



November 8, 2024
Our File: 418153

R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited
15 Townline
Orangeville, ON L9W 3R4
Attention: Carley Dixon, P.Eng.

Re: Marsville North Subdivision
Township of East Garafraxa
Draft Plan of Subdivision 22T-141585 and Zoning
By-Law Amendment

Dear Ms. Dixon,

In response to the comments received September 30, 2022, we offer the following responses for your review and consideration:

R.J. Burnside Comments (dated September 30, 2022)

Proposed Lot Fabric

Comment 1: The developer has proposed minimum lot size of 0.5 acres. We note that to ensure reasonable amenity space is provided, the developer is proposing tertiary sewage systems due to the 0.5-acre lot sizes. As noted previously, Council has a general preference for the use of ditches and lot sizes that are at least 0.6 acres to maintain the rural feel. Acceptance of this smaller lot size is subject to Council direction.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 2: A revised draft plan was not submitted; therefore, the following comments have not been addressed:

- a) The corner of Lot 30 should be adjusted to less than a 90 degree turn.
- b) The existing Park/Utility block should be relabeled to Park/Municipal Water System.
- c) The municipal drain block is to be widened to accommodate a 3.5 m flatter area on one side to allow for maintenance.
 - The developer's engineer proposed a 3.5 m maintenance easement on Lot 25 to address this comment. The use of a proposed easement on Lot 25 as a maintenance access to the stormwater Block 24 is not appropriate because fencing along the block/lot line will obstruct access to the drainage channel. Block 33 should be wide enough to include the access route which will avoid obstruction by fencing the block.
 - The channel side slopes in the stormwater conveyance Block 24 are to be a minimum 3:1 (h:v) which may also affect the width of the block. The FSR states that the proposed channel side slopes in Block 24 are 2:1 which are too steep for safety and maintenance purposes.
- d) The rear yard swale behind Lots 1 to 5 is over 200 m long and is directed to one rear yard catch basin (RYCB) in close proximity to the SWM Pond. GM BluePlan wishes to defer further review until detail design; however, the proposed grading design can impact the draft plan.
 - The SWM Block lot limits should be expanded to accommodate RYCB.37
 - Another RYCB is required. The location needs to be determined at this stage to confirm if the Township will require a drainage block and/or easement.

- Topographic information does not extend beyond the limits of the subdivision. It's not clear whether this rear swale will accept drainage from the external subdivision which would further exacerbate the need for an additional inlet.
- e) It's not clear why a portion of the Brouwer drainage area is being diverted through the subdivision. The drainage should continue to outlet as it does in existing conditions which will likely require additional land area by the 13th Line on Lot 17. The drainage feature should be contained within land owned or to be dedicated to the Township.

Response:

- a) *The corner of Lot 30 has been adjusted to less than 90 degrees.*
- b) *The Park / Utility block has been relabelled as Park / Municipal Water System.*
- c) *The side slopes of the swale on Block 24 have been revised to 3:1 and the block has been widened by 3.5m for maintenance.*
- d) *The rear yard swale has been revised to include a second rear yard catchbasin (RYCB) approximately halfway along the swale. The stormwater management facility block (Block 32) has been revised to include the rear yard catchbasin RYCB.45. Topographic information has been extended beyond the limits on the storm sewer catchment plan and the drawings showing the municipal drains. The topographic information could not be added to all drawings as it made the files too large to be practicable.*
- e) *Grading has been revised to divert the Brouwer Municipal Drain area around the proposed subdivision.*

Comment 3: Further direction from Council is required with respect to the 13th line road connection. Preference would be to service the subdivision off the two existing entrances off of County Road 3.

Response: *To be addressed by others under separate cover.*

Comment 4: There still remains some design concerns and until they are addressed, we cannot confirm that the 30 lots can be developed from an overall grading/groundwater/stormwater management perspective. There also remains the urban cross section question.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Groundwater

Comment 5: The slab elevations of numerous lots are at or below the groundwater table contours shown on the Grading Plans. The slab elevations and grading design should be revised to prevent the mining of groundwater through permanent dewatering. Further consultation with the geotechnical and hydrogeological consultant to obtain input with respect to minimum separation from the seasonally high groundwater and other design considerations for high groundwater is required. After the preliminary grading is revised, a revised "Foundation Recommendations" letter should be submitted.

