

**Town of Halton Hills**  
**2147925 Ontario Inc. (McMASTER STREET & MEGAN DRIVE)**

**Town Comments Received: March 1, 2018**  
**RESPONSE MATRIX Completed: November 26, 2019**

**LIST OF COMMENTS RECEIVED**

No.	Reference	Comments	Consultant	Consultants Response	Response Accepted Y / N
-----	-----------	----------	------------	----------------------	-------------------------

**TOWN OF HALTON HILLS - DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING DEPT.- TOWN COMMENTS**  
**March 1, 2018**

1.0	<b>Planning</b> Tony Boutassis – Senior Planner, Development Review Adam Farr – Manager of Development Review				
1.1	<b>Draft Plan of Subdivision</b>	The proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision should be revised based on the comments provided in this letter by Town departments and external agencies and should be included in the next submission. Notwithstanding the references to features of the currently submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision (i.e. specific lots, blocks, etc.), a revised Plan must be submitted that incorporates all of the comments outlined in this letter.	Wellings Planning Consultant	The revised plan dated June 22, 2018 addresses the comments as described in the subsequent sections.	
1.2	<b>Draft Zoning By-law</b>	A revised Draft Zoning By-Law is required to implement the Draft Plan of Subdivision that complies with the polices and guidelines of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan and the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Completed and submitted as a Schedule to the Planning Justification Report	
1.3	<b>Planning Justification Report</b>	A Planning Justification Report is required that makes specific reference to the policy direction found in the Glen Williams Secondary Plan and Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines and indicate how the proposed development conforms to those applicable policies and guidelines. Please see Sections 1.5 and 1.6 of this letter for more information.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Completed – see sections 1.5 and 1.6	
1.4	<b>Urban Design Guidelines &amp; Architectural Design Guidelines</b>	Urban Design Guidelines & Architectural Design Guidelines are required that make specific reference to the policy direction found in the Glen Williams Secondary Plan as required under Policy H4.5.3 c) ii) and the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines and indicate how the proposed development conforms to those applicable policies and guidelines. Please see Sections 1.5 and 1.6 of this letter for more information.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Completed. See below.	
1.5	<b>Conformity with the Glen Williams Secondary Plan (GWSP)</b>	As indicated above, the required Planning Justification Report and Urban Design & Architectural Design Guidelines will need to demonstrate conformity to the Glen Williams Secondary Plan Polices indicated below. Based on a review of the materials received from the Applicant to date, Town staff has provided comments with regard to each of the policies listed. Please note that only policies pertaining to the proposed development have been listed.	Wellings Planning Consultant		
1.5.1	<b>Policy H4.3.3 – Trail Systems:</b>	See Section 3.2 – Trail Linkages of this letter for comments related to pedestrian trails from Recreation & Parks.	Wellings Planning Consultant	As addressed in the Planning Justification Report, a trail linkage can be achieved by way of an easement over Lot 21 if deemed appropriate.	

1.5.2	<b>Policy H4.3.5 – Water &amp; Wastewater Services:</b>	Generally, the policy indicates that all new development shall be serviced by piped Regional water and the primary method of servicing for new development shall be through piped Regional wastewater services. The subject development is proposed to be connected to both Regional piped water and wastewater services. In addition to the Regional comments listed in the next section below, please see attached the comments of the Halton Region letter of January 15, 2018, on the revised Functional Servicing Report, dated September, 2017, that will need to be satisfied with the next submission.	Condeland	We updated the FSR to discuss the water servicing by piped Regional water on Section D.2 the wastewater primary method of servicing through piped Regional wastewater services on Section C.1. FSR dated November 2019.	
1.5.3	<b>Policy H4.3.6 – Groundwater Protection</b>	As per Schedule H4-2-Glen Williams Environmental Areas, the proposed development is not located in an Area of Potentially Higher Recharge.	LGL	Information was added to the EIR under Policy Section 4.5 The Town of Halton Hills.	
		An Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) and a Preliminary Hydrogeological Assessment (PHA) have been submitted by the Applicant. Please see the attached comment memos from Halton Region (Shelly Partridge), dated September 14, 2009, and December 7, 2011, for comments related to the EIR and PHA that will need to be satisfied with the next submission.	LGL		
		Town staff note that a number of residents either adjacent to or in close proximity to the subject property have raised concerns regarding the high groundwater in the area and the flooding of basements.	Terraprobe	Section 7.0 of the updated Hydrogeological Assessment addresses Water Table Elevation.	
1.5.4	<b>Policy H4.3.7 – Stormwater Management</b>	Discussion relating to stormwater management and how the quality and quantity of runoff will be managed has been included within the revised Functional Servicing Report (September 2017)	Condeland	We updated the FSR to discuss the quality of runoff on Section F.2.2 and the quantity of runoff on Section F.2.1. FSR dated November 2019.	
		See Section 2.2.3 – Stormwater Management of this letter for specific comments / deficiencies from Development Engineering relating to stormwater management.	Condeland	We updated the FSR to address the specific comments/ deficiencies reviewed by the Development Engineering.	
1.5.5	<b>Policy H4.3.8 – Hamlet Boundaries and Buffers</b>	This section states in part that: “To further achieve the objective of preserving the hamlet character, a general lot line setback of 20 metres from the hamlet boundary in new development areas should be targets. However, lesser widths may be approved where it can be shown to the Town of Halton Hills, that this has been achieved. Lands within this setback will be allowed to regenerate as private natural areas or be used for public park purposes such as trail systems.”	LGL and Wellings Planning Consultant	Policy H4.3.8 is noted in the EIR under Policy Section 4.4 The Hamlet of Glen Williams Secondary Plan.	
		The Hamlet Buffer is shown on the northern limits of the subject lands on Schedule H4-1-Glen Williams Land Use Plan.	LGL and Wellings Planning Consultant	Information was added to the EIR under Policy Section 4.5 The Town of Halton Hills.	

		The EIR currently proposes a 4.5 metre wide enhanced buffer that would be retained in private ownership without any justification for proposing a reduced width.	LGL	Addressed on page 25 of the LGL report. The 4.5m buffer width is consistent with sketch provided by Town staff (fax from Warren Harris, Sept 2005) and will support a variety of native plant species including shrubs and upper canopy that will provide a natural screen. Plant diversity will provide wildlife habitat. This buffer meets the intent of Section 6.4 especially compared to the existing hedgerow that is narrow, with gaps and with limited screening capacity.	
		See section 3.4 – Hamlet Buffer of this letter for specific comments related to the buffer from Recreation & Parks.	LGL	Noted.	
1.5.6	<b>Policy H4.3.10 – Archaeological Resources:</b>	A Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment, prepared by AMICK Consultants Limited, was submitted by the Applicant, dated May 18, 2010  As per the Halton Region comments dated December 7, 2011, the Region requires a copy of the approval from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport for their records prior to clearing this requirement.	AMICK Consultants	A copy of the letter from Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport is provided along with the submission.	
1.5.7	<b>Policy H4.3.11 – Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection</b>	See Section 1.5 – Conformity with the Hamlet Design and Protection Guidelines of this letter for comments related to urban and architectural design.			
1.5.8	<b>Policy H4.3.12 – Traffic</b>	A Traffic Impact Study is required as part of the next submission. See Section 4.1 – Traffic Impact Study of this letter for more information.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Traffic Impact Study completed – Cole Engineering, August 2018.	
1.5.9	<b>Policy H4.5.2 – Hamlet Residential Area – Permitted Uses</b>	The lands are designated Hamlet Residential Area, which permits the proposed development of single detached residential dwellings.	Wellings Planning Consultant		
1.5.10	<b>Policy H4.5.3 – Hamlet Residential Area – Land Use Policies</b>	The following provides a list of required studies and revisions to satisfy deficiencies outlined in this letter:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A Traffic Impact Study is required;</li> <li>- Urban Design and Architectural Design Guidelines are required. See Section H4.5.3 c)ii) of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan for more information on what matters the Guidelines should address;</li> <li>- A revised Functional Servicing Report (September 2017) requires significant revisions based on Town and Regional comments;</li> <li>- An Environmental Implementation Report requires revisions based on Regional comments. Please see Section X7 – Hamlet of Glen Williams Terms of Reference for Environmental Implementation Reports in the Town’s Official Plan for more information.</li> </ul>	Other Consultants and LGL	The studies have all been completed to address agency comments.	

		<p>The maximum lot size for residential development on Regional water and wastewater services for residential development on Regional water and wastewater services is 0.1 hectares (0.25 acres). Upon review of the Draft Plan of Subdivision, all lots seem to comply with this requirement.</p>	<p>Condeland and Wellings Planning Consultant</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	
		<p>Similarly, the proposal should provide for a range of lot sizes, consistent with the existing hamlet character, generally ranging from 0.1 hectares (0.25 acres) to 0.4 hectares (1.0 acres).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The required Planning Justification Report and Urban Design and Architectural Design Guidelines need to address these polices.</li> </ul>	<p>Wellings Planning Consultant</p>	<p>A range of lot frontages (from 10m to 41.5m) have been provided. Lot areas range from approximately 1200m<sup>2</sup> to close to 3000m<sup>2</sup>. This is addressed in both the Urban and Architectural Guidelines and the Planning Justification Reports.</p>	
		<p>The maximum permitted density for a Plan of Subdivision on Regional piped water and wastewater services shall be 5 units per net residential hectare (2 units per net acre).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The currently proposed 32 residential units have a density of 4.96 units per net residential hectare, which complies with the maximum permitted density requirements outlined in the GWSP.</li> <li>- However, the required Planning Justification Report and Urban Design &amp; Architectural Design Guidelines needs to address whether the proposed density complies with the other polices of the GWSP, and also has to respond to comments from Town departments and external agencies.</li> </ul>	<p>Wellings Planning Consultant</p>	<p>The Planning Justification Report concludes that the proposed plan of subdivision conforms to the policies of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan. The Urban And Architectural Design Guidelines reflect the overall objective and vision for the Hamlet of Glen Williams.</p>	
1.6	<b>Conformity with the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines (HDHPG)</b>	<p>As indicated above, the required Urban &amp; Architectural Design Guidelines will need to demonstrate conformity to the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines. As a Design Study has not yet been submitted to the Town by the Applicant, it is difficult for Town staff to provide detailed and specific comments on guidance with the below comments.</p>	<p>Wellings Planning Consultant</p>	<p>Section 2.5 of the Urban Design Guidelines address architectural vision and objectives</p>	
1.6.1	<b>Guideline X6.1 – Street Type and Pattern:</b>	<p>The proposed street width of 20 metre is acceptable to Town staff as it generally matches the street widths of McMaster Street and Meagan Drive, which are being extended to provide road access to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Wellings Planning Consultant</p>	<p>As per the Urban Design Guidelines, the street is proposed with a 20 metre right-of-way. The streetscape condition of Street ‘A’ will be compatible with the existing Meagan and McMaster streetscapes condition as it will introduce the following streetscape elements to promote the rural character of the Hamlet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rolled curbs, consistent with the rural cross section provided in the Hamlet Design and Heritage Protection Guidelines (appended to the</li> </ul>	

