

Peer Review, Agency & Public Comments

Applications for Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment & Zoning Bylaw Amendment

45 Bishop Street, Lakefield (Township of Selwyn)

County File No.: 15T-21002, 15OP-21007, Township File No.: C-04-21

Agency Comments

- | |
|---|
| 1. Bell Canada received April 26, 2021 – conditions requested, see attached |
| 2. Canada Post – no comments received to date |
| 3. Curve Lake First Nation received email July 4, 2021 – no comments/concerns |
| 4. Conseil scolaire catholique MonAvenir – no comments received to date |
| 5. Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. received April 26, 2021 – no objections |
| 6. Hiawatha First Nation – no comments received to date |
| 7. Hydro One Inc. received May 3, 2021 – no comments or concerns |
| 8. Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board received May 11, 2021 – no objections, conditions requested, see attached |
| 9. Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing – no comments received to date |
| 10. Nexicom – no comments received to date |
| 11. Ontario Power Generation Inc. – no comments received to date |
| 12. Otonabee Region Conservation Authority received August 17, 2021 – see attached |
| 13. Peterborough Public Health received June 16, 2021 – no capacity to provide comments at this time |
| 14. Peterborough Utilities Group received June 29, 2021 – see attached |
| 15. PVNC Catholic District School Board – no comments received to date |
| 16. Williams Treaty First Nation Claims – no comments received to date |

WSP / BELL

OPA, ZBLA, Draft Plan of Subdivision - 45 Bishop St - File No. 15T-21-002, &15OP- 21007

Re: OPA, ZBLA, Draft Plan of Subdivision - 45 Bishop St - File No. 15T-21-002, &15OP-21007; Your File No. 15OP-21007,15T-21002

Our File No. 90210

The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada.
The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."

The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.
It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada's existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.
If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.
To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations.
Please note that WSP operates Bell's development tracking system, which includes the intake of municipal circulations. WSP is mandated to notify Bell when a municipal request for comments or for information, such as a request for clearance, has been received. All responses to these municipal circulations are generated by Bell, but submitted by WSP on Bell's behalf. WSP is not responsible for Bell's responses and for any of the content herein.

Enbridge Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment 45 Bishop Street

File No.: 15T-21002, 15OP-21007, C-04-21

Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions.
This response does not constitute a pipe locate, clearance for construction or availability of gas.
The applicant shall contact Enbridge Gas Inc.'s Customer Connections department by emailing AreaPlanning40@Enbridge.com to determine gas availability, service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping (including, but not limited to: tree planting, Silva cells, and/or soil trenches) and/or asphalt paving.
If the gas main needs to be relocated as a result of changes in the alignment or grade of the future road allowances or for temporary gas pipe installations pertaining to phased construction, all costs are the responsibility of the applicant.
In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, and any future adjacent developments, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas Inc. at no cost.

KPR Comments

**Plan of Subdivision File No.: 15T-21002; and Official Plan Amendment File No.: 15OP-21007;
and Zoning By-law Amendment File No.: C-04-21**

KPR Planning staff would like to provide the following comments:

Planning staff have no objections to the proposed draft Plan of Subdivision; Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.
KPR Planning staff would like to request the following conditions be included as part of draft plan approval:
Prior to the final approval of the draft plan, Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board (KRP) shall be satisfied that appropriate clauses are contained within the Subdivision Agreement as follows:
i. All offers of purchase and sale shall contain a statement advising prospective purchaser(s) that accommodation within a public school in the community is not guaranteed and students may be accommodated in temporary facilities; including but not limited to accommodation in a portable classroom, a “holding school”, or in an alternate school within or outside of the community.
ii. All offers of purchase and sale shall include a statement advising prospective purchasers that <u>if</u> school buses are required within the development in accordance with Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board Transportation policies, as may be amended from time to time, school bus pick up points will generally be located on the through street at a location as determined by the Student Transportation Services of Central Ontario.”

Otonabee Conservation

File: 15T-21002, 15OP-21007 and C-04-21; 45 Bishop Street, Lakefield Ward; (ORCA File: PPLS-4426)

The Otonabee Region Conservation Authority (Otonabee Conservation) has received the Draft Plan of Subdivision Application (15T-21002), Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBLA) for the property noted above.

The purpose of the applications are to establish an 1 hectare (2.47 acre), 16-unit, medium density Plan of Subdivision with townhouses and semi-detached houses. The subject property is located on the boundary of a residential community on the south side of Bishop Street within the settlement area of Lakefield.

The property is surrounded by vacant fields to the south and west and natural features, including a wetland and a watercourse, to the east.

