

**556, 560 and 576 Conservation Drive  
Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-16402  
Response to City circulation comments (Dated August 31, 2018)**

No.	Comment	Response
1	Based on the current Draft Plan, the density of the proposed development is between 44 and 50 residents and jobs per hectare (rj/ha). The planned density of the Beaver Creek Meadows District Plan (BCMDP) area is 58 rj/ha as per OPA 15, which applies to the entire BCMDP area. Any shortfalls in the density of this subdivision area will impact, and need to be made-up in, other areas of the BCMDP. Please confirm the total density (in rj/ha) to be generated by this development	Revised draft plan of subdivision results in a density range of 52.3 to 76.5 residents and jobs per hectare. It should be noted that the proposed draft plan of subdivision is required to accommodate a future school block, a future community park block and a large open space block, which has a significant impact on overall density.
2	The density of the Mixed-Use Node appears under capacity compared to the land uses and density contemplated in the Official Plan and BCMDP. Density targets included within Table 3 of the District Plan for Mixed-Use Medium Density Residential is between 60 to 100 units per hectare. The proposed Draft Plan is showing approximately 53 units per hectare for the Mixed-Use Medium Density Residential lands. Please demonstrate how the density of the Node is consistent with the planned density outlined in the BCMDP and the Official Plan. Consider increasing density, in particular Block 251 (Multiple Residential).	Revised draft plan of subdivision modified to provide for a maximum density of 87.2 units per hectare in Mixed-Use Node
3	Block 253 (Park) must be a minimum dedication of 5% of the Draft Plan lands. All natural features and associated buffers must not be included within this calculation. Land within buffers will not be considered as contributing to the parkland dedication requirements (Official Plan policy 8.2.4(12)).	Park Block 32 (formerly Block 253) identified as 1.49 ha, which equates to 5.2% of overall site area; with the removal of the future Conservation Drive road widening, Park Block 32 equates to 5.3% of the overall site.
4	A portion of Block 253 (Park) remains within the buffer area of the adjacent natural environmental feature. Revise the limits of Block 254 (Open Space) and Block 253 (Park). All natural features and associated buffers should be within Block 254 (Open Space). All lands within Block 253 (Park) should be unencumbered.	Park Block 32 (formerly Block 253) has been revised to reflect limits of Open Space Block 33 (formerly Block 254) and accompanying buffer
5	A portion of Block 256 (SWM) remains within the buffer area of the adjacent natural environmental feature. Revise the limits of Block 254 (Open Space) and Block 256 (SWM). All natural features and associated buffers should be within Block 254 (Open Space). All SWM features (including infiltration galleries) and trails/maintenance access should be located within the limits of Block 256 (SWM). Please also refer to the Environmental comments below.	SWM Block 335 (formerly Block 256) has been revised to reflect limits of Open Space Block 33 (formerly Block 254) and accompanying buffer

Dated: September 18, 2020

6	Block 253 (Park) is in the same location as the park lands identified in the BCMDP, however, the south side of the park frontage is limited and partially blocked by Block 244 (Street Townhouses). While the park frontage has been slightly increased from previous versions of the proposed Draft Plan, the frontage to the park still remains limited due to the location of Block 244 (Street Townhouse). Policy 3.8.3 of the BCMDP requires that the park maximizes its accessibility to residents and visual presence within the community. Policy 3.8.4 of the BCMDP identifies that parkland should have sufficient frontage to the satisfaction of the City of Waterloo, to enhance visibility. Furthermore, street townhouses were not contemplated in the BCMDP in this location (Block 244).	Park Block 32 frontage has been significantly increased along Street 'E' to provide for clear, sufficient access to the Park Block from both Street 'E' to the south and Pinery Trail to the north
7	Block 253 (Park) is in the same location as the park lands identified in the BCMDP, however, the north side of the park frontage is limited and partially blocked by Lot 154 and Lot 155. Policy 3.8.3 of the BCMDP requires that the park maximizes its accessibility to residents and visual presence within the community. Policy 3.8.4 of the BCMDP identifies that parkland should have sufficient frontage to the satisfaction of the City of Waterloo, to enhance visibility. Please remove Lot 154 and Lot 155.	Park Block 33 frontage has been increased along Pinery Trail to 69.2 metres to provide clear, sufficient access to the Park Block from both Street 'E' to the south and Pinery Trail to the north
8	As per the BCMDP, the subject lands are planned to include an elementary school in a central location and north of the Mixed-Use Node. Block 252 (School) is 2.99 ha in size, consistent with policy 3.7.5(b) of the BCMDP. Final site design and layout of the school site should be coordinated with the School Board, in accordance with policies 3.7.5 of the BCMDP.	Noted
9	Additional information is required in support of the requested site specific reductions. Please provide a Lot Plan(s) showing a typical single detached dwelling on a typical lot (both internal and corner lots) with the requested yard setbacks. Please also provide additional rationale and/or justification for each proposed reduction to the zoning regulations, including encroachments	<p>Lot Plans with product overlay to identify requested variances to zoning provided on October 28, 2018</p> <p>Updated proposed draft zoning provided on February 5, 2019</p> <p>Meeting with City staff to discuss Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations on May 8, 2019</p> <p>Proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) provided to City on September 3, 2019</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020

10	<p>Staff have concerns with the request to reduce front yard setbacks. Front yard setbacks should comply with zoning standards. A front yard setback of 4.0 metres plus an allowance for a porch encroachment of 1.5 metres will negatively impact the streetscape. This results in a minimum front yard setback of 2.5 metres deep. Rideau River Street and Pinery Trail have larger front yard setbacks. A front yard depth of 4.0 metres is insufficient for a car to park in the driveway. In addition, a 2.0 metre wide easement is required along the frontage of each lot.</p>	<p>Updated zoning regulations provided to City on September 3, 2019</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances yard depths, front yard building setback, side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks and maximum garage width</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>
11	<p>Lot depths shown are a minimum of 28 metres (with the exception of Lot 108 and Lot 109 which has a depth of 27.8 m). This is below the typical lot depth of 30 m. Consider increasing lot depths to achieve required front yard and rear yard setbacks, and to provide appropriate amenity area in the front and rear yards.</p>	<p>Lot depths increased to 30.0 for single detached lots north of Rideau River Street</p> <p>Lot depths increased to 29.0 metres for single detached lots for balance of subdivision</p>
12	<p>Staff have concerns with the request to reduce side yard setbacks. Reduced side yard setbacks will increase the need for easements to access the rear yard, provide insufficient space to maintain the house and side yard, and provide insufficient space for infrastructure (i.e., meters, air conditioning units). The need for easements to access private single detached backyard does not seem reasonable. This indicates the house is too large for the lot. Side yard setbacks should comply with zoning standards.</p>	<p>Updated zoning regulations provided to City on September 3, 2019</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances to side yard setbacks. As discussed with City staff, the proposed zoning regulations have been successfully implemented in the City of Kitchener, the City of Cambridge, Town of Milton and Town of Oakville with example site specific zoning previously provided to City.</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>
13	<p>Lot 138 and Lot 242 appear to be very small corner lots. Ensure lot dimensions are such that minimum flankage yard setbacks can be accommodated along the entire length of the flankage façade (i.e., both front and back corners of the dwelling). Consider increasing the size of these lots or provide Lot Plans for each lot to show how required setbacks will be met.</p>	<p>Revised draft plan of subdivision proposes lotless blocks for single detached residential uses; Lot sizes and frontages to be determined prior to registration</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020

