



SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES

November 19, 2024

File No. 20200

Planning and Development Department
County of Wellington
74 Woolwich Street
Guelph, ON
N1H 3T9

Attn: Meagan Ferris
Manager of Planning and Environment

**Re: Application for Plan of Subdivision (File No. 23T-24001)
Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
Part of Lot 23, Concession 7 (Geographic Township of Erin)**

Dear Ms. Ferris:

On behalf of our client, Thomasfield Homes Ltd., GSP Group (“GSP”) is pleased to re-submit the enclosed Application for Plan of Subdivision for development proposed on the above-noted property (the “Property”) in the Hillsburgh Urban Area in the Town of Erin. A concurrent application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law has been submitted to the Town of Erin.

The applications regarding the proposed development were originally submitted on March 21, 2024. The County declined to deem the original Application for Plan of Subdivision “complete” and issued an Acknowledgement of Application letter, dated May 28, 2024, which indicated that additional materials would need to be submitted to the Town of Erin before the County would consider this application complete. (A copy of the Acknowledgement of Application letter has been attached, for your reference.)

Accordingly, please find attached to this letter a Comment Response Table, which addresses the matters raised in the Complete Application Screening Comments letter issued by the Town on June 4, 2024, in respect of the applications for the proposed development. The comments included in the table are those received from the Town of Erin, from the Town’s engineering and urban design consultants (Ainley & Associates and The Planning Partnership, respectively), and from Credit Valley Conservation (“CVC”).

PLANNING | URBAN DESIGN | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

72 Victoria St. S., Suite 201, Kitchener, ON, N2G 4Y9
162 Locke St. S., Suite 200, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4A9
gspgroup.ca

The re-submitted applications are accompanied by the original application materials, with revisions and modifications as needed, as well as additional materials requested by the Town and County. The enclosed materials comprise the following:

- the signed Application for Plan of Subdivision form, accompanied by a signed copy of the County's Public Consultation Strategy Form;
- Instrument No. WC474774, being the Land Transfer from the previous owner to Thomasfield Homes Limited;
- the Abbreviated Parcel Register for PIN 71143-0459 (LT);
- a list of the landowners and mailing addresses of all properties within 120 metres of the Property, prepared by Town of Erin Planning Staff;
- Plan of Survey of the Property, prepared by Van Harten Surveying Inc.;
- four (4) copies of the Draft Plan of Subdivision for the proposed development;
- a revised Planning Justification Report, prepared by GSP;
- a revised Environmental Impact Study, prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. ("NRSI"), which includes (as Appendix VI) a Tree Preservation Plan, also prepared by NRSI;
- a revised Functional Servicing Report, prepared by GM BluePlan Engineering ("GMBP"), now known as GEI Consultants, Inc. ("GEI"), which includes (as Appendix "A") the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared by V.A. Wood (Guelph) Inc.;
- revised Engineering Drawings (Existing Conditions Plan, Constraints Plan, Overall Servicing Plans, Grading Plans, SWM Pond Profile, SWM Pond Sections and Details, Storm Sewer Catchment Areas, Sanitary Sewer Catchment Areas, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, and Sewage Pumping Station Concept Plan), prepared by GMBP/GEI;
- a revised Hydrogeological Study, prepared by GMBP/GEI;
- a revised Urban Design Brief, prepared by GSP;
- Noise Feasibility Study, prepared by HGC Engineering;
- Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, prepared by AMICK Consultants Limited, accompanied by the acknowledgement letter from the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism;
- Transportation Impact Study, prepared by Salvini Consulting;
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared for this resubmission by GEI;
- Slope Stability Study, prepared for this resubmission by JLP Services Inc.; and
- a draft Operation & Maintenance Manual for the proposed SWM facility, prepared for this resubmission by GMBP/GEI.

In addition, please find enclosed one (1) cheque payable to the County of Wellington in the amount of **\$29,940** for the Application for Plan of Subdivision fee.

Digital versions of all items listed above, including an AutoCAD-compatible version of the proposed Plan of Subdivision and a scanned copy of the cheque, have been submitted by e-mail to landdivisioninfo@wellington.ca.

We look forward to working with the Town of Erin and County of Wellington on these applications. If you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me (hhandy@gspgroup.ca, or by telephone at 226-243-7296) or Patrick Casey (pcasey@gspgroup.ca, or by telephone at 226-499-6769) of this office.

