



PLANNING
URBAN DESIGN
& LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURE

August 18th, 2023

Stephanie Lacey-Avon | Senior Planner
County of Grey
595 9th Avenue East
Owen Sound, ON N4K 3E3

Dear Ms. Lacey-Avon:

**RE: Glenelg Phase 3 Draft Plan of Subdivision – County File No. 42T-2022-08
Our File: 15184AT**

This table is intended to address all comments received from the County of Grey and Township of Southgate, as well as other commenting authorities on the 2nd draft plan approval submission for Glenelg Phase 3. Please do not hesitate to contact MHBC if you have any questions or concerns.

	Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority June 20, 2023		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Recommendation			
At this time, GRCA recommends that this application be deferred to allow the applicant an opportunity to address the comments below. Please note that previous GRCA comments for the first submission were not addressed as part of this submission and remain outstanding.			
GRCA Comments			
GRCA has reviewed this application under the Mandatory Programs and Services Regulation (O.R. 686/21), including acting on behalf of the Province regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2020), as a regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 150/06 and as a public body under the Planning Act as per our CA Board approved policies.			
GRCA offer the following comments for the second submission of Draft Plan of Subdivision 42T- 2022-08:			
1.	Technical reports submitted as part of the first submission should be revised as necessary to account for the new proposed 3.3-hectare school block and changes to proposed land use.	SLR	Acknowledged and figures in the EIS have been updated to include the current site plan.
2.	GRCA comments submitted as part of the first submission (dated November 25, 2022, enclosed) have not been addressed and remain outstanding.	SLR	Acknowledged. Please refer to the memorandum provided.

Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority June 20, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
For municipal consideration			
3.	Please be advised that on January 1, 2023, a new Minister's regulation (Ontario Regulation 596/22: Prescribed Acts – Subsections 21.1.1 (1.1) and 21.1.2 (1.1) of the Conservation Authorities Act) came into effect. As a result, non-mandatory technical review services that the GRCA formerly provided under agreement with municipalities (e.g., technical reviews related to natural heritage and select aspects of stormwater management) will no longer be provided beyond a transition period. To assist our municipalities, we will continue to provide our advisory services for up to 6 months (July 1, 2023) for files under review prior to January 1, 2023 to minimize disruptions to approval processes.	SLR	Acknowledged.
GRCA Plan Review Fee			
4.	As stated in our first submission comments, the fee required for our review of this draft plan of subdivision is a \$2,410 base fee in addition to a fee of \$1,255 per net hectare (excluding natural areas) to a cap of \$31,520. Based on the proposed 17.65 hectares to be developed, a total fee of \$24,560.75 is required.	FLATO	Acknowledged
5.	Please note that 70% is due at this time (\$17,192) , and the applicant will be invoiced. 30% will be due prior to the issuance of draft plan conditions. Note that should there be adjustments to the proposed draft plan configuration, the total required GRCA review fee may change.	FLATO	Acknowledged

	Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority November 25, 2022		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Recommendation			
At this time, GRCA recommends that this application be deferred to allow the applicant an opportunity to address the comments below.			
Documents Reviewed by Staff			
Staff have reviewed the following documents submitted with this application:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Environmental Impact Study, Glenelg Phase 3. SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. Dated September 9, 2022. · Preliminary Hydrogeological Assessment. Glenelg Phase 3. SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd. Dated September 12, 2022. · Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report, Glenelg Phase 3 Dundalk Village Two Inc., Township of Southgate. Crozier Consulting Engineers. Dated August 2022. · Glenelg Phase 3, Draft Plan of Subdivision. Dated August 18, 2022. 			
Background			
6.	We note that, based on watershed mapping, the property is located within both the GRCA watershed and the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority (SVCA) watershed. The GRCA has agreed, in consultation with the SVCA, to be the lead CA for this application review. We further note that GRCA had been the lead CA for Phase 1 (42T-2018-12) of the larger development while the SVCA reviewed Phase 2 (42T-2020-09) of the larger development as those lands were fully within the SVCA watershed.	SLR	Acknowledged.
7.	GRCA staff provided comment on the submitted Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) (SLR, September 2022) in an email dated July 7th, 2022. GRCA staff subsequently acknowledged and accepted revisions to the EIS in an email dated August 4th, 2022. These emails have been provided as an enclosure to these comments.	SLR	Acknowledged.
GRCA Comments			
8.	GRCA has reviewed this application as per our delegated responsibility from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2020) and as a regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 150/06. GRCA has also provided comments as per our MOU with the Township of Southgate and as a	SLR	Acknowledged.

Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority November 25, 2022			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	public body under the Planning Act as per our CA Board approved policies.		
9.	The subject property contains an unevaluated wetland. A watercourse is located on lands directly to the north of the property, adjacent to the proposed stormwater management pond. Proposed development within these regulated features or their regulated allowance will require prior written approval from the GRCA / SVCA in the form of a permit pursuant to Ontario Regulation 150/06 or Ontario Regulation 169/06. Resource mapping for both GRCA and SVCA on this property have been enclosed with these comments.	SLR	Please refer to the provided memorandum.
Engineering:			
10.	The Preliminary Hydrogeological Assessment notes that an assessment of groundwater surface water interactions within the natural heritage features on the subject property will be completed to identify groundwater-dependent natural heritage features. Please confirm the timing of this work.	SLR	Please refer to the provided memorandum.
11.	GRCA supports the continuation of the groundwater monitoring program until a minimum of one (1) year of groundwater elevation data has been collected.	SLR	Acknowledged.
12.	Monthly surface and subsurface water balance for the wetland is required, complete with preliminary details regarding proposed infiltration facilities (lot level soakaway pits, bioretention cells, communal infiltration galleries, etc.). Please include a figure delineating overall existing and proposed catchments draining towards the wetland.	Crozier	A preliminary water balance has been created to analyze surface and subsurface flows to each outlet. Preliminary details regarding the proposed infiltration facilities (bioretention cells) have been included. Additional geomorphological and ecological studies are underway to analyze the receiving capacity of the wetlands. Pending the results of the geomorphological and ecological studies, the water balance will be revised if required. Figures delineating the existing and proposed catchments draining towards each outlet have been provided.

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Natural Heritage:			
13.	<p>The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is incomplete as submitted. Section 7.0 states as follows: "<i>Completion of this section will be deferred until natural feature boundaries are verified in the field by the GRCA, following which, appropriate setbacks are applied. This will allow for a more accurate determination of impacts which will inform the proper mitigation measures and recommendations.</i>"</p> <p>The GRCA has provided comment on the document as submitted. Please note that when finalized, additional comment on the updated document will be provided considering the EIS in its entirety. Subsequent revisions should consider additional information throughout the report.</p>	SLR	Please refer to updated figures in the current revised EIS.
14.	The approved Terms of References (TOR) for the EIS, as well as relevant correspondence relating to TOR approval, should be included as an Appendix to the EIS.	SLR	TOR is included in the Appendix of the EIS dated May 23, 2023 as part of the 2 nd submission package.
15.	Wetland evaluation work should be completed using Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) protocols, as requested in comments provided in the TOR.	SLR	The wetland will be treated as a PSW for purposes of the development application(s). The sensitivity will be assessed as per the details provided in the memorandum.
16.	The finalized EIS must include GRCA-confirmed staked wetland boundaries (confirmed on September 21, 2022) on all relevant figures and plan drawings. These confirmed boundaries must be used to finalize the appropriate buffers provided for these features.	SLR	The current revised EIS includes the surveyed limit of the staked feature boundary.
17.	Water balance information from Section 7.6 of the Stormwater Management (SWM) report should be incorporated into the EIS to assess the potential impacts of predicted changes in site water balance on the wetland. This information should also be used to prescribe adequate	SLR	Please refer to the provided memorandum.

Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority November 25, 2022			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	measures to mitigate for these predicted impacts.		
18.	<p>To support the proposed road through the unevaluated wetland, the GRCA will require the following:</p> <p>a. A wetland evaluation using Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (OWES) protocols, as requested in comments provided for the TOR.</p> <p>b. Justification for the need of the road.</p> <p>c. An Environmental Assessment or other comprehensive plan to satisfy policies 8.4.6 and 8.4.7 of the GRCA Policies for the Administration of the Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation for Ontario Regulation 150/06.</p> <p>It should be noted that, depending on the outcome of the above studies, intrusion of the proposed road through the wetland (mapped as environmental protection area) may not be supported by the GRCA.</p>	SLR	<p>Please refer to the provided memorandum.</p> <p>An EA is not required however an alternatives assessment will be completed as per the memorandum.</p>
Advisory Comments for Municipality:			
19.	It is recommended that the timing of survey work (particularly for time sensitive surveys like birds and amphibians) and personnel conducting the work be included in the EIS. It is further recommended that weather conditions be included for bird surveys.	SLR	The May 24, 2023 EIS (2 nd Submission) report includes the recommended information.
20.	It is recommended that a figure showing survey locations be included in the EIS report. Table 4 - 2021 Amphibian Survey Results is difficult to interpret as it doesn't reference survey stations and therefore cannot be tied to a given wetland/habitat feature. It is further recommended that an indication of the numbers of calling individual amphibians detected at Level 1 and Level 2 be provided.	SLR	The May 24, 2023 EIS from the 2 nd Submission includes the requested information related to survey stations.

Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority November 25, 2022			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
21.	Section 3.9 of the EIS indicates the presence of a single type of confirmed significant wildlife habitat (Habitat for Special Concern and Rare Wildlife Species- Eastern Wood Pewee). It is recommended that additional assessment of potential SWH types be included in the EIS as others have the potential to be present in the subject lands (e.g. Amphibian Breeding Habitat - Woodland, Terrestrial Crayfish). It is further recommended that candidate or confirmed Significant Wildlife Habitat be clearly mapped on a figure.	SLR	The May 24, 2023 EIS (2 nd Submission) report includes the recommended information.
22.	The bat window provided in Section 5.1.4 of the EIS (April 1-Sept 30) may be too narrow to prevent impacts to tree roosting bats. It is recommended that a March 31-November 15 timing window be used.	SLR	Current MECP guidance indicates that the April 1st to Sept 30 is sufficient for Southern Ontario and will continue to be the window that is referenced.
23.	It is recommended that detailed design consider potential amphibian mitigation to nearby significant breeding habitat to reduce the impact of the development (e.g. roadkill) on wetland dependant wildlife.	SLR	Acknowledged.
24.	It is recommended that more detail be provided on proposed mitigations (e.g. proposed buffer restorations, location of permanent fencing, LIDs, etc.).	SLR	This will be addressed at detail design.
25.	It is recommended that post-construction monitoring needs and methods be provided at the detailed design stage.	SLR	Acknowledged.
26.	When providing a response in subsequent submissions, we request that a summary table be provided which clearly demonstrates how each of the above comments have been addressed.	SLR	Acknowledged.
GRCA Plan Review Fee			
27.	GRCA charges a fee for its plan review services in accordance with the current approved GRCA Plan Review Fee Schedule. The fee required for the review of draft plans of subdivision is a \$2,410 base fee in addition to a fee of \$1,255	FLATO	Acknowledged

Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority November 25, 2022			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>per net hectare (excluding natural areas) to a cap of \$31,520. Based on the proposed 17.65 hectares to be developed, a total fee of \$24,560.75 is required.</p> <p>Please note that 70% is due at this time (\$17,192), with 30% due prior to the issuance of draft plan conditions. Note that should there be adjustments to the proposed draft plan configuration, the total required GRCA review fee may change.</p> <p>We trust that this information is of assistance. Should you have any questions, please contact me at 519-621-2763 ext. 2236 or clorenz@grandriver.ca.</p>		
28.	The terms of reference state that the proposed subdivision development is subject to a Minister's Zoning Order. This should be clarified in the EIS report.	SLR	Please refer to Section 1.0 of the EIS as corrected for the 2 nd Submission.
29.	According to the existing map layer, no regulated features are present within the Grand River portion of the study area. However, a pond and headwater drainage feature (HDF) appear to be present at #752212 Ida Street. We agree that the HDF should be assessed using accepted guidelines developed by Credit Valley Conservation (CVC) and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA).	SLR	This is not relevant for the Glenelg Phase 3 application.
30.	Water depths and vegetation species in the pond should be assessed to determine if this feature is a wetland. If a wetland is determined to be present, it is requested that the boundary be delineated, verified by the GRCA and clearly illustrated in the EIS report. A minimum buffer width and supporting rationale should also be included in the EIS report.	SLR	There is no pond on the Glenelg Phase 3 property.
31.	It is requested that the key conclusions and recommendations of related	SLR	Acknowledged and will be addressed in subsequent submissions.

