

November 8TH, 2023

Lanark County Planning Department
County of Lanark
99 Christie Lake Rd.,
Perth, ON., K7H 3C6

To the attention of Ms Koran Lam

RE: Draft Plan of Subdivision: Menzie Enclaves
County of Lanark File No. 09-T-23006

Dear Ms Lam

This is a response to Ms Julie Stewart's status letter of June 12, 2023 which provided a brief summary of the agency and public comments as received by the County as of June 12, 2023 providing the evaluation of our application for draft plan approval for a subdivision in the Municipality of Mississippi Mills.

Unfortunately due to a confusion which created a lot of back and forth between the engineer, our planner and even the Municipality of Mississippi Mills, we are unfortunately late by nearly 5 months in sending you this feedback to the points as raised by various parties in the June 12th, 2023 status letter from Ms Julie Stewart.

I am, thus, forwarding our response to the following agencies and to public comments:

Municipality of Mississippi Mills- First Submission Comments	-June 12, 2023	SECTION I
Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority	- June 6, 2023	SECTION II
Lanark County Public Works Department –	-March 30, 2023	SECTION III
MECP –Species at Risk	-March 30, 2023	SECTION IV
Bell Canada	- April 10, 2023	SECTION V
Enbridge Gas Inc	- April 14, 2023	SECTION VI
Hydro One	- April 17, 2023	SECTION VII
Comments from the public		SECTION VIII
Support Documents Addenda		SECTION IX
Addenda I	Application for change of zoning	

Addenda	II	Subdivision Concept Plan as originally submitted (with 50 semi-detached, 5 singles)
Addenda	III	Planning Rationale by Tracy Zander (RPP)
Addenda	IV	Alternative Subdivision Concept Plan with high density units (with 18 townhouses, 38 semi-detached) To meet Amendment 22 requirements
Addenda	V	Potential architectural styles being considered (Front Elevations)

The main issue that we have confronted is that when we had a pre-consultation meeting, we had a full impression that our subdivision concept with mostly semi-detached homes was accepted. In view of the rectangular nature of the two combined lots with two independent accesses, we felt that it made for a development with an ambiance of a private enclosed community and felt that semi detached homes would allow a familial development. We also planned single floor semi-detached bungalows for elderly seniors as well. Thus, the name Menzie Enclaves was chosen.

However, there was much discussion on the density requirements between us and our engineer and our then planner and our engineer even communicated with Ms Melanie Knight, who indicated per her email of October 3rd that the most important factor out of all the density controls of the maximum density was 25 units per net hectare or 19.25 units per gross hectare.

We even requested our planner Ms Tracy Zander for her counsel but no clear cut suggestion came about and unfortunately Ms Zander who we managed to get is not able to continue on the project application due to her excessive workload, thus, I am continuing with the process of our application for Draft Plan Approval for the time being till we manage to get another planner.

We shall continue with our subdivision plan as presented and supported in the August 14, 2022 pre-consultation meeting with the county, municipality staff and our engineer as well as two consultants from Novatech. However, we have also made an alternative plan with higher density townhouses as required per amendment 22. This new subdivision concept while meeting the high density requirements results in 56 units due to the necessity of even distribution even after allowing greater spacing between the townhouses and is included in our **Addenda IV**.

I hope the attached response to the comments as received on June 12th, 2023 answers all demands and we can proceed further.

Thank you

Ash Sharma
for 13165647 Canada Inc
(514) 817-9265

SECTION I

FIRST SUBMISSION COMMENTS RESPONSE TO THE MUNICIPALITY OF MISSISSIPPI MILLS

Introductory Note from 13165647 Canada Inc

The following response has been prepared to the letter dated June 12, 2023 from Ms Melanie Knight by Mr Mongi Mabrouk, Eng of Advance Engineering (AE below) who prepared the documents in relation to grading, drainage, storm water control and subdivision concept in our application for Draft Plan Approval.

I may add that there was much much discussion on the responses as below between the engineer and me representing 13165647 Canada Inc. where I understood that every item had to be answered and Mr Mabrouk felt very strongly that we are at the draft plan stage to get our subdivision approved and more detailed responses shall follow on approval of the draft plan when more detailed engineering plans will be done Also a coordination with Hannan Hills project is required but we have not had any feedback from their planners and their project seems to be still in preliminary stages from what we understand.

First Submission Comment Letter – Subdivision Application

From

Melanie Knight
Planning Department
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
14 Bridge Street, Box 400,
Almonte, ON., K0A 1A0

To

Julie Stewart, MCIP RPP
County Planner ,
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
3131 Old Perth Road, PO Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

Re: The First Submission Comment - Subdivision Application Menzie Enclave
09-T-23005 (County File Number as addressed by Municipality of Mississippi Mills Planning Department

Zoning By-law Amendment and Planning Rationale

1. Please submit a complete Zoning By-law Amendment application so that the

Zoning By-law Amendment and the Draft Plan of Subdivision applications can be dealt with in tandem. Please note that the Zoning By-law Amendment will not be passed until such time that the application has received Draft Plan approval by the County.

Advance Engineering (AE) Response: Noted.

13165647 Canada Inc Response: Zoning Application attached as Addenda I and the check of \$ 3,786.00 as required to be sent by mail immediately.

2. Consideration of the design of the lots should incorporate the parking of vehicles on-site, preferably two vehicles per lot (can be in tandem). It appears that the lots that abutting the unopened Menzie road allowance have enough depth to accommodate a greater front yard setback without any structures encroaching into the 10-metre buffer. The Department would appreciate receiving conceptual site plans for each standard type of lot proposed with the proposed building envelopes, fully dimensioned with the Zoning By-law Amendment application to ensure that the proposed lots (and associated zoning) can accommodate an appropriate building envelope as well as on-site parking.

AE: Two vehicles per lot is achievable in each lot. One vehicle in the garage and one on the driveway. R2D and R1D have respectively 3 and 4.5 m minimum front yard setback.

We may expand the front setback in the lots abutting Menzie St, however we prefer to keep the 10-m buffer as a no touch zone and not as a normal rear yard.

13165647 Canada Inc Response: Conceptual Subdivision plans and plans showing the footprints of proposed house types for each lot type in Addenda II. No elevations shown as the developer wants to develop a plan meeting the character of the Municipality of Mississippi Mills and work with neighboring developments to have uniformity in the subdivision's character.

