

Detailed Comment Response Matrix - November 11, 2024

Marsville South Comments Received September 2022		
Comment	Responsability	Response
Bell		
1 However, we hereby advise the Owner to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during detailed design to confirm the provisioning of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.	Thomasfield	Noted
2 The following paragraph be included 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."	Town	Noted
3 It shall also 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.	Thomasfield	Noted
4 County Waste		
5 Based up the Draft Plan, Dufferin Waste can provide waste collection if the parameters above are met.		Noted
6 Hydro One		
7 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.		Noted
8 County Building Department		
9 Please be advised that the Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment for the above noted address has not revealed any issues. Please keep in mind that each lot must maintain septic clearances to property lines, structures, and wells.		Noted
10 County Planning		
11 The applicant to submit a trail network in regards to OS block and overall site connectivity for the proposed subdivision for review.		See engineering plans for details on trail within the ROW connecting to the park block and SWM pond.
12 Rogers		
13 Rogers Communications Canada Inc. ("Rogers") has reviewed the application for the above Subdivision and has determined that it intends to offer its communications services to residents of the Subdivision. Accordingly, we request that municipal approval for the Subdivision be granted subject to the following conditions:		Noted
14 The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement to (a) permit all CRTC-licensed telecommunications companies intending to serve the Subdivision (the "Communications Service Providers") to install their facilities within the Subdivision, and (b) provide joint trenches for such purpose.	Subdivision agreement	Subdivision agreement to be prepared by Town
15 The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement to grant, at its own cost, all easements required by the Communications Service Providers to serve the Subdivision, and will cause the registration of all such easements on title to the property.	Subdivision agreement	Subdivision agreement to be prepared by Town
16 The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement to coordinate construction activities with the Communications Service Providers and other utilities, and prepare an overall composite utility plan that shows the locations of all utility infrastructure for the Subdivision, as well as the timing and phasing of installation.	Subdivision agreement	Subdivision agreement to be prepared by Town
17 The Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement that, if the Owner requires any existing Rogers facilities to be relocated, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities and provide where applicable, an easement to Rogers to accommodate the relocated facilities.	Subdivision agreement	Subdivision agreement to be prepared by Town
18 In addition, we kindly request to, where possible, receive copies of the following documents:		
19 the comments received from any of the Communications Service Providers during circulation;	Town to circulate	Town to circulate
20 the proposed conditions of draft approval as prepared by municipal planners prior to their consideration by Council or any of its committees; and	Town	Town to circulate
21 the municipal planners' report recommending draft approval before it goes to Council or any of its committees.	Town	Town to circulate
22 GRCA		
23 Comments to be Addressed Prior to Detailed Design:		
24 Natural Heritage:		

25	The EIS report suggests that a minor increase in surface water directed toward the offsite wetland is acceptable. A feature-based water balance assessment would be required to substantiate this conclusion. Depending on the sensitivity of the vegetation communities and the degree of hydrologic alterations, a monthly water balance assessment could be required to fully assess impacts on the offsite wetland. Additional information regarding the sensitivity of the wetland communities and pre- and postdevelopment surface runoff volumes of water directed toward the wetland is required to assess impacts to the wetland. If all drainage from Catchment 4000 is directed to the Thunderbird Drainage Works, resulting in no increase in surface water directed toward the offsite wetland, the above additional information would not be required.	NRSI	See EIS Addendum included in the submission package
26	A detailed grading plan showing existing and post-development contours within catchment 4000 is needed to fully assess impacts to the offsite wetland.	GEI Consultants	See Grading Plan included in the submission package
27	According to the EIS, the lands do not slope steeply toward the wetland. This is not sufficient rationale to support a 15 meter development setback from the wetland. A 30 meter setback from the offsite wetland is requested and would be consistent with subdivision applications in other portions of the watershed.	NRSI	See EIS Addendum included in the submission package
28	Post-development flow volumes toward the Thunderbird Drain are expected to increase significantly during the 25 mm and 2-year events. The current agricultural drain outlets to a watercourse that supports cold water fish habitat. The potential for thermal impacts should be assessed.	NRSI	See EIS Addendum included in the submission package
29	It is requested that the offsite wetland boundary and setback approved by the GRCA be clearly illustrated and labelled on the draft plan.	NRSI/GSP	Setback is shown on the draft plan
30	Comments for Detailed Design:		
31	It is requested that heavy-duty sediment fencing be placed along the approved setback limit.		Fence specification has been changed to reflect this comment
32	Part of the proposed Thunderbird Drainage Works appear to cross a GRCA regulated wetland northwest of the proposed subdivision. GRCA requests that the presence of this wetland be confirmed and, if present, measures are taken to ensure its protection during and post development. Please delineate the wetland on the drawings to allow for the review of drainage, grading and site works proposed in the regulated area.	GEI Consultants	Wetland features have been shown on the drawings.