Chris Lorenz, M.Sc. Resource Planner Grand River Conservation Authority November 25, 2022			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	hydrogeological assessments, stormwater management plans, and functional servicing plans be discussed in the EIS report.		
32.	The EIS report will need to clearly demonstrate that wetland hydroperiods are maintained, restored, or enhanced. A pre- and post-development wetland water balance assessment will be required to demonstrate that the development will not negatively impact the hydrologic or ecological functions of the wetlands located within the Saugeen River watershed.	SLR	Please refer to the provided memorandum.
33.	The need for thermal mitigation measures and enhanced quality control should be discussed in the EIS.	SLR	Acknowledged and will be addressed in subsequent submissions.
34.	We recommend that all biological surveys (e.g. breeding amphibians, breeding birds, vegetation) be conducted in accordance with widely accepted provincial standards. The need for targeted surveys of species at risk should be determined in consultation with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks	SLR	Acknowledged. Accepted standards were used for all surveys as required.
35.	According to mapping information obtained from the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources, and Forestry (MNDMNR), the following fish species have been recorded in the unnamed watercourse: - Blacknose Dace, Brassy Minnow, Brook Stickleback, Brown Bullhead, Central Mudminnow, Central Stoneroller, Common Shiner, Creek Chub, Emerald Shiner, Fathead Minnow, Golden Shiner, Iowa Darter, Johnny Darter, Least Darter, Northern Pike, Northern Redbelly Dace, Pumpkinseed, Rainbow Darter, White Sucker	SLR	The only feature on site related to this application is an HDF that does not contain fish habitat.

Dustin Lyttle & Ray Kirtz Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Draft Plan Comments:			
Supporting Studies:			
36.	1.1 Comments regarding the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) are provided under separate cover and are to be addressed. <i>Pending, refer to comments under separate cover.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
37.	1.2 A Municipal Servicing Assessment (MSA) will be provided that assesses the expected impact on the sanitary and water systems based on the design provided. Available water pressure and fire flows for the site will also be assessed and results provided for the proponent's information and use. This process will identify the necessary external improvements required to support this development. <i>Deferred, this will be provided once the Draft Plan is finalized.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
38.	1.3 GRCA and SVCA comments are to be provided for Township record. <i>Pending, GRCA comments and responses are to continue in circulation. Additionally, SVCA comments are to be provided.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
39.	1.4 Tree Inventory and Protection plan (TIPP) as referenced within the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is to be provided once available. <i>Pending.</i>	SLR	SLR - Acknowledged. Crozier - TIPP to be provided in a future submission.
40.	1.5 Confirm the status of the Stage 2 Archeological Study referenced within the MHBC Planning Justification Report. <i>Pending.</i>	MHBC	Stage 2 Archeological Study is ongoing and field work will begin once the site is ploughed. Completing of Stage 2 will be a condition of Draft Plan Approval.
41.	1.6 Confirm that the Natural Heritage Area has been delineated. The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSR) indicates that it has, however the EIS does not. <i>Note: Natural Heritage Feature Boundaries and associated setbacks are to be reflected on the Draft Plan. Pending, the</i>	SLR	SLR - The natural heritage feature boundaries are included in the current version of the EIS along with associated setbacks. Crozier - Acknowledged. The Natural Heritage Feature Boundaries and

