

Town of Shelburne

- Record of Pre-Submission Comments March 2021
- S. Burnett & Associates Ltd. Engineering & Environmental Comments Dated November 4, 2020

Flato Shelburne Development Phase 1

Issued: March 19, 2021

Comment	Response
<p>Please forward the following additional reports :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical Report • John Theaker Municipal Award Drain Erosion Hazard Assessment, Flato Developments Inc., prepared by GeoMorphix, dated December 5, 2018 • Floodplain Hydraulic Analysis Report, Flato Developments Inc., prepared by COLE, dated November 2018 (Revised July 2019) 	<p>Noted. Refer to the submission package.</p>
1. Functional Servicing Report – Flato Shelburne – Phase 1, Town of Shelburne, Prepared by Cole Engineering Group Ltd., Dated December, 2019	
2. Proposed Development	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A SWMP and a park are required to be included in Phase 1. 	<p>An interim SWM pond to service Phase 1 is proposed to be located in the ultimate location, within the Phase 2 lands, that will service both Phase 1 & the future development of Phase 2.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A second entrance needs to be included in the plan for Phase 2. It is anticipated that the future entrance will align with an extension of John street. 	<p>The FSR addresses Phase 1 requirements and a connection to John St is not proposed as part of Phase 1. A connection to John St will be reviewed as part of future developments, including Phase 2.</p>
3.2 Proposed Grading and Road Network	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum slope is to be 4:1 where achievable. A maximum slope of 3:1 is permitted only when necessary. 	<p>Where possible a maximum slope of 4:1 will be used; however, the proposed Phase 1 grades need to be raised compared to existing grades to support the conveyance of storm and sanitary drainage. As a result, a maximum of 3:1 slopes along the perimeter of the site is required to transition to existing grades. 3:1 slopes are also considered to be geotechnically stable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an analysis that the changes to the drain for the SWM facilities will be stable and will maintain the functionality of the drain. 	<p>As per the Floodplain Report, the SWMP do not require changes to the drain. All developments will be controlled post to pre and no increases to the flows to the drain are expected.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split grading of the lots is preferred. 	<p>The existing topography and proposed grades will assist to determine the type of lot grading. Where possible, split grading</p>

Comment		Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed 20m wide ROWs are acceptable, however if required, the minimum width of ROWs can be 18.5m. 	lots will be provided. To be reviewed in greater detail, during detail design. Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The connection of the East and West parcels over the drain would be in line with the Town of Shelburne's secondary plan. 	Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urbanization of Main street up to the entrance to Phase 1 will be required. A portion of this work could be eligible for DC credits. 	Noted. Further discussion with the Town and MTO will be required to confirm the scope of the urbanization. Details to be confirmed as part of detailed design.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 250mm watermain will be required to service the apartment building 	The watermain design has been revised to include a 250mm Watermain to service Phase 1 development.
4.2 Proposed Water Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A hydrant flow test will be required at each phase of the development to confirm available fire flow. 	Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The water demand calculations will be confirmed upon the official submission as changes to the design are anticipated from these preliminary comments. 	Noted.
5.1 Existing Sanitary Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our records show the existing sanitary sewer connection to be PVC. 	Noted.
6.3 Proposed Drainage System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note that an easement will need to be registered in favor of the Town for the proposed swale from the storm sewers to the East SWM pond. 	Noted.
7.1 Stormwater Management Design Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please use the IDF values from the Town of Shelburne Design Guidelines or the MTO website. 	IDF values for Toronto-Milton, from the MTO website, were used in the VO model as requested.

