

Department	Contact	Comment	Response	Responsibility
Triton	Terry Kuipers	Submitted Items List: - Draft Plan of Subdivision, dated 13 August 2024, prepared by GSP group. - Functional Servicing Report, dated 24 June 2024, prepared by Urbtech Engineering Inc. - Transportation Impact Study, dated August 2024, prepared by C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc. - Archaeological MCM Submission Confirmation Letter, dated 22 May 2024, submitted by AMICK Consultants Limited	Noted.	Cachet
Triton	Terry Kuipers	Current Submission Comments General: 1.1 Confirm and provide a development timeline and anticipated start time for internal infrastructure works. The Town requires this information to plan for the design of external Town right-of-way works and associated Developer/Town responsibilities. The external sanitary sewer works will need to be constructed prior to the start of any internal servicing works.	Internal grading is anticipated in July/August 2025, and we are targeting internal servicing commencement in September/October 2025.	Cachet/GSP/Urbtech/Soil-Mat Cachet
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.2 Confirm if development will be phased. Note: Depending on the proposed phase sizing, temporary secondary access to the site may be required.	No phasing is contemplated for the development.	Cachet
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.3 The draft plan labels the accesses connecting to Main Street. This appears to be mislabeled and should be Park Street West.	For reference, "Main Street" was the historic name on original Village Plan of Clifford. Historic surveys and plans formed the base of the original draft plan, as per typical practise and was labelled "Main Street (known as Park St)". However, as per comment, reference to former "Main Street" name has been removed and draft plan revised accordingly.	GSP
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.4 The total number of units shown in the draft plan and functional servicing report do not match. Revise accordingly.	The number of units in the FSR has been revised as per the draft plan to 189.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.5 A copy of the Geotechnical Investigation Report is to be provided.	The Geotechnical Investigation Report and supplemental Hydrogeological study have been included in this submission.	GSP
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.6 Confirm and provide seasonal high groundwater levels for the development. This is required for building footings and SWM pond design. Typically, this is achieved by way of monitoring for at least a one-year period.	Soil-Mat has put wells in place on site, and has conducted both a borehole and test pit study to assess groundwater. Soil-Mat has confirmed in their studies that the groundwater is below the proposed foundation, servicing, and SWM pond depths. It is Soil-Mat's opinion that the studies conducted thus far are sufficient to characterize the groundwater conditions for the development, however Soil-Mat has installed groundwater data loggers in the monitoring wells, and will continue to monitor.	Soil-Mat
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.7 Confirm and indicate the new farmstead driveway entrance location connecting to Under Way Road.	A conceptual driveway location has been added to the engineering plans. Further details will be provided during detailed design.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	Functional Servicing Report (FSR): 1.8 Ensure details and calculations shown in the report are correct. We find the following issues: a. There is a typo in Section 4.2 where 255 should be revised to 188. b. The site is shown on the street in the key plan. Revise accordingly.	a. The unit number has been revised to 189 and population of 567. b. The key plan has been updated.	Urbtech Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.9 Confirm that the peaking factor for water demand calculations is as per MOE Manual 2008. (i.e. peaking factors for daily and hourly should be 2.75 and 4.13 and there is no Appendix L).	The maximum day factor has been revised to 2.75 and the peak hour to 4.13 as per MOE manual.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.10 Water and sanitary servicing section to comment on and refer to Clifford's available hydraulic reserve capacity. The current 2024 hydraulic reserve capacity for water and sanitary are 1,169 and 411 equivalent residential units (ERU), respectively.	This statement has been added to both the water and sanitary servicing sections.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	Storm Water Management (SWM) Design: 1.11 Indicate the proposed bank slopes for pond design by providing a cross-sectional view to confirm sufficient land area has been provided to accommodate the pond geometry. Note, as per MOE 2003 SWM Planning and Design Manual, the maximum slope is to be 5:1 for a minimum of 3.0 metres from the permanent pool elevation. All other slopes are to be a maximum 3:1.	