

Attachment 1

Public Meeting Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: Blue Meadows

File No: P3162 & P3163

Public Meeting Date: July 11, 2022

Comments Received By:	Comments/Concerns/Questions Summary:
AGENCY COMMENTS	
Blue Water District School Board (BDSB)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BDSB requires conditions to be included as part of the draft plan approval which relate to the availability of accommodation within a public school operated by BDSB, that student busing is at the discretion of Student Transportation Service Consortium of Grey-Bruce, and that if school buses are required within the subdivision in accordance with Board Transportation policies school bus pick up points will generally be located on the through street at a location determine by the Student Transportation Service Consortium of Grey Bruce.
Canada Post	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The completed development project will be serviced by centralized mail delivery provided through Canada Post Community Mailboxes and will apply to buildings of 3 or more self-contained units within a common indoor area. The developer will be required to install a mail panel and provide access to Canada Post subject to several conditions.
Ontario Lands	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is Enbridge Gas Inc.'s request that as a condition of final approval that the owner/developer provide to Union the necessary easements and/or agreements required by Union for the provision of gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge.

EPCOR Standing Comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EPROC provided standard Standing Comments relating to servicing.
Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject property is regulated as a result of Little Beaver Creek. A permit is required from GSCA prior to any site alteration, construction, reconstruction or placing on building of any kind. 2. Overall, the GSCA is generally supportive of the approach to address water quality and runoff from the site. Some additional clarification and some re-design may be required. 3. The natural hazards associated with the lands include flood and erosion potential associated with Little Beaver Creek. A floodplain assessment was completed by the proponents consulting engineers, GSCA reviewed the report and are accepting of the findings of the study, the current Draft Plan has captured the hazards and an appropriate hazard zoning designation is proposed. 4. As the consulting engineers did not mention the drainage channel on the subject property that outlets the Little Beaver Creek. The GSCA is looking for confirmation that the drainage channel was considered in preparation of the reports. 5. The natural heritage features on the property include fish habitat, potential for significant wildlife habitat, and potential habitat for threatened or endangered species. An Environmental Impact Study was completed by the applicants and found fish habitat, unevaluated wetlands and valleylands. The study demonstrated no negative impacts on these features through the proposed development provided the mitigation measures are adhered to. 6. The landscape plan provided does not address revegetation at Block 5 & 23. Specific revegetation plans should be provided and for the storm sewer outlet within the valley. 7. The applicants are required to provide a detailed erosion and sediment control plan be prepared which reflect the recommendations in the EIS. 8. An Addendum to the EIS is required to reflect the review by a qualified fisheries ecologist regarding the storm sewer outlet into the valley once the detailed design for the storm sewer is proposed. 9. The proponents provided a geotechnical and supplemental hydrogeology study which was reviewed by the GSCA. The GSCA concludes that the presence of high groundwater levels should be addressed in the design of the stormwater management (SWM) facilities.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Relevant groundwater information should be included in the drawings for SWM. Indicate whether a liner is recommended and if not, why? The detailed recommendations from the geotechnical consultant should be included within the SWM design report. 11. The dry pond is smaller than the typical design standard. GSCA requires the estimated detention time and how TSS removal is being achieved with a dry pond that is smaller than required. 12. The designation side slope of the dry pond is recommended to be 4:1 or flatter, not 3:1.
Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HSM has reviewed the Plan of Subdivision and Zoning Amendment and has no objection or opposition to the proposed application.
Hydro One	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No comments or concerns at this time. For proposals affecting Low Voltage Distribution Facilities please consult your local distribution supplier.
Enbridge Gas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is Enbridge Gas Inc.'s request that as a condition of final approval that the owner/developer provide to Union the necessary easements and/or agreements required by Union for the provision of gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge
PUBLIC COMMENTS	
Joshua Gross & Emily Hoxford	<p>Area residents comments have been consolidated into themes including traffic, parking, recreation, open space, schools, water/sewer/stormwater servicing, density, and design, construction activity and other comments received.</p> <p>Traffic:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the Town considered the impact of traffic on Alice and other streets? 2. Concerns that additional traffic will cause noise on Alice Street West. 3. Will this development effect the flow of traffic in Thornbury overall? 4. Concerns with increase traffic on Highway 26 and the inability for pedestrians to cross the road at Highway 26.
John Van Der Ster	
Melissa Hutton	
Michael Richter & Janet Reekie	
Richard Lamperstofer	

**Robert Mitchell &
Marsha Mitchell**

Pamela Spence

5. Roundabouts should be implemented to smooth the increase of traffic at Beaver Street and Alice Street.
6. Suggested to implement amber lights in a place at a crossing and the speed limit to be reduced to 30 km per hour to facility safe crossing of the public.
7. Will Beaver Street be closed?
8. Traffic in the Town should be reduced greatly. Suggested to utilize Grey Road 40 to Owen Sound.
9. Encourage the Town to implement traffic calming mechanisms along Landsdowne Street such as speed bumps.