14	The requested maximum porch encroachment into the side yard of 1.5 metres is greater than either of the minimum side yard setbacks requested (0.6 metres and 1.2 metres). This is not reasonable.	<p>Updated zoning regulations provided to City on September 3, 2019</p> <p>Proposed porch encroachment reduced to 0.6 metres</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>
15	Confirm proposed coverage. Combination of reduced front yard, rear yard and side yards means the dwelling is too large for the lot. Smaller lots, shorter front yards and reduced side yards are all out of character with the existing homes on Pinery Trail and Rideau River Street and would not provide sufficient amenity space for future homeowners/residents.	<p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances yard depths, front yard building setback, side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks and maximum garage width</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>
16	Confirm proposed garage and driveway dimensions. Minimum standards for garage sizes and driveway sizes will be recommended through zoning to ensure appropriate and sufficient parking is provided.	<p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances yard depths, front yard building setback, side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks and maximum garage width</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>
17	Additional information is required in support of the requested site specific reductions to the various forms of dwelling units. Please provide Lot Plan(s) showing typical street townhouse dwelling and requested yard setbacks. Please also provide additional rationale and/or justification for each proposed reduction to the zoning regulations, including encroachments.	<p>Lot Plans with product overlay to identify requested variances to zoning provided on October 28, 2018</p> <p>Updated proposed draft zoning provided on February 5, 2019</p> <p>Meeting with City staff to discuss Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations on May 8, 2019</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020

		<p>Proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) provided to City on September 3, 2019</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances yard depths, front yard building setback, side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks and maximum garage width</p> <p>Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>
18	<p>Provide additional information related to the Back-to-Back Townhouse dwellings proposed on Block 250 in the form of a concept plan showing building form and setbacks. Additional rationale and/or justification is also required for the requested setbacks, including encroachments.</p>	<p>Lot Plans with product overlay to identify requested variances to zoning provided on October 28, 2018</p> <p>Updated proposed draft zoning provided on February 5, 2019</p> <p>Meeting with City staff to discuss Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations on May 8, 2019, which included the presentation and review of existing Mattamy products for Back-to-Back Townhouses</p> <p>Proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) provided to City on September 3, 2019</p> <p>Back-to-back townhouse product removed from Street Townhouse Blocks (Blocks 25 to 28); Back-to-back townhouses permitted as part of proposed RMU Zone</p>
19	<p>Provide a conceptual lot layout for all townhouse blocks. Are the townhouse dwellings intended to be condominium units? Lotted on the final plan to be registered</p>	<p>Lot Plans with product overlay to identify requested variances to zoning provided on October 28, 2018</p> <p>Revised draft plan of subdivision proposes lotless blocks for street townhouse uses; Lot sizes and frontages to be determined prior to registration</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020

20	Please remove Block 244 (Street Townhouses). Townhouse dwellings are not contemplated in this location in the District Plan (refer to #6).	Former Block 244 (Street townhouse units north side of Street 'E') removed from proposed draft plan of subdivision
21	Please increase the depth of Block 248 and 249 (Street Townhouses). A depth of 25.1 to 26.2 metres does not appear to be sufficient for the intended units while still providing appropriate outdoor amenity area.	Former Blocks 248 and 249 (formerly located between Conservation Drive and Street 'E') redesigned/relocated as part of proposed draft plan of subdivision
22	Block 250 (Back-to-Back Townhouses) is only 28 metres deep, while Block 246 (Street Townhouses) is 27 metres deep. Confirmation is required that a depth of 28.0 metres is sufficient for back-to-back townhouse units without negatively impacting the streetscape and still providing adequate outdoor amenity area. Please demonstrate how this design would be achieved with such a narrow block depth (see also #18).	Former Block 250 (Back to Back Townhouses) removed proposed draft plan of subdivision  Proposed Street Townhouse Blocks 25 to 28 range in depth from 27.7 metres to 35 metres
23	It is not clear how uses along Conservation Drive will address the street while avoiding backing onto interior blocks. Policies 3.2.10 and 3.2.19(b) of the BCMDP discourage back-lotting onto municipal streets such as Conservation Drive and Beaver Creek Road. Block 248 and 249 (Street Townhouses) are proposed to front Conservation Drive and Street A, and back onto Street F. Having Block 248 and 249 'back' onto the front yards of the townhouse units in Block 250 (Back-to-Back Townhouse) is not an appropriate configuration. Please consider revising the configuration of the townhouse blocks. Staff have reviewed possible configurations for this area and are available to meet to discuss these options, should you wish.	Provision of traditional street-fronting townhouses on Conservation Drive difficult due to controlled access and grading considerations  Revised draft plan of subdivision to include future multiple residential block along Conservation Drive
24	Please confirm if commercial is proposed within any of the Townhouse Blocks. This is strongly encouraged within the Mixed-Use Medium Density Residential lands and within the Mixed-Use Node. Blocks 245, 246 and 250 could contain a mixture of street townhouses and live/work style townhouses to achieve density targets and design priorities of the BCMDP.	Commercial not proposed as part of any Street Townhouse and/or Multiple Residential Blocks
25	Confirm proposed coverage. Combination of reduced front yard, rear yard and side yards means the dwelling is too large for the lot. Smaller lots, shorter front yards and reduced side yards are all out of character with the existing homes on Pinery Trail and Rideau River Street and would not provide sufficient amenity space for future homeowners/residents.	Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances yard depths, front yard building setback, side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks and maximum garage width  Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City
26	Staff have concerns with the request to reduce front yard setbacks. Front yard setbacks should comply with zoning standards. A front yard depth of 4.0 metres plus an allowance for a porch encroachment of 1.5 metres will	Proposed porch encroachment reduced to 0.6 metres

Dated: September 18, 2020

	negatively impact the streetscape. This results in a minimum front yard setback of 2.5 metres deep. Rideau River Street and Pinery Trail have larger front yard setbacks. In addition, a front yard depth of 4.0 metres is insufficient for a car to park in the driveway. A 2.0 metre wide easement is required along the frontage of each lot.	Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances yard depths, front yard building setback, side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks and maximum garage width  Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City
27	A maximum height of 10.5 metres is being requested for townhouse dwellings. A height of greater than 10 metres will require an Official Plan Amendment for Blocks outside the Mixed-Use Node (i.e., Block 243 (Street Townhouse)).	Updated zoning regulations included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City consistent with height restrictions identified in Official Plan
28	Block 243 has been modified from single detached units to townhouse units. This is consistent with the direction of the BCMDP.	Noted
29	Confirm proposed garage and driveway dimensions. Minimum standards for garage sizes and driveway sizes will be recommended through zoning to ensure appropriate and sufficient parking is provided.	Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) includes variances yard depths, front yard building setback, side yard setbacks, rear yard setbacks and maximum garage width  Proposed front yard garage setback intended to accommodate sufficient off-street parking for each unit  Final proposed variances to Beaver Creek Meadows District zoning regulations (proposed new draft zoning) included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City
30	Have stacked townhouse dwellings been considered?	Stacked townhouse permitted as part of proposed RMU Zone
31	Please confirm built form proposed for Block 251 (Multiple Residential). Show conceptual plan(s) for the proposed / possible development of this block.	Conceptual designs for proposed Multiple Residential Blocks 29 and 30 included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City
32	Please show dimensions (i.e., frontage) on the Draft Plan for Block 251 (Multiple Residential).	Dimensions identified for Block 30 (formerly Block 251) on revised draft plan of subdivision
33	Density targets included in the BCMDP for the Mixed-Use Medium Density Residential lands within the Mixed-Use Node is between 60 to 100 units per hectare. The proposed density of Block 251 (Multiple Residential) is 30 to 37	Revised draft plan of subdivision modified to provide for a maximum density of 87.2 units per hectare in Mixed-Use Node