				Glen Williams Secondary Plan);	
		Considering the existing McMaster Street and Meagan Drive cross-sections employ standard curbs and gutters and those roads are being extended into the subject property to provide access, Town staff recommends that a similar road design cross-section is continued for the proposed development, while implementing the GWSP Design Guidelines by utilizing semi-mountable type curbs.	Wellings Planning Consultant	See above.	
1.6.2	<b>Guideline X6.2 - Lot Configuration</b>	Town staff notes that the Applicant has included some variation in the frontages and depths of lots to maintain the Hamlet's random lot pattern. Further, the Applicant has varied the lot frontage so that no more than four (4) consecutive lots all have the same frontage.	Wellings Planning Consultant	The plan dated June 22, 2018 provides a range of lot frontages and sizes. See below.	
		Nonetheless, Town staff recommends that the Applicant revise the lot configuration prior to the next submission to incorporate greater lot frontage and depth variation. For instance, there are many examples within the Draft Plan of Subdivision where the lot frontage variation represents a minimal change in street frontage (1.2 metres), where a person on the street would not be able to comprehend a difference. The HDHPG permits adjacent lot frontages to vary up to 50%.	Wellings Planning Consultant	The plan dated June 22, 2018 provides lot frontages that range from 10m to approximately 40m. Lot areas range from approximately 1200m <sup>2</sup> to 2900m <sup>2</sup> providing a wide range of lot frontages and sizes.	
1.6.3	<b>Guideline X6.3 – Setbacks</b>	A Plan showing proposed building footprints has not been submitted by the Applicant. The Urban Design Guidelines to be submitted should have regard for the front, side and rear yard setback guidelines outlined in this section of the HDHPG.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Building setbacks are addressed in the draft zoning bylaw and in the urban design guidelines.	
1.6.4	<b>Guideline X6.4 – House at Focal Locations</b>	The required Architectural Design Guidelines to be submitted by the Applicant must discuss the design treatment of houses on corner lots and houses at pedestrian trails / links to open space areas.	Wellings Planning Consultant	The Urban Design Guidelines (Section 3.4) provide specific direction on prominent lot locations including corners, gateways and buildings adjacent to open space.	
		Based on the submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision, lots 1, 6, 7, 21, 22, 24, 29 and 32 are considered lots that are located in focal locations.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Noted and reflected in the Urban Design Guidelines.	
1.6.5	<b>Guideline X6.5 – Garages and Auxiliary Buildings</b>	The Urban Design and Architectural guidelines submitted should specifically discuss offering detached or attached garage options.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Section 4.1, 4.2 of the Architectural Design Guidelines address garage options.	
1.6.6	<b>Guidelines X6.6 – Architectural Design Principles for New Development &amp; X6.8 – Gateways</b>	The Architectural Design Guidelines to be submitted by the Applicant should specifically discuss how the proposed design of the homes and proposed development as a whole comply with the guidelines related to street address, entrance architecture, relationship to grade, windows and projecting elements, roofs, construction materials, landscaping, and gateways.	Wellings Planning Consultant	See Section 3.0 of the Architectural Design Guidelines The Urban Design Guidelines address landscaping and gateways under Section 4.0.	

		Additional information should be included that investigates the interface between the subject property and adjacent properties, including information on fencing details.	Wellings Planning Consultant	See Section 5.4 of the Architectural Design Guidelines Fencing is also addressed under Section 4.6 of the Urban Design Guidelines.	
--	--	---	------------------------------------	--	--

<b>2.0</b>	<b>Development Engineering</b> <b>Jeff Jelsma – Manager of Development Engineering</b>				
	Please ensure that all comments noted in the memo and associated redlines from Jeff Jelsma, dated December 21, 2011, as well as all the comments listed below are addressed with the next submission.				
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Revised Functional Servicing Report (September 2017)</b>	Development Engineering requires a revised Functional Servicing Report (FSR) that satisfies the comments below. The FSR, dated September 2017 did not address any of the comments or concerns from the previous memo from Jeff Jelsma, dated December 21, 2011. It appears that some sections relating to grading and stormwater management are word for word identical to the FSR, dated May 2009. Further, the submission did not include an updated Environmental Implementation Report or revised Draft Plan of Subdivision.	Condeland LGL	Please see updated the FSR dated November 2019. EIR to be addressed by LGL.	
<b>2.1.1</b>	<b>General Comments</b>	The list of reference documents and policies is missing from the FSR. Include with the next submission.	Condeland	Reference has been added in the FSR dated November 2019.	
<b>2.1.2</b>	<b>Grading, Drainage and Overland Flows</b>	The proposed grading shown does not meet the Town's standards. Refer to the rear yard grades for lot 26. Additional rear lot catch basins may be required. Include the rear yard drainage of the adjacent lots within the catchment of the pond or provide a suitable alternative.	Condeland	By introduction of storm sewer conveyance system along the north boundary to Meagan Dr. then follow existing road. Please see "Conceptual Servicing Plan" Appendix D, Fig.5 in the FSR dated November 2019.	
		Confirm the external drainage areas for this site. The pre-development drawing of the FSR indicates an outlet near drainage area 304 where our aerial photos identifies that this is an inlet with a substantial catchment area.	Condeland	We have confirmed an external area of 5.45 ha.	
		Rear yard catchment is required for all lots within this development. Lots 16 through 21 shall not drain to the lands to the north.	Condeland	We have installed rear yard catch basin on Lot 21.	
		The FSR needs to identify the major overland flow routes for this development and pond. All major overland routes not within a ROW shall be contained within a block owned by the Town.	Condeland	Refer to "Post Development Storm Tributary Plan", Appendix D, Fig.8 in the FSR dated November 2019.	
<b>2.1.3</b>	<b>Stormwater Management</b>	Update the Functional Servicing Report (FSR) to reflect the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) issued by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) regarding treatment train approach.	Condeland	Included extra depth SWM facility wetland.	

		Update the FSR to evaluate and discuss the proposed pond outlet. The Report needs to discuss the impacts to the existing infrastructure from the pond to the water course located on Wildwood Road.	Condeland	We updated the FSR to discuss the impact of the proposed pond outlet to the existing infrastructure.	
		Further discussion in the FSR is required related to how quality control will be achieved. Will there be a forebay, how long will the forebay need to be, will this fit within the proposed Stormwater Management Block?	Condeland	The SWM facility is a wetland pond per MOE, SWM Planning and Design Manual.	
		Provide discussion related to proposed outlet through the easement on 12097 existing lot grading and trees?	Condeland	Please see "Conceptual Servicing Plan" Appendix D, Fig.5 in the FSR.	
		Update the design of the pond to comply with the Town's Stormwater Policy dated March 2009. For example, an access road is required to both the inlet and outlet structure which will increase the pond block area. Further, Recreation and Parks are suggesting the pond incorporate a passive trail and recreational use. Ensure the sloping is designed accordingly.	Condeland	The pond has been updated to comply with the Town's Stormwater Policy dated March 2009.	
		Note that the Town may retain the services of a peer review consultant to review and provide comments on the next submission related to stormwater management and major surface drainage.			
2.1.4	<b>Proposed Road (Street 'A') and Curbs</b>	4.5m x 4.5m daylight triangles are required for the inside corners at lots 24 and 29	Condeland	The roadway geometry plan has been revised with 4.5m x 4.5m daylight triangles at lot 24 and 29.	
		The enlarged asphalt roadway bulbs as shown on the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and Grading Plan are not acceptable. Refer to Section 2.1.3 – Design Elements of the Subdivision Manual for roadway design requirements.	Condeland	The roadway geometry plan has been revised to an even width bends.	
		Although 0.5% curb grades are permitted, the detailed design shall incorporate a minimum 1% curb grade. Update the FSR accordingly.	Condeland	The FSR shows the road centerline grades at 1.00% and on the outside radius of the bends are at a min. of 0.70%.	
		Update the FSR to demonstrate the proposed road cross-section	Condeland	The FSR has been updated to demonstrate the proposed road cross-section.	
2.1.5	<b>Geotechnical and Hydrogeology</b>	The soil type identified in the FSR (Oneida Clay Loam) differs from the soil type identified in the Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Assessments prepared by Terraprobe (Clay / Silt Till). Further, the groundwater depth noted in the same report ranges from 1.1m to 2.8m below the surface as identified by Terraprobe. The FSR identifies that infiltration trenches are feasible for rear lot drainage. Provide clarification as to the types of soil for this site and provide comments from Terraprobe confirming infiltration is feasible in an updated report.	Condeland	Refer to "Infiltration, Groundwater Re-charge", Section F.5 in the FSR dated November 2019.	
		Note that the Town may retain the services of a peer review engineering consultant to review and provide comments on the next submission of this development.			
2.1.6	<b>Low Impact Development (LID)</b>	Update the FSR to discuss the suitable L.I.D. features proposed for this site	Condeland	L.I.D. will be determined at the detailed engineering design stage following Draft Plan approval.	
2.1.7	<b>Source Water Protection</b>	Update the FSR to include discussions related to source water protection	Condeland	The proposed pond is not located within the source water protection boundary.	

2.2	<b>Construction Management Plan</b>	<p>Due to the infill nature of this development and the potential impact to the surrounding road network based on the proposed extension of sanitary services, communication with existing residents and coordination of construction will be an important undertaking.</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of Draft Plan Conditions, Town staff request the confirmation of a Terms of Reference for a staged Construction Management Plan, which is to be implemented prior to any site alteration occurring and throughout the entire construction process up until occupancy of the last home. The Terms of Reference should be included in the Revised FSR. Please contact Jeff Jelsma – Manager of Development Engineering to discuss the Terms of Reference.</p> <p>The Construction Management Plan would include but is not limited to the following:</p>	Condeland	C.M.P. will be included as part of the engineering design stage.	
-----	-------------------------------------	---	-----------	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Central coordination contact for all community complaints;</li> <li>- Trades communication and enforcement plan;</li> <li>- Project phasing and staging</li> <li>- Parking;</li> <li>- Traffic, truck, access route plan;</li> <li>- Material delivery loading areas, coordination and enforcement;</li> <li>- Office space (construction trailer);</li> <li>- Working hours;</li> <li>- Debris (garbage);</li> <li>- Noise &amp; dust control;</li> <li>- Disposal of sill material;</li> <li>- Site safety and access;</li> <li>- Communications Plan for providing notification to and addressing the concerns of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Immediately adjacent residents;</li> <li>Glen Williams residents;</li> <li>Residents from surrounding neighbourhoods who may be impacted i.e. trail users, McMaster Street, Meagan Drive, Thomas Court, Eighth Line and Wildwood Road residents; and,</li> <li>The broader community who may have questions about the development</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Impact Mitigation Plan for residents impacted by off-site servicing. The Construction Management Plan to be implemented at the Applicant's cost will be required as a Condition of Draft Approval.</li> </ul>			
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Noise Impact Confirmation Letter</b>	<p>Development Engineering requires the Applicant to submit a Noise Impact Confirmation Letter prepared by a Professional that confirms a Noise Impact Study is not required based on an assessment of Policy C15 – Noise and vibration of the Town's Official Plan. If the Letter confirms that significant noise generators exist and / or future noise generators will be created, a full Noise Impact Study may be required.</p> <p>Please contact Jeff Jelsma – Manager of Development Engineering, for more information.</p>	Wellings Planning Consultant	Noise letter prepared by SS Wilson Associates dated April 30, 2018 concluded that no Noise Impact Study is required.	

