



Credit Valley Conservation
 1255 Old Derry Rd,
 Mississauga, ON
 L5N 6R4
 905-670-1615 ext. 380
 Annie Li
 Planner, Planning & Development Services

RESPONSE TO CVC COMMENTS DATED AUGUST 22, 2022
16-18 MILL ST, GEORGETOWN, ONTARIO

This bellow table constitutes the response to CVC's comments dated August 22, 2022 for the development proposal at 16-18 Mill St, Georgetown, ON. This letter is to be read in the context of the May 2023 revised development application.

CVC Comment	Response
GENERAL	
1. Please include in the next submission a response matrix outlining how the following comments have been addressed.	This file constitutes the response to CVC comments
2. The limit of the Regulatory Floodline (elevation of 243.69m) has been delineated on the subject property and the proposed right-of-way (proposed road widening). However, the floodplain would appear to continue on Mill Street and may be located at the access of the site on Mill St. This has not been delineated on the updated Grading and Drainage Plan nor on the provided survey in this 2nd submission. As such, additional surveying should be undertaken on all of Mill Street adjacent to the subject site to confirm the limit of the floodplain depth on the road and at the entrance of the subject site as it relates to safe access. Please provide an updated Grading/Drainage Plan and the topographic survey to show this information.	The flood line is shown on the topographic survey by J. R. Finnie dated 2020-01-17. This line extends across the corner of the property all the way to Mill St.
3. Please clarify whether the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Schedule would include the "road widening" portion of the subject property which would be within the new right-of-way. If so, the limit of the Floodline should be	All setback and density requirements in the ZBA and OPA are calculated after any deductions to the municipality for a road widening. The majority of the flood line falls within the "road widening" right-of-way.

placed in an appropriate hazard zone.	
4. Detailed design review of the erosion and sediment control drawings and landscape plans will be deferred to the subsequent site plan approval application. Preliminary comments to guide the preparation of these drawings are included in the Appendix.	Updated Erosion and Sediment control drawings and landscape plans have been provided.
ENGINEERING	
5. It is unclear if there is any grading taking place along the project north edge of the site within the sideyard/building setback adjacent to the floodlines. Please confirm and/or provide elevations or sections depicting the proposed grading in this area.	Only minor surface grading will be done during the replacement of pavement with topsoil and vegetation. The proposed grades are shown in the Grading and Drainage drawing.
6. Please confirm the drawdown time of the infiltration trench as per the provided comment response. The SAGES infiltration system has conflicting details within the text and Table 6b, with discrepancies between the infiltration rate as well as the volume stored per pipe.	Infiltration is no longer planned from stormwater management due to a conflict with the basement of the building. Instead, rooftop storage will be used. Stored water will be used for landscaping and flush tanks. See section 3.10 of the FSR. SAGES system has been removed from proposal.
7. The assessment of the infiltration rate within the geotechnical report could not be located. Please clarify.	Infiltration is no longer planned for stormwater management.
8. The Site Servicing Plan drawing has a label at the project west end of the site indicating an infiltration trench of dimensions 18m x 1.5m x 1.0m. This trench was not mentioned in the FSR, nor is there any associated linework on the plan. Please clarify if this is a proposed feature.	This infiltration trench has been removed from the proposal
9. The response letter notes conversations have occurred with Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks (MECP) staff and that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS) has been updated. This submission did not include an updated EIS, please provide this in the next submission for our record/file.	The updated EIS is included.
10. Based on the review of the current submission documents, the Tree Protection Report notes individual tree removals are required to accommodate the development. To avoid contravention of the Migratory Bird Convention Act, tree removals should be planned to occur outside of	This comment has been added to the Tree Inventory & Preservation Plan dated 2023-02-13.