Response: *The grading plans and groundwater contours have been reviewed and revised with the latest data to place proposed slab elevations higher than the high groundwater level.*

Comment 6: The letter prepared by JLP Services Inc. recommends raising the proposed finished grades near the monitoring wells installed on the east side of the municipal drain to avoid permanent under foundation drainage systems. This was not reflected in the preliminary grading design. The site needs to be raised as much as possible to mitigate issues with groundwater to the extent possible.

Response: *The grading plans and groundwater contours have been reviewed and revised with the latest data to place proposed slab elevations higher than the high groundwater level.*

Comment 7: An updated hydrogeology tech memo should be submitted documenting the groundwater hydrographs measured between Feb. 2020 and Dec. 2021. The levels noted in the table included in the JLP Consultants letter dated April 4, 2022 have not been documented and reviewed.

Response: *An updated hydrogeological memo has been included with this submission.*

Comment 8: Should foundation drain connections (by gravity or by pumping) to the storm sewer become part of a final foundation drainage system after addressing basement slab levels relative to high groundwater elevations, a 100-year storm hydraulic gradeline analysis will be required to show the lowest living space floor is 0.5 m above the 100 year storm HGL.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Municipal Drain

Comment 9: Brouwer Drainage Works

The revised concept proposes to re-direct external drainage from Brouwer Drainage Works through the subdivision and stormwater management facility ultimately changing the outlet of this water to the Thunderbird Drainage Works. The diversion of this external runoff results in larger storm sewers and a larger SWM facility, not to mention there has been no downstream analysis regarding the impact. This diversion is not supported. The double ditch inlets at the entrance to the 13th Line should be removed and a culvert installed sized to ensure major storms continue to be directed to the Brouwer Drainage Works. The reduced volume of runoff through the SWM pond block may reduce the pond block size and offset for the creation of the drainage block beside 13th Line.

Response: *The stormwater management design has been revised to remove the diversion of external contributing flows from the Brouwer Drainage Works.*

Comment 10: Thunderbird Drainage Works

As noted in the previous submission, we are generally supportive of the overall concept to divert the drainage around the existing built-up area subject to additional review being completed to assess the downstream impacts and improvements required. This work remains outstanding and will need to be completed by the applicant.

Response: *Further discussion has been included in the revised stormwater management design to assess downstream impacts.*

Comment 11: We had requested clarification regarding the design criteria and noted that the downstream impacts had not been completed which could result in modifications to the criteria. The Functional Servicing Report should be updated to address the following: We are generally supportive of the overall concept to divert the drainage area around the existing built-up area subject to additional review downstream being completed.

- a) Section 5.1 should clearly state the intended quantity control design criteria for the two SWM ponds (i.e. post development to pre-development peak flows, overcontrol to particular target or pipe capacity, etc.).
- b) The proposed quality control criteria is to treat the runoff volume only from the Marsville subdivision areas and not from the total tributary area to the pond. This is not consistent with the MECP guidelines which state the entire contributing drainage area needs to be considered in order to achieve the level of treatment required. Also note that part of the lots in the existing Thunderbird subdivision will flow overland through the Marsville subdivision and into the SWM pond. The boundary of drainage areas 2300 and 2400 on Figure 17 is to be adjusted and the analysis updated.
- c) Section 5.1 should state the proposed design criteria for the new storm sewer outfalls and any overland channels from the SWM ponds and through the agricultural lands to the outlet of drainage area 2600.

Response: *Section 5.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report has been updated to more clearly state the intended quantity control design criteria for the two stormwater management facilities to the pipe capacity of the proposed Thunderbird Drain improvements.*

The quality control calculations have been updated in the revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report to include all contributing drainage areas. The boundary of drainage areas 2300 and 2400 have not been updated on Figure 17 as they drain to the same location (Marsville North stormwater management facility) and the only distinction in the analysis is descriptions of existing versus proposed.

Section 5.1 of the revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report has been updated to more clearly state the proposed design criteria for the new storm sewer outfalls and any overland channels from the stormwater management facilities.

