

No.	Report	Technical Comment	Response	Response by
1	EIS	Due to the potential presence of amphibians and/or reptiles, de-watering be considered outside of sensitive periods (e.g., sensitive over wintering periods).	Noted - can be included as a draft plan condition. No further action required.	
2	EIS	If a wildlife exclusion fence is necessary, installation should be considered supplemental to the silt fence as silt fence and wildlife exclusion fencing require supports to be on opposite sides of the fence.	Noted - can be included as a draft plan condition. No further action required.	
3	EIS	De-watering effluent should not enter watercourses or wetlands/waterbodies unless it meets provincial water quality standards.	Noted - can be included as a draft plan condition. No further action required.	
	Geotechnical	Various grammatical and spelling corrections "For Consideration"	Edited within the revised Geotechnical Report.	Cambium
1	Geotechnical	Recommendation 1 - It is recommended that a brief summary of the groundwater depths obtained from the hydrogeological study be added to the Geotechnical Report.	Added to the revised Geotechnical Report.	Cambium
2	Geotechnical	Recommendation 2 - Paragraph 2 references excavations to a maximum depth of 3.0 m. It is inferred that this depth considers the conditions encountered in the hydrogeological investigation but it would be of benefit explaining if this is the case considering the stated assumption that excavations for basements are assumed to only extend 1.8 m below and that residence foundations would presumably be founded on/in the bedrock.	Increased depth to possible due to high groundwater level. The need for dewatering during construction is anticipated to be minimal. If, for whatever reason, excavation extends into the groundwater, this can be addressed during construction	Cambium
3	Geotechnical	Recommendation 3 - Paragraph 1 states that foundations placed on the clean, sound bedrock do not require frost protection. This recommendation is viewed as consistent with basements that extend below the finished ground surface to be founded on bedrock. It is acknowledged that the current scope of development does not include residences without basements. However, it is recommended that this scenario be addressed in the report given the possibility that the developer and/or designers may consider residences with a slab-on-grade floor slab where a raise in grade cannot be accommodated or in lieu of the more difficult and costly excavation into the bedrock.	Noted. Mention of possible slab-on-grade design in some instances is included in the revised Geotechnical Report.	Cambium
4	Geotechnical	Recommendation 4 -Paragraph 2 refers to a lift thickness of 200 mm for engineered fill placed below proposed foundations. Section 5.3, Paragraph 3 discusses the use of OPSS Granular B for grade raises beneath structural elements such as building foundations and specifies a lift thickness of 150 mm. This difference should be resolved in the text.	Changed in the report for consistency.	Cambium
5	Geotechnical	Recommendation 5 - Paragraph 4 recommends additional reinforcement or use of geosynthetics where foundations are constructed in areas of fissures. Fissure widths of between 150 mm and 200 mm and depths of 1.3 m to 1.5 m were reported. Subject to inspection in the field to confirm that the fissures are not more extensive than that observed in the test pits, it is suggested that consideration be given to the placement of lean/fill concrete in the open fissures to provide a more uniform base for foundation construction (in addition to the requirement for additional reinforcement and/or geosynthetics stated).	Noted. Lean mix may be considered.	Cambium
6	Geotechnical	Recommendation 6 – The section provides guidance for design of foundations on the bedrock. Design parameters for foundations placed on engineered fill should also be provided as this scenario is described and discussed in the report.	Added to the revised Geotechnical Report.	Cambium
7	Geotechnical	Recommendation 7 – With respect to the recommendation regarding the modulus of sub-grade reaction, the text line references “on the soils at the site” whereas the recommended design parameter references “engineered fill”. Could the authors clarify if the same value is to be used for slabs constructed on the existing soil strata and on imported and compacted engineered fill or if different values would apply for the two scenarios.	Clarified in the report. The parameter is for engineered fill.	Cambium
8	Geotechnical	Recommendation 8 - The section provides a recommendation that the existing soils on the site can be reused to develop the design finished subgrade level in areas of pavement. It would be of benefit to specify what imported materials could be used for this purpose, should onsite soils not be available for reuse.	Clarified in the report.	Cambium
9	Geotechnical	Recommendation 9 – Paragraph 2 refers to the geotechnical report as “for preliminary planning and design . . . “. It is suggested that reference to the report being “Preliminary” be included in the title and/or in the introduction of the report, assuming this is consistent with the Terms of Reference for the investigation and the proposal submitted by Cambium for the work.	Noted. Preliminary is considered as final design is not completed. However if the assumptions made in the report are kept true, the report can be considered final.	Cambium