3. Please be advised that the Municipality does not typically accept Planning Rationales which have not been prepared by a Registered Professional Planner (RPP). For the requested Zoning By-law Amendment, please provide a Planning Rationale prepared by a Registered Professional Planner including the following Information:

1. **13165647 Canada Inc Response: Per the demand of the Municipality, Planning Rationale originally prepared by a professional engineer has been modified accordingly by Ms Tracy Zander of Tracy Plan Inc. who is a registered Planner (RPP) and it is attached as Addenda III. Included in the Planning Rationale is the following:**

- Correct reference to the Municipality's updated density requirements of 25 units per net hectare and residential split of 60:40 (Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential) as per the Municipality's approved Official Plan Amendment 22 which can be found here on the Municipality's website:

Official Plan - Mississippi Mills

13165647 Canada Inc Response: When we had a pre –consultation meeting, we actually came with a full impression that our subdivision concept with mostly semi-detached homes was accepted. And we would like that the project is accepted as per the subdivision concept plan in Addenda II. However, we have made an alternative subdivision concept design incorporating the density as demanded which includes Townhouses. Plan attached in Addenda IV with floor footprints plans.

- Correct any reference from the “City” to “Municipality”
- Detailed plan indicating the requested zoning for the subject property.
- Fully dimensioned site plans of typical lots with proposed building envelopes.

AE: Noted. To be provided as noted above as the developer wants to develop a plan meeting the character of the Municipality of Mississippi Mills and work with neighboring developments to have uniformity in the subdivisions’ character. However, varying Architectural approaches in Addenda V.

Environmental Impact Statement

4. The EIS contains a number of recommendations. Please be advised that these will be included as Draft Conditions or as part of the Subdivision Agreement, as Required.

AE: Noted.

For questions or concerns regarding the comments above, please contact Melanie Knight, Senior Planner at 613-256-2064 ext. 501 or mknight@mississippimills.ca.
Engineering Department

AE: General Comment:

1- Please note that many comments involve detailed drawings or design which were not required at this stage. We are at the conceptual level focusing on the feasibility rather on the details. The reports are titled Preliminary for that reason.

The pre-consultation meeting did not ask to submit detailed design plans at this stage. They will be submitted subsequently.

If there are still technical questions, we would suggest scheduling a zoom meeting to solve them.

Water

5. Section 1.4.1 says that the Municipality and its consultant will examine the available capacity. This is incorrect. The applicant must approach the Municipality with preliminary design values and the Municipality will refer the applicant, upon approval, to the consultant

for verification of available capacity. This should have happened prior to the submission of an application. Applicant to resubmit with appropriate completed studies. The workflow and work request has been communicated to you via email dated November 15, 2022. Without this engineering work, the water servicing study is not completed.

AE: This will be done after the detailed design. So far, we did provide the overall demands of Menzie Enclaves subdivision to the Consultant through the Municipality to check the available capacities. We were given two scenarios for water supply, both were acceptable to us. After the detailed design is submitted, the boundary conditions will be checked.

6. There is no diagram showing the proposed water servicing within the subdivision. There is no diagram showing proposed connections to municipal services. The applicant must submit drawings showing the proposed water servicing within the subdivision and the connection points complete with elevations and inverts of the proposed system.

AE: Please refer to General Comment above.

7. Please also note that although it is a good practice to mention the other development activities in the area, the report shall distinguish the “existing condition” and “other future infrastructure in the area”.

AE: The report distinguishes between the current existing infrastructure in the immediate area of the undeveloped land and the proposed infrastructure provided by Hannan Hill project team which is not final at this stage.

8. Section 2.1: please use 350 L/c ap/d. Please use peak factors in the City of Ottawa. Please show how you obtained 4.9 and 7.4.

AE: We can use 350 L/cap/day, however the City of Ottawa guidelines changed the requirement to use 280 L/cap/day (see Technical Bulletin ISTB-2018-01). As noted Peak factors of 4.9 and 7.4 for maximum daily demand and maximum hourly demand from Table 3-3 of the MOE Design Guidelines for Drinking-Water Systems for population fewer than 500 persons. Subdivision population is 152 persons. Table can be found at:

<https://www.ontario.ca/document/design-guidelines-drinking-water-systems/general-design-consideration-and-source-development>

9. Please use FUS method. OBC fire flow is only accepted as an interim condition where the Master Plan identified infrastructure have not been put in use.

AE: FUS has been used. OBC method was used for cross checking only. In future submissions, we will use FUS 2020 instead of FUS 1999.

10. Please show the reference of system pressure requirement.

AE: System pressure requirements was shown in table 1 of the report as per the design guidelines.

11. The sentence of “It is understood that the Municipality has a fire department equipped with a superior tanker shuttle service” is not needed in the report.

AE: It will be removed.

12. Section 2.3, where is the “General Plan of Services”?

AE: See general comments above. Will be provided later.

13. Please describe “the proposed connection” and the status of “the proposed 250 mm diameter watermain at Adelaide”.

AE: A shared 250 mm diameter pipe for sanitary sewer will be proposed along Adelaide St as shown on Hannan Hill proposed servicing plans.

14. Section 6, based on the comments above, a number of conclusion items may need re-considerations.

AE: As stated above, the report submitted is a “preliminary” servicing report required for the draft agreement that deals with the feasibility and paves the way for next steps.

15. Please demonstrate the coordination effort between this application and other development applications in the area and provide a written acknowledgment that some infrastructure needed for this development will depend on other developments.

AE: The coordination between the two design teams started at the conceptual level in November 3rd 2022 meeting, and will resume for the detailed design. However, please note that we have no control on Hannan Hills project timeline and have not received any feedback from their planner Novatech.

Wastewater

16. The applicant should submit the water flow calculation to the Municipality. The Municipality approves the calculation and will forward the request to the Municipality’s consultant to confirm the servicing requirements, opportunities, and constraints. The Municipality’s consultant will provide the Municipality with the costs associated with this work which will be invoiced to the applicant. The Municipality will then confirm the result. The workflow and work request has been communicated to you via email dated November 15, 2022. Without this engineering work, the water servicing study is not completed.

AE: Noted.

17. There is no diagram showing the proposed wastewater servicing within the subdivision. There is no diagram showing the proposed connections to municipal services. The applicant must submit drawings showing the proposed wastewater servicing within the subdivision and the connection points complete with elevations and inverts of the proposed system.

AE: Will be provided at the detailed design stage.

18. Please also note that although it is a good practice to mention the other development activities in the area, the report shall distinguish the “existing condition” and “other future infrastructure in the area”.

AE: Same comment as No. 7 above.

19. Section 3.1, please use 350 l/cap/d. Don't need show wet and dry I/I calculation, use an overall 0.33. Use K=1.

AE: We can use 350 L/cap/day, however the City of Ottawa guidelines changed the requirement to use 280 L/cap/day as per Technical Bulletin). An overall 0.33 factor has been used. Dry flow may be useful if pumping station is required. Ok for K = 1.

20. Section 3.3, Appendix B has been reviewed, however it is a normal practice to prepare a sanitary sewer calculation sheet street by street showing your sanitary system design. Conclusion in Section 3.3 and Appendix B are not adequate.

AE: Sanitary sewer calculation sheet will be provided at the detailed design stage. It is also required for the ECA application.

21. Please describe the sanitary system outlet. Please confirm the status of “the Adelaide St. proposed sewer”, whether it is existing, or future, or affected by other development activities in the area. Please show the basic information of “Adelaide St. proposed sewer” and confirm there is “adequate capacity to accommodate your proposed development.”