33	Advisory Comments to the Municipality:		
34	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 is will be provided along this route. A typical section for an overland flow path is recommended.	GEI Consultants	A road cross section has been included in the Functional Servicing Report, prepared by GM BluePlan (GEI) and is included in the submission package
35	A table summarizing the hydraulic parameters used in the MIDUSS model is recommended.		GEI Consultants to provide parameters
36	There appears to be inconsistency in the elevations shown in Figure 21 compared to the rest of the report. The emergency overland flow weir and top of berm elevations should be confirmed.	GEI Consultants	Report updated
37	We recommend using a permanent pool depth of at least 1.0m to minimize resuspension of sediment.	GEI Consultants	This has been accommodated
38	Please be advised that Appendix C in the FSR is missing the Geotechnical Investigation report for the Marsville South Subdivision. However, the document was provided standalone with the submission package and has been reviewed.	GEI Consultants	Noted
39	GRCA recommends running a 24-hr SCS storm event to confirm that the pond can sufficiently provide volume detention from that storm event.	GEI Consultants	SWM report updated
40	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. Based on the proposed 28.1 hectares to be developed, a total fee capped at \$31,520 is required.		Fee already paid
41	Please note that 70% is due at this time (\$22,064), with 30% due prior to the issuance of draft plan conditions. Note that should there be adjustments to the proposed draft plan configuration, the total required GRCA review fee may change.		Fee already paid
42	Upper Grand District School Board		
43	Please be advised that the Planning Department does not object to the application, subject to the following conditions:		
44	That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Subdivision agreement	Noted

45	That the developer shall agree to provide the Upper Grand District School Board with a digital file of the plan of subdivision in either ARC/INFO export or DWG format containing parcel fabric and street network.	Subdivision agreement	Noted
46	That the developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement that adequate sidewalks, lighting, and snow removal (on sidewalks and walkways) will be provided to allow children to walk safely to school or to a designated bus pickup point.	Subdivision agreement	Noted
47	That the developer and the Upper Grand District School Board reach an agreement regarding the supply and erection of a sign (at the developer's expense and according to the Board's specifications) affixed to the permanent development sign advising prospective residents about schools in the area.	Subdivision agreement	Noted
48	That the developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease: <i>"In order to limit liability, public school buses operated by the Service de transport de Wellington-Dufferin Student Transportation Services (STWDSTS), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point."</i>	Subdivision agreement	Noted
49	Burnside		
50	Draft Plan		
51	For all the intersections, the following sight triangles per the Township's Official Plan should be provided. Intersections between Township Roads (10 m x 10 m) Intersections between Township and County Roads (15 m x 15 m) as well as meeting minimum County entrance policy visibility triangles.		Addressed
52	A 0.3 m reserve should be added adjacent to the roads at Lots 1, 41, 42, and 90.		Addressed
53	For lots that back on to one another, it can be advantageous when lot corners adjoin in terms of fencing and grading. The applicant should review opportunities to improve this aspect of the design.		Addressed
54	The proposed roundabout is not supported.		Roundabout has been removed
55	Lots 88 and 89 are narrow lots (25 m) as opposed to the minimum 30 m. While a reduced frontage could be considered on a lot specific basis, for example at a road bend where the width of the lot is narrower only for a small portion, a reduced frontage has not been justified at this location.		Few lots are less than 30m in width. See Planning Justification Addendum Report for justification for the lots less than 30m in width.
