Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Area E

Comment #	Comment	Response
Rebecca Lau Correspondence Block E – June 14, 2021 Letter		
Key Comments		
1 a	<u>Density</u> Although the subject applications were submitted before the new Official Plan was approved by Halton Region, the new Official Plan represents Council's vision for the future and should be considered. Please provide an addendum to the Planning Justification Report to discuss how the proposed development at Area E relates to the growth framework and policy objectives of the City's new Official Plan. Staff have concerns about whether the proposed density can be accommodated on the subject site in a manner that contributes to an attractive, harmonious streetscape and supports the City's sustainability goals and objectives	See planning addendum report for analysis on City's new Official Plan which is presently under appeal.
1 b	<u>Dundas Street Widening</u> Please provide a survey to confirm where new property line will be once land is dedicated to Region for Dundas Street. All setbacks, landscape areas, amenity areas, etc. must be based on the future property line.	A complete survey/legal package has been provided with the submission as requested by City staff. This includes a draft reference plan showing the new property line along Dundas Street following road widening.
1 c	<u>Setbacks From Dundas Street</u> Existing setbacks along Dundas surrounding the site are much larger than 3 m, and surrounding buildings are primarily low-rise. Proposed building height combined with a smaller front yard setback than surrounding buildings will result in a building that is out of scale with surrounding context. Setback of proposed building should be increased to at least 7 m in order to maintain the existing streetscape character along Dundas Street. Consider front door townhouse type approach for units facing Dundas to better relate to the existing townhouse context to the west. Proposed 0.5 m setback of underground parking from Dundas Street is not supported by staff and should be increased to 3 m in order to provide sufficient room to accommodate permanent trees and vegetation, and to ensure that there is adequate space for the development to be constructed within property boundaries. Planting of permanent trees and vegetation is important for contributing to an attractive streetscape and providing privacy for ground level units facing Dundas Street.	A proposed 2.8m setback along the Dundas street frontage to remain with the new road widening location. A dropped parking garage roof slab to 1.5m depth in combination with raised planters will allow for tree planting along the street frontage. The proposed design incorporates a ground level inset patio that will allow for a front door approach and allow for direct access off Dundas Street. The setback at the U/G parking garage along Dundas Street has been increased to 1m to allow for additional landscaping, tree planting and shoring when constructing the U/G parking garage.
1 d	<u>Proposed Reduction in Outdoor Amenity Area</u> Planning staff have concerns about the proposed reduction in amenity area from 25 m2 to 20 m2/unit, as not all units appear to have their own private balcony and it is unclear whether the	The overall amenity area has been increased to provide for 25 m^2/unit as per the current Burlington standard.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Area E

Comment #	Comment	Response

	proposed outdoor common amenity areas at ground level would be comfortable or functional for residents, or contribute to an attractive streetscape:
	
	• The eastern ground level outdoor area may not be comfortable for residents to sit as it is located adjacent to Dundas Street. Also, there is an exhaust vent located next to the gazebo sitting shelter. In consultation with Engineering Services staff, it is my understanding that the proposed eastern outdoor amenity area would require a noise barrier potentially 3.5 m in height to mitigate for noise from Dundas Street. Staff are concerned that the height of the noise barrier may not contribute to an attractive streetscape.
	
	  • Permanent trees should be planted along Dundas Street in front of the future noise barrier to help soften its appearance. This will require an increase to the setback of the underground parking structure.
	
	• The west outdoor area is located close to the parking lot and loading area, and is not visually connected to the proposed indoor amenity space. This area will feel semi-private due to the ground-level units that face it.
	
	  • Please extend the indoor amenity space to replace the ground level units on the south side of the building so that the outdoor amenity space on the west is visually and physically connected to indoor amenity space.
		The supplemental site plan package provided with submission illustrates the updated amenity calculations.
		
		Areas totals include.
		
		1) Soft landscape areas (sodded areas, landscape strips, raised planters).
		2) Hard landscape areas (walkways, gazebo)
		3) Patio/terrace areas (public/private)
		4) Drainage easement area.
		5) Indoor amenity areas.
		
		The exhaust vent has been relocated away from the outdoor gazebo. Additional planting and landscaping to be added to mitigate the visual appearance of the vent.
		