The typical pond section PSEC-1 and to the POND drawing has been added. The pond will have slopes of 4:1, 7:1 below and above permanent pool and then 4:1 to the top of the pond.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.12 Indicate spillway location on pond drawing plan. The adequacy of the downstream ditch capacity to accept the pond spill will need to be discussed.	The spillway has been added to the pond plan.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.13 Ensure legends are showing correct information. (i.e. two different arrows indicate the same major overland flow route).	The arrows have been updated.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.14 Provide reasoning for dividing the drainage area near the east end of the pond.	In the pre-development condition, the external area 105 and 107 is draining to the site Area 103 and then to Park Street, Outlet 'A'. Area 104 is draining to site area 101 and then to the existing ditch along walkway, Outlet 'B'. External Area 106 drains to site area 102 and then to the existing ditch at the walkway, Outlet 'C'. To establish the allowable flows from this site to each Outlet point.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.15 Confirm all design parameters are correct. (i.e. Curve Number of 58 or post-development area 205 is low)	There is no CN 58 in the report. Based on the MTO design manual, the hydrologic Soil Group BC for crops and other improved land is 78 in the pre-development condition. In post-development condition the CN for soil group BC and good grass cover is 68.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.16 Confirm that the 65% overall impervious area directed to the SWM pond has accounted for the requested additional lot coverage.	The imperviousness number has been adjusted, based on the zoning to 75% for the towns and 65% for the singles.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.17 A comparison between the existing and proposed outlets is to be verified for adequacy, specifically Catchment 201 which indicates an increase in impervious area to 65% resulting in increased flows and run-off volume to the outlet location.	The pond outlet has been designed based on the pre-development drainage area to Outlet 'B'. The flows from this site will be reduced significantly to each outlet, please refer to Outlet tables in the FSR.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.18 Extraneous catchment areas are to be included in modeling calculations as this will impact sizing of any required drainage features, for example field area abutting Catchment 201.	The external drainage areas have been included in the model. The filled area next to area 201 will spill into Park Street and in the post-development scenario it will spill to Outlet 'C'. It should be noted that only the site areas and the external areas 104, 105, 106 and 107 were included in the calculation for each outlet. The post development flows from this subject lands will be significantly reduced to each outlet, therefore there will be no impact on the existing ditch. Notwithstanding we have provided two ditch sections showing the post-development water level for the 5 and 100 year storm events on PSEC-2 drawing.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC): 1.19 Confirm why the silt barrier is discontinued along Street A.	The fence has been corrected.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.20 Ensure all the notes are up to date. (i.e. Note 10 indicates "Township of Wellington North" that should be revised to "Town of Minto").	The notes have been corrected.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.21 As mentioned in FSR, more details and calculations for ESC measures should be provided at the detailed design stage.	Noted.	Urbtech
Triton	Terry Kuipers	Traffic Impact Study (TIS): 1.22 Section 2.1 "Study Road Network" Table 1 indicates that Minto Street South is a local road from Park Street West to Queen Street and a County Road north of Ann Street. This should be clarified as Minto Road switches to County Road 2 at the intersection with Allen Street and continues northerly.	Acknowledged, the wording in the report has been revised.	Crozier Crozier
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.23 Table 2 indicates that Allen Street West is a local road. This should be clarified as Allen Street West is a County Road between Elora Street and Minto Street. Allen Street West also has sidewalks on both sides of the road from Minto Street to Elora Street.	Acknowledged, the wording in the report has been revised.	Crozier
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.24 Section 3.3 "Intersection Operations" indicates that a southbound left turn lane is warranted but doesn't state for which intersection. This should be clarified. The report should also provide the calculation for this left turn warrant.	Acknowledged, the TIS has been updated to clarify that the southbound left-turn lane was found to be warranted at the intersection of Elora Street South and Park Street West based on future background volumes. The Left-Turn Lane graphs have been included in Appendix G for reference.	Crozier