Comment 12: We identified the further need to confirm the proposed 675 mm dia. pipe is a sufficient outlet considering the location will receive additional runoff volume due to the development. This remains an outstanding item that needs to be resolved. The applicant should revise the FSR to address the following:

- a) The description of locations for flow comparisons in Table 10 are not clear. The numbered key flow point locations used in the MIDUSS model should be included in Table 10 and on Figures 16, 17 and the modeling schematics in Appendix F.
- b) Additional flow comparisons need to be included in Table 10. These include all the areas modelled downstream of the proposed developments, including the junction of the proposed new south drain from the south SWM pond with the new Thunderbird drain. Also at the confluence of areas 1500 and 2500. Provide a summary for the total watershed modelled flows at the outlet of area 2600.
- c) As noted in related comments, it is not clear what design criteria has been used to size the new branches of the Thunderbird piped and overland drainage system (i.e. storm sewer segments and overland channels). In one instance, it is noted the proposed 525 mm dia. storm sewer from the Marsville south SWM pond does not have the 100-year storm capacity which raises a question of how the total flow will be conveyed as proposed.
- d) An additional table summarizing the preliminary design flow, capacity, dimensions, length, slope, material, etc. for each of the proposed drain segments (pipe and overland flow) should be provided to demonstrate servicing feasibility.

Response: *Key point locations have been coordinated between the revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report text, Figures, and MIDUSS modelling outputs.*

Additional flow comparison points have been included in Table 10, including the junction of Marsville South and Marsville North outlet flow rates, flows in the existing drain, and the confluence of the existing drain with the proposed drain improvements.

The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report has been revised to clarify the proposed drain improvements are intended to have sufficient capacity of the proposed flow rates from the subdivisions to the channel portion of Thunderbird Municipal Drain.

As the stormwater management analysis uses the capacity of the pipes under a hydraulic gradeline to determine the feasible outlet flow rates from the pond, the flow rates can be higher than the gravity pipefull capacity.

Two tables have been added to the revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report detailing the existing and proposed drain segments to demonstrate servicing feasibility.

Comment 13: The applicant should revise the FSR to provide further detail with respect to the function of the 300 mm tile drain from the Thunderbird Subdivision. The points in page 11 (5th and 6th) should be further amended to address the following:

- a) It should clarify however that the intent is the drain will only service downstream agricultural lands. The FSR is confusing when read with the engineering drawings which show that the 300 mm dia. tile drain will be disconnected from the downstream sections at the SWM pond outlet and connected to the new storm sewer.
- b) It is not clear what is connected to the existing 300 mm dia. tile drain from the Thunderbird Subdivision (i.e. roadside ditches). Burnside is not aware of direct connections to the drain, however potential backwater or surcharge effects resulting from connecting the drain to the new storm sewer outlet from the SWM pond should be addressed.

Response: *A discussion of the 300mm dia. tile drain has been added to the report. The 300mm dia. tile drain is maintaining drainage but is not directly connected to the proposed development. It will be routed around the proposed stormwater management pond.*

Proposed Road Cross Section

Comment 14: The proposed cross section is urban (storm sewer with curb and gutter). This requires further consideration by and direction from Township Council. Street lighting may be completed at detail design stage and may not necessitate the high street lighting wattage specified in the preliminary design.

Response: *Further discussion with the Township resulted in the cross-section included in the revised drawings provided with this submission.*

Comment 15: A portion of the road is at or below the existing groundwater level. The geotechnical report did not provide discussion or recommendations related to the road design other than pavement structure. Previous comments will likely result on road grade changes however, if areas remain lower than the groundwater, the geotechnical consultant is to provide preliminary recommendations for design.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Water Supply

Comment 16: A Servicing Options Report was submitted in 2021 and we accept the report as fulfilling the completion of a Servicing Options Report. We noted that a draft plan condition would require a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment to evaluate and select the preferred alternative for a municipal water system expansion including the review of fire protection options for the Community of Marsville. A well drilling testing program and consultation is a vital component in the evaluation process to determine the preferred servicing strategy for Marsville. The Township has received funds from the developers to complete the EA which is underway. We expect well drilling will occur in the near future. Any additional well supply will require the necessary source protection studies to delineate new wellhead protection areas which we will prepare as part of the EA study.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Stormwater Management (SWM)

Comment 17: The proposed design for Marsville North requires the grading work/flow diversion related to Marsville South to be constructed in order that the upstream drainage area by-passes Thunderbird. Comments related to the Marsville South SWM design will be provided under separate cover.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 18: The proposed addition of the storm sewer system eliminates the previous roadside ditch issues noted in the first submission, however, the sewer outlet elevation is 0.5 m below the permanent pool elevation of the SWM pond which reduces the system's hydraulic capacity and would cause sediment to accumulate within the sewer system. The storm sewer outlet is to be raised to at least the permanent pool elevation. If the storm sewer system proposal is not acceptable to the Township, then the previous roadside ditch issues will have to be re addressed.

