Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
	General Comments		
1	Beckwith Township, in coordination with the County, has initiated peer reviews of Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Pinchin, dated January 13, 2025, Servicing Options Statement, Terrain Assessment and Hydrogeological Study, prepared by Pinchin, dated January 13, 2025 and the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Tatham Engineering, dated January 13, 2025. The peer review comments are provided in full as a part of the Status Letter. The Township and County reserves the right to seek subsequent peer reviews of report updates or reports not reviewed to date as the application develops.	Z Developments	Aknowledged.
2	The County encourages the applicant and the local municipality to dialogue early on how any potential unique requirements related to wells and septics (i.e. increased casing depth, non-standard designs, limiting septic daily flow rates, increased setbacks etc.), as an outcome of the Hydrogeological Assessment, will be implemented to ensure compliance during development build out. Based on our experience, this can be a complex issue to track, manage and adequately regulate. It is best to build early consensus on a robust approach, should it likely apply. • The sufficiency of the outlet and legal entitlement of the stormwater conveyance pathway needs to be assessed and verified all the way to its outlet at natural waterbody or water course. • As will also be indicated in the Status Letter, for ease of issue identification, response and follow-up, the County requests that the applicant review all correspondence received and build a comprehensive table of issues/comments grouped by subject area and/or agency, including a specific section for public comments, along with a column indicating a the response and/or how the matter has been addressed in the updated submission (or will be addressed if delayed) as well as point to the related updated document, and specific section as applicable, for more details.	Z Developments	Aknowledged.
	Draft Plan of Subdivision		
3	• Is the cul-de-sac area shown as Part 2 on Plan 27R11142 outside the Plan of Subdivision/already owned by a third party? If owned by the Township and no longer needed for the dead-end given the road extension, would it be beneficial to transfer it back and include it as a part of Lot 5.	Z Developments	The Cul-de-sac area will be transferred back to the Owner of the property and will form part of lot 4 as indicated in the revised draft plan. Coordination with the municipality to start October 2025 for the acquisition
4	Section 51(17) d) of the Planning Act - it is the preference of the County to see a table on the draft plan that identifies the specific land use and for each lot/block and please also include lot/block dimensions.	Z Developments	We're happy to include the land use tabl and dimentions on the draft plan in the final submission after confirming with the municipality and the county the final lot sizes inline with the 1st submission comments that have been addressed as part of the 2nd submission. Currently, the concept plan dated Aug 29,2025 includes the required table.
5	What will be the disposition of Block 26 - retained by owner or transferred to a third party?	Z Developments	Block 26 will be retained by the owner.
	Conceptual Plan		
6	Lot 5 - will the proposed dwelling and septic field locations meet the respective zoning and Ontario Building Code setbacks from the side yard lot line?	P2 Concepts	Lot 5 has been removed. Please see the updated concept plan and draft plan.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
	Environmental Impact Study		
7	In the previous severance application, it was noted a Fish Habitat study would be required due the subdivision road entrance adjacent to wetlands and watercourses. While the EIS report mentions the completion of the Fish Habitat study, this study was done over 8 years ago. It is recommended the applicant follow the suggested MVCA recommendations in their comment letter.	Geo-Process	GeoProcess has been retained in the project and provided updated fish habitat memo as part of the 2nd submission and dated Sep 5,2025
	Hydrogeological & Terrain Analysis Report		
9	• The applicant is directed to the following documents related to the scope of Hydrogeological assessments for projects in Lanark County: Missing references and should be attached.	Pinchin	We followed up with Koren Lam at the county and received 'Scoped Hydrogeological Report Requirements for Development by Consent in Lanark County, developed by MVCA & RVCA, dated July 2, 2015.
10	Was a survey of surrounding wells/users performed per D-5-5 Sec 4.6? Not indicated in scope or report.	Pinchin	Permission to access wells was requested by letter from the homes located along the southwest side of Ridgemont. We received permission from three homes to measure their water levels. Letters have been distributed to all addresses within 200 m of the property boundary seeking permission to sample their raw water and complete a short survey on water quantity and quality issues. See sections 3.1 and 5.6 of revised report.
11	Missing clear statement on hydrogeological sensitivity	Pinchin	This has been added to the report in 5.10. 5.11 and 5.12.2 of the revised report.
12	Well 4 - slower recovery and greater drawdown vs other 3 test wells? Implications were not discussed.	Pinchin	Section 5.5 of the report has been updated with additional discussion on the variation in hydraulic parameters for the test wells and the implications to the proposed development
13	Is the 10 m of bedrock being adequate isolation for Nitrate loading a reasonable conclusion. Is there reasonable evidence that the bedrock is competent and not fractured?	Pinchin	The peer reviewer did not support the bedrock as sufficient isolation and due to challenges in time and cost to challenge the reviewers opinion, a more conservative approach of defaulting to the site being hydrogeologically sensitive has be taken and Step 3 of the MECP D-5-4 aquifer vulnerability assessment has been completed and can be found in section 5.11.3 of the updated report.