<b>3.0</b>	<b>RECREATION &amp; PARKS</b>				
	Kevin Okimi – Manager of Parks and Open Space				
	Please ensure that all comments noted in the memos from Warren dated August 16, 2010, and March 9, 2012, as well as all the comments listed below are addressed with the next submission.				
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Tree Preservation</b>	An updated Environmental Implementation Report will be required that resolves the following issues related to tree preservation, as outlined in the memo from Warren Harris, dated March 9, 2012:			
		Section 3.5.1 and Appendix B do not provide any recommendations on the retention of any of the 53 on-site trees relative to their health or the feasibility to integrate them with the lotting design and preliminary lot grading plans. Additional rationale is required to support Item 3 of the conclusions in Section 8: "It is possible that several of these trees will be to be removed...".	LGL	Noted. LGL revised Section 8 to provide additional rationale on item 3. The majority of trees within the hedgerow are in poor condition as a result of Emerald Ash Borer. None of the trees identified within the study area are regulated under the Ontario Endangered Species Act, the Canada Species at Risk Act, or are of local significance. A total of 50 trees within the hedgerow on the western side of the subject property will be removed to accommodate the proposed development. Any tree replacement that	



				might be necessary should include only native tree species.	
		Given the extent of <i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i> in the existing tree inventory, reference should be given to evidence, or the potential for impact by the Emerald Ash Borer as part of the analysis in Section 3.5.1	LGL	Noted. LGL revised Section 3.5.1 of the EIR accordingly to include information on the 2018 visit, in which red ash trees within the hedgerow showed varying levels of decline with a number of the trees in serious decline or dead. These trees exhibited typical symptoms of Emerald Ash Borer infestation including epicormics branching, 'D' shaped exit hole, and thinning crown. As such, it was determined that Emerald Ash Borer is widespread throughout the red ash trees on the subject property.	
		Section 3.5.1 also states that the off-site hedgerow along the south-eastern property line have canopies that extend 12m into the subject site. Section 6.2.1 recommends tree protection 1m beyond this dripline and minimal grading. Due to the importance of this off-site vegetation as screening to the existing residential properties, additional information is required to confirm that no grading to the fence/property line occurs within this setback zone, especially with the rear yard catch basins referenced in E.2 Lot Grading Design of the Functional Servicing Report.	LGL	Tree protection measures have been added to Section 6.2 of the EIR. No grading is being proposed within the dripline of these trees and tree protection fencing and mitigation measures have been recommended.	
		A similar review should be done with the northwestern hedgerow to substantiate the protection measures for off-site trees and the amount of planting required to supplement them to achieve the Hamlet Buffer.	LGL	Tree protection measures have been added to Section 6.2 of the EIR. No grading is being proposed within the dripline of these trees and tree protection fencing and mitigation measures have been recommended.	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Trail Connections</b>	Schedule A of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan shows a trail linkage to the former CN Rail Line, now the Trans Canada Trail east of Halton Hills. An on-street connection is shown from the existing Wildwood Trail to the proposed subdivision. A provision for a future trail linkage to the former CN Railway will be required as a condition of approval.	Wellings Planning Consultant	A trail connection is proposed to be accommodated by way of an easement of a portion of Lot 21 if deemed appropriate.	
		A minimum 6m walkway/access block will be required to be transferred to the Town for the purposes of a future trail linkage. Fencing will be required to be installed by the developer at the east and west sides of the block.	Wellings Planning Consultant	See above	
		Further, pedestrian connections within the Town's right-of-way to the existing Wildwood Rail Trail will be required. The final routing of the connection will be determined through detailed design and in coordination with the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). Alternatively, a separate walkway block or sidewalks could be dedicated to the Town through the proposed subdivision pending further adjustments to the Draft Plan and discussions with Town staff.	Wellings Planning Consultant	See above	
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Parkland / Green Space</b>	Town staff notes that there has been interest expressed by the community in the creation of a shared gathering space.	Wellings Planning Consultant	An area has been identified in associated with Block 33, SWM.	
		The Applicant should include a passive recreational / gathering space in conjunction with the Trail Access Block or stormwater management pond block (pedestrian trails, overlooks, benches, etc.) in coordination with the SWM engineering design and maintenance standards, or in conjunction with the proposed community mail boxes.	Wellings Planning Consultant	An area has been identified in associated with Block 33, SWM.	
		Based on a review of relevant Town policies regarding parkland, Cash-in-lieu of parkland at a rate of five percent (5%) of the total developable area pursuant to the requirements of the Planning Act will be required for the development.	Wellings Planning Consultant	Noted.	
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Hamlet Buffer</b>	The Glen Williams Secondary Plan sets out a requirement for a 20 metre "Hamlet Buffer" to further achieve the objective of preserving the hamlet character. Lands within this setback will be allowed to regenerate as private natural areas or be used for public park purposes such as trail systems.	Wellings Planning Consultant	As noted, a 4.5m "Hamlet Buffer" has been identified and addressed in the LGL Report.	

		Town staff is not supportive of privately-owned Conservation Easements due to long term management and enforcement issues.	Wellings Planning Consultant		
		The Applicant is required to provide supporting justification as to how their proposal will fulfill the requirements of the Hamlet Buffer policies in the GWSP.	Wellings Planning Consultant	See above.	
		Additional discussions regarding the Hamlet Buffer between the Applicant and Town staff will be required.	Wellings Planning Consultant		

<b>4.0</b>	<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>	Maureen van Ravens – Manager of Transportation			
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Traffic Impact Study</b>	Based on the infill nature of this development, a detailed Traffic Impact Study (TIS) is required. The Applicant is required to have a Terms of Reference approved by the Town prior to commencing with the study. The Terms of Reference must include discussion on Active Transportation and connectivity within the existing community. Town staff note that when the application was originally submitted, the Town did not ensure all Transportation related matters have been adequately addressed. Please contact Maureen Van Ravens – Manager of Transportation, to discuss the Terms of Reference.	Wellings Planning Consultant	A traffic report has been completed by Cole Engineering dated August 2018.	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>ADDITIONAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS</b>	In addition to the Town’s comments lists, this section provides a description of other issues and concerns outlined by external agencies and residents for your consideration.			
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Water and Wastewater Servicing</b>	Halton Region has provided detailed comments, dated January 15, 2018, on water and wastewater servicing based on the revised Function Servicing Report (September 2017).			
		The Applicant should discuss sanitary pipe capacity and sizing with the Region to ensure that a large enough pipe is installed to allows residents along the pipe’s route to connect to wastewater services.	Condeland	Please see "On-site and External Sanitary Design Chart" Appendix B3 in the FSR dated November 2019.	
		The Credit Valley Conservation Authority (CVC) has indicated that their review of the Functional Servicing Report would be scoped for information on the alignment of the sanitary sewer pipe east of the proposed development where the pipe is proposed to traverse into the CVC Regulated Area (the Credit River valley on the west side, under the Credit on the east side of the valley where it connects to the existing pumping station).	Condeland	Please see "External Sanitary Sewer Plan and Profile" Appendix D, Fig.4 in the FSR dated November 2019.	
		The CVC has indicated that they would be providing high level comments as it relates to the design and construction of the sanitary sewer pipe as soon as received.			
		A Condition of Draft Plan Approval will indicate that a CVC Permit is required for the sanitary servicing crossing the Regulated Area.			
<b>5.2</b>	<b>Hydrogeology</b>	Town staff notes that a Preliminary Hydrogeological Assessment, prepared by Terraprobe Limited, dated June 6, 2006, was submitted for review.		The Hydrogeological Assessment was updated November 2019.	
		Based on Halton Region comments, dated December 7, 2011, and significant concerns from adjacent properties and residents indicating high ground water and basement flooding, the Report should be reviewed, updated and revised to ensure that no negative effects to surrounding residents are experienced.	Terraprobe	Section 7.0 of the Hydrogeological Assessment addresses Water Table Elevation, while Section 8.3 includes recommended mitigation measures to assist in maximizing infiltration across the site following development.	
		The Applicant will be required to conduct a Well Impact Assessment on wells within 500 metres of the limits of the subject property along with any associated Well Monitoring program prescribed.	Terraprobe	A door-to-door well survey was completed. No impact to wells is not anticipated. Monitoring can be addressed as a condition of draft approval.	
<b>5.3</b>	<b>Water Pressure</b>	Please see the Halton Region comments, dated January 15, 2018, for technical comments related to water pressure.			
		The lack of sufficient water pressure is an issue that a number of residents have brought to the attention of the Town and Region. The Applicant should ensure that the proposed development either causes no impacts to surrounding water pressures or improves the situation.	Condeland	A water distribution analysis has been provided in Appendix D of the updated FSR confirming the	

				development can be accommodated by the existing system.	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>TOWN AND EXTERNAL AGENCY COMMENT CORRESPONDENCE</b>				
	The following provides a list of all received comments received for the proposed development from Town departments and external agencies. All the below comment memos have been attached to this letter.				