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.25 Section 4.2 assumes that 40% of traffic will travel north via Elora Street South/County Road. Based on the existing road network, a portion of this northbound traffic may elect to use Minto Road and West Heritage Street to travel north on Highway 9 or Allen Street West and turn left at the traffic signals with Elora Street to travel north.	Acknowledged, it is not expected that this would have a significant impact on the results of the study. The Elora Street South/Park Street West intersection is forecast to operate with a LOS 'C', while Minto Street and Park Street is forecast to operate with a LOS 'A'. The redistribution of trips would improve operations at the intersection of Elora Street South/Park Street West and is not expected to have a significant impact on the remaining intersections. Furthermore, with the Allen Street intersection signalized, it is anticipated that it will be able to accommodate a higher portion of left-turn vehicles. Hence, no changes were made on the TIS trip distribution as discussed in Section 4.2.	Crozier
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.26 Section 5.2 uses a 60km/h design speed for Elora Street South at the intersection with Park Street West. While it is common practice to use 10km/h above posted speed limit in lower speed, urban environments, this intersection is at the edge of the urban limits and the posted speed is 60km/h on Elora Street South (Highway 9) 70m south of the intersection. As vehicles are entering the urban area from a higher speed highway at this intersection, a design speed of 20km/h above posted is more appropriate at this location.	Acknowledged, a 15 m southbound left-turn lane is warranted at the intersection of Elora Street South/Park Street West under 2029 future background conditions. Additionally, a 15m northbound left-turn lane is now warranted as of 2029 future total conditions. Updated graphs have been included.	Crozier
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.27 Table 13 indicated both analyses are for Access A. It should clarify which analysis is for which access.	Acknowledged, this was a typo and Site Access B has been labelled properly.	Crozier
Triton	Terry Kuipers	1.28 Section 7.2, there is a downgrade on Park Street West for eastbound vehicles approaching proposed Street B. The report should comment on whether this slope requires an adjustment to the stopping sight distance.	The available Sight Distance for vehicles approaching Street 'B' from west was measured to be 123 m. Over that distance, the downgrade is 2.4% (based on google earth, could confirm with survey if available). If you round to 3% it would result in a minimum requirement of 87m (only 2m higher than flat) therefore applying the grade adjustment has no impact on the sufficiency of the Sight Distance. Discussion on grade has been added to the TIS.	Crozier
County of Wellington	Zach Prince	1. In regard to the proposed park on the draft plan of subdivision, Planning Staff note that consideration should be given to relocating the park to a more centralized location within the development. A central location would improve accessibility and integration of the park into the neighbourhood. The proposed park has a long and narrow design that may not be ideal in terms of functionality and usability. Planning staff understand that the park is proposed in its current location by the applicant due to servicing constraints and costs (this area may need a sewage pump station). Alternatively, the Town could take cash in lieu of parkland for all or a portion of the park.	This comment has been discussed with Terry Kuipers, and the Town has confirmed that they are satisfied with the location of the park as proposed along Park Street West. The proposed neighbourhood park will be within a 400 m walking distance of the entire subdivision, which is a best practise and reasonable distance to be accessible to all new residential units. This distance results in an approximate 8 minute or less walk.	Cachet
County of Wellington	Zach Prince	2. Planning staff have some initial concerns with the proposed reductions to setbacks and increased lot coverage without additional information and justification from the applicant why they are needed and appropriate.	In consultation with the Town, several revisions made to zoning, including increasing front yard setback, eliminating reduced interior side yard setback and reducing maximum lot coverage for bungalow dwelling models. Please refer to submission cover letter and revised draft zoning by-law. Further context also provided in chart below on Town's zoning comments. The draft zoning by-law has been revised in response to Town comments, and discussed in detail with Terry Kuipers.	GSP

