WILLS

PARTNERS IN ENGINEERING, PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

April 17, 2024

County of Peterborough
470 Water Street
Peterborough, ON
K9H 3M3

**Attention: Ken Scullion, Planner**

Township of Douro-Dummer
P.O. Box 92, 894 South Street
Warsaw, ON
K0L 3A0

**Attention: Christina Coulter, Planner**

**Re: Riel Subdivision**
**Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision**
**D.M. Wills Project No. 19-85010**

On behalf of our client, Jason Riel, please find the following responses to comments received on the Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications (file no. 15T-23002) in the summary table below.

| Agency | # | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bell | | Contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed design to confirm the provisioning of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development. | Acknowledged. |
| Bell | | Include the following paragraph as a condition of approval: "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" | Acknowledged. County to include this condition within the Draft Plan Conditions. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bell | | Owner responsible for providing entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada's existing network infrastructure to service the development. Where no network infrastructure exists, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such infrastructure. Should the Owner choose not to pay for the network connection, Bell may decide not to service the development. | Acknowledged. To be addressed during Detailed Design |
| County Public Works | | Submit a response matrix | A comment response Matrix has been included in the submission. |
| County Public Works | | Update traffic report to reflect most recent traffic data and design guidelines | Please see Traffic Impact Study Response Letter, prepared by Tranplan Associates, dated January 2024, |
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 1 | Discussion regarding potential flood mapping is recommended | The Indian River floodplain has been added to the Grading and Drainage Plan and statement that the development will be outside of this area has been added to the SWM Report in the Site Description section. |
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 2 | Further discussion on potential presence and impacts to Blanding's Turtle and Eastern Hog-nosed Snake. | Acknowledged. Field work is currently underway to |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 3 | Consideration of additional mitigation measures for turtles. | address comments through next resubmission. |
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 4 | An IGF is recommended to be filed with the MECP in support of the project to determine MECP's acceptance of mitigation measures to maintain conformance with the ESA, 2007. This could be completed post approval but is recommended as a condition. | |
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 5 | Mitigation measures for the removal of potential Bat Maternity Trees is recommended including in the filing of the IGF to the MECP. | |
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 6 | Based on mapping in Figure 7, it appears that FOC4 is not completely protected within the VPA. Some further context is recommended. | |
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 7 | Since the PPS indicates that "Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in: d) significant wildlife habitat", and development is proposed in candidate SWH identified in the EIA, it should be clear in the EIA, how the proposal is in conformance with the policy. | |
| Peer Review EIS (Stantec) | 8 | It was noted that although FOC4 was identified for protection, there were some areas of the FOC4 ecosite that appear to be impacted as a result of the proposed severance. FOC4 is not completely protected within the VPA but the text in the reports infers that it is fully protected. Some further context is recommended. | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Enbridge Gas | | The applicant shall use the Enbridge Gas Get Connected tool to determine gas availability, service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping and/or asphalt paving. | Correspondence received from Enbridge February 12 indicated that there is no gas in the vicinity of the site. |
| Enbridge Gas | | 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. | Correspondence received from Enbridge February 12 indicated that there is no gas in the vicinity of the site. |
| Enbridge Gas | | 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 at no cost. | Correspondence received from Enbridge February 12 indicated that there is no gas in the vicinity of the site. |
| Peer Review HydroG (Stantec) | | Developer should be responsible for completing the well certification program prior to lot creation and as a condition of draft plan approval as opposed to being completed prior to issuing a building permit. | Acknowledged. |
| KPRDSB | i | Inclusion of the following clause within the Subdivision Agreement registered on title: "KPR recognizes the need for the pedestrian linkage (Block B) from the subdivision through to Warsaw Public School. The Owner(s) agrees that the pedestrian pathway shall be maintained year-round to ensure the safe passage of KPR students to the school site. | The County shall include these clauses in the final subdivision agreement. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Further, it should be understood that pedestrian access for the general public through the school site will not be permitted during school hours to ensure the safety of KPR students." | |
