Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
Contents CH – April 16, 2021 Letter....1 Halton Region – April 23, 2021 Letter....7 City of Burlington – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021....18 Burlington Fire Department – May 6, 2021....68 Hydro One – January 12, 2021....69 Burlington Hydro – April 19, 2021....71 City of Burlington Engineering Services - Landscaping....73 City of Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021....80 City of Burlington Transportation Operations (February 12, 2021) included in May 7, 2021 comments....81 City of Burlington Parking Service (February 10, 2021) included in May 7, 2021 comments....81 TransCanada Pipelines Limited – January 29, 2021 (MHBC Planning)....82 City of Burlington Parks and Open Space (Park Dedication Comments) January 25, 2021....84 City of Burlington, Engineering Services, Accessibility Coordinator Comments January 27, 2021....85 CN Rail (provided by WSP)....86 Burlington Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021....88		
CH – April 16, 2021 Letter		
Key Comments		
Comments A, B, D-G related to SWM and were omitted		
C	As per CH regulatory Policy 2.2, no new development is permitted within 7.5m from the limit of the flooding or erosion hazards; within 15 m of the limit of a wetland less than 2 ha in size; or, within 30 m of a wetland greater than 2 ha in size. As such, staff recommends that all hazards, wetlands, required regulatory setbacks, and any additional natural heritage buffers be designated and zoned for protection (i.e. NHS designation; the appropriate Open Space Zone) and placed into public ownership. If the proposed flood plain alterations are supported by CH, proposed grading in Area A will create a new regulated top of bank on the east side of the creek. New lot limits would need to be revised to be a minimum of 7.5m from the proposed stable top of bank.	Noted with respect to ownership, designations and zoning. A 7.5m lot line setback, from the greatest hazard and or 15m lot line setback from the riparian wetland has been incorporated into the draft plan configuration in Area A. CH staff have confirmed that a new regulated top of bank is not created on the east side of the creek and, that the eastern side continues to be an unconfined system.

Comment #	Comment	Response
H	Staff recommends that ecological linkages be identified and discussed in more detail, understanding that their existing ecological functions will be maintained post development.	Given the current land use type and suburban matrix in which the golf course is located, ecological linkages are limited. Those that do exist are below the thresholds defined by the Region. Nevertheless, the discussion re: linkages will be expanded in the EER (see Section 5.3).
I	As per the EER ToR, staff recommends that a SWH assessment be provided and discussed within the report.	Noted. The EER has been updated to include an expanded discussion of the potential for SWH.
J	Additional surveys are recommended for the pond/wetland within Area D to confirm reptile and amphibian habitat and to identify any potential negative impacts from the post-development condition.	Types and locations of biophysical survey sites were shared and discussed with CH on multiple occasions prior to submission of the EER and as part of establishing the EER ToR. This included discussion of efforts to assess amphibian and reptile populations. Since the receipt of comments, CH has agreed that rounds 2 and 3 of amphibian surveys were sufficient to characterize the herpetofauna of lands adjacent to Area D. The results of these surveys have been integrated into the revised EER.
General Comments		
1	**CH Permits** Development within the regulated area will require CH Permits and must meet CH regulatory policies. Such works include but are not limited to the following: • Creek and/or hazard land alterations • Reconfiguration of Mill Pond / stormwater management (SWM) pond • SWM pond access road • New and reconfigured SWM outlets/swales/overland flow routes • Trails • Pedestrian Crossing • Grading associated with the above As outlined throughout the comments below, additional information is required to assess the proposed works relative to CH Policy. All applicable drawings should be updated based on the following: a. The trails and pedestrian bridge may only be considered in the regulated area if the lands are within public ownership. Please confirm City objectives in this regard. Trails must maintain a minimum 3m setback from the hazards. Watercourse crossings are to be minimized and designed in accordance with CH Policies 2.19-2.20 and 2.49j). b. The SWM pond access road should generally be outside of the flood hazard limit. If the pond is proposed between the 100-year and Regional floodplain, the road may extend into the flood hazard to the extent necessary, provided it does not extend within the 100year floodplain.	a. The pedestrian bridge is no longer proposed. The trail will be within lands that are publicly owned and have been designed to be a minimum of 3m from the greatest hazard where possible. It is important to note that there is an existing golf cart path, that is used by both golfers and the general public (as an informal walking trail) within the existing Regional Storm flood plain. The City has advised that they would like a trail connection between Millcroft Park Drive and Upper Middle Road, which has been accommodated in the updated plans. b. The pond is no longer proposed to be a SWM pond but rather, will only be used for irrigation purposes. A 4.0m wide pond access road has been provided for maintenance purposes and can also serve as a trail connection. The access road / trail cannot be raised above the 100-year flood extent since this would limit the ability of the pond to drain at a suitable elevation (emergency spillway). The original RJB design of the offline irrigation pond did not intend for the berm to be so high. The 100-year flood extent is illustrated on both the grading plan and floodplain drawing and are intended to overtop the berm / utilize the floodplain storage above the pond's dead storage elevation. c. As shown on all of the drawings depicting existing and proposed hazard limits, and as confirmed in Area A-D FSR Table 4-8, the proposed work does not result in an increase in hazards or regulation limits/restrictions on adjacent, upstream or downstream properties. The project team notes that this requirement limits the potential for wetland creation within the Appleby Creek corridor as CH has advised that any newly created wetlands within the corridor will be considered regulated with a 30m regulated allowance applied. In order to ensure that this 30m regulated

Comment #	Comment	Response
	c. Works must not result in an increase in hazards or regulation limits/restrictions on adjacent lots. d. Be advised that any works proposed beyond the Millcroft Greens property boundaries will require the applicable landowner to receive a permit from CH.	allowance does not impact existing residences and/or the proposed development layout, the potential locations for wetland creation are limited. d. Acknowledged.
2	**CH Policy Document Update** CH's *Policies and Guidelines for the Administration of Ontario Regulation 162/06 and Land Use Planning* went through a housekeeping amendment on November 26, 2020. Although the general policy content has not changed, all reports should reference the updated document and revised policy numbers (https://www.conservationhalton.ca/policies-and-guidelines).	Noted.
3	**Phasing** Confirm whether there are plans to phase development across Areas A-E. Any alterations to the regulated area, including pond modifications, must be completed to the satisfaction of CH prior to development proceeding in Areas A and B.	The phasing will be determined through detailed design and will be addressed in the permit application process. At this time, it is anticipated that all of the works within Area A/B will occur at the same time (i.e., remove online pond, re-instate watercourse low flow channel, grade within the flood plain).
[Comments 4-28 relate to SWM]		
Environmental Evaluation Report		
29	**Section 1 Introduction (page 1)** The report indicates that crossing of the realigned channel is proposed as part of the PTTW works. The pedestrian crossing has not been included in the PTTW drawings and will be reviewed as part of this development application. Please update the report accordingly.	Please see response to Comment 1a. The pedestrian crossing has been removed following discussions with the agencies.
30	**Section 3.2.2.5 Anurans, (Page 22)** As suitable amphibian habitat is present within Area D, additional surveys should be conducted to characterize, identify any negative impacts associated with development, and establish the appropriate mitigation measures and setbacks.	As per the response to Comment J, types and locations of biophysical survey sites, including discussion of efforts to assess amphibian populations, were shared and discussed with CH on multiple occasions prior to submission of the EER (i.e., as part of the pre-consultation with all agencies and with CH on 20 January 2020, 9 July 2020). Nevertheless, in recognition of the type of habitats available within Area D and the timing of the comment relative to timing windows for amphibian surveys, the study team undertook additional amphibian calling surveys (surveys 2 and 3 of three only) in Area D. An early spring survey (survey 1) was not completed as the comments were received after that window closed, and potential habitat for early-breeding species is not present.
31	**Section 4.2.2.1 Vegetation Communities, (Page 41)** Update this section to include the results of the characterizations for each of the vegetation communities identified within Area D.	As discussed with CH on several occasions prior to the submission of the EER (see response to Comment 30, above), detailed surveys were not planned for Area D. The vegetation community classifications for Area D included in the EER are based on a combination of air photo interpretation and casual observations made during other

Comment #	Comment	Response
		surveys. A fulsome assessment per ELC was not planned given the limited potential for sensitive habitats and negative impacts. Nevertheless, an assessment of vegetation communities per ELC in Area D was completed and has been included in the EER.
32	**Section 4.2.6 Significant Wildlife Habitat (Page 47)** As per Terms of Reference, July 2020, a Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) assessment should be carried out to determine if SWH is present and confirm status in accordance with the 2015 SWH Ecoregion Criteria Schedules. Include a screening table to indicate if candidate habitats are present and how they will be confirmed, understanding additional surveys may be required.	Noted. See response to Comment I, above.
33	**Section 5.2.2 Other Wetlands, (Page 49)** a. The FSR indicates that an outlet in Area D will be draining towards Sheldon Creek. As the feature in this area has not been characterized, impacts from the proposed development are unknown. Revise the report to speak to the potential impacts associated with the development and update the Impact Assessment section accordingly. b. Not all wetlands in Area E have been characterized so it is premature to provide management recommendations. Please refer to comment 43 below.	a. Drainage from Parcel D is no longer proposed to be sent to Sheldon Creek but rather, will be directed to the storm sewer on Millcroft Park Drive for ultimate discharge to Appleby Creek. b. See response to comment 43.
	Report or Drawing Specific Comment	
34	**Section 5.3 Linkages, (Page 50)** Within Areas A and D, both Appleby and Sheldon Creeks are considered RNHS Key Features and the corridors currently provide both aquatic and terrestrial connection from the escarpment to Lake Ontario. Therefore, the report should include a discussion to indicate that the existing linkages and wetland connections to Appleby and Sheldon creeks are being maintained through the development process.	Noted. The Study Team questions the linkage function from the Escarpment to Lake Ontario given the urbanized nature of most of the creek length, multiple fish barriers, and transportation infrastructure crossings. It is the Study Team's opinion that the corridor features within the Study Area do not meet the definition of Linkage per the ROP. Nevertheless, the EER has been updated to speak to the (limited) corridor function(s) of the hydro corridor and Appleby and Sheldon Creeks.
35	**Section 5.5 Enhancements to Key Features, (Page 52)** Since the works to take Mill Pond offline are required independent of this application, identify additional enhancement opportunities to ensure all associated impacts are mitigated appropriately and to demonstrate net gain is being achieved	Enhancements to key features include planting within the floodplain, wetland creation and increasing urban forest canopy cover. Potential impacts to the RNHS are minimal and, as outlined in the EER will be mitigated as appropriate. As there is no policy basis for achieving net ecological gain (i.e., there is no Secondary Plan or SWS for these lands that have identified this requirement), the study team disagrees that such demonstration is required. Notwithstanding this position, the Benefit Analysis Report provides a summary of the benefits that will be achieved as a result of the proposed development.
36	**Figure 7C – Natural Heritage System Area D; and Figure 9D Constraints to Development Area D** The "Wetlands (Conservation Halton)" lines delineated on these figures do not match CH's Approximate Regulation Limit mapping. Provided the proposed development remains more than 30m from the limit of the wetlands as shown on the figure and these areas are not to be rezoned	See responses to Comments 33a and 46. The previously proposed emergency outfall (i.e. swale) within the setbacks to the RNHS is no longer proposed.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	or redesignated, the line can be removed from this application and CH will confirm the status and limit of those wetlands through any future applications in the area.	
	[Comments 37-42 relate to SWM-related aspects of the EER]	
43	**Table 24. Summary of Natural Heritage Constraints to Development** Regarding the other wetlands within Area E (Polygons 6c and 6d), further discussion with all appropriate agencies is needed for any proposed removal or rehabilitation plan. As Polygons 6d are outside of development Area E, please confirm if the wetlands being removed and replicated are instead Polygons 6b and 6c. Understanding biophysical surveys were not conducted within this area, the proposed 1:1 replication ratio may not be adequate. Further discussion is recommended moving forward to confirm if staking is required.	Wetlands in Area E consist of pockets of Phragmites and one pocket of narrow-leaved cattail marsh. These wetlands have low ecological value and present sources of invasive species that could conceivably spread into the Appleby Creek corridor. CH staff (L. Jennings) confirmed in June 2021that the wetlands in Area E were not regulated by CH, staking was not required, and a 1:1 replacement ratio (with wetland to be located in Area A) was sufficient compensation for the minor wetland impacts in Area E.
44	**Section 8. Constraints to Development and Conservation Halton's Approximate Regulation Limit (ARL), (Page 83)** A site visit and staking are necessary, during the appropriate time (June to end of September), to confirm the status and limits of the wetlands in Area A. Provided the EIA and supporting studies demonstrate there will be no negative impact on the hydrologic function of the wetlands, the refined ARL should follow the greater of the 15m wetland buffer or 7.5m creek hazard allowances. If wetlands are determined to be greater than 2 hectares in size, a 30m buffer would apply. Constraints plans should be updated accordingly.	The studies in the submission package demonstrate that the proposed development will have no negative impact on the riparian wetland and, it is anticipated that there will be a positive influence on the existing narrow riparian wetland through the creation of additional habitat in proximity to it. A wetland staking took place with CH on June 8, 2021 and these limits have been reflected on all figures. Please note that CH (E. DeFields) indicated that wetland staking is only required in Area A; wetlands in Areas D and E were not staked.
`45	**Figure 9C Constraints to Development Area A** Please revise the proposed development limit to be outside all the identified physical and natural heritage constraints.	The proposed development limit for Area A has been revised to be outside of hazard limits and natural features.
46	**Figure 9D Constraints to Development Area D** Update this figure to reflect all proposed development (including proposed outfall/grading), and ensure it is outside of the physical and natural heritage constraints.	Note that the outfall is no longer proposed and development and site alteration have been directed away from applicable buffers and setbacks. The development limit in Area D has been revised slightly to remove a small portion of the easternmost lot that was previously within CH's regulatory setback.
47	**Section 9.1 Conceptual Restoration and Enhancement Plan, (Page 88)** Staff recommends additional restoration and enhancements be provided for the development plans to achieve net gain, separate from any enhancements associated with PTTW-related works	Note that the Study Team maintains that there is no Official Plan (Region or City) policy requirement to demonstrate net gain to the NHS (only restoration, enhancement, and protection, which have been demonstrated). The requirement to demonstrate net gain is often identified in subwatershed studies however, this area has not had a subwatershed study completed and, as such, it is requested that specific policy requirements for net gain be provided to the Study Team. Furthermore, if this comment is related to CH regulatory policy requirements (i.e., CH policy 2.19.1) CH staff (K. McCormack, email July 29/20) have previously indicated that demonstration of net benefit is not required but rather, that the proposed flood plain alteration is not only to facilitate more developable land but that it also provides

Comment #	Comment	Response
		upstream/downstream benefits, that it will provide a benefit to the overall system and/or that it is in the public interest. As noted in correspondence with CH, the Study Team disagrees that Policy 2.19.1, and the definitions associated with this policy, requires the demonstration of a net benefit in the public interest but rather, only requires an assessment of existing conditions and the potential impacts of the proposed development with respect to, at a minimum, hydrology, hydraulics, hydrogeology, fluvial processes, erosion, slope stability and the natural environment (including, but not limited to, ecological functions). Notwithstanding the above, the Benefits Analysis Report and EER both demonstrate that there are significant enhancements to the existing watercourse corridor as a result of the proposed development.
[Comment 48 relates to SWM-related aspects of the EER]		
49	**Section 10. Policy Conformity, (Page 90-91)** a. **General** – Additional details are required before staff will comment on policy conformity conclusions related to creek, hazard, and pond alterations for Area A. b. **PPS (2020) Section 2.3 – Natural Hazards**: This section should reference Section 3.1 of the PPS. There is insufficient information at this time to conclude there will be no negative impacts regarding flooding hazards. c. **CH Regulations and Policies**: Please clarify the process for implementing the PTTW related works given they are interrelated with the development proposal.	a. Noted. b. Reference to Section 3.1 of the PPS has been added to Section 2.4.3 the EER. The FSR has demonstrated that there will be no impacts to upstream or downstream flooding as a result of the proposed development. c. Through the PTTW process, the MECP required Millcroft to explore opportunities to reduce reliance on Appleby Creek for irrigation purposes. Millcroft began that process by initiating a Permit application with CH and discussions with MECP to create a by-pass pond that would have involved shifting the location of the pond further east from its current position, the re-instatement of approximately 150m of low flow channel and the creation of a by-pass channel to direct higher flows to the pond. These discussions began prior to the initiation of the development application. Through the development application, the ability to utilize this pond for both irrigation and stormwater management was explored. Upon receipt of comments on the first submission, the plan has been revised such that the pond is proposed to be taken entirely offline, as part of the development application, and used solely for irrigation.
50	**Appendix G – Preliminary Development Concept** CH cannot comment on the feasibility of conceptual golf course modifications as supporting details have not been provided through this application. Staff understands the modifications will be reviewed separately from this Planning Act application. Any works within CH's regulated area will be subject to meeting CH Policy as CH Permits will be required.	Noted.
Planning Justification Report		

Comment #	Comment	Response
51	**Planning Act** Revisions to the Planning Justification Report related to "conservation and flood control matters" may be required once feedback on the technical studies is addressed.	Noted.
Conceptual Open Space		
52	**Existing & Proposed Trail Network** Staff understands that trails beyond the boundaries of Areas A-E are shown for context only and are not intended to be reviewed through this application. Additional information would be required for staff to assess those trails from a CH Policy and NHS perspective.	Noted.
53	**Strategic Golf Course Plantings** See comment 50 above	See response to Comment 50.
54	**Areas A and D** Plantings proposed within regulated watercourse areas will need to follow CH landscape guidelines and enhance the existing riparian wetland features associated with Appleby and Sheldon Creeks. Wildlife habitat features are also highly encouraged to help improve existing habitat function. Please review and revise.	Plant material shown on plans conforms with CH's landscape guidelines. Habitat features can be dealt with at detailed design. CH can provide a condition of draft plan approval to address this requirement if necessary.
Urban Design Brief		
55	**Section 3.2.3 Storm Water Management, (Page 31)** As the reconfigured pond may be within CH's regulated area, additional details are required as per the comments in this letter for CH to confirm what may be supported regarding passive recreation and viewing opportunities pertaining to the pond area.	Reference to passive recreation and viewing opportunities around the pond has been removed from the Urban Design Brief. A trail/access road is proposed around the perimeter of the pond which will provide for passive enjoyment of the natural heritage features in the area.
[Comments 56-58 and 60-61 relate to SWM]		
Drawings – Areas A and B		
59	**LID Drawings** LIDs should be located outside of CH's regulated area.	The proposed LIDs, specifically within Areas A and D, where a CH regulated limit exists, are outside CH's regulated limit as shown in the December 2020 FSR. CH's regulated limit is included on the appropriate LID drawings for reference.
Halton Region – April 23, 2021 Letter		
Appendix A – Detailed RNHS Comments		
1	The sequencing of the PTTW and development applications needs to be clarified in the EIA as the realignment of the watercourse would have implications on the limits of development. If the applications are to occur concurrently, than the EER needs to provide additional design details on the Appleby Creek realignment and as part of the assessment on the impacts to the RNHS.	Please see previous responses related to the phasing of the development.

Comment #	Comment	Response
2	The significant wildlife habitat assessment is insufficient and does not address the study requirements as outlined in the approved ToR (dated July 9, 2020). Please refer to CH comments dated April 16, 2021 for detailed comments.	See response to CH Comment I, above.
3	*Section 5.3 Linkages:* The location of potential linkages and the functions should be reassessed with the additional assessment of significant wildlife habitat that has been completed. This should include a review of any potential linkages from Appleby Creek corridor to the wetlands located within Area E.	Noted. The EER has been updated accordingly. No SWH is present and linkage functions along Appleby Creek and Sheldon Creek are limited due to the surrounding landscape and multiple barriers to fish and wildlife passage. There is no ecological connection between the Appleby Creek corridor and the wetlands within Area E. This is discussed in the EER.
4	*Section 4.2.1.2.2 Aquatic Community:* The EER indicates that Fish Habitat is present in Appleby Creek and associated pond (Area A) that are subject to in-water works and realignment. Section 118(2) a) of the Regional Official Plan prohibits site alteration within fish habitat except in accordance with Provincial and Federal legislation or regulations. The EER should include information on the results of self-assessment from Department of Fisheries and Oceans and if an application for authorization is required.	A DFO self-assessment can only be accurately completed following the completion of the detailed design. The Study Team recommends that, based on previous experience with DFO, the removal of an online pond, the removal of a weir that is preventing fish passage, the re-instatement of 150m of low flow channel and enhanced riparian plantings are looked upon very favourably by DFO and we do not anticipate DFO rejecting this proposal, even if an authorization is required.
5	Comment omitted as it relates to SWM	
6	*Section 6.1.2 Trail Network:* The pedestrian trail system is proposed within the RNHS, which includes a pedestrian bridge crossing of the Appleby Creek fish habitat and wetlands. Permitted uses within the NHS are outlined in Section 117.1 of the 2009 Regional Official Plan and are subject to the tests outlined in Section 118(2) a) and b). While pedestrian trails would be permitted on publicly owned lands, a formal paved structure/path/sidewalk would not be permitted. The EIA needs to confirm the proposed ownership of the RNHS in Area A, as pedestrian trails are not supported within the RNHS on private lands. Environmental Planning staff recommend that the proponent should first examine all alternatives to relocate the services and trail outside of the key features and include an appropriate buffer to the features. If the pedestrian trail system cannot be relocated, potential impacts to any features and functions will need to be fully evaluated in the EIA. The EIA must demonstrate that the proposed development will result in no negatives impacts to these features in accordance with Section 118(2)a) and b) in Halton Regional Official Plan.	It is proposed that the lands in Area A, outside of the proposed development limit, will be dedicated to the City as part of the development approvals process. As such, any trails in this area would be on publicly owned land. The pedestrian bridge crossing has been removed from the proposal. An easement over the pond will be required as it will continue to be used for irrigation purposes. City staff have advised that they would like to see a trail connection between Millcroft Park Drive and Upper Middle Road. As a result, a connection is shown along the sidewalk within Area A, connecting into the watercourse corridor such that a portion of the trail is proposed within the Regional Storm flood plain along the western perimeter of the relocated pond. It is important to remember that Area A is currently an active and mowed golf course that has a cart path within the flood plain that is used by both golfers from spring to fall as well as an informal trail by members of the community on a regular basis (even though it is on private lands). The removal of the golf course use and cart path within the flood plain will be of benefit to the NHS and it is respectfully recommended that it should not be necessary to evaluate the impact of a trail, within the buffer or within the flood plain, given the current use of the NHS lands.
7	As shown on the *Storm Drainage Plan (Area A) and (Area D) prepared by Urbantech (dated December 2020),* a SWM outlet has been proposed in the buffer and key features of the NHS. The ROP does not support stormwater management facilities within the NHS or buffer areas. Stormwater management components such as ancillary pipes, outlets, headwalls and other associated infrastructure required to convey flow from facilities outside of the NHS to receiving	Area A: There is an existing online pond that is currently receiving untreated stormwater directly into Appleby Creek. The proposed development will remove the online pond and create an entirely offline pond that will not have a formal outfall to the creek. The existing stormwater that currently discharges to the online pond, will be treated within Area A and will then need to be directed to the creek (since it will be disconnected from the offline

Comment #	Comment	Response
	water bodies may be supported in the NHS where deemed *essential* (as defined in the ROP) after all alternatives are explored and it is determined there are no negative impacts to the NHS through an appropriate environmental study. Appropriately designed SWM outlets may also be essential to mitigate impacts on the features and function of the NHS provided they themselves would not negatively impact features and functions of the NHS through their construction and on-going maintenance. The EER must include a policy conformity analysis and impact assessment on the proposed SWM outlet based on these matters.	pond), thereby necessitating an outfall to the creek. The headwall has been proposed at the outer edge of the watercourse corridor and a naturalized outfall channel has been shown which will direct treated stormwater flows to the creek. Given that the existing subdivision has been designed to direct stormwater flow to these outlets, it is not possible to re-direct these treated flows elsewhere. Even if these flows could be directed elsewhere, this subdivision was designed without stormwater pond controls and, as such, any alternate outfall location would necessarily still be directly to the creek. The EER has been updated to include reference to ROP policy 117.1(9) (EER section 2.5.1) and an updated policy analysis related to essential utilities in Table 26 (EER Section 10). Area D: An outfall to Sheldon Creek is no longer proposed. The EER has been updated to demonstrate the proposed infrastructure's conformity with the ROP.
8	Enhancements are identified as opportunities that go beyond mitigating impacts, contributing to the long-term protection of the RNHS. The EIA should review the approach to the restoration along the Appleby Creek in Area A and provide additional plantings to enhance the buffer design that supports and protects existing or increase habitat features and/or diversity of the key features and their functions in this area.	Conceptual Open Space Plans have been included in Appendix J.
9	The subject lands that are within the refined RNHS should be designated and rezoned to a more restrictive designation/zone to ensure the key features and associated buffers as outlined in the EIA are protected in accordance with Regional Official Plan policies.	See response to CH Key Comment C.
10	Comment omitted as it relates to SWM	
Appendix B – Detailed Regional Servicing Comments (please note – comments were not numbered in the original letter but have been numbered in the matrix for ease of reference; also, a few additional comments were provided in a November 10, 2021 letter and have been included herein)		
1	The proposed watermain connections to existing Regional watermains may need to be by way of full size water valve chambers, full size fittings and valves on each leg, the size and location of the chambers must be able to be accommodated in the field and not conflict with other utilities.	Acknowledged.
2	The watermain sizes should follow Halton's Linear Design Manual (LDM) standards with nominal sizes. 250mm diameter is not permitted for Regional mains.	The 250 mm pipe has been increased to 300 mm for Area E. For Area A, fire flows of 153 L/s are modelled to occur at the end of a 200mm watermain should it be proposed for this development. Given this result marginally exceeds the single-family home fire flow requirement of 150 L/s, a 250mm watermain was proposed as per the Preliminary Water Distribution Modelling prepared in March 2020 included as FSR Appendix F. If a 300mm watermain is used in place of the 250mm watermain currently proposed, this may pose a water quality issue and impact the need for a water flushing program. In order to analyze this potential water quality issue, the estimated turnover rate based on Area A average day demands for a 300mm watermain is 22.5 hours with a fire flow of 377 L/s. For

Comment #	Comment	Response
		reference, this is more than double the turnover rate (approximately 10 hours @ fire flow of 153 L/s) for a 200mm watermain. We look forward to continued dialogue with the Region on this matter and endeavor to follow industry best practices while adhering with all applicable Region LDM standards.
3	It will need to be determined at the detail design stage whether watermain looping will be required, and the extent.	Acknowledged.
4	As was mentioned in the report, some residential homes may require individual pressure reducing valves.	Acknowledged.
5	A watermain flushing program may be required for each of the different condominium development areas. This will be determined at the site plan application stage or sooner, as required.	Acknowledged.
6	A few watermain and water main extensions will be required in order to service a couple of the development areas.	Acknowledged.
7	As is standard, any infrastructure works required for the development, including but not limited to watermains, wastewater mains, stormwater mains and Regional road works will be required to go through the Region's Development Agreement process.	Acknowledged.
8	The Region forecasts a capital works project for the widening and reconstruction of Dundas Street (RR #5) by 2023. The developer must ensure that there are no conflicts between the Region's project and the development project. This can be done with sufficient coordination between the Region and the developer.	Urbantech Consulting is already retained by Hatch to support the SWM related components of this project and has coordinated the Area E development of limits accordingly. Continued coordination will be maintained with Hatch as well as the Region.
9	The developer must ensure that their site development details along the Dundas Street frontage do not conflict with the Regin's road design.	Refer to Comment Response No. 8.
10	The consultant will be required to provide detailed confirmation that overland flow from the subdivision will have no appreciable impact to Upper Middle Road (RR #38) and Dundas Street (RR #5) and its function.	Overland flow from Area A is not proposed to outlet to Upper Middle Road ROW and will be conveyed during the regional storm within the existing Upper Middle Road culvert crossing. The FSR does not propose an increase to the regional water surface elevation in this area or elsewhere. Instead, the FSR proposes reductions to the regional water surface elevations within Area A as demonstrated in FSR Table 4.8.
11	Water and wastewater servicing capacity within the Burlington area of Halton Region is currently on a first come first serve basis. Servicing capacity is deemed to be in hand at the issuance of a Regional Subdivision Agreement, Special Financial Agreement, Regional Services Permit (which is reviewed and obtained towards the end of the City's Sit Plan approval process) and/or Regional Servicing Agreement (if applicable).	Acknowledged.
12	The owner, at the time of detail engineering design, shall hire a professional soils and aggregate consulting engineering firm that specializes in geotechnical and environmental engineering, construction quality control and materials testing, to undertake pre-construction	A Geotechnical Investigation Report, prepared by DS Consultants, was submitted as part of the FSR in Appendix A.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	investigative soils testing, analysis and recommendations and at construction also undertake on-site compaction testing and soils issues administration, for the duration of the development works project.	
13	The Arborist (Report) should be aware of Halton Region Report LPS31-08 – Tree Canopy Replacement Policy on Regionally Owned Lands. An Arborist's Regional Tree Inventory, Removal, Replacement and Recommendations Proposal is a standard requirement for dealing with trees located within Regional Road ROWs.	Noted. The Arborist Report has been updated to include the Region's replacement requirements for trees 717 (Area E), 3361 and 3369 (both Area A). As noted in the Arborist Report, opportunities for tree retention and replacement will be revisited at the detailed design stage.
14	Any existing water or wastewater services that must be abandoned will be required to be disconnected at the main by the owner.	Acknowledged
15	The Region's Skyway WWTP has undergone an expansion that has increased the capacity of the plant from 118 MOD to 140 MLD.	Acknowledged
16	We have reviewed CH's comment letter dated Sept. 16/21 and Wood's Peer Review Comments dated Sept. 15/21 and reviewed Urbantech's FSR again Dec. 2020 (Storm Servicing and Stormwater Management re: Regional Roads). Please be advised that post development storm water flows from the development should be designed to not affect the existing drainage system within Upper Middle Road (Regional Road 18) and Dundas Street (Regional Road 5). The report would benefit by having a section specifically related to the impacts to the Upper Middle Road (Regional Road 38) road right-of-way and associated infrastructure, including but not limited to adjacent channels, storm water culvert crossings and land grading required for the development	The requested text section regarding evaluation of downstream impacts / capacity of culverts has been added to the report.
17	Regional Urban Services Guidelines state that for developments adjacent to a Regional Road, the design of storm sewer systems and storm water management ponds are to accommodate storm flows from the Regional Road at no cost to the Region. At no time shall the Region contribute to the cost of land required to construct a storm water management pond or the oversizing of the storm sewer service to accommodate regional or municipal flows. But, please be advised that the Region does not (currently) have any road widening projects forecast in the future for Upper Middle Road (Regional Road 38). For information, the Region has initiated a Regional Official Plan review exercise, and including updates of the various W/WW Servicing and Transportation Master Plans. It is unknown at this time what capital works projects may be proposed in the future in the areas of this development, or for Upper Middle Road (Regional Road 38).	The proposed design accommodates the major system spillway, which has been sized for post-development flows.
18	The Region is currently in the design stage for the Dundas Street (Regional Road 5) road widening project from 4 to 6 lanes. The road is proposed to be urbanized, and storm sewers and catchbasins installed along with broad pedestrian pathways. The utilities works are tentatively forecast for 2022. The road construction is tentatively forecast for 2023. At this point in time in the Region's design stage, no Regional road minor stormwater drainage is proposed to flow to the development's Area E (i.e., the current golf course maintenance	Acknowledged. The servicing for Parcel E has been coordinated with the Region's consultants (HATCH)