Yours truly,
GSP Group Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Hugh Handy". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Hugh Handy, MCIP, RPP
Vice President

cc. Deborah Turchet, Development and Administration Supervisor, County of Wellington
David Waters, Manager of Planning & Development, Town of Erin
Tom McLaughlin, Thomasfield Homes Ltd.

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
November 19, 2024

Comments from the Town of Erin

Comment	Response
Town staff have identified the outstanding items as per the attached Application Submission Checklist are as follows	
- Elevation drawings	As explained in the Urban Design Brief, the design of the proposed development will be consistent with the Town's Urban Design Guidelines. Elevation drawings and more specific details will be determined and confirmed as part of the detailed design stage.
- Landscape drawings/cost estimate	The overall landscape approach will be consistent with the Town's Urban Design Guidelines. Detailed landscape drawings and cost estimates will be provided during the detailed design stage.
- Arborist Report	A Tree Protection Plan ("TPP") is included as Appendix VI to the EIS. The TPP meets the requirements established for the "Arborist Report" (see response below).
- Construction Management plan	The Functional Servicing Report addresses construction insofar as it pertains to erosion and sedimentation control. Further details will be confirmed during the detailed design stage and administered through conditions of draft approval.
- Lighting/photometric plan	Lighting for the proposed development will be designed to comply with the Town's Urban Design Guidelines, to be confirmed through the detailed design process.

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from the Town of Erin

Comment	Response
<p>- Waste Management plan</p>	<p>Details regarding waste management, presumably relating to the proposed multi-residential block, will be addressed and confirmed through a future Site Plan Application submitted for development on that block.</p>
<p>- Compatibility study</p>	<p>The required study, identified on the Submission Checklist as “Compatibility Study (i.e. Noise, Vibration, Air, MDS),” has been provided in the form of a Noise Feasibility Study.</p>
<p>- Source Water Protection Analysis</p>	<p>The Property does not overlap any Intake Protection Zones (“IPZs”) or Wellhead Protection Areas (“WHPAs”). Much of the Property is identified as overlying Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (“HVA”) with a Vulnerability Score of 6 and Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (“SGRA”).</p> <p>Implications of these vulnerable area designations are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHPAs – None (no WHPAs). • IPZs – None (no IPZs). • SGRA – None. (No policies attributed to SGRA, though there may be a blanket/ general municipal policy regarding maintaining recharge.) • HVA – Road salt (handling/storage or application) is a listed threat activity in HVA(6). <p>Based on the above, it is recommended that the conditions of Draft Plan Approval include a condition that requires the preparation of a Salt Management Plan.</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
November 19, 2024

Comments from Development Engineering (Ainley & Associates)

Comment	Response
<p>An Arborist Report should be included to assess the health of the trees and provide recommendations for tree protection/removal. The Environmental Impact Study identifies butternut trees are within the limits of the subject site and/or the proposed site development will impact the environment of butternut trees.</p>	<p>The TPP includes the required content identified here. The TPP also directs the reader to the EIS for detailed results of the Butternut Health Assessments and details specific to <i>Endangered Species Act, 2007</i> provisions regarding butternut trees.</p>
<p>A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and a Phase 2 ESA should be completed and submitted with the purpose of leading to a Record of Site Condition.</p>	<p>A Phase 1 ESA has been completed and is included with this re-submission. The Phase 1 ESA has found that no further investigation is recommended at this time.</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Urban Design (The Planning Partnership)

Comment	Response
<p>1. Site Plan</p> <p>A site plan for Block 145 – Multi-residential has not been provided, either as a separate plan or in the Urban Design Brief. In order to review the urban design elements / attributes of this block, we would require information regarding the arrangement of the site, the built form (massing, orientation, etc.), access, parking and loading areas and how the proposal would address the three public street frontages, as well as the gateway corner (see #5 below).</p>	<p>A concept plan for Block 145 is provided as Figure 6 in the Planning Justification Report (“PJR”).</p>
<p>2. Elevation Drawings</p> <p>Elevation drawings for the single-detached dwellings, street townhouse dwellings and multi-residential block have not been provided. The urban design brief includes a number of statements about the future design of the single-detached and street townhouse dwellings but does not provide any visual examples such as elevation drawings and/or images of dwelling models which show the quality and architectural expression of the dwellings (form, styles, materials, etc.) in order to demonstrate how these statements would be achieved.</p>	<p>The design of the proposed development will be consistent with the Town’s Urban Design Guidelines. Elevation drawings and more specific details will be provided during the detailed design stage.</p>
<p>3. Landscape Plans & Details</p> <p>A concept plan for Block 146 – Park has been included in the Urban Design Brief, however, information regarding the overall landscape approach, including streetscaping, walkways, fencing, etc. has not been provided and is necessary to assess the intended character of the public realm.</p>	<p>The overall landscape approach will be consistent with the Town’s Urban Design Guidelines, with more specific details to be determined and confirmed as part of the detailed design stage.</p>
<p>4. Landscape Cost Estimates</p> <p>Landscape cost estimates have not been provided however, these are not required for the urban design review.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Urban Design (The Planning Partnership)