Otonabee Conservation staff have reviewed the noted submitted documents in accordance with our mandate and policies and now offers the following conditions:

- Environmental Impact Assessment – 45 Bishop Street Lakefield, prepared by GHD limited, dated September 22, 2020 (EIS);
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report-in support of rezoning application 45 Bishop Street Residential Development, prepared by Counterpoint Engineering, dated Feb 26, 2021.

Otonabee Conservation’s mandate and role in this application are highlighted below:

<p>1. <i>Otonabee Conservation has reviewed this application through our delegated authority from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).</i></p>
--

<p>The current design indicates Low Impact Development (LID), including rain gardens, infrastructure will be established bordering the subject property. Technical issues have been identified and are articulated in the accompanying technical memo (ENG Review dated July 28th 2021).</p> <p>Until these issues are satisfactorily addressed, consistency with Section 3.1 of the PPS has not been demonstrated.</p>
<p>2. <i>The Authority has reviewed the application as a service provider to the County of Peterborough and the Township of Selwyn, in that we provide technical advice on natural heritage matters through a Memorandum of Understanding.</i></p> <p>As noted, there are wetlands, and a mapped watercourse to the east of the subject property.</p> <p>ORCA technical staff request additional information regarding the proposed rain garden infrastructure and wetland boundary identification. See find the accompanying technical memo (Ecological Review dated August 16th 2021).</p> <p>Until these issues are satisfactorily addressed, consistency with Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the PPS has not been demonstrated.</p>
<p>3. <i>Otonabee Conservation has reviewed the application through a regulatory lens. Under Ontario Regulation 167/06, this Authority's 'Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses' regulation under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act, any development, interference with or alteration within a flooding hazard, erosion hazard, watercourse, wetland and their adjacent lands/areas of interference requires a permit from the Authority. When an application is circulated under the Planning Act will also require an Otonabee Conservation permit, it is the practice of the Authority to establish the policy requirements of both processes during the planning stage.</i></p> <p>The subject property appears to not be subject to Ontario Regulation 167/06, Otonabee Conservation's "development, interference with wetlands and alterations to shorelines and watercourses" regulation. Permits for development will not be required from this agency.</p>
<p>4. <i>Otonabee Conservation has reviewed the application in terms of the Revised Trent Source Water Protection Plan (SPP), prepared under the Clean Water Act. The SPP, intended to protect Ontario's drinking water at its source, came into effect on January 1, 2015 and contains policies to protect sources of municipal drinking water supplies from existing and future land use activities.</i></p> <p>It was determined that the subject property is not located within an area that is subject to the policies contained in the SPP.</p>

ORCA Engineering Review – 45 Bishop Street, Townships of Selwyn Roll #:

PPLS-4426 1516 030 003 20803

The Otonabee Region Conservation Authority (Otonabee Conservation) technical staff has been given the following items to review with respect to the proposed development project:

- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, 45 Bishop Street (Counterpoint Engineering, February 26, 2021)

I have reviewed the above noted document and drawing and have the following comments;

1. It is unclear why 60% allowable release rate from Area 102 is allocated to Area 201 as noted Storage Calculations for 100-Year Storm Event for Area 201-South in Appendix D. Based on Table 3, the pre-development peak flow rates during the 100-year storm calculated for Area 101 and Area 102 are 0.027 m³/s and 0.077 m³/s, respectively. The post-development peak flow rates for Area 201 and Area 202 outlined in Appendix D are 0.046 m³/s and 0.031 m³/s, respectively. There are no existing storm sewers on Bishop Street. Increased flows as a result of the development to Bishop Street are not allowed due to the lack of storm sewer capacity analysis. In addition, post-development flows should be controlled to pre-development flow with respect to two drainage areas.

a. Please modify the design accordingly.

b. Please calculate the capacity of the existing Bishop Street ditch, cross culvert and catch basin system. Under the current drainage system, runoff from the site is spilling at the low point onto the neighboring property. The downstream conveyance will be discussed.

2. As noted in Section 4.3 of the report, drainage from the cul-de-sac is directed along the proposed curb and gutters to LIDs. Please explain how runoff from Area 201 will be captured and directed to LIDs within the right of way (ROW) during the design storm. As per the conceptual grading plan, it appears that there is no high point to retain runoff within the site.

3. How flows from the north LID will be controlled at the allowable release rate?

4. There are multiple discharge points down to the south LID; two rear yard swales and one SWM pipe from the north LID. Please demonstrate that the discharge points to be added up together will match the post- to pre- development peak flow rates.

5. Per the drawing set, an overflow of the LIDs is not specified. Please provide details where and how the overflow is leaving the LIDs and the site.