Comment #	Comment	Response
	building property). The development's Area E will require a watermain and wastewater main extension within Dundas Street. There should be no conflicts between the Region's project and the development project. This can be done with sufficient coordination between the Region and the developer.	
19	As mentioned, all external storm drainage areas must be properly identified for the storm sewer/water management design, including Regional Roads as external drainage areas.	The external storm drainage areas have all been identified with the prefix "E-".
Appendix C – Detailed Regional Transportation Comments (please note – comments were not numbered in the original letter but have been numbered in the matrix for ease of reference		
1	Provide the HCM reports for all study intersections.	All HCM reports have been included within the report. Halton Region has also been circulated digital copies of the Synchro analysis
2	Calibrate Synchro model for the existing 2020 intersection operations and update Synchro results accordingly.	The analysis has been updated accordingly.
3	Provide calculations in the Appendix for future background volumes as shown in Figure 4.	Additional figures were created to show trip assignments from background developments.
4	Provide mitigation measures where intersections or movements are operating above capacity.	This information is provided in Section 7 within the report.
5	Provide calculations in Appendix G for site traffic distribution percentages and provide trip assignment for each site.	The report appendix has been updated to include all site distribution and assignments.
6	Provide calculations in Appendix G for site traffic distribution percentages and provide trip assignment for each site.	The report appendix has been updated to include all site distribution and assignments.
7	Update turning arrows in Figures 6 and 7 to a RIRO restricted access.	The figures have been updated accordingly.
8	Provide the SimTraffic 95th percentile queue summary results for all intersections and scenarios.	All SimTraffic queueing has been provided.
9	Provide mitigation measures for the northbound and westbound left movements in the PM peak hour at the Dundas Street and Walker's Line intersection.	The report has been updated to included mitigation measures such as signal optimization and focusing on reducing single occupancy vehicles throughout the road network.
10	Provide operational analysis for 2025 future total traffic operations with mitigation measures such as split optimization.	This information has been provided in Section 7.
11	Provide documentation from the Region for the approval of the analysis conducted in Section 7.1.	All correspondence with the Region and City has been provided in Appendix A.
12	Calculate the sight distance requirement based on an 80 km/h design speed for Dundas Street.	The sight distance has been included
13	Provide mitigation measures in the case that a center median island is not installed by the 2025 horizon year.	The median should be extended as apart of Area "E" developing.
14	Evaluate site accesses with respect to pedestrian, cyclist, and BRT facilities.	Access safety has been reviewed as a part of the report.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
Noise Impact Study		
1	Truck percentages for Upper Middle Road must be based on existing truck percentages. A request can be made to Halton Road Operations for the latest area turning movement count to determine the existing truck percentages – traffdatarequests@halton.ca	Noted.
2	The proposed noise barrier along the Upper Middle Road development area lands, must be located along the Regional right-of-way, as it will be owned and maintained by Halton Region. The Study analysis must be revised based on the new location of the noise barrier in this area. Additionally, the barrier must connect to the existing rail line noise barrier to the east along Upper Middle Road. Halton's preferred and recommended noise barrier material is durisol/concrete.	Noted.
Parcel A- Upper Middle Road Area		
3	A detailed noise study would be required when siting/grading information, detailed floor plans and building elevations are available for the building in Area A as part of a detailed design/ implementation	Noted.
4	Ownership of walls near Upper Middle Road: The ownership and future maintenance of the noise barrier will be the responsibility of the owner until the subdivision is assumed by the Municipality, at which time ownership and maintenance will become the responsibility of Halton Region	Noted.
5	The heights of noise walls will require confirmation following finalization of site plan details	Noted.
6	Warning clauses: An additional warning clause is required - "Purchasers are advised that the construction of elevated decks within their yards may compromise the effectiveness of the noise mitigation measures and controls which have been established within the subdivision for their lots."	Has been updated in latest report.
Parcel E- Dundas Street Area		
7	A detailed noise study would be required when siting/grading information, detailed floor plans and building elevations are available for the building in Area E as part of a detailed design/implementation	Noted.
8	Potential East OLA: The proposed location of the East OLA must be relocated on site or eliminated from the plan, in order to avoid the requirement for a noise barrier.	Noted.
Regional Land Dedications Requirements		
1	Any lands within 25m of the centre line of the original right-of-way of Dundas Street (Regional Road 5) that are part of the subject property shall be dedicated to the Regional Municipality of Halton for the purpose of road right-of-way widening and future road improvements	FSR Area E Drawing RL-E illustrates the Dundas Street property requirements as coordinated with Hatch (refer to CH Appendix B - Comment Response No. 8)

Comment #	Comment	Response
2	Any lands within 17.5m of the centre line of the original right-of-way of Upper Middle Road (Regional Road 38) that are part of the subject property shall be dedicated to the Regional Municipality of Halton for the purpose of road right-of-way widening and future road improvements	Upper Middle Road is already 50m wide so no further widening is required.
3	Daylight triangles measuring 15m along Upper Middle Road (Regional Road 38) and 15m along Country Club Drive shall be dedicated to the Regional Municipality of Halton for the purpose of road right-of-way widening and future road improvements	As there is currently a 10m by 10m daylight triangle, the additional lands to revise into a 15m by 15m daylight triangle will be dedicated to the Region at the time of registration.
4	Municipal Class EA Study/ESR (Transportation Planning) Right-of-Way Requirements – Dundas Street: Any additional lands that are part of the subject property and have been identified as required for the future widening of Dundas Street (Regional Road 5), as identified in the Dundas Street Corridor Improvements Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Study/Environmental Study Report, shall be dedicated to the Regional Municipality of Halton for the purpose of road right-of-way widening and future road improvements	Acknowledged.
5	Detail Design Project (Engineering & Construction) Right-of-Way Requirements – Dundas Street: a) Any additional lands that are part of the subject property and have been identified as required for the future widening and of Dundas Street (Regional Road 5), as identified in the Dundas Street Detailed Design Project, shall be dedicated to the Regional Municipality of Halton for the purpose of road right-of-way widening and future road improvements. b) All lands to be dedicated to Halton Region shall be dedicated with clear title (free and clear of encumbrances) and a Certificate of title shall be provided, in a form satisfactory to the Director of Legal Services or their designate. c) Any proposed signage, plantings etc., for the site must be placed outside of the new Regional right-of-way (on private property). d) Halton Planning must circulate the LOPA, ZBA and DPS circulation and any drawings to the Dundas Street Detailed Design Project Manager for review and comments. The Dundas Street Project Manager at Halton Region is Joseph Ng. Construction Easement: e) For Halton's Dundas Street capital project, the applicant must review and confirm with the Dundas Street Project Manager in Engineering and Construction, if there will be the requirement for any construction easement along the development frontage.	a) Acknowledged. Refer to FSR Area E Drawing RL-E which illustrates the Dundas Street property requirements. b) Acknowledged. c) Acknowledged. d) Acknowledged. e) FSR Area E Report is submitted to Hatch for review.
Detailed Design Matters to be addressed for Parcel E (Proposed Setbacks & Zero Lot Lines)		
1	With respect to the development frontages, we request that a set-back be implemented/maintained from roadway right-of-way limits (i.e.: Dundas Street, Upper Middle Road), as per the City of Burlington Zoning By-law requirements	A building setback and landscape buffer of 2.8 metres is proposed from the ultimate road allowance of Dundas Street following road widening. This setback will be captured through an amendment to the Zoning By-law. The 2.8 metre setback/landscape buffer will be

Comment #	Comment	Response
		maintained by the future condominium corporation along with the boulevard within the Region's right-of-way. The identification of a similar setback from Upper Middle Road is unnecessary based on the configuration of the proposed development and existing land ownership.
2	Additionally, the applicant will be required to demonstrate that construction of any underground/above ground development infrastructure (underground parking, SWM tanks, buildings, etc.,) will not impact or encroach upon the Regional right of way (i.e.: temporary or permanent infrastructure including structural tiebacks will not be permitted within the Regional Right of Way)	As per email comment and attachment from Tarra (Luca Yu) dated 2021-10-01 attached to this matrix, it is feasible to modify shoring system within the property line along Dundas Street. No further update to report is required at this point
3	The location of development infrastructure (including but not limited to - underground/above ground parking structure, building, SWM storage tank, etc.,) 0m from the property line would limit or potentially preclude the Region's ability to locate infrastructure, such as utilities, AND will limit any future Regional Capital Project's grading flexibility, within the Regional right of way in close proximity to the right of way limit, i.e. within the zone of influence. Transportation Planning does not support setbacks of 0m from property line	Please see attached email dated May 31 from Region of Halton (Adam Huycke) to Rebecca Lau –"The underground parking structure is proposed 0.5 m from property line, and the building above ground is proposed to be setback approximately 3 m (assuming that the extent of widening shown on site plan is correct). So long as all required construction infrastructure (tiebacks, shoring, etc.) are not within the Region's deemed road width, we do not have an issue with the proposed development setback..."
Regional Comments on the Proposed Construction Activities		
1	Construction - Shoring/Tiebacks: Halton Region will not allow any encroachment of developme nt infrastructure within the ultimate Regional right-of-way	See response to comments 2 and 3 above.
2	Construction – Crane Swing: Review and approval of the crane swing proposal may be subject to the developer applying for a Special Encroachment Agreement with Halton Region	Noted.
3	Construction – Access: Construction access, traffic management plan and any proposed use of the Regional right-of-way, is subject to review and approval from Halton Region	Acknowledged. Refer to FSR CMMP drawings and the TIS.
Halton's Capital Plan		
1	The updated timing of Halton's capital works, is as follows: • Dundas Street (Regional Road 5) - Widening from 4 to 6 lanes from Guelph Line to Northamptom (BUR) – Start of Construction planned for Q2 2022. • Dundas Street (Regional Road 5) - Widening from 4 to 6 lanes from North Hampton to Appleby Line (BUR) - Start of Construction planned for Q2 2022. • Appleby Line (Regional Road 20) - Widening from 4 to 6 lanes from Fairview Street to Taywood Drive (BUR) – Start of Construction planned for 2029. • Upper Middle Road (Regional Road 38) - Widening from 4 to 6 lanes from Appleby Line to Burloak Drive (BUR) – Start of Construction planned for 2030. • All timings are subject to change.	Acknowledged.
Appendix D- Detailed Regional Waste Management Comments		

Comment #	Comment	Response
1	<u>Parcels A, B, C & D:</u> Regional waste will service for full curbside waste collection. Please note the following requirements for private roads: a) Private Road layouts shall allow for direct, consistent and safe access from a Municipal Road to the Waste Collection Point and back to the Municipal Road without delays or reversing onto the Municipal Road. b) Private Road layouts shall allow for the continuous forward collection of Waste without the need for Waste collection vehicles to reverse. c) All Private Roads shall be constructed with a hard surface, such as asphalt, concrete, or another suitable material acceptable to the Region, and have a minimum width of 6 metres. d) All turns shall have a minimum turning radius from the centre line of 13 metres to the satisfaction of the Region. e) Overhead clearance throughout the Private Road must be a minimum of 7.5 metres and be free from obstructions such as overhangs, awnings, utility wires, balconies, and must be kept clear of tree branches, etc. f) A completed drive through agreement must be submitted for each road before collection is to commence	**Items a) through e):** Waste Management Plan, Section 2.1 discusses these items for Blocks A-D. *All ROWs in Areas A through D have roundabouts with a minimum 13.0 m radius. Additionally, a minimum 6.0 m pavement width is provided in each Area, with most sections of road exceeding that minimum. **Item f):** This application will be completed (*by the developer*) once construction has commenced and prior to attaining 90 percent occupancy, per s.1.7.2 in Halton Region's 'Development Design Guidelines for Source Separation of Solid Waste'.

2	<u>Parcel E (6 story apartment building):</u>
	Regional Waste will require 3 separate chutes or a bi sorter for waste diversion within the building
	a) Supplementary Waste Plan required (including representative scaled drawings):
	• Residential units included.
	• Residential floors included.
	• The number of front end recycling containers.
	• The number of Organic Material Receptacles required as per Section 1.8.1 of the Guidelines.
	• The size and number of Front End garbage collection bins required as per Appendix 2 of the Guidelines;
	• Truck turning plan showing waste collection truck route from the municipal road to the Collection Point and back to the municipal road.
	• Configuration of Waste containers, compacting and sorting equipment in the internal Waste handling room(s) (as per Section 1.3.7. of the Guidelines) – show how residential and commercial waste will be separated.
	• The flow of Waste receptacles from the Waste storage room to the outdoor Waste collection loading area.
	• The Waste collection loading area(s), including the configuration of the required number of Waste containers. Include area for required bins and 9.7 m for truck.
	• External enclosures showing the configuration of the required number of Waste receptacles, if applicable
		As discussed between R.J. Burnside and the Region's Multi-Residential Waste Diversion Coordinator, Andrew Suprun via phone on July 21, 2021, a single chute with a tri-sorter is acceptable to the Region. This is also identified in the Region's current guidelines. Section 2.2.1 of the Waste Management Plan describes the Waste Storage Room and how waste is collected.
		
		Item a) These items are all included or referenced within the prepared Waste Management Plan (Plan):
		• Residential units included in Section 1.0 – Introduction.
		• Residential Floors included in Section 1.0 – Introduction.
		• Table 2 in Section 3.0 provides the number of carts and bins, as follows:
		  ○ Organics receptacles = six 360 L carts
		  ○ Recycling = three 3 c.y. front lift bins
		  ○ Garbage = two 3 c.y. front lift bins.
		• Truck turning plan attached as Appendix A to the Plan.
		• Configuration of containers and equipment included as Appendix B of the Plan.
		• The flow of waste receptacles is shown in Appendix B of the Plan and described in Section 2.2.3 – Waste Collection.
		• Bin collection is illustrated in Appendix B of the Plan.
		• No external enclosures for waste management are present.
		
		Item b):

Comment #	Comment	Response
	b) Items to ensure are addressed as per of the Region's Guidelines: • Turning radius of 13 m centre line is required for waste collection vehicles. • Overhead clearance of 7.5 m if waste collection truck required to drive under. • Collection point level (+/- 2%) • Weight capacity 35 tons (P.Eng certified) if waste collection truck required to drive over structure (i.e. parking garage). • Two-way traffic – 6 m road width/One-way traffic – 4.5 m road width • Continuous forward collection of Waste collection vehicles without reversing (Cul-de-sac or T-turnaround may be acceptable). • 18 m minimum head-on approach • 18 m maximum back-up distance • Collection area – minimum area required for waste receptacles. • Door width for waste rooms and any door where a waste receptacle must go through– minimum 2.2 m. • Internal storage requirements included as per Section 1.9. Note which section applies c) A completed drive through agreement just be submitted before collection is to commence. d) A stamped certified engineering letter must be submitted for the underground garage slab stating that it can support a 35 tons collection vehicle	• The Waste Collection Vehicle turning figure annotates the 13 m turning radius, found in Appendix B of the Waste Management Plan. • Waste loading area is 7.5 m tall. The garage door is 5.0 m tall (see Figure 2 in Appendix B of the Plan). • Collection point is level (+/- 2%) as confirmed by architect. The architect to confirm upon submission of a site plan application. • Weight capacity of 35 tonnes confirmed by the structural engineer. Structural engineer confirm the weight capacity of any structures the truck is required to drive-over upon submission of site plan application. • Road widths meet width requirements, as confirmed by architect. To be confirmed at site plan approval. • T-turnaround present. Shown on Appendix A (Collection Vehicle Turning Plan) of the Plan. • 18 m head-on approach present. Dimension shown on Figure 1, Appendix B of the Plan. • 18 m back-up distance present. Dimension shown on Figure 1, Appendix B of the Plan. • Appropriate collection area present at the loading area, as shown in Appendix B. • Door widths for waste room and waste receptacle paths confirmed (as minimum 2.2 m) by architect. To be confirmed by architect upon submission of site plan approval. • Our Waste Management Plan (Report) was submitted in support of Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application. The Developer is prepared to amend the Report as necessary during subsequent stages to ensure compliance with Halton Guidelines (Section 1.9.2 and 1.9.3 are applicable). Elements of the current stage are discussed in Sections 2 and 3. **Item c):** The drive-through agreement, Appendix 9 of the Guidelines, must be completed to permit the Region full access to the external property for the purpose of performing waste collection services on private property. This will be submitted to the Director of Waste Management Services of the Region as part of final approval. In addition, the 'Application for Waste Collection Services' must be completed as well, included as Appendix 6 of the Guidelines. This application will be completed once construction has commenced and prior to attaining 90 percent occupancy, per guideline 1.7.2.

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Item d) Response: An engineering letter will be submitted by structural engineer confirming the garage slab. Structural Engineer to confirm and prepare letter upon submission of site plan application
City of Burlington – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021		
i	The Site Engineering comments below that relate to stormwater management for Areas A-D, or Hydrogeological Investigation or Foundation Drain Collection Technical Memorandum, are not included this document. Stormwater-related comments for Areas A-D, as well as comments for the Hydrogeological Investigation and Foundation Drain Collection Technical Memorandum, will be shared upon conclusion of the peer review: Site Engineering is unable to provide a recommendation for Areas B, C, D or E at this time as there are several items that require peer review and/or revisions that will affect the site layout as outlined below, and are needed to confirm that City requirements and standards can be met. We are aware that Planning Staff brought a recommendation to the Development Committee/Council to continue to work with the Applicant on the project at the March 2nd and March 4th, 2020 meetings, which Council passed. We are also aware that Planning Staff has confirmed a Peer Review will be undertaken on the stormwater management materials, and welcome their assistance.	The Study Team has provided responses to the Peer Review comments in a separate comment response matrix included in this submission.
ii	Site Engineering defers to CH and the City's Stormwater Engineer to comment on CH hazards and setbacks, the permit to take water, proposed creek and pond works, and to determine if the materials provided are satisfactory to determine/conclude that there are no negative up or downstream effects from the proposed works. If it is determined that the CH regulated limits shown on the materials are not accurate, all materials will need to be revised to reflect the regulated areas (hazards and setbacks). Site Engineering's preliminary observations for Area A, based on the materials received to date is that it may be unsuitable for development. Our records indicate it is within the "ultimate flood lines" of Millcroft Phase 1 Part 1. Additionally, There are existing easements over Block 107 of 20M-414 that restrict development of the lands, and the lands contain CH regulated hazards and setbacks. With the development application it is typical that hazard lands and setbacks would be required to be dedicated to public ownership, which would mean the ownership of the facility needs to be established through mutual discussions. The pond receives flow from municipal sewers, however, at the same time it is proposed to treat runoff from the new proposed development areas and also serves as a source to irrigate the golf course. Area B is also identified as being within the "ultimate flood lines" of Millcroft Phase 1 Part 1. That being said, we have provided detailed comments to Planning Staff to be provided to the Peer Reviewer, if it is determined by Planning Staff and Council that development potential of Areas A and B are to be continued to be investigated.	Based on DWG FP-2 submitted, Area A is outside of the proposed regional floodplain limits as well as outside the proposed CH regulation limit. Note, Area B, does not have adjacency with Appleby Creek. Like Area A, Area B is also outside of the proposed regional floodplain limits as well as outside the proposed CH regulation limit. The reference to "ultimate flood lines" is unclear with respect to Millcroft Phase 1 Part 1. Note, existing regional floodplain extents presented reflect the detailed topographic information to support the geometry used to build the hydraulic model. Otherwise, hydrologic model inputs were sourced from CH.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	Site Engineering's preliminary observations for Areas C and D, are also that they may be unsuitable for development as our records indicate that they are within a "natural drainage area (of Millcroft Phase 2) or within ultimate flood lines' (of Millcroft Phase 1 Part 1). We have however, provided detailed stormwater management comments to Planning Staff to be provided to the Peer Reviewer, if it is determined by Planning Staff and Council that development potential of Areas C and D are to be continued to be investigated. If it is determined by Council in the future that they want to make a decision on the application before the revised materials can be submitted for review and commenting, we would recommend refusal of the application due to the application materials submitted to date not clearly demonstrating feasibility of the project.	
	Please find below a summary of the materials that require revision and resubmission to confirm the proposed development is feasible:	
1	Provide a Draft Reference Plan(s) showing all widening requirements as per Section 1.1 below.	Refer to Comment Responses 1.1.a to 1.1.c.
2	Applicant to provide updated Phase One Environmental Site Assessments and Phase Two Environmental Site Assessments, addressing items in Section 1.2 below and any other updates that may be required for submission to the Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks for a Record of Site Condition, including revised Letters of Reliance listing the updated reports dates. Due to a change of use to a more sensitive use (commercial to residential) the Record of Site Condition is Mandatory. Please note that all supporting documents listed on the Record(s) of Site Condition must also be provided to the City for our Records. Please be advised that if the application proceeds and is approved by Council, if the Record(s) of Site Conditions are not acknowledged by the MECP (by that time) then we will recommend a "Hold" zone be placed on the properties until such time as the Record(s) of site Conditions are finalized.	Refer to Comment Responses 1.2.a to 1.2.m
3	Provide revised drawings for review and approval as per comments in section 1.4 below	Refer to Comment Responses 1.3.a to 1.3.j as well as 1.4.a to 1.4.t
4	Provide revised Construction Mobility and Management Plans as per comments in Section 1.5 below	Refer to Comment Responses 1.5.a.i to 1.5.d.xviiii as well as Responses to Transportation Planning & Parking Service Comments dated May 7th 2021 numbers 1 to 11 from Daniel Ozimkovic.
5	Provide a revised Noise Feasibility Study for review and approval as per comments in Section 1.6 below	Refer to Comment Responses 1.6.a to 1.6.w.
6	Provide a revised Geotechnical Report for review and approval as per comments in Section 1.7 below, including a letter of reliance.	Refer to Comment Responses 1.7.a to 1.7.k.
7	Provide revised Architectural drawings as per comments in section 1.10 below	Refer to Comment Responses 1.10.a to 1.10.b.iv
8	Provide revised Landscape drawings for review and approval as per comments in section 1.11 below	Refer to Comment Responses 1.11.a to 1.11.i.iii

Comment #	Comment	Response
9	Provide revised Draft Plans of Subdivision as for review and approval as per comments in Section 1.12 below	Refer to Comment Responses 1.12.a to 1.12.b.vii
10	Provide written confirmation from the Director of Engineering Services that the easement over Block 107 of 20M-414 (Area A) can be partially released to allow for development, as per Section 1.13 below.	Refer to Comment Responses 1.13.a.i to 1.13.e.ii
11	Provide confirmation from CH that the regulated hazards and setbacks have been confirmed and are shown accurately on all plans.	All constraints, as coordinated with the EER, are illustrated on FSR Figure 1 – Constraint Mapping.
12	Provide confirmation from Planning/Region/Conservation Halton with regard to ownership of regulated hazard and setback lands.	The hazard and setback lands will be placed in public ownership as a condition of draft plan approval. An easement over the irrigation pond will be required in order to allow for private access to the pond for maintenance purposes by the golf course.
13	It is our understanding that a Peer Review, at the applicants cost, is required (at minimum) for stormwater management, hydrogeological and foundation drain collection, the comments below are subject to change depending on the results of the Peer Review. Comments have been provided to Planning staff on those items so that they can be evaluated by the Peer Reviewer.	Noted.
iii	Please be advised that Site Engineering's review of this application is considered preliminary at this time. Please note that Site Engineering may provide additional comments, raise additional concerns, or request additional information upon receiving the outstanding information, and upon further comprehensive review of its contents. Please also understand that some of the comments below may be duplicated in the various sections as often the same comments apply to different reports and drawings prepared by different consultants. Please ensure comments are shared between consultants are addressed consistently across all reports and drawings, i.e. if there was a change to site layout on the engineering drawings please ensure it is also reflected on the architectural drawings, and if the building footprint changes please ensure that information is also shared with the noise and environmental consultants. Site Engineering would also request that the Applicant receive comments from all vested departments and agencies prior to making any changes to ensure a comprehensive revision to the design is achieved.	Acknowledged.
1.1	**RIGHT-OF-WAY**	
1.1.a	Upper Middle Road and Dundas Street are both Region of Halton owned roads – please reach out to Region staff to confirm deemed and actual right of way widths and any widening requirements they may have. If there are widenings required, please advise City Staff and reflect any required dedications on all drawings across all disciplines. We would ask that a Draft Reference Plan be provided, to confirm the widening dedication is accurately shown on the site plan for Area E. If there is a widening required for Upper Middle Road, please also provide a Draft Reference Plan for that widening as well. The City defers to the Region in all regard for the	Refer to Detailed Regional Servicing Appendix B Comment Response No. 8.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	widenings of Regional ROW's, we just ask to be copied for our records and to confirm the other materials coordinate.	
1.1.b	Millcroft Park Drive is a City of Burlington owned road, the deemed width is 20m, actual width meets deemed, no widening required	Acknowledged.
1.1.c	Country Club Drive is a City of Burlington owned road, the deemed width is 20m, actual width meets deemed, no widening required	Acknowledged.
1.2	**ENVIRONMENTAL SITE CONDITION**	
1.2.a	Please note that the Region of Halton also comments on Environmental, therefore please be advised that in case of discrepancy between comments, the most stringent shall apply.	Acknowledged
1.2.b	The change of use from a golf course (commercial) to residential is a change to a more sensitive use, and therefore each area requires a Record of Site Condition (RSC), as it is mandatory under O.Reg. 153/04. If the development proposal is approved either through City Council or LPAT, and if the RSC's are not completed/acknowledged by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), before the approval, Site Engineering would recommend a "HOLD" zoning be placed over the development properties until such time as the RSC's are acknowledged by the MECP.	Acknowledged, an RSC application will be submitted for each parcel
1.2.c	All reports indicate groundwater monitoring wells have been installed, at some point during the current or future application process(es) we will require confirmation that the wells have been decommissioned in accordance with provincial regulations.	Acknowledged, once the monitoring wells have been decommissioned, a notification will be provided. We assume this will be a condition of approval.
1.2.d	An executed Environmental Site Screening Questionnaire dated October 7, 2020 signed by the registered owner (no name provided, only signature), was submitted. The questionnaire answered "yes" to the following questions: • Has fill ever been placed on the property? • For agricultural purposes, were pesticides or herbicides ever applied to the property? • Is the land use changing to a more sensitive land use (e.g. industrial/commercial to residential/institutional)? • Have any environmental documents (e.g. Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments, Record of Site Condition, etc.) ever been prepared for the property? If yes, please submit these documents in digital and hardcopy format with your application together with a letter of reliance granting third party reliance on the documents to the Region of Halton.	No response required.
1.2.e	Two letters of Reliance, both dated December 10, 2020 for the following reports was provided, extending reliance on the reports to both the Region of Halton and the City of Burlington: • Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, 2155 Country Club Drive, Areas A & B, Burlington, ON, dated November 1, 2019 and revised November 11, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 18-867-20.	No response required.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, 2155 Country Club Drive, Areas A & B, Burlington, ON, dated February 15, 2019 and revised November 11, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 18-867-100 • Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block C), Burlington, ON, dated January 29, 2020 and revised July 2, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 19-199-101. • Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block C), Burlington, ON, dated July 2, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 19-199-101. • Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block D), Burlington, ON, dated January 29, 2020 and revised July 2, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 19-199-100. • Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block D), Burlington, ON, dated July 2, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 19-199-100. • Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block E), Burlington, ON, dated January 30, 2020 and revised July 2, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 19-199-102. • Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block E), Burlington, ON, dated July 2, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. project number 19-199-102.	
1.2.f.	Areas A & B Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, 2155 Country Club Drive, Areas A & B, Burlington, ON, dated November 1, 2019 and revised November 11, 2020. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. was submitted with the application, and we offer the following questions/comments:	
1.2.f.i	Section 4.2.4 (page 17) states that the PTTW was to expire December 31, 2018 – was this renewed? Does the golf course still use the pond for irrigation? With or without a permit required?	The PTTW was re-issued on March 22, 2021. The golf course does still use the pond for irrigation.
1.2.f.ii	Section 4.2.11 (Areas of Natural Significance), the report states that the Phase One Property includes no areas of Natural Significance, we would ask that this be confirmed by the Region and/or Conservation Halton as the property is Conservation Halton regulated and contains a section of Appleby Creek. If it is determined that the property meets one of the categories outlined in this section then we would ask that the Phase One ESA be revised to include discussion on the natural significance.	No Areas of Natural Significance as defined by O.Reg. 153/04 have been identified to be present.
1.2.f.iii	Section 4.2.13 references the City of Burlington's 2017 Official Plan, we have been advised by Planning staff that the Official Plan for this development is the 1997 as amended, however we have also been advised that the 2020 Region approved Official Plan should also be considered. Please revise the report to reflect the correct Official Plan.	Report has been updated to reference the 2020 Official Plan
1.2.f.iv	Section 4.3.5 indicates 22 (twenty-two) water wells were identified in the water well system for the phase one study property, and references the ESRIS report in Appendix C which only identifies 2 (Water Well Information System) on the project property and 2 Boundary to 0.25km, total 4 – why the difference?	This is a typo and iis updated in the report.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.2.f.v	Section 6.2.23 indicates there is a certificate of approval for golf course irrigation from the pond on site – please provide a copy of the certificate.	Please see response to Comment 1.2(f) (i). A copy of the PTTW has been added to the Area A-D FSR Appendix J.
1.2.f.vi	Appendix B, PIN 07182-0254 (LT) has an easements on title H308774 and H317621, please provide a copy of the easement document and plan 20R9030 and 20R16553 and 20R8142, and a regional agreement H291037 and city agreement H302428	Documents attached
1.2.f.vii	Appendix B PIN 01782-0255 (LT) has a 20M414 drawing listed and a regional agreement H291037 and a city agreement H302428 and a partial release H536321 and a plan 20R16553, please provide copies.	Documents attached
1.2.g	Area A & B Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, 2155 Country Club Drive, Areas A & B, Burlington, ON, dated November 11, 2020, prepared by DS Consultants Ltd was submitted with the application, and we offer the following comments:	
1.2.g.i	Section 1.0 indicated 7 groundwater monitoring wells were installed in 2018, at some point during the current or future application process(es) we will require confirmation that the wells have been decommissioned in accordance with provincial regulations.	Acknowledged. Once the wells have been decommissioned, notification will be provided. It is assumed this will be a condition of approval.
1.2.g.ii	Section 2.4 indicates that bedrock was not encountered within 2 meters of the ground surface, but BH18-6 in Appendix B, indicates shale bedrock encountered at 1.5mbgs, does that have any impact on which table is used?	Borehole log BH18-6 Identified the layer as being highly weathered shale, which is not considered to be competent bedrock. Additionally, the average depth to bedrock across the property is greater than 2m depth, thus there is no reason to switch the site condition standards table.
1.2.g.iii	Section 3.1.1, Please confirm with Conservation Halton and/or the Region of Halton that there are no areas of natural significance on the subject property.	No Areas of Natural Significance as defined by O.Reg. 153/04 have been identified to be present.
1.2.g.iv	Section 3.2 notes the Phase One ESA's date as November 2018, the Phase One ESA was revised November 2020 – should this section be updated to reflect the most current date?	Noted, this has been completed.
1.2.g.v	Section 3.2 references a Geotechnical Investigation dated January 21, 2019, the Geotechnical Investigation submitted with the application is dated November 12, 2020, should this section be updated to reflect the most current date (if the Phase Two ESA has to be updated)?	Noted, this has been completed.
1.2.g.vi	Section 5.2 details the selected borehole locations, how were the locations determined? It is our understanding that golf course holes have three grass area components: green, fairway and rough. The green area is very manicured/maintained, then the fairway areas would be the second most manicured/maintained. It would be reasonable to assume that the most manicured/maintained areas would also be subject to the most fertilizer and pesticide applications, and therefore the soil under these areas could have the most concentration of contaminants. Figure 2 does not clearly show the green, fairway and rough areas of the existing holes in Areas A & B. We ask that a plan of the existing holes be provided, with the borehole locations overlaid to confirm that the boreholes (at minimum) were drilled in each of the hole's greens, fairways and rough areas.	Due to the continued operation of the golf course, boreholes were not advanced directly on the green or fairway, as this would hinder the functionality of the course. Boreholes were advanced as close to the fairways as possible without causing disruption, while still providing an adequate location for the investigation. It is DS opinion that direct advancement on the green and fairway would not have any major advantage to the investigation. Additionally, in our report for Areas A and B, the pesticides were non detected concentrations in all samples for soil and groundwater. Thus, there was no evidence of the application of environmentally persistent pesticides affecting the Property.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.2.g.vii	Section 6.2.4 provides groundwater elevations taken in January 2019, R.J. Burnside has completed a Hydrogeological Investigation with multiple groundwater readings over all seasons, please review the R.J. Burnside document, and if necessary update this section.	No further updates are required. The existing groundwater measurements have been used to assess the groundwater flow direction. The requirements of O.Reg. 153/04 have been met.
1.2.g.viii	Section 6.9 item G. indicates that the "development will feature a multi-story building with seventy-two (72) residential units". This report is for Areas A & B, which to our understanding is to allow for 33 and 42, respectively, single detached units on POTL lots on a common element private road. Does this section need to be updated to reflect Areas A & B specifically?	Noted, this has been updated.
1.2.g.ix	The Urbantech FSR, SWM section 4.1.2 for Areas A & B discusses methane gas risks when excavating in Queenston Shale, and advised that the boreholes were not drilled into the shale, does this need to be completed and assessed? Basements could be in the shale since the boreholes show the shale as high as 1.5m bgs.	Although not encountered during borehole drilling, methane gas can exist in the bedrock, normally below the top 1m and more concentrated with depth. Appropriate care, venting and monitoring is essential in all confined bedrock excavations. Basements floors will generally be constructed in glacial till deposits. However, in any areas where basements are to be constructed near or in the bedrock surface, methane gas monitoring will be carried out during excavation. If methane gas is encountered during excavation, gas venting systems may be required depending upon the gas concentration readings
1.2.h	Area C Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block C), Burlington, ON, dated 2020-01-29 and revised 2020-07-02. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. was submitted with the application, and we offer the following comments:	
1.2.h.i	Section 3.1.4 indicated a chain of title was not completed but would be required prior to RSC submission, has it been completed since time of report? Please include in an updated report.	Refer to appendix G.
1.2.h.ii	Section 3.2.2 indicates an MECP FOI was submitted but no reply yet, since time of report has a reply been received? If so please include in an updated report.	MECP has responded indicating that a third party notification is required which will result in slower than usual response times. No response has been received to date.
1.2.h.iii	Section 3.3.4 indicates that the property includes not Areas of Natural Significance, we would ask that this be confirmed with Conservation Halton and the Region of Halton, and if necessary if there are areas of natural significance confirmed by the agencies, please update this section.	No Areas of Natural Significance as defined by O.Reg. 153/04 have been identified.
1.2.h.iv	Section 6.4.3 discusses no utilities on the property, there is a TransCanada Pipeline directly adjacent to the subject property, and should this be discussed in this section?	The TransCanada Pipeline is not located on the Phase One Property, and thus was not discussed in this section. Further, the TransCanada Pipeline is for natural gas and thus will not have any effect on the environmental quality of the soil and groundwater.
1.2.h.v	Appendix A did not include a survey of the property, is a survey available? If so, please include in the report.	Survey is included under Appendix A.
1.2.i	Area C Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block C), Burlington, ON, dated 2020-07-02. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. was submitted with the application, and we offer the following comments:	

