



SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES

March 12, 2026

File No. 20200

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

Attn: Joanna Henderson
Senior Planner

**Re: Thomasfield Homes Ltd., Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001
Part of Lot 23, Concession 7 (Geographic Township of Erin)**

Dear Ms. Henderson:

On behalf of our client, Thomasfield Homes Ltd. ("Thomasfield"), we are pleased to provide the enclosed resubmission of Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001 for development proposed on the above-noted property. A concurrent resubmission of Zoning By-law Amendment Application No. Z24-01 is being made to the Town of Erin.

Applications regarding the proposed development were submitted to the Town and to the County of Wellington in November 2024, and a public meeting was subsequently held on April 10, 2025. Based on the comments received from members of Council and the public, as well as through the circulation of the applications, we have made several revisions to address multiple aspects of the proposed development, including environmental impacts, stormwater management, the location and configuration of the proposed park block, the design of the transportation network (including facilities to support active transportation), and emergency access.

This resubmission includes the following reports and materials, which have been updated to address the changes made to the proposed development:

- Planning Justification Report Addendum, dated March 2026, prepared by GSP Group to accompany the Planning Justification Report ("PJR") submitted in November 2024;
- Draft Zoning By-law Amendment, included both as Appendix 'A' to the PJR Addendum and as a separate Word document, as requested by the Town;

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

- Plan of Survey of the Property, prepared by Van Harten Surveying Inc. (one correction made to address Comment No. 2 from Ainley & Associates Limited: see appended comment–response table);
- Draft Plan of Subdivision, dated December 9, 2025, prepared by GSP Group;
- Environmental Impact Study, dated February 27, 2026, prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. (“NRSI”), which includes (as Appendix V) a Tree Preservation Plan, also prepared by NRSI;
- Functional Servicing & Preliminary Stormwater Management Report (“FSR”), dated February 2026, prepared by C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc. (“Crozier”);
- Engineering Drawings (Constraints and Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, Overall Servicing Plans, Sanitary Sewer Catchment Areas, Sewage Pumping Station Concept Plan, Storm Sewer Catchment Areas, Grading Plans, SWM Plan & Profile, SWM Sections & Details, Pre-Development Drainage Plan, Post-Development Drainage Plan, Pre-Development Water Balance Catchments, and Post-Development Water Balance Catchments), dated February 2026, prepared by Crozier;
- Stormwater Management Operations & Maintenance Manual, dated February 2026, prepared by Crozier;
- Updated Transportation Impact Study, dated December 2025, prepared by Salvini Consulting; and
- Urban Design Brief, dated March 2026, prepared by GSP Group.

In addition to the above, the following items from the November 2024 submission, and which have not been revised, have been included with this resubmission, as requested by the Town:

- Instrument No. WC474774, being the Land Transfer from the previous owner to Thomasfield;
- the Abbreviated Parcel Register for PIN 71143-0459 (LT);
- Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by V.A. Wood (Guelph) Incorporated and dated April 2015, included in Appendix ‘A’ to the revised FSR prepared by Crozier;
- Hydrogeological Study, prepared by GM BluePlan Engineering and dated November 7, 2024, included in Appendix ‘A’ to the revised FSR;
- Noise Feasibility Study, prepared by HGC Engineering and dated January 10, 2024;
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by GEI Consultants Canada Ltd. and dated July 18, 2024;
- Slope Stability Study, prepared by JLP Services Inc. and dated November 6, 2024;
- Stage 1–2 Archaeological Assessment, prepared by AMICK and dated December 1, 2023, accompanied by the acknowledgment letter (dated March 4, 2024) from the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism;

Please also find attached to this letter a comment–response table, prepared at the County’s request to accompany this resubmission. The comment–response table addresses comments from the following agencies (in the order as listed):

- Town of Erin Planning Department;
- Ainley & Associates Limited, GWS Ecological & Forestry Services Inc., Harden Environmental Services Ltd., and The Planning Partnership (peer review comments provided on behalf of the Town of Erin);
- Wellington County: Planning & Development Department and Roads Department;
- Wellington Source Water Protection;
- Credit Valley Conservation;
- Upper Grand District School Board and Wellington Catholic District School Board; and
- Canada Post.

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

Yours truly,
GSP Group Inc.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Hugh Handy".