6. Please provide stage-storage-discharge tables for the south and north LIDs.

7. Please provide the sizing and volume calculations of LIDs.

8.	Please provide orifice calculations for 2 year through 100-year storms.
9.	Please provide confirmation of a minimum 1 m separation between the infiltration facilities and the groundwater at the location of LIDs as per MOE requirements.
10.	Please specify cross-sections of LIDs including the invert of the base of the headwall, the seasonal high-water table, the bottom of the infiltration facility to ensure that the LIDs are sufficient measures for the development.
11.	As per CVC/TRCA's LID SWM Planning and Design Guide (2010), ratios of impervious drainage area to bioretention cell area range from 5:1 to 15:1. Please ensure that the proposed footprint area of the LIDs can accommodate runoff from the impervious drainage area.
12.	SWM Facility Outlet – Under existing condition, surface water runoff from this site is naturally flowing downhill as sheet flow onto the adjacent property. The surface water does not flow in a defined channel of a natural watercourse. The proposed development will collect and concentrate surface water and eventually discharge as a point source onto the neighbouring property.
	A standard riprap spreader is not sufficient and doesn't mimic the natural conditions of sheet flow. A vegetated filter strip/level spreader as presented in Section 4.5.12 of the 2003 MOE manual.
a.	Please modify the design using the criteria within the manual and provide calculations.
b.	Based on the existing vegetation in that area, what is the proposed vegetation to be planted within the filter strip component?
c.	Please provide a cross section on the grading plan.
d.	The vegetated filter strip/level spreader will be located within the development limits.

Plan Review and Permitting Services Memo

1516 030 0032 0803

PPLS-4426

The Otonabee Region Conservation Authority (Otonabee Conservation/Authority) Plan Review and Permitting Services technical staff have received the following information in support of a Subdivision application at 45 Bishop Street, Lakefield:

Environmental Impact Assessment – 45 Bishop Street Lakefield, prepared by GHD limited, dated September 22, 2020 (also referred to as the EIS);
Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report-in support of rezoning application 45 Bishop Street Residential Development, prepared by Counterpoint Engineering, dated Feb 26, 2021.

Technical staff have reviewed the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and generally agree with the conclusions and recommendations made in the EIS; although have the following comments:

1. The constraint mapping requires an adequate buffer (30m minimum recommended) on the watercourse southeast of the property to demonstrate the development envelope is setback appropriately.
2. Staff require additional details to provide commentary on the Rain Garden surface LID feature including:
 - Planting plan;
 - Maintenance requirements, including identifying who's responsible for ongoing maintenance considering the placement of the LID;
 - Spreader design and location.
3. Technical staff observed signs of ponding water on the front lawn on the residential lot at 43 Bishop Street immediately west of the purposed development. Consultation with the municipality is recommended to ensure there is adequacy capacity for additional surface water drainage on Bishop Street with a focus on existing residential lots without a defined ditch/culvert.
4. While Species at Risk (SAR) were addressed and technical staff generally agree with the statements made in the EIS regarding SAR, please note that Proponents/landowners are ultimately responsible to ensure ESA compliance prior to commencement of work.
5. Additional commentary may be warranted by technical staff if conditions change or new information becomes available.

Date: June 29, 2021

45 Bishop Street – 15T-210001 Township Review of Grading, Water Servicing, Sanitary Servicing, Storm Water Management and Traffic.