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.2.i.i	The executive summary (page iii) did not indicate that the groundwater was sampled and chemical analysis completed. The Phase Two ESA for Areas A & B, did complete chemical analysis on groundwater. We would ask that chemical analysis of groundwater samples be undertaken and included in a revised report. Sections 4.6 and 4.7 state that groundwater sampling was not identified as a media of potential concern, why is Area C different from Areas A & B? Additionally Section 3.1 states that groundwater samples were collected and compared to analytical data, but the analysis does not appear to be included in the report. Additionally Appendix B also states that groundwater samples will be submitted for chemical analysis. Additionally Table 6-2 in the Area E Phase One ESA indicates that pesticides are media that potentially impacts soil and ground water.	Groundwater was not identified as a media of potential concern, thus groundwater was not sampled. Section 3.1 includes a typo. Groundwater was not collected for chemical analysis. Appendix B states that the only media of concern is soil. The other reference in section 3.0 of Appendix B (the last bullet point) is a typo and has been corrected in a revised copy of the report. Areas A & B were completed prior to Areas C, D and E, and included both soil and groundwater sampling for the pesticides that were considered a potentially contaminating activities. The results of that analysis indicated that all soil and groundwater samples were all at non detectable concentrations. Thus, there was no evidence of the application of environmentally persistent pesticides affecting the Property. During the investigations of Areas C and D pesticides were not considered a potentially contaminating activity that could affect the groundwater since the previous investigations did not identify any indication of pesticides in the groundwater. In the case of Area E, the PCA was for the storage of pesticides, not the application to the grass surface. Therefore, it was the QPs decision to test the groundwater for pesticides in the area that the pesticides were being stored as a conservative measure. Results also did not detect concentrations of pesticides, thus confirming that environmentally persistent pesticides are not present.
1.2.i.ii	Section 2.2.1 indicates there are no areas of natural or scientific interest identified in the Phase Two study area, we would ask that Conservation Halton and the Region of Halton also confirm this, and if necessary update the report, if it is determined there are areas of natural or scientific significance.	No Areas of Natural Significance as defined by O.Reg. 153/04 have been identified.
1.2.i.iii	Section 5.6 compared soil analysis to Table 3 RPI SCS, was it confirmed with the Region that the non-potable table could be used? If not, then please confirm with the Region, if the Region says potable should be used, please update Section 5.6	Permission has not been granted. The report has been updated to compare against Table 2 Standards.
1.2.i.iv	Figure 5 outlines the borehole locations, how were the locations determined? It is our understanding that golf course holes have three grass area components: green, fairway and rough. The green area is very manicured/maintained, then the fairway areas would be the second most manicured/maintained. It would be reasonable to assume that the most manicured/maintained areas would also be subject to the most fertilizer and pesticide applications, and therefore the soil under these areas could have the most concentration of contaminants. Figure 5 does not clearly show the green, fairway and rough areas of the existing holes in Area C. We ask that a plan of the existing holes be provided, with the borehole locations overlaid to confirm that the boreholes (at minimum) were drilled in each of the hole's greens, fairways and rough areas.	Due to the continued operation of the golf course, boreholes were not advanced directly on the green or fairway, as this would hinder the functionality of the course. Boreholes were advanced as close to the fairways as possible without causing disruption, while still providing an adequate location for the investigation. It is DS opinion that direct advancement on the green and fairway would not have any major advantage to the investigation. Additionally, in our report for Areas A and B, the pesticides were non detected concentrations in all samples for soil and groundwater. Thus, there was no evidence of the application of environmentally persistent pesticides affecting the Property.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.2.i.v	Appendix A – please include a survey of the Area C	Survey has been included in updated report.
1.2.i.vi	Appendix E – conceptual site model states field work in December 2019 and April 2020, the boreholes were advanced November 26, 2019, should the CSM reflect the dates of the fieldwork/match the borehole reports?	The CSM was referring to the sampling dates in December 2019 and April 2020. The CSM has been updated to provide the dates of the drilling activities as well.
1.2.i.vii	There is a “Figures” section after Appendix E, and a “Figures section before the “Tables” section, appears to be duplicated.	This has been updated.
1.2.j	Area D Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block D), Burlington, ON, dated 2020-01-29 and revised 2020-07-02. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. was submitted with the application, and we offer the following comments:	
1.2j.i	Section 3.1.4 indicated a chain of title was not completed but would be required prior to RSC submission, has it been completed since time of report? Please include in an updated report.	This has been updated.
1.2.j.ii	Section 3.2.2 indicates an MECP FOI was submitted but no reply yet, since time of report has a reply been received? If so please include in an updated report.	MECP has responded indicating that a third party notification is required which will result in slower than usual response times. No response has been received to date.
1.2.j.iii	Section 6.4.3 discusses no utilities on the property, there is a TransCanada Pipeline directly adjacent to the subject property, should this be discussed in this section?	The TransCanada Pipeline is not located on the Phase One Property, and thus was not discussed in this section. Further, the TransCanada Pipeline is for natural gas and thus will not have any effect on the environmental quality of the soil and groundwater.
1.2.j.iv	Appendix A did not include a survey of the property, is a survey available? If so, please include in the report.	A survey is now included in the report.
1.2.k	Area D Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block D), Burlington, ON, dated 2020-07-02. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. was submitted with the application, and we offer the following comments:	
1.2.k.i	The Executive Summary page ii states that groundwater samples were collected and submitted for analysis, page iii states that the soil samples meet the applicable standards but does not state whether the groundwater samples did. The Phase Two ESA for Areas A & B, did complete chemical analysis on groundwater. We would ask that chemical analysis of groundwater samples be undertaken and included in a revised report. Sections 4.6 and 4.7 state that groundwater sampling was not identified as a media of potential concern, why is Area D different from Areas A & B? Additionally Section 3.1 states that groundwater samples were collected and compared to analytical data, but the analysis does not appear to be included in the report. Additionally Appendix B also states that groundwater samples will be submitted for chemical analysis. Additionally Table 6-2 in the Area E Phase One ESA indicates that pesticides are media that potentially impacts soil and ground water.	The line “Soil and groundwater samples were collected…” is a typo and should only include soil samples. Groundwater wells were only installed for geotechnical purposes. Areas A & B were completed prior to Areas C, D and E, and included both soil and groundwater sampling for the pesticides that were considered a potentially contaminating activities. The results of that analysis indicated that all soil and groundwater samples were all at non detectable concentrations. Thus, there was no evidence of the application of environmentally persistent pesticides affecting the Property. During the investigations of Areas C and D pesticides were not considered a potentially contaminating activity that could affect the groundwater since the previous investigations did not identify any indication of pesticides in the groundwater. In the case of Area E, the PCA was for the storage of pesticides, not the application to the grass surface. Therefore,

Comment #	Comment	Response
		it was the QPs decision to test the groundwater for pesticides in the area that the pesticides were being stored as a conservative measure. Results also did not detect concentrations of pesticides, thus confirming that environmentally persistent pesticides are not present.
1.2.k.ii	Section 2.2.1 indicates there are no areas of natural or scientific interest identified in the Phase Two study area, we would ask that Conservation Halton and the Region of Halton also confirm this, and if necessary update the report, if it is determined there are areas of natural or scientific significance.	No Areas of Natural or Scientific Interest as defined by O.Reg 153/04 have been identified.
1.2.k.iii	Section 3.3.3 indicates there are no underground utilities on site, there is however a TransCanada pipeline directly adjacent to the site – does that have to be addressed in the report?	The TransCanada Pipeline is not located on the Phase One Property, and thus was not discussed in this section. Further, the TransCanada Pipeline is for natural gas and thus will not have any effect on the environmental quality of the soil and groundwater.
1.2.k.iv	Section 5.6 compared soil analysis to Table 3 RPI SCS, was it confirmed with the Region that the non-potable table could be used? If not, then please confirm with the Region, if the Region says potable should be used, please update Section 5.6	Permission has not been granted. The report has been updated to compare against Table 2 Standards.
1.2.k.v	Sections 5.6 and 6.0 state there are no exceedances for Table 3 SCS, however, Tables 4 and 10 show that Boron (Hot Water Soluble far exceed the MECP Table 3 SCS Limits, Table 3 is 1.5ug/g and BH 19-1, DUP-1 BH19, BH 19-2 and BH 19-3 have values of 10ug/g, 8ug/g, 6ug/g and 8ug/g, respectively. Are there typos in Tables 4 and 10? Appendix C pag3 4/25 lists the results for all samples as <0.5, however, we defer to the author of the Phase Two ESA to confirm if there was an error when transferring information. If not a typo/transfer error, do additional drilling/sampling/analysis and/or site remediation activities need to be undertaken? Do Sections 5.6 and 6.0 need to be updated? Does the conclusion change if no typos?	Yes, there is a typo in the tables. The boron (total) and boron (hot water soluble) were mixed up, as confirmed by the laboratory certificate of analysis under appendix D. There are no exceedances for metals and inorganics under the Table 3 SCS. Conclusions of the report will not change.
1.2.k.vi	Section 5.9 indicated that the duplicate sample for BH19 exceeded the recommended limit for arsenic – should a third sample be taken and analyzed to confirm arsenic limits?	The duplicate samples from BH19-2 S2 does not exceed the SCS. The variance between the parent sample and the duplicate sample was above the recommended value. This is likely attributed to the heterogeneity of the fill material. There are no arsenic exceedances, thus no additional samples need to be collected.
1.2.k.vii	Figure 5 outlines the borehole locations, how were the locations determined? It is our understanding that golf course holes have three grass area components: green, fairway and rough. The green area is very manicured/maintained, then the fairway areas would be the second most manicured/maintained. It would be reasonable to assume that the most manicured/maintained areas would also be subject to the most fertilizer and pesticide applications, and therefore the soil under these areas could have the most concentration of contaminants. Figure 5 does not clearly show the green, fairway and rough areas of the existing holes in Area D. We ask that a plan of the existing holes be provided, with the borehole locations overlaid to confirm that the boreholes (at minimum) were drilled in each of the hole's greens, fairways and rough areas.	Due to the continued operation of the golf course, boreholes were not advanced directly on the green or fairway, as this would hinder the functionality of the course. Boreholes were advanced as close to the fairways as possible without causing disruption, while still providing an adequate location for the investigation. It is DS opinion that direct advancement on the green and fairway would not have any major advantage to the investigation. Additionally, in our report for Areas A and B, the pesticides were non detected concentrations in all samples for soil and groundwater. Thus, there was no evidence of the application of environmentally persistent pesticides affecting the Property.
1.2.k.viii	Appendix A – please include a survey of Area D	A survey has been included.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.2.k.ix	Appendix E – conceptual site model states field work in December 2019 and April 2020, the boreholes were advanced November 26, 2019, should the CSM reflect the dates of the fieldwork/match the borehole reports?	This has been updated.
1.2.k.x	There is a “Figures” section after Appendix E, and a “Figures” section before the “Tables” section, appears to be duplicated.	This has been updated.
1.2.l	Area E Phase One Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block E), Burlington, ON, dated 2020-01-30 and revised 2020-07-02. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. was submitted with the application, and we offer the following comments:	
1.2.l.i	Considering there is a municipal address for this area (4274 Dundas Street), it would be appreciated if the municipal address could also be included on the cover page of the report.	This has been updated.
1.2.l.ii	Section 3.1.1 outlines surrounding uses, should the hydro corridor be mentioned as well? Our understanding is that utility corridors can also be a source of contaminants; however we do defer to the QP to confirm what should be stated.	Section 3.1.1 has been updated
1.2.l.iii	Section 3.1.4 indicated a chain of title was not completed but would be required prior to RSC submission, has it been completed since time of report? Please include in an updated report.	This has been updated.
1.2.l.iv	Table 5-3 indicates that the property to the east is open vacant space, however it is also a hydro corridor, should this be mentioned?	This has been updated.
1.2.l.v	Table 6.3 indicates there are no underground utilities on the site, which can affect contaminant and distribution and transport. The site is has a regional water service and a septic system, are either of these considered underground utilities?	Table 6.3 of the Area E Phase One ESA does not mention underground utilities. Section 6.4.3 does mention that there are no underground utilities, which is a typo. The report has been updated to reflect this. Section 5.2 and Table 5-2 do mention the utilities that are located on the site.
1.2.l.vi	Section 6.4.5 indicates an MECP FOI was submitted but no reply yet, since time of report has a reply been received? If so please include in an updated report.	MECP has responded indicating that a third party notification is required which will result in slower than usual response times. No response has been received to date.
1.2.l.vii	Appendix A – please include a survey of Area E	A survey has been included.
1.2.l.viii	Appendix C – the ERIS Report Summary page 4 does not note any Aboveground Storage Tanks or Fuel Storage Tank on the property. Do the three tanks existing on site have current permits from the governing authority? Or are permits required? If so, why aren’t they listed on the ERIS report? The Detail Report does look to list Petroleum Distillate and waste oils & lubricants, so why wouldn’t it show up on the summary page?	The ERIS report is inherently limited to the data inputs. It is possible for tanks to exist which are not in the ERIS database. The petroleum distillate and waste oils and lubricants are not intrinsically associated with the tanks, they simply indicate that at a point in time, waste was removed from the Site and registered under the HWIN registry. The Tanks on site are owned by Ultramar, and Ultramar is contractually obligated to maintain the tanks. Ultramar was contacted and confirmed that no permits are required. This does not affect the findings or conclusions of the report.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.2.l.ix	Appendix C – the ERIS Report Summary Page 5 does not note a Pesticide Register for the property, does the golf course have a pesticide registration? Are they required to? If so, why isn't it listed on the ERIS report?	The ERIS report is inherently limited to the data inputs. The golf course is registered with the Integrated Pest Management Council of Canada, and completes annual reports to the council, ensuring compliance. Bulk storage of pesticides which would be of environmental concern was not observed. As such this is not considered to be of concern.
1.2.l.x	Appendix D includes correspondence from TSSA that states "We confirm there are no records in our database of any fuel storage tanks at the subject addresses." Do the existing three tanks on site require TSSA approval/registration/etc.?	See comment 1.2 l viii above
1.2.m	Area E Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment, Millcroft Golf Club (Block E), Burlington, ON, dated 2020-07-02. Prepared by DS Consultants Ltd. was submitted with the application, and we offer the following comments:	
1.2.m.i	Considering there is a municipal address for this area (4274 Dundas Street), it would be appreciated if the municipal address could also be included on the cover page of the report.	This has been updated
1.2.m.ii	The Executive Summary and Sections 1.4, 5.6 and 5.7 compared soil and groundwater analysis to Table 3 RPI SCS, was it confirmed with the Region that the non-potable table could be used? If not, then please confirm with the Region, if the Region says potable should be used, please update Sections 1.4, 5.6 and 5.7	Permission has not been granted. The report has been updated to compare against Table 2 Standards.
1.2.m.iii	Section 2.2.1 states that the Phase One ESA was dated January 30, 2020, the Phase One ESA for Area E that was submitted with the application was dated 2020-01-30 but it was also revised 2020-07-02, should this section reflect the revision date of the Phase One ESA?	Yes, the report has been updated to include the revised date of the Phase One ESA report.
1.2.m.iv	Section 3.3.5 states that DS Consultants Ltd. is still waiting for a response on the MECP FOI – has it been received yet? If so, please update this section.	MECP has responded indicating that a third party notification is required which will result in slower than usual response times. No response has been received to date.
1.2.m.v	Table 8 indicates an exceedance of Dibenz (a,h) anthracene, Section 5.6.7 stated the raised levels were caused by a sample matrix interference. Was there a duplicate sample taken for BH-19-1? If so, could it be tested. Also, Table 15 indicated "All Samples" for location of maximum concentration (exceedance) for Dibenz (a,h) anthracene, is it just BH-19-1 that exceeded or is it all samples?	DS does not have a DUP sample at this location. A second sample will need to be collected at this location to verify the Dibenz(a,h)anthracene concentration prior to the submission of a Record of Site Condition. This work will be completed in Spring 2022.
1.2.m.vi	Table 15 looks to indicate BH-19-1 was close to exceeding Fluoranthene (0.66vs. 0.69), Benz (a) pyrene (0.28 vs. 0.3), and Acenaphtylene (<0.15 vs. 0.17), as mentioned above was there a duplicate sample that was tested? If not, should a new sample be tested?	DS does not have a DUP sample at this location. None of the identified parameters are exceeding the SCS and thus it is the QPs decision that an additional sample does not need to be collected for this reason. However, due to the previous comment, a sample will be collected for confirmation of the detection limit exceedance of the Dibenz(a,h)anthracene.
1.2.m.vii	Appendix A – please provide a copy of the survey	This has been updated.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.2.m.viii	There is a "Figures" section after Appendix E, and a "Figures" section before the "Tables" section, appears to be duplicated.	This has been updated.
1.3	**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT**	
1.3.i	We have reviewed the Functional Servicing and SWM Report prepared by Urbantech Consulting dated December 2020, Stormwater Management Section (Region of Halton will review Sanitary and Water information) and have the following comments/questions. Please be advised that the Region of Halton, Conservation Halton, TCPL, CN Rail, and the City's Stormwater Engineer may also review the stormwater management section of the report, in case of discrepancies in requirements, the most stringent criteria shall apply:	Acknowledged.
1.3.a	The CH regulated limits (hazards and setbacks) need to be verified by CH and clearly shown on all plans. If the current lines shown on the drawings do not prove to be acceptable to CH, please revise and provide revised reports/drawings. Furthermore it is our understanding that through a development application CH regulated hazard lands and setbacks are to be dedicated to public (City) ownership, however we would defer to CH and Planning Staff to provide guidance on dedication requirements.	Acknowledged. CH staff attended on-site to stake the wetland limits within Area A. CH staff staked the physical top of bank on the west side of Appleby Creek within Area A and confirmed that the eastern side of the creek is considered to be unconfined (i.e., no top of bank). CH staff confirmed that wetland limit staking was not required for Areas D or E. Please refer to the CH section of this matrix for comments/responses related to their regulated limits. It is the Study Team's understanding that the regulated area associated with Area A will be dedicated to a public agency and it is assumed that the City will take ownership.
1.3.b	The Millcroft Golf Course contains sections and tributaries of Appleby Creek and Sheldon Creek, previous subdivision applications zoned these areas as open space, and therefore formal easements over these areas may not have been established. We require an overall reference plan for the Millcroft Community and golf course, clearly showing CH regulated limits and setbacks (as verified by CH), any blocks containing regulated areas, municipal infrastructure and overland flow routes that are not currently in City ownership or within (City) easements, must either be dedicated to public ownership or at minimum (with Conservation/City approval) easements conveyed through the application process.	With respect to CH regulated & various hazard limits, refer to Area A-D FSR Figure 1 – Constraints Mapping and all FSR grading series drawings. Otherwise, refer to Comment 1.3.f.iii.
1.3.c.	The Site Engineering comments that relate to stormwater management for Areas A-D are not included this document. Stormwater-related comments for Areas A-D will be shared upon conclusion of the stormwater peer review	Acknowledged.
1.3.d.	**Area E, Section 7 of the Urbantech FSR:**	
1.3.d.i	Section 7.1.1 indicates that the maintenance building will be relocated to beside the existing clubhouse on Country Club Drive, please be advised that a site plan application will be required for this work, including review of stormwater management, noise, etc.	Noted.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.3.d.ii	**City SWM comments:**	
1.3.d.ii.i	Dundas is a Region of Halton owned Right of Way, please also confirm SWM criteria with Halton.	Refer to Detailed Regional Servicing Appendix B Comment Response No. 8.
1.3.d.ii.ii	Further to above, please also confirm with Hydro One Network Inc. if they are supportive of overland flow from redevelopment of the existing maintenance building property through their lands. Do they have concerns with erosion near their structures? Similarly, TCPL specifically advised that no flows can be directed to their lands (for Areas C & D).	The pre-development drainage plan for Area E, as illustrated on FSR DWG EX-E, demonstrates that the maintenance building already directs uncontrolled discharge to the Hydro One Network Inc. (HONI) lands as sheet flow. Additionally, a point discharge of flow is directed uncontrolled from Dundas Street and onto HONI lands. The post-development drainage plan does not increase the drainage area but rather reduces the drainage area directed to HONI's lands primarily due to sub-catchment S-02E is proposed to direct discharge along the condo frontage towards Dundas Street. Further, the amount of sheet flow directed to HONI's lands in the post-development condition is reduced and re-directed for conveyance in an existing swale on HONI's lands for ultimate discharge to Appleby Creek. Refer to HONI Conditions of Draft Plan Approval Comment Response A. The post development drainage plan for Area C, as illustrated on FSR DWG STM-C, demonstrates that all discharge is contained within the development and is not directed towards TCPL lands. Rather, the existing drainage condition, which allows for TCPL lands to discharge towards Area C, is enhanced as sub-catchment S01-C (Area = 0.60ha) is reduced in the post-development condition to 0.06ha. This differential in drainage area is overcontrolled within Area C via an underground superpipe prior to ultimate discharge to the existing residential minor storm system on Country Club Drive. Refer to Area C SWM quantity control is detailed in Area A-D FSR Section 5.6.2 for further details. The post-development plan for Area D, as illustrated on FSR DWG STM-D, demonstrates that proposed storm infrastructure will control all flows up to the 100-year storm to the existing sewers in Millcroft Park Drive. Refer to Area D SWM quantity control is detailed in Area A-D FSR Section 6.6.2 for further details.
1.3.d.ii.iii	Please also be advised that Area E appears to be adjacent to a CH regulated area, therefore please also confirm if they have a vested interest in the SWM for the site, and if so, incorporate their criteria. Please note that in case of differing criteria between agencies (Region, City, CH, Hydro One, etc.), the most stringent criteria shall apply. Please also ensure that any regulated limits or setback lines are clearly shown and labeled on all drawings.	CH Comments, dated April 16, 2021 indicate that Area E is outside of CH's regulated area. Note, FSR DWG GR-E and EER Figure 8e collectively illustrate with labels the applicable constraint linework with respect to Area E.
1.3.d.ii.iv	Section 7.6.3 of the Urbantech FSR states quantity control criteria is not required, please be advised that as per the City's Stormwater Management Design Guidelines (Section 6.1.1.1) , if stormwater is outlet to a watercourse then the quantity control criteria would be control the 2 through 100 year storms post to pre. If the stormwater is outlet to a municipal storm sewer then the quantity control criteria would be control the 100year post to 5 year pre. as per the City's SWM	Area E calculations are revised. Storage volume estimates are based on control of the 100-year post-development flow to the 2-year pre-development flow as discussed in Area E FSR Section 9.3.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.3.d.ii.v	Section 7.6.2 of the Urbantech FSR discusses quality control for Area E, but does not specify if 80% TSS removal will be achieved, which is required as per the City's Stormwater Management Design Guidelines (Section 6.1.4.1).	Refer to Area E FSR Section 9.2 of water quality strategy in this submission.
1.3.d.ii.vi	Section 7.6.4 of the Urbantech FSR discusses water balance, and states a potential reduction of 37%, but the R. J. Burnside report Table 4 indicates 18% for Area A. Also, the City's Stormwater Management Design Guidelines provides Water Balance criteria (Section 6.1.3)	Area A-D FSR Sections 4.6.4, 5.6.3 & 6.6.3 and Area E FSR Section 9.4 are updated to reflect the revised site wide water balance calculations as provided by RJB in Appendix B.
1.3.d.ii.vii	The City's Stormwater Design Guidelines Section 6.1.2 discusses Erosion Control criteria, please include a section in the FSR for Area E, discussing how the erosion control is met for the site.	Area E FSR Section 6.6.1 is updated to address erosion control.
1.3.d.ii.viii	Section 7 does not discuss groundwater and how it is managed, please provide discussion in the report if the foundation of the underground parking structure will have a foundation collection system, or be waterproofed, and no collection. If groundwater is to be collected, does the chemical analysis of the groundwater meet municipal or regional discharge criteria (depending on where it is outlet)? Also, if it is to be collected it needs to be accounted for in the stormwater quantity control for the site. The Hydrogeologist will need to provide seasonally high estimated flows.	Area A-D FSR Sections 4.1.4, 5.1.4, & 6.1.4 and Area E FSR Section 4.4 are updated to reflect the Foundation Weeping Tiles and Groundwater Quality Evaluation Report prepared by RJB.
1.3.d.ii.ix	Appendix H, SWM Design Calculations, SWMF-1, Post-Development Release Rates Area E, looks to exceed the predevelopment flows. Please see section iv. above for quantity criteria. On the same figure, where is S-03E accounted for, it looks to outlet to the same place?	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.d.ii.iv.
1.3.d.ii.x	On Drawing PR-E please label the outlet(s)	Drawing STM-E is updated to include a label identifying the single discharge outlet as HW1 from Area E.
1.3.d.ii.xi	Private condominium (intensified) developments shall control all storms up to the 100 year storm on site, as per Section 6.1.1.2 of the City's SWM Design Guidelines. Please demonstrate how the 100 year storm is controlled and treated on site.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.d.ii.iv.
1.3.d.ii.xii	Please provide a storm sewer design sheet for Area E	A storm sewer design sheet, for Area E, was provided in Area E FSR Appendix F entitled, "PR STM Design Sheet – 5 Year – Area E". Note, there exists only one (1) leg of storm pipe outside of the parking garage that is applicable to include.
1.3.e.	**Urbantech FSR Section 8 Erosion Control:**	
1.3.e.i	Please note that erosion control fencing along watercourses or ponds will be required to be double heavy duty fence with straw bales staked in between.	Acknowledged and to be implemented as part of the Erosion and Sediment Control plans that will be submitted as part of the Site Plan application / site alteration application.
1.3.e.ii	Please note that for the mud mats, the large diameter clear stone (50mm/150mm) of the mud mat shall begin inside the property lines of the various Development areas. The area between the pavement/curb and property line shall be an alternate dust free surface that will not track onto the road or sidewalk, as large stones tracked onto the road are hazardous.	Acknowledged and to be implemented as part of the Erosion and Sediment Control plans that will be submitted as part of the Site Plan application / site alteration application.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.3.e.iii	Sediment traps shall be “silt-sacs” or equivalent, not just landscape fabric, and will need to be installed in the existing municipal catch basins fronting the site on both sides of the road and in the CB’s one set downstream from the proposed development.	Acknowledged and to be implemented as part of the Erosion and Sediment Control plans that will be submitted as part of the Site Plan application / site alteration application.
1.3.f.	**Drawings & Figures:**	
1.3.f.i.	Figure ROW-1, ROW-1TX, ROW-2 and ROW 2TX, please show subdrain under curb and gutter	All Area A-D FSR Right-of-Way drawings (SEC-A1, SEC-A2, SEC-A3, SEC-A4, SEC-B1, SEC-B2, SEC-C1, SEC-D1) are updated to illustrate subdrains under curb and gutter.
1.3.f.ii	Figure ROW-1, ROW-1TX, ROW-2 and ROW 2TX, all for a 10.3m or 10.8m common element ROW notes min. cover for storm sewers, please revise the min. cover requirements to 2.5m as per Section 5.2.3 of the City’s SWM Design Guidelines. In areas where it can be demonstrated that greater depths cannot be reasonably achieved, a minimum permissible depth of cover for storm sewer is 1.25, maximum depths as per OPSD.	All Area A-D FSR Right-of-Way drawings (SEC-A1, SEC-A2, SEC-A3, SEC-A4, SEC-B1, SEC-B2, SEC-C1, SEC-D1) are revised to indicate storm pipe cover depths are in conformance with Section 5.2.3 of the City’s SWM Design Guidelines.
1.3.f.iii	Figure ROW-1, ROW-1TX, ROW-2 and ROW 2TX, all for a 10.3m or 10.8m common element ROW show the lighting, utilities, hydrants, trees, etc. all outside the 10.3m or 10.8m ROW, considering the single family lots are Parcel of Tied Land (POTL) lots, please show an easement for the encroachments or increase the ROW widths so that all required components of a common element ROW can be contained to the common element limits.	All private & public easements with lot adjacency will be determined at detailed subdivision design and approval. Private utility easements may include but not be limited to blanket easements associated with blocks containing ROW as conveyed to the City per the draft plan of subdivision. Lots will have both exclusive use & common element components as part of the condominium corporation in conjunction with RLCB servicing & private utility easements. However, for the purposes of this submission, RTG has informed the utility corridors abutting ROW limits as illustrated Area A-D FSR Right-of-Way drawings (SEC-A1, SEC-A2, SEC-A3, SEC-A4, SEC-B1, SEC-B2, SEC-C1, SEC-D1).
1.3.f.iv	Figure ROW-1, ROW-1TX, ROW-2 and ROW 2TX, all for a 10.3m or 10.8m common element ROW show a 1.4m sidewalk down one side of the private common element road, please confirm with Transportation and Planning staff that this approach is supported. Please also confirm with the accessibility coordinator that a 1.4m width sidewalk is supported, typically sidewalks are required to be min. 1.5m width not including top of curb width.	All Area A-D FSR Right-of-Way drawings (SEC-A1, SEC-A2, SEC-A3, SEC-A4, SEC-B1, SEC-B2, SEC-C1, SEC-D1) are updated to reflect a minimum sidewalk width of 1.5m not including the top width of curb. XX
1.3.f.v	Figure ROW-1, ROW-1TX, ROW-2 and ROW 2TX, all for a 10.3m or 10.8m common element ROW, notes 6m setback to garage, for condominium type developments a 6.7m length driveway is required, we have confirmed with Transportation staff that a reduced length driveway is not supported.	Minimum driveway lengths of 6.7m are reflected in the lot envelopes in various FSR drawings and development concepts by Gerrard Design.
1.3.f.vi	Figure ROW-1, ROW-1TX, ROW-2 and ROW 2TX, all for a 10.3m or 10.8m common element ROW, with only 4.5m setback to houses, sidewalk on at least one side and double driveways, how will snow be managed? Is there room on the POTL front lawns for snow storage? Saying snow will be trucked off site is not supported. Additionally piling snow on Conservation Regulated lands is also generally not supported, but we would defer to Conservation Halton to confirm their restrictions.	Snow storage area will be the responsibility of the condominium corporation. As such, dedicated snow storage location and requisite area will be determined at the site plan design stage in conjunction with a coordinated utility plan to ensure all above ground street furniture is accounted and without conflict. The limits of the snow storage area will not conflict with CH regulated lands and/or the proposed development constraint limits.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.3.f.vii	Figure ROW-1, ROW-1TX, ROW-2 and ROW 2TX, all for a 10.3m or 10.8m common element ROW, please show where a Canada Post Mailbox Pad could be accommodated – would an easement be needed if it doesn't fit in the 10.3m or 108m ROW?	A proposed mailbox location will be determined at the site plan design stage and in conjunction with a coordinated utility plan to ensure all above ground street furniture is accounted and without conflict. Further, Canada Post will be engaged at this time to confirm the required footprint of the mailbox pad and determine any applicable setback requirements.
1.3.h	Provide an overall map of the Millcroft neighborhood/golf course, identify all (not just in the proposed development areas) stormwater management ponds, swales and overland flow routes that service municipal right of ways through the golf course lands. Including labeling any existing easements (including H number) on title. As mentioned above, IF there are overland flow routes, pipes, swales, etc. that are not currently in an easement, new stormwater easements will need to be conveyed to the City, and a draft reference plan showing proposed stormwater easements will need to be provided.	Wellings Planning Consultants Inc. has prepared a draft plan of subdivision which outlines all blocks, inclusive of new servicing easements to be conveyed to the City. As all ROW blocks are completely overlapped by 100-year capture zones per the SWM strategy detailed in the Area A-D FSR, overland flow routes do not exist up to the 100-year storm event within ROWs that will be conveyed to the City at the time of registration. In the case of Area E, refer to Drawing RL-E which specifies both Dundas Street property and STM easement requirements. All pertinent SWM infrastructure is already identified. Area A ties into existing SWM infrastructure that will be surveyed, refer to Comment Response 1.4.ii. Note, Area B ultimately ties into the same existing infrastructure as Area A. Area C and D both demonstrate that post-development flows are overcontrolled to pre-development levels prior to discharge into minor storm sewer system within the existing residential. Again, these existing control manhole locations with respect to Areas C and D as above-mentioned will be surveyed per Comment Response 1.4.ii. Area E maintains the existing point discharge location by utilizing the existing outfall and swale for ultimate discharge to Appleby Creek.
1.3.i.	Provide the maintenance records for the existing ponds that provide stormwater management controls for the Millcroft Community. The existing stormwater system for the Millcroft neighborhood needs to be assessed and confirmed in good working condition before additional hard surfacing/development can be considered. There are 6 existing ponds in the community that provide an outlet for the municipal right of ways and existing homes, addresses as follows: i. 4211 Millcroft Park Drive ii. 2199 Turnberry Road iii. 4356 Latimer Crescent iv. 4124 Stonebridge Crescent v. Pond behind 2538 Hogan Court (0000 Taywood Drive) vi. 2045 Country Club Drive	The existing ponds are online ponds and cannot be termed as storm water management ponds containing any form of active storage above the permanent pool elevation. These ponds are not intended to treat or management stormwater from the subject lands. The proposed overcontrol on site (100—year post-development flows based on updated IDF parameters controlled to 5-year pre-development flow based on original IDF parameters) will ensure that the downstream system receives less flow compared to existing conditions. Maintenance records are not required based on evaluating such a stormwater performance metric (i.e active storage volume above the permanent pool). Refer to Comment Response 1.3.j for further clarification in this regard. For specific reference to the online pond nearest to: • 4536 Latimer Crescent and Area D, this online pond drainage area is not proposed to change as all Area D discharge is controlled on-site up to the 100-year storm event. • 2045 Country Club Drive and Area A, this online pond (i.e. Mill Pond) has been discussed extensively and will be reconfigured with active storage offline from Appleby Creek as detailed in Area A-D FSR Section 4.5.3.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.3.j.	Provide a sediment survey for the existing ponds that provide stormwater management controls for the Millcroft Community. As advised in the notes of the March 2020 pre-consultation meeting we require a sediment survey of the existing ponds, dredging of the ponds will be required if the ponds have sediment accumulation resulting in decreased treatment efficiency or quantity controls. i. 4211 Millcroft Park Drive ii. 2199 Turnberry Road iii. 4356 Latimer Crescent iv. 4124 Stonebridge Crescent v. Pond behind 2538 Hogan Court (0000 Taywood Drive) vi. 2045 Country Club Drive (*this is the pond that is proposed to be taken off line)	See response above. Furthermore, the online ponds located nearest to: • 4211 Millcroft Park Drive; is upstream of the Millcroft Park Drive channel crossing along Appleby Creek and is not related to this ZBA approval process. However, a sediment survey can be undertaken by the applicant as a condition of pre-servicing. • 2538 Hogan Court; is upstream of the Taywood Drive ROW crossing along Sheldon Creek and is not related to this ZBA approval process. However, a sediment survey can be undertaken by the applicant as a condition of pre-servicing. • 2199 Turnberry Road; is downstream of Turnberry Road crossing along Sheldon Creek near Appleby Line and is not related to this ZBA approval process. However, a sediment survey can be undertaken by the applicant as a condition of pre-servicing. • 4124 Stonebridge Crescent, is along Appleby Creek nearest to the Clubhouse and is not related to this ZBA approval process. However, a sediment survey can be undertaken by the applicant as a condition of pre-servicing.
1.4	**CIVIL ENGINEERING DRAWINGS**	
1.4.i	On all plans please ensure the CH regulated and setback limits (that have been confirmed with CH, including long term stable top of bank if necessary), TransCanada Pipeline Limited (TCPL) ROW/easement and setback limits, Hydro One and the CN Railway setback limits are all clearly noted. As noted above, the stormwater management and related studies will be subject to a peer review, which may have bearing on the engineering drawings. Please ensure the results of the peer review are incorporated into the engineering drawings (if necessary).	Acknowledged. FSR grading series drawings reflect all applicable agency setbacks and regulation limits.
1.4.ii	Provide confirmation that the actual locations and inverts of all buried infrastructure (i.e. daylighting) was completed in the areas of proposed connections and crossings to confirm servicing is feasible, please note on the servicing drawings that this has been undertaken, i.e. physical locations and inverts of existing buried infrastructure were confirmed on XX date.	Currently, all inverts and locations of buried sanitary and storm pipe are confirmed based on the City and Region GIS information coupled with applicable As-Built Drawings. However, as we approach subdivision design, we have requested this survey and will rely upon this information on a going forward basis.
1.4.iii	**We have reviewed the Urbantech Drawings and have the following comments:**	
1.4.a	**General Plan of Services Area A & B, Drawing GP-AB, signed and dated December 18, 2020:**	
1.4.a.i	R. J. Burnside Hydrogeological Investigation Section 8.1 recommends anti- seepage collars or clay plugs to provide barriers to flow and prevent groundwater flow along the granular bedding	Acknowledged.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	and erosion of the backfill materials. If the project proceeds further, please ensure R.J. Burnsides recommendations are incorporated into the servicing design.	
1.4.a.ii	Provide hydraulic grade line analysis for the minor drainage system in order to preclude basement flooding (as advised in the pre-consultation notes and as per 20M-414 clause 24.(j))	A hydraulic grade line analysis was prepared to demonstrate the proposed 100-year water elevation delivered to existing storm sewers in both Hadfield Court & Parklane Crescent as illustrated in HGL1 & HGL-2 & modelled by PCSWMM in Area A-D FSR Appendix H.
1.4.a.iii	There are no street catch basins shown on the plan, we acknowledge and understand this is early design stages, however we do want to advise that catch basins need to be designed in accordance with 5.2.5 of the City's SWM Design Guidelines	Acknowledged. All catchbasins are illustrated on FSR general plan series drawings in this submission in accordance with City's SWM Design Guidelines Section 5.2.5.
1.4.a.iv	If it is determined that the utilities need an easement along the common element private road (due to only a 10.3 or 10.8m ROW), please clearly show limits and label on the drawing.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii.
1.4.a.v	Please note the (asphalt) radius of the cul-de-sac, the waste management report indicates they recommend 13m radius to allow for Regional waste pick up.	The cul-de-sac radii is indicated on all applicable FSR general plan series drawings as 13.0m.
1.4.a.vi	Please show any existing buried infrastructure, including irrigation lines, and note removals	All buried infrastructure are reflected on all general plan series drawings. Specifically, an existing condition irrigation line plan drawing is included in Area A-D FSR Appendix J and any removals thereof will be presented at following draft plan approval to reflect the proposed conditions.
1.4.a.vii	Please show or note private storm services, i.e. sumps connected to storm sewer or sumps with outlet to grade. Please note that if sumps are proposed to outlet to grade they cannot outlet to a side yard.	Given the detailed hydraulic grade line analysis modelled in PCSWMM, most lots will require sump pumps. Note, the sump pumps will allow for groundwater flow to be hydraulically disconnected from the minor storm system and not proposed to outlet to a side yard. At detailed design, all USF elevations will be confirmed to determine sump pump requirements for each lot.
1.4.a.viii	There is an existing bus stop on Millcroft Park Drive fronting Area A, it may be required to upgrade the bus stop (pad, shelter, etc.) through the development application, at the Developer's cost, requirements to be confirmed with Transit Staff.	Acknowledged.
1.4.a.ix	The servicing plan was not looked at in detail, once comments are provided from all agencies/departments and the stormwater management/pond relocation/creek alignment is confirmed, we expect there could be changes. Servicing would be looked at in detail with the next submission.	Acknowledged.
1.4.b	**Draft Grading Plan (Area A & B), Drawing GR-AB, signed and dated Dec 15, 2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	INFO
1.4.b.i	Please separate out the grading plans for Areas A and B, so that they can be a larger more legible scale, like the LID plans.	Separate grading plans exist for Area A as DWG GR-A1 & GR-A2 and Area B as DWG GR-B, in this Area A-D FSR submission.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.b.ii	Please provide additional grades for the rear yards of the existing residential that back on to the proposed development so that it can be seen how the proposed and existing grading will interface.	Additional grades along the rear yards of existing residential have been included on DWGs GR-A1, GR-A2, GR-B, GR-C, & GR-D to clarify the interface with proposed development for Areas A to D.
1.4.b.iii	Please indicate the radii of the curbs at the proposed road to Millcroft Park Drive	The curb radii at the proposed road to Millcroft Park Drive is provided.
1.4.b.iv	The minimum % slope for vertical alignment is 0.6%, maximum is 8%, please ensure proposed grades on the private roads meet this.	As per City of Burlington Site Plan Guidelines, the minimum slope for asphalt surfaces (i.e. private roadways) is 0.5% whereas the maximum desirable driveway slope is 6% and maximum permitted driveway (& roadway) slope is 8%.
1.4.b.v	Swales min. 2% slope or subdrains to be installed (looks like you achieve this), and swales in rear yard must be set back min. 0.6m from property line.	Rear yard swales are offset 0.6m from the property line along a minimum 2% slope.
1.4.b.vi	The base of swale elevations in the proposed rear yards that back onto the existing yards of Parklane Crescent and Hadfield Court must be min. 200mm less than the elevations of the back yards of the existing homes. The existing homes rear yards in existing conditions look have some drainage directly to the existing golf course lands, so the drainage cannot be cut off. These areas will have to be looked at in detail as there is existing vegetation/trees in the 6m buffer, grades will need to be taken in the buffer to determine swale base elevations. Staff was unable to complete site walk due to snow to look at how the backyards generally drain onto the golf course in existing conditions.	The swale centerline, along the rear lot property & 6.0m buffer interface, is set at an elevation 0.2m below the elevation of the back yards of the existing residential lots. The drainage from the existing residential rear yards continues to be directed towards the channel and is proposed to be intercepted by the subject swale. Although infiltration is promoted, any runoff that does not infiltrate will outlet to the rear-yard catchbasin as part of the minor storm system.
1.4.b.vii	The proposed top of curb on the north side of the Area A private road must be min. 200mm lower than the rear yard elevation of the existing homes on Hadfield Court that back onto the new private road to ensure drainage from the back yards still has an outlet, as they look to currently drain to the golf course lands.	The proposed top of curb and existing residential rear yard elevations are not tied to a vertical slope relationship given the proposed lots are split drainage and existing residential runoff is intercepted by the rear-yard swale as described in detail in Comment Response 1.4.b.vi. Note, the proposed lot split drainage design directs rear yard discharge (in addition to half of roof area) to be intercepted by the aforementioned rear-yard swale.
1.4.b.viii	Please reference S-119 for individual lot grading, i.e. top of foundation wall min. 150mm above outside grade, ground to slope away from foundation at min. 2% - 5%, grade at outside of foundation to be min. 400mm higher than grade at front property line for lots with split drainage and 500mm higher for lots with one way drainage, etc.	Individual lot grading will be established with plot plans and architectural elevations as coordinated with the building envelopes as part the of the building permit process. As part of the site plan design process, this note will be added to a general notes page as per Comment Response 1.4.d.v.
1.4.b.ix	If walkways/paths to the pond/creek/hazard lands are supported by staff, the walkways will need a removeable bollard installed at the path entrance from the private road.	Noted. Walkway/trails, as extended throughout Areas A & B, will include all applicable appurtenances as part of subsequent detailed design submissions.
1.4.b.x	Please show the potential building envelopes and driveway locations (like the LID plans do)	All potential building envelopes and driveway locations are shown for Areas A to D.
1.4.b.xi	Please revise so that side yard swales are located fully on one property, not along the property line between houses	Side yard swales are not proposed. All grading plans indicate split lot grading where applicable, as coincident with the property line.
1.4.b.xii	Please provide a typical lot detail, i.e. show building envelope, servicing, driveway, swale, infiltration trench (and easement), slopes, dimensions from property lines, etc.	All Areas A-D lot details illustrate building envelopes, driveway & swale locations as per the FSR grading series. All private easements, inclusive of public easements for rear-yard catchbasin leads as offset 0.6m from the property line, will be dimensioned as referenced in Comment Response 1.3.f.iii.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
		Note, infiltration trenches are no longer included in this submission.
1.4.b.xiii	Please provide a typical lot detail for lots with private rear yard catch basins, please also show the easement, min. 2.4m width, for the condo corporation's access to the catch basin. The catch basin lead has to be fully installed on one lot min. 0.6m from property line, and concrete encased. If this was a typical subdivision on a municipal road then the easement would be in favor of the City, but since a common element private road is proposed, then the condo corporation will be responsible for the storm sewer system and they will need access to the private rear yard catch basins for inspection and maintenance (if necessary). The maintenance of the rear yard catch basins will have to be confirmed as part of the subdivision process if the project moves forward, i.e. will the condo be responsible or the homeowner? There will also have to be clauses in the condo declaration in this regard.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xii.
1.4.b.xiv	An easement across the rear of the lots with infiltration trenches (if they are part of the site's stormwater management system) will also be required, in favor of the future condo corporation, for access for inspection and maintenance. The maintenance of the infiltration trenches will have to be confirmed as part of the subdivision process if the project moves forward, i.e. will the condo be responsible or the homeowner? There will also have to be clauses in the condo declaration in this regard.	As mentioned in Comment Response 1.3.f.iii, all private & public easements will be determined at detailed design and infiltration trenches are no longer included as referenced in Comment Response 1.4.b.xii. Instead, the proposed rear yard swales will only convey and direct stormwater flows to RLCBs.
1.4.b.xv	Please provide elevations for the proposed flood line (when confirmed) and provide recommendations for minimum top of foundation wall/openings in foundations for structures adjacent to the flood lines.	Given the 7.5m development setbacks within Area A (i.e. NHS buffer block), lots do not have adjacency to proposed flood lines. However, it is noted that all rear lot property lines that have adjacency to Block 91 feature a minimum vertical difference of 0.4m to the Regional Storm water surface elevation as demonstrated on Area A-D FSR DWG GR-A2. Note, the Regional Storm floodplain elevations are provided, as referenced from Area A-D FSR DWG FP-2.
1.4.b.xvi	Please provide elevations for max. depth of flow in the overland flow route and provide recommendations for minimum top of foundation wall/openings in foundations for structures adjacent to the overland flow route	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.h. for overland flow routes associated with blocks containing right-of-ways. Otherwise, the overland flow route, within a 8.0m servicing easement in Area A from Hadfield Court, is detailed as part of conveyance calculation included in FSR Appendix G in this submission.
1.4.b.xvii	There is a green line shown on the drawing, but nothing in the legend, what is the green line?	The green line is a drafting error and has been removed accordingly.
1.4.b.xviii	Please provide a detail for the overland flow route(s)	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xvi.
1.4.b.xix	Please provide more detail on how the bioretention cells work, dropped curb/sheet flow into the cells? Is a permeable paver road proposed (like in the photo on the LID drawings)?	A biofiltration cell is proposed in place of the previous bioretention cell. Note, both in this submission as well as in the previous submission, this feature is not considered as necessary to meet quantity controls. Instead, this biofiltration cell is considered to operate as a part of a treatment train approach to quality controls in conjunction with OG/S units and CB Shields as referenced in Area A-D FSR Section 4.6.2. In both Areas A & B, an underground storage facility is located below these biofiltration cells and will allow infiltration via appropriate soil media from the top of the storage volume in conjunction with