Comment	Response
Based upon review of the Urban Design Brief, the following information should be provided:	
<p>5. For Block 149 – Pumping Station</p> <p>The intersection of Wellington County Road and proposed Street A is the main entrance to the subdivision and as such should be considered a primary gateway location. The proposed pumping station in this location will need to be carefully considered within this gateway context. In order to assess the urban design merits of this arrangement, a concept plan and drawings should be provided; they should show, at a minimum, the layout of the block, the landscaping, and the design of the structure in combination with the proposed streetscape and the design at and within the adjacent corner of block 145.</p>	<p>A concept plan for the sanitary pumping station on Block 149 has been provided as Figure 9 in the PJR.</p>
<p>6. Pedestrian Circulation / Connectivity</p> <p>In order to assess pedestrian connectivity, a pedestrian circulation plan should be provided. The street cross sections show sidewalks within the right-of-way; these should be identified on the Concept Plan. As well, any trails and trail connections should also be identified.</p>	<p>A Pedestrian Connectivity Plan has been provided as Figure 5 in the Urban Design Brief (“UDB”).</p>
<p>7. Views and Vistas</p> <p>Views and vistas to landscapes and natural areas are one of the defining attributes that should be considered in all new developments. In order to understand how this has been addressed in the proposed development, a plan should be provided that identifies these features and/or landscapes.</p>	<p>Section 5.2.12 of the UDB discusses “Priority Lots” — Gateway Lots, Corner Lots, View Terminus Lots, and Elbow Lots — with respect to view corridors in the proposed development.</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
General	
1. A drawing should be provided and labeled appropriately which shows the limit of all natural and hazardous features, their associated buffers, and the proposed limit of development as well as the proposed development. The drawing should be submitted separately from the reports/studies.	<p>The following layers have been added to NRSI's Proposed Development Map (Map 5 of EIS):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top of Bank Buffer (10m); • CVC Vegetation Limit Buffer (10m). <p>Map 5 also includes the following layers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top of Bank (CVC 2023); • Woodland/Forest Dripline (NRSI 2023); • Woodland Buffers; • CVC Vegetation Limit (CVC 2023).
2. It is recommended that the appropriate restrictive zoning be placed over all lands beyond the approved limit of development (natural hazards) including buffers and placed into public ownership for long term protection and maintenance.	The Open Space buffer (Block 147) will have appropriately restrictive zoning that prohibits the construction of any building or structure (including accessory structures).
3. A response matrix should be provided outlining how comments have been addressed.	This is the response matrix referred to in this comment.
4. A CVC permit is required for the development as proposed.	The proponent acknowledges that a permit will be required for any development proposed in the CVC regulated area.
Hydrogeology	
Geological Characterization and Groundwater Conditions	
5. The occurrence of a wetland feature(s) downgradient of the site (part of the West Credit River Provincially Significant Wetland Complex) has	The Hydrogeological Study figures have been updated to show the Provincially Significant Wetland ("PSW"), and the report