14	Need for comment on Additional Residential Unit (ARU) viability and/or if future further assessments would be required if one is proposed or certain daily flow thresholds are proposed to be exceeded based on final dwelling design or future changes/additions.	Pinchin	Discussion of secondary unit is presented in Sections 5.12 and 5.13 of the revised report.
15	Comment on the representative nature of the test wells given none were provided in proximity to locations of past agricultural practices on parts of the lands, including cropping/likely nutrient application in the north-west corner, and farm yard and potential soil stripping and material or nutrient stockpiling along the northern boundary.	Pinchin	Test well 3 is on the very edge of the field. No nutrient stockpiling is present on the farmed land to the north. Framing in the area has been practiced for many decades if not generationally. The nutrient concentrations in the wells on site are incorporated into the Step 3 attenuation calculations using the highest value (1.08 mg/L) as background in Section 5.11.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
16	The subject property has previously been severed in 2016 (B16/083). The Lanark Leeds Grenville & Lanark District Health Unit (LLGLDHU) previously raised concerns of poor drainage as there is shallow silty clay soils over bedrock. It was also recommended that while the property would be large enough to accommodate on-site sewage disposal, an imported leaching bed fill will be required to construct a conforming septic system. Please consult with Mississippi Rideau Septic System Office (MRSSO) for more details.	Pinchin	Mississippi Rideau Septic System Office (MRSSO) indicates that "The use of a “clay seal” (0.10 m of imported clay material placed over the loading area) and imported sand fill for a “mantle” will be required for sites with less than 0.25 m of unsaturated soil (as defined in 8.1.1.2., Ontario Building Code Compendium, O.Reg. 203/24). This information is added to the revised report (Section 5.10)
	Stormwater Management Report		
17	The SWM report is based on the findings of Pinchin’s hydrogeological work, which was flagged as incomplete. An updated report should be prepared once/in concert with an updated/ finalized hydrogeological report.	Tatham	Please refer to updated SWM report dated Sep 23,2025
18	Will the site be raised with fill to reach the 1m ditch depth, or the bedrock excavated? If bedrock excavation, are there impacts for hydrogeological considerations (aquifer or well interference)?	Tatham	The proposed road and ditch grading within the site will require a combination of rock excavation and imported fill.. Please refer to updated Hydro-G report by Pinchin dated Sep 22,2025.
19	Verify uncontrolled rear and side yard drainage acceptable to the Township of Beckwith given potential for nuisance ponding or complaints from adjacent landowners.	Tatham	Uncontrolled drainage areas include Catchments 201 and 203. Catchment 203 drains directly into the Munro Municipal Drain. Catchment 201 drains west onto neighbouring properties at peak flow rates less than existing (see Catchment 101), thereby reducing the potential for drainage impacts including nuissance ponding on the adjacent properties.
20	A review of the tile drain should be completed to ensure its outlet will not be impacted by the development or that the development will not interfere with the tile system if partially on the subject lands. If partially on the subject lands an assessment of the viability of decommissioning the impacted portion of the drain needs to be undertaken to ensure future excavations and residential foundation drainage are not impacted.	Tatham	Tile drains were identified to be partially located on the subject lands through additional topographic survey completed on site. The drains were observed to be capped on site, with an end elevation of approximately 135.15 m. The adjacent McArton Road Ditch, directly across from the tile drain, has an elevation of approximately 131.80 m. The tile drain outlet could not be confirmed due to the overgrown condition of the ditch; however, based on the relative elevations and the capped condition on site, the outlet is not located within the subject property and is likely within the McArton Road Ditch.
21	If the site is deemed hydrologically sensitive due consideration in the storm pond viability and design should be given.	Tatham	Please refer to Pinchin updated Hydro-G report dated Sep 22,2025 The proposed SWM design matches the existing condition drainage outlets and drainage areas to those outlets to the extent possible.
22	Outlets should be assessed from sufficiency and legal ability to convey over third party lands all the way to the receiving natural waterbody or watercourse.	Tatham	See comment 27 from Public Works which confirms the development will not adversely impact the Munro Municipal Drain.