Comment #	Comment	Response
		minor system inputs. Permeable pavers within blocks containing right-of-ways are not proposed.
1.4.b.xx	We acknowledge that it is early stages, however we ask that you do consider and have room for utilities (vaults/poles/pedestals/etc.) and snow storage, i.e. poles have to be min. 1.2m setback from curb/driveways, where will snow be stored, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii in conjunction with Comment Response 1.3.f.iv
1.4.b.xxi	If it is determined that the utilities need an easement along the common element private road (due to only a 10.3 or 10.8m ROW), please clearly show limits and label on the drawing	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii
1.4.b.xxii	Please provide a few grading sections through the proposed development and existing homes to demonstrate how grading works, including property lines, dimensions from property lines, and clearly labeling the roads, curbs, swales, etc. We acknowledge that the landscape architect has provided some concept plans to demonstrate the landscape buffer but we ask that the Civil consultant provide specific sections for each of the areas.	Area A-D FSR Figure 2 – Sections demonstrates the proposed grading design, in profile-view, at various Area A locations along Appleby Creek.
1.4.b.xxiii	Grading was not looked at in detail, once comments are provided from all agencies/departments and the stormwater management/pond relocation/creek alignment is confirmed, we expect there could be changes. Grading would be looked at in detail with the next submission.	Acknowledged.
1.4.c.	**Conceptual LID Plans (Areas A & B, Drawings, LID-A1 LID-A2 and LID-B), all signed and dated Dec/18/2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	
1.4.c.i	Please provide a typical detail for the proposed infiltration trench, proposed enhanced swale, proposed vegetated filter strip (overland flow route?), and proposed bioretention cell.	Refer to both Comment Responses 1.4.b.xiv & 1.4.b.xix.
1.4.c.ii	Are the private roads proposed to be permeable pavers? Or sections of the road? The photo example on the plans looks to show permeable pavers as part of the bioretention cells.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xix.
1.4.c.iii	Please ensure any comment on the grading and servicing plans that have bearing on the LID plans are incorporated.	Acknowledged.
1.4.d.	**Other Plans needed for Areas A & B:**	
1.4.d.i	Plan profile drawings including hydraulic grade line for the storm sewers for the common element roadways will be needed with the next submission, due to high groundwater levels and proposed gravity storm connections to demonstrate feasibility.	Acknowledged and refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.ii.
1.4.d.ii	A coordinated utility plan will be needed after draft approval	Acknowledged.
1.4.d.iii	A streetlighting plan will be needed if the project proceeds, private street lighting shall be in accordance with the City's Outdoor Lighting Guidelines	Acknowledged.
1.4.d.iv	An erosion control plan will be needed after draft approval	Acknowledged.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.d.v	A notes and details plan will be needed after draft approval, including all City, Region, CNR and Conservation notes, and any details or specifications that are noted please ensure there is a corresponding detail on a details page, i.e. all City "S" details, Regional details, OPSD, etc.	Acknowledged.
1.4.e.	Our understanding is that Areas A and B would require a subdivision application/agreement as it is a POTL with common element road development. At this time, we are unable to provide further comment on the plans with regard to the subdivision application as there could be revisions required to the reports and drawings that could affect layout.	Noted.
1.4.f.	**General Plan of Services Area C, Drawing GP-C, signed and dated December 18, 2020:**	
1.4.f.i	Provide hydraulic grade line analysis for the minor drainage system in order to preclude basement flooding (as advised in the pre-consultation notes)	Acknowledged and refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.ii.
1.4.f.ii	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. requires the private laneway and cul-de-sac's (including sidewalks) of Area C to be setback 7.0m from their easement, please revise all drawings accordingly.	All applicable FSR drawings, illustrating TCPL lands, are revised to reflect a 7.0m setback inclusive of dimension label of the same. Refer to TCPL Comment Response A for further details as it pertains to Area C and D.
1.4.f.iii	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. (TCPL) requires permanent fencing along the limits of TCPL's right of way abutting residential lots, please revise the drawings for Area C to reflect this requirement, i.e. note and show on the drawing the limits of fence. Please confirm type of fence required with TCPL.	Refer to TCPL Comment Response No. 5.
1.4.f.iv	R. J. Burnside Hydrogeological Investigation Section 8.1 recommends anti- seepage collars or clay plugs to provide barriers to flow and prevent groundwater flow along the granular bedding and erosion of the backfill materials. If the project proceeds further, please ensure R.J. Burnsides recommendations are incorporated into the servicing design.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.ii
1.4.f.v	Please note the (asphalt) radius of the cul-de-sac, the waste management report indicates they recommend 13m radius to allow for Regional waste pick up.	Refer to Comment Responses 1.4.a.v
1.4.f.vi	Please show any existing buried infrastructure including irrigation lines	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.vi
1.4.f.vii	There are no street catch basins shown on the plan, we acknowledge and understand this is early design stages, however we do want to advise that catch basins need to be designed in accordance with 5.2.5 of the City's SWM Design Guidelines	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.iii
1.4.f.viii	If it is determined that the utilities need an easement along the common element private road (due to only a 10.3 or 10.8m ROW), please clearly show limits and label on the drawing.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.iv
1.4.f.ix	Please show or note private storm services, i.e. gravity connection or sumps connected to storm sewer or sumps with outlet to grade. Please note that if sumps are proposed to outlet to grade they cannot outlet to a side yard.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.vii
1.4.f.x	The servicing plan was not looked at in detail, once comments are provided from all agencies/departments and the stormwater management/pond relocation/creek alignment is	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.xix

Comment #	Comment	Response
	confirmed, we expect there could be changes. Servicing would be looked at in detail with the next submission.	
1.4.g	**Draft Grading Plan (Area C), Drawing GR-C, signed and dated Dec 15, 2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	
1.4.g.i	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. requires the private laneway and cul-de-sac's (including sidewalks) of Area C to be setback 7.0m from their easement, please revise all drawings accordingly.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.f.ii.
1.4.g.ii	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. (TCPL) requires permanent fencing along the limits of TCPL's right of way abutting residential lots, please revise the drawings for Area C to reflect this requirement, i.e. note and show on the drawing the limits of fence. Please confirm type of fence required with TCPL.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.f.iii
1.4.g.iii	As per TCPL's comments, please ensure the development grading does not slope towards TCPL ROW/easement.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.d.ii.ii
1.4.g.iv	Please provide additional grades for the rear yards of the existing residential that back on to the proposed development so that it can be seen how the proposed and existing grading will interface.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.ii
1.4.g.v	Please indicate the radii of the curbs at the proposed road to Country Club Drive	The curb radii at the proposed road to Country Club Drive is provided on FSR GR-C in this submission.
1.4.g.vi	The minimum % slope for vertical alignment is 0.6%, maximum is 8%, please ensure proposed grades on the private roads meet this.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.iv
1.4.g.vii	Swales min. 2% slope or subdrains to be installed (looks like you achieve this), and swales in rear yard must be set back min. 0.6m from property line.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.v
1.4.g.viii	The base of swale elevations in the proposed rear yards that back onto the existing yards of Berwick Court and the neighboring Condo development must be min. 200mm less than the elevations of the back yards of the existing homes. The existing homes rear yards in existing conditions look have some drainage directly to the existing golf course lands, so the drainage cannot be cut off. These areas will have to be looked at in detail as there is existing vegetation/trees in the 6m buffer, grades will need to be taken in the buffer to determine swale base elevations. Staff was unable to complete site walk due to snow to look at how the backyards generally drain onto the golf course in existing conditions.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.vi
1.4.g.ix	Please reference S-119 for individual lot grading, i.e. top of foundation wall min. 150mm above outside grade, ground to slope away from foundation at min. 2% - 5%, grade at outside of foundation to be min. 400mm higher than grade at front property line for lots with split drainage and 500mm higher for lots with one way drainage, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.viii