Hugh Handy, MCIP, RPP
Vice President

cc. David Waters, Manager of Planning & Development, Town of Erin
Tom McLaughlin, Thomasfield Homes Ltd.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<i>Town of Erin Planning</i>	
1. See updated comments for ZBA attached.	See responses below.
<i>Comments on draft ZBA (attached):</i>	
Please provide in Word format.	A Word document with the revised draft ZBA has been provided with this resubmission.
If it is a standard Stormwater Pond or Park - they do not need exception zones unless they are at an intersection and need a reduced daylight.	The proposed OS1-XXX zone is meant to prohibit any buildings or structures in the 10m buffer behind Lots 1–23 and Lots 31–35.
Please provide examples of Lot Plans for dwellings (corner lots, internal lots) to ensure zoning compliance.	Individual Lot Plans are not available at this time. It is anticipated that confirmation of zoning compliance will be made a condition of draft approval.
<p>If reducing daylight triangles an exception zone will need to be created for the UR1 Zone for the entire site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum 6.0 m for local to local. - Minimum 6.0 m for local to collector streets. - Minimum 15.24 m for collector to arterial streets or as per County requirement. 	Standard daylight triangles have been added to the revised draft plan.
This is fine for holding for turning circle.	Acknowledged.
Please provide an Explanatory Note - See Briarwood and Ballantry By-laws.	The revised draft ZBA includes the requested Explanatory Note.
Schedule: Please remove all hatching and follow same layout as Briarwood and Ballantry examples.	The revised ZBA schedule has been formatted to match the examples provided.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
2. Provide examples of Lot Plans for dwellings (corner lots, internal lots) to ensure zoning compliance.	Individual Lot Plans are not available at this time. It is anticipated that confirmation of zoning compliance will be made a condition of draft approval.
3. SDEs need to be confirmed.	Noted and acknowledged.
4. The draft zoning by-law needs to be formatted along the lines of two recently approved zoning by-law amendments: a) Briarwood Zoning By-law https://pub-erin.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=15760 b) Ballantry Zoning By-law https://pub-erin.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=15842	The revised draft ZBA has been formatted to match the examples provided.
5. A concept site plan and preliminary elevations for the Multiple Residential Block 145 are required.	A concept plan was provided with the original applications to demonstrate this block can function as proposed. Development on this block will be subject to Site Plan Control, and will proceed only after the proposed holding provisions regarding emergency access have been removed.
<i>Ainley & Associates Limited</i>	
<p>General</p> <p>1. All the reports and documents submitted in the 1st Draft Plan Submission should be submitted in subsequent Draft Plan Submissions, even if no edits are applied to the document(s). This is to assist in keeping a complete package together with each Submission. This item is carried forward for tracking purposes.</p>	Noted. The resubmission includes all reports and documents from the first submission that have not been revised.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>Legal Survey of Property</p> <p>2. Near the northeast corner of Lot 23, Concession 7 is a dimension "10.818" (i.e., below the dimension "336.436") that should be clarified showing where its intended limits are.</p>	<p>This dimension has been corrected and clarified on the survey.</p>
<p>Draft Plan of Subdivision</p> <p>3. At the Street A-Wellington County Road 22 Intersection a minimum 10 m x 10 m daylighting triangles should be included per the Engineering Standards, subject to the County's requirements. In accordance with the Town Zoning By-Law, all local-to-local road intersections should have a minimum of 6m x 6m daylight triangle, not a 8m rounding.</p>	<p>Daylight triangles have been added to all intersections, as requested.</p>
<p>4. Street A, from Wellington County Road 22 to Street B, is a collector road and should have a minimum ROW width of 26 m per the Engineering Standards.</p>	<p>The ROW width for Street A between WR22 and Street B has been increased to 26 m, as requested.</p>
<p>5. A 0.30 m Reserve should be shown along Wellington County Road 22 where it fronts the Multiple Residential Block 145.</p>	<p>A 0.3m reserve block (Block 160) has been added in the specified location.</p>
<p>6. For the Temporary Turning Circle at the west end of Street C, the geometry shown in Engineering Standard Dwg. ERIN SD. 112 should be included.</p>	<p>The required geometry has been included on the revised plan.</p>
<p>Environmental Impact Study & Tree Preservation Plan</p> <p>7. Correspondence from MECP should be provided prior to any tree clearing and/or earth works to confirm and accept the plan for protecting, harming or removing butternut trees, and compensating for harmed/removed butternut trees as proposed in this report.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. Consultation with MECP regarding these matters has already begun, and a record of correspondence with MECP is provided in Appendix XI to the updated EIS.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
8. A Woodland Edge and Buffer Management Plan is recommended to be developed during detailed design. This comment is included for tracking purposes.	A Woodland Edge & Buffer Management Plan will be prepared and implemented, in accordance with the recommendations made in the EIS.
9. Table 16 should be extended to include the post construction mitigation measures of noise, dust and lighting discussed in Section 7.4.2, Wildlife. This table will be referenced as a summary of constraints and mitigation efforts for planning construction activities and post-construction practices.	The corresponding table in the updated EIS (Table 19) has been extended as requested.
<p align="center">Functional Servicing Report</p> <p align="center"><i>Water Supply</i></p> <p>10. The Water Supply calculations should include fire flow demands for the various types of housing units, and the calculations should be as per the Town Engineering Standards. Note: In accordance with the FUS calculations recently completed for other new developments in Erin, the Town will require Fire Flow of 133 L/s for detached and semi-detached units and 200 L/s for Townhouses units.</p>	Fire flow demand is addressed in Section 2.3 of the revised FSR, in accordance with the standards and specifications cited in this comment.
11. Ainley on behalf of the Town has updated the Town's Water Model for the Erin and Hillsburgh Water Systems. As this development proceeds through the approval process, Ainley will review the proposed water distribution network within and adjacent to the development to confirm that it can supply the necessary flows and pressures as per the Town Standards, MECP and Fire Underwriters Survey with respect to maximum day flows, peak hour flows, and maximum day plus fire flows.	Noted and acknowledged.
12. The external watermain design should be prepared during the Detail Design Stage.	Noted and acknowledged.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p align="center"><i>Sanitary Servicing</i></p> <p>13. The design flows and flow capacities provided in the sanitary sewer design sheet should be expressed in l/s rather than m³/s.</p>	<p>Sanitary flows in the revised FSR and associated materials are expressed in L/s.</p>
<p>14. On the Detail Design Sheet, for Street E, Sub-Area 104, the "From" column should reference Sanitary MH 8A (rather than MH 4A). This typo can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>15. The external forcemain design should be prepared during the Detail Design Stage.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>16. Please reach out to Carson Reid Development to determine if the southern portions of their development will need to drain to this Sewage Pumping Station. If so, the Sanitary sewers within the development may need to be lowered to accommodate the Carson Reid Development.</p>	<p>At present, our understanding is that sanitary flows from the Carson Reid Homes development will be directed north to the main along the Elora Cataract Trail and not to the pumping station in the Thomasfield Homes development.</p>
<p align="center"><i>Storm Servicing</i></p> <p>17. The Storm Sewer Design Sheets and Storm Sewer Catchment Areas Dwg. 10 have discrepancies that should be resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On Street A, MH 37 to MH 39, shows a length of 66.5 m on the design sheet and a length of 49.8 m on Dwg. 10 - On Street C, MH 8 to MH 9 shows a length of 50.8 m on the design sheet and a length of 43.8 m on Dwg. 10 - On Street C, MH 10 to MH 11, the pipe diameter on the design sheet is 675 mm and is 600 mm on Dwg. 10 <p>These discrepancies can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. All drawings and sewer design sheets have been revised per the latest design. If errors remain, these will be addressed at detailed design and illustrated on the plan/profile drawings for municipal review.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>18. On Street C, MH 9 to MH 10, the Cumulative AxC value should be checked. It appears to exclude a portion of the contributing area from MH 8 to MH 9. This can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. Design calculations and measurements have been revised per the latest design. If errors remain, these will be addressed at detailed design and illustrated on the plan/profile drawings for municipal review.</p>
<p>19. On Street D, MH 22 to MH 45, the Cumulative AxC value should be checked. It appears to exclude a portion of the contributing area from MH 50 to MH 22. This can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. Design calculations and measurements have been revised per the latest design. If errors remain, these will be addressed at detailed design and illustrated on the plan/profile drawings for municipal review.</p>
<p>20. On Street A, MH 63 to MH 27, the design flow exceeds the pipe flow capacity. On Street B, MH 28 to MH 38, and MH 38 to MH 1, the storm pipes show design flows that are practically at 100% of the flow capacity. These issues can [be] addressed during the Detail Design Stage.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. Design calculations and measurements have been revised per the latest design. That said, this latest design does not have any sewer capacity issues. If design changes are made at detailed design, capacities will be reviewed to ensure no exceedances occur.</p>
<p>21. The Storm Sewer Design Sheets assume that during a 5-year storm event, the stored runoff in the SWM Pond is below the invert of the incoming 1050 mm dia. Storm Sewer (i.e., below the downstream end of the 1050 mm dia. storm sewer at 437.60 m shown on Dwg. 9). The SWM Stage-Storage-Discharge charts in Appendix E indicate the high water level during a 5-year event is 438.39 m. The downstream storm invert for the 1050 mm dia. storm sewer entering the SWM Pond should be at or above the high water level during a 5-year event to avoid runoff backing up into the storm sewer system. This should be addressed during the Draft Plan Stage to confirm that the SWM Pond Block is sized correctly.</p>	<p>As shown on Drawing C-701, the pond has been redesigned as a wet pond style facility. The 1050 mm inlet pipe has been redesigned to ensure its invert remains at or above the estimated 5-year water level in the pond. Please refer to Drawing C-701 for a plan and profile view of the proposed SWM facility. Further details will be provided at detailed design.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p align="center"><i>SWM Criteria & Plan Infiltration Assessment</i></p> <p>22. Minor storm events from the SWM pond discharge via Outlet No. 1 to CR22. However, for storms exceeding the 5-year event, flows will also discharge via Outlet No. 2, dispersing over a broad area draining to the existing woodlot located east of the site and ultimately reaching the Erin Branch of the Credit River. Discharge rates from Outlet No. 2 into the woodlot range from 55 L/s during the 10-year storm to 1.52 m³/s during the Regional storm. Although the total post-development runoff volumes directed to the woodlot are reduced for events up to and including the 50-year storm, volumes will increase by approximately 250 m³ during the 100-year event and by approximately 5,800 m³ during the Regional event.</p> <p>Between the SWM Pond Outlet No. 2 and the Erin Branch of the Credit River is two privately owned properties that do not constitute a natural watercourse. Consequently, the Town will require the conveyance of land, establishment of an easement, or a registered agreement on title in favor of the Town, extending from Outlet No. 2 to the Erin Branch of the Credit River to provide a legal outlet for the flows discharging from SWM Pond Outlet No. 2.</p>	<p>The stormwater management strategy for the proposed development has been modified to direct all discharges to CR22, and no longer requires discharge over the adjacent property to the east.</p>
<p>23. Information is required regarding proposed quality controls and expected sediment accumulation for areas draining to the proposed superpipe system on Street A.</p>	<p>The County Road 22 roadside ditch is grassed and will provide the necessary treatment for this small portion of the Draft Plan. Further details can be provided at detailed design as part of the coordination with the County regarding improvements to the County Road 22 ditch.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>24. Given the susceptibility to freezing and snow accumulation, additional information is required to determine how quality control requirements will be achieved for runoff to the wetland under winter conditions without specifying a hybrid facility as recommended in the MECP manual.</p>	<p>There is no longer any direct runoff to the downstream wetland as all runoff will be attenuated and controlled prior to discharging to the County Road 22 ditch. If further water quality considerations are required, these can be addressed at detailed design.</p>