Dated: September 18, 2020

	units per hectare. Consider increasing the density of Block 251 (Multiple Residential).	
34	Additional land will be required along the eastern boundary of Block 251 (Multiple Residential) which will form part of the ultimate road allowance and future road construction of Roy Schmidt Road (refer to 'Roy Schmidt Road' comments below).	Revised draft plan modified to reflect future proposed alignment of Roy Schmidt Drive
35	Commercial is strongly encouraged to be included as part of the development of Block 251 (Multiple Residential). This aligns with the policies of the BCMDP.	Commercial uses and/or live/work units permitted as part of proposed RMU Zone
36	The Draft Plan has been revised from previous versions to include Multiple Residential on Block 251 instead of townhouse units. This change is consistent with the BCMDP.	Noted
37	It is recommended that the land uses of Block 251 (Multiple Residential) be coordinated and compatible with the lands to the east which also form part of the Mixed-Use Node.	Noted
38	Special Provision Area 37 (SPA 37) of the Official Plan applies to a portion of the subject lands identified as the Beaver Creek Node, which allow for higher densities and building heights, as well as a wide range of uses to create a mixed-use centre with a concentration of neighbourhood-oriented retail, service commercial uses, institutional employment and residential uses. The extent of the node has been determined through the BCMDP. Blocks 245 to 251 are within the identified node area. Development within these blocks is permitted to be as high as 20 metres and permitted to have a density of up to 300 bedrooms per hectare.	Noted
39	SPA 37 of the Official Plan encourages a mix of uses. Staff recommends that a wide range of uses be considered for Blocks 245 to 251 including commercial, and to develop these blocks as a mixed-use area, consistent with SPA 37.	Commercial uses and/or live/work units permitted as part of proposed RMU Zone
40	Policy 3.4.14 of the BCMDP outlines a range of commercial uses both permitted and encouraged within the Mixed-Use Node. Staff recommends commercial uses and live/work style units within the Mixed-Use Node (refer to policy 3.4.13 of the BCMDP). The inclusion of limited commercial uses and live/work units, well integrated with residential uses within the Node, is an important component of the overall vision and structure of the BCMDP.	Commercial uses and/or live/work units permitted as part of proposed RMU Zone
41	The heights of the buildings within the Mixed-Use Node should be a minimum of 9.0 metres and should not exceed six storeys. The BCMDP contemplates a range of uses within the Node, with a high degree of pedestrian orientation. Policy 3.6.2 of the BCMDP encourages a range of residential uses to provide accommodation for a broad income and social mix. The proposed development should be consistent with policies 3.6.3 and	Updated zoning regulations included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City consistent with height restrictions identified in Official Plan

Dated: September 18, 2020



	3.6.4, which require high quality urban design and visually interesting spaces that consider pedestrian movement and streetscapes.	
42	At a minimum, buildings along Conservation Drive should be designed to accommodate future main floor commercial uses (minimum ground floor height will be recommended).	Revised draft plan of subdivision to include future multiple residential block along Conservation Drive
43	Roy Schmidt Road shall have a road allowance width of 18.0 metres, to be measured at 9.0 metres on either side of the historic centre line of the road.	Revised draft plan modified to reflect future alignment of Roy Schmidt Drive
44	The developer shall coordinate the design of Roy Schmidt Road and cost-share on the reconstruction with the owner/developer of the lands on the east side of the road (Draft Plan 30T-17403), including a new multi-use trail extending from Conservation Drive to the City of Waterloo boundary north of Pinery Trail.	Revised draft plan modified to reflect future alignment of Roy Schmidt Drive  Trail connection from Roy Schmidt Drive to Conservation Drive (as part of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-17403) identified conceptually on revised draft plan
45	The width of Roy Schmidt Road south of Street E does not appear to be 18 metres, specifically along the eastern property line of Block 251 (Multiple Residential). The configuration of Block 251 (Multiple Residential) should be modified to allow sufficient road width.	Roy Schmidt Drive and Street 'E' identified as 18.0 metres in width on revised draft plan of subdivision
46	The Draft Plan shows Roy Schmidt Road to be closed between Rideau River Street and Pinery Trail. Roy Schmidt Road is only proposed to be closed at the intersection of Conservation Drive. The remainder of Roy Schmidt Road is to remain open. The width of Roy Schmidt Road north of Pinery Trail shall be 18.0 metres. Lot 211 and Lot 212 will need to be revised to allow sufficient road width.	Revised draft plan of subdivision modified to provide for connection of Roy Schmidt Drive between Rideau River Street and Pinery Trail
47	Registration of Lots 226 to 242 will be conditional upon the construction of Roy Schmidt Road.	Noted
48	Roy Schmidt Road is to be closed at Conservation Drive. A trail connection is required from Roy Schmidt Road to Conservation Drive in the location of the shared boundary between this development and the adjacent lands (Draft Plan 30T-17403), in the form of a 4.0 metre walkway block for a multi-use trail. If additional land is required to provide proper grading and drainage of the trail, this additional land will be included in the walkway block and conveyed to the City. City land outside that needed for the walkway block may be declared surplus. Such lands may be sold by the City in accordance with the City's Disposition of Property process.	Revised draft plan modified to reflect future alignment and termination of Roy Schmidt Drive  Trail connection from Roy Schmidt Drive to Conservation Drive (as part of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-17403) identified conceptually on revised draft plan
49	Show accurate lot lines of adjacent / surrounding lands on the Draft Plan, including lands owned by the City in the area of Roy Schmidt Road.	Noted on revised draft plan of subdivision
50	Staff support the accesses provided to the future development lands to the west (Brohman lands), through the extension of Pinery Trail and Street B. The precise location of these streets should be coordinated with the adjacent landowner throughout the Draft Plan process. The final location of Pinery	Extension of Rideau River Street and Pinery Trail to provide further connections to land to the west

Dated: September 18, 2020

	Trail and Street B are to be located in such a way as to permit, and not hinder, the appropriate development of the adjacent lands (Brohman lands).	
51	Show and dimension daylight triangles where streets intersect, particularly in the location of Street H, at Conservation Drive. How will reduced flankage affect visibility on corner lots? Daylight triangles shall be provided as per TAC guidelines.	Street 'H' removed from revised draft plan of subdivision
52	The configuration of Street corners should be curved. Ninety degree angles are not desirable and create driveway issues (Street E).	All street corners noted as curved on revised draft plan of subdivision
53	Consider revising Street E and Street F as one Street name (as a future crescent). The current configuration of Street E and Street F creates confusion – where does one end and the next begin? Street G and Street H could remain with separate names.	Street 'E' and Street 'F' reconfigured on revised draft plan of subdivision
54	Temporary cul-de-sacs will be required at the terminus of Street B, Pinery Trail and Street E.	Noted
55	Include 0.3 metre reserves between Conservation Drive and proposed residential Blocks to restrict driveway access.	0.3 metre reserves provided on Block 41 and Block 42 adjacent to Conservation Drive
56	Street H alignment / functioning is to conform with correspondence dated July 7, 2017 ( <i>Conservation Drive and Beaver Creek Road Upgrades and Extension of Municipal Services – Update to Transportation Forecasts and Left Turn Lane Requirements, Stantec, 2017</i> ), which was provided to the Beaver Creek Meadows Developer's Group on July 14, 2017.	Street 'H' removed from revised draft plan of subdivision
57	A Traffic Management Plan is required to be submitted with all subdivision applications, as per Policy 3.9.1(f) of the BCMDP. Traffic calming measures are to be recommended, reviewed and implemented as the subdivision is built, rather than retrofitted after the fact. Such measures will be included as conditions of Draft Approval, to be implemented as the subdivision is built out. For additional information refer to Part D.	"Intersection Operations Assessment", as prepared by Salvini Consulting, submitted with original application for draft plan of subdivision; "Intersection Operations Assessment" prepared in accordance with discussions/direction from City staff January/February 2016
58	There is a lack of pedestrian connections between streets. Please show walkways in strategic locations throughout the Draft Plan to increase pedestrian connectivity and to reduce walking distances.	Additional pedestrian connections provided along Open Space Block 33, Park Block 32 as well as well as Trail Block 39 (north property boundary) and Walkway Blocks 36 to 38
59	In previous versions of the Draft Plan an east-west walkway was proposed between Street B and Rideau River Street. This connection has since been removed. It is recommended this connection be retained as limited east-west connections exist in this area. Maintaining this connection is consistent with policies 3.9.5 and 3.9.6 of the BCMDP.	East/west connection provided along north property boundary and identified as Trail Block 39 on revised draft plan of subdivision
60	A pedestrian connection should be included between Street B and Street D to improve north south pedestrian connections, consistent with policies 3.9.5 and 3.9.6 of the BCMDP.	Additional pedestrian connection provided via Walkway Block 37