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.g.x	Please show the potential building envelopes and driveway locations (like the LID plans do)	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.x
1.4.g.xi	Please revise so that side yard swales are located fully on one property, not along the property line between houses	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xi
1.4.g.xii	Please provide a typical lot detail, i.e. show building envelope, servicing, driveway, swale, infiltration trench (and easement), slopes, dimensions from property lines, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xii
1.4.g.xiii	Please provide a typical lot detail for lots with private rear yard catch basins, please also show the easement, min. 2.4m width, for the condo corporation's access to the catch basin. The catch basin lead has to be fully installed on one lot min. 0.6m from property line, and concrete encased. If this was a typical subdivision on a municipal road then the easement would be in favor of the City, but since a common element private road is proposed, then the condo corporation will be responsible for the storm sewer system and they will need access to the private rear yard catch basins for inspection and maintenance (if necessary). The maintenance of the rear yard catch basins will have to be confirmed as part of the subdivision process if the project moves forward, i.e. will the condo be responsible or the homeowner? There will also have to be clauses in the condo declaration in this regard.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xii
1.4.g.xiv	An easement across the rear of the lots with infiltration trenches (if they are part of the site's stormwater management system) will also be required, in favor of the future condo corporation, for access for inspection and maintenance. The maintenance of the infiltration trenches will have to be confirmed as part of the subdivision process if the project moves forward, i.e. will the condo be responsible or the homeowner? There will also have to be clauses in the condo declaration in this regard.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xiv
1.4.g.xv	Please provide elevations for max. depth of flow in the overland flow route and provide recommendations for minimum top of foundation wall/openings in foundations for structures adjacent to the overland flow route	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xvi.
1.4.g.xvi	We acknowledge that it is early stages, however we ask that you do consider and have room for utilities (vaults/poles/pedestals/etc.) and snow storage, i.e. poles have to be min. 1.2m setback from curb/driveways, where will snow be stored, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii in conjunction with Comment Response 1.3.f.iv
1.4.g.xvii	If it is determined that the utilities need an easement along the common element private road (due to only a 10.3 or 10.8m ROW), please clearly show limits and label on the drawing.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii
1.4.g.xviii	Please provide a few grading sections through the proposed development and existing homes to demonstrate how grading works, including property lines, dimensions from property lines, and clearly labeling the roads, curbs, swales, etc. We acknowledge that the landscape architect has provided some concept plans to demonstrate the landscape buffer but we ask that the Civil consultant provide specific sections for each of the areas.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xxii
1.4.g.xix	Advisory, if the development proceeds, as per TCPL's conditions - please note on the grading drawing that "Permanent buildings and structures, driveways and parking areas shall be setback	Acknowledged. Refer to TCPL Comment Response A with regards to 7.0m setback.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	7 meters from the edge of the pipeline right of way. All pools and accessory structures including retaining walls shall have minimum 3m setback from the edge of the pipeline right of way. Written Consent from TransCanada Pipeline for any works on properties adjacent to TransCanada Pipeline is required, call 1-877-872-5177 for details"	
1.4.g.xx	Grading was not looked at in detail, once comments are provided from all agencies/departments, we expect there could be changes. Grading would be looked at in detail with the next submission.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xxiii
1.4.h	**Conceptual LID Plans (Area C, Drawings, LID-C), signed and dated Dec/18/2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	
1.4.h.i	Please provide a typical detail for the proposed infiltration trench	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.c.i
1.4.h.ii	Please confirm with TCPL that the proposed infiltration trench can be located in the 7m buffer they have requested.	This request for information is included in TCPL Comment Response A.
1.4.h.iii	Please ensure any comment on the grading and servicing plans that have bearing on the LID plans are incorporated.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.c.ii
1.4.i.	**Other Plans needed for Area C:**	
1.4.i.i	Plan profile drawings including hydraulic grade line for the storm sewers for the common element road will be needed with the next submission, due to high groundwater levels and proposed gravity storm connections to demonstrate feasibility.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.i
1.4.i.ii	A coordinated utility plan will be needed if the project proceeds	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.ii
1.4.i.iii	A streetlighting plan will be needed if the project proceeds, private street lighting shall be in accordance with the City's Outdoor Lighting Guidelines	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.iii
1.4.i.iv	An erosion control plan will be needed before draft approval.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.iv
1.4.i.v	A notes and details plan will be needed before draft approval, including all City, Region, TCPL, and any details or specifications that are noted please ensure there is a corresponding detail on a details page, i.e. all City "S" details, Regional details, OPSD, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.v
1.4.j	Our understanding is that Area C would require a subdivision application/agreement as it is a POTL with common element road development. At this time, we are unable to provide further comment on the plans with regard to the subdivision application as there are revisions required to the reports and drawings that could affect layout.	Noted.
1.4.k	**General Plan of Services Area D, Drawing GP-D signed and dated December 18, 2020:**	
1.4.k.i	Provide hydraulic grade line analysis for the minor drainage system in order to preclude basement flooding (as advised in the pre-consultation notes)	Acknowledged and refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.ii.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.k.ii	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. requires the private laneway and cul-de-sac's (including sidewalks) of Area C to be setback 7.0m from their easement, please revise all drawings accordingly.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.f.ii.
1.4.k.iii	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. (TCPL) requires permanent fencing along the limits of TCPL's right of way abutting residential lots, please revise the drawings for Area D to reflect this requirement, i.e. note and show on the drawing the limits of fence. Please confirm type of fence required with TCPL.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.f.iii
1.4.k.iv	Please confirm with TCPL that they are agreeable to relocation of the DI onto their ROW/Easement, and provide a copy of the written confirmation from TCPL to the City.	The acronym "DI" is understood as "ditch inlet." Based on this understanding with the current submission, there is no relocation of an existing ditch inlet on Area D. Will continue to coordinate with TCPL in detailed design.
1.4.k.v	Please note the (asphalt) radius of the cul-de-sac, the waste management report indicates they recommend 13m radius to allow for Regional waste pick up.	Refer to Comment Responses 1.4.a.v
1.4.k.vi	Please show any existing buried infrastructure including irrigation lines	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.vi
1.4.k.vii	R. J. Burnside Hydrogeological Investigation Section 8.1 recommends anti- seepage collars or clay plugs to provide barriers to flow and prevent groundwater flow along the granular bedding and erosion of the backfill materials. If the project proceeds further, please ensure R.J. Burnsides recommendations are incorporated into the servicing design.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.ii
1.4.k.viii	There are only street catch basins shown at the Millcroft Park Drive end of the private laneway on the plan, we acknowledge and understand this is early design stages, however we do want to advise that catch basins need to be designed in accordance with 5.2.5 of the City's SWM Design Guidelines, and max spacing for a two lane road is 100m for roads with slopes of 0.5% to 3%.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.iii
1.4.k.ix	Please show the RLCB leads so it can be determined where they outlet to, i.e. to Millcroft Park Drive or to the private road	RLCB leads are reflected on all applicable FSR GP series drawings in submission.
1.4.k.x	The control MH should be on private property, as should an OGS.	The control MH as well as the OGS are relocated within Area D in this submission.
1.4.k.xi	If it is determined that the utilities need an easement along the common element private road (due to only a 10.3 or 10.8m ROW), please clearly show limits and label on the drawing.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.iv
1.4.k.xii	Please show or note private storm services, i.e. gravity connection or sumps connected to storm sewer or sumps with outlet to grade. Please note that if sumps are proposed to outlet to grade they cannot outlet to a side yard.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.vii
1.4.k.xiii	Please state the max. Pond elevation for the existing pond north of the proposed development site.	The ponding elevation of this online pond, nearest to lots on Latimer Crescent, is illustrated by Area A-D FSR Drawing GR-D. As Area D is not proposed to discharge to Sheldon Creek, such pond information is not relevant to this development. The proposed Area D development limits, albeit a small portion, are based on the Sheldon Creek Regional Storm floodplain limits rather than any associated online pond information.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.k.xiv	The servicing plan was not looked at in detail, once comments are provided from all agencies/departments and the stormwater management/pond relocation/creek alignment is confirmed, we expect there could be changes. Servicing would be looked at in detail with the next submission.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.xix
1.4.l	**Draft Grading Plan (Area D), Drawing GR-D, signed and dated Dec 15, 2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	
1.4.l.i	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. requires the private laneway and cul-de-sac's (including sidewalks) of Area C to be setback 7.0m from their easement, please revise all drawings accordingly.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.f.ii.
1.4.l.ii	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. (TCPL) requires permanent fencing along the limits of TCPL's right of way abutting residential lots, please revise the drawings for Area D to reflect this requirement, i.e. note and show on the drawing the limits of fence. Please confirm type of fence required with TCPL.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.f.iii
1.4.l.iii	As per TCPL's comments, please ensure the development grading does not slope towards TCPL ROW/easement.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.d.ii.ii
1.4.l.iv	If the lots in Area D are proposed to have walk-outs at the rear yard, please clearly label which lots.	All lot conditions are labelled accordingly on the FSR grading plan series drawings in this submission.
1.4.l.v	Please provide additional grades for the rear yards of the existing residential that back on to the proposed development so that it can be seen how the proposed and existing grading will interface.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.ii
1.4.l.vi	Please indicate the radii of the curbs at the proposed road to Millcroft Park Drive	The curb radii at the proposed road to Millcroft Park Drive is provided on FSR GR-D in this submission.
1.4.l.vii	The minimum % slope for vertical alignment is 0.6%, maximum is 8%, please ensure proposed grades on the private roads meet this.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.iv
1.4.l.viii	Swales min. 2% slope or subdrains to be installed (looks like you achieve this), and swales in rear yard must be set back min. 0.6m from property line.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.v
1.4.l.ix	The base of swale elevations in the proposed rear yards that back onto the existing yards of Chasewood Court must be min. 200mm less than the elevations of the back yards of the existing homes. These areas will have to be looked at in detail as there is existing vegetation/trees in the 6m buffer, grades will need to be taken in the buffer to determine swale base elevations. Staff was unable to complete site walk due to snow to look at how the backyards generally drain in existing conditions.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.vi
1.4.l.x	Please reference S-119 for individual lot grading, i.e. top of foundation wall min. 150mm above outside grade, ground to slope away from foundation at min. 2% - 5%, grade at outside of	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.viii

Comment #	Comment	Response
	foundation to be min. 400mm higher than grade at front property line for lots with split drainage and 500mm higher for lots with one way drainage, etc.	
1.4.l.xi	Please show the potential building envelopes and driveway locations (like the LID plans do)	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.x
1.4.l.xii	Please revise so that side yard swales are located fully on one property, not along the property line between houses	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xi
1.4.l.xiii	Please provide a typical lot detail, i.e. show building envelope, servicing, driveway, swale, infiltration trench (and easement), slopes, dimensions from property lines, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xii
1.4.l.xiv	Please provide a typical lot detail for lots with private rear yard catch basins, please also show the easement, min. 2.4m width, for the condo corporation's access to the catch basin. The catch basin lead has to be fully installed on one lot min. 0.6m from property line, and concrete encased. If this was a typical subdivision on a municipal road then the easement would be in favor of the City, but since a common element private road is proposed, then the condo corporation will be responsible for the storm sewer system and they will need access to the private rear yard catch basins for inspection and maintenance (if necessary). The maintenance of the rear yard catch basins will have to be confirmed as part of the subdivision process if the project moves forward, i.e. will the condo be responsible or the homeowner? There will also have to be clauses in the condo declaration in this regard.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xii.
1.4.l.xv	An easement across the rear of the lots with infiltration trenches (if they are part of the site's stormwater management system) will also be required, in favor of the future condo corporation, for access for inspection and maintenance. The maintenance of the infiltration trenches will have to be confirmed as part of the subdivision process if the project moves forward, i.e. will the condo be responsible or the homeowner? There will also have to be clauses in the condo declaration in this regard.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xiv
1.4.l.xvi	Please provide elevations for max. depth of flow in the overland flow route and provide recommendations for minimum top of foundation wall/openings in foundations for structures adjacent to the overland flow route	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xvi.
1.4.l.xvii	We acknowledge that it is early stages, however we ask that you do consider and have room for utilities (vaults/poles/pedestals/etc.) and snow storage, i.e. poles have to be min. 1.2m setback from curb/driveways, where will snow be stored, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii in conjunction with Comment Response 1.3.f.iv
1.4.l.xviii	If it is determined that the utilities need an easement along the common element private road (due to only a 10.3 or 10.8m ROW), please clearly show limits and label on the drawing.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii
1.4.l.xix	Please provide a few grading sections through the proposed development and existing homes to demonstrate how grading works, including property lines, dimensions from property lines, and clearly labeling the roads, curbs, swales, etc. We acknowledge that the landscape architect has provided some concept plans to demonstrate the landscape buffer but we ask that the Civil consultant provide specific sections for each of the areas.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xxii

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.l.xx	Advisory, if the development proceeds, as per TCPL's conditions - please note on the grading drawing that "Permanent buildings and structures, driveways and parking areas shall be setback 7 meters from the edge of the pipeline right of way. All pools and accessory structures including retaining walls shall have minimum 3m setback from the edge of the pipeline right of way. Written Consent from TransCanada Pipeline for any works on properties adjacent to TransCanada Pipeline is required, call 1-877-872-5177 for details"	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.g.xix
1.4.l.xxi	Grading was not looked at in detail, once comments are provided from all agencies/departments, we expect there could be changes. Grading would be looked at in detail with the next submission.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xxii
1.4.m	**Conceptual LID Plans (Area D, Drawings, LID-D), signed and dated Dec/18/2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	
1.4.m.i	Please provide a typical detail for the proposed infiltration trench	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.c.i
1.4.m.ii	Please ensure any comment on the grading and servicing plans that have bearing on the LID plans are incorporated.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.c.ii
1.4.n	**Other Plans needed for Area D:**	
1.4.n.i	Plan profile drawings including hydraulic grade line for the storm sewers for the common element road will be needed with the next submission, due to high groundwater levels and proposed gravity storm connections to demonstrate feasibility.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.i
1.4.n.ii	A coordinated utility plan will be needed if the project proceeds	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.ii
1.4.n.iii	A streetlighting plan will be needed if the project proceeds, private street lighting shall be in accordance with the City's Outdoor Lighting Guidelines	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.iii
1.4.n.iv	An erosion control plan will be needed before draft approval	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.iv
1.4.n.v	A notes and details plan will be needed before draft approval, including all City, Region, TCPL, and any details or specifications that are noted please ensure there is a corresponding detail on a details page, i.e. all City "S" details, Regional details, OPSD, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.v
1.4.o	**Our understanding is that Area D would require a subdivision application/agreement as it is a POTL with common element road development. At this time, we are unable to provide further comment on the plans with regard to the subdivision application as there could be revisions required to the reports and drawings that could affect layout.**	Noted.
1.4.p	**General Plan of Services Area E, Drawing GP-E signed and dated December 18, 2020:**	
1.4.p.i	The development is located on a Regional Road (Dundas Street), we defer to the Region to provide comment on number of entrances and entrance locations and any other restrictions on access to the site, i.e. right in right out only	Acknowledged and refer to Region Comment Response 8.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.p.ii	Please confirm if Hydro One Network Inc. has any setback requirements, if so please clearly label on the drawing	Acknowledged and refer to HONI Comment Response No. F.
1.4.p.iii	Please confirm with CH that the regulated hazard and setback limits shown are accurate, and reflected on all drawings. It is our understanding that hazard lands are to be dedicated to public ownership through the development application, we defer to CH and Planning staff to confirm.	Acknowledged and refer to Comment Response 1.3.a.
1.4.p.iv	Please show any existing buried infrastructure (sanitary/storm/water/etc.) that is to be removed.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.vi
1.4.p.v	R. J. Burnside Hydrogeological Investigation Section 8.1 recommends anti- seepage collars or clay plugs to provide barriers to flow and prevent groundwater flow along the granular bedding and erosion of the backfill materials. If the project proceeds further, please ensure R.J. Burnsides recommendations are incorporated into the servicing design.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.ii
1.4.p.vi	Plan will need to be updated to accommodate SWM comments (upon conclusion of Peer Review), i.e. quantity controls, quality controls, etc.	Acknowledged.
1.4.p.vii	The servicing plan was not looked at in detail, once comments are provided from all agencies/departments and the stormwater management is revised, we expect there could be changes. Servicing would be looked at in detail with the next submission.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.a.xix
1.4.q	**Draft Grading Plan (Area E), Drawing GR-E, signed and dated Dec 15, 2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	
1.4.q.i	Please confirm any setback and/or fencing requirements with Hydro One and note and show on the drawing.	Acknowledged and refer to HONI Comment Responses.
1.4.q.ii	Please ensure the development grading does not slope towards existing townhomes to the west.	The Area E development does not slope towards the existing residential abutting the western property limits. This detail is now illustrated as it relates to Comment Response 1.4.xxii
1.4.q.iii	Please provide additional grades for the rear yards of the existing residential that back on to the proposed development so that it can be seen how the proposed and existing grading will interface.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.ii
1.4.q.iv	Swales min. 2% slope or subdrains to be installed (looks like you achieve this), and swales in rear (side) yard must be set back min. 0.6m from property line.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.v
1.4.q.v	Please provide elevations for max. depth of flow in the overland flow route and provide recommendations for minimum top of foundation wall/openings in foundations for structures adjacent to the overland flow route	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xvi. Note, overland flow routes across the parking garage structure are irrespective of right-of-way limits. Additionally, the conveyance capacity of the proposed overland flow route abutting the existing residential is detailed as included in Area E FSR Appendix F.
1.4.q.vi	We acknowledge that it is early stages, however we ask that you do consider and have room for utilities (vaults/poles/pedestals/etc.) and snow storage, i.e. poles have to be min. 1.2m setback from curb/driveways, where will snow be stored, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.3.f.iii in conjunction with Comment Response 1.3.f.iv

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.q.vii	Please provide a few grading sections through the proposed development and existing homes to the west to demonstrate how grading works, including property lines, dimensions from property lines, and clearly labeling the curbs, swales, etc. We acknowledge that the landscape architect has provided some concept plans to demonstrate the landscape buffer but we ask that the Civil consultant provide specific sections for each of the areas.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.b.xxii
1.4.r	**Conceptual LID Plans (Area E, Drawings, LID-E), signed and dated Dec/18/2020, prepared by Urbantech:**	
1.4.r.i	Please provide a typical detail for the proposed vegetated filter strip	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.c.i
1.4.r.ii	Where is the enhanced swale proposed? There is a photo on the drawing and a shading in the legend, but I don't see it on the plan?	Refer to the Area E GSR Drawing GR-D & SEC-E illustrate emergency overland swale grading in both plan & profile view, respectively. Refer to landscape set included in this submission for planting details.
1.4.r.iii	Please ensure any comment on the grading and servicing plans that have bearing on the LID plans are incorporated.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.c.ii
1.4.s	**Other Plans needed for Area E:**	
1.4.s.i	A coordinated utility plan will be needed if the project proceeds, please ensure any above ground pedestals/vaults/transformers/etc. are not located at the entrance doors and do not encroach into walkways	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.ii
1.4.s.ii	An outdoor lighting plan will be needed if the project proceeds, private street lighting shall be in accordance with the City's Outdoor Lighting Guidelines	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.iii
1.4.s.iii	An erosion control plan will be needed if the project proceeds	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.iv
1.4.s.iv	A notes and details plan will be needed if the project proceeds, including all City, Region, Hydro One, and any details or specifications that are noted please ensure there is a corresponding detail on a details page, i.e. all City "S" details, Regional details, OPSD, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.d.v
1.4.t	**Crozier Consulting Engineers Traffic Control Plans:**	
1.4.t.a	Drawing TCP.1, TCP.2, TCP.3, TCP.4 , TCP.5, TCP.6, and TCP.7 all revision 2, all unsigned, all dated 2020/OCT/19, Site Engineering defers to Transportation Staff to comment on acceptability of plan, we do want to advise that it seems premature to submit a traffic control plan for a temporary lane closure for connecting proposed services. UNLESS, the developer is proposing to close a lane of traffic and the sidewalk or the duration of servicing works? If the latter we would ask that the anticipated timeline be clearly stated on the CMMP drawing so that Council has that information to consider when making a decision on the application. Note 2 states "work defined as short duration during asphalt restoration", however, a temporary lane closure would also be needed for water and sanitary servicing, as well as for the surface asphalt restoration approx. a year after servicing is installed.	Traffic Control Plans are conceptual and should be viewed as such. More detailed plans will be provided at the detailed design stage.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.4.t.b	Drawing TCP.8, revision 2, unsinged, dated 2020/OCT/19, Site Engineering defers to the Region of Halton in all regard for works within their ROW.	Traffic Control Plans are conceptual and should be viewed as such. More detailed plans will be provided at the detailed design stage
1.5	**CONSTRUCTION MOBILITY AND MANAGEMENT PLANS**	
1.5.a	**Construction Management & Mobility Plan, Drawing CMMP-AB, dated Dec. 2020, prepared by Urbantech Consulting:**	
1.5.a.i	Please be advised that Transportation Staff also reviews the CMMP, in case of differing requirements, the most stringent criteria shall apply.	Acknowledged. Refer to Transportation Planning and Parking Services Comment Responses.
1.5.a.ii	Please clearly note that sidewalks will remain open during construction	A note indicating sidewalks will remain open during construction has been added to all CMMP series drawings in this submission. However, the contractor assigned to these projects reserves the right to restrict pedestrian traffic should it be deemed necessary remain in compliance with any regulations, by-laws or any other restriction imposed by applicable agencies.
1.5.a.iii	The plan must clearly note that there are no trades parking allowed on City Streets	A note indicating that trades parking is restricted to the development site but not limited to any necessary works as it relates to external servicing has been added. External servicing requirements are indicated on the CMMP series and TCP series drawings with applicable measures.
1.5.a.iv	The plan must clearly note that no truck stacking/staging allowed on City Streets	A note indicating that truck stacking/staging is restricted to the development site has been added.
1.5.a.v	Please show the location of construction staging areas, for concrete pours, material deliveries, etc.	Locations for construction staging areas are illustrated on all CMMP series drawings.
1.5.a.vi	Please show the location of the site trailer	Locations for the site trailers are within areas designated for parking on all CMMP series drawings.
1.5.a.vii	Please show the location of the sanitary facilities	Locations for the sanitary facilities will be illustrated on all CMMP series drawings at the time of tender in coordination with the general contractor.
1.5.a.viii	Advisory for future site plan/subdivision application: Erosion protection along the creek and pond must be double silt fence with straw bales in between, and location of silt fence to be confirmed with CH Staff. We acknowledge that a separate erosion control plan will be provided at the site plan/subdivision stage of development, but wanted to provide this advisory.	Acknowledged for the ESC series drawings to be included in the Site Alteration submission.
1.5.a.ix	The mud mats will be reviewed in detail at the site plan/subdivision stage, however we do want to advise that the mud mat should begin at the property line and the area between the curb and property line should either be paved or another dust free suitable alternative, to prevent large rocks from tracking onto the sidewalk or pavement.	Acknowledged and a note has been added to all CMMP series drawings.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.5.a.x	The CMMP will be looked at comprehensively at the site plan/subdivision stage, additional details will be required once building plans are more detailed, if the application is approved/proceeds.	Acknowledged.
1.5.a.xi	A revised CMMP is required	A revised CMMP has been provided.
1.5.b	**Construction Management & Mobility Plan, Drawing CMMP-C, dated Dec. 2020, prepared by Urbantech Consulting:**	
1.5.b.i	Please be advised that Transportation Staff also reviews the CMMP, in case of differing requirements, the most stringent criteria shall apply.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.i
1.5.b.ii	Please label the TransCanada Pipeline easement and TCPL has advised that the private laneway, including sidewalks must be set back 7m from the TCPL easement/ROW, please revise the drawing, accordingly, including dimensioning the 7m setback.	Refer to Comment Response 1.4.f.ii
1.5.b.iii	Please clearly note that sidewalks will remain open during construction	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.ii
1.5.b.iv	The plan must clearly note that there are no trades parking allowed on City Streets	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.iii
1.5.b.v	The plan must clearly note that no truck stacking/staging allowed on City Streets	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.iv
1.5.b.vi	Please show the location of construction staging areas, for concrete pours, material deliveries, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.v
1.5.b.vii	Please show the location of the site trailer	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.vi
1.5.b.viii	Please show the location of the sanitary facilities	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.vii
1.5.b.ix	The mud mats will be reviewed in detail at the site plan/subdivision stage, however we do want to advise that the mud mat should begin at the property line and the area between the curb and property line should either be paved or another dust free suitable alternative, to prevent large rocks from tracking onto the sidewalk or pavement.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.ix
1.5.b.x	The CMMP will be looked at comprehensively at the site plan/subdivision stage, additional details will be required once building plans are more detailed, if the application is approved/proceeds.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.x
1.5.b.xi	A revised CMMP is required	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.xi
1.5.c	**Construction Management & Mobility Plan, Drawing CMMP-D, dated Dec. 2020, prepared by Urbantech Consulting:**	
1.5.c.i	Please be advised that Transportation Staff also reviews the CMMP, in case of differing requirements, the most stringent criteria shall apply.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.i
1.5.c.ii	Please clearly note that sidewalks will remain open during construction	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.ii

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.5.c.iii	The plan must clearly note that there are no trades parking allowed on City Streets	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.iii
1.5.c.iv	The plan must clearly note that no truck stacking/staging allowed on City Streets	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.iv
1.5.c.v	Please show the location of construction staging areas, for concrete pours, material deliveries, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.v
1.5.c.vi	Please show the location of the site trailer	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.vi
1.5.c.vii	Please show the location of the sanitary facilities	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.vii
1.5.c.viii	Advisory for future site plan/subdivision application: Erosion protection along pond must be double silt fence with straw bales in between, and location of silt fence to be confirmed with Conservation Halton Staff. We acknowledge that a separate erosion control plan will be provided at the site plan/subdivision stage of development, but wanted to provide this advisory.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.viii
1.5.c.ix	The mud mats will be reviewed in detail at the site plan/subdivision stage, however we do want to advise that the mud mat should begin at the property line and the area between the curb and property line should either be paved or another dust free suitable alternative, to prevent large rocks from tracking onto the sidewalk or pavement.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.ix
1.5.c.x	The CMMP will be looked at comprehensively at the site plan/subdivision stage, additional details will be required once building plans are more detailed, if the application is approved/proceeds.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.x
1.5.c.xi	A revised CMMP is required	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.xi
1.5.d	**Construction Management & Mobility Plan, Drawing CMMP-E, dated Dec. 2020, prepared by Urbantech Consulting:**	
1.5.d.i	Dundas Street is owned by the Region of Halton, we defer to Halton to confirm acceptability of the plan with regard to impact to the Dundas Street ROW.	Acknowledged.
1.5.d.ii	Please be advised that Transportation Staff also reviews the CMMP, in case of differing requirements, the most stringent criteria shall apply.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.i
1.5.d.iii	Area E has a municipal address, 4274 Dundas Street, we would ask that the municipal address be included on the plan	Acknowledged and Area E's municipal address has been added to CMMP-E.
1.5.d.iv	Please clearly note that sidewalks will remain open during construction	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.ii
1.5.d.v	The plan must clearly note that there are no trades parking allowed on City Streets	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.iii
1.5.d.vi	The plan must clearly note that no truck stacking/staging allowed on City Streets	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.iv
1.5.d.vii	Please show the location of construction staging areas, for concrete pours, material deliveries, etc.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.v

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.5.d.viii	Please show the location of the site trailer	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.vi
1.5.d.ix	Please show the location of the sanitary facilities	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.vii
1.5.d.x	Advisory for future site plan/subdivision application: Erosion protection adjacent to Conservation Regulated wetland must be double silt fence with straw bales in between, and location of silt fence to be confirmed with Conservation Halton Staff. We acknowledge that a separate erosion control plan will be provided at the site plan/subdivision stage of development, but wanted to provide this advisory.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.viii
1.5.d.xi	The mud mats will be reviewed in detail at the site plan/subdivision stage, however we do want to advise that the mud mat should begin at the property line and the area between the curb and property line should either be paved or another dust free suitable alternative, to prevent large rocks from tracking onto the sidewalk or pavement.	Refer to Comment Response 1.5.a.ix
1.5.d.xii	The CMMP will be looked at comprehensively at the site plan stage, additional details will be required once building plans are more detailed, if the application is approved/proceeds.	Acknowledged.
1.5.d.xiii	A revised CMMP is required	A revised CMMP-E is provided and will be updated / refined when more information becomes available at the site plan design stage.
1.5.d.xiv	The Five Nine letter dated December 14, 2020 was reviewed, which confirms the type of crane feasible to construct the 6 storey building in Area E. Please be advised that Site Engineering defers to the Ministry of Labor and the City's Building Department in all regard to the crane, we are only interested in the radius of the crane swing.	Noted.
1.5.d.xv	Shoring Plans, SH0, SH1, SH2 and SH3, all prepared by Tarra Engineering and Structural Consultants Inc, all revision 1, all signed and dated DEC 11-2020 have been reviewed as part of the CMMP (only) for Area E (the Building department at the site plan stage will review the shoring in detail prior to issuing a permit):	Noted.
1.5.d.xvi	All Plans clearly show a Pile & Raker system for foundation construction, no tiebacks or other encroachments into adjacent lands or the Regional Right of way are noted.	No response required.
1.5.d.xvii	If temporary dewatering is required, chemical analysis of pumped groundwater is required to determine appropriate outlet or disposal of pumped groundwater. (at site plan stage)	Noted.
1.5.d.xviii	The zone of influence will need to be looked at and determined if there is any settlement risk to adjacent structures or infrastructure, comments have been provided under the FDC memorandum section	Noted. Will be assessed at Site Plan Stage.
1.6	**ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE**	
1.6.i	We have reviewed the Noise and Vibration Feasibility Study dated November 19, 2020 and the response letter dated November 13, 2020, both prepared by Howe Gastmeir Capnik Limited. (HGC), and offer the following comments/questions:	