56	It is requested to provide an increased radius at the road bends so that they are gradual and less abrupt.		Radius has been increased
57	The road connections to County Road 3 will need to be approved by the County. Two connection points across from Maple Street and Grand Crescent are preferred locations. Grand Crescent would only be an option if the Developer could purchase 062390 Dufferin Road County 3. The 13th Line road connection should be removed. Preliminary drawings show islands provided at each entrance. The proposed islands are not supported due to increased maintenance and snow removal requirements and related costs.		As per Carley's email, dated April 24, 2024 (included in digital submission package), connections to 13th line are provided for both North and South Marsville. Detailed discussion and justification of the proposed road network are included in the Planning Addendum Report.
58	A trail block rather than a road connection is requested to the 13th Line.		Trail will connect the north east access point to the park block which connects to 13th line. The road connection to 13th Line is discussed and justified in the Planning Addendum Report.

59	The Township normally have environmental areas conveyed to a public entity such as the local conservation authority. There is a very small area on Lot 20 and 21 that requires protection due to setbacks from the wetland and woodland. These limits will be to the satisfaction of the GRCA. There was no zone proposed as Environmental Protection on Lots 20 and 21. It is required otherwise there is no mechanism in place that would prevent construction of an accessory building or on-site sewage system for example in the area to be preserved/protected. Both Lot 20 and 21 regardless of the environmental areas will provide at least 0.5 acres of land that would be zoned hamlet residential.		The area of the lot affected by the southern wetland (now Lot 15) is proposed to be zoned Environmental Protection (EP) Zone where protection is required. The portion of Lot 15 that remains hamlet residential is greater than 0.5 ac.
60	Hydrogeology Comments		
61	The monitoring based approach was used to justify on-site sewage servicing for the proposed 90 lots. We are satisfied with the approach used.		Noted
62	Overall Drainage Comments:		
63	It is not clear how drainage from the external area at south corner of County Rd. 3 and 13 Line (i.e. Area no. 230 in pre-development and area no. 1200 in post development) will be re-directed to the south SWM pond. Some lot areas appear to outlet directly to the south roadside ditch and presumably the storm sewer system on County Rd. 3 outlets to ditches as well. These would have to be diverted internally to the plan of subdivision which does not appear on the preliminary engineering drawings (i.e. Storm Sewer Drainage Plan drawing no. 21). The feasibility of this diversion is in question. More detailed contour information for area no. 1200 and the layout of the existing storm sewers should be provided to confirm existing conditions. A functional design for any proposed diversion is required. If area no. 1200 will not be diverted, the impact on the North Marsville SWM pond will have to be assessed. For example we note the public works yard runoff outlets near the south west corner of the site which has not been considered.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
64	Runoff from the rear of lots 21 to 30 will flow uncontrolled across the southwesterly property line. This area should be identified separately from post development area no. 1300 and a post development to pre-development flow comparison with area no. 110 should be provided. The adjacent property owner is not to be impacted by increased flows. Also, a post vs. pre-development peak flow comparison should be provided where this flow combines with area no. 1400 and with the SWM pond outflow at the crossing of County Rd. 3. Same	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
65	Describe the overland flow route direction and capacity from the proposed SWM pond south of County Road 3 (i.e. is the overland flow outlet west around the Marsville developments or east towards the cross culvert upstream of the Thunderbird subdivision). As noted in comments on the north plan of subdivision, additional design criteria description and summary of functional design results are required. The capacity to control and convey the full range of flows at equal to or less than predevelopment flow rates to the outlet of drainage area 2600 is to be demonstrated.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
66	The SWM facility south of County Road 3 should be constructed as part of the Marsville North subdivision works. A block together with any ancillary easements to be determined at detailed design should be provided to the Township.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
67	The FSR or separate correspondence from the developer should acknowledge the phasing of construction required as part of the Marsville North development.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
68	It is proposed that catchment 1100 be conveyed overland through the lots. However, this catchment area is 4.16 Ha, which is significant. A drainage block should be provided between the lots for this catchment area which could be used for overland flow and/or to contain a rear yard catch basin and storm sewer.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