Dated: September 18, 2020

61	The Draft Plan shows very limited active transportation connections. This is inconsistent with policy 3.9.4 of the BCMDP, which requires the active transportation network to be designed to ensure convenient and safe travel throughout the community. Proposed lots along the north limit of the Draft Plan have no direct access to key areas such as the school, park, Mixed-Use Node, or transit services. Policy 3.9.5 of the BCMDP requires an active transportation network that provides multiple options for pedestrians and cyclists to travel within the community.	Additional pedestrian connections provided along Open Space Block 33, Park Block 32 as well as well as Trail Block 40 (north property boundary) and Walkway Blocks 36 to 38
62	Map 5 of the BCMDP shows a proposed trail connection running north-south including a route along the buffer area on the west side of the plan. Staff recommends that a pedestrian connection along the buffer be implemented, subject to environmental sensitivities. The EIS submitted as part of this proposal should confirm the feasibility of implementing a trail in this buffer area prior to final development approval. All trails should be developed in accordance with policies 3.9.7- 3.9.15 of the BCMDP.	Revised draft plan of subdivision includes a trail connection within the outer 5m of the buffer along the west side of the plan (Trail Block 39). The EIS has been updated to address the feasibility of encroachment into the buffer (Section 5.4.1) and for the proposed trail in this location (Section 5.4.1.3).
63	A continuation of the Avon Trail was previously shown along the north boundary of the Draft Plan, as per policy 4.4.8 of the BCMDP and has since been removed. This is an important community trail connection.	Connection to Avon Trail provided as Trail Block 39 and within the outer 5m of the wetland/woodland buffer.
64	Consider including a walkway connection from the roundabout at Beaver Creek Road and Conservation Drive to Street E / Street F through Block 249 (Street Townhouse).	No longer applicable
65	Overall, the proposed Draft Plan does not meet the intent of Policy 3.9.2 to 3.9.6 for an active transportation system. Please refer to Map 5 of the BCMDP.	Revised draft plan of subdivision to include appropriately sized trail connection and buffer along the north property boundary as Trail Block 39
66	If phasing of the development is proposed, please submit a Phasing Plan. Also, confirm how the phasing of the development will relate to the availability and timing of the broader stormwater management plan.	Proposed phasing identified on revised draft plan of subdivision
67	All proposed retaining walls throughout the plan (i.e., at west property limit, within SWM Blocks, etc.) shall be removed or minimized to the extent possible.	Retaining walls have been reduced to the extent possible. Retaining walls have been removed between Conservation Drive and Street E, along the trail at the north property line and as part of the stormwater management block. Additional retaining wall reduction efforts will be made at the detailed design stage.
68	The Preliminary Environmental Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by Meritech, dated May 2018 recommends a 1.8 metre high noise wall along Conservation Drive and Street A, along with noise warning clauses for lots within 20 metres and 40 metres of Conservation Drive. Staff do not support the use of noise walls to mitigate noise levels generated by traffic along Conservation Drive. Acceptable measures include building orientation / site layout, berms, and setbacks (physical separation).	The revised Draft Plan has replaced all individual lots at the south end of the site along Conservation Drive – the traffic noise generator – with multi-residential blocks that will be developed through the Site Plan process. Blocks 29 and 30 will require individual noise assessments in support of Site Plan Approval.

Dated: September 18, 2020

69	Development of the subject lands should be consistent with urban design policies of the BCMDP (Section 4). Generally, the Draft Plan should reflect a complete community with high quality design, a high degree of connectivity, well designed and attractive streetscapes, and a sense of identity. Good urban design principles should also be incorporated into the built form, including each dwelling unit type. In particular, townhouses should be consistent with policies 3.4.17-19 of the BCMDP.	Noted
70	The development as a whole should be consistent with the City's Urban Design Manual	Noted
71	An Urban Design Brief was not submitted. Subdivision Urban Design Guidelines will be required as a condition of draft approval.	Noted
72	When compared to the previous submission, the wetland limits shown on the Draft Plan of Subdivision (last revised February 23, 2018) have changed. The rationale for the new limits needs to be confirmed, as does GRCA's acceptance of the new limits. Also, the wetland limits shown on the Draft Plan differ from those shown on the Conceptual Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (dated February 2018). The wetland limits on the Conceptual Erosion and Sediment Control Plan match those from the previous version of the Draft Plan. Further, the dripline shown in the northwest corner of the site on the Draft Plan is different than that shown on the Conceptual Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.	Open Space Block 34 (formerly Open Space Block 255) accurately reflects limits of wetland and required buffer  Open Space Block 33 (formerly Open Space Block 254) revised to reflect woodland boundary delineation as agreed to Regional and City staff during September 2018 site visit  All plans now show the same limits
73	Figure 6 of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (Revised May 2018) includes a note that reads "Dripline knob to be removed". Through the EIS, the "knob" is mapped as Significant Woodland (Core Natural Feature) and Significant Wildlife Habitat (Supporting Natural Feature). Official Plan policies 8.2.4(2) and 8.2.5(2) require the form and ecological function of such features to be maintained, enhanced or, where feasible, restored. Policies 8.2.4(3) and 8.2.5(3) also restrict development and site alteration within such features to a limited range of uses/activities. As per the Official Plan and the North Waterloo Scoped Subwatershed Study (NWSSS), the feature should remain intact and be afforded a 10 metre buffer. In terms of that buffer, as set out in Official Plan policy 8.2.4(9), buffers are to remain in or be restored to a primarily natural state and portions of stormwater management facilities may be permitted in them where the feature is enhanced, no other alternative location is feasible, low impact development measures are implemented to the extent feasible outside the buffer, root zones are not impacted, and the facility replicates or complements an existing function of the buffer lands.	Through further discussions with the Region of Waterloo and GRCA and based on discussions and agreements from September 26, 2018 site visit, the Core Natural Feature boundary was revised to exclude the dripline knob. This area was excluded due to the distinct difference in characteristics of the knob from the bulk of the significant woodland, as discussed in the field with City and Regional ecology staff. The knob contains declining and dead trees, is not wetland and does not contain Significant Wildlife Habitat. Trees may be retained in this area depending on the detailed design. See EIS report Section 5.4.1.1.
74	It is unclear whether the constructed wetland will include a cooling trench. Figure 6 of the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (Revised May 2018) shows a level spreader but a cooling trench is referenced on page 29.	A cooling trench is not proposed. The Stormwater Management Report will be updated accordingly.

Dated: September 18, 2020

75	<p>While the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (Revised May 2018) sets out recommendations for the during-development and post-construction monitoring programs, the Terms of Reference for each phase will need to be finalized at the time of transition. This comment also applies to the monitoring recommendations put forward in the EIS. Further, while the 2016 and 2017 Pre-development Biological Monitoring Reports were submitted in early 2017 and 2018 respectively, the 2016 Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring Report and subsequent reports are still outstanding. These reports should be submitted together and as soon as possible following the end of the monitoring year.</p>	<p>Noted. Terms of reference for monitoring plans will be provided prior to completion of the detailed design submission.</p> <p>All monitoring reports and updates to be submitted as soon as they become available. The 2019 Pre-Development Biological Monitoring Report was submitted in early 2020. Stantec has prepared an updated groundwater and surface water monitoring report.</p>
76	<p>Based on the direction provided in the District Plan, a trail, that would have to be supported through the EIS if it is in the buffer, should be incorporated into the plan that extends from Block 256 (Stormwater Management) down to Conservation Drive. Further, approximate trail locations should be shown.</p>	<p>Revised draft plan of subdivision includes trail connection along outer limits of Open Space Block 33 (formerly Open Space Block 254) adjacent to Park Block 32 (former Park Block 253) and Stormwater Management Block 35 (former Stormwater Management Block 256). The EIS has been updated to address the proposed trail in this location (Section 5.4.1.3).</p>
77	<p>Section 5.4.7 of the EIS states that the wet cells of the pond have been placed outside of the Category 2 habitat of the Blanding's turtle which will avoid the need for registering any maintenance works for an exemption under the ESA. However, in MNR's comments, it was noted that the stormwater management pond could become Blanding's Turtle habitat in the future and would therefore require any maintenance of the pond to proceed in consultation with MNR to ensure the species is not negatively impacted. This needs to be clarified and City Engineering staff need to be made aware of the requirements.</p>	<p>Follow-up blanding turtled habitat response submitted to the Ministry of Environmental, Conservation and Parks (MECP) in April 2019. The mitigation plan includes fencing of natural features such that turtles cannot access the SWM pond.</p> <p>MECP confirmed on July 30, 2019 that no additional information or material pertaining to mitigation of Blanding's Turtle habitat required. Timing windows and wildlife impact mitigation measures are provided in the EIS (ie. fish and wildlife salvage prior to maintenance works) See EIS Section 5.4.6.</p>
78	<p>The Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (Revised May 2018) and the Conceptual Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (dated February 2018) show part of an infiltration gallery within the wetland buffer (to varying degrees, as different wetland limits are used on each plan). Official Plan policy 8.2.4(9) states that buffers are to remain in or be restored to a primarily natural state and portions of stormwater management facilities may be permitted in them where the feature is enhanced, no other alternative location is feasible, low impact development measures are implemented to the extent feasible outside the buffer, root zones are not impacted, and the facility replicates or complements an existing function of the buffer lands. It has not been demonstrated that these criteria are met. If it can be shown that</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Infiltration galleries have been relocated and are proposed outside of the buffer areas. This will be reflected in the revised SWM report figures to be submitted at the detailed design stage.</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020