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021;
Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.6.a	Please add the addresses on the cover page of the report (2155 Country Club Drive and 4274 Dundas Street)	Addresses have been added to the cover page.
1.6.b	Please also provide an area context figure (or update Figure 1a) labeling the sources of noise within 1000m of the site, i.e. Upper Middle Road, Dundas Street, Millcroft Park Drive, CN Railway, Commercial Plaza on Appleby Line, high school and community center on Dundas, etc. Figure 1a doesn't show/label the CNR line to the full extents adjacent to Area D, the high school/community center, or the Appleby Line commercial plaza.	Figure 1a has been updated with the corresponding labels. .
1.6.c	Section 2, please confirm if aircraft noise needs to be considered or not. (we appreciate that it is likely not a concern, but do ask that it be clarified/stated in the report)	Aircraft noise is not a concern. This is stated in the updated report.
1.6.d	Section 3.1, please add a statement summarizing the velocity plots, i.e. 5 pass-by measurements were conducted on XX date and the measured vibratory velocity level and the acceleration spectrum @ peak level (1 sec. duration) were below (or met) MECP and CNR guidelines, in whatever wording you recommend. We do see that this is further discussed in Section 5.4.	Section 3.1 discusses the criteria for which vibration is evaluated against. Our findings are discussed in Section 5.4.
1.6.e	Section 5.1 discusses 59dBA for the OLA at lots with exposure to railway and upper middle road, generally speaking the City does not accept OLA sound levels above 58dBA, therefore we would ask that a 3.8 or 4m wall be provided for this area.	Acoustic barrier requirements have updated to include the latest grading information and the new proposed location for the acoustic fence along Upper Middle Road as requested by the Region of Halton.
1.6.f	Section 5.3, similar to Figures 3a to 3c, please provide a corresponding figure showing which lots will require brick or masonry exterior walls and upgraded glazing requirements. We acknowledge that this is subject to change at the detailed noise study stage.	Figure has been updated to show brick or masonry exterior construction requirements for the proposed development.
1.6.g	Section 5.4 what was the date the vibration measurements were preformed?	Date has been added to the report.
1.6.h	Section 5.5 please provide a corresponding figure showing which lots require which warning clauses. Table 9 outlines the warning clauses at prediction locations, but the warning clause requirements are not clearly identified on Figures 3a to 3c which show barrier and ventilation requirements.	Due to the number of warning clauses, required it would be difficult to show this on a figure. At the detailed report stage when the lot numbering is available, the lot numbers will be added to the summary table to clarify which lots require which warning clauses.
1.6.i	Figure 2a notes a prediction location M1, but Tables 4, 5 and 6 don't have an M1, please include M1 in the calculations and in the tables.	Prediction location M1 is the vibration measurement location as stated in Section 5.4 of the report.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.6.j	Should Figures 3b and 3c be titled "…. showing barrier and ventilation requirements" like 3a is labeled?	Titles have been corrected on these figures.
1.6.k	Warning Clauses (if the application is approved and proceeds to site plan/subdivision, the warning clauses would also be required to be included in the condo declarations):	Noted.
1.6.k.i	CN Rail has advised the following warning clauses shall be included in all development agreements, offers to purchase, and agreements of Purchase and Sale or Lease of each dwelling unit within 300m of the railway right-of-way: i. "Warning: Canadian National Railway Company or its assigns or successors in interest has or have a rights-of-way within 300 meters from the land the subject hereof. There may be alterations to or expansions of the railway facilities on such rights-of-way in the future including the possibility that the railway or its assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand its operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwelling(s). CNR will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/or operations on, over or under the aforesaid rights-of-way."	Noted and corrected in the updated report.
1.6.k.ii	Section 5.5 of the HGC Engineering outlines suggested warning clauses, we have requested a figure detailing which lots require which warning clauses. If the application is approved and proceeds to site plan/subdivision, warning clauses will be included in the site plan/subdivision agreements and condo declaration listing the lots, areas, etc. that the warning clauses apply to. Table 9 outlines the types of warning clauses for the prediction locations, but there is no figure showing the prediction locations included in the report, please provide.	Due to the number of warning clauses required, it would be difficult to show this on a figure. At the detailed report stage when the lot numbering is available, the lot numbers will be added to the summary table to clarify which lots require which warning clauses.
1.6.l	Table 7, please provide a column for the NPC-300 criteria, identify façade requirements for the prediction locations, and the (estimated) mitigated (after upgraded façade/glazing) dBA for the prediction locations, we acknowledge that this is based on estimated floor/window ratios as detailed building plans are not available, however this report will advise the developer on the future building plans. Updated estimates will be included in the detailed study if the application is approved and proceeds to site plan/subdivision stage.	Preliminary STC requirements provided in Table 7 are what is required based on assumed window to floor area ratios. With the stated assumptions the STC requirements listed in the Table will provide sufficient mitigation for the indoor spaces such that they meet MECP sound level criteria.
1.6.m	Section 8, please note that at the Site Plan/Subdivision stage, the City will require a letter from the acoustical consultant confirming they have reviewed the final building plans to confirm recommendations have been incorporated.	Noted, will be provided at that time.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.6.n	Appendix D provides sample STAMSON calculations that should coordinate with Tables 4, 5 and 6.	Sample calculations for Tables 4 and 5 are included in Appendix D. Calculations for barrier heights included in Table 6 were conducted in Cadna due to the complex geometry.
1.6.n.i.	There looks to be a discrepancy between Table 6 and the calculations for Location 1 OLA Area A, the calculations state that for a 3.5m barrier 57.81dBA is achieved, but Table 6 states that a 3.8m barrier is required to achieve 58dBA, please clarify	Due to the complex geometry of the site at Upper Middle Road, updated calculations have been conducted in Cadna.
1.6.n.ii.	Location 4 OLA Area B, calculations look to show 2.5m barrier achieves 58.32dBA, but Table 6 has no value in the row, please clarify	This included the existing barrier along the railway and as such was not included in the table as it only considers existing conditions.
1.6.n.iii	Location 5 OLA Area B calculations look to show 7m barrier achieves 55.25dBA but Table 6 has no value in row, please clarify	The 7 m barrier in the STAMSON calculation is the effect of the house and not a stand-alone acoustic barrier.
1.6.n.iv	Location 6 OLA Area B, calculations look to show 7m barrier achieves 50.79dBA, but Table 6 has no value in row, please clarify	The 7 m barrier in the STAMSON calculation is the effect of the house and not a stand-alone acoustic barrier.
1.6.n.v	Location 7 OLA Area B, calculations look to show 7.0m/2.0m barrier achieves 49.39dBA but Table 6 looks to show 2.0m barrier, please clarify	The 7 m barrier in the STAMSON calculation is the effect of the house and not a stand-alone acoustic barrier
1.6.n.vi	Location 10, Area E, calculation, should the description state 6th floor, to be consistent with Tables 4 & 5?	Corrected in updated report.
1.6.n.vii	Location 10, ground floor Area E, calculations description says south façade, should that state “with exposure to Dundas...” to be consistent with Tables 4 & 5?	Corrected in updated report.
1.6.n.viii	Location 10, east façade, Area E at top of page	Corrected in updated report.
1.6.n.ix	Location 10, east/west façade, Area E, is there a calculation for the first floor?	Has been added into updated report.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.6.n.x	Location 10, potential east OLS, Area E, the calculations look to show 3.5m barrier providing 55.52dBA (56dBA), but Table 6 indicates 3.3m barrier for 56dBA, please clarify.	Calculation corrected in updated report
1.6.n.x.i	Location 10, potential roof OLA Area E, calculations indicate 1.07m barrier provides 54.37dBA, Table 6 has 1.07m barrier across the row for 55 to 59dBA, should the 1.07m just be listed under the first column for 55dBA?	Corrected in updated report.
1.6.n.xii	Location 8, OLA Area D, calculations look to indicate 2.0m/7.0m barrier height for 49.46dBA, Table 6 indicates 2.0 for 55dBA, please clarify.	The 7 m barrier in the STAMSON calculation is the effect of the house and not a stand-alone acoustic barrier
1.6.o	The response letter item 10 l), on-site noise measurements were not taken, HGC advised they were not required under MECP regulations, please be advised that on-site noise measurements of stationary (adjacent commercial) and ambient sources may be required at the subdivision/site plan stage (and included in the detailed noise study) if the application is approved.	Noted.
1.6.p	The response letter item 12 discusses vibration from construction activities. HGC states “In our experience, vibration studies during construction are not generally required for single family homes in the area.” Does that mean that your professional opinion is that it is not required because the construction related vibration will not impact adjacent structures/infrastructure? Or does it mean that your experience is that municipalities don’t require it? if the latter, we do require the acoustical and/or geotechnical consultant to confirm if construction related vibration could have a negative impact on surrounding structures/infrastructure for both the proposed single family home areas and the 6-storey building, and if so what is the estimated zone of influence that a precondition survey should be undertaken in, and what type of monitoring during construction should be undertaken? We do not require a detailed plan at this time, just the consultants professional (estimated based on the information they have available to them at this early stage) recommendations based on type of construction, soil conditions, etc., i.e. for Area E all structures and buried infrastructure (sewers, watermain, gas mains, etc.) within XX of the proposed construction should have a precondition survey and approximately XX number of vibration monitors be installed and monitored during construction, details to be firmed up at the site plan stage when detailed building plans are available. Same for the other Single-family home areas, do you recommend pre-condition surveys, if so, what radius from the site, and do you recommend vibration monitoring during construction? or not? We understand this is early stages and detailed building plans are not available, however we trust the experts have experience on similar sites and can provide guidance in this matter.	Our experience indicates only certain municipalities require construction vibration monitoring or assessment. This is outside of the scope of the environmental noise and vibration study. If the City of Burlington requires this assessment, this can be included as a condition of draft approval.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.6.q	Are there any impulsive sounds in the area? if not, please just include a brief statement that there are no impulsive noises in the area.	Statement added into our report.
1.6.r	For Area E (4274 Dundas) the 6 story building, are the hydro lines a source of noise?	Hydro lines are not considered to be a source of noise. There are several existing dwellings within the same distance of the hydro lines as the proposed building.
1.6.s	Please include a copy of the survey(s) in the appendix of the report	Noted and included in the report.
1.6.t	Location 1 has 2 CNR segments in the STAMSON calculations, Location 1 OLA, Location 5 OLA and Location 6 OLA all have 3 CNR segments, whereas Location 2 and 2 OLA, 3 and 3 OLA, 4 and 4 OLA, 5, 6, all have only 1 segment, please clarify.	The number of segments included depending on exposure. If the railway is partially shielded, a segment including shielding is included to account for it.
1.6.u	Locations 7 & 8 only have one segment for Millcroft whereas Location 7 & 8 OLAs have two, please clarify.	Please see response to comment t.
1.6.v	A revised report signed/sealed by the engineer is needed before a recommendation on the application can be made	Noted.
1.7	**GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION**	
1.7.i	**We have reviewed the Revised Report on Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Building – Area E, dated December 14, 2020, prepared by DS Consultants and have the following comments.**	
1.7.a	A letter of reliance from DS Consulting for the report was provided, the letter is dated November 12, 2020, and extends reliance to a report for Area E dated November 12, 2020, but the report submitted is dated December 14, 2020. Please provide an updated letter of reliance with the same date as the report.	Updated Letter of Reliance has been included
1.7.b	Section 5 indicates that a perimeter drainage system will be required around the exterior basement walls. Please be advised that the City of Burlington requires confirmation that the groundwater chemical analysis meets the City's Municipal Discharge by-law before outletting to a municipal storm sewer, the City will not accept filtered/or treated water into the storm sewer system. That being said, there are no municipal storm sewers fronting this site, therefore the Region would be the agency to provide comment on acceptability of outletting groundwater to their Dundas Street Right of Way ditches. We see that it is advised that R.J. Burnside undertook a Hydrogeological Assessment and will look to that report for further information	The groundwater flows estimated by the hydrogeologist are not considered material with respect to impacts to stormwater flows and/or tank sizing / storm water management. However, appropriate measures, informed by comprehensive groundwater chemical analyses prepared by RJB, are proposed as detailed Area E FSR Section 4.4.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	regarding groundwater, as if it is to be collected and managed in the stormwater system for the site, the flows will need to be accounted for in the stormwater management of the site.	
1.7.c	Section 10 states that a pre-construction survey should be completed prior to the start of construction and vibration monitoring during construction. Please expand this section a bit, given the preliminary information available at this time, what is the estimated zone of influence where structures and buried utilities should have precondition surveys completed? How many vibration monitors and general locations would be recommended? We acknowledge that it's early stages, so the recommendations would change at the site plan stage if the application is approved and proceeds. We also understand that this information could be supplied by the Geotechnical or Acoustical Engineers, so we defer to the Developer to provide guidance to their consultants on who should provide the information.	Geo-tech will provide a letter for the estimated zone of influence where structures and buried utilities should have precondition surveys at the detailed design stage. Preliminary vibration and monitoring plan will also be provided.
1.7.d	Advisory: if the development is approved and proceeds to the Site Plan stage, we will need to know if the site is a balance site or if cut/fill is required. If fill is required, it must meet applicable MECP chemical analysis requirements for residential use, and be supervised by the Geotechnical/Environmental Engineer. If fill is to be imported prior to Site Plan approval a site alteration permit from the City would be required, details are available on the City's website. Also, if the site is a cut situation, the City will need to be advised of the dump site, and if the dump site is within City limits, a Site Alteration for that site may also be required.	Acknowledged and the Site Alteration Application Submission will specify any cut/fill requirements for all development sites.
1.7.e	An updated geotechnical report is required for review and approval.	Acknowledged
1.7.ii	**We have reviewed the Revised Report on Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Residential Subdivision, dated November 12, 2020, prepared by DS Consultants and have the following comments.**	
1.7.f	A letter of reliance from DS Consulting dated November 12, 2020, for the report was provided	No response required.
1.7.g	Section 4.5 states that a pre-construction survey should be completed prior to the start of construction and vibration monitoring during construction. Please expand this section a bit, given the preliminary information available at this time, what is the estimated zone of influence where structures and buried utilities should have precondition surveys completed? How many vibration monitors and general locations would be recommended? We acknowledge that it's early stages, so the recommendations would change at the site plan stage if the application is approved and proceeds. We also understand that this information could be supplied by the Geotechnical or Acoustical Engineers, so we defer to the Developer to provide guidance to their consultants on who should provide the information.	Geo-tech will provide a letter for the estimated zone of influence where structures and buried utilities should have precondition surveys at the detailed design stage. Preliminary vibration and monitoring plan will also be provided.
1.7.h	The Urbantech Conceptual LID plans for Areas A, B, C and D, all show infiltration trenches, please provide discussion on infiltration rates (i.e. what is the drawdown time), and provide the information to the Urbantech so that they can include in their SWM report.	Infiltration trenches are no longer proposed in this submission. Refer to Area A-D FSR Section 4.6.2, 5.6.2 and 6.6.2.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.7.i	The ESA's indicated groundwater levels as high as 1.04m bgs for Areas A/B, 1.4m bgs for Area C, and 0.5m for Area D, how will this affect the proposed infiltration trenches? Is it feasible to have infiltration trenches in saturated ground/areas of high groundwater levels? As per the City of Burlington's Stormwater Management Design Guidelines Section 3.8, Generally, the City of Burlington does not support basements for single family detached residential development within the expected limits of the seasonal high groundwater table.	Infiltration trenches are no longer proposed in this submission and were previously not considered as part of the stormwater management strategy. Basements will be proposed within the seasonal high groundwater elevations. However, the combination of tight soils and construction of conventional foundation weeping tile drainage systems to collect the limited groundwater based on groundwater volume estimates presents no anticipated impacts to basement foundations. Note, any groundwater flows passively collected by this conventional foundation drain system is proposed as hydraulically disconnected from the minor storm system and materially insignificant in impacting pipe capacity during storm events.
1.7.j	Please include information on the long term stable top of bank/slope for Area A, adjacent to Appleby Creek.	CH has confirmed that the valley is unconfined on the east side (i.e., no top of bank). As such, information related to long term stable top of bank in Area A is not applicable.
1.7.k	Advisory: if the development is approved and proceeds to the subdivision stage, we will need to know if the site is a balance site or if cut/fill is required. If fill is required, it must meet applicable MECP chemical analysis requirements for residential use, and be supervised by the Geotechnical/Environmental Engineer. If fill is to be imported prior to subdivision approval a site alteration permit from the City would be required, details are available on the City's website. Also, if the site is a cut situation, the City will need to be advised of the dump site, and if the dump site is within City limits, a Site Alteration for that site may also be required.	Refer to Comment Response 1.7.d.
1.8	**HYDROGEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATION**	
1.8.a	The Site Engineering comments that relate to the Hydrogeological Investigation are not included this document. Hydrogeological comments will be shared upon conclusion of the peer review	Noted.
1.9	**FOUNDATION DRAIN COLLECTORS (FDC)**	
1.9.a	The Site Engineering comments that relate to the Foundation Drain Collectors (FDC) Technical Memorandum are not included this document. Comments will be shared upon conclusion of the peer review	Noted.
1.10	**ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS**	
1.10.i	Please note that the comments below are related to Site Engineering (Civil) related items only, other departments and agencies will also provide comment. Please ensure that all revised drawings across all disciplines coordinate, some comments below may be duplicated as similar information appears on multiple drawings.	Noted
1.10.a	Area E, Site Plan, Drawing dA1.2, revision 1, dated November 16, 2020, prepared by Kirkor Architects and Planners:	
1.10.a.i	The gazebo sitting shelter looks like it may conflict with the underground parking vent	Noted and will be addressed through submission of site plan application

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.10.b	Area E, Underground Parking Plan, Drawing dA1.3, revision 1, dated November 16, 2020, prepared by Kirkor Architects and Planners:	
1.10.b.i	Site Engineering defers to Transportation Staff to comment on number and size of parking spaces and turning movements in the underground parking structure.	Noted.
1.10.b.ii	The door to the mechanical room looks like it could be difficult to access if there are two cars parked in the adjacent parking spaces	Noted and will be addressed through submission of site plan application
1.10.b.iii	What is the width of the access to the elevator lobby? Shouldn't it be min. 2m wide to match the access isle for the barrier free parking spaces across the lane? Please confirm with the Accessibility Coordinator judi.lytle@burlington.ca if the configuration is acceptable. Please also confirm the location and number of barrier free parking spaces required with Judi.	Noted and will be addressed through submission of site plan application
1.10.b.iv	Please clearly show hatching on pedestrian routes, i.e. walkway to bicycle parking, and dimension the width, it should meet minimum walkway widths, i.e. min. 1.5m, or larger, it has to be enough room for a pedestrian and a bicycle to get between the pillar and a parked vehicle.	Noted and will be addressed through submission of site plan application
1.11	**LANDSCAPING DRAWINGS**	
1.11.i	We have reviewed the Millcroft Greens Conceptual Open Space drawings, dated November 17, 2020, prepared by NAK Design Strategies and offer the following comments as they relate to Civil items only, we defer to Tania Dowhaniuk and the Manager of Parks and Open Space for all other landscaping related commenting,:	
1.11.a	**Conceptual Open Space Plan, Areas A & B:**	
1.11.a.i	Are Parks and Open Space and Conservation Halton agreeable to the proposed pedestrian bridge and pathways within hazard lands?	The pedestrian bridge has been removed from the proposed development plans. At the request of the City, a walkway has been shown within the watercourse corridor.
1.11.a.ii	Is the trail system meant to be accessible by the General Public? It is located within a private development; will the Condo Board have liability insurance for non residents of the condo using the paths?	The walkway is proposed within the watercourse corridor, which will be dedicated to the City.
1.11.a.iii	Our understanding is that all CH regulated hazard and setback lands are to be dedicated to public ownership through the development application, we defer to CH and Planning staff to confirm requirements.	Acknowledged. Block 91, within Area A, will be conveyed to the City at the time registration.
1.11.b	**Conceptual Open Space Plan, Area C:**	
1.11.b.i	Please incorporate TCPL's requirement of a 7m setback from the TCPL ROW/easement	This has been revised.
1.11.b.ii	Will there be a formal agreement between the golf course and the condo corp. regarding golf cart access and liability?	Yes.
1.11.c	**Conceptual Open Space Plan Area D:**	

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.11.c.i	Please incorporate TCPL's requirement of a 7m setback from the TCPL ROW/easement	This has been revised
1.11.d	**Typical Existing Residential to Proposed Residential Interface:**	
1.11.d.i	Will the proposed landscape buffer be part of the back yard of the new homes? Or will the 6m wide swath be fenced in? if the latter, is this a security risk? If the former, how will it be guaranteed that the dense plantings will remain in perpetuity? Where will the rear fence of the proposed homes be located?	Landscape buffers will now be a part of the rear yards and it will not be fenced in; thus not a security risk. The 6.0m buffer will be zoned open space (O1) to ensure long term protection. The maintenance of this features & fencing will be addressed through the subdivision agreement.
1.11.e	**Conceptual Open Space Plan Area E:**	
1.11.e.i	It is likely an acoustical barrier will be required to protect the grade-level outdoor amenity area on the east side of the proposed building, please consult with the Acoustical Consultant and incorporate their recommendations into the plan.	Inputs from acoustical consultant have been incorporated
1.11.e.ii	Please indicate limits of underground parking on the plan.	Underground parking limit has been updated on plan
1.11.e.iii	We request that a double board (without gaps) fence be installed along the west property line in conjunction with dense coniferous plantings to mitigate headlight trespass (we see that Section 1 looks to support this approach)	The detail of such fence will be determined in the SPA stage
1.11.f	**Area A Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated November 16, 2020:**	
1.11.f.i	Please confirm with the Civil Consultant that the proposed plantings will not conflict with proposed swales, infiltration trench, etc.	The grading and servicing design has been coordinated with the landscape architect. Further landscape details will be prepared as part of subsequent approval processes.
1.11.g	**Area B Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated November 16, 2020:**	
1.11.g.i	Please confirm with the Civil Consultant that the proposed plantings will not conflict with proposed swales, infiltration trench, bioretention cell, etc.	The grading and servicing design has been coordinated with the landscape architect. Further landscape details will be prepared as part of subsequent approval processes.
1.11.h	**Area C & D Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated November 16, 2020:**	
1.11.h.i	Please confirm with the Civil Consultant that the proposed plantings will not conflict with proposed swales, infiltration trench, bioretention cell, etc.	The grading and servicing design has been coordinated with the landscape architect. Further landscape details will be prepared as part of subsequent approval processes.
1.11.i	**Area E Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated November 16, 2020:**	
1.11.i.i	Please show the limits of the underground parking structure	Underground parking limit has been updated on plan
1.11.i.ii	Please consult with the Acoustical Consultant and show any required acoustical barriers on the plan	Inputs from acoustical consultant have been incorporated
1.11.i.iii	Please clearly label the solid double board (without gaps) fence along the parking on the west property line and dense coniferous plantings for headlight mitigation.	We understand there is an existing fence at the residential property and the need of double board fence will be determined in SPA stage
1.12	**DRAFT PLANS OF SUBDIVISION**	

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.12.a	**Draft Plan of Subdivision Sheet 1 of 2 (for Areas A and B), Prepared by Ross Denbroeder, OLS, R-PE Surveying Ltd., signed and dated October 9, 2020:**	
1.12.a.i	The scale of the drawing is 1:925, is it possible for the scale to be revised to 1:750 or 1:1000?	Scale of the drawing has been amended to 1:1000
1.12.a.ii	Will the two private streets be part of one (the same) condominium corporation? If not, it is our preference to have separate Draft Plan of Subdivision plans for each area as they will likely have separate condo registrations/boards.	At this point it is undetermined if the private streets will be a part of one or two condo corps
1.12.a.iii	Have the CH regulated areas been confirmed? If necessary please update the limits of Block 99 to the limits confirmed by CH. Furthermore, it is our understanding that any hazard lands and setbacks (regulated by CH) are to be dedicated to public ownership through the application process, we defer to CH and Planning staff to confirm.	Regulated areas have been confirmed with CH through wetland and top of bank stakings. The NHS and buffer blocks accurately reflect all natural heritage and natural hazards and CH regulatory requirements. The watercourse corridor will be dedicated to public ownership through the application process.
1.12.a.iv	Please confirm with the Region the radii of the cul-de-sac and width of private lane is sufficient for waste collection, if not, please revise to Region's standards if Regional waste collection is proposed.	Per Halton guidelines, the Private condominium roads have been designed so that private lanes have a minimum width of 6 metres and a minimum turning radius from the centre line of 13 metres to the satisfaction of the Region. This is indicated on all applicable FSR general plan series drawings.
1.12.a.v	Please confirm with utilities if an easement is required along side the common element private road for buried and above ground utility infrastructure, and if so, show the proposed easements on the drawing.	Refer Comment Response No. 1.3.f.iii
1.12.a.vi	The 6m buffers are separate blocks, are they common element? How will the eventual private fencing work, will the POTL lots be able to extend their fencing to the back yards of the existing houses fencing? Or will there be a separate fence along the 6m buffer that runs parallel to the existing houses fencing? If the latter, this could prove to be a safety concern, a long narrow area fenced in on both sides could invite undesirable behavior or wildlife. Also, solid wood board fence across a drainage swale would not be supported	The plan has been revised such that the 6 m buffer is a part of the lot
1.12.a.vii	The overland flow route(s) block(s) ownership will need to be determined, it may be required to be dedicated to public ownership, or at minimum an easement granted in favor of the City of Burlington.	Refer Comment Response No. 1.3.h
1.12.b	**Draft Plan of Subdivision Sheet 2 of 2 (for Areas C and D), Prepared by Ross Denbroeder, OLS, R-PE Surveying Ltd., signed and dated October 29, 2020:**	
1.12.b.i	The scale of the drawing is 1:675, is it possible for the scale to be revised to 1:500 or 1:750?	Scale of the drawing has been amended to 1:750
1.12.b.ii	It is our understanding that TransCanada Pipeline Ltd. (TCPL) has advised that the private laneway, including sidewalks must be set back 7m from the TCPL easement/ROW, please revise the drawing accordingly, including dimensioning the 7m setback.	Plans have been revised accordingly

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.12.b.iii	Will the two private streets be part of one (the same) condominium corporation? If not, it is our preference to have separate Draft Plan of Subdivision for each area as they will likely have separate condo registrations/boards.	It has not been determined at this point how many condominium corporations there will be
1.12.b.iv	If it is determined there are any CH regulated areas, please clearly show the areas as separate blocks. Furthermore, it is our understanding that any hazard lands and setbacks (regulated by CH) are to be dedicated to public ownership through the application process, we defer to CH and Planning staff to confirm	Noted.
1.12.b.v	Please confirm with utilities if an easement is required along side the common element private road for buried and above ground utility infrastructure, and if so, show the proposed easements on the drawing.	Refer Comment Response No. 1.3.f.iii
1.12.b.vi	The 6m buffers are separate blocks, are they common element? How will the eventual private fencing work, will the POTL lots be able to extend their fencing to the back yards of the existing houses fencing? Or will there be a separate fence along the 6m buffer that runs parallel to the existing houses fencing? If the latter, this could prove to be a safety concern, a long narrow area fenced in on both sides could invite undesirable behavior or wildlife.	As per comment 1.12 .vi the buffer will now be included within the lot.
1.12.b.vii	Please confirm with the Region the radii of the cul-de-sac and width of private lane is sufficient for waste collection, if not, please revise to Region's standards if Regional waste collection is proposed.	Per Halton guidelines, the Private condominium roads have been designed so that private lanes have a minimum width of 6 metres and a minimum turning radius from the centre line of 13 metres to the satisfaction of the Region. This indicated on all applicable FSR general plan series drawings.
1.13	**PROPERTY INFORMATION**	
1.13.i	We have reviewed the property information provided by the Applicant and comments below are with respect to City Easements only, there are several other easements for the TransCanada Pipeline, CN Rail, Hydro One Inc, etc., we would defer to those agencies to provide comments on their interests.	Noted and Acknowledged
1.13.a	**Area A (PIN 07182-0254):**	
1.13.a.i	Area A is within Block 107 on 20M-414	Please see attached
1.13.a.ii	A Storm Sewer Easement H308774 is registered on title, and covers all of Block 107, and states *"The Transferor covenants with the Transferee, to keep the herein described lands of the Transferor free and clear of any trees, fences, buildings, structures or obstructions unless any of the forgoing are approved in writing by the Transferee's Director of Public Works"*	Please see attached
1.13.a.iii	There is a Standard Easement registered on title (H317621) for roadways, channels, sewers, conduits, drains, ducts, pipes, services, pole lines, markers, poles, wires, cables (buried and aerial), fixtures, guys, anchors, equipment and other works for storm sewage (whether increase	Please see attached

Comment #	Comment	Response
	or decrease in quality);electricity; other public utilities; and/or other municipal services. It states, *"The Transferor covenants with the transferee, to keep the herein described lands of the Transferor free and clear of any trees, fences, buildings, structures or obstructions unless any of the foregoing are approved in writing by the Transferee's Director of Public Works."*	
1.13.a.iv	Please be advised that the Director of Public Works is now known as the Director of Engineering Services.	
1.13.a.v	There are several notices/agreements listed on title that the City of Burlington is party to (we defer to the Region to comment on their notices/agreements), were not provided with the application please provide to confirm obligations/restrictions: • H302427 • H302428 • H321986 • H331068	Please see attached
1.13.b	Area B (PIN 07182-0255 and 07182-0258), no City easements noted on the PIN report, but there are several notices/agreements that the City of Burlington is party to (we defer to the Region to comment on their notices/agreements), please provide to confirm obligations/restrictions: • H311569 • H311570 • H302427 • H302428 • H321986 • H331068	Please see attached
1.13.c	Area C (PIN 07182-0234), no City easements noted on the PIN report but there are several notices/agreements that the City of Burlington is party to (we defer to the Region to comment on their notices/agreements), please provide to confirm obligations/restrictions: • H302428 • H445572	Please see attached
1.13.d	**Area D (PIN 07182-1072):**	
1.13.d.i	Please be advised that there are easements for Union Gas Limited and Western Pipe Lines noted on the PIN Report	Noted
1.13.d.ii	There is an easement on title (H601285) for the City of Burlington, but for a Hydro Electric Easement, Burlington Hydro Inc. in 1995 may not have been separate from the City of Burlington, but now it is, please confirm with Burlington Hydro any obligations they may have	Please see attached

Comment #	Comment	Response
	restricting development of this area. The easement is over Part 2 of 20R-11593, which was not provided with the application materials, please provide.	
1.13.d.iii	there are several notices/agreements that the City of Burlington is party to (we defer to the Region to comment on their notices/agreements), please provide to confirm obligations/restrictions: • H302428 • H454978 • H739768	Please see attached
1.13.e	**Area E (PIN 07182-2152):**	
1.13.e.i	There is a stormwater easement registered on title (H302472), over Parts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7 of 20R6131 save and except for what is shown on 20M-414 and 20M213. 20M413 was not provided with the application materials, please provide to determine if Part 1 20R6131 (where Area E is located) has easement obligations. If it is determined there are easement obligations then development of Area E may be restricted.	Please see attached
1.13.e.ii	There are several notices/agreements that the City of Burlington is party to (we defer to the Region to comment on their notices/agreements), please provide to confirm obligations/restrictions: • H302428 • H454978 • H667591 • HR138327	Please see attached
1.14	**EXISTING SUBDIVISION AGREEMENT**	
1.14.i	**Site engineering defers to the Applicant's OLS to confirm, however our records look to indicate:**	
1.14.a	Area A is Block 107 in 20M-414	**And** Part of Lot 8, Concession 1, South of Dundas Street (Geographic Township of Trafalgar) designated Part 1, Plan 20R-9030
1.14.b	Area B is Block 108 in 20M-414 and Block 13 in 20M-421	That is correct
1.14.c	Area C is Block 247 in 20M-535	That is correct
1.14.d	Area D is Block 109 in 20M-694	That is correct
1.14.e	Area E is not part of a subdivision agreement	Noted
1.14.ii	**Please be advised:**	

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.14.f	Typical Warning Clauses included in Millcroft subdivision agreements related to the golf course include the following, similar clauses would need to be included in the subdivision agreements and condominium declarations if the current development proposal proceeds:	Noted
1.14.f.i	The Owner covenants and agrees to indemnify and save harmless the City from any losses, damages, claims, actions, demands, suites, costs, or any other liability which may arise from the golf course inclusive of golf course operation, maintenance, repair, movement of motorized or other golf cars, golf course maintenance vehicles using the public road allowance at grade crossings, nuisance, trespass, noise or other inconvenience.	Noted.
1.14.f.ii	Purchasers are advise that because their lots back onto an operating golf course they may be inconvenienced by golfers, golf balls entering onto their property, nuisance including nuisance from golf course maintenance and early morning golf play.	Noted
1.14.f.iii	The Owner and Purchasers covenant and agree that they will not object to the City or make any claims against the City with respect to problems related to the golf course. Further, the Owner and Purchasers covenant and agree to save harmless, release, discharge and quit claim the City from any losses, damages, claims, actions, demands, suits, costs, compensation, injurious affection, interest or any other liability as a result of any noise, nuisance, trespass or other inconvenience resulting from the golf course.	Noted
1.14.f.iv	The Owner covenants and agrees to comply with any request of the City to adjust the golf course should problems related to the golf course occur in the early phases of development	Noted
1.14.f.v	The Owner covenants and agrees to provide adequate signage at designated locations for all “at grade” golf carts crossing the roadway	Noted.
1.14.g	**Typical Conditions/Clauses in the Millcroft subdivision agreements for lots abutting a walkway (there are lots abutting walkways in the proposed development areas) include:**	
1.14.g.i	Cause all buildings to be set back from a walkway a minimum of 4.6m or such setback as is specified in the applicable zoning by-law, whichever is the greater, unless the wall abutting the walkway is that of a garage no more than one storey in height, in which case the minimum setback may be reduced to 3m	Noted. We have included and addressed in the draft zoning by-law a minimum setback of 1.2m from abutting walkways.
1.14.g.ii	Landscape all lots having a side yard abutting a walkway with a 1.2m high cedar hedge, nursery grown stock; planted on 90cm centers, 30 to 60 cm in from the property line; extending from a point adjacent to the front elevation of the residential dwelling, to the rear lot line along the length of the walkway	Acknowledged. To be addressed in detailed design.
1.14.g.iii	Cause all habitable rooms of single family dwellings to have no windows facing a walkway, and cause the living room and dining room of semi- detached dwelling to have no windows facing a walkway. For the purpose of this condition, a bathroom will not be considered a habitable room	We do not agree with this comment.