23	The openness of Beckwith to assume two stormwater ponds along with the proposed maintenance schedule and costs should be developed and reviewed with Beckwith.	Z Developments/Tatham	Z Developments to confirm openness of Beckwith to assume 2 SWM ponds. We note 2 SWM ponds are required to meet the SWM design criteria for the site. A prelimenary maintenance schedule and costs has been developed and included in the stormwater management report.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
24	Does Block 24 have sufficient road access/frontage to allow for future maintenance and equipment access?	Tatham	Block 24 (SWMF#1) possesses a 3m wide maintenance path that encircles the facility, which provides adequate access for future maintenance and equipement access.
	Road Extension		
25	• A concept design and site investigation for the Douglas Rd extension should be completed to confirm: viability within existing road allowance or need for additional lands/width; non-interference with conceptual SWM outlets; environmental and archeological screening etc.	Tatham	Cross-sections of the proposed Douglas Side Road extension has been provided to confirm the viability within the existing road allowance, including conceptual SWM outlets.
	Fiscal Impact		
26	• Given the road configuration, the need for a road extension as well as two stormwater ponds for a 23 unit development, the developer should engage with Beckwith to confirm if they wish to have a fiscal impact analysis completed that would quantify the maintenance and lifecycle costs of the proposed public assets versus offsetting taxation from the development.	Z Developments	Noted. Coordination with the municipality to start October 2025
	Public works		
27	I have reviewed the documents for the Douglas Landing development. Based on the SWM Report proposed peak flows will be equal or less than existing going into the Munro Municipal drain. There is only one County drainage Structure on Appleton Side Road which the Munro Drain crosses. The proposed peak flows should not adversely impact the culvert's ability to function in a flood event. Public Works wouldn't have any concerns with the below noted development, it appears there will be no impact to the County Road network or drainage.	Tatham	Noted.
	Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA)		
	Environmental Impact Study, 9243 McArton Road, Beckwith Township, Ontario".		
28	Six lots (# 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 20) have portions of the proposed house and/or the septic bed within the 30 m RL. The alternative septic system, for several lots, is also within the 30 m RL. Two onsite wetlands meet MVCA's definition of a regulated wetland, with a 30 m RL. Any interference within the RL require written permission from MVCA. Reduced wetland setbacks are generally only considered if there is insufficient area to achieve the 30 m setback. However, based on our review of the application, it appears that most of the lots have space to achieve the 30 m setback. MVCA recommends the following prior to moving forward:	Pinchin	Setbacks have been revised to respect the 30m requirement. Please refer to updated Concept plan and draft plan.
29	1) An updated Concept Plan that shows: a. MVCA's Regulation Limit (i.e. 30 m extent from wetland boundary) b. Maximize the setback from the wetland, in an effort to develop outside the 30 m Regulation Limit.	P2 Concepts	Please see the updated concept plan showing the required 30 m wetland setback. Efforts to maximize the wetland setback have been successful with the exception of 1 lot which is able to accommodate a 20 m setback.
30	Elaborate on the comment in Section 7.0 that "Encroachment into the wetland buffer is anticipated." Clarify if this refers to the EIS's recommended 15 m buffer, or to MVCA's 30 m RL?	Pinchin	Please refer to updated EIS by Pinchin dated Sep 16,2025
31	Figure 5 of the Pinchin Report shows that the road alignment is intended to cross the MMD2-H1 water feature upstream of the central wetland. Elaborate on the comment in Section 7 that indicates "a re-alignment approach is being pursued to address this."	Pinchin	Please refer to updated EIS by Pinchin dated Sep 16,2025
32	Clarify if the exclusion fence recommended in Section 7.0 is a temporary mitigation measure for protecting the wetlands during site development, or if this measure is recommended for long-term mitigation of site use impacts such as rear yard creep.	Pinchin	Please refer to updated EIS by Pinchin dated Sep 16,2025

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
	• Douglas Landing Subdivision – Preliminary Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Tatham Engineering, dated January 13, 2025; and • Revised Geotechnical Investigation – Proposed Residential Development, prepared by Pinchin dated January 21, 2025.		
33	1. Given the proposed development will change the wetland drainage areas and hydrologic regime, please provide a Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation. MVCA will review the risk assessment to determine the level of study and mitigation measures required.	GeoProcess	Please refer to Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation by GeoProcess dated Sep 2025.
34	2. Water quality review, including water being directed to the wetland, is deferred to the municipality.	Tatham	Noted.
35	3. Further assessment of the downstream receivers, by MVCA, is required before MVCA can provide further comments on quantity control and the proposed increase in drainage area (22%) to the downstream outlet2 ditch and further downstream receivers.	Tatham	Noted.
36	4. Please provide a digital copy of the hydrology model for MVCA review alongside a model schematic. MVCA will provide detailed comments on the water quantity control once the model has been provided.	Tatham	We have provided the digital VO6 model with the submission.