AE: As stated above, the design of the infrastructure of Adelaide St was performed by Hannan Hills team. In their design, they also considered Menzie Enclaves demands. We have no objection on the design done. Our design starts with the connections facing the subdivision. There is no need to do 2 designs for Adelaide St. This will be coordinated further in the coming weeks.

22. Section 6, based on the comments above, a number of conclusion items may need re-considerations.

AE: See Comment 14.

23. Please demonstrate the coordination effort between this application and other development applications in the area, and provide a written acknowledgement that some infrastructure needed for this development will depend on other developments.

AE: See Comment 15.

Stormwater

24. Section 3.1, Item 3, Quantity control: in addition to post matching pre, please confirm with Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) if there is maximum allowed flow

requirement for discharging into the creek. In this report, the two terms “municipal drain” and “creek” are often mixed up. Please be consistent for the outlet call-out. A municipal drain is involved so the application as been sent to the municipal drain superintendent and these comments are below.

AE: Both terms are valid. See comment 56 below by the Municipal Drain Superintendent. We have also received feedback by MVCA. For quantity control, we will match pre-development levels as noted.

25. Item 4, Quality control: an “Enhanced” level of treatment with minimum 80% of TSS (total suspended solids) removal is required for the minor system drainage as per MECP guidelines.” Please confirm “major” or “minor”.

AE: Minor.

26. Item 7, any area within the land, in principle, should be included in the analysis, with an understanding that in the buffer zone if there is no proposed surface condition change, the pre and post flows will remain the same.

AE: Yes, the buffer zone will be a no-touch zone, not altered. It is a common practice to subtract it for the calculation.

27. Last item: culvert design approval needs to be coordinated with MVCA.

AE: Yes. This is also noted in the report conclusion.

28. Section 3.2.3, please confirm that there is no external drainage included. Please provide high- level drainage mapping figure in the report main body as well to support call-out of A1, A2 etc. Please describe outfall.

AE: Noted.

29. Section 3.2.3 and related to page 59/60, what are flow conditions for those proposed rear-yard catch basin? What are the conduits and flow directions from rear-yard to front-yard street.

AE: A14 for example will drain to a rear yard catch basin RYCB6 for which a lead pipe will connect to the storm sewer (see dashed line).

30. Site grading plan seemingly indicates laterals connecting pipes are proposed from rear yard to connect street storm sewer. Are easements identified for these?

AE: Yes, as per City of Ottawa details.

31. I believe the A1/A2 in Table 2 are different than A1/A2 in Table 3. In this way, please re-arrange the labelling to avoid confusion.

AE: These are different tables with different titles: the first is for Pre-development and the second is for post-development.

Plans ST-1 and ST-2 make them clear.

32. Section 3.2.5, please refer to comments on Section 3.1 above.

AE: Noted.

33. Section 3.2.6, the coefficient is 0.60 or 0.62, I see two different numbers for 100- year storm.

AE: It is the same, but 0.62 is reduced to 0.60 when including the stormwater facility (landscaped) when calculation the storage.

34. Section 3.3, please describe the proposed location, and design of the Stormceptor, and reflect this device in the appropriate appendix.

AE: Noted, the stormceptor will be shown on the grading plan upstream the Pond.

35. Section 5, regarding the Adelaide Street drainage, please confirm whether the flow will not flow into the proposed development area, or you will need coordinate the design and construction.

AE: There is small part of Adelaide St that will indeed drain inside the subdivision (see A23 on ST-2) this is because of the slope of the road and Crossfall.

36. Page 41/60, please clarify the purpose and the content of this figure.

AE: It is a representative sample of the subdivision to find out the Imperiousness Ration and the Runoff Coefficient to be used for the subdivision. We show the roofs, landscaped areas, half of the right of way, side walk, asphalt...

37. Page 43/60, initial time of concentration is different than the one mentioned in the report. Please use City of Ottawa design parameter (page 74/237 in the file).

AE: In the Modified Rational Method, we use an incremental time interval (not time of concentration) to find a worst case scenario for storage (see next comment 38). The real time of concentration T_c is not involved in the storage calculation. Inlet times are used for sewer sizing, which are shown in the sewer design sheet.

38. Please clarify the required storage volume of 283.38 m³ as summarized in the sheet and a much larger number were mentioned in the report.

AE: 283.38 m³ was calculated using the Modified Rational Method which is allowed to be used for small subdivisions less than 2 ha Ottawa Guidelines 8.3.10.3.. The hydro-geological modeling uses various design storms and gives larger values, so we maintain the larger values to size the pond.

39. Page 44/60, please provide 100 years storm HGL in a new row as a comparison. Please provide -0.3 m freeboard in a new row as a comparison.

AE: The 0.3 m free board measured from the top 100y water level will be provided. It will be shown in a cross section.

40. Please confirm the contour information used in this sheet, might be wrong.

AE: As per my response to MVCA, the contour elevations are for reference only to show the stages. Once the grading is final, we will update the contour elevations.

41. Page 46/60, I understand these figures were obtained in the model. When include the modeling result in the report, please provide notes and legends.

AE: Legends are shown on the graphs. We can provide the full output of the software if needed.

42. Please clarify A1, A2 in the runoff summary sheet.

AE: Runoff tables in page 42/60 should be read in conjunction with plans ST-1 and ST-2. For example, in Pre-development state, A1 and A2 are shown on ST-1 on page 58/60.

43. Please call out legends on the attached figure 3.

AE: There is no figure 3 in the Appendices. Do you mean figure 2 or the Runoff coefficient calculations?

44. Page 48/60, from the direction of respecting existing drainage pattern, a dry pond at southwest corner might be reasonable than at southeast corner. Please consider.

AE: We have evaluated that option, we decided that the south east corner is the best location. Adelaide St will be raised.

45. Page 49/60, $c=0.60$ or 0.62 , please confirm

AE: The Stormceptor online calculation sheet permits to enter the imperviousness ratio (50%), then it calculates the runoff coefficient. It has no impact on the Stormceptor type or size.

46. How 52.09L/s was obtained?

AE: The Stormceptor supplier company has an online calculation sheet that generates these numbers. The goal is to get a stormceptor that cleans water to 80% TSS.

47. Are culverts included in the modeling and design?

AE: No culverts inside the subdivision. There is a proposed culvert for discharging the detention pond into the creek at Augusta right-of-way. There might be a need for a culvert for the crossing of Adelaide St and the creek. As stated elsewhere, we are not proposing any work within Menzie St right-of-way.

48. From google map, there is a watercourse other than the municipal drain in the area (essentially the dividing line of A1 and A2). Please confirm.

AE: That line represents an unwooded trail as shown in the topo survey. The only watercourse is Spring Creek along Menzie and Augusta Streets.