County of Wellington	Zach Prince	3. It is important that minimum setbacks and maximum lot coverages be established which ensure that there is sufficient access to rear yards, room to maintain the sides of dwellings, allowance for sunlight between dwellings, room for parking, drainage, grading, landscaping, lawns and snow storage, and sufficient rear yard sizes for amenity and building separation. Planning Staff are requesting that the applicant prepare site plans showing the typical buildout of the units on the lots to assist with the review of the proposed new standards.	The draft zoning by-law has been revised in response to Town comments. During discussions with County and Town staff, conceptual site plans of single detached and townhouse lots were presented. The requested reduction to the minimum interior side yard setback for the R2 zone has been removed. With respect to rear yard sizes, this has also been discussed with Terry and revised according to our discussions. At Terry's request, we have also provided with this submission, simple conceptual site plans to explain the requested Exterior Side Yard and Landscaped Area in the R2 zone, and the requested Exterior Side Yard and Rear Yard in the R3 zone. Based on our discussions with Terry Kuipers, it is our understanding that the revised zoning is acceptable. Please refer to responses to the Town of Minto's comments below, regarding the proposed zoning.	GSP
Wellington Source Water Protection	Danielle	Based on our review of the submitted documents, WSWP have no objections to the proposed application receiving draft approval subject to the following requirements and conditions:	Noted.	Cachet
Wellington Source Water Protection	Danielle	1. Completion of a hydrogeological assessment for the property;	Noted. As previously confirmed by Danielle Walker, this comment will be addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.	Cachet
Wellington Source Water Protection	Danielle	2. A Salt Management Plan to manage winter maintenance activities until the roads are assumed by the Town;	Noted. As previously confirmed by Danielle Walker, this comment will be addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.	Cachet
Wellington Source Water Protection	Danielle	3. A liquid fuel handling / storage and spill response procedure for construction;	Noted. As previously confirmed by Danielle Walker, this comment will be addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.	Cachet
Wellington Source Water Protection	Danielle	4. Implementation of best management practices, such as LID measures, with the goal to maintain pre-development recharge;	Noted. As previously confirmed by Danielle Walker, this comment will be addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.	Cachet
Wellington Source Water Protection	Danielle	5. That the 3 existing, unused, wells are decommissioned as per Ontario Regulation 903 and that this documentation is submitted;	Noted. As previously confirmed by Danielle Walker, this comment will be addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.	Cachet
Wellington Source Water Protection	Danielle	6. Documentation of the ECA for future sanitary sewer servicing, once available.	Noted. As previously confirmed by Danielle Walker, this comment will be addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.	Cachet
Upper Grand District School Board		1. That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Noted.	Cachet
Upper Grand District School Board		2. That the developer shall agree, upon registration of the plan, 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.	Noted and agreed.	Cachet
Upper Grand District School Board		3. 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.	Noted and agreed.	Cachet
Upper Grand District School Board		4. That the developer shall supply, erect, and maintain a sign (at its expense and according to the Board's specifications) affixed to the permanent development sign advising prospective residents about schools in the area.	Noted and agreed. The specifications and location of the sign will be confirmed with the School Board, and installed prior to registration of the subdivision.	Cachet
Upper Grand District School Board		5. That the developer shall agree 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: "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."	Noted and agreed. No privately owned roadways (i.e. within a plan of condominium) are proposed in this development.	Cachet
Town of Minto	Terry Kuipers and Sama Haghghi	1. Concerns have been raised regarding the request for the minimum front yard in the requested R2 and R3 zones, which proposes a setback of 6 m (19.7 ft) to the garage and 4 m (13.1 ft) to the front wall. The proposed reduction in the front wall setback raises concerns, as no prior development approvals have been issued for this area in Minto. Additionally, concerns have been raised about the potential for further encroachments within the requested reduced setback, which may affect compliance with zoning regulations.	As agreed with Terry, the front yard setback has been increased to 4.5m, and further encroachments have been limited to a further 1.5m into the front yard. The draft zoning by-law has been revised accordingly.	GSP/Cachet