	<p>the criteria are met, details on the design of the infiltration galleries are needed, as they may be incompatible with a naturalized buffer. Potential areas of incompatibility include whether access to the galleries needs to be maintained, whether the vegetation over top of the galleries need to be maintained/manicured, whether tree roots will interfere with gallery function as the buffer matures from a meadow community to a treed one, and whether the galleries will need to be maintained in the short or long term, since accessing them would disrupt the buffer and remove any habitat that has been created, the provision of which is identified as a key ecological enhancement in the NWSSS.</p>	
79	<p>Sections 3.2 and 5.4.3 of the EIS note that Stantec is preparing a hydrogeological study as part of the application. A Terms of Reference for a hydrogeological assessment was submitted to the City on November 9, 2016. Has that assessment been completed and submitted?</p>	<p>Hydrogeological assessment included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City</p>
80	<p>Given the required removal of the suitable bat habitat features (residential buildings and isolated landscape trees), is there opportunity to create bat habitat in the buffer areas?</p>	<p>There was no requirement from MNRF to provide bat habitat at the time of the removal of the buildings and trees. Bat boxes can be installed, if desired, in the buffer areas to provide shelter and additional habitat and will be shown on the Rehabilitation and Enhancement Plan to be prepared as a Condition of Approval. See EIS Section 5.6.2.</p>
81	<p>Figure 14.4 of the NWSSS shows the northern edge of the property as an area to enhance in terms of its linkage function. While the EIS notes the lack of linkage connection/corridor function the hedgerow currently provides (page 41 and 50), the feasibility of enhancement has not been evaluated or addressed.</p>	<p>Connection to Avon Trail provided as Trail Block 39, including walkway and linkage/buffer area.</p> <p>The team has worked to re-design the trail block such that sufficient width is available to provide a MUT and plantings of trees, shrubs and meadow vegetation. Details of the measures to enhance the habitat and potential connection in this area can be included in a Rehabilitation and Enhancement Plan to be prepared as a Condition of Approval. Further discussion is provided in Section 5.6.6 of the EIS</p>
82	<p>The Draft Plan of Subdivision (last revised February 23, 2018) shows encroachment into buffers in three locations – a) in the residential lots that back onto the northern hedgerow, b) in the stormwater management block, and c) in the park block.</p> <p>a) With respect to the residential lots that back onto the hedgerow, while a 5 metre buffer is shown on the Draft Plan, both the hedgerow and buffer are, to varying degrees, within the lots. Could the lots be graded without interfering with the</p>	<p>Revised draft plan of subdivision modified to remove encroachments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised encroachments onto northern hedgerow (refer to Trail Block 39)</li> <li>• Revised encroachments from stormwater management block into adjacent wetland (refer to Open Space Block 33 and Stormwater Management Block 35)</li> </ul>

Dated: September 18, 2020

	<p>hedgerow? What is to prevent removal of the hedgerow by future homeowners if it is within the lot lines? Further, the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (Revised May 2018) shows both a maximum 2 metre high retaining wall and infiltration gallery along that boundary. It is presumed such infrastructure would require the removal of the hedgerow. The previous comment dealing with the linkage function of the hedgerow needs to be addressed to inform how the hedgerow will be managed. In addition to the impact the retaining wall and infiltration gallery would have on the hedgerow, their location would also pose significant challenges in terms of infrastructure maintenance. Access to the retaining wall would be severely restricted and the infiltration gallery would be on a number of private properties, with limited access and no opportunity to ensure functionality or prevent removal.</p> <p>b) With respect to the stormwater management block, the criteria listed in Official Plan policy 8.2.4(9) needs to be fully addressed in order to contemplate the location of the constructed wetland and infiltration gallery as currently proposed. Specific concerns regarding the infiltration gallery in the buffer are previously noted. In addition to these concerns, the proposed maximum 1.7 metre high retaining wall would pose a significant challenge in terms of maintenance and buffer functionality, as the buffer would need to be cleared to enable access.</p> <p>c) With respect to the park block, Official Plan policy 8.2.4(9) states that permitted uses within buffers are to be limited to low impact uses consistent with those permitted within designated features. Active park land is not one of those uses. Further, the policy states that buffers are to remain in or be restored to a primarily natural state. The buffer lands are therefore to be removed from the Park Block. This is consistent with Official Plan policy 8.2.4(12) which states buffers will not be considered as contributing to parkland dedication requirements. The situation is further complicated because a trail is to be potentially built within the buffer (as per an earlier comment). The combination of an infiltration galley and a trail could result in very little naturally-vegetated buffer.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encroachment of park block into adjacent wetland/open space area (refer to Park Block 32 and Open Space Block 33)</li> </ul> <p>The retaining wall in the stormwater management block has been removed</p>
--	--	---

83	<p>The EIS recognizes that the timing of construction activities must have regard for the breeding bird season. Consistent with the Westside Subdivisions, a timing window of April 1 to September 10 should be used. All land clearing, earthen works, servicing works, infrastructure work and tree removal between April 1 and September 10 should be prohibited unless a nesting survey is undertaken that demonstrates the activities will not have the potential to disturb or destroy migratory birds or their active nests.</p>	<p>Based on the habitats to be removed (ag fields, isolated trees), and the guidance of the Canadian Wildlife Service, a timing restriction window of May 1 – July 31 is appropriate. If clearing must occur within this time frame, nest searches are an acceptable mitigation method to avoid impacts to birds and their nests</p>
84	<p>The EIS notes that there will be an increase of 11-46% in post-development infiltration (page 56), with the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (Revised May 2018) providing further details (page 25). While the NWSSS recommends existing infiltration rates be maintained or increased, a potential increase of 46% seems significant. Section 4.2 of the EIS notes that the wetlands' primary hydrologic function appears to be the storage of surface water and the storage and expression of groundwater. Would increasing the rates this substantially result in impacts to the wetlands? Is groundwater mounding a risk?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Efforts will be made at the detailed design stage to maintain the existing surface drainage contribution from the Site to the wetland from clean sources such as rooftops or landscape areas. We anticipate that these changes will reduce the possibility of groundwater mounding.</p> <p>Detailed design of the proposed SWM system will incorporate input from the project's hydrogeologist as well as the results of recently completed hydrogeological field work. We may also seek guidance from the GRCA for outlet design and flow allowances.</p>
85	<p>As per the direction provided by the NWSSS and the EIS, a condition of draft plan approval will require the distribution of an environmental stewardship brochure. The City has a universal one available for purchase entitled "Naturally Your Waterloo". Experience has shown that requiring builders to distribute the brochure to new homeowners is challenging because of the time span over which the development occurs. Given this, the applicant should either be required to purchase all of the brochures needed for the subdivision upfront from the City and distribute them as appropriate or provide the funds necessary to print all the required brochures but rely on the City to distribute them as the subdivision builds out (e.g. it could be given out alongside the Building Permit). Further discussion is needed to determine the preferred approach.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
86	<p>The environmental lands and their buffers (i.e. the Open Space blocks) are to be dedicated to the City free of charge and without any encumbrances.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
87	<p>Under section 5.6.1 of the EIS, a historic farm dump is noted. This area will need to be cleaned up as a condition of approval.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This can be included in the Rehabilitation and Enhancement Plan.</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020