49. Please confirm Menzie street drainage design is included in this design scope.

AE: As noted, it is not intended to alter Menzie St right-of-way and the 15 m buffer zone, therefore they were not included in the design scope.

50. Site grading plan: the designer will need to initiate a meeting with the Municipality on grading/drainage design, proposed slopes at some locations are too high.

AE: Noted. A meeting will be proposed to discuss grading and servicing Issues.

Ground Water

51. In the adjacent subdivision on Finner Court high ground water levels lead to substantial infiltration of water into the foundations of homes. Section 4.3 of the Geotechnical Report also confirms this conclusion. Section 6.5 of the Geotechnical Report is not adequate to address high ground water level. Please include various design and construction methods to mitigate this risk.

AE: Noted.

Roads and Traffic

52. Applicant has not submitted a traffic impact study. Applicant to submit a traffic impact study for review. (Melanie, we need establish a trigger threshold).

AE: Our understanding is that the traffic study is not required for Menzie Enclaves subdivision since the subdivision traffic was considered in the Traffic Study conducted by Hannan Hills. The pre-consultation meeting did not ask for a traffic study.

53. Applicant needs to show coordination with Hannan Hills development with regard to street access and vehicular traffic on new section of Adelaide. Considerations for the Hannan Hills Subdivision must be included in a traffic Impact study. Please include detailed drawings of street access and alignment to Adelaide extension.

AE: See Previous comment about Traffic. So far, Adelaide St is to be designed by Hannan Hills. We have not surveyed it. We only needed the elevations at

intersections of Adelaide and proposed local roads of the subdivision.

54. Please show sidewalk on the draft plan on at least one side of each local street.

AE: Sidewalks and other details were shown on initial draft plans. An email from the County, dated March 8, 2023, asked to remove these details from the DP. Details will be shown on subsequent grading and servicing plans.

Environmental Impact Study

55. Section 3.3 regarding the fisheries, please confirm if a DFO review is triggered.

AE: We will follow up with the Conservation and the County.

For questions or concerns regarding the comments above, please contact David Shen, Engineer, at 613-880-5996 or dshen@mississippimills.ca.

Municipal Drain Superintendent

56. This property is within the Almonte MD (also referred to as “Spring Creek”) Drainage Area. Our brief review indicates that it is proposed to replace a (currently) wooded area with a residential block – as such, a change in land use is anticipated. We note that the drain itself is within the currently unopened road allowances that surround the property. The 2007 Engineer’s Report prescribes “The working space... shall be up to 15 m as measured from the edge of the ditch top of bank and within the property or adjacent properties as required to fulfill future maintenance provisions.” This 15 m provision may affect the property side of the subdivision. Additionally, should it be proposed that the ROW now be opened (to facilitate roads for the subdivision), it may be required to relocate the drain further into the property or to enclose the drain as a storm Sewer.

AE: We are proposing a 15 m setback (no touch zone) from the edge of the ditch/creek top of bank as shown in plans of subdivision and based on the environmental report recommendations. The 15 m setback are only affecting the subdivision along Menzie St property line. Along Augusta St, the 15m setback line falls within the right-of-way of the street, therefore no setback within the subdivision is proposed. Menzie St and Augusta St right-of-ways will not be altered to accommodate the subdivision and we don’t see the need to relocation of the drain. Also, the public opinion seems to oppose the opening of Augusta St.

57. Detailed review of the proposed work will be required. Development will require amendment to the existing report. A drainage Engineer will be required to confirm the process that this may proceed under (typically a minimum of Section 65 or a more detailed S. 78 report). Review, confirmation of the process and ultimately the amendment of the report (and associated costs) should be made a condition of the subdivision agreement.

AE: Noted. This should be further discussed between the two developers, the County and the Municipality.

Parks and Recreation Department

58. Cash-in-lieu of parkland will be required as per the Parkland By-law 15-78.

AE: Noted. Developer in charge.

The next submission should address each and every one of the comments or issues noted above, to ensure the effectiveness and consistency of the next review. A cover letter must be included that states how each comment was addressed in the resubmission. Please co-ordinate the numbering of each resubmission comment, or issue, with the above noted comment number.

13165647 Canada Inc Response: On confirmation of the density requirements the municipality prefers (that is per Addenda II or Addenda IV), the next submission will address each and every one of the comments or issues noted above, to ensure the effectiveness and consistency of the next review.

SECTION II

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

13165647 Canada Inc Response to Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority and The Technical Review Memorandum as prepared by Jane_Choe addressed to Mercedes Liedtke

Letter of June 6, 2023

From

Mercedes Liedtke
Environmental Planner
Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority

To

Julie Stewart, MCIP RPP
County Planner ,
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
3131 Old Perth Road, PO Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

Re: Application for Plan of Subdivision – 09-T-23006 Menzie Enclaves Part of Lot 16, Concession 10, Geographic Township of Ramsay, Almonte

The staff of Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) has reviewed the above noted application for concerns related to natural hazards for the subject property and surrounding lands. The scope of the natural hazards review includes flood plain, wetlands, unstable slopes and unstable soils. The MVCA has reviewed the subject application in the context of:

- Section 1.6.6 Stormwater, and Section 3.1 Natural Hazards of the Provincial Policy Statement under Section 3 of the Planning Act.
- The “Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses” regulation 153/06 under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act.
- The Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan (2014, revised 2022).

We note that Conservation Authorities no longer review for impacts to Natural Heritage Features as defined under Section 2.1 of the PPS (2020). And, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) is responsible for comments related to the Endangered Species Act.

The following comments are offered for your consideration:

Summary of Proposal

According to the information provided, the purpose of the subject application is to obtain approval for a plan of subdivision to develop the subject lands with a total of 50 semi-detached and 5 single detached dwelling units. The site is on full municipal services.

Property Overview

As per the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the site is primarily described as a lowland forest and a cultural thicket. MVCA mapping identifies the regulation limit of an unevaluated wetland on the subject property. According to MVCA's information sources, the wetland does not extend onto the subject property and is contained within the adjacent lands. MVCA mapping and the EIS also identify Spring Creek, a municipal drain, along the northeast and southeast bounds of the subject development. No other features relevant to MVCA's review were identified.

REVIEW

Natural Hazards

The scope of the natural hazards review includes flooding, erosion, slope stability, unstable soils and wetlands. The objective is to ensure that the control of flooding and erosion are not affected by the proposed development. The watercourse, wetland and organic soils are the features on the subject property that are relevant to MVCA's advisory review under Natural Hazards.

Wetland

MVCA mapping identifies the regulation limit of an unevaluated wetland along the northwestern edge of the site. The wetland is located approximately 6m from any proposed new development. MVCA has been in discussion for potential development to the North and the mapping will be updated accordingly. Until MVCA mapping is updated, a permit will be required for any development within the regulation limit.

Watercourse

MVCA mapping and the EIS identify the Spring Creek Municipal Drain along the subject property. As regulations mapping does not exist for this watercourse the extent of floodplain and erosion hazards for these parcels is not known. We note that the municipality has provisions for setbacks in the municipal planning documents. It is our understanding that the Town of Mississippi Mills requires a minimum 15m setback from municipal drains.