		The below grade setback on the U/G garage has been increased to 1m to allow for additional planting area. Permanent trees to be added along the Dundas Street frontage as indicated above. The building setback remains at 2.8m as per the previous design.
		
		The intent is to create two outdoor amenity areas for different uses. A passive area on the north corner of the site with a gazebo/sitting area will allow for seating and lounging. An active area on the east side for more recreational activities. There is a proposed walkway connection between both outdoor amenity areas and the indoor amenity space.
		
		The proposed indoor amenity area on the north rotunda corner is 253m^2 (2,700 sf.) and is sized appropriately to allow for a kitchen, lounge area and a small fitness area. Expanding the indoor amenity area will eliminate some of the ground floor interior units with private terraces and reduce the outdoor amenity area.

	• Wind study needs to be revised to confirm whether wind conditions at ground level amenity areas would be suitable for sitting in the spring, summer and fall and standing in winter, based on the City's Wind Comfort Criteria. (See Wind Study comments below.) • It is unclear whether balconies meet the minimum 1.5 m depth recommended in the City's Mid-Rise Design Guidelines. This recommended depth is intended to ensure that balconies are of a functional size. • Please show dimensions on the site plan BUD suggested pushing the building into the triangle and reorienting the building to create more of a courtyard style building to consolidate outdoor amenity spaces, and provide a more	Wind comfort analysis in the outdoor amenity areas has been reviewed and additional screening and barriers have been added. Refer to Gradient Engineering site plan figure that illustrates the revised wind barriers. All private outdoor balconies or terraces will be a minimum of 1.5m in depth. Additional dimensions added to the floorplans for verification. The building footprint was extended into the triangle area by adding the rotunda indoor amenity component to address the concern outlined in the BUD comment. Extending the building footprint further into the outdoor area is not possible without stepping the footprint along the pinch point at the tapered property line. This would also eliminate a larger portion of

Comment #	Comment	Response
	opportunities for residents to gather on the west side of the site. How has this suggestion been taken into consideration?	the outdoor space and further reduce the current amenity space proposed. We don't recommend this adjustment to the current design.
1 e	<u>Length of Building</u> Staff have concerns with the length of the building. It exceeds the 60 m maximum length recommended in the City's Mid-Rise Urban Design Guidelines; the proposed building is approximately 85 m long as measured to the east edge of the rotunda, or 77 m excluding the rotunda. • At the BUD meeting, the Panel recommended pushing middle massing (between the two masonry components) back further to create vertical articulation. • It appears that following the BUD meeting, an attempt was made to break up the massing by pushing the middle balconies back by 1 m. • Staff feels that this change is minor and does not alleviate concerns about building length. Please push the balconies back even further.	We have addressed most of the comments outlined in the BUD meeting regarding the overall length of the building mass. The current building massing along Dundas Street is divided into six components: 1) Corner element at the front entry- Articulated in window wall glazing. (Tempered vision glass / Black panel entry w/ canopy). 2) Inset void – Punched openings/ alternate exterior cladding. 3) Inset balcony and punched opening component #1- (Solid element- Gray/Buff masonry finish). 4) Inset void – Projected balconies / alternate exterior cladding. (Tempered vision glass) 5) Inset balcony and punched opening component #2- (Solid element- Gray/Buff masonry finish). 6) Rotunda element- alternate material. (Black panel system). The proposed 6 components with the various glazing and material cladding changes reduces the overall appearance of the building length. The roof parapet cornice and the mid-block element have been revised with additional adjustments and refinements. Balconies have been recessed on the inset void #4 and an alternate material/colour have been added. This will assist further in breaking up the façade length. Refer to the revised renderings.
1 f	<u>Parking</u> The surface parking spaces on the west side and rear of the site (spaces 1-13) should be eliminated and/or relocated underground. The surface parking spaces would be visible from the street, does not support an attractive streetscape or pedestrian-oriented site design, and contribute to a lot of hard surface. • A reduction to the number of units may be needed. • The parallel parking spaces on the west side could be replaced with a walkway and trees instead, to connect to the future hydro corridor trail to the south of the site, as	A 5m drainage easement with a landscape buffer has been added along the west property line adjacent to the townhouse blocks. Perpendicular parking has been added along the edge to allow for the required visitor parking. Currently, we are proposing that all the visitor parking be located on the surface parking areas to allow for ease of access and reduce any security issues with allowing visitor parking into the U/G parking area. Also, combining resident parking with visitor parking will require additional separation with access gates and additional security