Response: *The storm sewer system has been raised to above the permanent pool elevation.*

Comment 19: The post development drainage areas will need to be updated to reflect the drainage areas that will continue to be directed to the East Watershed (Brouwer Drainage Works) as opposed to diversion through the subdivision lands. Also, the adjustment of the drainage boundary between areas 2300 and 2400 on Figure 17 is required based on overland flow contributions from the Thunderbird subdivision. This will necessitate updates in the report and model.

Response: *The stormwater management analysis has been revised to reflect the areas that will continue to be directed to the East Watershed as opposed to diverting through the Marsville North Subdivision. The drainage boundary between areas 2300 and 2400 has not been revised as these two catchments are both conveyed to the stormwater management pond and included in quantity and quality calculations.*

Comment 20: The geotechnical assessment identifies the need for an impermeable liner to withstand almost 7 m of hydraulic pressure. The preliminary design should address how the design is intended to accommodate the groundwater and how the pond will be able to be drained and cleaned out due the hydraulic pressure. Additional input from the geotechnical consultant will be required to confirm the preliminary concept is satisfactory.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Stormwater Management (SWM) Analysis

Comment 21: The grading and servicing design shows that the post development flows from a portion of Lot 5 do not enter the SWM facility. Figure 17 was not updated to address the grading design of Lot 5 and related catchment areas.

Response: *Catchment 2450 has been added to the revised stormwater management design.*

Storm Drainage and SWM Ponds – Preliminary Design

Comment 22: The overland flow route is subject to further review at the detailed design stage. The response provided to the previous Burnside comment no. 28 mistakenly refers to Block 24 whereas the issue is the major system flow from the roadway into the SWM pond block. The low point on Maple Street is very close to the Block 32/Lot 6 property line and without further details, the 100 year storm overland flow may spread onto Lot 6. The flow route should also avoid following the maintenance road to prevent washouts and increased maintenance. The flow route should be relocated to an appropriate location along the frontage of the SWM pond block and be provided with appropriate erosion protection.

Response: *The grading from the roadway into the SWM pond block has been revised to relocate the flow route further from Lot 6.*

Comment 23: We had requested that access ramps at a maximum 8% slope from the maintenance access road to the pond inlet forebay and pond outlet pool locations for inspection and maintenance of the inlet and outlet be provided. This remains outstanding and is needed to confirm the size of the SWM Block.

Response: *Access ramps have been included in the revised drawings.*

Comment 24: The “CB Control with Orifice Plate” calculation in Appendix G is based on a head of 2.5 m on an orifice. However, this flow value is not used in the Stage-Storage-Discharge Table and there is no sharp edge orifice plate proposed in the manhole to justify use of $C_d = 0.60$.

Response: *The major control outlet analysis has been revised to include pipe flow based on the hydraulic gradline only rather than including an orifice style equation.*

Comment 25: The basis for the discharge values in the “1800x1800 Major Control” column in the Stage-Storage-Discharge table is not clear compared to the previous “CB Control with Orifice Plate” calculation which uses the orifice equation. Show the equation used for this calculation. The DICB grate inlet capacity should be checked based on the inlet acting as a weir with a 50% blockage factor at the same ponding elevations as those considered for the storm sewer inlet. This is to ensure the grate inlet area is not more restrictive than the outlet pipe.