88	Invasive Phragmites is discussed under section 5.6.3 of the EIS. An invasive species management plan will need to be provided as a condition of approval.	Noted
89	City-standard chain link fencing needs to be installed along the private-public interface.	Noted
90	Block 253 (Park) cannot include buffer lands within the lands calculated toward the 5% parkland dedication. Likewise, areas of the park encumbered with infrastructure such as stormwater management facilities and infiltration galleries cannot be included in the 5% parkland calculations.	<p>City staff noted in a meeting on Nov 26, 2018 that infiltration in Park Block 32 (former Block 253) is not ideal but would be allowed provided the park concepts show there is no conflicts with permanent park features.</p> <p>Pending the review of the hydrogeological assessment, more detailed sizing and layout infiltration galleries will be completed with the intent of minimizing or removing galleries under the park.</p> <p>Proposed Park Block 32 to also include sanitary connection. Impact on useable area of Park Block 32 and resulting parkland dedication to be reviewed with City</p>
91	Why is the Avon Trail link deleted? This is an important community trail connection.	Connection to Avon Trail provided as Trail Block 39, including walkway and linkage/buffer area
92	The hedgerow at the north and its 5.0 metre buffer are now incorporated into the rear lots of homes. This is not a viable way to protect, conserve and enhance this hedgerow. Regionally significant bird species are noted in this hedgerow therefore measures to preserve and enhance this feature should be undertaken. There is very limited protection for hedgerows when located within private property.	<p>Revised draft plan of subdivision to include appropriately sized trail connection and buffer along the north property boundary as Trail Block 39.</p> <p>See response to Comment #81. This has been addressed in the EIS Section 5.3.1.</p>
93	The servicing plan indicates that infiltration infrastructure is proposed in the lots at the north end of the site, between Rideau River Street and Street B. They seem to indicate water will flow off site, which is not permitted.	Existing drainage patterns are being maintained. Infiltration will be provided under the trail for the most common storms with excess flows draining to the wetland finger as in the existing conditions.
94	The servicing submission from Meritech (dated May 2018) shows the proposed locations for infiltration galleries. Most of these are inaccessible for future maintenance. Please revise or confirm how maintenance will be addressed.	Infiltration galleries are proposed in multiple locations in order to meet water quantity requirements in the 2-year storm event. Galleries on city-owned lands will be accessible for maintenance. Galleries on private lots are proposed to be rear-yard soakaway pits and are to be maintained privately. The purchase and sale agreements will outline the purchaser's requirement to maintain the gallery.

Dated: September 18, 2020

95	The proposed development to the east (Draft Plan 30T-17403) does not show a vehicular connection at the end of Street E as indicated on this Draft Plan. Coordination between plans and consulting firms is required.	Noted
96	The stormwater management pond maintenance access road is typically designed to form part of the overall pedestrian trail system. Linkages to the park and to the north- south trail system on the west edge of the property should be incorporated into the access road.	The access road through the stormwater management pond will be extended to connect to the trail network in the park.
97	It is recommended that a 2.0 metre wide (minimum) flat area be designed behind the residential lots that back onto the stormwater management pond rather than the 3:1 slope beginning at property line.	A 1.0 metre flat area has been provided behind the lots before transitioning into a slope.
98	The location of the infiltration gallery proposed within Block 252 (School) must be accepted by the School Board, to not encumber the development potential of this block.	The location of the infiltration gallery has not been determined but rather shown as a schematic representation on the drawing. The label has been updated accordingly and the location will be determined as part of the site plan process when the school is developed.
99	The EIS does not speak to the north-south trail connection through the buffer lands or other trails. The trail system should be shown conceptually. This trail connection should be provided within the buffer from Conservation Drive to the stormwater management pond. The City standard 3.0 metre wide asphalt trail with supporting buffer plantings is required.	Revised draft plan of subdivision to include appropriately sized trail connection and buffer along the north property boundary as Trail Block 39
100	The trail/linkage system should be designed holistically so that walkway blocks connect to major points of attraction such as the park and the school. Although the BCMDP shows this conceptually, the Draft Plan does not create these linkages. Linkages are not linking street to street in a linear fashion. Future residents should be able to use a walkway block from Street B to connect to Street D, and then to the park, etc.	Additional pedestrian connections provided along Open Space Block 33, Park Block 32 as well as well as Trail Block 39 (north property boundary) and Walkway Blocks 36 to 38
101	Block 253 (Park) must be unencumbered and for recreational purposes only. Portions of the park that do not provide useable parkland should be eliminated from the overall park calculation and/or moved out of the park block. These include the infiltration gallery and the sanitary service. These facilities are typically not permitted in parkland.	Revised draft plan of subdivision includes 69 metres of frontage along Pinery Trail and 70+ metres of frontage along Street 'E' for Park Block 34
102	Block 253 (Park) should be 80% flat tableland with grades no steeper than 2%. Areas of steep slopes will not be accepted.	Noted  Based on the preliminary grading this will be achievable as part of detailed design stage.  Additional park design information and conceptual design included as part of August 2020 comprehensive submission to City

Dated: September 18, 2020

103	City standard 1.5 metre high black vinyl chain-link fencing shall be provided at all public private interfaces where private lands abut wetlands, buffer lands, environmental lands, woodlots and open spaces meant to be naturalized to minimize encroachment. In all other areas, the City standard property demarcation posts and living fence shall be provided.	The details of the Open Space fencing are part of a Comprehensive Mitigation Plan for Blanding's turtle which has been approved by MECP. The fencing may be City-standard or higher. Specific wildlife fencing may be used in certain areas to prevent turtles or other wildlife from accessing infrastructure such as SWM ponds and roads. A Blanding's Turtle Mitigation Plan has been prepared by NRSI and is included in the EIS as an Appendix
104	The City is interested in discussing the School Board proposals for layout of the new school and associated green space. Given the size and layout of Block 253 (Park), it is perhaps not conducive to sharing sporting facilities and therefore the School Board may need to provide these 100% on their lands	Noted
105	Sufficient deterrents need to be designed into the shared property line between Block 253 (Park) and Block 256 (SWM) to maintain safety given the slopes of the pond and the proximity of the park.	Noted
106	Please confirm the design intentions of Blocks 254 and 255 (Open Space) and who is to maintain it. If it is Open Space, the developer must enter into an agreement to maintain these lands until the subdivision is build out.	Open Space Blocks 33 and 34 to be naturalized and conveyed to the City at the time of registration
107	The design and incorporation of a layby for bus drop-off for Block 252 (School) should be considered.	Sufficient frontage along Street 'A' and Street 'E' provided for School Block 31 and future bus drop-off areas as required
108	Walkway blocks shown on previous iterations of the plan have been removed. Interconnectivity throughout the neighbourhood must be provided. Walkway blocks are 4.0 metres wide, unless additional services are required which may warrant a width of 6.0 metres to 9.0 metres.	Additional pedestrian connections provided along Open Space Block 33, Park Block 32 as well as well as Trail Block 39 (north property boundary) and Walkway Blocks 36 to 38
109	A 6.0 metre high retaining wall is proposed along the west property limit. This is significant. Why does the west property limit not meet existing grades? How does the retaining wall work at future road extension (i.e., Pinery Trail and Street B)?	Proposed retaining wall reduced and eliminated where possible
110	A Vegetation Management Plan will be required as part of the first engineering submission.	Noted
111	A Hedgerow Enhancement Planting Plan is required.	Noted  Will be included in the Rehabilitation and Enhancement Plan to be prepared as a Condition of Approval.
112	An Invasive Species Control Plan is required.	Noted
113	An infiltration gallery cannot be located within buffers. Buffers can contain trails and naturalized plant material and some minor re-grading only.	See response to item #78
114	Block 252 (Park) will require stormwater, hydro and water stubs for playground and for a future rink area.	Noted To be advanced during detailed design.