Comment		Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation that a water balance study is not required from the NVCA, is needed. 	Water balance calculations were provided in the Hydrogeology Report by SLR Consulting.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The regional storm should be performed for the watershed west of the rail culvert. 	The Regional Storm was performed in the hydraulic model for the Drain.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmation that the flood line has not increased downstream is required. 	The floodplain report confirms that there is no increased to downstream flood lines.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please confirm the proposed watermain connection locations for the commercial block and the high density residential. 	The service connection to the commercial block and residential block were added to the watermain figure.
Figure No.: WM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design should include a road stub for connection to John street development (all drawings) 	The FSR addresses Phase 1 requirements and a watermain connection to John St will be provided as part of the Phase 2 development.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inverts are not as per design guidelines .03m for 0-45, .06m for 45-90. 	The intent of the FSR is to provide a functional design. The required invert drops will be provided at the detail design stage.
Figure No.: SAN-01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity of sanitary sewers needs to be confirmed for full buildout through Prop. MH201A 	A sanitary design sheet has been included in Appendix C showing sewer capacity.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed swale may need to be placed in future ROW as it will need to be in a dedicated block. 	The proposed temporary swale is located within the development blocks as opposed to the ROW, since construction of the ROW will occur ahead of the lots. Once the ROW is constructed, the temporary swale will be decommissioned. There are however, two locations where the swale needs to be in the ROW.
Figure No.: STM-01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure no erosion potential from the SWMP discharge and it must discharge onto own site. 	During detailed design, appropriate erosion prevention methods will be proposed to ensure no erosion potential from the SWMP discharge. Additionally, the SWMP will discharge onto own site.
Figure No.: DAP-02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The topographic survey of the area east of drainage area A1 is required to ensure no external flows onto the site 	Additional topographical survey will be conducted once the weather permits. We have identified an area on the east side that will be refined once additional topo is available.

Comment		Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The portion of land that is adjacent to Highway 89 may need to be granted to the Town or ministry. County of Shelburne should read Dufferin County What is located at the midpoint of the property line in Block 8 north of the pond? 	<p>The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to reflect the Flato Shelburne Phase 1 Development. Please refer to the submission package.</p>
2. Environmental Impact Study – Flato Shelburne Inc, Prepared by SLR Consulting (Canada) Ltd., Dated January 2020		
3.0 Planning Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please include analysis of the guidelines from A Place to Grow 2019 for your development. 	<p>Consistent with Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 in 'A Place to Grow', aquatic and natural heritage systems will be identified for protection, enhancement or restoration as appropriate.</p>
4.2 Aquatic Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide confirmation that the Rapid Method provided in the Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guideline is acceptable to the NVCA. 	<p>We submitted a Terms of Reference to Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority that included the guidelines for headwater drainage feature evaluation (CVC and TRCA 2014) as a way to characterize flow conditions in on site drainage features. NVCA response to the Terms of Reference made no comment on the proposed method drainage feature characterization, thus implying acceptance.</p>
5.3 Aquatic Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a management plan for the drainage segments to be used during the development construction. 	<p>A swale to convey storm water is included in the EIS. A more detailed management plan for drainage segments used during construction will be developed as part of detailed design.</p>
5.5 Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please provide the June 4th, 2018 Amphibian Survey Results for station 4. 	<p>Amphibian survey results for 4 June 2018 are included in the revised EIS.</p>
Figure No. 4 Ecological Land Classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FOD code is not listed in the table 	<p>Ecological Land Classification code FOD is defined in the revised EIS</p>
6.0 Description of the		Acknowledged

Comment		Response
development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For any improvements to the John Theaker Municipal Drain, a petition to the Town will be required under the Drainage act 	
Figure No. 6 Environmental Constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please confirm which culvert size these models utilize 	Flood lines associated with the environmental constraints were estimated based on replacement of existing railway culvert with twin 3.0m x 1.5m culverts, according to the FSR (IBI 2021).
3. Transportation Impact Study, Prepared by LEA Consulting Ltd., Dated January 2020		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transportation impact study still needs to consider the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed truck bypass route on 4th line internal connection to John Street and the increased traffic along that route the increased traffic due to the Highland village development and IK world traffic volumes pedestrian Accessibility for all phases of the site development subsequent submissions of the traffic impact study will be reviewed by the Town's traffic consultant upon receipt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the potential truck bypass route on 4th Line will likely be addressed in HAMP. The proposed development does not currently have an internal connection to John Street. The TIS has shown the subject site does not require a secondary access. The TIS has been updated to include Hyland and IK World background developments. Pedestrian accessibility is a site plan issue and can be addressed at a later stage.
4. Culvert Replacement on Existing Community Trail letter, Prepared by Cole Engineering Group Ltd., Dated August 12, 2019		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be noted that Walter's Creek downstream of the proposed twin culverts is still considered to be a portion of the drain according to the province and AgMaps. Based on this information it appears that the drainage act still applies for these upgrades. 	Noted.