Response: *The equation for the outlet controls has been included in the revised tables. The inlet grate capacity has been included with a 50% blockage in the analysis to determine the more restrictive flow rate at each elevation.*

Comment 26: The purpose of the “Storm Control – Hydraulic Gradeline Flowrate” data in Appendix G is not clear as it is not a hydraulic gradeline calculation. If the outlet pipe from the control MH does not have a control device (i.e. orifice plate or orifice tube) with a free flowing condition into the outlet pipe, a standard hydraulic gradeline analysis will be needed from the outlet of the new drain system at catchment 2600 throughout both the west and central drainage area to confirm the system hydraulics and required pipe sizes. The headwater at the south SWM pond may affect the sizing of the drains.

Response: *The outlet pipes from each pond do not have a control device. As such, the hydraulic gradeline approach included is needed to determine the discharge rate from the pond at each ponding elevation of the Stage-Storage-Discharge Table.*

Comment 27: Clarify why there is no discharge calculated for the 185 mm dia. knockout orifice at elevations greater than 485.10 m in the Stage-Storage-Discharge table. This orifice would continue to operate at higher stages.

Response: *The knockout orifice does not provide an additional release rate at elevations where the pipe outlet is the controlling factor. A note regarding this has been included in the revised Stage-Storage-Discharge tables.*

Preliminary Engineering Drawings

Comment 28: Existing Conditions Plan (Drawing 1)

- a) Label topsoil/fill berm and note removal along with the pile of debris in the northwestern part of the site prior to site development as recommended by the ESA consultant. This will ensure it won't be missed at the detail design stage.

Response: *The topsoil/fill berm and removal have been noted in the revised drawings.*

Comment 29: Overall Plan (Drawing 2)

- a) Add note on Lots 17 and 18 regarding 10 m setback from road allowance. This is to ensure it's not missed at detail design stage as it's not an OBC requirement.

Response: *The note for a 10m setback on Lots 17 and 18 have been added to the revised drawings.*

Comment 30: Overall Grading Plan 1 (Drawing 3)

- a) A maintenance hole should be provided at the connection point to the existing 300 mm dia. Thunderbird drain in order to increase cover over the drain.

Response: *A maintenance hole has been included at the connection point of the 300mm dia. Thunderbird drain in the revised drawings.*

Comment 31: Overall Grading Plan 3 (Drawing 5)

- a) As noted, there is a potential drain from the pavilion. Please add it to the general drawing (even if traced). This will ensure it's not forgotten at the detail design stage.

Response: *A note has been added regarding the potential drain from the pavilion in the revised drawings.*

Comment 32: Stormwater Sewer Drainage Area Plan

- a) Based on contours accessed off GRCA mapping, it appears that some of the Thunderbird lots would drain into the Marsville lots which has not been considered in the sewer sizing and the Marsville North stormwater management pond sizing.

Response: *The storm sewer design has been revised with consideration of the contours accessed off of GRCA mapping.*

Other

Comment 33: Specific draft plan conditions in addition to typical conditions should include:

- a) The requirement for the Owner to agree in the subdivision agreement to prepare and fencing plan to the satisfaction of the Township. Typically, a fence is required around the perimeter of the development and Park/Municipal Water System Block. Fencing may also be considered around the SWM Pond dependent on design.
- b) There should be a purchaser's acknowledgements,
- that the existing and/or new park/utility block could be used in the future for other municipal purposes such as expansion of the water system which may include above ground or below ground structures.
 - for lots are situated in wellhead protection areas, including those that will require onsite sewage systems maintenance inspection programs.
 - that lots have level IV treatment units which requires homeowners to have maintenance contract with an authorized representative of the manufacturer of the treatment technology

Response: *Acknowledged.*

County of Dufferin – Building Services (dated September 26,2022)

Comment 1: This letter serves to confirm that I have commenced a preliminary review of the above application and request for comment. After review of the application, the Building Division would like to note that we have no further concerns.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 2: It should be noted that the applicant is still required to submit an application for building permit prior to commencement of construction to our office with respect to the above, at which time we will be reviewing it in more depth for compliance to the Ontario Building Code.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Hydro One Networks Inc. (Email dated September 29,2022)

Comment 1: We are in receipt of your Draft Plan of Subdivision Application, 22T-141585 dated September 19, 2022. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One's 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 2: For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities' please consult your local area Distribution Supplier. To confirm if Hydro One is your local distributor please follow the following link: Stormcentre (hydroone.com)

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Enbridge Gas Inc. (dated October 4, 2022)

Comment 1: Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions.