69	Drawing No. 4 shows that runoff from at least half the houses and rear yards of Lots 44, 45, 46, potentially a portion of the park and nearby adjacent existing lot would be directed between Lot 42 and 43. The grading design and additional details need to be added. There is too much drainage being directed to this location and re-design is required. Contours should extend beyond the site boundaries to assist with the preliminary grading design to understand how neighbouring properties drainage is being conveyed around and/or through the subdivision.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
70	The existing drainage swale going through Lots 22-25 is being proposed to be removed with runoff fully directed to the farm field. There may be a need for an internal swale along this area which needs to be determined.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants

71	Contours should be extended outside the subject lands to verify drainage areas. At the detail design stage, we will require topographic information beyond the subject lands to reconfirm the contour information presented especially near Lot 13-16 where the grade is being raised at the rear. Lot 22 will require a rear swale to provide an outlet for the runoff as the property line is at a higher elevation in some areas.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
72	SWM Facility:		
73	The geotechnical assessment identifies the need for an impermeable liner to withstand over 3 m of hydraulic pressure. Please confirm the feasibility of this approach, especially the ease to perform pond cleanouts when water would need to be drained. A preliminary design should be provided and endorsed by the Geotechnical Engineer that show the feasibility of meeting this requirement.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
74	The following comments on the pond hydraulic design are provided:		
75	a) Include the overflow weir discharge equation used in the discharge table included in Appendix G.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
76	b) 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 $C_d = 0.60$.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
77	c) 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.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
78	d) 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.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
79	e) 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.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
80	The following comments are provided on the Marsville south SWM pond block:		
81	a) The FSR should show that the overland flow capacity of Street A at the access route/driveway to the pond block (i.e. broad crested weir flow over the curb) and the cross section of the access road in the pond block (i.e. Section D-D, drawing No. 10) are adequate to convey the greater of the 100 year or Regional storm runoff peak flow rate to the pond. If the sewer capacity or the width of the overland flow block need to be adjusted, this should be identified in the FSR.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
82	b) Provide calculations to support the forebay dimensions based on the MECP design guidelines.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
83	c) Access ramps at a maximum slope of 8% are to be provided to the bottom of the forebay and the outlet structure for inspection and maintenance. The pond volume is to be reduced accordingly to account for grading of the ramps.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
84	d) The pond's permanent pool depth should be between 1 m and 2 m to avoid resuspension of sediment as opposed to the consistent 0.5 m depth proposed.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
85	e) The SWM pond design should include a maintenance by-pass pipe from the inlet manhole to the outlet headwall to divert incoming flows around the pond during maintenance periods when sediment drying and clean-out is being done. Alternatively, the pond block should be increased to provide sediment drying areas.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
86	The routing of the proposed storm sewer outlet for the Marsville South SWM pond within the County Road allowance is subject to approval by the County. We have not received correspondence with respect to comments on the proposed new infrastructure in their right of way.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
87	Servicing Options Report:		

88	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.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
89	A well drilling testing program and consultation is a vital component in the evaluation process to determine the preferred servicing strategy for Marsville.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
90	The Township has received funds from the developers to complete the EA which is underway. We expect well drilling will occur shortly. 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.		Noted
91	Functional Servicing Report:		
92	We were unable to locate the January 2020 V.A. Wood Geotech report referenced in Appendix C in the submission documents.		See report included in submission
93	Page 3 under topography, adjust the 'under existing conditions' topography from south to north (rather than from north to south).		See updated report