Dustin Lyttle & Ray Kirtz Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<i>setbacks are to be established and reflected on the Draft Plan.</i>		associated setbacks are reflected on the Draft Plan.
Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance:			
42.	1.7 The WWTF upgrades will not be completed early 2023, rather are expected to tender construction of the project in 2023. Section 5.1.1 of the FSR is to be updated/revised accordingly. <i>Note: for consistency, the Dundalk Wastewater Treatment Plant is typically referred to as the "Dundalk Wastewater Treatment Facility" (WWTF). Acknowledged.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Stormwater Management and Water Balance:			
43.	1.10 The proposed water balance methods (Tree Pits, Bioretention Cells) within the Municipal ROW are not preferred methods as they create future home owner issues and additional infrastructure that needs to be maintained by the Township. Other water balance methods such as roof-top drainage infiltration are to be investigated. <i>Pending, the proposed tree pits within the boulevards are to be formally proposed to the Township, including detailed drawings/cross sections and discussions regarding annual maintenance requirements and how the pits do not interfere with utilities and services.</i>	Crozier	Please note that the proposed water balance methods have been revised. Tree pits within the boulevards are no longer proposed.
44.	1.11 The findings of the additional studies required to analyze the receiving capacity of the northeast wetland are to be provided for Township review. <i>Note: a separate SWMF to other outlets should be considered. Pending.</i>	Crozier	Additional ecological and geomorphological studies are underway to analyze the receiving capacity of the northeast wetland.
45.	1.12 – 1.15 Addressed.	Crozier	Noted
DP Submission No.2 Comments:			
46.	2.1 Given the interconnectivity of this development to adjacent lands, the FSR is to be expanded to include consideration of this development in the context of existing/future development in the north quadrant of Dundalk.	Crozier	Acknowledged. Interconnectivity provisions with adjacent lands have been reflected in the Draft Plan and Functional Servicing Plans any additional connection details will be addressed as part of future applications.

Dustin Lyttle & Ray Kirtz Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>Specifically, the following issues need to be examined:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement for the future extension of Street A easterly, ultimately with a connection to Highway 10 including the associated supporting infrastructure (i.e., watermain). The importance of future street/infrastructure connections to existing linkages at McDowell, Highpoint and Braemore Streets. <p>Although these issues may not affect the configuration of the subject Draft Plan directly, the Township needs assurances that these items will be addressed in the future to support the subject development.</p>		
47.	2.2 Provide correspondence from the MTO confirming that they acknowledge the future Street A/Highway 10 connection requirement and that it will be permissible subject to conditions.	Crozier	Acknowledged. Correspondence with MTO will be provided as part of future applications when the design of adjacent lands has commenced.

Howard Wray, P. Eng. Traffic Impact Study Comments Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>We prepared peer review comments on December 12, 2022 for the Traffic Impact Study (TIS), August, 2022, prepared by Crozier Consulting Engineers for Phase 3 of the proposed Glenelg residential development in the community of Dundalk, Township of Southgate.</p> <p>For the second submission, a letter was prepared by Crozier dated May 26, 2023. Our comments on this letter are provided below in <i>bold italics</i>:</p>		
48.	1.1 Traffic counts were undertaken at all the intersections identified in the Terms of Reference comments, and were done on June 7, 2022. These are considered to be representative, and were not taken during periods when significant Covid-19 restrictions were in place. <i>No action required</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.

Howard Wray, P. Eng. Traffic Impact Study Comments Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
49.	1.2 Figure 3 shows the existing traffic controls on a plan that is schematic, but shows the general lay-out of the streets, including angles. The rest of the figures (4 through 20) were done on a right-angle schematic, which does not aid understanding, and in particular, does not well represent the alignment of Bradley Street into the proposed subdivision. These figures should be revised to the lay-out of figure 2, with the addition of the new development for greater clarity. <i>An additional figure was provided. Addressed.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
50.	1.3 Site Trip Distribution and Assignment appears to follow reasonable assumptions, but Figures 13 and 14 should be expanded to show the proposed development and assumptions for trips in and out of the development on each of its connecting roads. <i>Previous Glenelg phases were added to Figures 13 and 14 which is helpful. Although not commented on in the First Submission comments, we question why no traffic was assigned to the intersection of Grey Street and Osprey Street, as the distance to Main Street appears similar to Bradley Street, and some drivers may choose this route.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged, see response below.
51.	1.4 Section 6.4 Qualitative Impacts on Connecting Roadways is not sufficient. Bradley Street is identified to have future traffic volumes of 150-200 but this is not identified as being peak, one way or two way. The figures indicate pm peak two-way traffic volumes of over 400 vph, which represents an AADT of over 4,000 vpd. Crozier identified 400 vehicles per lane as being "typical" for local streets, but this represents an AADT of approximately 8,000 vpd. The TAC Geometric Guide identifies that Local Residential Streets have AADT of up to	Crozier	Based on further discussions with Triton staff, the TIS was updated to reflect a larger proportion of vehicles utilizing Grey Street and Osprey Street, diverting away from Bradley Street. The intersections of Bradley Street and Grey Street as well as Grey Street and Osprey Street were added to the scope of the study. Further details will be discussed and assessed through detailed design, however it is understood that a mutually agreed-upon modified cross-section for