Comment #	Comment	Response
1.14.h.	**Additional warning clauses from Utilities (TransCanada Pipeline, CN Rail, Hydro One, etc.) and Agencies will also be required, as will warning clauses for Noise, in the subdivision agreement and condo declaration if the application proceeds. Wording to be determined in the future once revised materials have been submitted and reviewed.**	Acknowledged.
1.15	**ADVISORIES FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE GOLF COURSE**	
1.15.a	Grading changes to the existing golf course (outside of Conservation Halton regulated areas) may require a Site Alteration Permit from the City of Burlington, information regarding site alterations is available on the City's website: https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/Site-Alteration-Permits.asp	Acknowledged.
1.15.b	Relocation of the maintenance building will require a Site Plan process, where stormwater management, noise, lighting, grading, servicing, etc. will be reviewed, we would ask that a site plan pre-consultation be held prior to an application. Please contact charles.mulay@burlington.ca for details of a site plan pre-consultation.	Acknowledged. The relocation will be dealt with through the site plan process following approval of the Draft Plan/rezoning.
1.15.i	**Please also note the following:**	
1.15.i.i	The Applicant/Developer is cautioned that notwithstanding the above a full detailed review of all documents, reports and drawings will be completed at the time of Subdivision/Site Plan Application(s).	Acknowledged.
1.15.i.ii	Site Engineering's review of this application is considered preliminary at this time. Please note that Site Engineering may provide additional comments, raise additional concerns, or request additional information upon receiving the aforementioned information, and upon further comprehensive review of its contents.	Acknowledged.
1.15.i.iii	If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call or email. Please advise the Applicant that I am happy discuss the comments above if they have questions or require clarification on the site engineering comments, or to meet with them or their consultants prior to resubmission of updated materials, to ensure our comments have been addressed satisfactorily, we would however ask that Planning staff be included on communications.	Acknowledged.
Burlington Fire Department – May 6, 2021		
1	The proposed fire access route for Area E is to be designed, constructed and designated as a fire access route in accordance with Articles 3.2.5.4., 3.2.5.5. and 3.2.5.6. of the 2012 Ontario Building Code. Fire access route orientation as indicated on Drawing is acceptable without revision.	Noted.
2	The fire access route is to be posted on both sides, where possible, excluding designated parking in accordance with the City of Burlington Parking and Idling By-law #40-2014. Please	Noted.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	contact Kelly Hall of the Transportation Department at (905) 335-7600 Ext. 7560 for number and location of required signs during the construction stage of the project.	
3	Applicant to submit an electronic copy of a reduced site plan clearly denoting the designated fire access route, fire hydrants and fire department connections (where applicable) to jason.bridge@burlington.ca. A copy of this plan will be forwarded to the Transportation Department for sign designation and record purposes.	This can be provided at a later date when more details are available and a site plan application is submitted
4	A fire safety Plan is required to be submitted to this Department prior to occupancy of the building.	Noted.
Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021		
1	Transit request funds to upgrade two bus stops on Dundas St near the Development Area E, with additional passenger amenities	Noted
Hydro One – January 12, 2021		
1	Please be advised that Hydro One Networks Inc. (“HONI”) has completed a preliminary review of the proposed plan of the above noted subdivision application. As the subject land is abutting and/or encroaching onto a HONI high voltage transmission corridor (the “transmission corridor”), HONI does not approve of the proposed subdivision **at this time**, pending review and approval of the required information. Please be advised that the transmission corridor lands affected by the proposed development and identified as such herein are subject to a statutory right in favour of HONI pursuant to Section 114.5(1)of *The Electricity Act, 1998*, as amended. The owner of these lands is Her Majesty, The Queen In Right of Ontario, as represented by The Minister of Infrastructure (“MOI”). Ontario Infrastructure & Lands Corporation (“OILC”) as agent for the Province, must review and approve all secondary land uses such as roads that are proposed on these lands. HONI is currently acting as a service provider to OILC, and undertakes this review on their behalf. The comments detailed herein do not constitute an endorsement of any element of the subdivision design or road layout, nor do they grant permission to access, use, proceed with works on, or in any way alter the transmission corridor lands, without the express written permission of HONI. Should the developer require any use of and/or access to the transmission corridor at any time, the developer must contact **Joan Zhao, Real Estate Coordinator** at **416-573-7987** in order to ensure all of HONI’s technical requirements are met to its satisfaction, and acquire any applicable agreements.	Noted

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
The following should be included as **Conditions of Draft Approval:**		
A	Prior to HONI providing its final approval, the developer must make arrangements satisfactory to HONI for lot grading and drainage. Digital PDF copies of the lot grading and File: 505-07/20, 520-07/20, & 510-02/20 (24T-20002/B) Page 2 of 3 drainage plans (true scale), showing existing and proposed final grades, must be submitted to HONI for review and approval. The drawings must identify the transmission corridor, location of towers within the corridor and any proposed uses within the transmission corridor. Drainage must be controlled and directed away from the transmission corridor.	Noted. With respect to controlling storm water discharge on HONI's lands, the amount of uncontrolled sheet flow is reduced by the proposed Area E development with the majority of flows controlled (100-Year post to 2-year pre) to a point discharge at the existing swale location as detailed in Area E FSR Section 9.3.
B	Any development in conjunction with the subdivision must not block vehicular access to any HONI facilities located on the transmission corridor. During construction, there must be no storage of materials or mounding of earth, snow or other debris on the transmission corridor.	Noted.
C	At the developer's expense, temporary fencing must be placed along the transmission corridor prior to construction, and permanent fencing must be erected along the common property line after construction is completed.	Noted
D	The costs of any relocations or revisions to HONI facilities which are necessary to accommodate this subdivision will be borne by the developer. The developer will be responsible for restoration of any damage to the transmission corridor or HONI facilities thereon resulting from construction of the subdivision.	Noted
E	This letter and the conditions contained therein should in no way be construed as permission for or an endorsement of proposed location(s) for any road crossing(s) contemplated for the proposed development. This permission may be specifically granted by OILC under separate agreement(s). Proposals for any secondary land use including road crossings on the transmission corridor are processed through the Provincial Secondary Land Use Program (PSLUP). HONI, as OILC's service provider, will review detailed engineering plans for such proposals separately, in order to obtain final approval. Should approval for a road crossing be granted, the developer shall then make arrangements satisfactory to OILC and HONI for the dedication and transfer of the proposed road allowance directly to the City of Burlington. Access to, and road construction on the transmission corridor is not to occur until the legal transfer(s) of lands or interests are completed.	Noted
F	In addition, HONI requires the following to be conveyed to the developer as a precaution: The transmission lines abutting the subject lands operate at either 500,000, 230,000 or 115,000 volts. Section 188 of Regulation 213/91 pursuant to the Occupational Health and Safety Act, require that no object be brought closer than 6 metres (20 feet) to an energized 500 kV	Noted

Comment #	Comment	Response
	conductor. The distance for 230 kV conductors is 4.5 metres (15 feet), and for 115 kV conductors it is 3 metres (10 feet). It is the developer's responsibility to be aware, and to make all personnel on site aware, that all equipment and personnel must come no closer than the distance specified in the Act. They should also be aware that the conductors can raise and lower without warning, depending on the electrical demand placed on the line.	
Burlington Hydro – April 19, 2021		
Specific Comments		
1	At this time there has been no pre-engineering design or capacity study performed, however, Burlington Hydro will not deny request for servicing and in the unlikely event that additional system capacity be required, all associated costs will be at the Developer's expense.	Noted.
2	The proposed hydro servicing infrastructure will be underground as per City requirements. The existing 13.8kV distribution system will be extended into each site (A, B, C, & D) by intercepting and connected to the existing distribution system that runs along the existing road allowances. There will be excavations within the existing road allowances in order to remove existing distribution cables and make good the new ducts to the existing ducts. Burlington Hydro must complete all work within the existing road allowance including the installation of the cables that connect the new development to the existing distribution system. The exact location of these tie in points are not known at this time. Since removing of existing distribution cables will result in the supply loop being temporarily impacted, it is critical that that the work done by Burlington Hydro and the Developer is well coordinated to ensure the supply loop is reinstated in a timely manner.	Noted.
3	The Developer must provide their construction schedule for the installation of the new hydro assets. Connecting more than one Area to the same loop is not possible unless the Areas fall within the same cable segment and must be completed within the same time frame. Burlington Hydro has not assessed whether this limitation is applicable particularly when looking at Area A & B.	Noted.
4	Be advised that splicing the new cable to the existing cable is not permitted, therefore, Burlington Hydro will attempt to remove the existing cables from the existing ducts. In the event this cannot be done, Burlington Hydro will be required to install new duct and cable from the existing equipment to the new development as required at the Developer's expense.	Noted.
5	It is important to note that areas A, C & D each have a Burlington Hydro switchgear unit on the proposed development lands which appear to lie within a proposed lot or road allowance. The Developer must confirm whether the current plan conflicts with these switchgear units. Relocation of these switchgear units may not be possible and would certainly carry a significant cost to the Developer if relocation is a viable solution. Burlington Hydro has sole	The switchgear locations were considered in proposed development in consultation with RTG Systems Inc.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	discretion in determining whether relocation of the switchgear units are possibility, in which case the Developer will be required to alter the proposed plans.	
6	Note that site E is a high-rise condo development which will be supplied three phase from the 27.6kV distribution system along the South side of Dundas and presume will be development under the City's site plan approval process. The Developer shall meet with Burlington Hydro to discuss the option to supply and installation of suite revenue metering for the high rise development.	Noted.
7	The Developer shall grant Burlington Hydro easements if required and shall be acquired at the Developer's expense.	Noted.
General Comments		
8	Service is available under BHI's latest Standard Service Conditions http://www.burlingtonhydro.com/images/PDFs/bhi-conditionsofservice.pdf	Noted.
9	Relocation, modification or removal of existing hydro facilities, if required, shall be at the Developer's expense. BHI will refer to the latest Ontario Electrical Safety Code ("OESC") if issues arise with the clearances between existinghydro facilities and existing building structures. For proposed building structures, Burlington Hydro will refer to their standards for clearance issues from Hydro lines which will either meet or exceed the national building code	Noted.
10	Customer is to ensure that BHI has clear unobstructed access to hydro equipment to operate, maintain and replace as required.	Noted.
11	Planting shrubs, trees or flowers, or build fences or walls in the obstruction free zone of Burlington Hydroequipment is not permitted; also the obstruction free zone cannot be used for storage at any time.	Noted.
12	Revenue metering shall be in accordance with BHI's metering standards and requirements	Noted.
13	Project must meet City of Burlington Standards	Noted.
14	Machine excavation within one metre of underground plant is not permitted	Noted.
15	Do not excavate within two metres of hydro poles and anchors with the exception of the termination pole wherethe duct structure shall be terminated by the customer under the supervision of BHI inspector	Noted.
16	Please arrange for underground hydro cable locate(s), prior to beginning construction, by contacting Ontario OneCall @ (800) 400-2255.	Noted.

Comment #	Comment	Response
17	Please refer to the latest edition of the Occupational Health and Safety Act ("OHSA") and Regulations for Construction Projects when a work is planned to be performed in the proximity of hydro distribution system.	Noted.
18	Arrange for disconnect and isolation of the power supply if a person or an equipment is to encroach within the minimum distance permitted under the OHSA and OESC	Noted.
City of Burlington Engineering Services - Landscaping		
Area A – Public Trees		
1	There is one tree in the Regional right-of-way (ROW): Tree #3361, Blue Spruce, 46cm DBH which is proposed for protection and preservation. This is not documented in Table 9, and has been identified as a City of Burlington Tree in the Table provided in TP-2.	The report has been updated to reflect ownership status of tree #3361.
Area A – Private Trees		
2	Based on the review of Table 10, the totals provided equal 248 vs. the 250 noted in the subject text. Staff reviewed the data and total 69 trees for preservation, with 7 of those 69 proposed for preserve with impacts expected, and those with preserve with injury. Please provide the difference between Preserve-Injury vs. Preserve with Impacts Expected and what tools would be used to ensure preservation. Any required tree work should be completed by a certified Arborist and documentation provided to the City.	Further detail re: cause and extent of impacts have been provided in the updated Arborist report. See also response to comment # 3 (Arborist report).
3	Of the 250 total trees, the City identified 188 trees proposed for removal. In the third paragraph of Section 5.1, the second sentence reads as "of these 177, 13 trees are recommended for removal due to their condition", can staff confirm if this is to be of these 188 trees, and confirm the total number of trees to be removed due to condition. There are a total of 22 Ash trees noted, in addition to the other species provided which is greater than 13. A review of the data is needed to ensure the correct quantities are reported per Area.	The updated Arborist report includes revised numbers (i.e., removals, preserve with impacts, and aggregate caliper calculations) that reflect design changes made primarily in response to comments received from the agencies.
4	Please confirm totals in Table 9 – please provide an explanation as to the difference between the first column for Area A, and in the text noting 5,800cm total caliper of trees proposed for removal, vs. total cm in the 3rd column of only 5,656cm. Can staff identify the remaining 144cm? Based the current proposed tree removals noted in the Arborist Report and shown on the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TP-1 & TP-2) in Area A, the Planning Summary Estimates provided in the Conceptual Open Space plans note that +/- 200 "Street Trees, Buffer Planting, and Enhanced Planting" has been proposed, and +/- 580 trees are proposed within the Appleby Creek Channel Area. Staff require more information on the proposed removals, as some trees are proposed for removals, where others along the same plane are not. Measures should be taken to explore methods of avoidance and mitigation, and to incorporate the trees into the design.	Please see responses to comment "Area A #3", and "Arborist Report #5".

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
5	Note, the proposed number of trees identified in the Planning Summary Estimates does not provide the required number of trees necessary to address the loss and removals. Detailed planting plan(s) and plant list(s) should be provided to ensure that compensation and enhancement for tree removals can be realistically accommodated.	As discussed, detailed planting plans will be provided at a later stage and will be a condition of approval. Conceptual planting plans, complete with a species list and quantity estimates have been provided with this submission.
Area B – Public Trees		
6	There are no public trees in Area B.	Noted
Area B – Private Trees		
7	There is a total of 196 trees in Area B, of which the City count 68 trees for preservation in total, with 16 of the 68 identified to have expected impacts but, those trees should be able to withstand any grading related injuries. More information is required for how specific measures will be used for each tree to identify preservation, including the percentage of impact associated with the minimum tree protection zones and critical root zones. Any required tree work should be completed by a certified Arborist and documentation provided to the City.	Percentage of TPZ impacted have been included in the updated report. The report also includes the requirement for tree work to be completed by or under the direct supervision of a certified arborist, with documentation provided to the city.
8	Of the 196 total trees, 128 trees are proposed to be removed. There are seven (7) Ash trees proposed to be removed. The remaining 121 trees are proposed to be removed “to accommodate the proposed development”, or due to condition. Please review the tables with respect to the drawings to ensure they capture the same information, for example, Tree #3344 is identified as a removal on the plan, but in the associated table on TP-2 it is identified for preservation, and in Appendix B it is identified as a removal.	Noted.
9	Based the current proposed tree removals noted in the Arborist Report and shown on the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TP-1 & TP-2) in Area B, the Planning Summary Estimates provided in the Conceptual Open Space plans note that +/- 190 “Street Trees, Buffer Planting, and Enhanced Planting” which is insufficient to compensate for the loss of canopy. A detailed planting plan and plant list should be provided to ensure that compensation and enhancement for tree removals can be realistically accommodated.	See Note 5 above
10	Staff require more information on the proposed removals, as some trees are proposed for removals, where others along the same plane are not. Measures should be taken to explore methods of avoidance and mitigation, and to incorporate the trees into the design.	Please see responses to comment “Area A #3", and “Arborist Report #5”.
Area C – Public Trees		
11	There are no public trees in Area C	Noted.
Area C – Private Trees		
12	There is a total of 75 trees in Area C, of which 31 trees are recommended for preservation. Of the 30 preserved trees, the City identifies nine (9) to have expected impacts but should withstand any grading related injuries compared to the 16 trees reported in Section 5.3. Any	Noted. See response to comment “Arborist Report... #3”, below.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	required tree work should be completed by a certified Arborist and documentation provided to the City.	
13	Of the 75 total trees, 44 trees are proposed to be removed. All 44 trees (of which 90% are noted to be in good condition) are proposed to be removed "to accommodate the proposed development". Based the current proposed tree removals noted in the Arborist Report and shown on the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TP-3) in Area C, the Planning Summary Estimates provided in the Conceptual Open Space plans note that +/- 110 "Street Trees, Buffer Planting, and Enhanced Planting" has been proposed, which is insufficient to compensate for the loss of canopy. A detailed planting plan and plant list should be provided to ensure that compensation and enhancement for tree removals can be realistically accommodated.	See Note 5 above
14	Staff require more information on the proposed removals, as some trees are proposed for removals, where others along the same plane are not. Measures should be taken to explore methods of avoidance and mitigation, and to incorporate the trees into the design.	Please see responses to comment "Area A #3", and "Arborist Report #5".
Area D – Public Trees		
15	One (1) City tree is proposed for removal (#680). The City also notes that the table provided on TP-4 is the same table provided on TP-5. The City will require an updated table reflecting the trees associated with Area D in order to provide further comment and confirm those to be preserved, injured or removed. Note that any city trees proposed to be removed adjacent a site for which a development application has been submitted requires Council approval, in accordance with the city's Public Tree Bylaw 68-2013. Alternatives to the design will need to be illustrated and documented relative to the trees such that it has been properly demonstrated the removals are justified.	Noted. The report has been updated to reflect opportunities for tree impacts and preservation in Area D.
Area D – Private Trees		
16	Similar to the above, the City notes discrepancies with the information provided and illustrated on TP-4 compared to what has been reported in the text. The City will require an updated table reflecting the trees associated with Area D in order to provide further comment and confirm those to be preserved, injured or removed.	Noted. See response to Area D – Public Trees: #15, above.
17	Based the current proposed tree removals noted in the Arborist Report and shown on the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TP-4) in Area D, the Planning Summary Estimates provided in the Conceptual Open Space plans note that +/- 70 "Street Trees, Buffer Planting, and Enhanced Planting" has been proposed. A detailed planting plan and plant list should be provided to ensure that compensation and enhancement for tree removals can be realistically accommodated.	See Note 5 above
Area E – Public Trees		
18	There are no public trees in Area E.	Noted.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
Area E – Private Trees		
19	Of the 21 total trees in Area E, all (100%) are proposed to be removed. All 21 trees (of which 88% are in good condition) and proposed to be removed "due to the proposed underground parking area and associated above ground development". Please confirm totals in Table 9 – please provide an explanation as to the difference between the first column for Area E, and in the text noting 349cm total caliper of trees proposed for removal, vs. total cm in the 3rd column of only 284cm. Can staff identify the remaining 65cm?	The discrepancy has been corrected in the forthcoming submission. Again, please note that opportunities for tree retention will be revisited at the detailed design stage.
20	The Planning Summary Estimates provided in the Conceptual Open Space plans note that +/- 120 "Street Trees, Buffer Planting, and Enhanced Planting" has been proposed. A detailed planting plan and plant list will be required at the Site Plan Application stage.	Refer to comment response # 11, below.
Arborist Report and Tree Inventory and Preservation Plans		
1	On Page 8 Section 1.18 of the Public Tree By-law (68-2013) is noted, but Section 1.19 should also be noted: *The City Arborist shall not issue a Tree Permit for Trees located on Public Property immediately abutting Private Property for which a development application has been submitted, until such time as the development application has been approved and Council has also approved the removal of these Trees.* Although Section 1.18 specifies that "Where the total combined diameter of the Tree(s) to be planted is less than the total combined diameter of the Tree(s) removed, Council approval will be required." Council approval is also required for the removal of any city tree due to Section 1.19. To save staff and council time and resources, the request to remove the city tree(s) noted in Area D Table 8 in Area D will be reviewed through this OPA/RZ/SD application by Forestry staff once the final plans are near approval (the plans may be revisions and location of driveway moved, potentially allowing the tree to be preserved). Trees in the Regional ROW (Upper Middle Road) will be commented on by Regional staff.	Noted. The report has been updated accordingly.
2	Under 6 Tree Protection and Preservation Guidelines, point 8. of the recommended tree protection measures on page 16 notes "Trees that have been damaged beyond repair shall be removed and replaced at the City's expense with trees of a size and species approved by the City's Parks & Forestry Division/Community Services Department". Please change the underlined words above to "Developer's expense" and "Manager of Urban Forestry or delegate".	Noted. The report has been updated accordingly.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
3	To ensure protected trees noted to have expected impacts due to grading or other work within the MTPZ, a certified arborist should be retained to implement all tree protection and preservation recommendations, including maintenance of tree protection fencing, and any required root/branch pruning, as noted in the approved Arborist Report and Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan. Please provide details required for each tree that demonstrates the requirements and outlines the full impacts expected to the MTPZ as a percentage impact, which shall be illustrated on the plans relative to the proposed works. A letter of retention will be required to be submitted to the City, as well as a post construction report/brief outlining work completed (including dates, work completed, and site photos)	Noted. The report has been updated to include the City's during and post-construction requirements.
4	Preserving more existing mature trees that are in fair to good condition should be explored, as it has taken 30 years for the existing trees to grow to their current size. Landscape Buffer planting is shown, but it would take many years for newly planted trees to establish and grow to a substantial size. (50mm caliper trees are recommended to be planted, as smaller-diameter trees can generally recover and re-establish more successfully than larger diameter trees). Additional information explaining the justification for removals should be provided in a revised Arborist Report and Tree Inventory Plans (e.g. grading, servicing, within building footprint/proposed driveway) once alternate layouts are considered and it is determined that the proposed removals cannot be avoided. Maximum building footprints, driveway locations and service connections should also be shown to ensure proposed removals are necessary and that tree preservation as shown on the approved plans can be implemented.	As discussed in the meeting with the City on 14 July 2021, • The landscape plan will include use of mixed sizes, recognizing that 50 mm caliper sized trees will be required in order to match, to the extent feasible, the mature character of the existing neighborhood. Caliper equivalents for stock < 50 mm will be discussed with the City. See letter included in the landscape design package for further details. • The updated Arborist report includes further details re: justification for removals / impacts as well as conceptual locations for building footprints and driveways.
5	Plans should be revised to consider and prioritize tree preservation, rather than existing trees being preserved as an afterthought. Alternate layouts and grading options should be reviewed to protect and preserve more existing trees; options for consideration may include reducing number of lots, providing lots on one side of the road instead of two, revising lot configurations, modifying road and turning bulb layouts, eliminating proposed landscaped islands in roads, increasing the width of landscape buffers between proposed and existing lots, providing retaining walls as required to maintain the grades in the MTPZ of existing trees, etc.	Tree retention was considered during the development of the proposed plan, and was balanced with design and financial feasibility considerations. Further opportunities for tree retention will be explored as some elements of the proposed plan are redesigned in accordance with comments received from other agencies and City departments. As outlined in the revised Arborist Report and the letter included in the landscape design package, opportunities for tree retention will be revisited at the detailed design stage.
6	Appendix B: Add a column that denotes which Area the trees belong to.	Please refer to drawings TP-1 to TP-5 which include a list of trees by Area.
7	Review the Tables provided within the report relative to those on the TP-X plans as there are noted discrepancies between the data provided and what is noted within the report. Please provide the excel file in future submissions as part of the City review.	Noted. The updated TPP drawings reflect changes in the proposed design/layout that were developed following the initial submission.
8	Provide graphic differentiation for those trees to be injured as part of the development (i.e., Preserve-Impacts Expected), so that they are clearly identifiable on the Tree Preservation Plans. For example, use a different colour or hatching.	Noted. See response to comment 9, below
9	Provide graphic differentiation for those trees identified to be injured such that the area to be impacted is clearly identifiable and a percentage of impact is provided in the associated tables, both on the plans and in Appendix B.	Noted. Trees to be injured are shown in yellow/orange, with the area of incursion into the TPZ shown in hatching. Trees to be preserved are shown in green and those proposed for removal are shown in red.

Comment #	Comment	Response
Re: Conceptual Open Space		
10	The currently proposed 6m landscape buffers between the existing and proposed residential lots are encouraged to be increased to provide an opportunity to preserve existing mature trees and to plant a double row of large canopy deciduous and coniferous trees with understory planting, as is shown conceptually in the *Typical Existing Residential to Proposed Residential Interface* and the *Typical Existing Residential to Proposed Bungalow Residential Interface* section/elevations that were provided with the *Conceptual Open Space* drawing set. Plans should be revised to increase and enhance landscape buffers, including the following comments: **Areas A & B** • The proposed row of houses on each side of the road and Landscaped Islands greatly limits the potential for tree preservation between proposed lots and existing residential properties. • Sufficient space to provide a planted buffer between the Proposed Pathway Connection between Areas A & B and the side and rear lots of existing and proposed residential properties should be provided (i.e. move the path closer to the CN Rail corridor, rather than flush against the property lines as shown on the Proposed Landscape Plan for Parcels A & B) **Area D** • A Landscape Buffer is shown conceptually in the Proposed Landscape Plan for Parcel D, but the TP-4 shows the bulb less than 2m from the property line, which is not enough space to provide tree plantings in addition to a double board fence, which is required to mitigate headlight trespass from the turning bulb to adjacent residential properties to the south. The turning bulb should be revised to provide the proposed Landscape Buffer, which may allow existing trees to be preserved (e.g. trees 700, 701, 702, 704, all in good condition). • Increasing the Landscape Buffer may enable trees 694, 695, 697 and 698 (all in good condition) to be preserved.	The proposed 6 m landscape buffer has not been increased. Areas A & B: opportunities to provide a planted buffer between rear lots and pathways will be explored at the detailed design stage. We have provided additional planting between the lots and the pathway to provide more screening Area D: We have increased the planting buffer to a minimum of 4.0m which allows us to provide dense conifer planting (trees as well as shrubs) to be able to screen the headlight. This will be confirmed at detailed design.
11	More detailed planting plan with associated size and species is required to be submitted for review and approval, to ensure that the proposed landscape buffers are feasible. It is not certain if the conceptual plans can accommodate the proposed trees to be installed, and furthermore, whether it can accommodate existing trees that are to be preserved, or that can be preserved following the additional review with the Arborist. Detailed Landscape Plans and Details are required to be submitted for review and approval including the following (items indicated with an * are not required for Area E which will require Site Plan Application submission after OPA/RZ approval):	Noted

Comment #	Comment	Response
	• Is stamped and signed by a qualified member of the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects. • Contains legible drawings on 24x36 inch paper. • Includes all dimensions in metric, to scale, and on a consistent base map layer. • Includes a bar scale. • Includes planting plan and plant list (including species, size and quantity) *and Details. • Plantings should be native and non-invasive species and incorporates Conservation Halton's Landscape and Tree Preservation Guidelines. • Tree plantings apply the following ratios: 10% maximum of any species, 20% maximum of any genus, 30% maximum of any family • Shows location and dimensions of pedestrian walkways (1500mm minimum width, 1800mm recommended) and crossings. Include dimensions from open doors if doors open out onto walkways. • Identifies minimum required soil volumes for proposed street trees (between proposed driveways) and trees planted on slab, and the location of any structural soil cell installation areas to achieve minimum soil volumes ($30m^3$ of soil per tree in a single tree pit, $15m^3$ per tree in a shared planting environment. Excavation for each planting environment should be 0.75m to 1.2m depth and should not exceed 1.5m depth). • Identifies the location, type and height of proposed fencing *and construction details. • Identifies snow storage. • Shows the location *and details of site furnishings. • Identifies the location of air vents/shafts and limit of underground parking (for Area E). • Identifies property lines, easements, regulated areas, impermeable surfaces (including curbs, roads, driveways, sidewalks, etc.), buildings and entrances, landscaped beds, lawns or other permeable surface areas, other information as needed. • Identifies the location of all underground, at grade and overhead utilities. • Identifies the location of any storm water management infrastructure, including swales, sub-drains, catch basins, pipes, and other quality and quantity controls as required. • Is coordinated with the Site Plan, Grading and Servicing drawings, Planning Justification Report, Noise Study, Wind Study, and shows any recommended mitigation measures (e.g. buffer planting, screening, fencing) on the Landscape Plans *and Details.	
12	Detailed planting plan and details (as outlined above) are required to be submitted, showing what is proposed along Appleby Creek, within the limits of Area A and around the proposed SWM Pond. Plantings should comply with Conservation Halton's Landscaping and Tree Preservation Guidelines (https://conservationhalton.ca/policiesand-guidelines). Approval from Conservation Halton and Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) may be required.	We have provided the plans with recommended species and sizes. More details would be submitted at a later stage

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
13	For area E, space between the property lines and the limit of underground parking should be provided to grow large canopy trees that will not need to be removed when the underground parking garage requires repairs.	We have maxed out the opportunities to plant trees based on the site plan
14	Provide updated section/elevations for Areas A, B, C, D and E	Sections have been updated
15	Should the plan of subdivision be draft approved, a Landscape Cost estimate will be required for areas A, B, C and D for the proposed plant material, seeding and sodding, fencing and site furnishings for each area.	Noted.
City of Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021		
1	The applicant is required to provide a visitor parking plan for the proposed private roads. We will be asking for 0.5 spaces per unit;	Noted.
2	The driveway length for the single family homes needs to be at least 6.7m	Noted. Driveway lengths are at least 6.7m
3	Transportation Planning staff doesn't have concerns with the proposed parking rates for the condo building on Dundas Street;	Noted.
4	Transportation Planning staff will require more info from the applicant/traffic consultant on how the golf carts will operate on the sidewalk/multi-use path adjacent to the proposed single family homes;	The Updated Transportation Impact Study dated February 2022 has provided more context to the concerns about the interaction between pedestrians, golf carts, and vehicles.
5	City of Burlington Traffic Operations staff will inform me if improvements are warranted at the golf path crossings. As soon as I receive that info, I will share it with you.	Noted.
City of Burlington Transportation Planning (Condo Site Plan)		
6	Please refer to City's Site Plan Guidelines for applicable design standards for structured parking and ground floor;	Noted.
7	The columns in the underground parking garage will need to be offset by 0.5m	Noted.
8	Provide dimensioning for the proposed parallel parking spaces	Parallel parking stall sizes are 2.75 m x 6 m and will be included when a site plan application is made
9	Provide truck turning templates to demonstrate the functionality of the accesses, loading spaces, etc;	Noted and will be included on site plan application
10	For construction of the building, staff will not support temporary closure of vehicle lanes, bike lanes, boulevards, sidewalks, etc.	This comment has been noted and discussed with City staff. It is our understanding that construction closures may happen for short duration work such as servicing connections. Long duration closures to support construction of the building such as deliveries will not be permitted.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
City of Burlington Transportation Operations (February 12, 2021) included in May 7, 2021 comments		
11	Individual CMMPs to be submitted for each development site (i.e. for each block), must include the following details: a) Daylight/Visibility triangles noted on the plan b) Staging areas (i.e. material, site servicing etc) c) Proposed Encroachments (temporary or permanent) d) Mud mat and vehicle wash down area e) Site trailer, material storage, sanitary facilities f) Truck haulage route (include all route details within Burlington's boundaries) g) Truck stacking/staging area h) Trades parking i) Traffic control measures j) Pedestrian control measures (including hoarding/protection) k) Asset removals (temporary or permanent) and relocations	Noted and will be provided at a later stage when more details are available.
General Comments/Notes		
12	Road Occupancy Permit (ROP) required for any work/occupancy of public right-of-way and subject to applicable fees.	Noted.
13	Full street and/or lane closures shall be strongly discouraged and generally not permitted, unless extenuating circumstances (which have been mutually agreed to by the developer and the Director of Transportation Services) exist;	Noted.
14	Sidewalk closures are not permitted unless extenuating circumstances (which have been mutually agreed to by the developer and the Director of Transportation) exist. Closure of sidewalks adjacent to Arterial streets is not permitted under any circumstance;	Noted.
15	Loss of on-street parking is not permitted unless extenuating circumstances (which have been mutually agreed to) exist and financial compensation for loss of parking may be required;	Noted.
City of Burlington Parking Service (February 10, 2021) included in May 7, 2021 comments		
16	CMMP E subject too: • Contact Parking Services for all Fire Access Route signage and placement prior to occupancy • Contact Parking Services for all Accessible signage and placement prior to occupancy	Noted.
17	CMMP AB, C, D • All roads designated private road ways • No required changes	All proposed internal roads will be privately owned and maintained by the condominium corporation. A public easement will be provided over the condominium roads as requested by the City.