1	Hydrogeological	Surficial bedrock fractures were noted in some the test pits suggesting that water infiltrating at the Site may recharge the bedrock aquifer system. Nitrate was detected in some of the groundwater samples collected from the test wells suggesting that the bedrock aquifer is susceptible to impacts from anthropogenic sources occurring at ground surface (e.g., fertilizer applications). Stantec is concerned with the scale of the proposed development (i.e., 58 residential lots and one commercial lot serviced by septic systems) and the potential impact to the water quality of the bedrock aquifer, from which the proposed residential lot wells will draw their potable water supply. Further study and a strategy for minimizing potential impacts from septic systems to well water quality needs to be developed	Please see enclosed response.	Cambium
2	Hydrogeological	Although the individual pumping tests indicate that the bedrock aquifer is capable of supplying sufficient water for individual residential lots, further discussion is required about whether the bedrock aquifer could sustainably support the water demand of the fully built-out development (e.g., will there be unacceptable interference effects on neighbouring wells under the scenario of all 58 residential lots and one commercial lot pumping concurrently). Additional study is needed to determine if the bedrock aquifer could sustainably supply the proposed 58 residential lots and one commercial lot.	Please see enclosed response.	Cambium
1	Traffic	As the TIS was prepared in 2023, the horizon years should be updated to reflect applicable scenarios in 2025. The full build-out year was assumed to be 2025; this, along with existing, +5, and +10 year horizons, should be revised accordingly	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
2	Traffic	A default PHF value of 0.92 was used in operational analyses. We recommend calculating and utilizing existing PHF values for available turning movements. Use of PHF = 0.92 for future movements is acceptable.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
3	Traffic	The study assumes planning capacity of 750 vphpl for Northey Bay Road and 1,000 for Highway 28. It is unclear how these capacity values were applied in subsequent sections. Clarifications is requested.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
4	Traffic	Turning movement counts were collected on Tuesday, September 20, 2022. Review of Highway 28 AADT and SADT volumes (Table 2) indicates that summer traffic volumes are considerably higher than average (AADT is 37% to 47% lower than SADT). Please provide justification for using September data or adjust the collected volumes to account for seasonal variation.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
5	Traffic	As the turning movement counts are over three years old, we recommend conducting a new set of counts.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
6	Traffic	The trip generation rates reported for ITE LUC 210 – Single Family Detached Housing are incorrect. The rates used appear to be from ITE LUC 215 – Single-Family Attached Housing, which are lower than appropriate. All content and analysis for the proposed site and future scenarios should be updated accordingly.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
7	Traffic	Turn lane requirements should be updated based on revised horizon years, updated trip generation calculations, and adjusted turning movement volumes to reflect potential summer traffic increases.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
8	Traffic	Left and right turn lane requirements should also be provided for the intersection of Highway 28 and Northeys Bay Road.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham

9	Traffic	Please provide further information on how the available sight distances in Table 11 were calculated. Given the vertical alignment of the road and a review of the site access location via Google Street View, the available sight line may be less than the 120 meters reported.	Please see enclosed response.	Tatham
1	Stormwater	Section 2 of the report states that “groundwater flow through underlying bedrock was established”, however, the report doesn’t include any criteria related to the water balance and groundwater recharge. Please include relevant criteria and provide details and measures showing how these criteria will be satisfied.	To be addressed in future submission.	Tatham
2	Stormwater	In the Wet SWM Facility Stage Storage Table of Appendix A, it seems that the quantity and quality column heads were interchanged, please revise the titles as needed.	To be addressed in future submission.	Tatham
3	Stormwater	The Visual Otthymo VO6 summary output doesn’t provide sufficient information to review the model analysis and results. Please provide a soft copy of the model for review.	To be addressed in future submission.	Tatham
4	Stormwater	The report doesn’t include erosion protection criteria, to confirm that the proposed development should not increase the downstream water course erosion by detaining the runoff generated from a 25mm storm event over 24 to 48 hours. Please justify.	In our experience, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should be required as a condition of draft plan approval as it relates directly to detailed design.	Tatham
5	Stormwater	Dwg SG-1 -Preliminary Site Grading Plan: There are some locations on the drawing where the drainage pattern and flow outlet are not clear, such as the area between lots 36 to 39 and lots 46 to 43. Please provide more details to show the drainage pattern.	To be addressed in future submission.	Tatham
6	Stormwater	Provide preliminary ESC Drawing to support and explain the ESC and measures as stated in Section 6 of the report.	In our experience, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should be required as a condition of draft plan approval as it relates directly to detailed design.	Tatham