As noted in the EIS, a 15m wide buffer from the edge of the Spring Creek highwater mark is recommended. This setback is consistent with adjacent developments, also located along Spring Creek municipal drain.

Organic Soils

Available soils mapping indicates there is a potential for organic soils to be associated with the subject lands. Organic soils can be a concern as they lack structure and compress so much they usually cannot support structures. MVCA notes that a Geotechnical Investigation has been completed for the proposed development which notes that topsoil and deleterious fill containing organic material should be stripped from under any buildings, paved areas, pipe bedding and other settlement sensitive structures.

Stormwater Management

MVCA has been circulated the following report in support of a Subdivision application for Menzie Enclaves Subdivision Development:

- Stormwater Management Report – Preliminary, prepared by Advance Engineering Limited, dated January 31, 2023

The conceptual SWM provided with the subject application has been reviewed by MVCA's Engineering staff, with a focus on stormwater quantity management. Potential flooding and erosion impacts to the receiving watercourse and ultimate receiving watercourse, the Mississippi River, have been considered. Refer to the enclosed *MVCA Technical Review Memorandum* for details.

Ontario Regulation 153/06 (MVCA Regulations)

Under MVCA's Ontario Regulation 153/06, *Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses*, written permission is required from the MVCA prior to the initiation of development (which includes construction, site grading and the placement or removal of fill) within an area regulated by the Conservation Authority, as well as straightening, changing, diverting or interfering in any way within the existing channel or the shoreline of a watercourse.

With respect to the subject property, all outlets to regulated watercourses and any works within the regulation limit will require written permission from MVCA under Ontario Regulation 153/06.

Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan

No areas or matters of significance under the Mississippi-Rideau Source Protection Plan have been identified.

Conclusion

Prior to moving forward, we request that MVCA's recommendations with respect to the SWM (refer to the attached MVCA Technical Review Memorandum), be addressed.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. Please advise us of the decision in this matter. Please contact the undersigned with any questions that may arise.

Regards,



Mercedes Liedtke
Environmental Planner

To: Mercedes Liedtke, Environmental Planner
Technical Review Memorandum June 6, 2023

Response By Mongi Mabrouk P. Eng, Advance Engineering to The Technical Review Memorandum prepared by Jane Choe and addressed to Mercedes Liedtke, Environmental Planner dated June 6th, 2023.

File Number: PMMSB-33

Re: Draft Plan of Subdivision – 09-T-23006 – Menzie Enclaves Subdivision, Municipality of Mississippi Mills

Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA) has been circulated the following report in support of a Subdivision application for Menzie Enclaves Subdivision Development at the southwest intersection of Adelaide Street (unopened) and Menzie Street (unopened):

- Stormwater Management Report – Preliminary, prepared by Advance Engineering Limited, dated January 31, 2023

The subject site, located southwest of Adelaide Street and Menzie Street intersection, is approximately 2.84 ha. The proposed development includes 55 single/semi-detached dwellings, 2 blocks for future road widening, and a designated block for a stormwater management (SWM) facility.

The stormwater management criteria for the subject site include controlling the post-development flow to the pre-development rates for all storms up to and including 100-year storm events.

This report was reviewed with a focus on stormwater quantity management with respect to natural hazards from the receiving watercourse perspective and any potential impact on the ultimate receiving watercourse, Spring Creek and the Mississippi River.

Servicing and Stormwater Management (SWM) Report Summary

Under existing conditions, the subject site consists of trees and vegetation and is sloped west to east and south to north. Runoff from the majority of the site flows overland to the east towards Spring Creek and ultimately discharges to the Mississippi River, approximately 800 m south of the site. Under post-development conditions, minor and major system flows from the site will be conveyed to a SWM detention basin at the southeast corner of the site, which outlets into Spring Creek. A 15 m buffer zone from the bank of Spring Creek along Menzie Street east of the site will not be considered in the proposed SWM plan since this area will remain unchanged to protect the banks of the Creek.

The pre-development flow from a contributing area of 2.69 ha (excluding the 0.15 ha buffer area) using the Rational Method is calculated as 156 L/s and 334 L/s for 5-year and 100-year storm events, respectively, the allowable release rates for the site. Post-development flows are calculated as 376 L/s and 702 L/s for 5-year and 100-year storm events, respectively. Runoff exceeding the allowable release rates for storms up to and including the 100-year events is proposed to store in the SWM detention basin. An orifice and a weir are proposed to control the outflow from the detention basin to the allowable release rates prior to discharging to Spring Creek.

The proposed SWM detention basin is designed to provide a maximum volume of 771 m³ at 1.6m depth, which exceeds the required storage volume of 283.38 m³ during the 100-year storm event. An overflow spillway is proposed to convey overland flow to the existing watercourse, Spring Creek when it exceeds the capacity of the detention basin.

The report stated that the post-development flow rates from the site would be controlled to the pre-development conditions. Also noted that the minor and major flows from the site will be directed to the SWM detention basin, which ultimately discharges to the receiving watercourse. Prior to finalizing our assessment as to the potential impact on Spring Creek and safe conveyance downstream without any negative impacts, we request the following:

1. It is recommended to provide a summary table that shows post-development flows, the required and provided storage volumes, and allowable release rates.

Advance Engineering (AE) Response: Noted.

2. A preliminary design and sizing of the detention basin to provide the required storage volume should be included. Also, provide a preliminary cross-section profile of the SWM detention basin, including elevations at the bottom, top, inlet, outlet, 100-year water level, freeboard, and overflow spillway.

AE: Noted.

3. Contour elevations (105.825 m to 107.475 m) of the Dry Pond given in the Storage Stages table in Appendix C do not match the existing grades within Block 28 (i.e., 137.90 m) shown on the grading plan. Please clarify.

AE: Elevations will match once the grading is final. Reference elevations have been used just for showing the theoretical pond stages.

4. In Section 2.1, it is stated that 'soil exhibits signs of regular saturation due to periodic inundation and ponding'. Please provide details on where this ponding occurs.

AE: This is a pre-development stage as part of land along the creek is low. No ponding within the site is expected after development. There will be fill throughout the subdivision.

5. Is any surface ponding anticipated on local residential roadways during the 100-year event? Please note that the maximum flow depth shall not exceed 0.35 m as per City of Ottawa Technical Bulletin PIEDTB-2016-01 (2016) during the 100-year event.

AE: In the preliminary design, we used a uniform minimum slope towards the detention basin. However, we might add one ponding area with ICDs in catch basins if slopes allow it. In that case the ponding will not exceed 0.3 m. Please note that the subdivision will be constructed on fill.

In addition to the above comments, the following should be submitted at a minimum during the detailed design:

6. Please include a stage-discharge table for the SWM detention basin demonstrating that the development does not negatively impact the runoff receiving watercourse.