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
not been discussed or referenced in the hydrogeological study. Please indicate the feature(s) on mapping and reference accordingly.	updated to address potential impacts. Impacts on the PSW are not expected, as these have already been considered generally in the impact assessment for the Erin Branch of the Credit River.
Proposed Mitigation Plan	
6. Please clarify how the mitigation volumes were derived and how the depth /volumes compare with the components of the pre-development water balance at the site level.	The mitigation volumes are discussed in Section 5 of the Functional Servicing Report (“FSR”).
7. The Functional Servicing Report (FSR) incorrectly references the water balance criteria. Because the infiltration is predicted to be reduced in the post-development condition (i.e. mitigation required), a third water balance table – post-development with mitigation - should be presented to demonstrate how Low Impact Development (LID) measures can be applied to restore the pre-development infiltration condition. This table should incorporate the proposed LID and show how / where it can be applied to increase the infiltration lost on the post-development water balance.	The post-development water balance with and without mitigation has been discussed in Section 5 of the FSR and detailed in Appendix “F” to that report.
8. The mitigation plan / LID proposal outlined in the FSR must be supported by design components (calculations describing the capacity / sizing), which in turn should reflect the mitigation outlined in the (site-based) post-development with mitigation water balance.	The Infiltration Gallery Sizing Calculations are included in Appendix “F” to the FSR and are reflected in the water balance tables (also included in Appendix “F”).

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
<p>9. Please demonstrate that the proposed mitigation measures are practically applicable and implementable. For LID submissions, the following considerations are generally required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LID implementation must comply with guidance issued by the MECP / CVC; • The specific LID measure must be compatible with site conditions i.e. geology, soil type, groundwater elevation etc.; and • Design specifications for the infiltration measure must meet the LID Guidelines to be considered a practical solution. 	<p>The proposed infiltration galleries have been compared to the MECP / CVC guidelines in Section 4.3 of the FSR.</p>
Wetland Water Balance	
<p>10. The FSR and the hydrogeology study should reference the same content consistently, particularly with respect to the identification of natural features and the requirement for water balance work. The existence, location and significance of the natural features and the requirements for water balance work should be referenced (and cross-referenced) in all relevant documents.</p>	<p>The FSR and Hydrogeology Study have been revised to make consistent references to the same content.</p>
<p>11. Please clarify how the depth /volumes in the post-development phase compare with that of the pre-development phase of the assessed wetland.</p>	<p>The volume of runoff in the post-development phase has been compared to the pre-development phase in the wetland water balance discussed in Section 5 of the FSR and details provided in Appendix "F" to that report.</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
Construction Dewatering Plan	
12. Prior to commencement of dewatering, water level measurements should be obtained from all on-site monitoring wells to verify the assumed high seasonal groundwater levels used in the calculations. If significant variation is found to occur, the dewatering volume calculations may have to be reviewed and updated.	The monitoring program has been updated to include initial monitoring of on-site monitoring wells to confirm the validity of construction dewatering estimates.
13. The proponent must ensure and demonstrate that the proposed measures to mitigate impacts are not only implemented, but closely monitored to ensure efficiency and efficacy. This applies both to the protection of the Erin Branch, its environs and to private well user identified within the zone of influence.	Acknowledged. The Contractor will be held responsible for the implementation of the dewatering and discharge plan. GEI will provide on-site inspection to confirm that the discharge plan is being followed and monitoring is being completed.
14. The dewatering plan should detail the arrangement for removing the extracted (dewatered) groundwater from the work area. The material has not identified the proposed location to which this water will ultimately be discharged / disposed of. This location needs to be clarified and subject to review as soon as possible. Where the local sewer system is considered, a permit or application to the town may be required.	Acknowledged. This level of detail will be provided in a "water-taking and discharge report" prepared according to O. Reg. 63/16 for construction dewatering. That report will be submitted as part of the final engineering design and approval process.
Engineering	
General	
15. All drawings and reports should be signed and sealed by a professional engineer.	Drawings and reports have been signed and sealed.

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
16. The outfall locations are to be investigated by CVC staff on site for the potential presence of erosion hazard.	Acknowledged.
17. Please explain why 2 outfalls are proposed.	Two outfalls have been proposed to recreate and match pre-development recharge conditions as much as is feasible with the east property line elevation constraints. This is discussed in Section 5.5 of the FSR.
Functional Servicing Report (FSR)	
18. Figure 4 is missing the post development drainage area plan. Please provide the post development drainage area plan in the FSR.	Figure 4 has been included in the revised FSR.
19. Please include a summary table with pre-development target flows, the post development-controlled flows and post development uncontrolled flows for each storm event.	The FSR has been updated to include summary tables to the west farm field, woodlot/right-of-way, and overall from site with comparisons of the pre-development, uncontrolled post-development, and controlled post-development flows for each storm event.
20. Quantity sizing: Please provide a permanent pool volume reflecting the required permanent pool volume or provide the monthly turnover calculations using monthly precipitation data (including summer months) to support the provided permanent pool volume.	Sufficient permanent pool volumes have been provided to achieve an enhanced level of treatment, as described in Section 5.4 of the FSR.