<p>25. The Pre-development flows provided in Table 13 do not match the Pre-development flows for Area 103 provided in Table 4. This discrepancy should be resolved.</p>	<p>All peak flow rates have been revised per the updated design and are presented in the updated FSR.</p>
<p>26. The Pre-development flows provided in Table 14 do not match the Pre-development flows for Area 101 provided in Table 4. This discrepancy should be resolved.</p>	<p>All peak flow rates have been revised per the updated design and are presented in the updated FSR.</p>
<p>27. As discussed in Section 6 of the FSR, the infiltration calculations will be updated as part of the detailed design based on in-situ infiltration rates.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p><i>Pond Drawings (Dwgs. 8 & 9)</i></p> <p>28. A sediment drying area in accordance with the requirements provided in the Engineering Standards Section 8.10.9 will be required which could potentially increase the required Pond Block area.</p>	<p>A sediment drying area has been provided within the revised SWM block.</p>
<p>29. An emergency overflow weir located above the 100-year water level will be required, designed in accordance with Section 8.10.2 of the Engineering Standards.</p>	<p>An overflow weir has been designed for all peak flow rates above the 100-year return period event.</p>
<p>30. In accordance with the recommendations in the MECP manual for wetland design the invert of the inlet pipe to the facility should be set above the maximum design water level in the wetland due to the elevated risk of winter freezing.</p>	<p>The SWM facility has been redesigned. Please refer to updated design details in the FSR and on Drawing C-701.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
31. A maximum 7:1 slope along the bank is required below the elevation of the permanent pool within the facility in accordance with Erin SD 502.	The pond has been designed to MECP standards which are typical for the industry. 7:1 sloping is excessive and takes up valuable land within the subdivision. As such, we have designed to the typical MECP requirements.
Geotechnical Investigation Report	
32. Understanding that Street A, Street B and Street C will be classified as minor collectors, the pavement structure should comply with the Engineering Standards for collector roads. This can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.	Noted and acknowledged.
33. Although the Phase 1 ESA indicates that the site has no environmental concerns to warrant a Phase 2, the geotechnical investigation should be extended to examine the contaminants in the soil for the purpose of a excess soils management plan if soils need to be hauled off site. This can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.	Noted and acknowledged.
Hydrogeological Study	
34. Understanding that Street A, Street B and Street C will be classified as minor collectors, the pavement structure should comply with the Engineering Standards for collector roads. This can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.	Noted and acknowledged.
Operation & Maintenance Manual	
35. Understanding that Street A, Street B and Street C will be classified as minor collectors, the pavement structure should comply with the Engineering Standards for collector roads. This can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.	Noted and acknowledged.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
(1) Additional inspection items per Section 8.12.5 of the Design Standards including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - verification of drawdown time - safety and security measures - checking for evidence of vandalism, illegal access and/or encroachment. 	Noted and acknowledged.
(2) A monitoring program per Section 8.12.6 to provide details of quality control performance, outlet structure rating curve verification, and bathymetric survey details.	Noted and acknowledged.
(3) More details regarding the Sediment Removal and Disposal Plan for the facility in accordance with Section 8.12.7.	Noted and acknowledged.
(4) Estimated Annualized Operation and Maintenance Costs including but not be limited to, procedures, frequency and full costing of all operations and maintenance items, including sediment removal, over the life of the facilities.	Noted and acknowledged.
(5) Additional details regarding the proposed clay liner once the design has been finalized.	Noted and acknowledged.
(6) The manual must include similar details for the superpipe system and associated water quality treatment devices.	Noted and acknowledged.
<p>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment</p> 36. Understanding that a Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment is not required per the report, filing a Record of Site Condition is optional per the amended Regulation 153/04.	Noted and acknowledged.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>Noise Feasibility Study</p> <p>37. We are satisfied that the methodology used in the report meets the requirements of the MECP (per NPC-300) and we agree with the report's findings and conclusions.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>38. Possible typos that will not likely alter the conclusions of the report are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References to 'condo tower' should be deleted or revised if incorrect. - Section 4.1 refers to prediction location A as being 'townhouses' while it is shown as a single-detached lot on Fig 2. - The source-receiver distance used for location A is 93.8m (see App B) while we measured it to be closer to 83.8m on Fig 2. This will result in noise levels slightly higher than predicted. 	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>Transportation Impact Study</p>	
<p>39. In Section 2, Proposal and Site Transportation Context:</p>	
<p>(a) Existing intersection configuration and control should be provided for the intersection of Wellington Road 22 / Wellington Road 24 / Trafalgar Road.</p>	<p>Please see Section 3 of the updated TIS.</p>
<p>(b) Road classification should be identified as per the Town's Official Plan (i.e. Street A, Street B and Street C will be minor collectors, and Wellington Roads 22 & 24 are arterial roads).</p>	<p>See Section 2 of the updated TIS.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
(c) As per the County’s Traffic Impact Study Guidelines, the County’s Active Transportation Master Plan should be reviewed. It should be noted that paved shoulders are proposed on the section of Wellington Road 22 in the study area.	Please see Section 2 of the updated TIS.
(d) As per the County’s Traffic Impact Study Guidelines, existing transit routes and schedules should be reviewed.	See Section 2 of the updated TIS.
40. In Section 3.1, Existing Traffic Volumes:	
(a) The 2021 April and October counts are within the Covid period with travel restrictions and should be lower than normal. Those counts should not be used for comparison. The January 31, 2023 counts are winter counts. Therefore, the need for a seasonal variation factor should be reviewed.	The need for seasonal adjustments has been reviewed and determined not to be necessary, as noted in Section 3 of the updated TIS.
(b) It is not clear if a signal timing plan for the intersection of Wellington Road 22 / Wellington Road 24 / Trafalgar Road has been obtained from the County. This should be clarified.	Signal timing was provided by County staff, and has been appended to the updated TIS: see Section 3 of the updated TIS.
41. In Section 4.1, Background Traffic Forecasts:	
(a) As per the County’s Traffic Impact Study Guidelines for the size of the development, future horizons should include the opening year (i.e., represents full build out of the proposed development) and a 5-year after opening.	Horizons agreed to with County staff and their consultant have been incorporated into Section 4 of the updated TIS.
(b) Other specific developments in the area should be considered, such as, Hillsburgh Heights (i.e., Briarwood), 63 & 63A Trafalgar (i.e., Ballantry) and Carson Reid Development etc.	Specific developments are identified in Section 4 of the updated TIS. These developments are included in the background forecasts, as noted in that section.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
42. In Section 5, Site Traffic:	
(a) The 22 street fronting townhome units should be single-family attached housing units (LU Code 215) instead of multifamily housing (low-rise) units.	The requested change has been made with respect to the revised design: see Section 5 of the updated TIS.
(b) As per the ITE Trip Generation Handbook 3rd Edition Figure 4.2, equations should be used instead of average rates for the site land uses.	The use of average rates is addressed in Section 5 of the updated TIS.
43. In Appendix A: Figures, Traffic Volume Diagrams, Northerly Carson Development Traffic, the total AM and PM traffic volumes are more than the estimated trips in Table 5 and should be revised.	Please refer to the updated TIS.
44. In summary, an addendum to the TIS is recommended to address the above noted comments.	An updated TIS has been provided with this resubmission.
<p>45. With 215 residential units and only one (1) entrance into the Subdivision we have concerns with Emergency Services always having access and request that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the development be phased with the first 100 units being developed on the single entrance and the remaining 115 units being developed in conjunction with the Carson Reid Development which will provide a second entrance to the developments via Station Street; or 2) The Draft Plan be reconfigured to provide two entrances onto CR22. 	The draft plan has been revised to provide an emergency access easement over the Multiple Residential block, providing a second access point from WR22 in case of emergency. The proposed ZBA includes a holding provision to prevent the development of the Multiple Residential block until such time as the Town has determined that the emergency access is no longer needed.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>Slope Stability Study</p> <p>46. Enclosure 1, Site Plan, should include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the lot numbers on it - contour elevations - the top of slope corresponding to Sections A-A', B-B' and C-C' 	<p>The lot numbers have changed from the earlier version of the draft plan shown in this enclosure.</p>
<p>47. The recommendation to decrease the development setback from 15 m to 10 m from the top of slope should be accepted by the Credit Valley Conservation (CVC).</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>48. JLP should review the proposed grading for Lots abutting the Block 147, Open Space, to confirm that the proposed grading incorporates their recommendations in the Slope Stability Study. This can be addressed during the Detail Design Stage.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>Engineering Drawings</p> <p><i>Dwg. 1A (Existing Conditions Plan)</i></p> <p>49. The contours should be labeled with their corresponding elevations.</p>	<p>Existing conditions and ESC figure includes contour labels and spot elevations.</p>
<p>50. Understanding that Construction North is from the right side to the left side of the drawing frame, the 3 cross sections labeled near the (construction) northeast corner of the property appear to reflect Sections A-A', B-B', and C-C' in the Slope Stability Report.</p> <p>If that is the correct interpretation, those sections should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - be labeled as such - show where the top of slope is as indicated in the Slope Stability Report for each cross section. 	<p>The cross-sections are not labelled on the updated drawings.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
51. The Slope Stability Study indicates that the site should have a 10 m setback from the CVC vegetation limit/Significant Woodland. The 10 m setback should be plotted on the drawing.	Noted and acknowledged.
52. The drawing has a 5 m Significant Woodland setback, but unclear is the basis of this 5 m setback (i.e., rather than 10 m).	Section 6.0 of the updated EIS explains that a standard 10m buffer was deemed unnecessary due to current conditions.
<i>Dwgs. 2 & 3 (Overall Servicing Plans)</i>	
53. The Engineering Standards require the watermain on the north or west side of the roadway. The locations of watermain on Street A, Street C and Street D should be revised to comply with the Standards per Dwg. ERIN SD. 102.	Noted and acknowledged.
54. The locations of storm sewer on Street A, Street C and Street D should be revised to comply with the Standards per Dwg. ERIN SD. 102 (i.e., located on the north or west side of the C/L of roadway).	Noted and acknowledged.
55. The locations of sanitary sewer on Street A, Street C and Street D should be revised to comply with the Standards per Dwg. ERIN SD. 102 (i.e., located on the south or east side of the C/L of roadway).	Noted and acknowledged.
56. On Dwg. 4, a 5 m Woodland Forest Buffer line is labeled. From which document this 5 m buffer is recommended should be explained.	This buffer is addressed in Section 6.0 of the updated EIS (which recommends a minimum 1m buffer).
<i>Dwgs. 4-7 (Grading Plans)</i>	
57. For rear yards that depend on Rear Yard Catch Basins (RYCBs), rear yard swales will need to be included on the drainage plans to indicate the catchment areas for each RYCB.	Detailed grading and catchment area limits to be provided at detailed design.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p><i>Dwgs. 8 & 9 (SWM Pond)</i></p> <p>58. A maximum 7:1 slope along the bank is required below the elevation of the permanent pool within the facility in accordance with Erin SD 502.</p>	<p>The pond has been designed to MECP standards which are typical for the industry. 7:1 sloping is excessive and takes up valuable land within the subdivision. As such, we have designed to the typical MECP requirements. Happy to discuss as needed.</p>
<p>59. The side slopes for the Forebay, and the Deep Pool at the outlet should be as per Erin SD. 503.</p>	<p>The pond has been designed to MECP standards which are typical for the industry. 7:1 sloping is excessive and takes up valuable land within the subdivision. As such, we have designed to the typical MECP requirements.</p>