Comment	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The currently proposed design of twin 1.5 meter high by 3.0 meter wide by 19.0 meter long precast concrete box culverts would place this structure as an asset that would require it to be included in the OSIM reporting for the municipality that owns the infrastructure. This needs to be properly conveyed to Dufferin County in order for their review and comments to be fully informed. 	<p>Noted.</p>
Record of Pre-Submission Consultation – Town of Shelburne	
1. Planning Policies and Required Approvals	
<p>1.1 Application for Official Plan Amendment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate that the proposed OPA is consistent with the PPS and conforms to the Growth Plan, DCOP (subject to the requirement for a related County OPA) and the applicable objectives and policies of the Town OP; Demonstrate land use compatibility with existing land uses in the area (e.g. agricultural uses, existing residential, hydro transmission line, municipal wells); Demonstrate the need for more land to be designated for high density residential and commercial uses and the suitability of the subject land for the proposed uses, and for seniors housing as encompassed within the OP definition of special needs housing and policy 4.2.3.9; Demonstrate that the development will contribute to meeting the residential targets in OP policy 4.2.3.4 c) including housing mix, density and affordable housing; Calculate and comment on the proposed density of development (population and jobs <p>Noted. Refer to the Planning Rationale and Draft County and Town OPA</p>

Comment	Response
	<p>per hectare, and residential units per hectare) in relation to the targets identified in the Official Plan (and the DCOP and Growth Plan) understanding that, if added to the urban area, the subject land would become part of the Designated Greenfield Area (DGA);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the impact of the proposed added DGA and density of development on the ability to achieve and maintain the intensification target within the built-up area; • Review and comment on the affordable housing target and whether any of the proposed seniors housing units will be "affordable" as defined in the PPS and, if so, a strategy for how that will be achieved on the subject land and if Town support is requested or proposed as described in policy 4.2.3.7 and 4.2.3.9, and considering the comments summarized below. • Post meeting update: a meeting with County Planning and Housing staff was held on December 1, 2020. Flato provided an overview of Edgewood Suites in Dundalk where some reductions of the rental prices for new seniors apartments in the development were realized with support from the local municipality involving application fast-tracking and upper-tier municipal support in the form of Development Charges waiver/relief. The definition of "affordable" was discussed, with reference to metrics in the PPS definition which are used by the County and the Town to assess whether proposed housing is "affordable" from a policy perspective and if it contributes to meeting related needs and targets. It was noted that currently there are no formal Town incentive programs such as Development