Comment #	Comment	Response
	suggested by Parks & Open Space staff. Freeing up the west side could also allow more room to accommodate both the required landscape buffer (trees and fencing) and any needed drainage swales. • Alternatively, spaces #1 & 2 and #6-8 could be replaced by landscaped bump outs with trees to help screen the spaces from the street and reduce the amount of hard surface on site. • The visitor spaces at the rear (#9-13) could be replaced with a landscaped gathering area next to the future hydro corridor trail connection with trees and vegetation. Please confirm whether the number of parking spaces proposed meets the new residential parking rates that are now in effect. Based on my calculations, it appears that the number of visitor spaces may be deficient. A draft of the parking rates can be found on the City's webpage here.	measures required. It is recommended that we maintain a separation of the parking areas. Additional adjustments to the west edge have been incorporated as per the previous response. Visitor parking total is based on the current 0.25 per unit ratio. Refer to the revised TIS report and project statistics.
Wind Study		
2	Please revise so that the study findings and conclusions are based on the City's Wind Comfort Criteria and Pedestrian Wind Safety Criteria, as outlined in the City's Pedestrian Level Wind Study Guidelines and Terms of Reference (June 2020). Ground-level common outdoor amenity areas should be suitable for sitting in summer, spring and fall; and standing or walking during winter, in order to allow for a wide range of activities to occur in these areas, especially since a reduction in amenity area is being proposed. Please clarify the type of qualitative study that was conducted (Desktop Assessment or Computational Fluid Dynamics). Please revise Figure 1A (Summer Ground Floor Plan with Reference Markers), and Figure 1B (Winter Ground Floor Plan with Reference Markers) to include a sensor in the area that is labelled "Gazebo sitting shelter" on the Site Plan, and move location C to the pedestrian area beside building. If a walkway POPS connection is to be provided, please show a sensor in that area as well. Alternatively, in lieu of a sensor location map, provide a map of the assessment in plan view (e.g. Figure 3.2 in the City's wind guidelines). If revised ground floor plans are to be provided, please also include a description of each sensor location in a tabular format (refer to Appendix A: Graphical Standards of the City's Pedestrian Level Wind Study Guidelines and Terms of Reference). Mitigation measures were recommended by the consultant: • Main Building Entrance (Tag B): "*Although the canopy above and nearby landscaping will provide some wind protection, it is recommended to either recess the entrance into*	See addendum to Pedestrian Wind Assessment. Any additional wind related matters can be addressed at the site plan approval stage.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	the building façade or flank the entrance with vertical wind barriers, to ensure conditions at the doorway will be suitable for standing or better on a seasonal basis" (p.5). Has this recommendation been reflected in the submitted plans? • Site design measures (wind screens and coniferous plantings) for the outdoor common amenity areas were recommended by the consultant. Have building design measures been considered (e.g. canopies)? It would be beneficial to consider these measures now, to ensure that they are covered in the zoning by-law amendment if needed/appropriate. Any changes to site/building layout in response other comments should also be reflected in the revised wind study.	
Shadow Study		
3	Section 5.0 (Sun Access Factor Calculations and Analysis - Public Realm and Sidewalks) of the study does not appear to account for the full width of the boulevard opposite the site. Currently, the analysis only considers the sidewalk but the boulevard across from the subject site extends north of the multi-use trail (see screenshot below). As per page 12 of the City's Shadow Study Guidelines and Terms of Reference, the calculation is to evaluate shadows on the "[…] full extents of the boulevard and sidewalk on the opposite side of the adjacent right-of-way." Please confirm whether the Sun Access Factor exceeds minimum requirement of 0.5 on March 21st.	We revised the sun access factor calculation to include the boulevard and multi-use trail on the opposite side of Dundas as part of the overall calculation for the March 21st interval. Since there is only additional shadow impact at one interval at 11:00 AM, there is minimal additional impact and the SAF is less than 0.5 since the current calculation is 0.94. Refer the revised sun shadow study with amended calculations.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Area E