<p>the breeding bird window of April 1 – August 31. Alternatively, if removals are planned within this window, a qualified avian biologist should conduct a nest search within 24 hours prior to removals and develop mitigation plans for any active nests discovered. Please plan works accordingly and include this timing restriction on the plans.</p>	
<p>APPENDIX</p>	
<p>1. Landscape planning plans were provided in the 1st submission OPA/ZBLA submission but not provided in the 2nd submission. As such, the following 1st submission comments regarding the landscape plans are re-iterated below:</p>	
<p>a. The landscaping plan appears to show an overall increase in vegetated areas on site. Ideally the sod strip along the north and rear of the property would be naturally vegetated with a native seed mix to enhance the area which will help support RSD habitat. Ideally the area would be seeded with CVC 1 Upland Mix from the CVC Plant Selection Guideline (https://cvc.ca/wpcontent/uploads/2018/04/Plant-Selection-Guideline-FINAL-APRIL-24th-2018.pdf) and be left as a no mowing area.</p>	<p>This has been considered by the landscape architect. It is recommended not to use no-mow plants there as it is identified as outdoor amenity space adjacent to the patios of the units on that side of the structure.</p>
<p>b. False spirea (<i>Sorbaria sorbifolia</i>) and <i>Hemerocallis</i> ssp. are considered priority invasive species by CVC. Please replace these species with common native/non-invasive species to reduce the risk of spread into the surrounding natural environment.</p>	<p>These species have been removed from the landscape plan.</p>
<p>2. Detailed review of erosion and sediment control measures/drawings will be undertaken at details design. Please see the following comments on the expectations for the erosion and sediment control measures:</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>a. Please refer to the Standard Notes for Drawings Submitted for CVC Review and apply the notes to the Erosion and Sediment Control drawings as necessary. https://cvc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Standard-Notes-for-Drawings-Submitted-for-CVC-Review.pdf</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>b. As per TRCA's Erosion and Sediment Control</p>	<p>The catchbasin protection has been replaced with</p>

<p>Guide for Urban Construction, for inlet catchbasin protection, the use of geotextile fabric placed under the inlet grates is discouraged due to the frequent cleaning required. Please consider a recommended alternative such as a bag/sack configuration.</p>	<p>a bag configuration.</p>
<p>c. The mud mat detail shows 50 mm clear stone over existing ground. A nonwoven geotextile fabric or graded aggregate filter is recommended under the stone layer. Additionally, a minimum depth of 300 mm is required (450 mm recommended) for the stone layer. Refer to Figure B2-29 within TRCA's Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for further details.</p>	<p>Proposed mat has been proposed of minimum 300mm stone over geotextile.</p>
<p>d. While a mud mat detail is shown on the ESC plan, it is not shown in the plan view. Please update.</p>	<p>Proposed mud mat has been included on plan view.</p>
<p>e. The drawing notes indicate that straw bales should be erected along the existing ditch. Straw bales are not a supported ESC measure as per TRCA's guidelines. Consider replacing with filter socks or fibre rolls. Additionally, please indicate the location and configuration of this measure on the plans.</p>	<p>Straw bales have been removed from drawing.</p>
<p>f. Please indicate on the drawings the pump discharge location for dewatering/unwatering and treatments provided at the outlet. The outlet should be located 30 m from the watercourse. If this is not achievable, a multi-barrier approach is required. Due to the depth of excavation required for the construction of the underground garage, please demonstrate whether dewatering will be required. If so, please provide a dewatering plan and obtain necessary permits.</p>	<p>Dewatering will be required. A preliminary calculation for dewatering requirements is included with the application submission. Detailed dewatering requirements are to be determined at the structural design stage when the footing types and depths are known.</p>
<p>g. Please indicate on the plan where the staging and stockpile areas are located, and ensure these areas are isolated with ESC measures.</p>	<p>No stockpiling of soil is intended.</p>
<p>h. It is unclear if the new sidewalk and associated landscaping located in the area between the new and existing property line are to be constructed as a part of the proposed works. If so, please provide ESC measures to isolate this area.</p>	<p>ESC measures to be built along entire property perimeter.</p>



File 30663J
April 26, 2023
16-18 Mill St, Georgetown ON
Response Letter to CVC

CONCLUSION

This letter was prepared to provide a response to CVC comments for the development permit at 16-18 Mill St. We trust that this response in addition to the revised application documents are sufficient to address the CVC comments. Please do not hesitate to contact us for future questions or concerns.

Egmond Associates Ltd
Geotechnical & Environmental Engineers

Julie vanderMeulen, B.Eng., M.A.Sc