Comment	Response
<p>1.2 Application for Zoning By-law Amendment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Charges waiver/relief or application fast-tracking for affordable housing projects, and that the Town's Official Plan supports the provision of affordable housing and identifies the related County-wide target (20%). Increasing construction costs and servicing costs for the subject land were noted as challenging factors. The growing waitlist for affordable housing in Dufferin County and the need for seniors housing projects that will reduce that list and more generally the need for housing that is designed and attainable for local seniors were also discussed. Flato stated in the meeting that without incentives, affordable housing as defined by the PPS, County and Town would not be possible for the proposed development. Further, Flato's team clarified that there was a difference between the County's own affordable housing projects and a private development.
<p>1.2 Application for Zoning By-law Amendment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) application is required to re-zone the subject land to appropriate residential and commercial zones that will implement the proposed OPA and any site-specific exceptions or standards required (e.g. height, density, parking, yards/setbacks, coverage, etc.). b) It was noted at the pre-application meeting that a Holding (H) Zone may be considered related to servicing. However, other aspects of the proposed ZBA and related application requirements were not specifically discussed at the pre-application consultation meeting. Further pre-application consultation with the <p>Comments noted.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>Town Planner should be considered prior to submitting a ZBA application to review a preliminary outline of proposed zoning, permitted uses and standards and preliminary site plans for the proposed residential and commercial block developments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • c) The Planning Justification Report will be required to demonstrate that the proposed ZBA conforms with the Town's OP and the related OPA. If approved, the timing for a ZBA to come into effect will depend on the related OPA and its approval by the County which in turn will not come into effect until the related County OPA is approved by the MMAH and in effect. The OPA may be subject to change through the process and the ZBA is required to implement and conform with the final OPA. • d) The timing of a ZBA application impacts the determination of the applicable development charge under the Development Charges (DC) Act (s. 26.2). The cost of certain infrastructure required to service the west area has not been determined and is not included in the Town's current Developments Charges. Therefore, front-ending or DC credit agreements for those services including any oversizing may not be possible unless the timing of a complete ZBA application is deferred to after the DC's are updated to include those costs/services or an agreement is made to address these matters. It is anticipated that there will be an area-rated DC for the west expansion area if/when the land to be serviced by said infrastructure is added to the settlement area boundary through the MCR

	Comment	Response
	<p>and related County/Town OPAs. Where DC's are determined per sections 26 (1) (a) or (b) of the Act, interest charges apply in accordance with the Town's policy established under section 26 (3) of the Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) Based on the above, while an application for ZBA may be made at the same time as the required OPA application, consideration should be given to deferring the ZBA application until land use designations and policies are established through the related OPA, the size/ dimensions and configuration of the development blocks and access location(s) are determined through the Draft Plan application process, servicing costs are determined and DC's are updated accordingly to provide the infrastructure required to facilitate development on the west side, and the site plan details for each block development are determined through the required Site Plan Applications. 	
1.3 Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision	<p>a) It was noted at the pre-application meeting that a Draft Plan of Subdivision will be required to create the proposed blocks and future street right-of-way for the proposed development, and that certain servicing requirements can be established through conditions of approval. However, Draft Plan of Subdivision matters and related application requirements were not specifically discussed at the pre-application consultation meeting. Further pre-application consultation with the Town may be needed to</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>review the Draft Plan application requirements in conjunction with the required ZBA.</p> <p>b) The Planning Justification Report will be required to address the criteria in section 51(24) of the Planning Act and demonstrate that the proposed Draft Plan is in keeping with the applicable OP policies and specifically the policies for the applicable land use designations identified in the related OPA and policies 5.3.9 and 8.3.1. The Draft Plan shall include the contents prescribed by the Planning Act (s. 51(17)).</p> <p>c) The Planning Justification Report shall assess parkland needs for the proposed development and describe how parkland dedication requirements are proposed to be addressed.</p> <p>d) An application for Draft Plan of Subdivision may be made in advance of a related ZBA application. The Town's standard Draft Plan conditions require the approval of a ZBA to establish appropriate zones for the land subject to the Draft Plan prior to final approval.</p>	
2. Transportation Impact Study, Prepared by LEA Consulting Ltd., Dated January 2020	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The transportation impact study still needs to consider the following items: o the proposed truck bypass route on 4th line internal connection to John Street and the increased traffic along that route the increased traffic due to the Highland village development and IK world traffic volumes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of the potential truck bypass route on 4th Line will likely be addressed in HAMP. The proposed development does not currently have an internal connection to John Street. The TIS has shown the subject site does not require a secondary access.