37	5. It is unclear how the storage volumes for SWMF 2 have been calculated. The volume column appears to be correct based on the accumulated area and depth columns using the average end method, however, the values in the storage volume column do not appear correct. Please review and revise as required for accuracy to ensure the proposed SWM pond blocks have been sized adequately.	Tatham	The SWMF 2 volume calculations have been revised.
38	6. It is difficult to verify the ditch capacity calculations as the contributing area appears low and is not shown on the proposed drainage plan. Additionally, the 100-year peak flow of 0.296 m3/s does not appear to have been applied in the ditch capacity calculations as 0.048 m3/s was used instead. Please review and revise the ditch capacity calculations as required to ensure the full uncontrolled 100-year peak flows from the propose drainage catchments will be fully conveyed within the proposed enhanced grassed swales to the receiving outlets.	Tatham	Subcatchment 202A within figure DP.2 illustrates the largest contributing area to the ditch for calculating the ditch capacity at the worst case scenario.
39	7. At the detailed design submission, the following calculations and details will be required. a. Permanent erosion control at each outfall demonstrating the proposed protection has been sized to withstand the expected erosive velocities. b. Orifice calculations to confirm the discharge from the proposed SWMFs will be controlled to ensure the total peak flows to each outlet does not exceed the allowable release rates. c. SWMF drawings including relevant details and cross sections to confirm the stage storage discharge calculations and rating table in the hydrology model.	Tatham	Noted.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
	GEMTEC Consulting Engineers and Scientists (GEMTEC) Peer Review of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS)		
40	Please refer to GEMTEC 1st Submission Comments table and provide responses accordingly in the table	Pinchn	Noted. Please refer to GEMTEC comments responses sheet in the updated EIS dated Sep 16 2025.
	GEMTEC Consulting Engineers and Scientists (GEMTEC) Peer Review of the Pinchin's Report "Servicing Option Statement, Terrain Assessment and Hydrogeological Development"		**Study in Support of**
	2.2 Hydrogeological Characterization GEMTEC Comments		
41	GEMTEC is of the opinion that the hydrogeological characterization completed by Pinchin is not sufficient to adequately characterize the site. While the test pits, test wells and boreholes (advanced as part of the geotechnical investigation) provide adequate coverage across the site to delineate surficial and bedrock geology, there is no discussion of the physical setting, mapped geologic conditions or groundwater flow directions. Available background resources, namely the Ontario Geologic Survey surficial and bedrock geology maps must be presented and incorporated into the hydrogeological characterization of the site. It is noted that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by Pinchin includes a description of landforms, soils and geology.Also, the report references a seperate geotechnical investigation but does not provide a reference to the report, which should be included.	Pinchin	Section 1 of the revised report includes expanded discussion on site setting including bedrock, quaternary, and physiography. Three accompanying figures also included in Appendix I. Groundwater table elevation and flow direction discussed 5.7 and shown on Figure 13.
42	There is limited discussion or interpretation of the proposed water supply provided; limestone was indicated on all test well records, but the Pinchin report notes that background well records indicate shale layers that may be indicative of the transition to the sandstone unit underlying the limestone in the area. Additional discussion is required to support the hydrogeological characterization and identification of the proposed water supply aquifer / target drilling depths. Further, discussion on groundwater flow is required, to be supported by background studies and/or on-site test well water levels.	Pinchin	Description of targeted zone included in revised report in Section 5.3.4 and Section 6.1
43	With regards to the hydrogeological sensitivity of the site, the Pinchin report does not clearly state whether or not the site is hydrogeologically sensitive, but concludes that the ground surface is isolated from the water bearing fractures of the target aquifer. GEMTEC does not agree with Pinchin's conclusion that the ground surface is isolated from the proposed water supply in accordance with MECP Procedure D-5-4 without additional supporting evidence. Generally, areas consisting of thin soils, taken to be less than two metres in thickness are considered to be hydrogeologically sensitive. Pinchin's assessment of the hydrogeological sensitivity of the site must be substantiated, which can include boreholes advanced within the upper bedrock and doorto-door survey / homeowner sampling of neighbouring private well users (i.e., does the water quality of existing well users support the assessment of the hydrogeological sensitivity of the site). To note, two of the four test wells reported detectable nitrate concentrations in the proposed water supply aquifer that is concluded to be isolated from surface impacts.	Pinchin	A door to door survey undertaken with 29 homes. One property agreed to participate and samples have been collected. Results and interpretation pending. As a conservatism and also due to the difficulty in producing additional information to counter the reviewers assertion, the report has been updated to classify the Site as Sensitive and the assessment for potential impacts was progressed through Step 3 of the MECP D-5-5 three step process. This additional work is included in Section 6 of the revised report. Sections 5.10. 5.11 and 5.12.2 of the revised report.