AE: Noted.

7. Please refer to comment #4. Measures (adequate fill/grade rise) in eliminating the ponding under post-development conditions should be shown on the grading plan.

AE: Noted. No post-development ponding is expected. Grades of adjoining properties will be matched. The north development will deal with its stormwater, minor and major systems, separately from the subject development.

8. An estimated average runoff coefficient of 0.57 was used in post-development flows and storage calculations for Blocks 21 to 24 (Appendix C). Please included weighted runoff coefficient calculations for actual drainage areas.

AE: Blocks 21 to 24 are chosen as a good representative sample to find an average runoff coefficient for the whole subdivision. We have included the right of way sidewalk and pavement and considered the maximum permitted lot coverage by the zonings (30%). Please note that we do not know how the built-out of the houses at this stage, accessory buildings etc. That estimation is conservative as we may find smaller values for rear yard drainage areas for examples and single detached.

9. It is noted that underside of footings (USF) elevations for the proposed development and detailed HGL analysis will be provided.

AE: Yes.

Please note that any development within the MVCA's Regulation Limit (i.e., construction of the proposed outlet and/or culvert to the watercourse) will require a permit from MVCA under Section 28 of the *Conservation Authority Act*.

13165647 Canada Inc Response: Permit would be demanded

SECTION III

Lanark County Public Works Department – March 30, 2023

Response to Director of Public Works

per letter of March 30, 2023

Terry McCann C.E.T.
Director of Public Works, County of Lanark
99 Christie Lake Road
Perth, ON K7H 3C6
(613) 267-1353 ext. 3190
(Cc: [Sean Derouin](#))

To

Julie Stewart, MCIP RPP
County Planner ,
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
3131 Old Perth Road, PO Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

Subject: RE: Notice of Application and Consultation - Menzie Enclaves
Subdivision - County of Lanark File No. 09-T-23006 **Date:** March 30, 2023 3:04:54 PM

This proposed subdivision is three blocks from Martin Street North (County Road 17) and would not have any impact on the County Road, main traffic patterns will go toward Ottawa Street. Storm water does not affect the County Road either, therefore the Lanark County Public Works does not have any concerns to be addressed with respect to this development.

Response by 13165647 Canada Inc.

To

Terry McCann C.E.T.
Director of Public Works, County of Lanark

Per above , the proposed subdivision is three blocks from Martin Street North (County Road 17) and would not have ANY IMPACT on the County Road, MAIN TRAFFIC PATTERNS will go towards Ottawa. Storm water does not affect the County Road either, therefore the Lanark County Public Works does not have any concerns to be addressed with respect to this development.

SECTION IV

RESPONSE TO SPECIES AT RISK (MECP)

Per Automatic reply dated March 30, 2023 12:26:28 PM

From: Species at Risk (MECP)

To

Julie Stewart, MCIP RPP
County Planner ,
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
3131 Old Perth Road, PO Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

Subject: Notice of Application and Consultation – Menzi
Enclaves Subdivision - County of Lanark File No. 09-T-23006
Thank you for your inquiry to the Species at Risk Branch, Ministry of the
Environment, Conservation and Parks.

Who are we?

- The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) has responsibility for the administration of the [Endangered Species Act \(ESA\)](#). The Species at Risk Branch is responsible for the day-to-day work associated with administering the ESA, including developing policy and regulations, providing grants through the SAR Stewardship Fund, and issuing permits and agreements.
- This inbox is managed by the permissions team in the branch and is the point of contact for anyone making inquiries about permits or agreements under the ESA, submitting applications for permits or agreements, making general inquiries about permits and agreements, or making other submissions related to the requirements of the ESA.

What Next?

- Your email is being reviewed by branch staff to determine the nature of your submission. Your submission will then be actioned to someone from our team for follow up as required.
- In some cases, we can provide a direct response within 15 business days.
- Some submissions, such as an Information Gathering Form or a C-Permit application Form where someone is seeking a permit or agreement, require a formal technical review. In these cases, you will receive acknowledgement that your submission has been actioned out, but the time to review and comment on the submission can vary depending on such things as the time of year it is received, the volume of current active applications already in queue, and the type of submission.

Are you contacting us because you want to know if any species at risk are at, or near, your project site?

- We have developed a guide to help clients work through the screening process, providing data sources to help you determine if there might be species at risk on or around the site of your activity.
- If you are seeking information regarding species at risk likely to occur at or near your site, you will be provided a copy of the guide and guidance from the branch for you to complete the screening.
- **If after considering the SAR screening and potential for impacts you have determined that the proposed activities COULD POTENTIALLY have adverse impacts prohibited by sections 9 and/or 10 of the ESA, please consider submitting an Information Gathering Form (IGF).**

Do you think you may need an ESA permit or agreement?

- If you can carry out your activity in a manner that does not contravene the ESA, that is what we call “avoidance” of impacts to species at risk or their habitat and it is the ideal scenario for clients and the species - the species aren’t adversely impacted, and you don’t need an authorization. You need an authorization under the ESA (a permit or agreement) if you are planning to carry out an activity that is going to contravene the ESA (i.e. if the activity you are proposing is going to kill, harm or harass a species at risk or damage or destroy their habitat – please refer to sections 9 and 10 of the ESA).
- The process to obtain a permit or agreement has several stages, through which there are three forms that you might have to complete, the first being the Information Gathering Form.
 - Please visit <https://www.ontario.ca/page/species-risk> to learn more about protecting and recovering species at risk, then navigate to the Resources and Permits section, including [Register or Get a Permit](#) for more information about permits and authorizations under the ESA.

What is the Species at Risk Conservation Fund?

The Fund provides funding for activities that protect or recover conservation fund species or support their protection or recovery.

- For designated species at risk, a species conservation charge may be paid in lieu of completing certain on-the-ground beneficial actions required under permits, agreements and certain conditional exemptions.
- Proponents still need to undertake actions that minimize impacts on species at risk and their habitats as required by the applicable permit, agreement or conditional exemption.
- The Species Conservation Action Agency determines the best way to use the funds to protect and recover conservation fund species province-wide.

The payment made by the proponent goes to the Fund administered by the Agency. · The Agency will pool funds and invest in strategic, large-scale and coordinated actions that are beneficial to the conservation fund species.

- Strategic actions may include, for example, creation or enhancement of large areas of habitat or research into significant threats to a conservation fund species, such as the fungus that kills Butternut trees.

For more information about the Fund option, visit [Species at Risk Conservation Fund | ontario.ca](#).

NOTE THAT if you need a permit or agreement, it can take an average of 12-15 months from the time an Information Gathering Form is submitted to the issuance of a permit.