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
21. Please include a summary table of the water balance in the FSR with pre-development, post development and post development with mitigation volumes. Please include inputs (such as precipitation) and outputs (such as infiltration, runoff, ET etc.) in each scenario.	The water balance summary tables for pre-development, post-development and post-development with mitigation have been included in Appendix "F" to the FSR with the inputs and outputs of each scenario. Summary tables of the Site Water Balance and Wetland Contributing Water Balance have been included in Section 6 of the revised FSR.
22. With the detailed design submission, an operation and maintenance manual for the wetland SWM facility should be submitted for review.	A draft operation and maintenance manual for the wetland SWM facility has been included with this re-submission.
Engineering Drawings	
23. Drawing #10 is missing the labelling of ID 200. Also, the identification of these catchment areas is not matching the areas with section 5.2 of the FSR. Please revise and ensure consistency with the drawings and report.	Drawing 10 has been relabelled as "Storm Sewer Catchment Areas Plan" to clarify its intention, in contrast to the stormwater management design catchments in the FSR.
24. Both outlet pipes from the pond are 300mm diameter in size while the requirement as per MOE manual (2003) Table 4.7 is min 450mm. Please explain the need for the 450mm diameter.	Outlet pipes have been revised to be 450mm diameter in accordance with the 2003 MOE Manual.
25. ESC Drawings: Construction staging drawings have not yet been submitted for review. Please include with your next submission. Please refer to the drawing checklist provided on Table 8.2 of ESC Guide for Urban Construction (TRCA, 2019) and submit the appropriate drawings for all four stages of the development. Stage 1: Topsoil stripping, grading and destabilization; Stage 2: Site servicing; Stage 3:	The ESC drawings have been updated to show the preliminary construction dewatering details and staging notes. Further details related to construction staging will be determined and provided as part of the detailed engineering design and approval process.

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
Building Construction and Stage 4: Final stabilization and decommissioning.	
26. Dewatering measures are not discussed in the SWM Report or shown in the ESC plan. Please confirm and provide the required dewatering plan.	The ESC drawings have been updated to show the preliminary construction dewatering details and notes.
27. Please provide erosion and sediment control pond sizing calculations on the drawing.	Sizing calculations for the erosion and sediment control pond have been included in the revised FSR.
Site servicing plan drawing 3	
28. Concentrated flows are released at one point at outfall 2. A 14.5m long 300mm diameter perforated pipe is shown at the end of outfall 2 to dissipate energy down the slope towards the woodlot. Please show the associated calculations for this structure in the appendix.	The outlet calculations have been included in the appendices to the FSR.
Appendix C (SWM Calculations)	
29. The following sizing calculations will be required for the detailed SWM design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculations for major system flow conveyance capacity • Spillway capacity • Outfall design (size, orifice etc.) 	Calculations for major system flow conveyance capacity has been included in the revised FSR. Details of the weir and outfall have been included in the appendix to the revised FSR.
30. Hydrologic modelling is submitted in support of the proposed SWM design and sizing of the wet pond/wetland facility. However, the overflow feature is turned off in the VO model, please clarify.	Instead of the overflow feature, the flow diversion function has been applied in the VO model. The flow diversion contained overflow to the wetland north of the site.

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
Pond (wetland facility) Design	
31. The following are comments relating to the detailed design of the pond (wetland facility):	
a. Please be consistent with the terms used for this SWM facility. It is mentioned as both a pond and as a wetland facility throughout the report and drawings.	The FSR has been revised to consistently refer to the SWM facility.
b. In the FSR under section 3.4 (ground water) it is mentioned that the clay liner is required as per Hydrogeological study and should be confirmed by the Geotech. Please confirm if this is a requirement.	Yes, a clay liner is a requirement. This will be further refined and additional details will be provided as part of the detailed engineering design and approval process.
c. Details of the ditch inlet catch basin and the control manholes (invert elevations, orifice sizes) should be provided with the detailed design.	Details of the outlet controls have been included in the revised drawings and FSR.
d. Please confirm whether partial blockage of the outlet was considered within the design assuming 50% blockage.	The revised FSR includes a 100-year scenario with 50% blockage of orifices to ensure the stormwater management facility will still contain the storage volume. Assuming 50% blockage during all design storm events would release excess flows during the lower design storm events if the outlet is not blocked.
e. Confirm that the emergency spillway can safely convey the greater of uncontrolled Regional and 100-year flow to the downstream channel supported by calculations.	Details of the weir have been included in the appendix to the revised FSR.
f. In accordance with CVC's stormwater management criteria, the outlet invert should be located above the 25-year water level in the	The existing roadside ditch has a slope of approximately 15% at the outlet and