<p>60. The detail design for the SWM Pond should include a dewatering sump detail per Erin SD. 505.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>61. The Forebay has no berm around its immediate perimeter. Removing silt from with an excavator on the maintenance access road requires a long-reach-arm machine that can reach in excess of 20 m. This configuration should be reviewed to enable cleaning the forebay with more conventional equipment.</p>	<p>A forebay berm has been included in the pond per Town and MECP standards.</p>
<p>62. The inlet for the storm sewer has an invert of 437.60 m. The SWM Pond highwater level during a 5-year event is 438.39 m. The storm runoff will back-up into the storm sewer system and, at the storm sewer outlet into the SWM Pond, will be 0.79 m deep. The storm design works should be revised to have the storm sewer out letting to be at or above the 5-year highwater level in the SWM Pond per the MOE 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual.</p>	<p>The pond and inlet storm sewers have been redesigned to ensure the 5-year water level remains below the invert of the upstream storm sewer. Please refer to Drawing C-701 for details. Further detail will be provided at detailed design.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p align="center"><i>Dwg. 12 (ESC Plan)</i></p> <p>63. The Temporary Construction Access Road should include ERIN STD. 120 in the Engineering Standards.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>64. Cut off swales directing runoff to the Sediment Control Pond should be shown on the drawing, and design calculations provided for conveying the runoff flows to the Pond.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. However, we note that ESC plans are dynamic and will be revised through detailed design and at the construction stage.</p>
<p>65. Stockpile locations should be identified on the drawing and including silt fence around their perimeter, and volume of material for each stockpile.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>66. In Note 18, copies of the Records of Inspection shall be provided to the Town for its records, too.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p align="center"><i>Dwg. SPS (Sewage Pumping Station)</i></p> <p>67. No Comments at this stage.</p>	<p>(No response required.)</p>
<p align="center"><i>GWS Ecological & Forestry Services Inc.</i></p>	
<p>1. The ELC vegetation community mapping now extends well beyond the property boundaries and the descriptions given in Table 3 seem appropriate.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>2. The botanical inventory of vascular plants given in Appendix V only identifies 109 species on the subject property but is nonetheless adequate given the vegetation communities found in this area. No nationally, provincially or regionally significant plants were observed other than butternut. Sixteen (16) endangered butternut trees were identified around the perimeter of the agricultural field that covers most of the property and 8 of these butternuts are recommended for removal. All of these butternuts were determined</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Consultation with MECP regarding the endangered trees has already begun: see Appendix XI to the updated EIS.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>to be retainable category 2 trees so their proposed removal is subject to MECP review and approval. A permit from MECP may be needed to facilitate the removal of these trees and compensatory planting and/or a cash payment will also be required. In any event, this matter must be resolved with MECP and confirmation must be provided to the Town.</p>	
<p>3. A breeding bird survey was completed during the appropriate time period and NRSI biologists recorded 35 bird species on the subject property and adjacent lands. Only one significant species, the Eastern Wood Pewee, was observed nesting in the adjacent woodland on the east side of the property. This bird is considered a species of Special Concern in Ontario, and it will not be affected by the proposed development.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>4. No amphibians, reptiles, mammals or insects of national, provincial or regional significance were observed on the subject property.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>5. To accommodate the proposed residential development approximately 0.118 ha (0.3 acre) of vegetation will have to be removed from hedgerows H1, H2 and H3, as well as some successional communities (CUT 1 and CUW 1) and a small portion of upland deciduous forest (FOD 5-7). These losses of tree cover are minimal and can be replaced with new plantings in the proposed buffers which vary from 1m to 12.9 m beyond the residual treed edge. In this environmental setting, the proposed variable width buffers seem acceptable to me.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>6. The loss of tree cover will also result in the loss of potential bat maturity habitat for endangered bat species, particularly in FOD 5-7. Given the amount of available habitat in the surrounding area NRSI considered this loss of potential habitat to be minimal and I agree with their assessment.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>7. In Section 7.4.3 a detailed analysis of potential development impacts to surface and groundwater flows to the adjacent PSW and West Credit River is provided. It was determined that adequate groundwater infiltration can be maintained in the recharge area so that there is no negative impact to the groundwater table in the wetland. Post development run-off volumes will increase but the majority of the run-off volume will be attenuated by the SWM facility which is also designed to mitigate the potential for thermal impacts to the West Credit River. I agree with the analysis provided in the EIS. but it must also satisfy the CVC who has the mandate to ensure the protection of wetlands and watercourses.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>8. A naturalized landscape plan must be prepared for the proposed wetland SWM facility and this should be a condition of draft plan approval. In addition to planting details, this plan should also clarify how the proposed overland discharge of run-off through the woodland to the West Credit River will be achieved without causing any significant erosion and/or sedimentation damage to the receiving woodland, wetland and watercourse.</p>	<p>The design of the proposed SWM facility has been revised since the original submission was made, and discharge through the woodland is no longer being proposed. Naturalized landscaping will be addressed through conditions of draft approval, as noted.</p>
<p>9. The Tree Preservation Plan provided in Appendix VI indicates that 385 trees were inventoried in 2021 that could potentially be affected by the proposed development. A total of 175 trees were recommended for removal and based on the Town of Erin's Design Guidelines 273 replacement trees are needed as compensation</p>	<p>A revised Tree Preservation Plan has been provided as Appendix V to the revised EIS provided with this resubmission.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>for these tree losses. There are, however, some significant inconsistencies in the recommendations on trees to remove or retain. For example, trees numbered 81 to 119 identify some boundary trees in poor condition that are rated as possible to improbable for structural failure and they are recommended for removal while other boundary trees in poor to very poor condition and rated as probable potential for structural failure are to be retained. Similarly with trees 379 to 385 there are white ash boundary trees infested with Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) that are in very poor condition and only rated as possible potential for structural failure that are to be retained instead of being removed. These kinds of recommendations appear inconsistent with the data that was collected and should therefore be re-evaluated. Since it has now been 3 years since these trees were inventoried, I suggest a site visit is needed to accurately update the data as I suspect there are many more hazardous trees that should be removed before any new homes are built. Additional tree removals will correspondingly increase the amount of compensation planting that is required. Trees worthy of retention that clearly require the pruning of hazardous limbs or have low overhanging branches that will be damaged by construction equipment should also be identified for corrective pruning as part of the tree inventory.</p>	
<p>10. Tree protection fencing is to be installed along the limit of woodland buffers and is to consist of paige wire farm fence with silt screen attached. This type of protective fencing seems appropriate given the adjacent natural features.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>11. I support the proposed Woodland Edge and Buffer Management Plan that is to be provided at the detailed design stage. The requirement for this Plan should be identified as a condition of Draft Plan approval. It should provide details on the species, quantity, size and arrangement of native trees shrubs and herbaceous ground cover to be planted, as well as details on the removal of invasive species and any remaining hazard trees.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>12. A more detailed environmental monitoring plan should be provided that clearly outlines the monitoring data to be collected and periodically reported to the Town and CVC. In addition to the standard monitoring requirement for erosion and sediment control, consideration should also be given to monitoring the growth and survival of buffer plantings, the health of residual trees along woodland edges and the vegetation downslope of the SWM facility and the quality of run-off being discharged from this facility. I suggest that this monitoring plan and all other requirements that must be left to the detailed design stage could be incorporated into an Environmental Implementation Report rather than being presented as individual documents in a piecemeal fashion.</p>	<p>Section 7.6 of the updated EIS (February 2026) includes additional recommendations for monitoring, including the preparation of an Environmental Implementation Report, to be required as a condition of approval, as well as follow-up monitoring to assess the effectiveness of mitigation, restoration, and enhancement measures.</p>
<p><i>Harden Environmental Services Ltd.</i></p>	
<p>1. Development to be serviced by municipal water and sanitation.</p>	<p>The proposed development will be provided with municipal water and sewage services, as detailed in the FSR.</p>
<p>2. Present drainage includes 5.81 hectares in Catchment 102 that flows southerly.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>3. Future drainage except for Catchment 203 (0.29 hectares) will be northward into Block 148.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>4. Foundation drainage for each lot will be via sump pumps discharging to storm service laterals. Is the Chief Building Official for the Town of Erin aware that foundation drainage will be occurring in this way?</p>	<p>We are proposing that sump pumps will discharge at-grade and no storm service laterals are required. To be discussed with Town staff as required.</p>
<p>5. Post development infiltration must be augmented via lot level infiltration galleries. Infiltration tests will be conducted as part of final design.</p>	<p>Agreed. Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>6. Hydrologic soil group for infiltration is C or D across the site. These are not ideal conditions for infiltration.</p>	<p>Understood. Infiltration galleries will be sized accordingly.</p>
<p>7. Groundwater levels are between two and eleven metres below grade in the spring of 2023.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. Groundwater levels will continue to be monitored through the life of the project.</p>
<p>8. The lower water levels observed occur in the sand and gravel unit and the higher water levels observed occur in the silt layer above the sand and gravel layer. The red line shows approximate water level in MW-02.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>9. The Credit River occurs at a significantly lower elevation than the site and is likely the end receiver of groundwater infiltration at the site. Should there be ecological features that are sensitive to groundwater level changes, we suggest that a long-term monitoring program be established to verify that the proposed infiltration strategy is working appropriately and that mitigation measures are in place should groundwater levels be lower than acceptable. The review ecologists should consider if there is sufficient resiliency in the ecological functioning of the adjacent wetland to withstand potential changes to the groundwater flow system, if not then an appropriate monitoring plan with future mitigation should be implemented. It is our</p>	<p>Long-term monitoring details will be determined at detailed design.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>opinion that there is low to medium risk of significant changes to the groundwater flow system.</p>	
<p>10. The SWM system will release water with elevated chloride concentrations. Flora and fauna sensitive to chloride (salt) may be impacted downstream of the SWM pond in Block 148.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p><i>The Planning Partnership</i></p>	
<p>Subdivision Plan</p> <p>1. We appreciate that the proposed development addresses Wellington County Road 22 (higher hierarchy road) through the location of the higher density block (Blk 145 Multiple Residential), and that it incorporates shorter internal blocks that promote walkability and permeability. However, other than the connection to Wellington County Road 22 and the Street C connection to the west, the development does not include any physical or visual connection to its surroundings context.</p>	<p>The revised draft plan includes an additional Future ROW (Block 158) to provide for long-term connectivity to the west, in the event that the Hillsburgh Urban Area is expanded at some point in the future.</p>