Authorizations and Indigenous Engagement

If you are carrying out an activity that requires an ESA authorization, it may trigger the Crown's duty to consult on decisions that have the potential to adversely impact the Aboriginal and/or treaty rights of First Nations or Métis communities. Early consideration of whether your activity could trigger Crown consultation obligations can help avoid delays at later stages of the approval process. The ministry is ultimately responsible for ensuring the Crown's duty to consult has been met; however, the Crown may delegate certain procedural aspects of consultation to you as the proponent. Sharing information about the activity with potentially interested and impacted Indigenous communities early is recommended as a means to begin learning more about the potential for impacts to Aboriginal and/or treaty rights and resolving those impacts and other substantive issues that Indigenous communities might raise about your activity.

More information can be found at [Duty to consult with Aboriginal peoples in Ontario | ontario.ca](#).

Do you want to report a suspected violation of the ESA?

- Please call the MECP Tips/Pollution Hotline at 1-866-663-8477 or use the [online reporting tool - Report Pollution | Ontario.ca \(gov.on.ca\)](#) and provide the details requested. Someone may follow up with you directly to request additional information. We may not be able to follow up with you to provide you an update on the status of your tip as the status of any ongoing inspections or investigations is confidential until resolved.

Are you inquiring about or making a submission related to Butternut? The following information can assist you if you have some of the more common questions regarding the ESA and impacts to Butternut.

Do you think you may need an ESA permit or authorization to cut down a Butternut tree?

1. If a Butternut tree has been identified, a Butternut Health Assessment will need to be completed to assess the health of the tree in accordance with the document titled [Butternut Assessment Guidelines: Assessment of Butternut Tree Health for the Purposes of the Endangered Species Act, 2007](#). This will determine if the tree is Category 1, 2 or 3.
2. Please note that Section 4.2 (Timing of Assessment) on page 10 of the Butternut Assessment Guidelines states that "A complete and accurate assessment of a Butternut tree can only be conducted during the leaf-on

season.” It also notes that “For the purposes of the ESA, an assessment will be considered to have been conducted during the leaf-on season if it was conducted between the dates of May 15 and August 31.” For this reason, a Butternut Health Assessment should not be conducted until May 15 in order to get an accurate assessment of the live crown.

Are you submitting a Butternut Health Assessment?

Once a Butternut Health Assessment has been completed and submitted to the ministry and 30 days have elapsed, ESA requirements can be identified as per below:

- If a BHA identifies a tree as a hybrid, no authorization under the ESA is required to remove the tree, as it is not a pure Butternut and not protected under the ESA.
- If a BHA identifies a tree as a Category 1 tree, no authorization under the ESA is required to remove the tree, as it is affected by Butternut canker (a fungal disease) to such an advanced degree that retaining the tree would not support the protection or recovery of Butternuts in the area.
- If a BHA identifies a tree as a Category 2 or 3 tree, registration is enabled under Part V of Ontario Regulation 830/21 so long as all requirements of the Regulation are met.
- Please note there is a maximum number (see below) of trees which can be removed under this regulation. If the maximum number of trees is exceeded then a [17\(2\)\(c\) Permit](#) will likely be required.

If you are proposing to rely on section 25 of the Regulation 830/21 for the removal of Category 1 trees or hybrids, you are eligible to proceed 30 days after you have submitted your BHA unless you are contacted by this branch prior to the end of the 30 day period.

If you are proposing to rely on section 26 of the Regulation 830/21 for the removal of a maximum of 15 Category 2 or a maximum of 5 Category 3 trees, after 30 days from the date of the submission of the ESA have elapsed, then you can proceed to register a Notice of Impact with the [ESA Registry](#) and follow additional rules. Once you have registered and received a reply in regard to your Notice of Impact, you may remove the trees.

NOTE THAT if you are not contacted by the ministry within 30 days of having submitted your BHA, YOU CAN PROCEED ACCORDINGLY.

Do you have a question about a conditional exemption under ESA regulations? Please contact ESAREg@ontario.ca with your inquiry.

Think you have seen a species at risk?

- Please visit

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/report-rare-species-animals-and-plants>
for information on how to report a species at risk sighting.

Would you like to learn more about species at risk and the ESA and its related policies?

- Please visit <https://www.ontario.ca/page/species-risk>.
- Operational policies, ministry-endorsed survey protocols and a number of best management practices related to how you can avoid or minimize impacts to species at risk can be found online at <https://www.ontario.ca/page/species-risk-guides-and-resources>.
- General inquiries related to the ESA or species at risk can be directed to SAROntario@ontario.ca

Response by 13165647 Canada Inc.

A full report by Gemtec Consultants was provided which indicated that no species were at risk and nobody from the ministry has contacted 13165647 Canada Inc in the 30 days since 30th March, 2023,

SECTION V

Response to Bell Canada

per letter of April 14, 2023 from

Juan Corvalan
Senior Manager - Municipal Liaison
For Bell Canada

To

Julie Stewart, MCIP RPP
County Planner ,
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
3131 Old Perth Road, PO Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

**Re: Draft Plan of Subdivision (09-T-23006), Maude St. & Menzie St.,
Mississippi Mills; Your File No. 09-T-23006**

We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval:

“The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada.

The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost.”

Upon receipt of this comment letter, the Owner is to provide Bell Canada with servicing plans/CUP at their earliest convenience to planninganddevelopment@bell.ca to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.

It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada’s existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.

If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.

To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations.

We note that WSP operates Bell Canada's development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. However, **all responses to circulations and requests for information, such as requests for clearance, will come directly from Bell Canada, and not from WSP.** WSP is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses.

Response by 13165647 Canada Inc.

To

Juan Corvalan

Senior Manager - Municipal Liaison

Email: planninganddevelopment@bell.ca

"The owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada"

And shall follow other conditions as outlined in your letter of April 10, 2023.

SECTION VI

Response to Enbridge Gas Inc

Per the letter of April 14, 2023 from

Mr Willie Cornelio CET Sr
Analyst Municipal Planning
Engineering —
ENBRIDGE

To

Julie Stewart, MCIP RPP
County Planner ,
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
3131 Old Perth Road, PO Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

Re: Draft Plan of Subdivision
13165647 Canada Inc
Henderson Section, Mclean Section, Alfred Street and Alexandria St
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
File No.: 09-T-23006

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

This response does not constitute a pipe locate, clearance for construction or availability of gas.

The applicant shall use the [Enbridge Gas Get Connected tool](https://enbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com/GetConnected_Th/Login2?OriginalURL=https%3A%2F%2Fenbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com%2FGetConnectedApp_UI%2F) 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. (https://enbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com/GetConnected_Th/Login2?OriginalURL=https%3A%2F%2Fenbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com%2FGetConnectedApp_UI%2F)

If the gas main needs to be relocated as a result of changes in the alignment or grade of the future road allowances or for temporary gas pipe installations pertaining to phased construction, all costs are the responsibility of the applicant.

In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, and any future adjacent developments, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas at no cost.