Comment		Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pedestrian Accessibility for all phases of the site development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TIS has been updated to include Hyland and IK World background developments. Pedestrian accessibility is a site plan issue and can be addressed at a later stage.
3. Environment / Natural Heritage and Hazards		
a)	<p>The Town Planner provided an overview of Schedule "E" of the Official Plan which shows the general location and extent of mapped natural heritage features and natural hazards in the vicinity of the subject land including local wetlands, woodlands and valleylands as well as flood plain and erosion hazard limits associated with the Theaker Drain. The mapping was provided by the NVCA as part of the last OP update (OPA 34). Some updates to the Natural Heritage System (NHS) mapping and policies are anticipated as part of the MCR process.</p>	<p>Acknowledged and included as part of the revised EIS.</p>
b)	<p>An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is required to assess potential impacts to the natural heritage features (including water resources), buffering and other mitigation and enhancement requirements, and any monitoring requirements. The scope and Terms of Reference for the EIS are to be confirmed with the NVCA. Flato to provide a draft Terms of Reference for review by the NVCA and the Town.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. A Terms of Reference was submitted to NVCA on December 8, 2020 and comments received on December 17, 2020. The EIS has been updated to address comments.</p>
c)	<p>Post meeting update: Flato representatives advised that a Terms of Reference was submitted to the NVCA and that EIS will be completed according to the Terms of Reference.</p>	<p>Agreed, works will be completed under a NVCA permit.</p>

	Comment	Response
	<p>The subject land is within the regulation limit of the NVCA which reflects a wetland and buffer as shown on a map displayed by the NVCA during the meeting (Attachment E). A NVCA permit will be required prior to any development or site alteration.</p>	
<p>d)</p>	<p>The NVCA noted that the west development limit of the Phase 1 area shown on the Concept Plan does not appear to correspond with the wetland and hazard limits shown on the NVCA mapping. The limits of development and required buffers will need to be reviewed and confirmed through the EIS. NVCA recommended that some of this information/study be submitted for review in advance of applications to map out the developable limits. The hazards assessment will be required to follow the NVCA's technical hazard guidelines. Flato representatives noted that Flato's team determined the development limits, natural feature boundaries and modelling of the flood lines in the context of the planned upgrades to the culvert under the former railway line/trail to the east.</p>	<p>The hazard assessments were completed by Geo Morphix and included in IBI's submission package.</p>
<p>e)</p>	<p>Development is generally not permitted within the floodplain. The proposed high density residential uses / seniors housing would not be permitted within the flood plain area. Flato's consultants have completed modelling work for the proposed culvert replacement project along the former rail corridor which shows that some of the backwater effects would be relieved and can alter the floodplain. Flato confirmed the development will be outside of the floodplain.</p>	<p>Acknowledge, proposed development will occur outside of the floodplain.</p>
<p>f)</p>		<p>Multi-season studies were performed as per ToR and</p>

Comment		Response
	Multi-season studies are being completed by Flato's consultants for terrestrial, birds and amphibians and for the watercourse features and all of that information will be analyzed and included in the EIS for NVCA review.	information and analysis is included as part of the revised EIS.
g)	It was noted that the NVCA also reviews stormwater management reports and plans and that a Stormwater Management facility is not identified on the Phase 1 Concept Plan. Flato's consultants described the intent to provide a SWM facility on the Phase 2 land to the north-east of Phase 1 with an interim drainage channel/swale until the storm sewer system is provided for the larger subdivision development in the future phases. On site controls may also be identified for the residential and commercial blocks.	Acknowledged. IBI developed stormwater management plans and reports. Information related to this comment are included as part of IBI's submission package.
4. Servicing		
a)	Water service connection options were discussed and Flato described the intent to connect to existing watermain along Main Street West with one connection at the future street location and to have the commercial and residential blocks connect to the new watermain with internal looping	The watermain figure WM-01 has be revised to reflect this option. A watermain connection is to be made to the existing 400mm watermain on Hwy 89
b)	<p>Potential sanitary sewer connection options were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal for a north connection to the existing gravity sewer in the Cedar Hills Subdivision requires a sewer crossing of the former rail corridor and private property to the east of the corridor. The possibility of connecting to the existing sanitary sewer and pumping station in the Hyland Village development was 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connecting to the existing Cedar Hills sanitary sewer is the preferred sanitary option. Refer to figure SAN-01 and SAN-02 showing the proposed sanitary alignment.