94	The proposal to develop the subdivision with an urban cross section, with storm sewer, curb and gutter and sidewalks, instead of having a rural cross section with ditches and no sidewalks as is currently found in Marsville requires further direction from Township Council.		Rural cross section has been deemed to be acceptable as per email correspondence from Township CAO Peter Avgoustis, dated November 1, 2023 which has been included in the digital submission package
95	The Public Works Yard can operate through the night especially during snow removal operations with equipment that also has backup alarms. A noise report should be provided to confirm whether a noise fence or landscaped berm subject to drainage considerations is required and to confirm that higher berms are not required along the County Road.		See noise study prepared by HGC
96	While fire flow requirements will be determined as part of the municipal class EA, please provide the reference used to determine the noted 38 L/s for 1.5 hours.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
97	While fire flow requirements will be determined as part of the municipal class EA, please provide the reference used to determine the noted 38 L/s for 1.5 hours.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
98	The FSR at the detail design stage will have to provide calculations that demonstrate that the major system flow will be contained within right of way.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
99	Figure 21, emergency weir elevation is outdated and not consistent with the overall engineering drawing set. It should be corrected in an updated FSR. A Hickenbottom design is preferable to the proposed DICB as proposed.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
100	Municipal Drain Re-Alignment:		
101	Comments with respect to the municipal drain are provided under the Marsville North Subdivision.		Noted
102	Groundwater:		
103	Monitoring of the groundwater levels should continue to verify seasonally high groundwater levels to finalize the grading as part of detailed design.	GEI Consultants	Noted
104	Some basements are proposed to be constructed within the groundwater table. The geotechnical consultant recommended raising the grade to avoid the groundwater which has not been completed. Street D for example would propose houses within the groundwater. The grading plan should be reviewed in greater detail to avoid complications with the groundwater.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
105	Traffic Impact Study:		
106	County Jurisdiction – County Road 3 is under the jurisdiction of the County of Dufferin. Their comments are vital to ensure any proposed connection points are acceptable. As noted, the TIS should be modified to determine the location of two connection points off County Road 3 with elimination of the 13th Line Road connection.	Salvini Consulting	See updates TIS included in the submission package
107	Traffic Count Data – Please provide the raw traffic count data that is referenced in the report.	Salvini Consulting	See updates TIS included in the submission package
108	Visibility Triangles – Visibility triangles should be confirmed at all intersections and bends, to confirm to the County's Entrance Policy and the Township's Zoning Bylaw requirements.		Draft plan has been updated
109	Internal Road Geometrics – Confirm that all internal road geometrics conform with TAC standards.	Salvini Consulting	See updates TIS included in the submission package

110	Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment		
111	There was no zone proposed as Environmental Protection on Lots 20 and 21. It is required otherwise there is no mechanism in place that would prevent construction of an accessory building or on-site sewage system for example in the area to be preserved/protected.	GSP	The area of the lot affected by the southern wetland (now Lot 15) is proposed to be zoned Environmental Protection (EP) Zone where protection is required. The portion of Lot 15 that remains hamlet residential is greater than 0.5 ac.
112	The zoning by-law includes requirements for hamlet residential by either private services or municipal services. As the site will be partially municipally serviced, we expect the setbacks would fall under the municipal section however confirmation should be provided by the Township planning consultant.	Township	Noted
113	The applicant has requested modifications to the Hamlet Residential zone including the minimum lot area down to 0.20 ha (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 further Council input.		The smallest lots are no smaller than 0.4ha in size. Functional layouts of the lots this size are included in the engineering drawings and demonstrate adequate space for the building, amenity, and infrastructure requirements.
114	The applicant is proposing a reduction of minimum lot frontage to 25 m. We have not been provided with a functional layout for a lot with 25 m frontage. A reduced frontage at a road bend for example may be considered on a lot specific basis but is not intended to be a mechanism to reduce the overall lot width. If such a frontage could be justified on a lot specific basis, it should be an exception, with the standard being the 30 m frontage.		See function lot layouts for lots widths less than 30m. Reduced lot frontages are also discussed in the Planning Addendum Report.