Open Space

10. The design incorporates minimal open space.
11. Require additional landscaping.
12. Maintenance of green space.

Accessibility

13. How will those with accessibility be able to access the rowhouses?

Affordability

14. The location of the development and size of the units is excellent for affordable housing.

Recreation

15. The Green Spaces are small and useless. Preference for larger green spaces by reducing the number of units.
16. Concerns that there is a lack if recreational components.

Nature Hertiage:

17. What effect will clearing the land have on the GSCA regulated area? Are there repercussions if Beaver Creek and the surrounding trees are harmed?
18. Encourage the developer to plant trees near the Beaver River and ensure a significant buffer between the units and the area surrounding the river to ensure minimal disruption.
19. Concerns about the impact of development on existing trees within the Plan of Subdivision.
20. Concerns regarding the proximity to Hazard lands.
21. Concerns regarding the quality of proposed trees to be planted and effects of existing trees and their roots.

Density

22. Too dense to fit within the surrounding community.
23. Support for the residential housing combination of condominiums, semi-detached and detached homes.
24. This site is an excellent location for high density development next to amenities like Foodland.

Character/Community

25. The design of the row houses is dense and bland.
26. Commercial building and the proposed residential units do not reflect the community.
27. Will these small units attract families?
28. The small size is similar to Short Term Rentals. We would not like that in our neighbourhood.
29. Concerns this development will change the density and design of the Town (heritage and building heights).
30. The character of the dwelling near the plan of subdivision is Italianate, 19th century, in the classical architectural style.

Design

31. The design is too dense and may disrupt the existing trees on the property located within the Plan of Subdivision.
32. The Open Space blocks should be visible from public street and illuminated for evening use.
33. Concerns about the compact design and the transition from the single detached dwelling units to rowhouses.
34. The Open Space block and Stormwater management facility should be integrated into one large open-space facility to achieve active recreation uses and passive recreation activities.
35. The Open Space and Stormwater management facility should be located away from Commercial designated lands to ensure greatest amount of non-residential floor area and resulting taxes for the Town.
36. Block 5 & 23 should be conveyed to the Town as non-parkland conveyances for walking trails.
37. There should be buffering between existing low density uses and higher density uses.

Water/Sewer/Stormwater Management

38. Has the Town reviewed the water and wastewater capacity?
Concerns that the existing water and wastewater capacity is not able to handle increase flows.
39. Concerns that water and wastewater systems are nearing capacity.
40. Will nearby homes who want to connect to sanitary services be provided the opportunity?

Height

41. Concerns that the 4th story would conflict with current by-laws.
42. Visual Impact of the development.
43. Concerns regarding the shadowing of the proposed rowhouses.

Land Use Plan

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Belief the an Official Plan Amendment is required to permit rowhouse dwelling types in the land use designation applied in the Official Plan. 3. Requests a full range of housing types and low density feel. <p>Parking</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 44. The provided number of parking spaces does not seem sufficient for the proposed number of units. 45. Concerns regarding the provision of visitor parking and overflow causing street parking. <p>Construction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 46. Concerns that the development activities will cause dust, noise, trash and disruptive construction workers. 47. Concerns that the timeline for construction will be lengthy. 48. Concerns about the track record of the developer and whether they will complete the development in a timely and tidy manner.
JULY 11, 2022 PUBLIC MEETINGS COMMENTS	
Deputy Mayor Bordignon, Mayor Soever, Councillor Matrosovs, Councillor Hope, Councillor Urim, Councillor Sampson, Councillor Abotts, CAO Shawn Evertt, Robert Mitchell, Lucy Richmond, Melissa Hutton	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why such an intense density? Concerns that it is a lot for the Town of Thornbury. 2. What is the square footage of the living space above the commercial space? 3. With regard to the Provincial Policy Statement, the development doesn't mention affordable housing, is there an idea of pricing of the units? 4. Does the proponent have a financial model for the development? 5. Concerns about the density and character. 6. Request more buffering. 7. Interested in green builds. 8. The 75 units are very small. Concerns that a couple could not live in this size. 9. Concerned that there isn't enough recreational area.

10. Concerned that too many single people will be living in the same dense place.
11. What can the developer do to protect the character of the dwelling within the subdivision? Requested additional buffering to protect its characteristics.
12. Requests a primary transit stop built into the Plan of Subdivision.
13. Concerns that Landsdowne and Alice will require upgrades and who is responsible?
14. Who is responsible for ensuring the stormwater management will appropriately convey the water from this Plan of Subdivision?
15. Need a balanced mix of housing that reflects the character of the existing town.
16. Where is the visitor parking for the rowhouses?
17. Concerns about the increase in traffic along Landsdowne.
18. Concerns about the developer managing a project of this size and scale.
19. Concerns regarding servicing and infrastructure.
20. Concerns regarding density. Want the single dwellings in this area to be recognized.
21. Small sized green space.
22. Concerns about the number of new students a development of this size could introduce. Concerns that the local school does not have capacity to accommodate additional new students.
23. Concerns about crossing the street with increase traffic a new development will bring.
24. Concerns that the commercial buildings and residential buildings will create shadow effects on the nearby residences.