<b>Town Department / External Agency</b>	<b>Reviewer(s)</b>	<b>Date</b>
Halton Region	Shelley Partridge	September 14, 2009
Union Gas	Bryan Day	July 15, 2010
Halton Catholic District School Board	Scott Bland	July 15, 2010
Halton District School Board	Laureen Choi	July 26, 2010
Bell Canada	John La Chappelle	July 26, 2010
Halton Hills Hydro	Leigh Scully	July 27, 2010
Recreation & Parks	Warren Harris	August 16, 2010
Zoning	Mike Cuthbertson	August 10, 2010
Glen Williams Community Association	GWCA	August 24, 2010
Credit Valley Conservation	Colleen Ditner	September 28, 2010
Glen Williams Community Association	GWCA	March 10, 2011
Halton Region	Shelley Partridge	December 7, 2011
Development Engineering	Jeff Jelsma	December 21, 2011
Recreation & Parks	Warren Harris	March 9, 2012
Credit Valley Conservation Authority	Annie Li	November 22, 2017
Halton Region	Shelley Partridge	January 15, 2018

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p><b>Halton Region</b></p> <p>September 14, 2009</p> <p>Mark Kluge Senior Planner Planning, Development &amp; Sustainability Dept. Town of Halton Hills 1 Halton Hills Drive Georgetown, ON L7G 5G2</p> <p>Dear Mr. Kluge</p> <p>Re: Confirmation of Application Requirements D12SUB09.001 and D14ZBA09.006 – 214925 Ontario Ltd. (formerly Devins) Part of Lot 21, Concession 9, Town of Halton Hills</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to provide clarification and further information regarding the Regional requirements for the applications proposing residential development on the above-noted property. The Region is in receipt of the letter from the Town of Halton Hills to Matthews Planning &amp; Management Ltd., dated June 24, 2009 which outlines why the submitted application materials were considered to be incomplete. The Region is also in receipt of the response letter from Matthews Planning &amp; Management. Dated July 23, 2009 that requests several study requirements be waived. The following provides the Regional perspective on the study requirements that were requested by Regional staff in order that the submission be considered complete.</p> <p><u>Environmental Implementation Report &amp; Hydrogeological Study</u> While the Region acknowledges that the subdivision is proposed to be fully serviced with water and sanitary sewers and that the subject property is not in an area of potentially high recharge, hydrogeological work is still required. As outlined in the notes from the pre-consultation meeting, section 3.6 of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan specifies that any residential proposal of four or more lots which is adjacent to residential areas serviced by a private water supply system shall be subject to an</p>	LGL and Condeland	The EIR implements the Scoped Subwatershed Study (Dillon 2003) at the tributary level for the study area. Section 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 of the EIR address the infiltration of surface water and Stormwater Management.		

<p>Environmental Implementation Report that will contain a hydrogeological study to address the protection of the existing groundwater supply in terms of both quality and quantity. As has been done with other subdivisions in similar situations, well monitoring will need to be undertaken to ensure that the proposed development does not negatively impact surrounding properties on private services.</p> <p>Regional staff agrees with the statement in the July 23, 2009 letter from Matthews Planning &amp; Management Ltd. That outlines there are no environmental features to be studied on the subject property. The Secondary Plan mapping also confirms that the subject property is outside of the Greenlands designations and as such, an Environmental Impact Study was not required.</p> <p>As recommended in Appendix B of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan, the applicant should discuss the scoping of the EIR with Town, Regional and Credit Valley Conservation staff. It would make sense for this property that there would be requirements of the EIR as outlined in Appendix B of the Secondary Plan that would not need to be included. The EIR is meant to implement the Glen Williams Scoped Subwatershed Plan. The Region would expect the EIR to address any recommendations from the Subwatershed Plan and include the hydrogeological work outlined above.</p> <p><u>Other Requested Studies</u> At the pre-construction meeting on December 11, 2008 the Region asked for other studies including an archaeological assessment, a functional servicing study and documentation as outlined by the Region's <i>Protocol for Reviewing Development Applications with Respect to Contaminated Sites</i>. It is assumed that these noted studies are underway or complete, as they were not referenced in the July 23, 2009 letter to the Town of Halton Hills.</p> <p><u>Local Official Plan Amendment</u> At the pre-construction meeting held on December 11, 2008 for this proposal, it was both the Town and Region's position that a Local Official Plan amendment was required. Further discussion on this matter has occurred between Regional and Town of Halton Hills staff and there is agreement that a Local Official Plan Amendment is not required.</p> <p>However, there are servicing capacity details outlined in the Glen Williams Secondary Plan that need to be addressed, since the current residential proposal for this property contains significantly more lots than the previously draft approved plan of subdivision. Regional staff was provided a copy of the Functional Servicing Study in the context of the Local Improvement project underway in Glen Williams. The detailed review of this study will be undertaken as part of the subdivision review, once a</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

<p>formal circulation occurs. Regional staff, however, mention that the report should be revised to include</p> <p>(i) a watermain analysis to confirm the proposed pipe sizing, expected fire flows and static pressures within both the proposed development and the adjoining existing subdivision;(ii) a revised Sanitary Design sheet that includes flows from Meagan Drive, Oak Ridge Drive, Wildwood Road and Eighth Line; and (iii) a discussion of the availability of capacity at the John Street Sewage Pumping Station and the Silver Creek Trunk sewer.</p> <p>Irrespective of location of the proposed sanitary sewer outlet, sewage treatment capacity must be accommodated from the 172 SDE that has been identified as being available at the Georgetown Wastewater Treatment Plant for new growth in Glen Williams. Allocation of an additional 20 SDE to this property will impact the Region’s ability to provide service to the remaining Glen Williams development properties, the Northwest Confederation and Bayfield lands.</p> <p>Regional staff would be happy to meet with the applicant or their representatives to review requirements and assist in the scoping of the work required for this plan of subdivision. I trust that this information provides the clarification required.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Shelly Partridge, MPI, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner</p>	<p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p>	<p>(i) A water distribution report will be provided under separate cover.</p> <p>(ii) Please see “Sanitary Sewage Conveyance and Treatment” ,Section C, FSR dated November 2019.</p> <p>(iii) The proposed project site was never a part of the John St Sewage Pumping Station and the Silver Creek Trunk Sewer.</p>		
---	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p><b>HALTON HILLS HYDRO</b></p> <p>July 27, 2010</p> <p>Town of Halton Hills 1 Halton Hills Drive Georgetown, Ontario L7G 5G2</p> <p>RE: Plan of Subdivision &amp; Zoning Amendment FILE: D12SUB09.001 &amp; D14ZBA09.006 Location: EDEN OAK – GLEN WILLIAMS Property described as PT LOT 21, CONC 9 Town of Halton Hills</p> <p>Sir/Madam:</p> <p>Halton Hills Hydro requires that the following be posed in the conditions for site plan approval or Committee of Adjustment in the note(s) section.</p> <p>Halton Hills Hydro must be contacted for an Electrical Service Layout if a new service or upgrade to an existing service is required; or metering changes. Location and method of servicing is at the sole discretion of Halton Hills Hydro.</p> <p>Please note that any costs due to changes required of Halton Hills Hydro's distribution system (i.e. moving poles to accommodate lane ways, driveways and parking lots, etc.) will be borne by the applicant.</p> <p>If it is an application for a subdivision, the applicant is required to complete the necessary requirements to obtain a Registered Subdivision Agreement with Halton Hills Hydro. Please contact Meg for further information at Ext. 22</p> <p>Regards,</p>	<p>Wellings Planning Consultant</p>			

Leigh Scully Engineering Clerk				
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			YES	NO
<p><b>RECREATION AND PARKS</b></p> <p><b>MEMO</b></p> <p>To: Mark Kluge, Senior Planner – Development Review  From: Warren Harris, Manager Parks and Open Space  Date: August 16, 2010</p> <p><b>RE: D12 EDEN OAK – formally Devins (24T-03002/H)  File: D12 DE</b></p> <p>A. We require confirmation that the lotting size is consistent with Town/Regional planning policies so that the total number of lots can be known.</p> <p>B. We request that the Functional Servicing Report be amended to include a justification for the sanitary sewer connection through Town owned lands (Wildwood Trail – former CN railway lands). The justification should define the net benefit with regard to environmental, planning and servicing policies, as well as mitigative measures to offset the impact/disruption to the existing Town trail. The justification is important to illustrate overall net benefit in the nest interests of the public.</p> <p>C. Schedule A of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan shows a potential trail linkage to the former CN Rail Line, now the Trans Canada Trail east of Halton Hills. An on-street connection would be made from the existing Wildwood Trail to the prosed subdivision. The Town requires the provisions of a future trail linkage to the former CN Railway as a condition of approval (see Item 3 below).</p>	<p>Condeland</p>	<p>A gravity sanitary sewer system is proposed to service all 32 residential lots of the subject development. Then is connected to a proposed external sewer starting at in Meagan Dr then routes easterly to Oak Ridge Dr. , northerly along Wildwood Road to Confederation St and then crossing the Credit River to the Glen Williams Pump. Please FSR dated November 2019.</p>		



<p>We will update the Trails Advisory Committee of this application at their next meeting (Fall 2010)</p> <p>D. Additional discussion is required with Town Planning-Policy staff around the Hamlet Buffer and how to integrate the Secondary Plan principle with the Draft Plan.</p> <p>E. Review of Hamlet Design Guidelines should be considered as part of refined Draft Plan E.g. street rights of way, gateways, corner lots. Coordination is required with Town Infrastructure Services staff to review swm block, road cross sections, sidewalks, etc.</p> <p>Pending the review of these key issues, the following are standard conditions that would apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision.</p> <p>Parkland Dedication</p> <p>1. That the Owner agrees to convey cash-in-lieu of parkland at a rate of five per cent of the total developable area pursuant to the requirements of the Planning Act.</p> <p>Open Space</p> <p>2. That the Owner agrees to have prepared by a qualified Landscape Architect and submitted to the Director of Recreation and Parks for approval, prior to any on-site works being undertaken, a Tree Inventory and Preservation Report, which shall address the existing trees along the perimeter of the site. Recommendations from this report shall be implemented in the design and construction phases of the development. The Terms of Reference for this report must be approved by the Director of Engineering and Public Works prior to the report being prepared. The report must be submitted and approved prior to finalization of the Engineering Drawings.</p> <p>Note that the EIR submitted July 14, 2010 makes reference to this information being available later in 2010.</p> <p>3. That the Owner agrees to satisfy the Town of Halton Hills with respect to the following:</p> <p>Convey, free and clear, a 6m easement on the east side of Lot 21 to the Town for the purposes of a future trail linkage. The easement will be maintained by the Owner of Lot 21. The Town will require the following restrictions: easement is to be kept clear, no buildings or structures, grading. The</p>	<p>Wellings Planning Consultant</p> <p>Wellings Planning Consultant and LGL</p>	<p>The locations of the recommended tree protection fencing are presented on the Tree Preservation Plan (<b>Figure 7</b>) in the EIR. The following tree protection measures are recommended to minimize impacts to trees on adjacent properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree protection hoarding/barrier should be installed in locations where trees are identified for retention. The barrier should be constructed of 1.2 m high orange plastic snow fencing on a 2' X 4' frame;</li> <li>• Tree protection hoarding/barrier should be installed prior to the commencement of any construction activities;</li> <li>• Tree protection hoarding/barrier should be installed 1 m outside of the dripline (i.e., canopy edge) (tree protection zone);</li> <li>• Construction materials, equipment, soil, construction waste or debris are not to be stored within 1 m of the dripline for trees identified for protection;</li> <li>• Any tree pruning or root cutting required is to be conducted by a Certified Arborist or City Forester;</li> <li>• Disposal of any liquids shall not occur within the tree protection zone; and</li> <li>• Should any incidental or accidental tree injuries occur during construction, a qualified Arborist or City Forester should be consulted to determine whether additional mitigation measures are required.</li> </ul> <p>These efforts will help to ensure that impacts to retained trees are minimal so that the condition and character of these trees will not change, either in the short-term or long-term period. These recommendations should be implemented in the design and construction phases of the development.</p>		
---	---	---	--	--