115	Other:		
116	Only one driveway will be permitted to each lot.		Noted
117	Notice to Purchasers will need to address the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the lands are in the vicinity of the Public Works Yard which could cause noises typical of municipal maintenance facilities which can operate 24/7. Winter snow removal operations will result in increased use of the facility. Vehicles/Equipment are equipped with back up alarms, and trucks are loaded at the site. - That lots 20 and 21 contain lands zoned as Environmental Protection which cannot be disturbed or developed. - That pending the outcome of the Municipal Class EA lots may be located within source water protection areas and subject to on-site sewage system inspections. - That lots will each be equipped with sewage treatment systems that require the Owners to maintain maintenance agreements with representatives approved by the manufacturer. 	Subdivision agreement	
118	A draft plan condition shall include the requirement for a fencing plan to the satisfaction of the Township. Typically, a fence is required around the perimeter of the development, the park, and may be considered around the SWM Pond dependent on the design.		Noted
119	Dufferin County Public Works		
120	General Comments:		
121	A Dufferin County issued Entrance Permit is required for any modification to an existing entrance, or for the construction of a new entrance accessing a County Road.	Subdivision agreement	Noted
122	A Dufferin County issued Road Occupancy Permit is required prior to completing any work within the Dufferin County Road 3 right of way.	Subdivision agreement	Noted
123	The County of Dufferin Public Works Waste Services comments will be circulated as a separate letter.	Subdivision agreement	
124	Draft Plan of Subdivision:		
125	Street 'A' should be relocated directly across from either Grand Crescent or Maple Street to avoid the introduction of a staggered intersection. Alignment with Grand Crescent would further afford opportunity of a connection to any future development to the west. This should be a consideration of the proposed development.		Street A has been relocated to align with Maple St

126	Include 15.0 metre x 15.0 metre sight triangles at the proposed Street 'A' and Dufferin County Road 3 intersection. Sight triangle dimensions must be confirmed to meet the greater of either the Township's Official Plan, or the County of Dufferin's Entrance Policy 5-3-17.		Sight triangles have been added.
127	Provide a 0.3 metre reserve along the entire development frontage on Dufferin County Road 3.		a 0.3m reserve has been added to the draft plan
128	Servicing Options Report for Marsville North and South:		
129	We understand that the Township may proceed with an EA for the Marsville water system expansion. The County requires that municipal/development servicing/infrastructure within a County right of way be kept to a minimum. In line with this any proposed infrastructure should be reduced and consolidated to road crossings only.		The water infrastructure facility lands have been delineated in the draft plan in the location and size of the EA which was completed and publicly published September 8th, 2023
130	Functional Servicing Report for Marsville North and South:		
131	The County supports a municipal drain connection from the existing Thunderbird Drain to the proposed SWM Facility. The County will continue to review this option and supporting detailed engineering drawings as the project progresses.		Noted
132	Additional investigation will be required to confirm that there is a suitable overland flow route for major flows exceeding the proposed SWM system.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
133	Transportation Impact Study:		
134	Update the TIS to reflect relocation of Street A. This should also include an updated sightline analysis.	Salvini Consulting	See updated TIS included in the submission package
135	Current traffic data should be collected and compared to data provided in the study. The greater of the two volumes should be utilized in the analysis. Further review of the TIS will be completed following receipt of an updated study.	Salvini Consulting	See updated TIS included in the submission package
136	Include consideration for interconnected pedestrian traffic within the area that also facilitates pedestrian connection to the East Garafraxa Public School.	Salvini Consulting	Not possible without going over county road. Provisions are included for future connection
137	Engineering Drawings for Marsville South:		
138	Update all applicable plans to show the realignment of Street 'A' and the 0.3 metre reserve.		Plans have been updated
139	It appears that the proposed SWM facility relies on grading work within the County Road allowance. The design should be revised so that it operates independently within the limits of the private development. This comment specifically refers to the proposed SWM berm.	GEI Consultants	See response memo prepared by GEI Consultants
140	The County supports walkable communities where continuity and connection of pedestrian infrastructure is provided. Pedestrian infrastructure that terminates at a County Road resulting in pedestrian traffic along an arterial road shoulder is not sufficient.		Pedestrian connectivity is provided within the development site.