	Comment	Response
	<p>discussed. The service area and existing and planned forcemain for Hyland Village and the service area for the pumping station were described. The design of the pumping station did not consider the subject land. It was noted that connection to the sanitary pumping station would require completion of additional forcemain through other private property east of Hyland Village, additional sanitary sewer along Highway 89 which would be subject to MTO approval, and expansion of the pumping station capacity. There is also an area-rated DC for the pumping station service area that would need to be amended if additional area is to be added to the service area and design capacity of the station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was discussed that some follow-up technical discussions may be helpful to review the sanitary servicing options further, and that the Town's 2003 MSP contemplated the land north of Highway 89 to be serviced via the north trunk sewer. It was noted that there is a bottleneck in the north trunk sewer at the Highway 10 crossing that will need to be addressed for additional flows directed to that trunk sewer. • Flato requested further review of the proposal of using the existing sewers to the east for an additional flow of 8.11 L/S that would be required for the Phase One (1) development. <p>Updates to the Town's 2003 MSP will be required to establish a comprehensive servicing strategy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Hyland Village sanitary servicing option is not feasible. Further investigation into this option is not required. • The sanitary sewer crossing at Highway 10 was identified as a constraint and the location is shown on figure SAN-02. Further consultation with the Town is required to confirm the size and length of sewer to be replaced, as well as if there is a need to replace other existing external sanitary sewers. • The updated Phase 1 sanitary flow to reflect the current Draft Plan is 6.46 l/s as noted in Table 5.1 of the FSR.

Comment		Response
	for the west side, including sanitary servicing, water servicing and stormwater management.	Noted
c)	<p>Environmental Assessments (EAs) are in process to plan for future capacity needs for water supply and wastewater treatment as well as a Master Servicing Plan (MSP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reserve servicing capacity is not currently available for the proposed development of the subject land and more generally for land outside of the current urban area. The ability to service the proposed development in the future will be dependent on future upgrades and re-rating of the WPCP as well as increased water supply and the MSP. <p>The Assimilative Capacity Study (ACS) was approved by MECP and that comments were received from the NVCA and SBA is working through the comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We ask the Town to kindly confirm the timing to complete the EAs for water supply and wastewater as well as the MSP. Available reserve servicing capacity is to be reviewed after the Town completes the current flow monitoring and the Sewage Capacity Allocation Report is made available. Noted
d)	<p>The potential timing for completion of the WPCP EA and upgrades was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SBA outlined the estimated timing as approximately Q1 2021 for the EA and after that the timing of upgrades will depend on a funding strategy and decisions by Council. Subject to a funding strategy is determined the estimated timeline is 1 year for design work and 18 to 24 months for construction of the WPCP upgrades. <p>SBA noted that the design work has not been budgeted for 2021.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We ask the Town to kindly provide an update on the timing to complete the EA and current funding strategies being considered. We understand there is limited allocation available which could apply to Phase1. Future phasing to be taken into account as part of the WPCP upgrades. Flato is willing to discuss upfronting their share of Development Charges in support of advancing the design and construction of the WPCP.
e)	<p>The Growth Plan (policy 2.2.8.5 (d)) requires that the settlement area to be expanded is serviced by municipal water and wastewater systems and that there is sufficient reserve infrastructure</p>	<p>We ask the Town to kindly provide an update on the status of the circulation.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>capacity to service the land to be added to the settlement area. Ministry staff advised that the MECP would need to be involved in discussions regarding the information required to satisfy this policy – i.e. what studies/approvals are required or what status do such studies/approvals need to have to satisfy this policy to demonstrate reserve infrastructure capacity. It was noted that the required County OPA for a settlement area expansion would be circulated by MMAH to partner Ministries including MECP for review and comment</p>	<p>Flato noted that there was discussion about whether there may be servicing capacity available that could be borrowed for Phase 1 until the water and wastewater EAs are completed and additional capacity is provided. This has been considered and as outlined below, there is no remaining reserve capacity available to borrow within the current rated capacity of the WPCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most recent summary of remaining wastewater treatment capacity within the current rated capacity of the WPCP is provided in a report prepared by SBA regarding Sewage Capacity Allocation Year End 2019, dated July 8, 2020. • The report identifies that 219 m3/day or 6.4% of the current rated capacity of the WPCP remained unallocated based on available flow data and approved developments to year end 2019, which could accommodate an estimated 268 residential units or 7.82 hectares of gross floor area for industrial/commercial/institutional (ICI) development. • The report also shows a shortfall in remaining WPCP capacity of more than
<p>7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available reserve servicing capacity is to be reviewed after the Town completes the current flow monitoring and the Sewage Capacity Allocation Report is made available.