Comment #	Comment	Response
TransCanada Pipelines Limited – January 29, 2021 (MHBC Planning)		
A	We are the planning consultants for TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TCPL), an affiliate of TC Energy Corporation (TC Energy). This letter is in response to notification of the application of a Draft Plan of Subdivision for the subject lands noted above. TCPL has one high-pressure natural gas pipeline abuttingAreas C & D on the proposed Plan. TCPL's pipelines and related facilities are subject to the jurisdiction of the Canada Energy Regulator (CER)– formerly the National Energy Board (NEB). As such, certain activities must comply with the Canadian Energy Regulator Act (Act) and the National Energy Board Damage Prevention Regulations (Regulations).The Act and the Regulations noted can be accessed from the CER's website at www.cer-rec.gc.ca. As was provided to the consultant in May 2020, TCPL's development guidelines require roads to be setback from the limits of the right-of-way. As such, the cul-de-sac in Area C and paralleling condo roadin Area D must be setback 7m from the edge of the right-of-way including curbs/sidewalks	A 7.0m setback is incorporated into the Draft Plan of Subdivision for both Areas C and D. Specifically, for Area D, the back of curb (or 9.1m ROW limit) is fully outside the limits of 7.0m setback (as part of Block 107) and the rear property line of the abutting Area C lots is coincident with the limits of the 7.0m TCPL setback. As requested by the City via Comment 1.4.h.ii, LIDs are no longer proposed within the TCPL setback.
We request that the following development and regulatory requirements also be included as conditions of Draft Plan approval:		
1	Written consent must be obtained from TCPL prior to undertaking the following activities: • constructing or installing a facility across, on, along or under a TCPL pipeline right-of-way. • conducting a ground disturbance (excavation or digging) on TCPL's pipeline right-of-wayor within 30 meters of centreline of TCPL's pipe (the "Prescribed Area"); • driving a vehicle, mobile equipment or machinery across a TCPL pipeline right-of-way outside the travelled portion of a highway or public road; • using any explosives within 300 meters of TCPL's pipeline right-of-way; and • use of the prescribed area for storage purposes.	Noted.
2	The cul-de-sac in Area C and paralleling condo road in Area D must be setback 7m from the edgeof the pipeline right-of-way including curbs and sidewalks	Refer to TCPL Comment Response A.
3	The conditions, restrictions or covenants specified by TCPL shall be registered against title in relation to the "Lands" and the plan by way of application to register conditions, restrictions or covenants, as applicable, pursuant to the Land Titles Act, or any amendments thereto	Noted.
4	During construction of the site, temporary fencing must be erected and maintained along the limits of the right-of-way by the owner to prevent unauthorized access by heavy machinery. The fence erected must meet TCPL's specifications concerning type, height and location. The Owner is responsible for ensuring proper maintenance of the temporary fencing for the duration of construction	Acknowledged. Please advise of TCPL's temporary fencing requirements.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
5	Permanent fencing is required along the limits of TCPL's right-of-way abutting residential lots. The fence erected must meet TCPL's and the municipality's specifications concerning type, location, and height. Any excavations for fence posts on, or within 30 metres of the pipeline must be done by hand or hydro vac. There shall be no augers operated on the right-of-way. The Owner shall notify TCPL 3 business days prior to any excavation for fence posts located on or within 30 metres of the pipeline. All fences made of metallic materials must be approved by TCPL prior to being erected on or within 30 metres of the pipeline	Acknowledged. Note, please respond to the City's request for information regarding TCPL's permanent fencing requirements as per Comment 1.4.f.iii.
6	Storage of materials and/or equipment on TCPL's right-of-way is not permitted	Noted.
7	Landscaping on TCPL's right-of-way is to be approved in writing by TCPL and done in accordancewith TCPL's Guidelines: • TCPL's right-of-way is to be seeded with Canada #1 seed. • The Owner shall ensure a five (5) meter continuous access way is maintained over, through and within the right-of-way to facilitate access for future pipeline operation and maintenance activities. • No portion of trees or shrubs at the time of maturity shall be permitted to encroach within five (5) meters of the edge of the TCPL pipeline within the right-of-way. • No trees or shrubs at the time of maturity that will reach a height greater than four (4) meters shall be planted within the right-of-way. • Tree roots must not interfere with the pipeline. • A minimum of five (5) meters between all groups of trees/shrubs will be established. A group is defined as 3-5 trees/shrubs. • Irrigation systems are not permitted within TCPL's right-of-way	Noted.
8	Original depth of cover over the pipelines within TCPL's right-of-way shall be maintained after construction. This depth of cover over the pipelines shall not be compromised due to rutting, erosion or other means. Grades of properties bordering the right-of-way must match the existing grades at the edge of the right-of-way	Noted.
9	Facilities shall be constructed to ensure drainage is directed away from the right-of-way so that erosion that would adversely affect the depth of cover over the pipelines does not occur	Noted
10	Should pooling of water or erosion occur on the right-of-way as a result of any facility installation or landscaping, the owner will be responsible for the remediation of the pooling or erosion to TCPL's satisfaction	Noted.
11	Any large scale excavation adjacent to the right-of-way, which is deeper than the bottom of the pipe, must maintain a slope of 3:1 away from the edge of the right-of-way.	Noted
12	Mechanical excavation within 1.5 meters of the edge of TCPL's pipeline is prohibited. Hand or hydrovac excavation must be utilized within this distance	Noted

Comment #	Comment	Response
13	In the event that TCPL's pipelines experience contact damage or other damage as a result of construction, stop work immediately and notify TCPL at once	Noted.
14	All display plans in the lot/home sales office shall identify the TCPL pipeline right-of-way corridor within the proposed linear park block(s)	Noted.
15	The Owner shall include notice of the following in all offers of purchase and sale: • notice of the easement agreement registered against the property which may affect development activities on the property; • notice of the 30m Prescribed Area as regulated by the CER Act; • the number of high pressure natural gas pipelines within the easement and the location of the easement in relation to the development; • the setback for all permanent structures and excavations from the limits of the right-of-way; and, • the local One Call number 1-800-400-2255 or www.clickbeforeyoudig.com	Noted.
16	The owner shall ensure through all contracts entered into, that all contractors and subcontractors are aware of and observe the foregoing terms and conditions	Noted.
17	In addition to the current zoning regulations, which restrict swimming pools within 3 metres of the edge of the pipeline right-of-way we request the following additional setback be implemented in the Zoning By-law Amendment: *"Permanent buildings and structures, driveways and parking areas shall be setback 7 metres from the edge of the pipeline right-of-way. All accessory structures including retaining walls shall have minimum 3 metre setback from the edge of the pipeline right-of way."*	Noted.
City of Burlington Parks and Open Space (Park Dedication Comments) January 25, 2021		
1	The subject lands are zoned Major Parks & Open Space (4 parcels), Residential Medium Density (1 parcel). The Major Parks and Open Space lands are privately owned and are not included in the City of Burlington's calculation of parkland provisioning levels.	Noted.
2	Parkland dedication will be a condition of approval.	Noted.
3	Parkland dedication for Site A through D will be calculated at 5% (low density residential) of the land area in accordance with Official Plan Policies and current Park Dedication Policies and By-law	Noted.
4	There will be preference to establish one public park block from land dedicated through Sections A through D	Noted.

Comment #	Comment	Response
5	Parkland dedication for Site E will be calculated in accordance with current City Park Dedication Policies and by-law using the alternative rate of 1ha/300 units to establish aconnection and amenity space from Dundas Street to the Hydro corridor	Noted.
6	Hazard lands will not be taken as parkland dedication	Noted.
7	The City will require the hazard lands as defined by Conservation Halton be conveyed tothe City as identified in Official Plan Policies. • Part II – 2.11.3 g) g) As a condition of development approval, the City will normally require the dedication of the greater of the regulatory floodplain, or the valley through whichthe watercourse flows including a conservation setback from top of bank, regulatory floodplain, or meander belt width. Dedication of these lands shall not be considered part of parkland dedication requirements of The Planning Act, unless the dedicated lands provide needed public recreational opportunities as identified by the City. If any such land remains in private ownership, it will be protected by zoning, agreement or easement to protect the ecologic and floodplain function of such land.	It is the intention of the applicant to dedicate the hazard lands and 7.5m setback to the City within Area A.
8	Public parkland should be free of encumbrances such as parking structures and will face onto a public street and hydro corridor. However, the City is willing to discuss with the applicant the possibility of privately owned, publicly accessible space	Noted.
9	Development charges will be a requirement for park development and the establishment of the multiuse trail along the hydro corridor, along with a bridge over Appleby Creek	Noted.
10	Parks Design & Construction support the Millcroft Greens Conceptual Open Space (October 2020) plan for a multi-use trail and bridge along the Hydro One corridor as an extension of the existing multi-use trail that currently ends at Berwick Drive and for a trail loop connecting Sections A & B	Noted.
11	If the road system proposed in Section A & B are not municipal roads, an agreement will be required to ensure the sidewalk connections are open to the public	Noted.
City of Burlington, Engineering Services, Accessibility Coordinator Comments January 27, 2021		
1	Proposed Site Statistics show 26 surface parking spaces proposed with 1 barrier free (bf) space shown. Through the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation, Design of Public Spaces Standards, 2 spaces are	All details related to the design of the site and building have been noted and where possible incorporated. All of the issues will be taken into consideration prior to making a site plan submission and building permit application

Comment #	Comment	Response
	required. One space shall be “Type A” being 3400 mm in width. The remaining space shall be “Type B” being 2750 mm as per the city zoning by-law. Access aisles shall be 2000 mm as per the city by-law.	
2	Locate the bf visitor parking on the shortest barrier free path of travel to the principal entrance, without the need to pass through vehicular traffic.	All details related to the design of the site and building have been noted and where possible incorporated. All of the issues will be taken into consideration prior to making a site plan submission and building permit application
3	Detail 4A1.2 is incorrect. Please adjust to the correct dimensions of 3400 mm for Type A parking space and revise language from 'handicap' to accessible or barrier free.	All details related to the design of the site and building have been noted and where possible incorporated. All of the issues will be taken into consideration prior to making a site plan submission and building permit application
4	The proposed plan shows 7 bf parking spaces. It appears there is the intention to provide both Type A and Type B spaces. All bf spaces should be positioned so that theyare as close as possible to the elevator lobby and avoiding the need to pass through vehicular traffic.	All details related to the design of the site and building have been noted and where possible incorporated. All of the issues will be taken into consideration prior to making a site plan submission and building permit application
5	The access aisle to the elevator lobby is not dimensioned and appears to be tight, especially for a person using a mobility device. The access aisle to the elevator lobbyshould be increased.	All details related to the design of the site and building have been noted and where possible incorporated. All of the issues will be taken into consideration prior to making a site plan submission and building permit application
6	The Open Space Plan, including proposed multi-use trails, recreational trails, boardwalks and other exterior paths of travel not captured by the Ontario Building Codewill be subject to the requirements of the AODA Design of Public Space Standards where applicable.	Noted.
CN Rail (provided by WSP)		
CN - May 27, 2021 Email		
With regards to sites C, D, E, CN Rail does not have any comments with regards to these sites since they are located outside our 300m concern zone from CN's Main line right of way. For site A&B, CN Rail recommends the municipality to pursue the implementation of the following criteria as conditions of an eventual project approval:		
1	Safety setback of habitable buildings from the railway rights-of-way to be a minimum of 30 metres in conjunction with a safety berm. The safety berm shall be adjoining and parallel to the railway rights-of-way withreturns at the ends, 2.5 metres above grade at the property line, with side slopes not steeper than 2.5 to 1	Noted.
2	The Owner shall install and maintain a chain link fence of minimum 1.83 metre height along the mutual propertyline	Noted.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment	Response
3	The Owner shall engage a consultant to undertake an analysis of noise (dwellings within 150 metres). At a minimum, a no se attenuation barrier shall be adjoining and parallel to the railway rights-of-way, having returnsat the ends, and a minimum total height of 5.5 metres above t op-of-rail. Acoustic fence to be constructed without openings and of a durable material weighing not less than 20 kg. per square metre of surface area. Subject to the review of the noise report, the Railway may consider other measures recommended by an approved Noise Consultant	Noted.
4	Ground-borne vibration transmission to be evaluated in a report through site testing to determine if dwellings within 75 metres of the railway rights-of-way will be impacted by vibration conditions in excess of 0.14 mm/sec RMS between 4 Hz and 200 Hz. The monitoring system should be capable of measuring frequencies between 4Hz and 200 Hz, ±3 dB with an RMS averaging time constant of 1 second. If in excess, isolation measures will be required to ensure living areas do not exceed 0.14 mm/sec RMS on and above the first floor of the dwelling	Noted.
5	The following clause should be inserted in all development agreements, offers to purchase, and agreements of Purchas e and Sale or Lease of each dwelling unit within 300m of the railway right-of-way: "Warning: Canadian National Railway Company or its assigns or successors in interest has or have a right s-of -way within 300 metres from the land the subject hereof. There may be alterations to or expansions of the railway facilities on such rights-of-way in the future including the possibility that the railway or its assigns or successors as aforesaid may expand its operations, which expansion may affect the living environment of the residents in the vicinity, notwithstanding the inclusion of any noise and vibration attenuating measures in the design of the development and individual dwelling(s). CNR will not be responsible for any complaints or claims arising from use of such facilities and/ or operations on, over or under the aforesaid rights-of-way."	Noted.
6	Any proposed alterations to the existing drainage pattern affecting railway property must receive prior concurrence from the Railway and be substantiated by a drainage report to the satisfaction of the Railway.	Noted
7	In the event of the proposal moving forward, CN will be seeking to enter into a development agreement with the owner, the registration of an environmental easement	Noted.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	on title, as well as a warning clause. (phases A&B)	
CN - May 28, 2021 Email		
1	With regards to my comment on point 7, within a development agreement there will be easements granted in favor of CN on all dwellings and private lots located within 30mm of CN ROW with regards to rail line operational noise and vibration emissions. To be more specific: • The Owner shall through restrictive covenants to be registered on title and all agreements of purchase and sale or lease provide notice to the public that the safety berm, fencing and vibration isolation measures implemented are not to be tampered with or altered and further that the Owner shall have sole responsibility for and shall maintain these measures to the satisfaction of CN. • The Owner shall enter into an Agreement with CN stipulating how CN's concerns will be resolved and will pay CN's reasonable costs in preparing and negotiating the agreement. • The Owner shall be required to grant CN an environmental easement for operational noise and vibration emissions, registered against the subject property in favour of CN.	Noted
2	Lastly, for CN to determine the conformity of the safety mitigation measures before the approval of the project, the following information may be illustrated on a preliminary site plan. This preliminary site plan, the mitigation measures derived from the N&V report and the design of the SWMF will be integrated to the development agreement to be signed by the applicant. • The location, height and slopes of the safety berm; • The location and height of the safety fence; • The 30m safety setback offset line from CN ROW	Noted.
Burlington Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021		
1	The Millcroft Greens development represents a significant reduction in the amount of greenspace withinthe Millcroft community and the City of Burlington. This development, as proposed, would create residential infill on five land areas currently utilized by the Millcroft golf course. This infill would result in a substantial loss of open space and the removal of almost 400 trees. While a landscaping and tree replacement plan is proposed, open space will be permanently lost. Further, development area E will replace land currently occupied by the golf course maintenance yard. To remain operational, the maintenance facilities would have to be relocated resulting in a further loss of green space. The City of Burlington should seriously review the precedence of this proposal in light of guaranteed preservation ofland areas previously designated open space, parkland and greenspace	It is important to differentiate between public open space and private open space. The Millcroft Golf Course, while used by the neighbourhood as public open space (i.e., golf cart pathways are used as trails) the property is privately owned and operated and is not public open space. For further discussion on this matter please refer to the PJR Addendum As part of the proposed development, the online irrigation pond will be taken offline and the low flow channel through this reach will be re-instated, another positive benefit to the natural heritage system in this area. The existing online irrigation pond currently receives stormwater from the adjacent development lands with no treatment prior to its release to the Appleby Creek. The proposed development removes stormwater discharge from the pond, treating the water on-site within underground tanks and oil/grit separators, thereby

Comment #	Comment	Response
		improving the water quality discharging to the creek as compared to existing conditions. This is another significant benefit to the system.
2	The original design of the Millcroft golf course located a number of fairways and water retention ponds along the course of Appleby Creek and Sheldon Creek. This design offered community flood protection with ponds and fairways accepting surges in flood waters in the event of a severe storm. Proposed development area A deviates from this design. Lots 1 through 18 of development area A encroach on the current flood line of Appleby Creek and the millpond. The development proposal suggests grading to raise these lots above the flood line. However, this design would restrict the channel of Appleby Creek in the area which may increase flooding risk in the area as well as upstream reaches of the creek. It is suggested that studies be done to determine redevelopment of area A does not pose a flooding riskin the event of a 100 year storm or greater. Landscaping plans for the area should also consider that trees and shrubs in a water course may further restrict storm water flow.	We trust that the City provided the SDC with a copy of Urbantech's FSR. Within that document it is demonstrated that the proposed cut and fill within the flood plain will not have an impact on the flood elevations upstream, downstream or adjacent to the proposed fill placement. CH regulatory policy does not permit such an increase in flood elevations and, as such, the proposed development in Area A was designed accordingly. The flood plain modelling has included the anticipated future vegetative condition of the flood plain. This is also a requirement of CH. The development in Area A is consistent with the approach to flood plain management throughout the remainder of the Millcroft community (i.e., lots are outside of the flood plain and development does not cause an increase to flood elevations elsewhere).
3	The Hydrological Assessment report by Burnside estimates the development of open space to residential areas decrease land permeability with runoff increasing by 30% in development area A to nearly 50% in development areas B, C and D. Suggested mitigation measures would grade yards with a minimum of 300mm topsoil and discharge of roof leaders into top soil. These measures would reduce runoff by an estimated 25%. The remainder of runoff would be collected by storm sewers.	No response required.
4	Residents in the Millcroft area have significant concerns about the potential for flooding as occurred on August 4, 2014. At that time the existing golf course was able to act as a buffer for surrounding properties and nearby creeks to reduce the impact of the excess waterflow. Implementation of the application could lead to even greater flooding risk/impact within Millcroft and on downstream watercourses and infrastructure which in turn could create additional downstream flooding risks.	Please see response to SDC Comment 2. Through the provision of stormwater management for the proposed development areas, there is no increased risk to flooding within Millcroft or downstream.
5	The primary form of development for areas A-D is cul-de-sac. While the road infrastructure will be a condominium element, all other municipal services will require significantly more infrastructure, servicing requirements and maintenance per dwelling than is typical even for the most suburbanized communities. We have concerns about road and sidewalk maintenance and the need to ensure condominium ownership is able to maintain infrastructure to city standards. A proposed layout with homes on one side of the street will add significant financial cost to the delivery of many city services including water, sewer, storm water and waste management over the life of the development	No response required.

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

<table>
<tr><th>Comment #</th><th>Comment</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td>Development area C is proposed for open space currently used as a path between fairways 10 and 11 of the Millcroft golf course. It would appear that if area C is developed, access between fairways 10 and 11 will pass through the community. Such a configuration would at best afford a privacy, security and traffic annoyance to the community. It is recommended that an alternate pathway around the community be considered</td><td>Noted. Could the SDC advise as to the sustainable development concerns that this raises? The current golf course exists within the community today. Golf carts and/or walking golfers will pass through Block C on a walkway block every 10 to 12 minutes. We do not agree that this will provide for traffic annoyance and privacy and security concerns on a short cul-de-sac. The alternate would be to run the pathway in between existing backyards and new backyards which we felt would be more of an annoyance to both existing and new homeowners and could definitely present security issues after hours.</td></tr>
<tr><td>7</td><td>The proposal will only increase the amount of traffic and resultant GHG emissions generated in what is already a very automobile dependent neighborhood. As presented there is very little to support the application from a sustainability lens and there remain several concerns. There is insufficient detail provided at this point for SDC to consider supporting this application.</td><td>From a traffic operations perspective the projected number of trips generated by the proposed redevelopment has a minimal impact on the traffic operations of the neighborhood. The current concept plans offer access to other modes of transportation and connect into the existing sidewalks and multi-use paths in the area.</td></tr>
<tr><td>8</td><td>The SDC would welcome discussions with the developer to consider how the sustainability of the application could be enhanced. In the meantime the SDC encourages the developer to review the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines and seek to implement these guidelines as best practices to enhance the sustainability of their application</td><td>Noted.</td></tr>
<tr><td>9</td><td><table><tr><th>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES</th><th>COMMENTS</th></tr><tr><td>1. Recognize the interdependenceof humans and the rest of nature in a common ecosystem; seek to prevent and reverse degradation of the earth, air, water, plants andanimals by human activity.</td><td>Use a Low Impact Design approach to storm watermanagement

Use of sustainable practices to manage construction waste</td></tr></table></td><td>1. Biofiltration LID measures are proposed for Areas A & B as referenced in Area A-D FSR Section 4.6.2.

Management of construction waste would be addressed through a condition of draft plan approval, if necessary.</td></tr>
</table>

Millcroft Greens 2nd Submission
Comment/Response Matrix – April 2022
CH Comments – April 16, 2021
City Comments – Site Engineering (Non-SWM) – May 14, 2021; Burlington Transportation Planning – May 7, 2021; Burlington Landscaping – May 21, 2021; Burlington Fire – May 6, 2021; Burlington Transit – May 6, 2021; Burlington Parks & Open Space – January 25, 2021; Burlington Engineering Services Accessibility – January 27, 2021; CN Rail – May 27 and 28, 2021; Sustainable Development Committee – May 28, 2021
Region of Halton Comments – April 23, 2021 and November 10, 2021
Hydro One – January 12, 2021

Comment #	Comment		Response
	2. Recognize the urgency of climate change and take measuresto reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt.	For Area E: the Developer has not provided information on design elements to encourage the conservation of energy. The building should be designed and built to help Burlington to achieve its goal of being net carbon neutral. SDC recommends: • Construction of a very efficient building shell • Incorporation of passive solar design elements • Reduction in the use of energy through efficientfixtures and appliances, and • Individual energy metering of each unit • Use of wood materials certified by FSC • Minimized use of construction materials containingVOCs A major goal of this development should be to encourage residents to use forms of transportation other than their automobiles. SDC supports the developer's plans to include 74 bicycle parking spaces within the area E development. SDC encourages the developer to also consider: • Reduced parking spaces • Providing ample electric vehicle charging capacity • Providing an on-site vehicle sharing program • Incorporating a "lay-by" area in the site plan • Providing one-year transit (bus) passes for newresidents	2. Thank you for the input. These comments can be considered at the site plan stage.

<table>
<tr><th>Comment #</th><th>Comment</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>3. Promote conservation, stewardship and responsible use of resources. Discourage processes and practices that resultin natural resources being consumed at a rate faster than they can be replenished.</td><td>For Area E: The SDC would like to see reference to:
Commitment to installation of energy efficientappliances (if provided)
Efficient use of water including grey water reusesystems, and water retention and rainwater harvesting capabilities
Use of native species, drought resistant and low maintenance landscaping elements throughout thedevelopment</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. Discourage the production anduse of persistent and harmful substances. Reinforce proper disposal practices for such substances</td><td>Developer needs to provide a detailed plan for the management, recycling and disposal of construction waste</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. Affirm and promote practices that provide a safe and healthy environment and build resilience,and engage our community in notonly meeting the economic and social needs of all citizens but enhancing quality of life.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>3. These items can be addressed at site plan stage.

4. This item can be addressed at site plan stage.

5. No response required.</td></tr>
<tr><td>10</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES</th><th>COMMENTS</th></tr>
<tr><td>a. Leadership: Take a leadership position onsustainability issue both within and outside the City of Burlington. Recognize that our local actions can have global implications.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>b. Protection and Enhancement of Natural Features: Protect and enhance Burlington’s natural features to ensure that shorelines, natural water courses, wetlands, flood plains, woodlands and forestry tracts, as well as notable landmarks such as the Niagara Escarpment, are preserved for future generations. Improve the connectivity of natural features to enhance the natural heritage system. Preserve habitat to maintainand increase biodiversity and</td><td>The developer needs to ensure the application recognizes and addresses the potential for increased flooding risk as a result of changes being made to the natural (e.g. Appleby Creek) and manmade water flow system throughout the area. The design needs to take into account both the flooding risk in the immediate area and the impact on downstream watercourses and infrastructure.
Developer needs to provide a comprehensive protection, restoration and enhancement planthat</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>a. No response required.

b. Flood risk has been addressed in Urbantech’s Area A-D FSR Section 4.5.4. Beacon’s EER has demonstrated no negative impacts to the natural heritage system (the PPS test that must be demonstrated). While there is no policy requirement to demonstrate a net gain, transitioning Area A from an active, manicured golf course hole to a natural valley feature will result in a benefit to the natural heritage system. Monitoring will likely be a draft plan condition of approval.</td></tr>
</table>

Comment #	Comment		Response
	protect species at risk.	demonstrates a net gain for natural heritage system areas. The plan needs to include management and monitoring plans.	c. No response required.
	c. **Protection of Natural Resources:** Sustainably manage and protect natural resources such as water, minerals and fertilelands. Reverse degradation of natural resources when feasible.		d. These can be addressed at the site plan stage.
	d. **Responsible Use of Natural Resources:** Reduce the consumption of natural resourcesand ensure users are responsible for the full local costs of services such as water, electricity and sanitary sewers. Provide educational programs to encourage conservation of natural resources and increase awareness of the full costs of services.	Provide fixtures and appliances that conserve water. Use of native species, drought resistant and low maintenance landscaping elements	e. These can be addressed at the site plan stage or as a condition of approval.
	e. **Waste Reduction:** Reduce waste generation and increase resource recovery.Minimize waste in designing, building, operating, renovating, demolishing and re- purposing buildings.	The Developer should consider ways to reduce resource usage, such as using recycled buildingmaterials. The Developer should ensure that proper recycling methods and facilities are available for residential tenants. This should include organic waste through the green bin program.	f. Tree replacement will be as per City requirements.
	f. **Greening of the City:** Promote the preservation, management and planting oftrees and other vegetation on private and public property within the City. Encouragethe use of native, non-invasive and diversespecies.	Existing trees should be preserved when possible. When this is not possible, the SDC requests compliance with tree replacement requirements in Section 9.4 of the Site Plan Application Guidelines for planting of equivalent caliper diameter at another site that will be paid for by cash in lieu.	g. Noted.
	g. **Natural Features and Green Space:** Ensure natural features and greenspace are fundamental components of the City includingnew developments and redevelopments.	Consideration should be given to providing community garden space for residents in area E.	h. No response required

Comment #	Comment			Response
	h. **Superior Neighbourhood Design:** Make land-use decisions considering the natural features, site characteristics and location relative to employment, transportation and amenities. Apply an ecosystem approach to assess the impacts of development and ensure environmental integrity, diversity andresiliency. Create vibrant, equitable communities that are healthy, walkable and transit supportive.			i. No response required.
	i. **Sense of community:** Create sustainable and appropriate forms of development that reflect the human scale, promote a sense of community, and connect and integrate urban development natural surroundings.			j. Noted.
	j. **Neighbourhood Connectivity:** Promote community development where residents can easily access necessities and amenities, such as housing, employment, locally produced food, retail, green spaces, education, recreation, and arts and culture through active transportation or transit.	Providing additional cycling/walking paths connecting residents to key Neighborhood destinations (e.g. Millcroft Park, Shops and offices at Highway 5 and Walkers etc.) would be supportive of complete communities and would encourage active transportation.		k. Noted.
	k. **Sustainable Transportation System:** Prioritize walking, cycling and transit and make the best use of the existing road systemfor the safe movement of goods and people. Support multi-modal connectivity within the City and with neighbouring municipalities.	For Area E: There should be a lay-by area to allow taxis/ride sharing businesses to pick up and drop off residents. The SDC recommends the Developer provide for an on-site car-sharing program and consider the provision of one-year transit (bus) passes for new residents.		l. No response required
	l. **Efficient Urban Design:** Increase the efficiency of land use in the urban communitywith the goal of reducing greenhouse gas and other air emissions and provide efficient, well-connected route for active transportation and transit. Promote urban intensification and development policies, rather than suburbanpolicies that generate sprawl.			m. Refer to Sustainability Comment Response 9.1 Note, proposed LID measures and a stormwater quality monitoring plan will be required as a condition of draft plan approval. As outlined in the FSR, the stormwater management plan ensures that there is not a flood risk in the immediate area or downstream.

Comment #	Comment		Response
	m. **Natural Storm Water Management:** Protect water courses in their natural state and encourage the restoration of water courses that have been degraded. Encouragelow impact development design and use of best practices to improve storm water qualityand reduce the quantity storm water sent to traditional storm water infrastructure.	Developer needs to embrace the use of LID design and a storm water quality monitoring plan to reduce the significant flood risk in the immediate area and the impact on downstream water courses and infrastructure.	n. Noted. These items can be addressed at site plan.
	n. **Energy Conservation, Efficiency and Generation:** Promote net zero carbon energy generation and usage. Increase energy conservation through efficient land use planning and building design. Encourage sustainable local thermal and electrical energygeneration and the supporting distribution network. Adopt low emission forms of transportation. Take all opportunities to switch from fossil fuel to renewable and electricity-based technologies.	For area E: SDC recommends: • Construction of a very efficient building shell • Incorporation of passive solar design elements • Reduction in the use of energy through efficient fixtures and appliances, and • Individual energy metering of each unit The developer should provide electric vehicle charging stations and consider inclusion of larger bicycle parking spaces for cargo or utility bicycles in designated parking areas.	o. No response required. p. No response required.
	o. **Agriculture and Food:** Promote policies that improve long-term food security with sustainable local agriculture in urban and ruralcommunities. Increase the supply of local, accessible, affordable, culturally diverse and nutritious food. Protect agricultural land fromloss and fragmentation.	.	
	p. **Healthy Lifestyles:** Promote and support healthy and active lifestyles through the development of complete neighborhoods, active transportation infrastructure, recreational facilities and parks.		q. Acknowledged. No response required.

Comment #	Comment		Response
	q. **Community Engagement:** Seek and encourage public participation and education,and, consider public input in city decision- making. The economic, environmental and social aspects of proposed developments should be considered. Decisions should address all aspects and build consensus among stakeholders.	The Developer is encouraged to ensure that the project is supportive of Halton Region's Comprehensive Housing Strategy and is in the alignment with the housing objective 86(26) of the Halton Region Official Plan: "Seek development opportunities for Assisted and Affordable Housing in Intensification Areas where public transit, retail and other facilities are readily accessible."	r. No response required. s. No response required.
	r. **Evaluation of Development:** Continuously monitor and evaluate community development to assess its sustainability in relation to social, environmental or economicimpacts.		
	s. **Sustainability Assessment:** To assess progress towards sustainability, the City ofBurlington should prepare a performance review of the entire municipality at regularintervals and develop and implement an action plan based on the findings.		
11	**<u>Summary of Above Discussion and Recommendations/Action Items</u>**: The proposed development should be further enhanced by addressing issues such as: • Impact of the development on local and downstream water flow systems and the potential for increased risk of flooding • Design elements to improve the sense of community • Design elements to promote active transportation • Design elements to reduce the use of energy and reduce GHG emissions • Enhancing TDM measures e.g.: o Information package available to residents; on site car share provided by the development; one-year transit (bus) passes provided to residents; bicycle storage and parking space available on site; creation of a lay-by space to allowfor pick up/drop off of residents • Providing a portion of the units as affordable/accessible housing • Ensuring that trees removed from the site are replaced (with equivalent caliper) on the site or elsewhere in the community • Within area E the developer has an opportunity to create a building that can set a standard for new developments by incorporating sustainable practices and LEED levelcomponents such as:		Please see responses to comments above.

Comment #	Comment	Response
	– Use of recycled building materials – Use of heat pumps – The use of effective recycling and waste facilities on-site SDC cannot be supportive of this development without further information such as: developer'splans for flood mitigation and storm water management (e.g. 100 year storm flood plain analysis for portion of Appleby Creek as affected by development of Area A), preservation and restoration of natural heritage systems, traffic and active transportation impacts, landscaping, construction waste management and impacts on the cost of providing and maintaining city services and infrastructure. **<u>Future Site Plan & Building Permit Considerations:</u>** The City of Burlington has approved the Sustainable Building and Development Guidelines. The Committee recommends that the applicant consider the Guidelines in this application. Many of the items identified in the Guidelines are implemented through site plan and/or building permitapproval, after a development proposal has received an Official Plan amendment and/or zoningby-law amendment, however, to ensure the design of sustainability features can be incorporated, the SDC recommends these items be given consideration at this early stage in theprocess. A full copy of the Guidelines can be downloaded at: https://www.burlington.ca/en/services-for-you/resources/Planning_and_Development/Official_Plan/Proposed-OP/18-304-PB-Sustainable-Building-and-Development-Guidelines-WEB_April-2018.pdf	