

Public Meeting Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: 24 Alfred Street

File No: P3146 (Plan of Sub) P3195 (ZBA)

Public Meeting Date: September 19, 2022

Recommendation Report Date: July 2, 2024

Comments Received By:	Comments/Concerns/Questions Summary:	Staff Commentary
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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Plan Condition added.
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. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Plan Condition added.
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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Plan Condition added.

	for the provision of gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge.	
Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM)	1. HSM has reviewed the Plan of Subdivision and Zoning Amendment and have no objection or opposition to the proposed application.	1. Acknowledged.
Hydro One	1. No comments or concerns at this time. For proposals affecting Low Voltage Distribution Facilities please consult your local distribution supplier.	1. Acknowledged.
Enbridge Gas	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	1. Draft Plan Condition added.
Saugeen Ojibway Nation	1. This application requires further engagement with Saugeen Ojibway Nation. Please have the proponent reach out to us to initiate consultation.	1. Draft Plan Condition added.
Wendake	1. Thank you for your email. Could you please let us know if any archaeological studies or fieldwork will be necessary as part of this project?	2. Archaeological Assessment is required. Draft Plan Conditions Added.
Bell	<p>1. We have no objections to the application as this time. However, we hereby advise the Owner to contact Bell Canada during detailed design to confirm the provisioning of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development. We would also ask that the following paragraph be included as a condition of approval: "The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."</p> <p>2. It shall also be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada's existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be</p>	<p>1. Draft Plan Condition added.</p> <p>2. Draft Plan Condition added.</p>

	<p>required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.</p> <p>If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.</p>	
County of Grey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands are within the Primary Settlement Area and mapped constraints in the Intake Protection Zone and Events Based Area. 2. The subject property should be developed at a density at 20 units per net hectare. The proposal meets the required density. 3. Staff recommend the applicant investigate opportunities for providing a diversity in housing type. 4. Housing Services states that the County owns an apartment building with many seniors across the street and this is something to consider in the construction and design if looking at an entrance in that area. 5. Transportation Services states that there are no issues with the submitted drainage study and does not recommend a road access that enter onto the County Road based on the separation of intersections as access can be achieved from lower-tier roads and with the substandard road allowance width of approximately 16 metres it does not lend itself for the County to acquire daylight triangles for utilities and sight lines. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledged. 2. Acknowledged. 3. Draft Plan revisions have been considered. Single Detached and Semi-Detached are included. 4. Acknowledged. 5. Internal condominium road has been converted from two-way to one-way traffic only. Modification provides additional space for pedestrian traffic and snow storage. County Transportation has accepted this revision. Draft Plan Conditions included to confirm intersection design requirements. See also Staff Report for further commentary on the internal street.
PUBLIC COMMENTS		
Jennifer OBrien	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns regarding the planned access road and development. 2. I object to the plan. The street is not conducive to having a road building on the property. It will look odd and is not expected. 3. Additional traffic resulting from the development will create significantly more traffic. 4. Concerns regarding the lights shining into the neighbouring properties, and additional noise. Concerns that the development will be disruptive. 5. The traffic generated by the proposed development will be dangerous to neighbourhood children and pets. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Internal Condominium road has been modified. See also County Comment above and Staff Report. 2. Internal Condominium road has been reduced in width presenting an internal laneway appearance as compared to a municipal street. 3. Limited traffic volume will be generated by the development. Road design and connection points to local and county roads are deemed appropriate. 4. Additional lighting will result from this development and opportunities to reduce impacts can be considered through the required landscape plan.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The lot sizes in the development are not in keeping with the existing lot sizes in the surrounding neighbourhood. 7. The density is too high for the size of the site. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Limited traffic volume will be generated by the development. Road design and connection points to local and county roads are deemed appropriate 6. Existing lot sizes adjacent to the development site are large and would exceed the maximum lot sizes permitted by current policies. New development must be more compact, be more efficient in the use of land, and meet current policies. 7. The proposed density is at the lowest possible density permitted by the Official Plan. Minimum density requirements of the County Official Plan and Town Official Plan is set at 20 units per hectare. Based on the size and number of units proposed on the development site, a density of 20.48 units per hectare are provided.
Peter Butler	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about the impact of a T intersection across from Alice. Concerns about the impact of lights into the neighbouring properties. 2. Concerned about increased traffic on a busy road. Louisa is switching to a one way road. 3. Why concentrate development in an established neighbourhood. 4. Neighbors will be diminished privacy and property value. 5. Concerned about lead, arsenate and pesticides used to control insects in orchards and how it will endanger neighbors. 6. Concerned about an aquifer underground, and weeper systems causing flooding. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An existing dwelling is located opposite of the Alice Street access. Limited traffic volume is expected and no adverse impact of vehicle lights on neighbouring properties is expected. 2. Internal Condominium road has been modified. See also County Comment above and Staff Report. 3. Infill development is encouraged by County and Town policy to more efficiently use land and infrastructure to accommodate growth. 4. Privacy concerns have been received and a Draft Plan Condition added so that detail landscaping and fencing details can be completed before final acceptance. 5. A Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment have been completed and providing clearance on the site. The Phase I report considered the presence of pesticides and herbicides. The Phase II report including borehole testing and groundwater monitoring. The reports conclusions to not identify any issues, required remedial work, or other recommendations. It is also noted that Environmental monitoring of construction activities has been added as a Draft Plan Condition. 6. A detailed Geotechnical Report has been prepared identifying site conditions. Draft Plan Conditions