	Water Supply Assessment GEMTEC Comments		
44	GEMTEC is of the opinion that the Pinchin report does not meet the procedural requirements of MECP Procedure D-5-5. The outstanding information required to support the assessment of groundwater quantity is listed below:□	Pinchin	See below response for comment 45.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
45	1. Four test wells is the minimum number of test wells for developments more than 15 and up to 25 hectares, with the proposed development being 21.9 hectares. However, that assumes that the test wells are technically representative of the proposed water supply aquifer. One of the test wells (Well 4 Tag #A430959) had lower yield compared to the other three test wells. The proponent must provide supporting rationale that Well 4 is technically representative. Further, all four on-site test wells were constructed with 12.2 metres (40 feet) of casing below ground surface which is greater than the Wells Regulation (O.Reg 903) minimum casing length of six metres below ground surface for wells completed in bedrock; rationale for the extended casing length is required to support the proposed water supply aquifer selection.	Pinchin	Lower yield of the 1 well is further discussed in Section 5.3 of the revised report also with more discussion of hydraulic properties of the test wells in comparison to the yield requirements for residential development. Additional comment on casing length also added.
46	2. The minimum well yield required to support the residential development is stated to be 13.7 litres per minute, the minimum specified in MECP Procedure D-5-5; however, MECP Procedure D-5-5 requires that the minimum well yield be calculated for the particular development. For septic system design on page 20, four-bedroom dwellings are considered, but the groundwater quantity sections do not specify the water demand requirements. Information on the proposed development is not provided and the calculation of the minimum well yield is required.	Pinchin	The yield of all 4 test wells was notably more than required for residential use and the higher rates were used to impart a more significant stress on the aquifer to aid in characterization. Section 5.4
47	3. Section 4.3 Well Water Quantity Testing indicates that the report must contain site aquifer characteristics such as hydraulic gradient, transmissivity and boundary conditions Assessment of aquifer properties such as transmissivity and storativity were not completed and are required to meet MECP Procedure D-5-5. The assessment of aquifer properties may also serve to support whether Well 4 is technically representative of the proposed water supply aquifer and/or comment on expected variability in aquifer properties.	Pinchin	Section 5.5 of the report has been updated to discuss site aquifer characteristics form both the survey and GW level information but hydraulic characteristics calculated from the pumping tests. This include discussion of variability of the Site wells and the wells in the surrounding area.
48	4. Section 4.6 Water and Land use Conflicts. where wells exist on or adjacent to the site, a survey of well owners, and sampling and analysis of representative well water, should be performed and reported The lack of off-site private well survey information does not allow for the identification of potentially existing conditions with respect to water quality that may be exacerbated and impact the neighbouring well users. A private well survey and private well water sampling program should be conducted to assess background conditions prior to the construction of the proposed development. The private well survey and sampling program would provide key information pertaining to the well performance and water quality on properties where wells and septic systems have been present for a significant period. It is noted that three off-site well users were incorporated into the groundwater quantity and interference assessment.	Pinchin	This has been added to the report in Section 5.4. A well sampling program was initiated and results of that work will be provided at a later time. The potential for well interference discussion was further developed based on the residential water level monitoring during the pumping tests.
49	5. The interference assessment included monitoring of on-site and off-site private wells, with minimal well interference noted. The observation well spacing of approximately 175 to 742 m is significantly greater than that expected for future on-site wells and the interference assessment should further comment on this using the pumping test data and water level monitoring of nearby existing private wells if they are considered to be technically representative of the proposed water supply aquifer. The conclusion that no adverse interference between wells should be re-evaluated once aquifer properties are assessed.	Pinchin	The potential for well interference discussion was further developed in the revised report (Section 5.4) based on the residential water level monitoring during the pumping tests. The spacing of wells, the pumping rates, and pumping duration is also further discussed. Aquifer properties were assessed.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
	4.2 Water Quality Assessment GEMTEC Comments		
50	The Pinchin report concludes that the water quality in on-site test wells is considered good and suitable as a potable water source. While the parameters tested are all within the ODWQS maximum acceptable concentrations (MAC) and maximum concentrations considered to be reasonably treatable (MCCRT), GEMTEC is of the opinion that the additional testing is required to confirm safe drinking water quality. Field measured water quality parameters and calibrations records (if available) should be included in the revised report.	Pinchin	See below response for comment 50.