<p>Town may install a fence at the east and west sides of the easement when a recreational trail link is established.</p> <p>4. The Owner agrees to include in offers of purchase and sale of the identified lots, a statement that advises prospective purchasers of the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Lots 21 and 22:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">(i) Recreational Trail link may be provided within an easement on Lot 21</p> <p>Signage</p> <p>5. That the Owner agrees that, prior to execution of the subdivision agreement, an information sign be erected in conformity with the Town Sign By-law 2003-0065. This sign shall be designed and located to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning. It is further agreed that the Owner is not required to obtain a permit under the Town Sign By-law of the provisions of this condition are followed. Further the Owner shall only erect the sign after the contents have been approved. Further the Owner agrees to maintain the sign and only remove the sign upon sale of the last residential lot in the plan or such other time as may be approved by the Director of Planning. The information sign shall accurately depict a colour rendered plan of subdivision which clearly details the following information:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) Approved zoning categories of the lands, including reference to the amending By-law number;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b) Storm Water Management block;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">c) Residential lotting pattern;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">d) Public walkways and future trail linkages;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">e) Canada Post facilities;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">f) Reserve blocks;</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">g) Street names and collector road designation;</p> <p>Please contact me at extension 2274 if you require any further information.</p>				

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p><b>TOWN OF HALTON HILLS</b></p> <p><b>Memorandum</b></p> <p>To: Mark H. Kluge Senior Planner – Development Review</p> <p>From: Michael Cuthbertson Zoning Officer</p> <p>Date: August 10, 2010</p> <p>RE: Town of Halton Hills Zoning By-law Amendment and Subdivision Applications – Eden Oak 2147925 Ontario Inc. Part Lot 21, Concession 9 Town of Halton Hills (Esquesing) Town of Halton Hills File Nos: D12/SUB09.001 24T-09001/H D14/ZBA09.006</p> <p>The proposed zoning by-law has no requirements for minimum exterior side yards.</p> <p>Building and Zoning staff has no other objections to the proposal subject to confirmation by the applicant's Ontario Land Surveyor that the resulting lots comply with the lot area and frontage requirements of the site specific zoning by-law prior to subdivision registration.</p> <p>Michael Cuthbertson Zoning Officer</p>				

August 24, 2010

With reference to:  
Part of Lot 20, Concession 9, Town of Halton Hills

Town of Halton Files:  
D12SUB09.001 (24T-09001/H) & D14ZBA09.006  
Eden Oak – 2147925 Ontario Ltd. (Glen Williams)  
(formerly File D12/D14 Devins)

Mark Kluge  
Senior Planner – Development Review  
Town of Halton Hills

Dear Mark:

Our response of July 21 requested that additional material be supplied by the developer:

- Transportation Study
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Combined Draft Development Plan (showing 8 lots Georgetown Investments plan, proposed 32 lot Desol lands plan, proposed 33 lot Devins lands plan, with all their lots and the surrounding neighbourhoods' lots shown and sized for comparison)

These requested reports would help us assess if the developer's private and public space designs in fact support or ignore the intent of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan (GWSP) to maintain the rural character of the hamlet. Without these, we have had to make some assumptions for our comments.

Here are some initial comments based on the available reports:

**1. Sanitary Sewage:**

It was never the intent of the GWSP that this property be serviced by sewers hooked into the Georgetown sewer allocation. All discussions for this property at the time of the GWSP pertained to the provision of private septic systems. Any provision of sewers in Glen Williams would be part of the Glen Developers' Joint Agreement. How can this current developer not honour these understandings and assume that this Glen property can access this Georgetown allocation? We need a review and a decision by the

Wellings Planning  
Consultant

Condeland

1. Please see "Sanitary Sewage Conveyance and Treatment", Section C., FSR dated November 2019.

<p>appropriate authorities (town, Region, CVC) about the viability of a development proposal that does not comply with this agreement. What elevation changes will there be to the Eden Oka Creditview Heights subdivision, i.e. lots and streets as a result of adding sewers to the Eden Oak Devins development and lowering the proposed Gamble Street sewer extension into the Creditview Hts. Development? If a sewer to this area does go forward, what a provision will be made for residents of the Meagan / Oak Ridge development and Wildwood Road to connect to sewers at construction at cheaper rates?</p> <p><b>2. Water Supply:</b> The extent of water pressure problems for existing residents needs to be properly assessed. A problem has been identified on the 8<sup>th</sup> Line near the hamlet boundary. It is expected that this proposed development of 32 homes will deteriorate the pressure in the wider area. Similar water pressure problems already exist in the Glen in the Bishop Court area. The developer will need to add a pressure booster.</p> <p><b>3. Stormwater</b> The current stormwater management design appears to be following an urban approach of hard road and curb surfaces, underground storm sewers, SWM Pond, etc. Change the design to provide a more sustainable development with open ditches, turfstone, bio-swales, etc. rather than storm sewers. In order to improve infiltration on the land and give a rural appearance to the development. AS per Environmental Implementation Report Pg. 18, 19 and 22, this should reduce flow across 8<sup>th</sup> Line, down Wildwood Road and into Silver Creek. We need some creative design input from CVC, Town and Region to find a greener solution that the one proposed. Stormwater drainage from this property on to neighbouring properties is already a concern. We question the effectiveness of rear lot drainage after the land is redeveloped since there would be less infiltration. Suggest lowering sewer and street to provide for all lot drainage to the front ditches, especially where lots back on each other.</p> <p><b>4. Number of Lots:</b> The proposed 33 lots greatly exceed the original plan for 12 lots on this rural property. In fact, the OMG endorsed the reduction of 12 large lots to 8 large lots because of poor soil conditions at the time of GWSP Hearings. The lots in</p>	<p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p>	<p>2. Please see “Water Supply and Distribution”, Section D, FSR dated November 2019.</p> <p>3. Please see “Stormwater Management Quantity and Quality Control”, Section F., FSR dated November 2019.</p>		
--	-----------------------------------	---	--	--

<p>the proposed development are smaller than those of the immediate neighbours. 33 lots on this poor soil with increased lot side ditches, hard surface driveways and paved roads will adversely impact stormwater management in the wider area. There a variety of issues to be addressed that will affect the number of lots, but all things considered the number needs to be reduced.</p> <p><b>5. Lot Pattern</b> More attention needs to be paid to creating a varied lot pattern to reflect the intent of the GWSP. The lot design between McMaster and Meagan is to some extent irregular, except each half is a mirror image. Eliminate long narrow lots and add driveways to create front and rear lots. More innovative design should be used on the outside of the crescent, i.e: front and rear lots.</p> <p><b>6. Hamlet Buffer</b> Given that the number of lots has risen to 33, a hamlet buffer of 20m not 4.5m is required. The suggested 4.5m hamlet buffer might have been acceptable under the previous Devins proposal for 8 large lots, but this is no longer the case with the increased quantity and smaller size of the reinforce the hamlet boundary and provide naturalized space between the new homes and the adjacent working farm.</p> <p><b>7. Park/Green Space</b> The developer offering funds in lieu of parkland does not create a development that encourages interaction between neighbours. A destination park connected to trails is needed in this neighbourhood. Planning should be completed now for the provision of a future connection to the Rail Trail, should it ever be able to be extended.</p> <p><b>8. Access to Glen Williams Public School</b> We need assurance the Glen Williams Public School can accommodate the pupils generated from the increased size of this proposed development. It is important to the sense of community that all students living in the Glen are able to attend their local school.</p> <p>From the materials reviewed, it is our view that this proposed development needs to be redesigned if it is to meet the intent of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan. Further comments will be made once we have seen the remainder of the reports, i.e: traffic, road, design, urban design etc.</p> <p>Regards,</p>	<p>Wellings Planning Consultant and LGL</p>	<p>To preserve the Hamlet character, a general lot line setback of 20 m from the hamlet boundary is proposed in the EIR under Section 4.4.</p>		
---	---	--	--	--

Wayne Van Hinte Gary Adamson Thom Gallagher Drew Leverette Keith Powell Bill Shuttleworth  Glen Williams Community Association (GWCA)				
--	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p><b>CREDIT VALLEY CONSERVATION</b></p> <p>September 28, 2010</p> <p>Mark H. Kluge BAA MCIP RPP  Senior Planner – Development Review  1 Halton Hills Drive  Halton Hills, ON L7G 5G2</p> <p>Attention: Mr. Kluge:</p> <p>Re: File: 24T-09001/H &amp; D14ZBA09.006  Formerly Devins  Part of Lots 21, Concession 9  Town of Halton Hills</p> <p>CVC has reviewed the most recent submission received on July 14, 2010. The proposed development consists of a 32-lot residential subdivision for single-detached houses.</p> <p>The proposed development is to be serviced by the Municipality. It is located outside of the regulated area and the SWM pond is to discharge to a Municipal drain. As such CVC has no comments for the proposed development.</p>				

<p>If alterations to the proposed development result in private servicing or development within a Regulated Area, CVC will resume the review of the proposed development.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Colleen Ditner</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			YES	NO
<p>March 10, 2011</p> <p>With reference to: Part of Lot 20, Concession 9, Town of Halton Hills</p> <p><b>Town of Halton Files: D12SUB09.001 (24T-09001/H) &amp; D14ZBA09.006 Eden Oak – 2147925 Ontario Ltd. (Glen Williams) Proposed 32-Lot Residential Subdivision (formerly File D12/D14 Devins)</b></p> <p><b>Mark Kluge, Senior Planner – Development Review Town of Halton Hills</b></p> <p>Dear Mark:</p> <p>The Glen Williams Community Association (GWCA) thanks the Town for the opportunity to comment on the updated Environmental Implementation Report – December 2010, submitted for this Eden Oak development.</p> <p>Again, we would request that these comments be shared with the appropriate departments (Planning, Engineering, Recreation &amp; parks) for the Town of Halton Hills, the Region of Halton and the Credit Valley Conservation, in order that they can note our concerns</p>				



in their analysis. If they have not already received it, we ask that our letter of August 24, 2010 concerning this application also be forwarded to them.

The Environmental Implementation Report – December 2010 is very clear that it is important to maintain the quantity and quality of groundwater recharge on this site and to maximize infiltration on the property to lessen the impact of development on the neighbouring properties and the receiving watercourse downstream (Silver Creek).