		have been added relating to grading, stormwater management, as well as details on construction methods.
Terry McWhirter	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about the development affecting privacy of my backyard. 2. Will being a corner lot have impacts on taxes and servicing? 3. Car lights will sweep through backyard and how will privacy be maintained? 4. Tree preservation, particularly with extensive root systems 5. An existing hedge is located on the property and provides privacy. Will this hedge be maintained? 6. Concerns regarding building heights and options to consider a lower height requirement. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The subject lands at 24 Alfred Street are identified for development. A Draft Plan Condition has been added to address privacy concerns with detailed landscaping and fencing designs to be completed before final acceptance.
Virginia Jamieson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about the Stormwater Management block and the proximity to my property and how it will affect the health of my family. 2. Concerned about the proposed development and how that will affect my pool. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed stormwater management techniques will be confirmed through detailed design and constructed in accordance with Town standards and best engineering practices. 2. Pool impacts are not anticipated as a result of the development of this project.
Karen & Glenn Goldenapple	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns regarding potential basement ground water issues for at least some of the proposed homes 2. Concerns regarding potential soil contamination as site is a former apple orchard that predates 1960's and therefore likely to contain arsenic from pesticides used back then 3. Concerns regarding density levels beyond reasonable for a land-locked in-town site 4. Concerns regarding heavy traffic implications for area residents and specifically potentially high frequency and volume of cars entering and leaving the condominium roadway directly across the street from my driveway and living room windows – very disturbing, especially with headlights shining into the windows after dark. 5. Concerns regarding visitor parking and whether there is any. 6. Suggests slab on grade to eliminate concerns regarding aquifer. 7. Do not support the proposed plan and requests that the county and town reject the plan. 8. Would prefer to see development of only 4-6 homes in keeping with the existing residential character. 9. Concerns regarding traffic congestion. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A detailed Geotechnical Report has been prepared identifying site conditions. Draft Plan Conditions have been added relating to grading, stormwater management, as well as details on construction methods. 2. A Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment have been completed and providing clearance on the site. The Phase I report considered the presence of pesticides and herbicides. The Phase II report including borehole testing and groundwater monitoring. The reports conclusions to not identify any issues, required remedial work, or other recommendations. It is also noted that Environmental monitoring of construction activities has been added as a Draft Plan Condition. 3. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 4. Traffic comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Visitor Parking has been considered in a redesign of the Draft Plan. See Staff Report for further commentary and drawings. 6. Geotechnical Report includes recommendations on groundwater levels and construction methods. 7. Acknowledged. 8. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 9. Traffic comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report.
Jacqueline Van Strien	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Irregular lot size/shape, need for an awkward internal road configuration, and presence of low density residential justifies a lower density from what is proposed. 2. Concerns over community character particular with the difference in lot sizes, and introduction of more permissive setbacks under the R2 zoning. 3. Concerns over lack of sidewalks and snow storage areas. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Irregular lot size/shape is acknowledged. Minimum density is provided while also meeting minimum density targets set by the County and Town. 2. Draft Plan and Zoning By-law revisions are presented in the Staff Report to reinforce community character, maintain consistent lot development requirements. 3. Internal road design modifications are incorporated in the latest draft plan design. Sidewalks are not proposed.
Mike Gillis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requests notice on project updates and decisions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledged.
Michele Vaugan, Renato Alessandrini	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns over density and the introduction of semi-detached units in an area of single detached dwellings. 2. Concerns over parking, space available in driveways, and pedestrian traffic. This concern increases in winter with snow storage taking additional space 3. Inadequate buffers between new development and existing homes 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 2. Recommendations are provided on Draft Plan modifications to include visitor parking. Internal street has been modified to increase snow storage areas. 3. A preliminary landscape plan including privacy fencing has been provided by the Owner. Further details are required under the Draft Plan Conditions
Bruce and Charlene Stewart	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns over density and the introduction of semi-detached units in an area of single detached dwellings. 2. Would like to receive background growth data as required by the Official Plan. 3. Development represents an over-intensification of the existing neighbourhood. 4. Supports the use of the R1-1 zone and single detached dwellings across the site. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 2. Growth Data is available as part of the Official Plan 5-Year review. Growth estimates to 2046 are provided in the Growth Allocations paper available on the project website. 3. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 4. Staff recommendation is to apply the R1-1 zone with exceptions to also permit Semi-Detached dwellings.