| KPRDSB | ii | Inclusion of the following clause within the Subdivision Agreement registered on title: "That the Owner(s) agrees to install, at their expense, a 6' black vinyl, chain link fence along the common boundary, between the school site and the subdivision lands. A lockable gate is to be installed at the pedestrian walkway (Block 'B')." | The County shall include this clause in the final subdivision agreement. The chain link fencing and associated details will be included in the detailed design submission. |
| KPRDSB | iii | Inclusion of the following clause within the Subdivision Agreement registered on title: "That any additional storm (surface) water runoff generated by the development of the lots adjacent to the school site, shall be diverted away from the school site." | The County shall include a clause related to surface water runoff directed to the school site in the final subdivision agreement.<br><br>It is noted that the proposed stormwater management design will direct sheet drainage towards the school site, as in existing conditions. However, this runoff will only be generated from |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | rear yards and the quantity of runoff will be less than existing conditions. |
| KPRDSB | iv | Inclusion of the following clause within the Subdivision Agreement registered on title: "All offers of purchase and sale shall include a statement advising prospective purchasers that if 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; and that additional pick-up points will not be located within the subdivision until major construction activity has been completed." | The County shall include this clause in the final subdivision agreement. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) | 1 a) i) | Figure #3 delineates the extent of the Epikarst Terrain and labels it the Limit of Dummer Complex Field. a) How was this extent generated? i) Has the extent / limit of the Epikarst terrain, as identified on Figure #3 Site Features (Hydrogeological and Site Servicing Study), been | Acknowledged and accepted. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | verified in the field? ii) Please identify the protocol used to field verify the extent of the Epikarst. | |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Karst | 1 b) | Figure #6 identifies the entire site as potential karst. Due to the specific nature of karst topography, it is difficult to accurately identify the location and extent of the hazard without undertaking site-specific technical reports. Table 1.0 Karst Assessment Requirements outlines the basic material that should be considered. Table 1.0 provided in comments document on pp.2-3. | The extent of known karst is within the natural heritage buffer and is sufficiently outside the area of proposed disturbance for the site. As such, a Karst Assessment has not been completed. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Karst | 2 | As outlined in Table 1, the extent of the karst feature will be delineated on the Grading and Drainage Plan. All development, including lot limits will be outside this hazard. | The extent of known karst is within the natural heritage buffer and is sufficiently outside the area of proposed disturbance for the site. As such, it has not been delineated on the Grading and Drainage Plan for this submission. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Floodplain | 3 | Please delineate the Indian River floodplain on the Grading and Drainage Plan. All development, including grading and lot limits will be outside this the flooding hazard. | The Indian River floodplain has been added to the Grading and Drainage Plan. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 1 | Since the surface runoff from this site will discharge into a wetland and the Indian River, Enhanced Level 1 water quality control is required. | Enhanced Level 1 protection has been included in the SWM Design Criteria and will be achieved by |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the proposed design. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 2 | Since the Township will be taking ownership of the road network and responsible for maintenance of the roadside ditches, please provide written approval that the Township of Douro-Dummer will accept their roadside ditches to be used for water quality control. | Wills has been in coordination with the Township and has confirmed that the proposed stormwater management methodology is acceptable. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 3 | To promote infiltration and enhance the water quality component, the roadside ditches need to be flat bottom with reduced slopes. | The locations within the roadside ditch that are intended to provide infiltration are flat bottom with minimal slopes. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 4 a) | The existing site currently has a mixture of land use / vegetation cover and is not properly defined with the grass runoff coefficient (C) of 0.3. a) Please provide the runoff coefficient break down and calculations for each pre-development drainage area. | Updated hydrologic parameters and reporting have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 4 b) | As above. b) Please adjust the pre-development peak flows for each drainage area. | Updated hydrologic parameters and reporting have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 5 a) | The runoff coefficient for the Blocks in the post development scenario assign a C value of 0.3. a) What is the surface treatment on Block 'B' the proposed walkway? | Updated hydrologic parameters and reporting have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) | 5 b) | As above. b) What exactly is being constructed on Block 'A'? The stormwater management | Block 'A' will be vacant, however the calculations |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Detailed | | scheme should include the change in impervious. | account for a new home and driveway on Block 'A'. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 6 | The runoff coefficient has been calculated, for the post development scenario, as one combined drainage area. Please provide the runoff coefficient break down and calculations for each pre-development drainage area. | Updated hydrologic parameters and reporting have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 7 | Drainage Area PT-1: a) The watershed length within the calculations is D=200m which is incorrect. Please apply the correct length in the TC calculations. b) The drainage area has a greater slope than 1.1%. c) Please apply the corrected TC value and slope for calculating peak flows. | Updated hydrologic parameters and reporting have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 8 | Drainage Area PT-2: a) The drainage area has a greater slope than 2.0%. b) Please apply the corrected TC value for calculating peak flows. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 9 | Drainage Area PT-3: a) The drainage area has a greater slope than 1.5%. b) Please apply the corrected TC value for calculating peak flows. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 10 a) | Drainage Area PT4: a) The watershed length within the calculations is D=60m. How was this length established when each of the lot line dimensions are all greater than 100m? Apply the corrected length in the TC calculations. b) Please apply the corrected TC value for calculating peak flows. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 11 | Provide summary of pre-development and post development peak flows for the two discharge points. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 12 | Based on the peak flow summary, are water quantity controls required? If yes, please provide appropriate sizing, location and cross-sections. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided.<br><br>Runoff directed to adjacent properties and the County right-of-way will be less than existing conditions, due to the reduction in catchment area. Runoff directed to the Indian River does not require quanity controls based on the size of the overall watershed and the lag time between peak flow rates from the site and peak flow rates within the river (i.e. "Beat the Peak"). |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 13 | The drainage arrows for drainage areas PT-1 and PT-2 on Figure 5 Post Development Plan are not pointing in the correct direction based on the Grading Plan. Please make the appropriate corrections. | A new SWM report and drainage figures have been provided. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 14 | The first 200m of roadside ditch and discharge from Block A drains toward County Road 4. There is no defined ditch on the east side of County Road 4. | There is a ditch on the east side of County Road 4. The recent As-built survey of |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Where and/or what is the ditch draining into (discharge point)? | County Road 4 also shows an existing 600mm CSP. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Detailed | 15 | Drainage Area PT-2 is capturing surface runoff with grass swales and directing point discharge onto the school property yard, at the low point behind Lots# 1, 2 and 4. Is there another appropriate discharge location that will not affect surrounding properties? | All runoff directed to the school property will be conveyed as sheet drainage, as in existing conditions. This will be limited to the rear yard and roof areas, which are clean sources of runoff. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Water Balance | 16 a) | The report does not deal with the loss of infiltration due to increased impervious area on the lots. To address the loss in infiltration, soak-away pits will be installed on every lot. a) Runoff will be captured from the entire rooftop area. Based on the house/roof design, there will be at least one or two soak-away pits per lot. | Soakaway pits will be provided on every lot. Conceptual sizing is provided within the updated SWM Report and further details will be confirmed during detailed design. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Water Balance | 16 b) | As above. B) The capture/storage volume will be captured will be 25mm across the entire rooftop. | The soakaway pits have been sized to provide 25 mm capture / storage volume. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Water Balance | 16 c) | As above. C) Please provide the sizing of the soak-away pits. | A new SWM report has been provided with sizing calculations. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Water Balance | 16 d) | As above. D) Please delineate the location of the soak-away pits on the Grading Plan. | The soakaway pits have been shown on the Grading Plan. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) Discharge | 17 | The discharge from the proposed drainage swale cannot be done as a point discharge. The discharge into the adjacent wetland will be done in a manner that replicates the current overland sheet flow. I suggest the vegetated filter strip, Section 4.5.12 of the MOE 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual. a) Please provide the sizing calculations. b) Please delineate the location of the vegetated filter strip on the Preliminary Servicing and Grading Plan. The vegetated filter strip will be located within the developable area of the site outside the Consolidated Vegetation Protection Area. | A level spreader and vegetated filter strip is provided at the outlet of the proposed drainage swale. Refer to new SWM report for sizing calculations. The level spreader and vegetated filter strip has been shown on the Preliminary Servicing and Grading Plan. Additional details for the grading of this feature will be provided during detailed design. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) ESC | 18 | There is filling and grading associated with lots #1, 2, 4, and 8 that drain onto adjacent properties. At a minimum, silt fence is required along the property limits. | Silt fencing has been added to the Preliminary Erosion Control drawing. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Engineering Review (ORCA) ESC | 19 | Please provide the sizing for the temporary sediment ponds, including outlet structure and drawdown time. | A detailed erosion and sediment control design is not required at this stage of the approvals process. Confirmation as to whether temporary sediment ponds/traps are required will be completed during detailed design and will include appropriate sizing calculations. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) ESC | 20 | Dimensions need to be added to the temporary sediment pond section on the Details Plan. | Confirmation and sizing calculations to be provided during detailed design. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) ESC | 21 | Additional ESCs are required around the construction of the vegetated filter strip and associated vegetation. | Silt fencing has been added around the vegetated filter strip. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) ESC | 22 | Additional rock check dams are required within the County Road 4 ditch. | Confirmation and locations for rock check dams within the County Road 4 ditch will be provided during detailed design. |
| Engineering Review (ORCA) ESC | 23 | Sequencing notes are required regarding the construction and protection of the infiltration trench (below the roadside ditches) and the vegetated filter strip and associated vegetation. | Sequencing notes will be provided during detailed design to protect the proposed stormwater and infiltration features. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Engineering Review (ORCA) ESC | 24 | Require notes for ESC operation, monitoring, and maintenance. | Erosion control notes will be provided during detailed design. |
| Environmental Review (ORCA) | 1 | The EIS Addendum references an April 2022 Conceptual Lot Layout Plan prepared by DM Wills – is this the same as the February 2023 version recently circulated? | |
| Environmental Review (ORCA) | 2 a) | Please update the Site Plan prepared by DM Wills to identify natural hazards/regulated area appropriately in accordance with the definitions/tests of the Conservation Authorities Act. a) Due to the presence of karst bedrock and organic soils, the "limit of consolidated vegetation protection area" should be renamed as "hazardous site/wetland". | The "limit of consolidated vegetation protection area" has been renamed as "Development Limit" in the drawings' legend. The wetland is a separate boundary also shown on the Plans. |
| Environmental Review (ORCA) | 2 b) | As above. b) Please add wetland boundary, the 30-m wetland buffer, and hazardous site boundary – this includes limit of organic soils and unstable bedrock, and/or the "limit of important groundwater discharge/recharge", for the permit submission, if applicable. | The wetland boundary, 30m buffer, and site/development boundary are shown on both DMW's GR and ESC plans. |
| Environmental Review (ORCA) | 2 c) | As above. C) ORE has not confirmed how, and if, the limit the Drumlin Complex Terrain illustrated on Figure 3 (hydrogeological study) was field verified. Please address N. MacFarlane's comments in support of satisfying Otonabee Conservation policies 6.0(1) and 6.1(1). | Acknowledged. Field work is currently underway to address comments through next resubmission. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Environmental Review (ORCA) | 3 a) | The EIS Addendum did not review or provide best management practices (BMPs) to minimize risk to the wetland from the redirected storm water as suggested in the proposed SWM design/easement. A) Provided the proposed SWM infrastructure/easement remains out of the 30-m wetland area of interference, the SWM design demonstrates no negative impact to wetland hydrology/water balance or an increased risk of erosion to features, and satisfies N. MacFarlane's engineering comments, Otonabee Conservation wetland policies appear to be satisfied. This has not yet been demonstrated. | Acknowledged. Details to be included and comments addressed through the next resubmission. |
| Environmental Review (ORCA) | 3 b) | As above. B) If SWM infrastructure encroaches into the regulated area, a submission addendum may be required to confirm BMPs, including a final Erosion Sediment Control and Work Sequence Plan, in support of the permit application. | SWM infrastructure does not encroach into the Regulated Area. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | The SWM Report (2022) should introduce a section on 'SWM Criteria', outlining the relevant SWM criteria applicable to the Site. Appropriate reference to those SWM criteria should be mentioned in the report. | The SWM Design Criteria has been added to the updated SWM report. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | The SWM Criteria applicable to the site should include the relevant criteria from the County of Peterborough and ORCA. | SWM methodology has been added to the new SWM report. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | ORCA SWM criteria indicates that a pre-development water balance should be maintained for the site. The general target set by ORCA for Peterborough is 15mm runoff retention. The SWM Report (2022) should introduce a section on Water Balance and elaborate how the Water Balance target is achieved. Currently there is limited discussion in the SWM Report (2022) about an infiltration gallery. The SWM Report (2022) does not demonstrate how the water balance target is satisfied. | In correspondence with ORCA retention of the 25 mm storm is proposed for all roof drainage within private soakaway pits and additional infiltration is proposed within the roadside ditching. A section has been added to the SWM Report to discuss these features. A detailed water balance analysis comparing to existing conditions has not been required. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | As above. The SWM Report (2022) has limited discussion on hydrogeological characteristics of the site. Reference to the hydrogeological information should be provided in the SWM Report (2022). | Hydrogeological characteristics are found in Section 4.1 of the new SWM report. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | As above. The SWM Report (2022) mentions both infiltration rate of 30-75 mm/hr and MOE infiltration rate of 15 mm/hr. It is not clear which value was used as the design infiltration rate. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. Infiltration rates of 30 mm/hr with a 2.5 factor of safety have been used for preliminary design purposes. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | As above. No information on the drawdown time calculation is provided in the SWM Report (2022). | A new SWM report and drawdown calculations have been provided. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | As above. No information on the separation between the bottom of the gallery and the seasonal high groundwater table is provided in the SWM Report (2022). | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. The groundwater level is ~4 m below the existing ground and the proposed grading design does not propose signficiant cut. As such, adequate groundwater separation will be provided. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | As above. The referenced hydrogeological report should be provided as an attachment in the SWM Report (2022). | The referenced Hydrogeological Report has been provided in the Appendix of the new SWM report. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | As above. There is no indication in the SWM Report (2022) if the in-situ soil percolation and seasonal high groundwater table locations align with the location of the LIDs. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Section 2.2 indicates that a normal level of protection is appropriate for the site. Enhanced level of quality control is required by ORCA. | Enhanced Level 1 protection has been provided. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Section 3.3 indicates that Enhanced level of protection is provided by an infiltration gallery located below the road ditch in the site. Detail B shows a cross-section of the infiltration | New details are provided and the subdrain has been removed. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | gallery (Drawing D1). In Detail B, the 150 mm perforated pipe should be located above 300 mm depth of 19 mm clearstone. | |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | A separate section on Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) should be introduced in the SWM Report (2022). The ESC information outlined in Section 3.0 should be removed from this section. Section 3.0 should be strictly dedicated to SWM quality control. | An Erosion and Sediment Control section has been added to the updated SWM Report. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Section 4.1 indicates that Figure 3 illustrates the pre-development condition, which is not correct and should be fixed. | A new SWM report and drainage area plans have been provided. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Section 4.0 outlines the quantity control assessment for the site. In the quantity control analysis MTO IDF data was used. However, Peterborough Engineering Design Standards (2016) refer to Table B.1.7.1, which are different from the IDF data used in the SWM Report (2022). In this study, the Peterborough IDF data from Table B.1.7.1 should be used. | A new SWM report and drainage area plans have been provided. Rainfall data for the City of Peterborough has been used. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Section 4.1 indicates that for the existing site, the peak flows from subcatchment PR-1 drains westward and the peak flows from subcatchment PR-2 drains eastward. Section 4.2 indicates that for the proposed site, the peak flows from subcatchments PT1 and PT2 drain westward and the peak flows from subcatchments PT3 and PT4 drain eastward. A comparison of the peak flows between the existing and proposed conditions shows that the combined proposed peak flows draining westward are higher than the existing peak flows. This drainage impact should be further investigated and addressed in the report. Adequate quantity control measures should be designed and discussed in the report. | A new SWM report and drainage area plans have been provided. Peak flow rates draining westward are less than existing due to the reduction in catchment area. Runoff directed to the Indian River does not require quanity controls based on the size of the overall watershed and the lag time between peak flow rates from the site and peak flow rates within the river (i.e. "Beat the Peak"). |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | The proposed V channel conveys flows with a velocity of 1.19 m/s. Adequate erosion control measures should be provided in the V channel. | A new SWM report and drainage area plans have been provided. If required, erosion control measures will be provided during detailed design. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Additional information and proper reference regarding the environmental study report should be provided. | Reference to the EIS is provided in Section 2.0 of the SWM Report. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Drawing D1: Detail B mentions 50 mm clearstone, whereas the SWM Report mentions 19mm clearstone. This discrepancy should be fixed. | A new SWM report and calculations have been provided. The preliminary |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | design proposes 50 mm clearstone. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Figure 5: The flow direction arrows shown for subcatchments PT-1 and PT-2 are incorrect and should be fixed. | A new SWM report and drainage area plans have been provided. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Drawing G1: the slope for the Proposed Drainage Easement should be shown and a plan view of the proposed V channel should be presented. | The proposed drainage easement has been changed to a block slopes are added to the Grading drawing and a cross-section drawing has been included on the Details drawing. Additional details will be provided during detailed design. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Figure 2: The figure shows TW-xx. Proper labels should be added for the represented items. | A new SWM report and drainage area plans have been provided. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | Figure 3: Temporary Mud Mat should be removed and placed elsewhere or in Appendix. The placement of Figure 3 does not align with the overall progression of the report. | A new SWM report has been provided. Mud mat detail is shown on the Prelminary Erosion and Sediment Control drawing. |
| Peer Review SWM (Stantec) | | A figure with the lot numbers for the proposed site should be included for reference. | Figure 3 in the new SWM Report shows the Lot numbers |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peer Review TIS (Stantec) | 1 | Section 1.1: Background: The study uses 2017 as the existing condition that is 6 years prior to this review process. We request the consultant to provide support on the validity of the TIS as the TIS documents are usually considered obsolete after 3 years. | The 2018 TIS used 2017 traffic data as the existing condition. The study has been updated with the recent 2023 traffic data. Please see Exhibit 1.1 (attached at the back of this report) for the Existing 2023 traffic volumes used as the base for the traffic analysis. |
| Peer Review TIS (Stantec) | 2 | Section 2.4: Current Traffic Data: The detailed traffic counts should be provided in the Appendix for reference. | Tranplan Associates Inc. collected the peak hour traffic volumes on County Road 4 & English Line South intersection on November 23,2023. The detailed 15 min traffic count report and an output diagram is attached in Appendix A.2 for reference. |
| Peer Review TIS (Stantec) | 3 | Section 3.1: Trip Generation Forecasts: When using the ITE Trip Generation Manual, it is recommended to calculate the site generated traffic based on average rate as well as fitted curve equation and choose whichever is higher for the analysis. | The site trip generation is done based on ITE Trip Generation Manual-11th Edition. The Land-use code LU 210 (single family |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | detached dwelling) was used to calculate trips based on average rate and fitted curve equation; the method that generated the highest number of trips was used for analysis. The fitted curve equation generated 17 total trips (4 inbound, 13 outbound) during AM peak hour and 22 total trips (14 inbound, 8 outbound) during PM peak hour. |
| Peer Review TIS (Stantec) | 4 | Section 4.1: Future Background Traffic: No background development was considered in this study. It is recommended to confirm if any background development exists. This is a concern especially with the 6-year span between preparation of the TIS and its peer review. | The new site traffic volumes are added to the background traffic volumes to generate the future 2033 traffic volumes. Please see Exhibit 1.4 for the 2033 total traffic volumes. |
| Peer Review TIS (Stantec) | 5 | Section 4.5: Future Site Access: The design ISD for left turn from stop is at the verge of exceeding the available ISD. It is recommended to provide a map illustrating the actual available sightline. | As requested, Exhibit 2.0 illustrates approximate "airline" distance of relevant sight distance measured from the proposed site |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | access on County Road 4 (measured using Google Aerial Photo Distance Measure Function). |
| Peer Review TIS (Stantec) | 6.1 | Synchro Parameters: The Section 2.4 indicates that peak hour factor of 0.70 is used in this study but peak hour factor of 0.92 is found in the Synchro analysis. | The synchro analysis was updated using the revised traffic volumes. |
| Peer Review TIS (Stantec) | 6.2 | Synchro Parameters: It seems that the conflicting pedestrians at the English Line South and County Road 4 intersections are assumed values (AM and PM pedestrian volumes are the same). It is recommended to use actual pedestrian volumes since it is a school access. | The intersection capacity analysis indicates that all individual movements of County Road 4 & English Line South is operating very well with LOS "A", minimal delay, and queue lengths at the existing, background and total traffic conditions. |

We trust the above comment/response summary table is satisfactory for your purposes. Please feel free to contact our office if you have any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Marnie Saunders, BES, CPT.
Senior Land Use Planner