As we have noted in our previous letter, the current design of the proposed development does not go far enough to achieve these objectives:

**1. Soil Conditions**

Poor soil conditions exist on this property and were central to the OMB decision to reduce the previous Devins application from 12 large lots to 8 large lots. The proposal for 32 smaller lots with an increased number of lot side ditches, hard surface driveways and paved roads on this poor soil will adversely impact recharge and infiltration on this property and stormwater management for the wider community. To achieve the desired recharge and infiltration in this soil, a more open, natural and sustainable subdivision design incorporating fewer lots is needed. A reduction in the number of lots must be considered.

**2. Hamlet Buffer, Park/Green Space:**

The proposed development should make better use of such design tools as the hamlet buffer and park/green space to assist with recharge and infiltration. One purpose for the buffer is allow lands to regenerate as natural areas. When the 4.5m buffer was suggested for the Devins application, it was linked to a less intense development of 8 large lots. Given the increased intensity of development now proposed with more homes on smaller lots, a proper 20m naturalized buffer should be utilized to improve both the recharge and infiltration on this property. Similarly, the provision of a proper park, separate from the stormwater management pond, should be used to assist these objectives. Provision of a 20m hamlet buffer and a neighbourhood park/green space must be considered.

Wellings Planning  
Consultant

<p><b>3. Road Design, Grading and Stormwater Management</b></p> <p>The previous Environmental Implementation Report called for a reduction in stormwater flow from the property across 8<sup>th</sup> Line, down Wildwood Road and into Silver Creek. How have the findings of December 2010 Report changed and improved the development’s design to achieve this? Reference is made in the report that an enhanced level of stormwater control, Level 1 or quality and discharge. What does that mean? How is it to be achieved? The report says that it is critical that all on-site measures be taken to the extent possible to maintain and enhance the local infiltration functions on the subject site, yet the development continues to follow an urban approach of hard road and curb surfaces, grading and underground storm sewers. How has the grading been improved to increase retention and mitigate drainage from this property on the amount of water that reaches the stormwater facility through infiltration trenches and bio-retention, etc., yet the subdivision design continues to omit the sustainable development features of a rural road profile with open ditches, turfstone, bio-swales, etc. utilized by the CVC, Town and Region in other developments in Glen Williams. On-site measures such as these would improve infiltration on the land, plus give the preferred rural Glen appearance to the development. A redesign of this development incorporating a wider range of sustainable design features for recharge and infiltration must be considered.</p> <p>From a review of the Environmental Implementation Report – December 2010, it is our view that “a greener solution” that the one currently being proposed is needed for this subdivision. The developer needs to reflect upon the intent of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan (GWSP) to maintain and enhance the rural character of the hamlet and provide a more creative and sustainable design for this development.</p> <p>Regards,  Drew Leverette</p>	<p>Condeland</p>               <p>Wellings Planning Consultant and LGL</p>	<p>3. Please see “Proposed Road Grade and Lot Grading Design “ , Section E and “,Stormwater Management Quantity and Quality Control”, Section F, FSR dated November 2019.</p>               <p>Noted.</p>		
---	---	--	--	--

Wayne Van Hinte Gary Adamson Thom Gallagher Keith Powell Bill Shuttleworth Glen Williams Community Association (GWCA)				
--	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p>December 7, 2011</p> <p>Mark Kluge Senior Planner Planning, Development &amp; Sustainability Dept. Town of Halton Hills Dr. Halton, Hills, ON L7G 5G2</p> <p>Dear Mr. Kluge:</p> <p><b>RE: Regional Preliminary Comments</b> <b>Applicant: Eden Oka – 2147925 Ontario Ltd.</b> <b>(formerly Devins)</b> <b>Files: D12SUB09.001 and D14ZBA09-006 – Eden</b> <b>Oak</b> <b>Part of Lot 21, Concession 9, Town of Halton Hills</b></p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to provide preliminary comments to the Town of Halton Hills on the above-noted subdivision and zoning amendment applications. The previous communication to the Town of Halton Hills on this development proposal was through a letter dated</p>				

September 14, 2009 which provided clarification and confirmation of the application requirements.

The following comments should be considered preliminary at this point, but they will give an indication of what has been addressed and what is still outstanding from a Regional perspective.

Background

The subject applications propose a 32 lot residential subdivision for single family detached homes on the subject property on full municipal servicing. However, that former plan of subdivision was formally withdrawn and replaced with the subject applications.

Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire

Regional Official Plan section 147(17) requires that, prior to the Region or Local Municipality considered any development proposals, the proponent identifies whether there is any potential for soils on the site to be contaminated. A completed Environmental Site Servicing Questionnaire was submitted to the Region for review.

Related to the Environmental Site Servicing Questionnaire, there is clarification with respect to the ownership of the property that is required. The Registered Owner/Applicant listed on the subdivision application form is 2147925 Ontario Inc., but the information included on the Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire references 2147925 Ontario Inc. We note that the subdivision application specifies that the legal name for use with the agreement is the latter of the two owner names. Clarification needs to be provided on this matter.

The submitted Environmental Implementation Report, updated December 2010 by LGL Limited references in section 3.4.1 that a portion of the subject property was formerly used as a railway line. This information should be included in the Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire and the applicant should anticipate that the review of an updated Questionnaire would likely trigger the need for a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment to be undertaken, if one hasn't already been completed.

Archaeological Potential

AMICK Consultants

<p>Regional Official Plan section 167(6) states that the prior to development occurring in or near areas of archaeological potential, that an assessment and mitigation activities be carried out in accordance with Provincial requirements and the Regional Archaeological Master Plan. Documentation has been provided to Halton Region that indicates that a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment was completed by AMICk Consultants Limited in May 2010 and that copies of the final report were provided to the Ministry of Culture for their review. Halton Region requires a copy of the approval from the Ministry of Culture for our records prior to clearing this requirement.</p> <p><u>Waste Management</u></p> <p>Regional Waste Management staff were circulated the applications for review. They have indicated that waste management services will be provided once the proposed homes are 90% constructed and the street can be safely accessed. The owner will be required to contact Andrew Suprun at Halton Region once the subdivision is near completion.</p> <p><u>Environmental implementation Report</u></p> <p>The subject property is designated as Hamlet Residential in Schedule A of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan. Section 5.3 c) outlines the required studies for any proposed plans of subdivision, to be provided prior to draft approval. An Environmental Implementation Report (EIR) was required as per the specifications of the Glen Williams Secondary Plan, section 5.3 c)iv. This report was completed by LGL Limited and dated December 2010.</p> <p>The subject property does not fall within Halton Region's Greenlands System. However, Regional Official Plan section 147(5)f) requires all development proposals to submit, at the time of initial application, an inventory of trees on site and at subsequent stages of the application, a tree saving and planting plan. ROP section 147(5)e) requires that all development proposals, to the maximum degree possible, preserve existing trees and plant additional trees in accordance with good forestry management practice. The existing trees on the subject property are primarily located along the perimeter of the property in hedgerows. The majority of the property is used for agricultural pasture land by the farmer directly to the north of the subject property. A trees survey was included as part of the submitted EIR. The Halton Regional</p>	<p>LGL</p>	<p>A preliminary inventory of the tree resources within the study area was conducted on September 2, 2010. A follow up survey was undertaken on July 8, 2018 to update the health status of trees and determine the extent of Emerald Ash Borer within the trees on the subject property. The trees survey was included as part of the EIR. LGL verified the completion of tree saving and planting plans.</p> <p>CVC staff have been and continue to be consulted on the EIR recommendations to ensure that recommendations don't change their earlier stated position.</p> <p>A Tree Preservation Plan has been provided in Figure 4.</p>		
--	------------	---	--	--

<p>Forester has confirmed that he does not need to review the tree inventory, any future tree saving plans or details regarding the Hamlet buffer and therefore this responsibility will fall solely with the Town of Halton Parks and Recreation Department staff.</p> <p>Regional staff note that Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) through a letter to the Town of Halton Hills dated September 28, 2010 have stated that they don't have any comments on the proposed development. This letter was provided before the EIR was submitted for review. Given that there are recommendations in the conclusions of the EIR that speak to potential off-site impact of fisheries and potential changes to the way the stormwater is addressed with the development, Regional Staff would recommend that CVC staff be consulted on the EIR recommendations to ensure that those recommendations don't change their earlier stated position.</p> <p><u>Hydrogeological Review</u>  The Glen Williams Secondary Plan, through section 3.6 directs the EIR to include a Hydrogeological Report, which should address the protection of the existing groundwater supply in terms of both quantity and quality. This is especially important when there are neighbouring properties that may be on private services. Regional staff notes that the subject property does not fall within a high groundwater recharge area.</p> <p>The Halton Region Health Department was circulated the subject applications and supporting materials and have advised that since the development is on full municipal services, they do not have any objection to the development as proposed. However, they have advised that an offsite well impact assessment within 500 metres of the limits of this subject property will be required. Baseline data will need to be collected prior to any site disturbance on the subject property.</p> <p><u>Regional Servicing</u>  A Functional Servicing Report was submitted by Condeland Engineering Ltd., in 2009 in support of this application. The report proposes the extension of municipal watermains and sanitary sewers to service the development. There is limited servicing capacity in the Georgetown water and sanitary sewers to accommodate additional development.</p>	<p>LGL and Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p>	<p>The EIR implements the Scoped Subwatershed Study (Dillon 2003) at the tributary level for the study area. Section 6.6.1 and 6.6.2 of the EIR address the infiltration of surface water and Stormwater Management. On-site Stormwater Management methods will be implemented to mitigate potential downstream impacts by implementing a Level 1 or Enhanced Protection stormwater management and diverting backyard drainage to infiltration trenches and existing overland drainage (swales). Level 1 treatment of stormwater has been recommended in the Scoped Subwatershed Study (Dillon 2003) when the receiving watercourse contains species at risk. While addressing natural heritage features and areas specific to the study area including potential impacts to Silver Creek through issues related to discharge of stormwater and possibly, groundwater recharge, consideration to the Dillon Subwatershed Study were undertaken.</p> <p>Please see "Sanitary Sewage Conveyance and Treatment", Section C and "Water Supply and Distribution", Section D, FSR dated November 2019.</p>		
---	---	--	--	--