Comment #	Comment	Response
		
	Any major changes to building height, massing, building location, amenity area location in response to public/technical comments would need to be reflected in a revised shadow study	No changes proposed to the building massing or locations. Revised current shadow study is still applicable. The site plan base drawing has been updated as per the current design and layout.
Urban Design Brief		
4	The City's expectation for the Urban Design Brief is that it explains how the proposal meets the urban design policies and objectives of the City's Official Plans and any relevant approved urban design guidelines. Please revise Section 5.4 of the brief to provide an itemized and detailed analysis of how the proposed development meets the City's Design Guidelines for Mixed-Use and Residential Mid-Rise Buildings (March 2019). Does the proposed building envelope fit within the City's 45-degree angular plane guideline from low-rise development (see 3.1, 3) of the City's mid-rise design guidelines)? Please provide a diagram showing the angular plane. How do the "Architectural Guidelines for Mid-Rise Apartment Building" of the Urban Design Brief relate to the City's Mid-Rise Design Guidelines? I note that there are some discrepancies in the proposed Architectural Guidelines, the City's Guidelines, and the submitted architectural plans, including:	Section 5.5 (previously Section 5.4) - Response to City's Design Guidelines for Mixed-Use and Residential Mid-Rise Buildings of the UDB has been updated as requested. Yes. The proposed 6 storey building will conform to the 45 degree angular plane requirement. The angular plane analysis has been added to the elevation drawings to illustrate compliance. Section 5.0 - Architectural Guidelines For Mid-Rise Apartment Building has been revised to align with the City's Guidelines.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Area E

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• Page 61 of the Design Brief states, "*Middle Portion: […] Where balconies are provided, they should be well-detailed to suit the architectural style of the building. Balconies should be large enough to comfortably accommodate space for seating.*" Please note that the City's Design Guidelines recommend a minimum 1.5 m depth for balconies.	Yes. The proposed balconies and terraces will have a minimum of 1.5m in depth. Additional dimensions will be added to illustrate compliance.
	• Page 64 of the Design Brief states that "*The predominant wall cladding materials should be masonry (i.e. brick and/or stone) or stucco. The use of accent materials (i.e. cementitious panels, metal panels, stucco, siding) is encouraged provided these elements enhance the quality of the building and blend harmoniously with the primary cladding."* Please note that the City's design guidelines strongly discourage the use of stucco and EIFs, or any materials which mimic other materials or which deteriorate quickly (2.4.4, p.14). Furthermore, heavy materials, such as brick and stone, are encouraged in the building base. For the upper portion of buildings, the City's guidelines generally encourage the use of lighter materials, although heavier materials may be used to define unique components within the building elevations and to create horizontal and vertical articulation (3.2.2, p.23).	Eifs or stucco is not a proposed exterior finish material for the cladding of the 6 storey building. Precast panels, masonry and aluminum/ceramic or cementitious cladding is proposed. A comprehensive exterior material finish schedule will be included with the SPA submission.
	• Page 66 of the Design Brief states, "*Ventilation shafts, vents, utility meters, and other above-ground mechanical equipment or site servicing elements should be located away from public sidewalks and outdoor amenity areas.*" Staff note that the submitted Architectural Plan shows a ventilation exhaust shaft located in the proposed outdoor amenity area on the west side of the site, adjacent to a 'Gazebo Sitting Shelter' and public right of way.	The ventilation grill will be flush with the ground with a concrete curb detail and will be screened with planting and vegetation. The appearance will be minimal with no impact to the public realm. The exhaust vent near the gazebo has been relocated as per the comment.
	Please explain how the Architectural Control Process in Section 6.0 of the Brief relates to the City's Site Plan Review process	Section 6.0 – Implementation has been revised by indicating all development will be subject to a Site Plan Review process conducted by the City.
Architectural Plan		
5	Overall, please simplify the Site Plan and Ground Floor Plan so that drainage layers are turned off and replace grid pattern in the sidewalk or concrete areas with a light grey shade instead. It is difficult to read the labels on the plans due to the many layers and patterns.	The site plan has been revised and simplified for improved legibility as requested.
	A "3 m Landscape Buffer" label is shown along the frontage of the site. Is one proposed?	Yes. There is a 2.8 m landscape buffer proposed along the frontage on Dundas Street.
	Please confirm with Halton Region the extent of the lands that are required to be dedicated along Dundas Street. The future property line must be clearly labelled on the plans and all setbacks, areas (e.g. amenity areas) must be measured/calculated based on the future property line.	The road widening along Dundas Street to be conveyed to Halton Region is not included in the outdoor amenity total. Refer to the sketch illustrating the area calculation.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Area E