51	MECP Procedure D-5-5 indicates the minimum parameter set required for testing and notes that other parameeters may be required. Further, the consultant must also determine whether conditions specific to the site or its surrounding area require the inclusion of additional parameters . Locally, trace metals are recommended for analysis by the City of Ottawa and Lanark County. Although the site is not within those boundaries, trace metals such as barium and strontium have been identified in the surrounding area at concentrations above their respective ODWQS and Healt Canada's health -related maximums. Where health-related maximum acceptable concentrations may be encountered, sampling is required to confirm acceptable concentrations.	Pinchin	Additional sampling for trace metals including barium and strontium have will be completed on the Site wells. Results will be compared to appropriate criteria and provided at a later time once available.
52	Further, there is a commercial/industrial property located within 500 metres of the site and the proponent should comment on whether additional parameters should be tested (e.g., volatile organics compounds, petroleum hydrocarbons, etc.), especially in the absence of known groundwater flow direction. For future studies, it is recommended that a technical pre-consultation with the Township and their technical reviewers be initiated to identify and confirm the minimum parameters to be considered.	Pinchin	In addition to the trace metal analysis samples collected from the Stie test wells will be analysis for PHCs F1 - F4 BETX and PAHs. These results will be compared to appropriate criteria and reported at a later time once available.
53	With regards to the manganese concentration in Well 1 of 0.144 mg/L, it is acknowledged that this concentration is within the ODWQS AO and MCCRT However, it exceeds tha Health Canada's (2019) MAC of 0.12 mg/L. While the federal drinking water quality standards are not necessarily applicable for development applications in Ontario, future drinking water users should be informed of health-related exceedances.As noted in the Pinchin report, the hardness concentrations exceed the operational guideline for hardness in all samples. The hardness concentrations exceed 100 mg/L and as per MECP Procedure D-5-5 the groundwater is considered to be hard. There is no upper treatable limit listed in MECP Procedure D-5-5 but concentrations of less than 500 mg/L are considered to be acceptable for most domestic purposes. GEMTEC agrees that the hardness concentrations are within treatable limits. Once additional water quality sampling is completed, the report recommendations should provide a consolidated list of exceedances, treatment options and recommendation for the local Medical Officer of Health be notified that sodium concentrations may exceed the ODWQS warning level for persons on sodium restricted diets. It is further recommended that the Township include the sodium notification on the Notice of Title.	Pinchin	As the reviewer notes, the Health Canada criteria are not applicable for development in Ontario. Further, a water softener will additionally reduce ionic manganese. Pinchin agrees that sodium should be noted on title. The water quality section of the revised report provides additional discussion on these parameters. The water quality section and results tables will be updated to reflect all analysis results once the data from the additional sampling is available. A consolidated list of exceedances will be updated in the report body.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
	Septic Systems GEMTEC		
54	GEMTEC is of the opinion that Pinchin has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed lots can accommodate septic systems while meeting all applicable setbacks / site constraints. The Pinchin report does not reference the EIS report, also completed by Pinchin, which indicates that the proposed development will be constrained within development envelopes, although the size and location of the development envelopes are not clearly indicated. A Conceptual Lot Development Plan incorporated wetland setbacks, development envelopes (if applicable) and other site-specific constraints must be prepared to demonstrate the proposed lots can be developed. The proposed leaching bed area of 300 m2 should be justified. For consideration, assumed septic flows of 2,500 to 3,000 litres per day with a conservative loading rate of 4 L/m2/day to account for fully raised septic beds over shallow bedrock would result in a leaching bed area of 625 to 750 m2. Replacement septic bed areas are not required.	Pinchin	As a conservatism and also due to the difficulty in producing additional information to counter the reviewers assertion, the report has been updated to classify the Site as Sensitive and the assessment for potential impacts was progressed through Step 3 of the MECP D-5-5 three step process. This additional work is included in Section 6 of the revised report. Replacement septic beds have been removed from figures and text. Guidance from Mississippi Rideau Septic System Office (MRSSO) indicates that The use of a “clay seal” (0.10 m of imported clay material placed over the loading
	Terrain Analysis and Septic Impact Assessment GEMTEC Comments		
55	GEMTEC does not agree with Pinchin's assessment of aquifer isolation. It is GEMTECs opinion that insufficient information has been provided by Pinchin to conclude that the site is not hydrogeological sensitive and isolated from surface impacts; comments are provided below for each of the bullet points identified above.	Pinchin	As a conservatism and also due to the difficulty in producing additional information to counter the reviewers assertion, the report has been updated to classify the Site as Sensitive and the assessment for potential impacts was progressed through Step 3 of the MECP D-5-5 three step process. This additional work is included in Section 5.11.3 of the revised report.
56	1. Weathered bedrock is thin with competent bedrock below. GEMTEC Comment: The report does not contain sufficient information to support this statement, e.g., identification of the geologic formation, detailed visual observations, photos, etc	Pinchin	See above response for comment 55..