<p>Prior to approval of any development application, the applicant must obtain sufficient servicing allocation from the Town of Halton Hills to accommodate the proposal.</p> <p>The Hamlet of Glen Williams is not serviced by municipal sanitary sewers at this time. Although the Hamlet is considered to be part of the Rural Area, existing Official Plan policies permit the extension of municipal sanitary sewers to service Glen Williams. Servicing capacity has been set aside at the Georgetown Wastewater Treatment Plant to accommodate the future servicing of the Georgetown Hamlets (Glen Williams, Stewartton and Norval). The Master Servicing Plan and Financial implementation report prepared by Stantec Consulting Limited in support of the proposed amendment to the Official Plan of the Town of Halton Hills (OPA 113) determined that there was capacity of 172 SDE (single detached equivalents) available to service new development in Glen Williams. The report tentatively assigned 12 SDE to the former Devins lands based on the application that was submitted at that time. Allocation of 32 SDEs to this property will impact the Region's ability to provide services to the remaining Glen Williams development properties, the Northwest Confederation and Bayfield lands.</p> <p>The Functional Servicing Report proposes to service the subject development by extending a sanitary sewer through other lands of the owner (previous Desol developments). In order to do this they are proposing to construct the sanitary sewer on lands owned by the Town that were previously a rail line and are now used as a trail. Approval of this location by the Town is required prior to further review of the Functional Servicing Report. The Report has only analysed capacity in the sanitary system to the limits of the Cachet Estate Homes Development. The Report must be revised to include a discussion of the availability of capacity at the John Street Sewage Pumping Station and the Silver Creek Trunk sewer. The analysis has also not included external flows from the existing developments adjacent to the site including Meagan Drive, Oak Ridge Drive, Wildwood Road and Eighth Line.</p> <p>There are existing 250mm diameter watermains on McMaster Street and Meagan Drive and a 200mm diameter watermain on Eighth Line. Static pressures in the</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

subdivision are expected to be in the vicinity of 270kPa which is at the low end of the pressure range as recommended by Region of Halton design standards and the Ministry of the Environment. There have been concerns raised in the past by neighbouring residents about the low water pressures and the potential for impacts from the new development. The impact from the 8 lots approved under the previous application were not anticipated to development. The impact from the 8 lots approved under the previous application were not anticipated to cause concern however, the draw from an additional 24 lots must be reviewed to assess whether there will be any negative impacts on the existing adjoining subdivision. A detailed watermain analysis must be undertaken to confirm the proposed pipe sizing and to determine the expected fire flows and static pressures within the proposed development and the adjoining existing subdivision.

Other Matters

Regional Official Plan Section 101(2) and the associated Council-adopted Livestock Facility Guidelines require local municipalities to apply provincially developed Minimum Distance Separation formulae. Town of Halton Hills staff needs to be satisfied that this direction has been addressed with respect to the proposed distance of the development from the adjacent livestock facility and associated manure storage area.

It should be expected that at a minimum, warning clauses will need to be registered on title with respect to the adjacent agricultural operation to the north of the subject property, warning new residents of normal farm practices, including potential noise, dust and odour impacts.

Conclusion

Due to the servicing limitations outlined above, it is Regional practice to not issue conditions of draft approval until such time as the property has secured servicing allocation through a Town of Halton Hills Council report. It is the Region's position that this development proposal is premature due to the lack of allocation. As such, the Region is not in a position to support the proposed zoning by-law amendment or plan of subdivision at this time. Formal comments will not be provided until allocation has been secured. However, Regional staff will continue to



<p>review any further submitted studies / materials and work with the applicant to have any applicable revisions undertaken.</p> <p>Should the Town of Halton Hills wish to move forward with respect to a decision on the Zoning By-law Amendment, the Region requests that the Town put a Holding Provision on the property which will prevent development until such time as Halton Region confirms there is sufficient servicing capacity allocated to this property.</p> <p>We trust these comments are of assistance. Please contact me at (905) 825-6000 ext 7180 if you have any questions on the provided information.</p> <p>Sincerely, Shelley Partridge, MPI, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner</p>					
REFERENCE	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE		RESPONSE ACCEPTED Y/ N	
<p><b>TOWN OF HALTON HILLS</b></p> <p><b>Memorandum</b></p> <p>To: Mark Kluge, Planning, Development &amp; Sustainability</p> <p>From: Jeff Jelsma, Infrastructure Services</p> <p>Date: December 21, 2011</p> <p><b>Re: Zoning Amendment and Subdivision Application Part of Lot 21 Concession 9 Town of Halton Hills (Esquensing) Town of Halton Hills 24T-09001/H File: D14ZBA09.006 and D12SUB09.001</b></p> <p>With respect to the above noted application, we have received and reviewed the following:</p>					

<p><u>Submitted Package, including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Plan of Subdivision, prepared by Matthews Planning &amp; Management Ltd., plotted June 1, 2009.</li> <li>• Functional Servicing Report, prepared by Condeland Engineering Ltd., dated May 2009</li> <li>• Environmental Implementation Report, prepared by LGL Limited dated June 2010</li> </ul> <p><u>Reference Documents Previously Submitted</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Assessment, prepared by Terraprobe Limited dated July 1991</li> <li>• Preliminary Hydrogeological Assessment, prepared by Terraprobe Limited, dated June 6, 2006</li> </ul> <p><u>General Comments:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4.5mx4.5m daylight triangles are required for the inside corners at lots 24 and 29</li> <li>2. The enlarged asphalt roadway bulbs as shown on the proposed grading plan are not acceptable. Refer to section 2.1.3 Design Elements of the Subdivision Manual for roadway design requirements</li> <li>3. Although 0.5% curb grades are permitted the detailed design shall incorporate a minimum 1% curb grade. Update FSR accordingly.</li> <li>4. The proposed grading shown does not meet the Towns standards. Refer to the rear yard grades for lot 26. Additional rear lot catchbasins may be required. Include the rear yard drainage of the adjacent lots within the catchment of the pond or provide a suitable alternative.</li> <li>5. The list of reference documents and policies is missing from FSR. Include with next submission</li> <li>6. Confirm with external drainage areas for this site. The pre-development drawing of the FSR indicates an outlet near drainage area 304 where our aerial photos (attached) identifies that this is an inlet with a substantial catchment area.</li> <li>7. Rear yard catchment is required for all lots within this development. Lots 16 through to 21 shall not drain to the lands to the north.</li> <li>8. The FSR needs to identify the major overland flow routes for this development and pond. All major</li> </ol>	<p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The roadway geometry plan has been revised with 4.5m x 4.5m daylight triangles at lot 24 and 29.</li> <li>2. The roadway geometry plan has been revised to an even width bends.</li> <li>3. The FSR shows the road centerline grades at 1.00% and on the outside radius of the bends are at a min. of 0.70%.</li> <li>4. By introduction of storm sewer conveyance system along the north boundary to Meagan Dr. then follow existing road. Please see "Conceptual Servicing Plan" Appendix D, Fig.5 in the FSR dated November 2019.</li> <li>5. Reference (bibliography) has been added in the FSR.</li> <li>6. We have confirmed an external area of 5.45 ha.</li> <li>7. We have installed rear yard catch basin on Lot 21.</li> <li>8. Refer to "Post Development Storm Tributary Plan", Appendix D, Fig.8 in the FSR.</li> </ol>		
--	---	---	--	--

<p>overland routes not within a ROW shall be contained within a block owned by the Town.</p> <p>9. Further discussion in the FSR is required related to how quality control will be achieved. Will there be a forebay, how long will the forebay need to be, will this fit within the proposed SWM block?</p> <p>10. The soils type identified in the FSR (Oneida Clay Loam) differs from the soil type identified in the Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Assessments prepared by Terraprobe 9 (Clay / Silt Till). Further the groundwater depth noted in the same report range from 1.1m to 2.8m below the surface as identified by Terraprobe. The FSR identifies that infiltration trenches are feasible for rear lot drainage. Provide clarification as to the types of soil for this site and provide comments from Terraprobe confirming infiltration is feasible in an updated report.</p> <p>11. Update the FSR to discuss the suitable L.I.D. features proposed for this site.</p> <p>12. Further discussion is required regarding the proposed external sanitary servicing through existing Town roads. In principle Infrastructure Services does not support the replacement of the new sanitary sewer within Gamble Street or the disturbance of Wildwood Road. Should the Region and the Town support this installation the following concerns shall be addressed as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The Eden Oak development at the end of Gamble Street shall be fully approved and serviced before or at the same time as this development</li> <li>B. As a minimum all disturbed roadways shall be restored (full width top asphalt, all new curbs and minor MH and CB repairs) to the Towns satisfaction.</li> </ul> <p>13. Refer to the redline drawings for further comments.</p> <p><u>Please note the following with regard to the resubmission:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Partial resubmission, which do not address all deficiencies listed in the letter, will NOT be accepted for processing</li> <li>2. A resubmission cover letter must be submitted with your resubmission outlining how each deficiency has been addressed.</li> </ul>	<p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p>	<p>9. Refer to "Stormwater Management Quantity and Quality Control", Section F, FSR dated November 2019.</p> <p>10. Refer to "Infiltration, Groundwater Re-charge" , Section F.5 in the FSR dated November 2019.</p> <p>11. L.I.D. will be determined at the detailed engineering design stage following Draft Plan approval.</p> <p>12. Refer to "Sanitary Sewage Conveyance and Treatment", Section C and "Proposed Road Grade and Lot Grading Design", Section E, FSR dated November 2019.</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

--	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p><b>RECREATION AND PARKS</b></p> <p><b>MEMO</b></p> <p>To: Mark Kluge, Senior Planner – Development Review  From: Warren Harris, Manager Parks and Open Space  Date: March 9, 2012  Re: <b>D12SUB09.001 Eden Oak Glen Williams – formally Devins (24T-09001/H)</b></p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <p>We have reviewed the updated Environmental Implementation Report dated December 2010 by LGL Limited and note the following issues that should be resolved prior to approval of the Draft Plan:</p> <p><u>Tree Preservation</u></p>				

<p>A. Section 3.5.1 and Appendix B do not provide any recommendations on the retention of any of the 53 on-site trees relative to their health or the feasibility in integrate them with the lotting design and preliminary lot grading plans. Additional rationale is required to support item 3 of the Conclusions in Section 8: "It is possible that several of these trees will need to be removed...".</p> <p>Given the extent of <i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i> in the existing tree inventory, reference should be given to evidence, or the potential for impact by the Emerald Ash Borer as part of the analysis in Section 3.5.1</p> <p>B. Section 3.5.1 also states that the off-site hedgerow along the south-eastern property line have canopies that extend 12m into the subject site. Section 6.2.1 recommends tree protection 1m beyond this dripline and minimal grading. Due to the importance of this off-site vegetation as screening to the existing residential properties, additional information is required to confirm that no grading to the fence / property line occurs within this setback zone, especially with the rear yard catch basins referenced in E.2 Lot Grading Design of the Functional Servicing Report.</p> <p>A similar review should be done with the northwestern hedgerow to substantiate the protection measures for off-site trees and the amount of planting required to supplement them to achieve the Hamlet Buffer.</p> <p>Please contact me at ext 2274 if you require any further information.</p> <p>2017 11 22 – CVC Condition of Approval</p>	<p>LGL</p>	<p>Noted. LGL revised Section 3.5.1 of the EIR accordingly to include information on the 2018 visit, in which red ash trees within the hedgerow showed varying levels of decline with a number of the trees in serious decline or dead. These trees exhibited typical symptoms of Emerald Ash Borer infestation including epicormics branching, 'D' shaped exit hole, and thinning crown. As such, it was determined that Emerald Ash Borer is widespread throughout the red ash trees on the subject property.</p> <p>Tree protection measures have been added to Section 6.2 of the EIR. No grading is being proposed within the dripline of these trees and tree protection fencing and mitigation measures have been recommended.</p>		
---	------------	---	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p>From: Li, Annie <a href="mailto:ali@creditvalley.ca">ali@creditvalley.ca</a>  Sent: November-22-17 4:13 PM  To: Tony Boutassis  CC: Jeff Jelsma; Adam Farr; Campbell, Joshua  Subject: Re: D12SUB09.001 &amp; D14ZBA09.006 – Eden Oak – Development Engineering Confirmation</p> <p>Hi Tony,</p> <p>Thanks for providing the copy of the FSR for review. I have circulated this to our technical staff.</p> <p>To follow up on our conversation and for your records, we wouldn't be reviewing the details of the FSR for the SWM and the details of the servicing as the subdivision development is outside of the CVC Regulated Area. We are scoping the review of the FSR only for information on the alignment of the sanitary sewer pipe further east of the subdivision lands where the pipe traverses into the CVC Regulated Area (the Credit River</p>	<p>Condeland</p>			