Comment		Response
	<p>300 m³/day relative to estimated servicing capacity needs of anticipated future development on remaining land within the current urban area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since the capacity analysis was completed in July 2020, the Town has received applications for approximately 325 residential units of which 10 units have been formally allocated / committed through development approvals, as well as 1 hectare of ICI gross floor area of which 0.4 hectare has been formally allocated. <p>Based on the most recent estimate of remaining capacity, any new development that is additional to approved and in-process applications will be dependent on future upgrades and re-rating of the WPCP.</p>	
g)	<p>Functional servicing, stormwater management, geotechnical and other engineering studies and information will be required for the proposed development applications. Financial viability and sustainability of the required infrastructure must also be demonstrated, and it is anticipated that the ability to complete this justification will depend on completed EA's and the TMP / HAMP, future DC updates and potential grant funding opportunities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Phase 1 Functional Servicing Report (FSR) is provided to address servicing, stormwater management, geotechnical and other engineering studies, and this study concludes that it is feasible to provide municipal services to Phase 1. The EAs, HAMP, future DC updates and potential grant funding opportunities will be addressed as part of the work being completed. <p>The Town is working towards completing the HAMP and the Flato team is available to assist as needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Phase 1 and 2 Environmental Site Assessments have been completed.
h)	<p>Phase 1 and 2 Environmental Site Assessment / Record of Site Condition required.</p>	<p>The Record of Site Condition is in the process of being completed and will be provided as a condition of the plan of subdivision.</p>

Comment		Response
4. Culvert Replacement on Existing Community Trail letter, Prepared by Cole Engineering Group Ltd., Dated August 12, 2019		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be noted that Walter's Creek downstream of the proposed twin culverts is still considered to be a portion of the drain according to the province and AgMaps. Based on this information it appears that the drainage act still applies for these upgrades. 	Noted.
	The currently proposed design of twin 1.5 meter high by 3.0 meter wide by 19.0 meter long precast concrete box culverts would place this structure as an asset that would require it to be included in the OSIM reporting for the municipality that owns the infrastructure. This needs to be properly conveyed to Dufferin County in order for their review and comments to be fully informed.	Discussions were had with the County of Dufferin's consultant RJ Burnside regarding including these culverts as an asset to the County of Dufferin. The culvert submission was circulated to the County of Dufferin and their comments are still pending.
Dufferin County Comments – March 17, 2021		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and Dufferin County Official Plan as they relate to the expansion of settlement areas and servicing requirements within settlement areas; land use compatibility with existing land uses in the area including MDS requirements; that the lands proposed to be added to the Town of Shelburne Settlement Area are 	Noted. refer to the Planning rationale.

Comment		Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• necessary to accommodate forecasted growth;• the full extent of lands proposed to be added to the Town of Shelburne Settlement Area in the form of a sketch or map; and• if the proposal is to be described as affordable housing, how it will meet the definition of “affordable” found in the Provincial Policy Statement and County Official Plan.	