Blasting and pile driving activities in the vicinity of Enbridge Gas Distribution and Storage (GDS) facilities require prior approval by GDS. The [Blasting and Pile Driving Form](#), referenced in Enbridge's [Third Party Requirements in the Vicinity of Natural Gas Facilities Standard](#), must be provided to mark-ups@enbridge.com by the Owner of the proposed work for all blasting and pile driving operations. In addition, a licensed blasting consultant's stamped validation report must be submitted to GDS for review if blasting is to occur within thirty (30) metres of GDS facilities. The request must be submitted a minimum of four (4) weeks prior to the beginning of work to allow sufficient time for review.

13165647 Canada Inc. Response to

**Mr Willie Cornelio CET
Sr Analyst Municipal Planning
Engineering —
ENBRIDGE
500 Consumers Rd, North York, ON M2J1P8**

13165647 Canada Inc. hereby confirms that conditions as above shall be respected including granting of easements as required.

SECTION VII

Response to Hydro One

Per the letter of April 14, 2023 from

Dennis De Rango
Specialized Services Team Lead,
Real Estate Department
Hydro One Networks Inc.

To

Julie Stewart, MCIP RPP
County Planner ,
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
3131 Old Perth Road, PO Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

Re: Draft Plan of Subdivision
13165647 Canada Inc
Henderson Section, Mclean Section, Alfred Street and Alexandria St
Municipality of Mississippi Mills - File No.: 09-T-23006

Subject: Draft Plan of Subdivision (09-T-23006), Maude St. & Menzie St., Mississippi Mills

We are in receipt of your Site Plan Application, 09-T-23006 dated March 30, 2023. 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.**

For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities, please consult your local area Distribution Supplier. , please contact Customer Service at 1-888-664-9376 or e-mail CustomerCommunications@HydroOne.com to be connected to your Local Operations Centre
Thank you,

Response by 13165647 Canada Inc.

Dennis De Rango
Specialized Services Team Lead,
Hydro One Networks Inc.

It is hereby noted that the developer shall follow conditions as outlined in your letter of April 14, 2023 and has already been informed by Hydro One of the local department to contact.

SECTION VIII

13165647 Canada Inc Response to Public Comments

Following summarized comments are responded to as follows:

a) Brian Hughes:

- i) Has no objection to the subdivision.
- ii) States that the proposed subdivision and Hannah subdivision will substantially increase traffic, suggest widening of the road.\
- iii) Suggests reducing the speed and use of traffic signals.

Developer notes that the party does not object. Adelaide Street widening and/or signs decision is the Municipality responsibility.

b) Ian Percy:

- i) Would like to have more information on the proposal.
- ii) Registers opposition to extension of Augusta Street
- iii) Supports access to the new development.

Developer notes that the party supports access to the new development but registers opposition to the extension of Augusts Street. As for more information, we can supply any new specific information desired.

c) Jacob Joron:

- i) Has strong concern that the project cuts through a well used park.

Developer' notes that the project does NOT cut through the well used park.

d) Tom Joron:

- i) States that the proposal calls for extension of Augusta Road
- ii) That it would be directly besides the community gardens and top of the existing creek bed.
- iii) That the proposed area is wetland and has many species, insects and turtles.

Developer's note: The proposal does not call for extension of Augusta Road and it is not directly besides the community gardens or top of the creek bed. Neither are there any wetland or danger to the species, insects and turtles as outlined in the report by Gemtec Consultants which was provided with the Application for Draft Plan approval.

e) Susan Macaulay:

- i) States that the proposal calls for building of a street through August Park.
- ii) Objects strongly to the part it believes extends August Street through the park and beyond.
- iii) Considers the above to be disruptive to their local community.

Developer's note: The proposal does not call for building of a street through Augusta Park, and there is no extension of August street through the park or beyond. The subdivision instead being disruptive to the community would allow for an area clear of bushes and insects and add to the homes and developments around.

- f) Brenda St. Marseille:
- i) Understands that the project calls for building of a street through Augusta Street Park in Almonte.
 - ii) Objects extension of Augusta Street through the Park and beyond.
 - iii) Is concerned about the potential impact on the environment as there is a creek that flows through the park

Developer's note: The project does not call for building of a street through Augusta street or an extension of Augusta street through the park or beyond. Further, the project does not affect the creek that flows through the park. Even buffer zones are provided behind the lots with backs to the creek.

- g) Erika Richer:
- i) Is new resident and believes that the extension of roads cuts through August Park and will decrease the park's size and increase the traffic around the current "safe" park.
 - ii) Feels that there will be only one park left if Augusta Park is removed.

Developer's note: There is extension of roads cutting through Augusta Park nor any reduction of the Augusta park or its removal.

- h) Gudrun Mendzigall:
- i) Objects to the part that extends through the park and beyond.

Developer's note: No part extends through the park and beyond.

- i) Jasmin Mori:
- i) Understands that there will be a road built through August Park
 - ii) That there is a stream that flows through the exact road where the road is proposed.
 - iv) Does not want traffic whizzing by the road the park.

Developer's note: There is no road being built through Augusta park and neither will there be any traffic created by the road to the park.

- g) Lorraine Mouland:
- i) Objects to the proposal of extension of August Street.
 - ii) Does not want the park touched.

Developer's note: The project does not involve extension of Augusta road or it touches the park.

h) Malta Mendzigall:

- i) Objects to the part that extends Augusta Park through the park and beyond.

Developer Note: The project does not call for any such extension.

i) Sandra Franks

- i) Opposes extension of Augusta street through the park.

Developer's note: There is no such extension in the project.

j) Katie Childs:

- i) Objects to extension of Augusta Street.

Developer Note: There is no such extension in the project.

k) Peggy McPhail

- i) Objects to extension of Augusta Street.

Developer's Note: There is no such extension in the project.

l) Sher Chretien:

- i) Feels extension of August Street will disrupt the park.

Developer's note: There is no such extension in the project.

m) Brenda Donnelly:

- i) Objects to the extension of Augusta Road.

Developer's note: There is no such extension in the project.

n) Derek Robinson:

- i) Concerned about the current proposal will cut into the slope and destabilize the ground and the back of the properties of Honeyborne.
- ii) Would like confirmation if there is a diversion of the creek.
- iii) Objects to extension of Augusta Street.

Developer's note: The subdivision lands will be raised as necessary to match with the neighboring land and a full soil report has been supplied which indicates the stability of the soil. Further, Augusta Street is not being extended on our project.

o) Mary Norwood:

- i) Understands that the stream would be buried and a culvert put in a road.

- ii) That the park will be destroyed.

Developer's note: The stream shall not be buried and neither the park will be destroyed.

- p) Nancy Conners:
 - i) Objects to the proposal of building a street through Augusta Park.

Developer's note: There is no such extension in the project.

- q) Stephanie Let:
 - i) States that the developer proposes construction of a street through Augusta Park.

Developer's note: There is no such extension in the project.

- r) Dian O'Brien:
 - i) Did not get the notice even though nearer to the project than others.

Developer's note: We are open to any questions or concerns you may have..