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
channel otherwise; a tailwater influence must be accounted for in the sizing of the SWM facility.	therefore tailwater influences are not anticipated to be a concern.
g. Please include the details of the outfall on drawings and appropriate sizing calculations in the appendix of the FSR.	Details of the outfall structures have been included in the revised drawings and stormwater management analysis, and the outlet sizing has been included in the revised FSR.
32. As per Table 9 of the FSR, the existing woodlot will not get any flow from 2-5yr (frequent events). Table 13 from the same FSR shows flows in pre and post development conditions. Also, if the woodlot is not getting flows from the site during minor events how would the woodlot/wetland get recharged that is initially received from the 6.86ha area runoff as sheet flow?	A discussions of the balancing of flows to the existing woodlot, as well as elevation constraints along the east property line, has been included in Section 5.5 of the FSR.
Water Balance	
33. Please provide the scenarios of pre-development, post development without mitigation and post development with mitigation in the appendix for both overall Waterbalance and for FBWB.	The FSR includes water balance scenarios of pre-development, post-development without mitigation and post-development with mitigation in Appendix "F".
Ecology	
Feature Based Water Balance	
34. The reports submitted differ in their reference to and assessment of the regulated wetlands. Please align the plans and ensure that all wetlands have been considered in the water balance and feature based water balance assessments. A data request to CVC should be made to obtain wetland mapping.	The EIS, FSR, and Hydrogeological Study have been aligned to ensure all water balance and feature-based water balance ("FBWB") data are reported accurately and consistently. The FBWB risk evaluation and ecological impacts analysis have been