57	2. There is at least 15 metres of competent bedrock above the water bearing zones in all onsite test wells. GEMTEC Comment: System isolation requires evidence that approximately 10 metres of low permeability materials (typically taken to be clay) underly the site, including beyond the development boundary in the downgradient direction. The identification of water bearing fractures reported by well drillers does not provide sufficient evidence that bedrock fractures do not exist. The Pinchin report does not identify the geologic formation or groundwater flow directions, which would be needed to support the conclusion that greater than 10 metres of competent bedrock is in place on-site and in the downgradient direction. Further, detectable nitrate concentrations were identified in two of the four on-site test wells, which would not typically be expected in an isolated water supply aquifer. No discussion of nitrates or other surface water quality indicators were included as supporting evidence of aquifer isolation.	Pinchin	Formation and flow direction updated in Section 5 of revised report. As a conservatism and also due to the difficulty in producing additional information to counter the reviewers assertion, the report has been updated to classify the Site as Sensitive and the assessment for potential impacts was progressed through Step 3 of the MECP D-5-5 three step process. This additional work including discussion of nitrates is included in Section 5.11.3 of the revised report

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
58	It is recommended that additional discussions and/or assessment be completed to support system isolation or that Pinchin proceed to MECP Procedure D-5-4 Step 3 Contaminant Attenuation Considerations. Determination of the hydrogeological sensitivity of the site is also required and identification of mitigation measures to support safe and sustainable development (if applicable, e.g., increased well casing lengths, increased separation between well and septic systems, clay liners beneath leaching fields, etc). Significant effort including additional field investigations are expected to support system isolation and should the proponent consider this approach, it is highly recommended that a technical consultation is carried out beforehand to discuss the proposed approach and scope of work. For consideration, GEMTEC is of the opinion that the site is considered to be hydrogeologically sensitive, and the water supply aquifer is not likely to be isolated from surface impacts unless a detailed assessment of the bedrock proves otherwise.	Pinchin	As a conservatism and also due to the difficulty in producing additional information to counter the reviewers assertion, the report has been updated to classify the Site as Sensitive and the assessment for potential impacts was progressed through Step 3 of the MECP D-5-5 three step process. This additional work is included in Section 6 of the revised report
59	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS: GEMTEC has identified the need for additional justification to support the hydrogeological conceptual model and incorporate recommendations from other studies (i.e., setbacks, developments envelopes indicated in the EIS). Once the additional assessment(s) are completed, the preparation of a Conceptual Lot Development Plan is required to support the development. The Conceptual Lot Development Plan must clearly demonstrate that all lots are capable of accommodating well and septic systems using conventional septic leaching beds and incorporating any other site-specific considerations should they be identified (e.g., protective measures to account for the hydrogeological sensitivity of the site, development envelopes or setbacks as identified in the EIS, etc). Also, it is recommended that the report comment on the ability of future lots to accommodate secondary dwellings (i.e., coach houses) and/or identify whether supplemental hydrogeological investigations will be required if future secondary dwellings are contemplated	Pinchin	Secondary residential units are discussed in Section 5.12 of the revised report.
	Novatech Engineering Peer Review – Preliminary Stormwater Management Report		
60	1. Background reports a) The Douglas Side Road - Fish Habitat Assessment prepared by Geofirma Engineering dated June 12, 2017, was not provided for reference or coordination.	Geo-Process	GeoProcess has been retained in the project and provided updated fish habitat memo as part of the 2nd submission and dated Sep 5,2025
61	2. Internal Roadways a) The proposed pavement structure should be reviewed in consultation with Pinchin's Geotechnical Investigation, January 21, 2025. b) Typically, in the Township of Beckwith paved road platforms are 6.1m with 1.5m shoulders, Public Works to review and confirm narrow shoulder (1.0m proposed) is sufficient for maintenance.	Tatham	The road cross-section has been revised to match the Township of Beckwith's typical cross-section.
62	3. Douglas Side Road Extension a) A preliminary level of detail should be provided for the extension of Douglas Side Road including proposed pavement structure and typical cross-section to ensure that the proposed road extension (including grading) can be accommodated within the municipal	Tatham	Cross-sections and proposed pavement structure have been provided to ensure the proposed road extension can be accomodated with the municipal ROW.
63	4. Grading a) Detailed grading should be completed along Street A between STA 0+360 and 0+530 to ensure that the roadside ditch, culvert, proposed utilities, backslope and grading to match existing property line will be accommodated within the 20.0m right-of-way and within the subdivision property limits.	Tatham	Road cross sections have been provided between STA 0+360 and 0+530 using additional topographic survey data.