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Please provide diagram illustrating how outdoor amenity area was calculated. Does this include the area to be dedicated to Region for road widening? Any lands required to be dedicated should not be included in final outdoor amenity area calculation. What is the length and setback of the canopy above the main entrance? Please show on plans to ensure it is accounted for in the draft by-law if needed. Part 1, 2.13(b) of the Zoning By-law 2020 states that in an RH3 zone, a canopy may project into a required front yard or street side yard up to half the distance of the required yard. Requested front yard setback is 3 m; therefore, canopy can project 1.5 m into front yard. Please show dimensions of accessible parking spaces and accessible pathway to confirm whether the proposed parking meets accessibility standards, and revise plans in accordance with City Accessibility Coordinator's comments from January 27, 2021 regarding the location of spaces in relation to elevator lobby. Please provide a conceptual floor plan for Floor 6 since it appears to be different from the lower floors. Also, what is the depth of the step back of the 6th floor? Please dimension the setback of the MPH from the edges of the 6th floor. Setbacks are taken from the nearest point of building to the nearest point on the property line. The draft by-law proposes a minimum 3.0 m setback. However, setback shown on Architectural Plan does not appear to be taken from the nearest points. Please confirm and show on Architectural Plan. Building Elevations: Please revise plans to show building height as per the definition of building height in the City's Zoning By-law: *Height, building* *For all other buildings, height means the vertical distance measured in linear metres, between grade and the highest point of a flat roof, or the mid-point between the eaves and the peak of a peaked roof, exclusive of any ornamental dome, chimney, tower, cupola, steeple, church spire, water storage tank, electric apparatus, sign, television antenna, structure for mechanical equipment required for the operation of the building, including elevator and stairway receiving area no larger than 9 m2.*	Yes. The entry canopy will extend 1.5m. Allowable canopy projection required. Accessible parking spaces to be revised as per the accessibility comments. 6th floor plan was omitted in the previous submission. Plan added. Refer to dA2.3. 6th floor to be setback 1.5m from the 5th floor below. MPH and roof plans added with setback dimensions. Building setbacks from the property lines have been added. See revised draft Zoning By-law which addresses the City's interpretation of building height. Although the proposed mechanical penthouse will be larger than $9m^2$, currently there is no residential component at the MPH and in our opinion should not be considered a floor.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Area E

Draft Zoning By-law		
6	**Lot Area**: Proposed lot area of 0.65 ha meets the RH3 zone requirements, so no need to include in the exception. **Setbacks:** • A minimum building setback of 7 m should be provided from Dundas Street. • Setbacks must be taken from the nearest point of building face to the property line. The draft by-law proposes a minimum 3.0 m setback from building to front property line. However, it does not appear to be taken from the nearest point. Please confirm and clarify on Architectural Plan. • Please also confirm that proposed setbacks, amenity areas, density etc., are based on the future property line after the required land dedication along Dundas Street is taken. • Also, for reference, below is a diagram from Zoning staff that clarifies the lot lines:	Acknowledged. Currently we are proposing a 2.8m front yard setback. Relief is required as part of the site specific rezoning. Dimension and setback taken from the nearest point to the property line. 2.8m setback required. Yes. The road widening to be conveyed is excluded from all the calculations, including, site area, setbacks, etc. See planning addendum for additional comments.
		Acknowledged.
	Building Height: Please ensure that linear height is measured according to the definition of building height in the City's Zoning By-law:	To be confirmed as noted above.