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
	<p>revised, with a detailed discussion provided in Section 7.4.3 of the EIS.</p> <p>NRSI acquired CVC's 2022 ELC mapping through their Open Data portal and have incorporated that data into the EIS (see Map 2 & Map 3). This information, along with topographic and catchment mapping from GEI, to establish the boundaries of Wetland 1 and Wetland 2, as discussed in Section 7.4.3 of the EIS. A data request and scoping e-mails were sent to CVC, and the data received have been incorporated into the revised EIS.</p>
<p>a. Impacts to infiltration should be avoided and minimized to the extent feasible, any need for mitigation requires a feasibility assessment and generation of post development with mitigation water balance tables. The provided site water balance indicates that mitigation is required for a reduction in infiltration but does not provide evidence that the mitigations are feasible (including accommodating a loss factor). Please update the reports accordingly.</p>	<p>Plans and references to the wetlands in GEI's and NRSI's reports and drawings have been aligned.</p>
<p>b. The EIS provides an evaluation of wetland sensitivities which appears accurate and should be used in relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>c. Provide clear figures depicting pre to post development area catchments. Pre to post development conditions should result in less than 10% change to the wetlands catchment area on site. The CVC SWM guideline provides information on the need to maintain feature based water balance for regulated wetlands.</p>	<p>The EIS provides reference to the pre- and post-development catchments presented in the FSR. A detailed discussion of the FBWB is provided in Section 7.4.3 of the EIS.</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
Stormwater Management (SWM)	
35. Please arrange a site visit with CVC to review the SWM outfall locations. The following comments relate to this concern:	Acknowledged. This site visit had not yet occurred at the time of re-submission.
a. Under the proposed post development scenario only major events will spill into the adjacent areas whereas most flows will be contained within the pond. Water balance to the watercourse and its associated vegetated valley is to be considered in the design; please see the CVC SWM Guideline for feature based water balance guidelines. The proposal must demonstrate that pre to post water balance for the valley system is maintained; this includes maintaining timing, duration, volume, location, and frequency of flows inputs.	<p>Monthly water balance analysis has been included in the revised FSR. Section 5.5 of the FSR includes a discussion of the attempt to balance flows to the existing woodlot and the elevation constraints along the east property boundary.</p> <p>The EIS has been updated to incorporate the revisions to the water balance provided in the FSR and the Hydrogeological Study. A detailed ecological impacts assessment that includes the natural features within the valley is presented in Section 7.4.3 of the EIS.</p>
b. Under the post development scenario major flow events will spill from outlet 2; if this strategy is permitted confirmation that impacts to the adjacent lands will not occur is required (i.e. erosion). Details for mitigating impacts of outfall 2 should be explored in more detail.	Details regarding the need for Outfall 2 and the proposed erosion control measures have been included in the revised FSR.
c. Provide a discussion on the impacts of outfall 1 on the West Credit River. Additional flows to the ditch along Wellington Road 22 may require works at the outlet to the watercourse.	<p>The revised EIS provides a detailed discussion of potential impacts on the West Credit River and the associated wetlands via Outfall 1 (see Section 7.4.3 for the water quantity discussion and Section 7.4.4 for the water quality discussion).</p> <p>Runoff directed to Outfall 1 under existing and post-development conditions is discussed in the revised FSR.</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
Buffers	
<p>36. There appears to be a variable buffer proposed for the vegetation associated with the Top of Bank (TOB). All development including rear lot lines, infrastructure and trails are to be placed outside the regulated area (TOB + 15m); where vegetation extends beyond the TOB a minimum 10m buffer is applied to the vegetation dripline (as staked by CVC). Please update the submission to revise the Limit Of Development (LOD) or include an assessment of alternatives to the design and provide satisfactory justification for any minor encroachments that may be required. The final plan should show that on average, a 10m buffer is being applied overall, and that any reductions are compensated elsewhere to enhance the feature, and that localized impacts are being sufficiently mitigated and minimized.</p>	<p>The Desktop Slope Stability Study (prepared by JLP Services Inc.) explains and supports the reduction of the TOB buffer from 15m to 10m.</p>
<p>a. Assess the effectiveness of a variable buffer to mitigate the land use change. This assessment should consider cumulative, and short and long-term impacts, and the potential for further demand or stress on natural features and functions, by the development proposal.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Desktop Slope Stability Study (JLP Services Inc.).</p>
<p>i. Please ensure that any assessment of the application of a variable buffer includes the full footprint of the development including grading, infrastructure, and trails.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Desktop Slope Stability Study (JLP Services Inc.).</p>
<p>b. Note that although the buffer areas are currently partially within active agricultural use this does not negate the application of standard minimum buffer width or the need to enhance buffers through restoration. Given the intensity of the</p>	<p>Please refer to the Desktop Slope Stability Study (JLP Services Inc.).</p>

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
 Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
 November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
land use change, standard buffers should be applied. These areas contain land base suitable for enhancement that can help to achieve a net ecological gain to the system to help mitigate the overall development activities.	
37. Given the intensity of the land use change, the recommendations in the EIS to develop an edge management and compensation plan are supported and strongly encouraged. CVC staff recommend that a buffer enhancement planting plan be developed. The CVC Plant Selection Guideline and the CVC Buffer Enhancement Guidelines, along with the recommendations made in the EIS should be referenced when developing the plans. Please see below for some general recommendations and high-level guidance: <i>[General recommendations (a)–(e) omitted.]</i>	Acknowledged. Planting details for buffers/ enhancement areas will be developed and confirmed at the detailed design stage. Those plans will use best practices for design, installation, maintenance (if any), and monitoring on-site.
Drawings	
38. The constraints mapping on the provided engineering package don't appear to match (e.g. dwg 1 and 2), please amend the plans to align and depict accurate constraints.	Constraints have been updated on the revised drawings.
Tree Protection Fencing / ESC	
39. The EIS includes a Tree Inventory and Protection Plan that should be followed to ensure there are no direct impacts to regulated vegetation. Please ensure the ESC plans as shown on dwg 12 align with the Tree Protection Plan as per the EIS. Clearly show that the ESC/TPF aligns with the tree inventory and preservation plan.	The ESC plans have been coordinated with the Tree Inventory and TPP.

Comment Response Table

Application for Plan of Subdivision
Thomasfield Homes, Hillsburgh Trails Subdivision
November 19, 2024

Comments from Credit Valley Conservation

Comment	Response
Trails	
40. Where trails are planned adjacent to natural features, buffers should be widened to accommodate the trail as well as continue to provide buffer function (e.g. 15m to woodlands instead of 10m with the trail placed on the outside edge).	Acknowledged. No trails are planned adjacent to natural features. The maintenance access road for the SWM facility is located well outside the vegetation limit buffer.