Enbridge Gas Inc. does not currently have gas piping within the immediate area. To arrange for natural gas servicing to this development please contact Enbridge Gas Inc.'s Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea20@Enbridge.com.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Grand River Conservation Authority (dated October 4, 2022)

Comment 1: Prior to any grading or construction on the site and prior to registration of the plan, the owners or their agents submit the following plans and reports to the satisfaction of the Grand River Conservation Authority.

- a) A Final Stormwater Management Report in accordance with the 2003 Ministry of Environment Report entitled, "Stormwater Management Practices Planning and Design Manual" and in keeping with the Functional Servicing Report (May 2022, G.M. BluePlan Engineering).
- b) Detailed Lot Grading and Drainage Plans showing existing and proposed grades.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

GRCA - Advisory Comments to the Municipality:

Comment 1: We acknowledge that as part of the subdivision stormwater management strategy, upgrades to the Thunderbird Drainage Works are proposed. This includes extending a storm sewer from the outlet of the SWM Facility to the open drain portion of the Thunderbird Drainage Works. We presume that overland flow relief will be provided along this route. A typical section for an overland flow path is recommended.

Response: *As part of the Thunderbird Drain improvements, we anticipate that an overland flow path along the route of the drainage improvements will also be provided to direct and convey emergency overland surface flows to the suitable outlet. The final design for the Thunderbird Drain will be per the Drainage Engineer's recommendations.*

Comment 2: A table summarizing the hydraulic parameters used in the MIDUSS model is recommended.

Response: *A table summarizing the hydraulic parameters for the MIDUSS model has been included in the revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report.*

Comment 3: GRCA recommends running a 24-hr SCS storm event to confirm that the pond can sufficiently provide volume detention from that storm event.

Response: *The 24-hour SCS storm event has been included in the revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Design Report to confirm volume retention.*

GRCA Plan Review Fee

Comment 1: 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 \$2,295 base fee in addition to a fee of \$1,255 per net hectare (excluding natural areas) to a cap of \$31,520. However, as there are no GRCA regulated features on the subject property and the Thunderbird Drain works will be reviewed as part of the Marsville South subdivision, GRCA will waive the per net hectare fee. A base fee of \$2,295 is required at this time. Note that should there be adjustments to the proposed draft plan configuration, the total required GRCA review fee may change.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board Comments (dated September 21, 2022)

Comment 1: That the applicant shall agree in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to include the following warning clauses in all offers of purchase and sale of residential lots:

- a) Whereas, despite the best efforts of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside of the neighbourhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighbourhood school.
- b) That the purchasers agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, the residents of the subdivision shall agree that children will meet the bus on roads presently in existence or at another place designated by the Board.

Response: *To be addressed by others under separate cover.*

Rogers Communications (dated March 17, 2021)

Comment 1: Prior to registration of the plan of Subdivision, the Developer/Owner will, at its own cost, grant all necessary easements and maintenance agreements required by those CRTC-licensed telephone companies and broadcasting distribution companies intending to serve the Subdivision (collectively, the "Communications Service Providers"). Immediately following registration of the Plan of Subdivision, the Developer/Owner will cause these documents to be registered on title.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 2: Prior to registration of the plan of Subdivision, the Developer/Owner will, with consultation with the applicable utilities and Communications Service Providers, prepare an overall utility distribution plan that shows the locations of all utility infrastructure for the Subdivision, as well as the timing and phasing of installation.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

County of Dufferin Public Works (dated November 3, 2022)

Comment 1: As the project progresses Dufferin County will continue to review details surrounding paving of the Dufferin County Road 3 and 13th Line intersection.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 2: Confirmation is required from the Municipal Drain Superintendent/Engineer that the proposed works associated with the Thunderbird drain will not negatively impact drainage within the Dufferin County Road 3 corridor. It is our understanding that this municipal drain starts south of the Dufferin County Road 3 right of way and extends through the proposed development site.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

Comment 3: The County of Dufferin Public Works Waste Services comments will be circulated as a separate letter.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

We trust this is the information you require at this time. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to call or write.

Yours truly,

GM BLUEPLAN ENGINEERING LIMITED

Per:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'AKroetsch', written in a cursive style.

Angela Kroetsch, P.Eng.