1.0 Grading and Draft Plan Layout
1.1 Please ensure that all roadway grades provide a minimum gutter grade of 1.0% around the cul-de-sac.
1.2 Please confirm that there are no utility conflicts with the majority of the boulevard within the rural section being occupied with LID features.
1.3 A minimum of 5 m of usable ($\leq 5\%$) rear yard space should be provided for each lot. This may require shifting the south LID feature or adjusting the dimensions of the feature near Lots 7 to 10.
2.0 Water Servicing
Wills has input the water demand values provided into the Lakefield WaterCAD model to confirm that sufficient capacity is available.
During peak hour demand, the development requires 3.5 L/s, while the 50 mm watermain has excess flow of 22.5 L/s. As such, the required capacity is available for the development during peak hour demand.
During fire flow conditions, the development requires 202 L/s, while the 150 mm watermain hydrant has excess flow of only 65.7 L/s. As such, the proposed hydrant will not provide the required fire flow capacity for the development. However, there are sufficient fire flows available on Concession Street (see model output below) which is located approximately 270 m east of the proposed development.
2.1 The Township/Fire Department has confirmed that the available fire flows on Concession Street are acceptable for the development to proceed.
2.2 Concession Street has been determined to be acceptable for fire flows, the proposed watermain can be 50 mm and a flushing hydrant (clearly indicating that it is not for firefighting purposes) is to be placed at the south limit of the cul-de-sac for flushing and testing. The looped watermain is not
2.3 An air relief valve is to be included for the proposed watermain based on the elevation and location of the development.
3.0 Sanitary Servicing
3.1 We do not have any concerns with respect to the required downstream sanitary sewer capacity.
3.2 Service laterals will not be permitted to connect directly to the maintenance hole structures. As such, the final sanitary sewer layout may need to be extend.
4.0 Stormwater Management
4.1 Existing catchment boundaries should be revised as the portion of existing flow directed to Bishop Street is over Based on the contour data provided, Catchment 101, as delineated, includes a low point that will actually spill into Catchment 102 and not to Bishop Street (see sketch below). Furthermore, external estimated and external drainage areas have not been defined. Drainage entering the property should be delineated.
4.2 Target flow rates have been established based on existing peak flow rates to each outlet location; however, it is preferred to direct as much runoff as possible to Bishop Street, as the south outlet is poorly defined and is in private ownership. As such, we recommend matching predevelopment peak flow rates for the entire site, regardless of the existing outlet and directing as little runoff as possible to the south outlet.

<p>4.3 Please clarify how the proposed storm sewer configuration will function in series and provide a table within the body of the report summarizing existing and proposed controlled peak flow rates at each outlet location, for each return period.</p>
<p>For Catchment 201, it appears that the water quality storm will be captured by the east and west LIDs, the minor storms (2 to 5-year?) will be controlled within the storm sewer and directed to the south outlet and the major storms (5 to 100-year?) will be controlled by a weir and directed to Bishop Street. For Catchment 202, it appears that the water quality will be captured by the south LID; however, no controls are proposed for larger storm events. If this is the case, there will be no outflow to Bishop Street other than major storm events.</p>
<p>4.4 The estimated storage volume required should be increased by 25% or a hydrologic model should be used to confirm the modified rational method results. While the modified rational method is acceptable for the Draft Plan Approval stage, it has a tendency to underestimate the storage volumes required when compared to hydrograph based methods. As such, we request that an additional factor of safety be included in the storage volumes calculations.</p>
<p>4.5 The storage volume provided within the MH structures should be revised as flows will spill to Bishop Street before reaching the rim elevations of MH-2 and MH-3.</p>
<p>4.6 Please provide typical sections for the east, west and south LID features. It is unclear if these are on the surface, underground or a combination.</p>
<p>4.7 As the LID features are an integral part of the proposed stormwater design, a hydrogeology investigation is required during draft plan approval to confirm in-situ infiltration rates and groundwater elevations at the location of the proposed LID features.</p>
<p>In particular, a minimum separation of 1 m between the bottom of the LID features to the seasonally high groundwater level and drawdown of the LID features within 48 hours (including factor of safety) should be confirmed.</p>
<p>4.8 The expected maintenance requirements for the LID features, including routine and non-routine items should be discussed in the report. A standalone operation and maintenance manual will be required during detailed design.</p>
<p>4.9 The south LID should be located in an easement or block accessible to the Township for maintenance and inspections. The design should also include a flow spreader such that concentrated runoff will not increase erosion potential to downstream properties.</p>
<p>4.10 The Water Balance Analysis should be completed based on the Conservation Authority Guidelines for Hydrogeological Assessments and should demonstrate that post development runoff volumes will not exceed pre-development runoff volumes, to the south outlet, on an average annual basis. Matching runoff volume to Bishop Street will not be required.</p>
<p>5.0 Traffic Impact Brief</p>
<p>5.1 Include a table showing trip rates used in the calculation of the generated trips.</p>

5.2 Comment on the sightline at the entrance of the development.

CPE comment response

Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
Understood thank you
see comments addressed below
Understood thank you
see comments addressed below
Understood thank you
Understood thank you

To be included in agreement
To be included in agreement

To be included in agreement
To be included in agreement
To be included in agreement
To be included in agreement
To be included in agreement

Noted.
Noted.
Noted.
Noted.
Noted.

Understood Thank you
To be included in agreement
To be included in agreement

d.

omments.

See below for responses to ORCA technical comments.
Noted.
See below for responses to ORCA technical comments.
Noted.
Noted.