Howard Wray, P. Eng. Traffic Impact Study Comments Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	1,000 vpd, and Residential Collectors of up to 8,000 vpd. Since Bradley is a local residential street, and has not been constructed to a Collector standard, volumes of over 4,000 vpd are not appropriate. Further, the street has a right-angle corner, and does not have sidewalks for the full length. <i>The impact of this substantial increase in traffic on Bradley Street has not been satisfactorily addressed, other than to acknowledge that a sidewalk should be provided on Bradley Street to Toronto Street. Bradley Street may need to be reconstructed to a Collector Road standard.</i>		Grey Street/Osprey Street will need to be created to incorporate the collector road elements within the existing 20 m ROW. Additionally, traffic calming measures could be applied to Bradley Street, south of Grey Street to deter users and encourage alternate routes.
52.	1.5 Scenario: Eco Parkway Crozier were asked to also consider the impact of the future connection of Eco Parkway. The intent was not to analyze the connection, but rather to determine if this future connection would impact the trip distribution and assumptions in the long term. Crozier did not redistribute any of the site traffic as part of their assessment. While it is acknowledged that the proposed southbound primary route would likely continue to be Main Street to Highway 10, Eco Parkway would provide an alternative route that would avoid travel through downtown and possibly lengthy left turns onto Main in the AM peak hour. As such, some traffic may choose to use Glenelg to Ida to Eco Parkway. A review of this potential partial re-distribution should be provided. <i>Crozier have responded that traffic from the development is unlikely to use Eco Parkway as an alternative route. We agree that this volume would not be significant. Addressed.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
53.	1.6 The Draft Plan shows that Street A could potentially connect to the east in the future. There is no discussion of this in the TIS. It should be identified	Crozier	Acknowledged. Street A has been widened to a 22 m minor collector road from the eastern intersection with Street E, to the eastern limits of the property.

Howard Wray, P. Eng. Traffic Impact Study Comments Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	whether this would potentially result in an alternative connection to Highway 10 in the future which would alleviate traffic on the adjacent local streets, or potentially introduce more traffic if this connection cannot be provided in future. If Street A is potentially a future Residential Collector, it should have a ROW greater than 20m. Further, if this will function as a Residential Collector, there are numerous closely spaced intersections proposed. <i>Crozier advised that this future connection is uncertain. Given its importance in understanding future traffic volumes and distribution, this needs to be better understood. The required road configuration including ROW width, sidewalks and/or multi-use trail on both sides, possible bike lanes should be established within the context of the future development of the lands to the east of Phase 3.</i>		The exact cross-section elements will be confirmed through detailed design in conjunction with Town and Triton staff.
54.	1.7 Both Street A and Street B are shown connecting to Glenelg Phase 2, which requires crossing the Rail Trail. While connectivity between the developments is important, safe crossing of the rail trail needs to be addressed. <i>To be addressed in Detail Design.</i>	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Comments related to Second Submission			
55.	<i>2.1 The letter addresses the possible inclusion of a public school site on Block 317. It is forecast that this could increase traffic by 474 trips in the AM peak, and 48 trips in the PM peak. Crozier advised that a further TIS will be required to fully assess traffic impacts. This will add to the already substantial increase in traffic volumes on neighbouring streets. See additional comments below.</i>	Crozier	The TIS Update (Crozier, August 2023) has been revised to include the traffic generated by the school block. It is noted that given the expected population of the Glenelg Phase 1-3 subdivisions, a portion of trips was assumed to remain internal to the site. The remaining trips were distributed to other neighbourhoods north of Main Street, as well as south east and west towards the existing residential areas and the Edgewood Greens subdivision. Exact details can be referenced in Section 5, with trip