<p>2. The UDG states that new developments should be designed to preserve, recognize and enhance views to adjacent natural heritage. The existing woodland to the north is a significant natural area that should be better integrated into the development. Instead, the proposed plan locates rear lots along this edge as well as along the SWM block that would otherwise provide open views from Street B to the Woodland. We suggest the applicant consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Shifting Street B to the north, along the edge of the SWM block; b) Relocating the lots backing onto the SWM block and the existing woodland; and, 	<p>The revised draft plan has considered and attempted to balance a number of factors, including providing a view to the adjacent natural feature, preserving that feature by discouraging excessive amounts of human interference, and making efficient use of the available land for development.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>c) Providing open space blocks in key locations.</p>	
<p>3. The UDG calls for the location of Parks in prominent places. Park block (Blk 146), is not located prominently within the community. We suggest the applicant consider these alternative locations/configurations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A location at the west end of the SWM block, with frontage on Street B. b) A location with frontage on Street B. 	<p>The location of the park was chosen to support the retention of butternut trees on the site. The revised draft plan includes a park block that has been reconfigured to provide frontage along Street B.</p>
<p>4. The UDG suggests that new development “Discourage long, uninterrupted blocks”. However, there are several such blocks proposed.</p>	<p>The draft plan has been revised to break up the uninterrupted block shown along the north side of Street B on the earlier version.</p>
<p>5. Given that the proposed townhouses are front-loaded, they seem to be very narrow which will result in streetscapes dominated by garages. Please ensure front-loaded townhouses are wide enough so that garages do not occupy more than 50% of the unit width (a minimum of 5.5m width is recommended). Revise response on page 21 of the UDB to reflect this approach – it is not acceptable for garages to occupy the totality of the ground floor elevation even when an enhanced 2nd level elevations is provided.</p>	<p>The townhouse blocks have been relocated and reconfigured on the revised draft plan.</p>
<p>6. It is generally encouraged to locate higher density-built form such as townhouses to frame parks and other public spaces. We appreciate that some townhouses frame the park and encourage a more consistent built form all around the park block. The applicant should also consider townhouse forms as a transition between the Multiple Residential Block (Block 145) and single-detached lots.</p>	<p>The townhouse block formerly shown adjacent to the park has been relocated to provide more of a transition.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>7. The applicant should consider incorporating a trail along the northwest edge (SWM and buffer blocks), if possible, to enhance the active transportation system from/to and within the proposed community. If proposed, access from/to Street C should be provided and elevation upgrades incorporated to units backing onto it.</p>	<p>A trail will be provided around the SWM facility. The grades within the buffer block make it an unsuitable location for a trail (which would also detract from the block's protective function).</p>
<p>Block 145 - Multiple Residential Concept Plan</p> <p>8. The prominent location of the Multiple Residential block at the gateway and main frontage of the development is a primary consideration in evaluating the proposed concept plan. We have a few questions and suggestions in this regard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The primary elevations of the cluster townhouses should be oriented to Wellington Count Road or these units should be swapped with the stacked townhouses which would provide greater massing along this street, a preferred condition. b) Is the large amount of surface parking necessary? Has the applicant considered integrated parking for the stacked townhouse product? (i.e. parking at the rear of the unit). This might create the opportunity for more units (increased density) on the block. 	<p>The development of the Multiple Residential block will be subject to a future application for Site Plan Approval (following the removal of the holding symbol proposed for this block, to maintain the emergency access easement until it is no longer required). The amount of surface parking shown on the concept plan is the minimum amount required under the Town's Zoning By-law.</p>
<p>Block 149 - Sanitary Pumping Station Concept Plan</p> <p>9. The intersection of Wellington County Road and proposed Street A is the main entrance to the subdivision and is to be considered as a gateway. The design of the proposed sanitary pumping station should provide an attractive presence in this location. There is a lack of detail to properly assess the urban design merits of the concept plan (it has been noted that such details will be provided with the detailed engineering submission</p>	<p>Design details for the pumping station block, including landscaping, screening, and fencing, will be confirmed during the detailed design stage. The prominent location of this block with respect to the entrance to the subdivision will be a principal consideration.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>(at a later date)) however, we recommend that the following elements be provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Landscape screening along all street frontages which should include trees and shrubs; b) Decorative fencing and or walls that enclose the site; and, c) Upgraded building elevations, including design and materials that are coordinated with that of the dwelling units. 	
<p>Urban Design Brief</p> <p>10. UDG request sidewalks along local roads to be minimum 1.8m wide. Revise cross-sections accordingly.</p>	<p>As requested by the Town, the cross-sections used are consistent with those in the Town’s Engineering Design Standard Drawings, all of which show 1.5m sidewalks.</p>
<p>11. While the responses included in section 5 express a commitment to comply with the listed guidelines, it is not possible to assess actual compliance as no specific details related to the proposed landscape or building placement and design have been provided (i.e., elevation designs, landscape plans/details, etc.).</p>	<p>Many details regarding site-level design have not yet been confirmed at this early stage in the process, although the developer is committed to ensuring compliance with the applicable requirements.</p>
<p>12. The Priority Plan should be revised to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) ‘T’ lots at the end of Streets ‘A’ and ‘D’. b) ‘Park Lot’ frontages for lots 76 and 77, and those adjacent to vista blocks (e.g., block between lots 24 and 25, and 33 and 34). 	<p>The Priority Lotting Plan has been updated to reflect the revised draft plan.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>13. Revise responses on priority lots so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 'Corner Lots' include upgrades that wrap around the rear elevation and main materials are terminated at changes in plane. b) 'Park Lot Dwellings' are required to include upgrades on all elevations exposed to public view (this is mandatory, not optional). 	<p>Details regarding corner lots and park lot dwellings have been revised.</p>
<p>14. There are a couple of references to 'parking areas' on pages 16 and 19. However, none are identified on the site plan. Clarification is needed.</p>	<p>The references are to parking areas on the future Multiple Residential block. This has been clarified in the revised UDB.</p>
<p>15. On page 19, there is a reference to 'larger lots' and a 'medium density block'. Clarification is needed as none of these are identified on the site plan.</p>	<p>This reference has been corrected in the revised UDB.</p>
<p>16. For the following submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The UDB should be updated/revised to reflect any changes on the site plan. b) It is encouraged to revise the formatting of the UDB (i.e., indentation of bullets and sub-bullets) to enhance its readability. 	<p>The UDB has been updated to reflect the revised draft plan, with indentation added for bulleted and numbered list items.</p>
<p>17. 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>Many details regarding site-level design have not yet been confirmed at this early stage in the process, although the developer is committed to ensuring compliance with the applicable requirements.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<i>Wellington County (Planning & Development)</i>	
<p>1. It is understood that the zoning by-law amendment proposes the following zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “UR1” (“Urban Residential One”) for Lots 1–142 and Blocks 143–145 to permit a combination of single detached dwellings and street townhouse dwellings; - “UR1” with holding provisions for Block 151 (“Future Residential”) to limit the use of that Block to a temporary turning circle; and - “OS1” (“Open Space Recreation”) for Blocks 146–150, with special provisions for the Open Space buffer on Block 147 to prohibit the erection of buildings or structures. <p>It is anticipated that based on the agency and Town consultants' comments that this may impact the Zoning By-law amendment. Our office will provide more detailed comments at a later date; however, it is noted there is an opportunity to place a buffer on the rear of lots 92 and 102 and Block 151 in the OS1 Zone to recognize buffers proposed on the northwestern property boundary in the submitted EIS.</p>	<p>The PJR Addendum includes a revised draft Zoning By-law Amendment that reflects changes made to the draft plan. Those changes include an additional buffer in the location specified in this comment (lot numbering has changed as part of the modifications made).</p>
<p>Density & Housing Mix</p> <p>2. The subject lands are located within a Designated Greenfield Area of the County of Wellington Official Plan. This section speaks to requiring new development to achieve densities that promote the overall greenfield density targets of 40 persons and jobs per ha. This is specifically achieved by requiring a minimum 16 units per gross residential hectare for new subdivision developments. The proposed draft plan achieves a density of 15.2 units per gross ha. It is understood that the number of dwelling units included in the proposed development is based on the allocation of sanitary sewer service capacity.</p>	<p>Proposed density is addressed in Section 4.3 of the PJR Addendum. It should be noted that the specific language used in Section 4.4.4.b) is that development should “strive to attain” a density of 16 units per gross hectare.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>Section 4.4.4b)ii) directs that somewhat lower densities may be considered where there are physical and environmental constraints.</p>	
<p>3. Section 4.4.4 further adds that the introduction of medium density housing types in new subdivisions and other designated Greenfield Areas are to be encouraged. With respects to the housing mix within the proposal, planning staff note that the development proposes 142 Single Detached Dwellings, 24 Street Townhouse Blocks and 30 stacked townhouse units and 12 cluster townhouse units. The Planning Justification Report states that the townhouse blocks on full municipality services exceed the recommended 35 units per ha in section 8.3.5 of the Official Plan, however the density of the overall development is proposed to be 15.2 units per hectare. Section 8.3.5 can be used to guide maximum density in developments within the Town. It is noted that this section was recently updated through OPA 123, which received Provincial approval on September 2, 2025, to direct that stacked or back-to-back townhouses which exceed the 35 units per ha density will be considered apartments for section 8.3.5.</p>	<p>Section 4.3 of the PJR Addendum cites the updated policy in Section 8.3.5. The proposed Multiple Residential block on the revised draft plan will have a density below the maximum of 75 units per hectare.</p>
<p>Phasing of Services</p> <p>4. Similarly to other development within the Town, including Hillsburgh, the timing/phasing of services and infrastructure required to accommodate the development of these sites will need to be considered prior to Draft Plan approval. It is noted that Town OPA#13 has previously stated that standardized conditions and holding provisions regarding servicing would be prepared and utilized by the Town. As this development progresses, County planning staff will review these items once prepared.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>Agency/Public Comments</p> <p>5. Attached are all the written comments (8) received to date by the County. We understand a public meeting was held on April 10th, 2025. We look forward to reviewing the applicant’s response within a formal response letter to all comments received including those raised by the public. Please provide this response to both the Town and County.</p>	<p>The written comments included in the eight attachments (three from Wellington Source Water Protection and one each from Canada Post, Credit Valley Conservation, Hydro One, the Upper Grand District School Board, and Wellington County Roads) are addressed in this response matrix.</p>