Town of Minto	Terry Kuipers and Sama Haghghi	2. Concerns have been raised regarding the request for the minimum interior side yard in the requested R2 zone, which proposes a setback of 1.2 m (3.9 ft) and 0.6 m (1.96 ft) (split). These concerns include access restrictions, potential obstruction, loss of green space, limited window openings, fire spread risks, non-conformance with surrounding subdivisions, grading issues, and other related factors.	The request for the reduced minimum interior side yard setback of 0.6m has been removed from the draft zoning by-law.	GSP/Cachet
Town of Minto	Terry Kuipers and Sama Haghghi	3. Concerns have been raised regarding the minimum exterior side yard setback in the requested R2 and R3 zones, which proposes a reduction from the required 6 m (19.7 ft) to 3 m (9.8 ft). No development has been proposed or approved in Minto. Additional concerns include the potential for further encroachments within the requested reduced setback, which may affect compliance with zoning regulations.	The draft zoning by-law has been revised to allow a 3.0m setback to the main building, while prohibiting further encroachments into the exterior side yard. The Town's existing zoning regulations allow porches and other features to be built 3 metres from the exterior side lot line as-of-right. The request is now to allow the main building itself to be at that same 3 metre distance. No additional extensions beyond this would be allowed. It is also important to note that the 3.0m setback is to the property line, however there is additional landscaped space between the property line to the sidewalk/pavement (there would be at least 6.45m of landscaped space between the main building to the sidewalk).	GSP/Cachet
Town of Minto	Terry Kuipers and Sama Haghghi	4. Concerns have been raised regarding the minimum rear yard setback in the requested R2 zone, which proposes a reduction from 7.6 m (24.9 ft) to 7 m (22.96 ft), and in the R3 zone, from 7.6 m (24.9 ft) to 6 m (19.7 ft). These concerns include the potential impact on the enjoyment and usability of rear yards, especially with the addition of decks, patios, or sheds, as well as potential effects on grading.	As per conversations with Terry, the minimum rear yard setback for the R2 zone was maintained at 7.0m. For the R3 zone, the minimum rear yard has been revised to be 7.0m for 2-storey buildings, and 6.0m for less than 2-storey buildings. As per Terry's request, a high-level worst case grading plan has been provided to demonstrate that there is still sufficient space between the back wall of the house (assuming a 6.0m setback) and the back yard swale.	GSP/Cachet
Town of Minto	Terry Kuipers and Sama Haghghi	5. A concern has been raised regarding the proposed increase in lot coverage in R2 zone from the maximum allowed 40% to 60%. Questions have been raised about whether there will be a reduction in the requested lot coverage due to concerns related to the setback relief. Additionally, clarification is sought on whether the increase in lot coverage includes the potential addition of sheds or other structures.	As per conversations with Terry, the request has been revised to 50% for 2 storeys buildings, and 60% for buildings that are less than 2 storeys. The increase in lot coverage includes the potential addition of sheds or other structures.	GSP/Cachet
Town of Minto	Terry Kuipers and Sama Haghghi	6. Concerns have been raised regarding the reduction in the minimum landscaped area in R2 zone from 50% to 35%, with questions about potential adjustments due to setback concerns and issues related to snow storage.	As per conversations with Terry, the request for minimum Landscaped Area (within the front and exterior side yard) has been revised to 36.5%. Please note we are assuming that the Landscaped Area does not include the front porch, as the definition of Landscaped Area in the zoning by-laws is unclear in this regard, however if the porch was included the Landscaped Area percentage would be higher. Furthermore, the Landscaped Area calculation only includes the area inside the property line, but there is additional landscaped space in the boulevard that is not counted. Please refer to the following document included in the submission for further information: "Explanation of Reduced Landscaped Area for Front Yard (R2 Zone)".	GSP/Cachet
Town of Minto	Terry Kuipers and Sama Haghghi	7. Concerns have been raised regarding the requested reduction in lot frontage for corner lots in the R3 zone from the required 14.0 m (46.0 ft) to 8.97 m (29.4 ft). There is a question of whether the requested relief will be reduced in light of the setback concerns.	The requested minimum lot frontage for corner lots in the R3 zone has been increased to 10.5m. We previously requested 8.97m having assumed that the townhouse lot adjacent to the walkway block would be considered a corner lot, however Terry has confirmed that it would not.	GSP/Cachet