64	5. Existing Watercourses a) The existing watercourses depicted in the Environmental Impact Study prepared by Pinchin, January 13, 2025, are not shown on the Preliminary the Grading Plan. These watercourses, including any possible alterations should be reviewed and addressed by the design team.	Tatham	Please refer to updated SWM report dated Sep 23,2025

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
65	6. Stormwater Management a) We agree with the assessment that there are no overland flows from the Ridgemont Subdivision draining onto the subject site. b) Clarify the headings in Table 4 to indicate peak flows are the outlet flows from the ponds and not the uncontrolled peak flows from the catchments. c) Review and update Tables 1 to 4 to be consistent with the peak flows from the model results. d) Describe how the ponds were sized including a discussion on the difference in peak flow, in all storm events, from each outlet. e) At the detailed design stage, review all outlets to the wetland in conjunction with environmental constraints.	Tatham	a) Noted. b) Table has been clarified. c) Tables have been verified to be consitent with the model. d) The SWM ponds have been sized on a preliminary basis for the purposes of ensuring the SWM blocks are adequately sized. Final SWM pond sizing including outlet controls will be specified at the detailed design stage. e) Noted.
66	7. Servicing: a) Septic Sizing: Septic system footprints shown on design plans should reflect the size indicated in the Hydrogeological Study. b) Well Locations: Designer should review and document wells suitable for domestic use. Notes should added to detailed drawings stating test wells that do not meet O.Reg 903, or Ontario Building Code setbacks must be abandoned.	Tatham	Please refer to updated SWM report dated Sep 23,2025
67	8. Species and Risks and Fencing: a) Based on the supporting studies, it appears that there is suitable habitat for many species at risk on the development property. It is recommended that further review be completed prior to Draft Plan Approval. b) At the detailed design stage, the designer should provide further information on permanent exclusion fencing including type, location access points.	Tatham	Please refer to updated EIS by Pinchin dated Sep 16,2025. Permanent exclusion fence details and required locations to be provided by Pinchin at detailed design.
68	9. Additional comments: a) The Township of Beckwith should confirm future ownership SWM Facility Blocks (24 and 25), and ownership of Block 26, Unevaluated Wetland with the Developer.	Tatham	The SWM facility blocks are to be transferred from the Developer to the Township at assumption. Ownership of Block 26 to be resolved between the Developer and the Township.
	Public Comments		
69	Please notified me if any updates. Question? Shouldn't there be two entrance's to this Subdivision for emergency vehicle's if one is blocked.	Z Developments	For a rural subdivision, one access road is sufficient to satisfy the emergency vehicle entrance.
70	This communication is intended to make known the concerns of adjacent land owners. Alan and Barb Hamilton at 9367 McArton Rd. These concerns/questions are as follows: • This property has active farming operations ongoing including the use of pesticides as part of a 4R nutrient management plan. • The proposed subdivision must be responsible for any future shared landowner costs of the municipal drain maintenance, being as it will be connected to the storm water management design. • Will the increased volume of traffic on McArton Rd be addressed? i.e. previous subdivision work has reduced the width of this road and depth of ditches to be not adequate for the movement of farm equipment meeting oncoming traffic • Increased use of McArton Rd because of previous/future subdivisions has/will result in an increase of volume and speed of traffic. This road should be reduced to 60km/hr as well as stop signs at intersections. Please send any updates to this application to: Barb Hamilton 674 Ramsay Concession 12 Almonte, ON K0A1A0	P2 Concepts	The subdivision agreement will include conditions regarding the design and maintenance of the stormwater management facilities, however the municipal drain is managed by the Township of Beckwith. The subdivision has direct access to Douglas Side Rd and it is expected that vehicles will travel east on McArton or east/west on the Highway 416 via Ashton Station Rd. Lots west of Ashton Station Rd are not expected to be impacted. It is not within the scope of this application, nor within in the applicant's ability, to reduce the speed of McArton Rd.

Date - Sep 25,2025 **09-T-25001 - Beckwith - Douglas Landing Subdivision - Consolidated Comments Responses**

No.	Comment	Responding Consultant	Response
	Lanark County		
71	I was concerned about the traffic flow of heavy equipment for Douglas landing and wondered about the plan for this. Douglas road doesn't allow commercial traffic. Ridgemont Drive with many young families sees a lot fast moving vehicles as a result. The development seems likely to increase this traffic with large equipment. Would there be another access point for the land development?	P2 Concepts	The subdivision has direct access to Ashton Station Rd via Douglas Side Rd and it is expected that vehicles will travel from Douglas Side Rd via Ashton Station Rd rather than Ridgemont Dr.