Howard Wray, P. Eng. Traffic Impact Study Comments Triton Engineering Services Limited July 10, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			distribution and assignments of the school block in Figure 15 and 17.
Summary Comments			
56.	<i>The lack of a Collector Road system in this area means that traffic volumes will increase on existing residential streets well beyond the accepted thresholds for local streets. The TIS has distributed most of the traffic to Bradley Street. This examination of the "worst case" scenario is accepted practice in preparing a TIS, but a further analysis is required to look at how traffic may distribute differently to reduce the impact on this street.</i>	Crozier	<p>Acknowledged. The timing/status of the future connection to Highway 10 is still unknown, however, as described in the previous responses, Street A has been widened to a 22 m minor collector road from the eastern intersection with Street E, to the eastern limits of the property. The exact cross-section elements will be confirmed through detailed design in conjunction with Town and Triton staff.</p> <p>The analysis has been revised to include the school block, and assigns more traffic to Osprey Street and Grey Street. The cross-section for future upgrades will be determined through consultation with Town and Triton staff to ensure desired elements can be accommodated within the existing ROW. Traffic calming measures on Bradley Street could be implemented to deter infiltration. This can be assessed further through detailed design.</p>
57.	<i>This phase may represent the threshold at which development can proceed without the provision of a new connection to Highway 10. In this regard, MTO should be consulted to determine what criteria will be required for approval of a future connection.</i>	Crozier	
58.	<p><i>Issues that should be addressed prior to approval of Phase 3 Draft Plan include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Status/conditions of a future connection to Highway 10</i> • Potential future extension of Highpoint Street • Designation of Collector Roads. Osprey/Grey may be an option to Bradley • <i>Road standards for internal collector roads, including active transportation</i> • <i>Reconstruction of existing local roads to collector road standards</i> • <i>Measures to reduce traffic infiltration on local roads</i> 	Crozier	

Carolyn Keir 47 Todd Crescent Dundalk Ontario June 14, 2023			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
59.	There is a mature tree line that runs between the said property and Todd Crescent that I would like to see remain.	MHBC	The mature trees that run along the back of the White Rose Development will need to be assessed if they are on Flato-owned lands or White Rose-owned lands. If the trees are located on Flato's property, we will assess if they are able to be maintained; however, if grading requirements in that area require the trees to be removed, they will be removed. If the Trees are on the White Rose lands and grading constraints will not impact root systems, they can be maintained.
60.	The Medical Clinic which I have known about for the last five (5) years. The township had Doug Ford come out and put on big show of putting the shovel in the ground and still nothing.	MHBC	Flato made a charitable donation to the South East Grey Community Health Centre for the proposed medical clinic. The development of the medical clinic is the responsibility of the South East Grey Community Health Centre organization.
61.	The face-lift for downtown Dundalk. Nothing happening.	MHBC	Not applicable to the Proposed Development.
62.	There is absolutely nothing in Dundalk for teenagers to do and I am concerned the crime rate is going to escalate.	MHBC	Not applicable to the Proposed Development. Flato has been working closely with the Township to provide the required parkland dedication in the various developments throughout the Township.
63.	Flato already have at least two (2) or Three (3) projects on the go and they are not complete yet. Whatever happen to completing one job before moving on to the next one.	MHBC	From obtaining the required planning approvals to construction, it is a long process. In order to adequately provide long-range planning in the Township, it is appropriate to continue to advance the planning approvals to address the required housing needs in the Township as well as conduct informed long-range infrastructure planning.
64.	Our current Highway 10 will not handle the extra traffic that is being created right now.	MHBC	As part of the typical approval process for subdivisions, an assessment of existing transportation systems and surrounding road networks needs to be completed in support of the proposed development by a Professional Engineer. This document has been prepared and submitted with the application package.

	Carolyn Keir 47 Todd Crescent Dundalk Ontario June 14, 2023		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			In addition to this, during the detailed design process for the proposed development, any external road network upgrades will be identified and will require completion for the development to proceed