<p>Environmental Impact Study</p> <p>6. The subject lands and adjoining lands contain the Greenlands System within the County of Wellington Official Plan. The Town and County are jointly utilizing an ecological consultant (GWS Ecological & Forestry Services Inc.) for the review of the submitted Environmental Impact Study.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>7. The peer review identified items to be addressed including requirements regarding the proposed removal of butternut trees and it was directed that this matter must be resolved with MECP and confirmation is to be provided. Further conditions of draft approval were also proposed including requirements for a naturalized landscape plan for the proposed wetland SWM facility, a recommended update to the Tree Preservation Plan, and a Woodland Edge and Buffer Management Plan. It was also recommended that a more detailed environmental monitoring plan should be provided that clearly outlines the monitoring data to be collected and periodically reported to the Town and CVC.</p>	<p>The items identified have been addressed in the revised materials accompanying this resubmission.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>8. In addition, the comments provided by the Ecologist, planning staff note that the Forest Conservation By-law is applicable throughout the County; however, any tree removal should not occur on-site until such time that the Town, County, Credit Valley Conservation Authority and where applicable the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks are satisfied.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>9. It is also noted that Credit Valley Conservation Authority has provided comments through both the draft plan of subdivision process and the zoning by-law amendment to be addressed within the next submission.</p>	<p>Please see the responses to the comments from Credit Valley Conservation below.</p>
<p>Traffic & Road Alignment</p> <p>10. The County of Wellington Roads Department has provided comments under a separate cover regarding this application. Their comments are to be addressed to their satisfaction within a resubmission.</p>	<p>Please see the responses to the comments from Wellington County (Roads) below.</p>
<p>11. The proposed lot configuration shows that Street C does not line up with unopened road allowance from the draft approved subdivision plan for the property to the north (Carson Reid Homes 23T-88015). The PJR states that the precise location of the of the future road between the two subdivisions will require coordination between Thomasfield and Carson Reid Homes and could entail minor modifications to the lotting and minor revisions to the site grading design. It is acknowledged that the Traffic Impact Study includes scenarios of the development of the Carson Reid site and connection to the subject lands.</p>	<p>The draft-approved unopened road allowance to the north passes through a significant woodland. Coordination between Thomasfield and Carson Reid Homes, and with engineering and environmental consultants, has determined that the proposed Street C connection is a more appropriate location for connecting the two subdivisions.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>12. It is noted that through this draft plan process there is an opportunity to align the road network between the Carson Reid subdivision and the subject proposal to increase connectivity and transportation movement for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists between these two developments and provide a link from Station Street to Wellington Rd 22. There is an opportunity to determine the connectivity between these developments early in the process to ensure major changes are not required in the future. The Town may wish to consider the street configuration between these developments early on in the process.</p>	<p>Coordination between Thomasfield and Carson Reid Homes has been undertaken to provide for appropriate connectivity between the two subdivisions, including active transportation connections via the proposed multi-use trail along Street C.</p>
<p>Additional Items</p> <p>13. Through the County’s review of these applications, we note a couple of items for consideration by the Town:</p>	<p>See responses below.</p>
<p>(1) it is noted that the Planning Justification Report (PJR) does not speak to Part 5 Greenland System in the County Official Plan, which are applicable in the urban centres and the PJR does not speak to the Growth Plan;</p>	<p>Section 4.3 of the PJR Addendum speaks to Part 5 of the County’s Official Plan. The Growth Plan was no longer in effect at the time the applications were first submitted (November 2024), and remains no longer in effect at the time of this resubmission.</p>
<p>(2) there appears to be a discrepancy in the area of the subject lands and the area assessed in the Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment which should be clarified;</p>	<p>The Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment refers to the study area as containing “entirely ploughable lands.” It is likely that the area around the edges of the property occupied by vegetation accounts for the small discrepancy.</p>
<p>(3) The outcome of the discussion between the Wellington Catholic School Board and developer regarding local school accommodation needs and integrating a potential school block should be clarified;</p>	<p>A meeting with the WCDSB was held on February 4, 2026, to discuss school accommodation needs. Lines of communication between the proponent and the WCDSB remain open.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>(4) It is noted the submitted Functional Servicing Report did not speak to Additional Residential Units (ARUs). The Urban Residential One (UR1) Zone permits an additional residential dwelling unit as-of-right and section 4.4.6 of the County of Wellington Official Plan contains policies for Additional Residential Units including servicing requirements. The potential for ARUs to be established within the proposed subdivision should be considered within the Functional Servicing Report.</p>	<p>The updated FSR addresses ARUs in its water and sanitary demand calculations by assuming an additional 20% population on demand calculations: see Section 2.2 and Section 3.2, respectively, of the updated FSR. For ARUs that are external to the primary residence (i.e., garden suites or accessory buildings) and that could potentially have an impact on stormwater management calculations, we have assumed a maximum lot coverage based on the Zoning By-law. ARUs must meet that maximum lot coverage requirement, so the SWM calculations take into account potential ARUs. If an ARU is proposed that exceeds the maximum lot coverage, a revision to the SWM calculations will be required by the proponent of the ARU at the time of the application.</p>
<p>Next Steps</p> <p>14. It is anticipated that a revised draft plan will be required to be submitted to the County for circulation based on the comments provided through the review thus far. A fee may be required for the revision which will be calculated and required upon submission.</p>	<p>A revised draft plan has been submitted to the Town and the County.</p>
<p>15. We look forward to reviewing a detailed response comment matrix to all the comments received from technical consultants and agencies and a formal response from the applicant to all the public comments received to date. The aforementioned items are all anticipated from the applicant in addition to the items identified by the Town in their May 12, 2025 comment letter and attached documents.</p>	<p>This comment response table has been provided to address this requirement.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<i>Wellington County (Roads)</i>	
<p>1. Require a conveyance of a one-foot reserve along Wellington Road 22 in the favor of the County of Wellington including daylight corners at the new Road entrance.</p>	<p>The revised draft plan includes the requested reserve (Block 160).</p>
<p>2. The County Roads will require that the stormwater pond outlet be conveyed to the nearest cross culvert structure and a direct outlet to the roadside ditch is not acceptable. A storm sewer system will be required on Wellington Road 22 which will be part of the external works required to support this development.</p>	<p>A meeting with County staff and Crozier occurred on September 12, 2025 on-site to discuss the drainage of the property. It was agreed that stormwater from the property can continue to be conveyed to the County Road 22 ditch (north side); however, drainage improvements such as new culverts, ditch grading improvement, ditch inlet CBs, etc., will be required as part of the application and approval. These improvements will be provided to the County and Town as part of detailed design. It should also be noted that the County acknowledged the poor condition of the retaining wall at the Credit River crossing downstream of the site and understood that the wall requires upgrades/replacement and that these costs would be carried by the County.</p>
<p>3. With the change of land use from agricultural into residential subdivision a Petition for Municipal Drain should be implemented. This is to ensure that the proposed storm water pond and storm sewer system outlet to the nearest cross culvert structure will be properly maintained under the Drainage Act.</p>	<p>No Petition is required as part of this development as discharge from the property will remain less than or equal to existing peak flow rates and will discharge to the County Road 22 roadside ditch. As noted previously, improvements will be required to ensure positive drainage. These improvements will be coordinated with the County through detailed design.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p><i>The Traffic Impact Study has been peer reviewed, and their comments are provided as attached:</i></p> <p>We have completed our review of the “Transportation Impact Study – Hillsburgh Residential Subdivision” prepared by Salvini Consulting. Based on our assessment, our recommendation is that this study should not be accepted by the County at this time. While the report addresses some of the technical requirements, there are several key issues that must be resolved before the study can be considered complete. Our primary concerns are as follows:</p>	<p>See responses below.</p>
<p>(1) Signal Timings at Wellington Road 22 & 24 intersection. It does not appear that the study used the actual signal timings that are found at this existing study area intersection.</p>	<p>The updated TIS used signal timing provided by the County: see Section 3 and Appendix B.</p>
<p>(2) Section 4.1 – Future Background Forecasts The study does not include any other background developments in the study area, such as Hillsburgh Heights (Briarwood), 63 & 63A Trafalgar (Ballantry), and the Carson Reid Development, noting other background developments may be identified by the Town of Erin. These developments are expected to contribute to background traffic volumes and must be incorporated into the future background forecasts and analysis.</p>	<p>Background traffic forecasts include background traffic from five nearby developments, as noted in Section 4 of the updated TIS.</p>
<p>(3) Town Comments (Ainsley) We agree with the majority of the Town of Erin’s comments. While the following two items may be deferred, others are essential and must be addressed in the revised submission:</p>	<p>Noted. Please see responses below.</p>
<p>(a) Item 39.2 – Road Classification: These are internal subdivision roads. While classification is relevant for long-term planning, it can be deferred to the detailed design stage.</p>	<p>Road classifications have informed decisions regarding right-of-way widths in the revised draft plan and are discussed in Section 2 of the updated TIS.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>(b) Item 39.4 – Transit Routes and Schedules: There is currently no transit service in Hillsburgh other than on-demand ridesharing services. While this is not a concern in the current rural context, it should still be acknowledged in Section 2 of the revised TIS for completeness.</p>	<p>Please see Section 2 of the updated TIS, which refers to the current status of transit service.</p>
<p>These concerns are particularly important given the scale of the proposed development and the cumulative impact of nearby projects. A revised TIS should be submitted that fully addresses these issues.</p>	<p>Please refer to the updated TIS that accompanies this resubmission.</p>
<p>Some other supplementary or minor comments on the submitted TIS are noted below:</p>	<p>See responses below.</p>
<p>(4) Collision History and Safety Analysis: The report does not include a review of collision history at the WR22/WR24 intersection. Given the rural context of this intersection and anticipated traffic growth, this analysis should be included to provide a high-level safety evaluation.</p>	<p>Collision data provided by the County is addressed in Section 3 of the updated TIS.</p>
<p>(5) Pavement Marking and Signage Plan: A westbound right-turn lane is recommended at WR22/Street A, but no drawing is provided. A preliminary/sketch plan is essential to ensure safe and efficient access. It is noted that the revised analysis may require changes to the geometric of this recommended turn lane and that other laning and/or traffic control may be ultimately recommended or required back on the revised future analysis.</p>	<p>A westbound right-turn lane is not recommended in the report, but could be provided, subject to discussion with County staff. There is no capacity requirement for a right-turn lane. If County staff determine that they want a right-turn lane into the new subdivision, a plan will be prepared for review.</p>
<p>(6) Data Discrepancy in Summary Table: In Table 1 (AM Peak), the NBTR delay is listed as 72 seconds, but Appendix C (Synchro outputs) shows 7.2 seconds. This and other summary tables should be reviewed for consistency and accuracy.</p>	<p>Please refer to the summary tables in the updated TIS.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<i>Wellington Source Water Protection</i>	
<p align="center">Section 59 Notice & Risk Management Plan</p> <p>1. A Section 59 Notice and Risk Management Plan are not required for this proposal.</p>	Noted and acknowledged.
<p align="center">Land Use Planning</p> <p>2. WSWP request that the owners or their agents submit the following documentation to the satisfaction of the Town Risk Management Official:</p>	See response below.