Dated: September 18, 2020

115	Infrastructure shall not be in parks unless required by the park.	<p>Groundwater depth at the intersection of Street C and Pinery Trail dictates the pond elevation and therefore the minimum road elevation in that location. The sanitary sewer depth is then designed accordingly. The sanitary sewer is being run through the park to minimize the required depth of the sewer and ensure ease of future maintenance by taking the shortest route possible. This eliminates the need for extra deep sewer in Pinery Trail (from Street D) and Street A (to Street E). Exact location in the park will be coordinated with permanent park features</p> <p>Impacts of proposed sanitary connection through Park Block 32 to be further reviewed with City</p>
116	Any garbage in the buffer, wetland, woodlands shall be removed by the developer to the satisfaction of the City of Waterloo. This includes any farm dump, old fences, building materials, etc..	<p>Noted</p> <p>Will be included in the Rehabilitation and Enhancement Plan to be prepared as a Condition of Approval.</p>
117	Educational signage is required to be designed, approved and installed in the buffer area to educate property owners regarding encroachment and dumping, ownership, etc. Signage plan to be submitted for approval.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Will be included in the Rehabilitation and Enhancement Plan to be prepared as a Condition of Approval.</p>
118	The plan for the restoration and enhancement measures to protect wildlife and cut down invasive species along Conservation Drive is required.	<p>Noted</p> <p>Will need to be coordinated with City project upgrades to Conservation Drive. Will be included in the Rehabilitation and Enhancement Plan to be prepared as a Condition of Approval.</p>
119	The plan for the animal crossing/ecological linkage enhancement crossing is required.	<p>Noted</p> <p>The eco-passage at Conservation Drive is being designed by Stantec as part of the City improvements and widening of this road. The Blanding's turtle fencing of the natural features on the subject property will tie into the eco-passage such that there are no gaps. See Blanding's Turtle Mitigation Plan appendix to the EIS.</p>
120	Park, SWM, OS, buffer, naturalization, living fence and property demarcation, fencing, signage plans are required to estimate the Letter of Credit requirements in Schedule B of the Subdivision Agreement. Developer	<p>Noted</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020

	to submit street tree planting plan OR to confirm with Parks and Environment to have the City undertake the street tree planting.	
121	Topsoil is not permitted to be stockpiled within Block 253 (Park).	Noted
122	The existing road allowance of Roy Schmidt Road appears to be 12 metres wide. A road widening on the west side of Roy Schmidt Road shall be conveyed to the City for the entire length of Roy Schmidt Road to establish the new property line at 9.0 metres from the historic centreline of Roy Schmidt Road. A similar widening has been requested from the developer of the proposed subdivision on the east side of the road (Draft Plan 30T-17403).	Road allowance for Roy Schmidt Road identified as 18.0 metres on revised draft plan of subdivision
123	Roy Schmidt Road is to be closed at Conservation Drive but the City will retain a 4.0-metre-wide walkway block for a MUT in this location (between Roy Schmidt Road and Conservation Drive). If additional land is required to provide proper grading and drainage of the trail, this additional land will be included in the walkway block and conveyed to the City. City land outside that needed for the walkway block may be declared surplus. Such lands may be sold by the City in accordance with the City's Disposition of Property process;	Trail connection from Roy Schmidt Drive to Conservation Drive (as part of Draft Plan of Subdivision 30T-17403) identified conceptually on revised draft plan
124	The developer shall confirm that the north limit of Conservation Drive is 13 metres from the historic centreline of the road, to facilitate the ultimate road allowance of 26 metres as per the City's Official Plan.	
125	4.0 metre* wide walkway blocks are required: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inside the west limit of the plan from Pinery Trail to Block 255 (Open Space).</li> <li>Adjacent to the rear of Lot 46 to Lot 71 on Street B.</li> <li>Adjacent to the rear of Lot 7 to Lot 23 on Rideau River Street to connect to the existing trail at the east limit of the Draft Plan and the trail on the west limit of the Draft Plan.</li> <li>Between Lot 45 and Lot 46 on Street B, between Lot 23 and Lot 24 on Rideau River Street, and between Lot 6 and Lot 7 (or Lot 7 and Lot 8) on Rideau River Street to connect the public sidewalks to the trail inside the north limit of the Draft Plan.</li> </ol>	Additional walkway connections provided as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trail connection identified along western limit of Stormwater Management Block 35 (former Stormwater Management Block 256) to Pinery Trail</li> <li>Trail Block 39 provided along rear property line, at the rear of Blocks 2 and 3 (former Lots 7 to 62)</li> <li>Walkway Blocks 36 to 38 providing pedestrian connection from Rideau River Street to Trail Block 39</li> </ul>
126	The trail within the plan is to be designated The Avon Trail: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Along the east limit of Block 254 (Open Space) from Conservation Drive to Pinery Trail.</li> <li>Inside the west limit of the Draft Plan from Pinery Trail to Block 255 (Open Space).</li> <li>Along the south limit of Block 255 (Open Space) to the north limit of the Draft Plan.</li> </ol>	Revised draft plan of subdivision to include appropriately sized trail connection and buffer along the north property boundary as Trail Block 39

Dated: September 18, 2020

	<p>d. Inside the north limit of the Draft Plan from Block 255 (Open Space) to the existing trail along the east limit of the Draft Plan.</p> <p><b>*Note:</b> <i>where detailed engineering determines that grading and drainage of trails, walkways or park facilities require additional land or easements, such transfers must be conveyed to the City at the time of engineering approvals.</i></p>	
127	The Developer shall submit a Transportation Study prepared by a qualified Transportation Engineer, for the review and approval of the City's Director of Engineering, to address the needs of all road users: pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and drivers.	
128	<p>The Transportation Study will use as background information the transportation studies for Conservation Drive and Beaver Creek Road, and provide projected peak hour and AADT volumes for each transportation mode on the following streets (which are considered to be feeder roads):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Street H</li> <li>Pinery Trail</li> <li>Street A, from Conservation Drive to Pinery Trail</li> <li>Street E, from Roy Schmidt Road to Street A</li> </ol>	"Intersection Operations Assessment", as prepared by Salvini Consulting, submitted with original application for draft plan of subdivision; "Intersection Operations Assessment" prepared in accordance with discussions/direction from City staff January/February 2016
129	Above feeder roads should have a Multi-Use Trail (MUT) on one side, and the study should provide options for enhanced crossings at all intersections on these roads.	MUT will only be constructed on the west side of Street A between Conservation Drive and Pinery Trail as per discussion with Darren Scott on January 30, 2019.
130	The Transportation Study shall determine the sight daylighting requirements at all roads intersecting with Conservation Drive. Lands to accommodate daylighting requirements shall be conveyed to the City.	"Intersection Operations Assessment", as prepared by Salvini Consulting, submitted with original application for draft plan of subdivision; "Intersection Operations Assessment" prepared in accordance with discussions/direction from City staff January/February 2016
131	The Transportation Study shall include options and recommendations for enhanced pedestrian and cycling safety and shall design and construct any traffic calming facilities and road safety features recommended by the Transportation Study.	"Intersection Operations Assessment", as prepared by Salvini Consulting, submitted with original application for draft plan of subdivision; "Intersection Operations Assessment" prepared in accordance with discussions/direction from City staff January/February 2016
132	All design and construction to be undertaken by the developer shall be to the satisfaction of the City's Director of Engineering Services.	Noted
133	The detailed design of City sidewalks, trails and parks shall address all grading and drainage issues to meet AODA requirements. Should additional land or easements be required to accommodate City infrastructure needs, the developer shall convey such transfers to the City at the time of engineering approval.	Noted