<p>Valley on the west side, under the Credit and on the east side of the valley where it connects to the existing pumping station).</p> <p>As such, the comments we would be providing would be high level comments as it related to the construction of the pipe in the CVC Regulated Area that the applicants should address at detailed design for the construction of the pipe.</p> <p>One further things, we didn't discuss, if you would be able to include a condition on the draft plan as it relates to the CVC permitting for the servicing that'll be great. Please include a condition of draft plan approval that a CVC permit and approval would be required as it relates to the servicing for the crossing in the CVC Regulated Area of the Credit River.</p> <p>In terms of timing for these comments, I'll provide them back in the first week of January when I'm back. If there's any questions that come up in the meantime, you ccan contact Josh.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Annie Li Planner, Planning &amp; Development Services / Credit Valley Conservation 905-670-1615 ext 380 / 1-800-668-5557 <a href="mailto:ali@creditvalley.ca">ali@creditvalley.ca</a> / creditvalleyca.ca</p> <p>From: Tony Boutassis (<a href="mailto:tonyb@haltonhills.ca">tonyb@haltonhills.ca</a>) Sent: November 10, 2017 2:23 PM To: Li, Annie CC: Jeff Jelsma; Adam Farr; Campbell, Joshua Subject: RE: D12SUB09.001 &amp; D14ZBA09.006 – Eden Oak – Development Engineering Confirmation</p> <p>Hi Annie,</p> <p>Thanks for providing the follow-up. I have forwarded you a copy of the revised FSR for review.</p> <p>Tony Boutassis, M.P.I, MCIP, RPP Senior Planner – Development Review Planning &amp; Sustainability</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p>Town of Halton Hills  1 Halton Hills Drive  Halton Hills, ON L7G 5G2  905-873-2601 ext.2338  905-877-3524 (fax)  Email: <a href="mailto:tonyb@haltonhills.ca">tonyb@haltonhills.ca</a></p> <p>From: Li, Annie (<a href="mailto:ali@creditvalleyca.ca">ali@creditvalleyca.ca</a>)  Sent: November-03-17 4:25 PM  To: Tony Boutassis  CC: Jeff Jelsma; Adam Farr; Campbell, Joshua  Subject: RE: D12SUB09.001 &amp; D14ZBA09.006 – Eden Oak – Development Engineering Confirmation</p> <p>Hi Tony,  To follow up on our conversation, the residential building development for this subdivision does not require a CVC permit as it is located outside of the CVC Regulated Area.</p>	<p>Condeland</p>			



It is understood that a sanitary sewer connection to service this development will need to be constructed by the developers which will be located within the CVC Regulated Area, connecting from the subject site into a CVC Regulated Area within the valley and under the Credit River watercourse to the existing pumping station. A CVC permit would be required for the portion of the servicing within the CVC Regulated Area.

As such, there are no fundamental CVC permitting issues foreseen and it's anticipated that CVC's review will be scoped to the technical details in the review of the construction methods and design details as it relates to the servicing. It's anticipated that the municipality would be technical advisors as it relates to the servicing and for the OMB are available for the Town as witness should that be requested.

It is understood that the applicants have provided the Town with an updated FSR for the servicing connection. Please provide CVC with a hardcopy for review.

Please contact me if there's any questions.

Thanks,

Annie Li  
Planner, Planning & Development Services Credit Valley Conservation  
905-670-1615 ext 380 1-800-668-5557  
[ali@creditvalleyca.ca](mailto:ali@creditvalleyca.ca) creditvalleyca.ca

From: Li, Annie  
Sent: October 26, 2017 3:42 PM  
To: Tony Boutassis  
CC: Jeff Jelsma  
Subject: RE: d12SUB09.001 & D14ZBA09.006 – Eden Oak – Development Engineering Confirmation

Hi Jeff, Tony,

Thanks for the background information, this is helpful.

As it relates to the OMB proceedings, we wouldn't need to be involved since the servicing is connected to the municipal servicing system and there's no CVC permitting concerns.

As it relates to the review of the sanitary sewer connection, we would be interested in reviewing it as a whole project as it goes into the CVC Regulated Area outside of the OMB process. It is the proposed

<p>works for the sanitary sewer connection project being reviewed as part of this subdivision application? Or would this project be reviewed through a municipal EA process with the Town? We can review these works through whichever one of the process it's going through.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Annie Li  Planner, Planning &amp; Development Services Credit Valley Conservation  905-670-1615 ext 380 1-800-668-5557  <a href="mailto:ali@creditvalleyca.ca">ali@creditvalleyca.ca</a> creditvalleyca.ca</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

REFERENCE / COMMENTS	CONSULTANTS	CONSULTANTS RESPONSE	RESPONSE ACCEPTED	
			Yes	No
<p><b>HALTON</b></p> <p>January 15, 2018</p> <p>Tony Boutassis  Planning, Development &amp; Sustainability Dept.  Town of Halton Hills  1 Halton Hills Drive  Halton Hills, ON L7G 5G2</p> <p>Dear Mr. Boutassis:</p> <p><b>RE:</b> Technical Regional Comments on Functional Servicing Report  Applicant: Eden Oak – 2147925 Ontario Ltd.  Files: D12SUB09.001 and D14ZBA09.006 – Eden Oak (McMaster – Meagan)  Part of Lot 21, Concession 9, Town of Halton Hills</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to provide technical comments specific to the revised Functional Servicing Report, prepared by Condeland Engineering Ltd., dated September 2017 and received by the Region on October 24, 2017 for review. The most recent Regional comments on this development proposal were provided through a letter dated December 7, 2011. Please do not consider this letter a replacement of the 2011 letter</p>				

<p>as it is specific to only the review of the revised September 2017 Functional Servicing Report. The subject applications are currently under appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board.</p> <p><b>General Comments</b>  A Functional Servicing Report (FSr) was submitted by Condeland Engineering Ltd., in 2009 in support of this application. Regional comments were provided on this study in 2011 and the revised FSR was provided in October 2017 in response to the 2011 Regional comments. The revised report proposes the extension of municipal watermains and sanitary sewers to service the development.</p> <p><b>Wastewater Comments</b>  The FSR proposes to service the subject development by extending a sanitary sewer from the property limit as Meagan Drive, easterly along Oak Ridge Drive, northerly along Wildwood Road to Confederation Street and then crossing the Credit River to the Glen Williams pump station. Municipal consent for the location of this proposed sewer within Town roads is required from the Town of Halton Hills and approval for the crossing of the Credit River is required from Credit Valley Conservation. The analysis should also include preliminary plan and profile drawings for the sanitary sewer from the property limit at Meagan Drive to Glen Williams pump station in order to properly assess the proposed sanitary servicing scheme. Appendix B2, drawing 1 of 8 in the FSR assumes a depth of 1.5m for the future sanitary sewer under the Credit River. Further comments on the crossing will be provided once preliminary plan and profile drawings for the sanitary sewer have been completed.</p> <p>The FSR must be revised to include a discussion of the availability of capacity at the John Street Sewage Pumping Station and the Silver Creek Trunk sewer.</p> <p>The Sanitary Tributary Plan (Appendix D, figure 1) in the FSR does not include a large portion of the Northwest Confederation lands as identified in the Sanitary Drainage Area Plan shown in Appendix B-1 ii). Table 1 on page 9 adds flows from the various development locations, but fails to account for the fact that the harmon Peaking Factor decreases as you aggregate these flows.</p> <p><b>Water Comments</b>  There are existing 250mm diameter watermains on McMaster Street and Meagan Drive and 200mm diameter watermain on Eighth Line. The FSR proposes that water servicing for the subject development will be provided by the installation of a 250mm diameter watermain along Street 'A' as well as an interconnection to the watermain on Eighth Line. It</p>	<p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p> <p>Condeland</p>	<p>The proposed project site was never a part of the John Street Sewage Pumping Station and the Silver Creek Trunk Sewer.</p> <p>The area is now included within the tributary plan. Details for the sanitary sewer design will be completed at the Detailed Design Stage.</p> <p>Refer to "Water Supply and Distribution", Section E, FSR dated November 2019. A water distribution report will be provided under separate cover.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

should be noted that 250mm is no longer a standard watermain size and therefore the watermain size will have to be revised.

The report states that hydrant flow testing was conducted in June of 2006 and that static pressures of 38 psi were recorded at the hydrants located at McMaster Street / oak Drive and Meagan Drive / McMaster Street intersections. Current fire flow tests along with water modelling must be completed to determine expected pressures and fire flows within the subdivision. The FSR should propose remedy measures for any areas that are expected to have pressures which are below the Regional standard of 40psi. Fire flow calculations must be completed to determine the actual fire flow requirements for this proposal and to confirm that fire flow requirements for this proposal can be met.

As previously noted in our comments of December 7, 2011, there have been concerns raised in the past by neighbouring residents about the low water pressures and the potential for impacts from the new development. The impact from the proposed 32 lots must be reviewed to assess whether there will be any negative impacts on the existing adjoining subdivision. A detailed watermain analysis must be undertaken to confirm the proposed pipe sizing and to determine the expected fire flows and static pressures within the proposed development. The analysis should also include the adjoining existing residential areas to determine any potential impacts from the new development.

**Conclusion**

Given the comments outlined above, Regional staff are not able to support the provided Functional Servicing Report. A revised study will be required that addresses the comments outlined in this communication.

Yours truly,

Shelly Partridge, MPI, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner

Cc: David Matthews, Matthews Planning & Management  
Jeffrey J Wilker – Thompson, Rogers  
Annie Li – Credit Valley Conservation