<p>(a) A Winter Maintenance Plan including, but not limited to, how salt is applied and stored on the property, snow clearing procedures, details regarding winter maintenance contracts, and contractor and/or employee training procedures. Please see attached Appendix C - Guidance Documents for additional information on Winter Maintenance Plans.</p>	Noted and acknowledged. This will be addressed through conditions of draft approval and/or the subdivision agreement.
<i>Credit Valley Conservation</i>	
<p align="center">General</p> <p>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 and show the staked dripline to the valley slope along with a 10m buffer.</p>	Please refer to the maps that accompany the EIS.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>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.</p>	<p>The draft Zoning By-law Amendment (in Appendix 'B' to the PJR) includes appropriate zoning for the open space buffers.</p>
<p>3. A response matrix should be provided outlining how comments have been addressed.</p>	<p>This response matrix has been provided to address this request.</p>
<p>4. A CVC permit is required for the development as proposed.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>Hydrogeology</p> <p><i>Wetland Water Balance</i></p> <p>5. The body of the report presents a summary wetland water balance table and references Appendix F for the background calculations. However, the appendix also contains a table with numbers, without demonstrating how these numbers were derived, and how / whether they tie into the site-based water balance. Please explain.</p>	<p>Please see the FSR prepared by Crozier, which addresses the updated design for the development and replaces the previous FSR.</p>
<p>Engineering</p> <p><i>General</i></p> <p>6. Drawing #10 has a storm sewer drainage area that is not assigned to drain towards the pond as delineated on post development drainage area plan (Fig 4). In Fig 4 of the post development drainage area plan, catchment ID 200 includes these lots from 61 through 71. However, servicing plan drawing #3 doesn't show any RLCB to collect the drainage. Please confirm if the uncontrolled drainage area towards the agricultural farmland shown as 0.29ha include these lots from 61 through 71. Otherwise, please show the appropriate drainage direction and collection point for these lots at post development conditions.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
7. Overall servicing plan drawings DWG #2 and #3, show the infiltration trenches. Please add them within the legend of these drawings.	Noted and acknowledged.
8. Feasibility of the infiltration trenches for the water balance calculations were checked and verified. Calculations are satisfactory. However, as the infiltration facilities are located at the backyard of the private properties, maintenance of the trenches and continued functionality will have to be confirmed.	Noted and acknowledged.
9. As per section 8.2 of the ESC Guide for urban construction (TRCA, 2019) a conceptual strategy to protect areas designated to LIDs during construction should be developed and discussed in the FSR.	Noted and acknowledged. Details will be provided through detailed design.
10. The comments are provided for ESC submitted for FSR. To complete the ESC plan for the detailed design, please refer to section 8.3 of the ESC Guide for urban construction (TRCA, 2019).	Noted and acknowledged.
<i>Functional Servicing Report</i>	
11. Please provide a permanent pool volume close to the required 861 m ³ volume or provide the monthly turnover calculations using monthly precipitation data (including summer months) to support the provided permanent pool volume.	Permanent pool volume meets MECP requirements.
12. 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 numbers derived are to be supported by the calculations. Feature based water balance is missing in the FSR – please provide.	Noted and acknowledged.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p align="center"><i>Engineering Drawings</i></p> <p>13. Please confirm and provide the required dewatering plan. Please note that Urban Guidelines for ESC have standard drawings for dewatering measures. Please refer to the guideline and add the standard drawings to the ESC drawing.</p>	<p>A dewatering plan will be prepared during detailed design.</p>
<p align="center"><i>Pond (Wetland Facility) Design</i></p> <p>14. In accordance with CVC’s stormwater management criteria, the outlet invert should be located above the 25-year water level in the channel otherwise; a tailwater influence must be accounted for in the sizing of the SWM facility.</p>	<p>The pond has been redesigned. Please refer to Drawing C-701 for details.</p>
<p align="center"><i>Water Balance</i></p> <p>15. Please provide the scenarios of pre-development, post development without mitigation and post development with mitigation in the appendix for both overall water balance and for FBWB. Site wide water balance calculations have been added, FBWB is to be added.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>Ecology</p> <p align="center"><i>General</i></p> <p>16. The development activities will result in removal of mature woody vegetation. The EIS recommends a tree compensation plan be developed to help achieve no net loss. The CVC Ecosystem Offsetting Guideline is recommended to be referenced when developing this plan to achieve a net ecological gain.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
17. To help avoid contravention of federal and provincial regulations all vegetation removals should occur outside the main active season of April – October. This timing window should be factored into project scheduling and included on the plans as notes to the contractor.	The timing of activities will be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations made in the EIS, which align with this comment.
18. A qualified environmental monitor should be on site to ensure that environmental protections are in working order and to ensure that impacts from development activities are avoided (e.g. wildlife salvages, ESC inspections).	Monitoring, including an environmental inspector, will be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations made in the EIS.
<p align="center"><i>Feature Based Water Balance</i></p> 19. Please consider expanded buffers along the rear lot lines that back onto the regulated top of bank (the east property line) where current infiltration galleries are proposed. This will ensure that infiltration capacity is maintained without the need for continued maintenance.	Noted and acknowledged.
<i>Upper Grand District School Board</i>	
Please be advised that the Board does not object to the proposed application, subject to the following conditions.	See responses below.
1. That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Noted and acknowledged.
2. That the developer shall agree in the subdivision agreement that adequate sidewalks, lighting and snow removal (on sidewalks and walkways) will be provided to allow children to walk safely to school or to a designated bus pickup point.	The subdivision agreement will provide for these elements.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>3. That the developer and the Upper Grand District School Board reach an agreement regarding the supply and erection of a sign (at the developer's expense and according to the Board's specifications) affixed to the permanent development sign advising prospective residents about schools in the area.</p>	<p>The subdivision agreement will include the necessary provisions.</p>
<p>4. That the developer agrees in the subdivision agreement to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease, until such time as a permanent school is assigned:</p> <p><i>"Whereas the Upper Grand District School Board has designated this subdivision as a Development Area for the purposes of school accommodation, and despite the best efforts of the Upper Grand School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the area, and further, that students may in future have to be transferred to another school."</i></p>	<p>The subdivision agreement will include the necessary provisions to ensure the required clause is included.</p>
<p>5. That the developer shall agree in the condominium declaration to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease.</p> <p><i>"In order to limit liability, public school buses operated by the Service de transport de Wellington-Dufferin Student Transportation Services (STWDSTS), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point."</i></p>	<p>Any condominium declaration will include the necessary provisions to ensure the required clause is included.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>6. Further to the conditions listed above, if the lands to the north of this subdivision (Carson site) are not developed at the time when this subdivision is being constructed, Board staff also suggest the creation of a temporary walkway connection from the proposed subdivision through the lands to the north where feasible and safe. This temporary walkway would need to connect to the Elora Cataract Trailway. This informal path could also provide Ross R. MacKay PS students the opportunity to walk to school.</p>	<p>This suggestion will be taken into consideration, but as the proponent/ applicant does not own the property to the north, no definitive statement can be made at this time.</p>
<p>7. That the developer shall agree to provide the Upper Grand District School Board with a digital file of the plan of subdivision in either ARC/INFO export or DWG format containing parcel fabric and street network.</p>	<p>A digital file of the plan of subdivision will be provided once it has been approved.</p>
<p>8. That the developer shall agree in the condominium declaration to advise all purchasers of residential units and/or renters of same, by inserting the following clause in all offers of Purchase and Sale/Lease.</p> <p><i>“In order to limit liability, public school buses operated by the Service de transport de Wellington-Dufferin Student Transportation Services (STWDSTS), or its assigns or successors, will not travel on privately owned or maintained right-of-ways to pick up students, and potential busing students will be required to meet the bus at a congregated bus pick-up point.”</i></p>	<p>The inclusion of the requested clause in all offers of purchase and sale or lease will be provided for in the condominium declaration.</p>
<p><i>Wellington Catholic District School Board</i></p>	
<p>1. Currently, the local high school is oversubscribed. All WCDSB secondary schools, including St. James Catholic High School, are located within Guelph, necessitating transportation for secondary students from surrounding areas.</p>	<p>A meeting between the proponent and WCDSB was held on February 4, 2026, to discuss the Board’s request. A final decision has not been made at this time, although lines of communication between the proponent and the WCDSB remain open.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>The local elementary school has some capacity to accommodate additional enrolment from growth. However, with a built capacity of only 314 pupil places, its ability to support significant long-term growth is limited. Furthermore, the WCDSB does not have a presence in Hillsburgh, with the nearest elementary school located approximately 10 km away in the Erin settlement area. As a result, students from Hillsburgh are provided with transportation into Erin to attend school. Given that the Official Plan designates Hillsburgh as a main settlement area within the Municipality of Erin, continued concentrated growth will generate the need for an additional school site in Hillsburgh to ensure adequate capacity and equitable access to Catholic education across the municipality.</p> <p>As such, the WCDSB requests a meeting to discuss local school accommodation needs and explore how a school block can be integrated into this proposal.</p>	
<p><i>Approval Conditions</i></p> <p>2. The WCDSB requests that the subdivision agreement between the Owner and the Municipality contain provisions, to the satisfaction of the WCDSB and the Municipality, requiring notice in every agreement of purchase and sale advising:</p> <p><i>“Students from this development who are enrolled in schools operated by the Wellington Catholic District School Board may be temporarily accommodated through portable classrooms or by transportation to facilities with space outside of the local area. For further details, please contact your designated local school.”</i></p>	<p>The subdivision agreement will include the necessary provisions to ensure the required clause is included.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
3. Additionally, the WCDSB requests for notification signage to be placed in a prominent location on-site. Please refer to the attached sign specifications for the WCDSB’s development-site signage requirements.	The subdivision agreement will include the necessary provisions.
4. We will continue to monitor development growth in Hillsburgh and the Town of Erin on behalf of the WCDSB as it relates to the cumulative impact on local schools. The WCDSB also requests notification of any modifications, community consultations, appeals, or notices of decision related to this Plan.	Noted and acknowledged.
5. Please note that further to the comments provided, the WCDSB reserves the right to revise their position as needed without further notice.	Noted and acknowledged.
<i>Canada Post</i>	
1. The owner/developer of any condominiums will be required to provide signature for a License to Occupy Land agreement and provide winter snow clearance at the Community Mailbox locations.	Noted and acknowledged.
2. Enhanced Community Mailbox Sites with roof structures will require additional documentation as per Canada Post Policy.	Noted and acknowledged.
3. There will be no more than one mail delivery point to each unique address assigned by the Municipality.	Noted and acknowledged.
4. Any existing postal coding may not apply, the owner/developer should contact Canada Post to verify postal codes for the project.	Noted and acknowledged.
5. The complete guide to Canada Post’s Delivery Standards can be found at: https://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mc/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf	Noted and acknowledged.