Dated: September 18, 2020

134	<p>A MUT is required within the Roy Schmidt Road right of way. The City preferred location for this 3.0-metre-wide MUT is on the west side of the road (due to a fewer number of driveways). This MUT will extend from Conservation Drive, up to and along Roy Schmidt Road, to the existing trail at the north limit of the Draft Plan. A 1.8 metre sidewalk is required along the entire length of Roy Schmidt Road, within the right of way on the east side of the road. The developer shall coordinate the design of Roy Schmidt Road with the developer of the lands to the east.</p>	<p>The design of Roy Schmidt Road will be coordinated with the developer of the lands to the east. These comments ought to be provided to the developer of the lands to the east.</p>
135	<p>While the City is constructing a MUT on the east side of Beaver Creek Road south of Conservation Drive, and on the south side of Conservation Drive, the preferred location of the MUT is on the west side of Street A adjacent to Block 252 (School). This will require enhanced crossings on the east and north legs of the roundabout at Street A and Conservation Drive.</p>	<p>Noted The roundabout is being designed by others as part of the reconstruction of Beaver Creek Road and Conservation Drive. We will coordinate with that design.</p>
136	<p>The developer shall design and construct the following 3.0 metre* wide Multi-Use Trails (MUT):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Along the east limit of Block 254 (Open Space) from Conservation Drive to Pinery Trail.</li> <li>b. Inside the west limit of the Draft Plan from Pinery Trail to the south limit of Block 255 (Open Space).</li> <li>c. Between Block 255 (Open Space) and the rear of Lot 63 to Lot 71 on Street B.</li> <li>d. Inside the north limit of the Draft Plan from the MUT on Block 255 (Open Space) to connect to the existing trail at the north-east limit of the Draft Plan.</li> <li>e. Along the east limit of Block 256 (SWM) connecting the MUT on Block 254 (Open Space) to the MUT at the north limit of Block 256 (SWM).</li> <li>f. Along the north limit of Block 256 (SWM) connecting Pinery Trail to the MUT on the east side of Block 253 (Park).</li> <li>g. Along the south and east limit of Block 253 (Park) connecting the MUT on Block 254 (Open Space) to Pinery Trail.</li> <li>h. On the west side of Street A from Conservation Drive to Pinery Trail.</li> <li>i. On the north side of Street E from Roy Schmidt Road to the property line between Block 252 (School) and Block 244 (Street Townhouse).</li> <li>j. Along the south limit of Block 252 (School) from the MUT in (i.) above, to the MUT on Block 253 (Park).</li> </ol> <p><b>Note:</b> where Block 244 (Street Townhouse) is removed, the MUT on the north side of Street E should connect from Street A to Block 253 (Park).</p>	<p>MUT shall be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• on the west side of Street A between Conservation Drive and Pinery Trail as per discussion with Darren Scott on January 30, 2019</li> <li>• from Street E to Pinery Trail through the park block</li> <li>• from the park block to Pinery Trail through the SWM block, utilizing the access road</li> <li>• from Conservation Drive to the park block through Block 248</li> <li>• in the trail block across the north property line</li> <li>• in walkway blocks connecting the north property line trail to Rideau River Street</li> </ul>
137	<p>The developer shall design and construct 1.8 metre concrete sidewalks on the following streets:</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Dated: September 18, 2020

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. On both sides of all streets with the exception of Street D and streets with a 3.0 metre MUT on one side.</li> <li>b. On streets with a 3.0 metre MUT on one side, a 1.8 metre sidewalk is required on the opposite side of the street.</li> <li>c. On Street D, a 1.8 metre sidewalk is required on one side only, in front of Lots 108 to Lot 128.</li> </ul>	
138	The developer shall design and prepare a pavement marking plan showing 1.5 metre painted bike lanes with a 0.3 metre painted buffer on Pinery Trail, and on Street A from Conservation Drive to Pinery Trail.	Noted
139	In accordance with the Transportation Study, the developer shall prepare a detailed design of the Pinery Trail and Roy Schmidt Road intersection to safely connect the MUT on Roy Schmidt to the buffered bike lanes on Pinery Trail.	Noted
140	Streets with bike lanes may not be able to accommodate on-street parking, due to the width of the road. Bike lanes on Street A will restrict on-street parking for the school and Block 243 (Street Townhouse). Bike lanes on Pinery Trail will restrict on-street parking at the park.	Noted
141	Please provide additional information with respect to the type of traffic control and traffic calming measures planned for the proposed Draft Plan.	To be determined as part of detailed design
142	How will school traffic be accommodated? The area around the school will have limited on-street parking to assist with student drop-off and pick-up.	To be determined as part of detailed design
143	The radius elbow corner on Rideau River Street presents a challenge for winter operations. Please consider modifying this design.	Revised draft plan of subdivision modified to revised curve associated with the extension of Rideau River Street (refer to street design adjacent to Block 1 and 2)
144	Driveway access to Block 251 is recommended from Street A and/or Street E, not from Roy Schmidt Road. The City intends to minimize the number of driveways on Roy Schmidt Road, because the preferred location for the MUT is on the west side of Roy Schmidt Road from Conservation Drive to the existing trail at the north limit of the subdivision; the driveways that conflict with the MUT are limited to Lots 226-242.	Access to Block 30 (formerly Block 251) can be provided from Street 'A'. Street 'E', or Roy Schmidt Drive
145	The developer shall design and construct a pedestrian refuge island and crossing within Conservation Drive at Street H, and at the MUT on Block 254 (Open Space). These are required to facilitate connections to facilities being constructed by the City, including bike lanes on both sides of Conservation Drive, and the MUT on the south side of Conservation Drive	Please note that the design and construction of Conservation Drive is being completed by others. Street 'H' removed from revised draft plan of subdivision.
146	The Street H connection with Conservation Drive is located just west of the proposed roundabout at Beaver Creek Road. Stantec completed a turn lane analysis for all subdivision entrances onto Conservation Drive and Beaver Creek Road. There were four recommendations made from the analysis. In its current location, Street H, will be limited to right-in/right-out (RIRO)	Street 'H' removed from revised draft plan of subdivision

Dated: September 18, 2020



	<p>movement only based on the recommendations outlined in the <i>Update to Transportation Forecast and Left Turn Lane Requirements Technical Memo</i> (Stantec, July 7, 2017). Should the developer maintain the location of Street H an analysis of the RIRO configuration and resulting reassignment of traffic for the proposed operations of the roundabout will need to be completed. Should RIRO not be desirable for Street H, please review the July 7, 2017 Turn Lane Analysis Memo for more intersection spacing options. Options may be investigated to remove Street H and extend Street E from Street F to Conservation Drive.</p>	
147	<p>Please ensure appropriate coordination between the lighting plan for the proposed Draft Plan and the lighting plan for Conservation Drive.</p>	Noted
148	<p>The Beaver Creek Road Sewage Pumping Station must be in place prior to final registration of the Draft Plan and the issuance of any building permits.</p>	Noted
149	<p>The Communal SWM facility must be constructed prior to servicing of the subdivision for water quality control.</p>	Noted
150	<p>The SWM report indicates an additional SWM Report will be submitted for the “off-site” stormwater management. City staff would not be in a position to accept this dual management proposal without further details of the off-site facility as well as securities/assurances that it will be built and available to this development.</p>	Noted. Approval for the off-site facility is being advanced by others
151	<p>Several discussions have been held about the off-site SWM pond concept. A letter has been sent offering options.</p>	Noted
152	<p>If it is determined that the external facility is not feasible or it does not materialize, all SWM controls would be required within the development, requiring significant revisions to the design and layout of the plan.</p>	Noted. Currently, the external facility is required by the NWSSS.
153	<p>The servicing strategy report indicates that matching elevations along the neighbouring properties is a design consideration. The conceptual grading plan includes some significant deviations from existing elevations on adjacent lands, namely a 6.0 metre high retaining wall in the northwest corner of the site and a 2.0 metre high retaining wall along the north property line. This will not be accepted by staff. This grading strategy will effectively preclude development of the adjacent property and will incur significant costs for retaining walls and importing fill. A realistic proposal needs to be provided. Development of the Draft Plan lands must be completed in a way that will not to negatively impact or encumber the adjacent lands.</p>	The grading at the north-west corner is addressed in comment #109. The retaining walls at the north property line have been reduced to the maximum extent possible.