Note that the pre-development drainage areas and allocated release rates have been updated.
The existing Bishop Street ditch capacity has been estimated. Record drawings of the downstream conveyance system has been requested from the Township's Engineering Consultant. In the absence of information to fully assess downstream conveyance, this report outlines a post to pre solution as a 'worst case' scenario with respect to storage volumes for the purpose of demonstrating serviceability as the threshold to support rezoning. The report includes a discussion of the need to review downstream conveyance at the draft plan stage or detailed design.
The conceptual design of this ROW has been updated to a more traditional approach in response to agency comments. There are no LIDs proposed in the ROW in the revised FSR.
The conceptual design of this ROW has been updated to a more traditional approach in response to agency comments. There are no LIDs proposed in the ROW in the revised FSR.
Please see the updated report for a review of the predevelopment and post development release rate to the south.
The conceptual design of this ROW has been updated to a more traditional approach in response to agency comments. There are no LIDs proposed in the ROW in the revised FSR.
The conceptual design of this ROW has been updated to a more traditional approach in response to agency comments. There are no LIDs proposed in the ROW in the revised FSR. The south LID is a quality treatment feature only with no storage volume.
The conceptual design of this ROW has been updated to a more traditional approach in response to agency comments. There are no LIDs proposed in the ROW in the revised FSR.

At this rezoning stage, the FSR reviews the storage requirements of the 100 year event. However, orifice sizing and an analysis of the 2 through 100 year event is not practical given the approach to stormwater management in this FSR. As noted above, the design shows the storage requirement for post to pre quantity control is feasible but due to the significant volume and storm sewer works required, further downstream analysis is recommended at detailed design to review conveyance capacity and take advantage of any available capacity by way of increasing the allowable release rate from this development. The detailed orifice sizing should occur after the further downstream investigations at draft plan approval or detailed design stage.
Not applicable as the design does not contemplate infiltration through LIDs.
Not applicable in the revised design.
The conceptual design of this ROW has been updated to a more traditional approach in response to agency comments. There are no LIDs proposed in the ROW in the revised FSR.
The proposed design contemplates a level spreader along the south property line followed by a vegetated filter strip. The City owned block will act as the vegetated filter strip.
Calculations provided on detail
Planting permissions on the Township Block and any landscape plan (if required) to be confirmed at a detailed design stage. The existing vegetation of meadow grasses and shrubs would be ideal to maintain within the filter strip zone.
Separate typical cross-section provided.
Please see attached correspondence from the Township. The use of the township block or purchase of the block is an option to facilitate the vegetated filter strip.

To be provided at detailed design. This submission is for rezoning only.
To be provided at detailed design. This submission is for rezoning only.
To be provided at detailed design. This submission is for rezoning only.
Note that the proposed storm drainage solution contemplates a storm sewer which can outlet to the south ditch of Bishop Street downstream.
See responpones by others
Noted.

=

Noted.
Not applicable as the LID features have been removed from the proposed ROW.
See Typical LID detail
Noted.
Noted, thank you.
Noted, thank you.
Schematic watermain drawing updated with notation as requested.
Noted, thank you. To be added to detailed design
Noted, thank you.
Noted as a consideration for detailed design.
Noted, the predevelopment drainage areas have been updated per comments. Based on our site visit, the areas may be per the original report but the revision shows a 'worst case' calculation for storage volume requirements due to minimal allowable release rate to Bishop Street.
This approach could help alleviate the storage requirements by assigning some allowable release rate to the Bishop Street outlet. In an effort to demonstrate serviceability in the absence of complete information for the downstream conveyance system, this FSR shows the storage requirements for post to pre to the Bishop Street outlet with the conservative estimate of pre-development area directed to this outlet.

Not applicable based on the revised design.
Not applicable based on the revised design.
Noted. As noted above the storage solution is considered 'worst case' based on the conservative release rate applied to Bishop Street. Accordingly, we have not increased the storage volume estimate by 25%. However, the 100 year runoff coefficient values used have been factored up by 25% for the 100 year event.
Not applicable based on the revised design.
Not applicable based on the revised design. However, ORCA has also requested a cross-section of the level spreader and vegetated filter strip along the south property line and a section is included on the grading plan.
A hydrogeological study has been provided and in-situ testing was completed to estimate infiltration rates of the soils on site.
No infiltration measures are proposed.
No maintenance of the level spreader or vegetated filter strip are anticipated. Maintenance of the OGS unit will be per manufacturers Operations and Maintenance recommendation.
Noted. The Township could request the inclusion of an access block for access, or the purchase of the Township owned block at the south limit of the lands at the draft plan stage. At the current rezoning stage, the FSR proposes only private rear yard drainage discharging to the south in keeping with the comments above, and provides a level spreader on private property. The existing Township block is proposed to act as a vegetated filter strip which is not anticipated to require maintenance.
Incorporated. Refer to revised report

Incorporated. Refer to revised report

ee