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>In order to provide mail service to this development, Canada Post requests that the owner/developer comply with the following conditions:</p>	
<p>(1) The owner/developer will consult with Canada Post to determine suitable permanent locations for the placement of Community Mailboxes and to indicate these locations on appropriate servicing plans.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. Consultation will take place at an appropriate stage of detailed design.</p>
<p>(2) The Builder/Owner/Developer will confirm to Canada Post that the final secured permanent locations for the Community Mailboxes will not be in conflict with any other utility; including hydro transformers, bell pedestals, cable pedestals, flush to grade communication vaults, landscaping enhancements (tree planting) and bus pads.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>(3) The owner/developer will install concrete pads at each of the Community Mailbox locations as well as any required walkways across the boulevard and any required curb depressions for wheelchair access as per Canada Post's concrete pad specification drawings.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>
<p>(4) The owner/developer will agree to prepare and maintain an area of compacted gravel to Canada Post's specifications to serve as a temporary Community Mailbox location. This location will be in a safe area away from construction activity in order that Community Mailboxes may be installed to service addresses that have occupied prior to the pouring of the permanent mailbox pads. This area will be required to be prepared a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of first occupancy.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. The subdivision agreement will include the necessary provisions.</p>
<p>(5) The owner/developer will communicate to Canada Post the excavation date for the first foundation (or first phase) as well as the expected date of first occupancy.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>

Comment Response Table

**Thomasfield Homes Ltd. — Hillsburgh Ridge Subdivision
Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z24-01 & Draft Plan of Subdivision 23T-24001**

Comment	Response
<p>(6) The owner/developer agrees, prior to offering any of the residential units for sale, to place a "Display Map" on the wall of the sales office in a place readily available to the public which indicates the location of all Canada Post Community Mailbox site locations, as approved by Canada Post and the Township of Erin.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. The subdivision agreement will include the necessary provisions.</p>
<p>(7) The owner/developer agrees to include in all offers of purchase and sale a statement, which advises the prospective new home purchaser that mail delivery will be from a designated Community Mailbox, and to include the exact locations (list of lot #s) of each of these Community Mailbox locations; and further, advise any affected homeowners of any established easements granted to Canada Post.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged. The subdivision agreement will include the necessary provisions.</p>
<p>(8) The owner/developer will be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Community Mailbox locations prior to the closing of any home sales with specific clauses in the Purchase offer, on which the homeowners do a sign off.</p>	<p>Noted and acknowledged.</p>