	H*eight, building* *For all other buildings, height means the vertical distance measured in linear metres, between grade and the highest point of a flat roof, or the mid-point between the eaves and the peak of a peaked roof, exclusive of any ornamental dome, chimney, tower, cupola, steeple, church spire, water storage tank, electric apparatus, sign, television antenna, structure for mechanical equipment required for the operation of the building, including elevator and stairway receiving area no larger than 9 m2* Furthermore, please include mechanical penthouse in the number of storeys, as it appears to exceed 9 m^2.	The MPH will be larger than 9m^2. The MPH should not be considered a separate storey since there will be no residential use. See revised draft Zoning By-law.
	Amenity Area: A reduction in amenity area is not supported by staff (see General Comments, above).	
	Parking Structure: A 0.5 m setback of below grade parking is not supported by staff along Dundas Street as it does not allow for permanent plantings of mature trees and vegetation which are needed to support an attractive and harmonious streetscape, and constructability. A 3 m setback should be provided instead Please be aware that a minimum 3 m landscape buffer is typically required adjacent to medium density zones (i.e. along the west side of the site). Note that "Landscape Buffer" is defined in the Zoning By-law as: "*The area of a lot which serves to provide separation and to partially obstruct the view of adjacent land uses by means of a dense landscape screen consisting of evergreen trees, or a combination of solid screen fencing with evergreen or deciduous trees, shrubs or berms.*" A swale related to Dundas Street overland flow looks to be located within 3 m of the west property line. Is it feasible to accommodate trees here? Would the Region allow trees to be located next to the swale?	As noted above, a dropped slab condition 1.5m on the roof slab of the U/G parking will allow for mature trees to be planted and flourish. The underground parking garage setback has been increased to 1m setback from the new property line following road widening. A 3 metre setback is not feasible since it will impact the parking significantly and is unnecessary since a drop slab is being proposed to allow for plantings. There is currently 14m of median frontage along Dundas Street from the proposed road widening line. The proposed setback will allow for mature trees to be planted and provide a landscape buffer. The landscape architect has proposed an appropriate landscape design for the frontage. A 6 metre drainage easement with a landscape buffer has been added along the west property line.
Planning Justification Report		
7	If a reduction in amenity space is proposed, please explain why the proposed reduction in amenity area is appropriate and represents good planning. Please discuss how the proposed development at Area E relates to the growth framework envisioned in the City's new Official Plan and maintains the objectives of the new Official Plan. Conservation Halton has commented that more information is needed regarding the existing wetlands in Area E and a Significant Wildlife Habitat assessment. Once the EER has been revised, please revise the PJR accordingly.	See planning addendum for additional discussion regarding these comments.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
Planning Comments – Area E

Summary of Submission Requirements		

8	Summary of Submission Requirements
	
	To address City Planning staff's comments, the following revised materials and information are expected to be included in a future resubmission as it pertains to Area E:
	
	• Revised Architectural Plans, including:
	  • Dimensioning of parallel parking spaces and barrier free parking spaces and pathways
	  • Conceptual floor plan for Floor 6
	  • Diagram showing how ground-level outdoor amenity area is calculated
	• Revised Wind Study
	• Confirmation from Shadow Study consultant that proposal meets City's criteria for Public Realm and Sidewalks
	• Addendum/Revised Planning Justification Report
	• Revised Urban Design Brief
	• Updated draft Zoning By-law Amendment
	
	Based on comments received to date from internal staff and external agencies, the following revised materials are also expected to be included in a resubmission pertaining to Area E:
	
	• Cover letter outlining how each comment has been addressed, and list of documents submitted
	• Revised Planning Justification Report
	• Revised Environmental Evaluation Report
	• Revised Phase 1 ESA and Phase 2 ESA reports
	• Survey by OLS of Dundas Street road widening
	• Revised Noise & Vibration Feasibility Study
	• Revised Functional Servicing Report
	• Revised Construction Management & Mobility Plan
	• Revised Geotechnical Report
	• Copies of existing registered easements, notices, agreements
	• Updated Arborist Report & Tree Inventory and Preservation Plans
	• Revised Conceptual Open Space Plan
	• Detailed Landscape Plans & Details
	• Updated Sections/Elevations
	• Revised Transportation Impact Study
	• Updated Waste Management Plan
		Acknowledged.
		
		Updated reports/materials included within submission.