether new wells will need to be drilled or additional water tanks provided to accommodate the proposed development.	IPS	No new wells or water tanks will be required to accommodate the proposed development. A Functional Servicing Report (FSR) has been submitted in support of these applications. The FSR concludes that proposed connection into the municipal water system can sufficiently support the proposed development, with no adverse impact to the municipal water supply and flows. The proposed water servicing plan has been submitted to the Township and County for review. However, it is understood that the Township is in the process of considering upgrades to the existing Mansfield water supply.
17.	Inquiry into the potential of a road access to be provided to north abutting property.	IPS	Full response is provided in response to comments received from Tiziano Zaghi – Planning Consultant.