<p>Liz Johnston Shelagh Fox Michael Arkless Gillian Arkless Virginia Jamieson Glenn Stewart Karen Newton Mike Gillis Jacqueline Boland Stephanie Fletch Paul Fletcher Michelle Green Denise Hall Pat Hall Burce Stewart Charlene Steward Kelly Nichols Andrea Nichols Marylee Hethrington Glenn Donley Margo Boyd Mike Boyd</p>	<p>1. Neighbourhood circulated letter noting the following concerns and signed by / on-behalf of the listed residents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate Density • Inappropriate Lot Size • Limited Environmental Site Assessments • Potential Environmental Hazards • Diminished Road Safety • Limited Traffic Study and Planning • Limited Geotechnical Investigation Report • Inappropriate Storm Water Management Plan • No Environmental Impact Study • Diminishing Neighborhood Character • Inaccurate Site Plan • Compromised Privacy • Light Pollution • Lack of Landscape Plan • Height of Proposed Residential Buildings • Lack of Architectural Details • Need for Forested Setbacks • Inappropriate Topsoil Storage 	<p>1. Comments are general in nature and have been addressed in this document and Staff Report. It is noted that an Environmental Study on the health and retention of butternut trees on site has been completed and that a preliminary landscape plan has been provided by the Owner with further details to be confirmed as a Draft Plan Condition.</p>
<p>Don Parks</p>	<p>1. Concerns over the proposed stormwater drainage design. 2. Requests that access be provided via Alfred Street only. 3. Density is too high. 4. Requests ability to negotiate and/or purchase portions of the 24 Alfred Street site for privacy and landscaping purposes. 5. Tree Preservation to be considered, particularly on town owned lands in north-west area.</p>	<p>1. Stormwater design has been accepted at the concept level. Further engineering review is required to confirm final design details. 2. Traffic comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 3. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 4. Owner and Applicant can complete negotiations outside of Town Staff. Staff noting that lot boundary adjustments are subject to Council approval, public process and staff recommendations. 5. Trees located on Town Lands are not permitted to be removed without first obtaining a permit from the Town.</p>
<p>Lorraine Sutton</p>	<p>1. Supports the increase in density based on location. 2. Consideration for a parkette in lieu of a residential unit should be given</p>	<p>1. Acknowledged. 2. Based on the proposed density, Staff are recommending cash-in-lieu.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Recommend converting entire development to semi-detached or multi-level dwellings as these unit types can be built more sustainable and attainable compared to single detached. 4. Would like to see green development standards imposed on this development recognizing the proclaimed climate change emergency 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Acknowledged, however this concept is not proposed at this time. 4. The Town is working to develop Green Development Standards in the future.
Brenda Murphy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns over the proposed density 2. Concerns over property values, particularly during nuisance years of construction 3. Consider revising plans to a maximum of 7 or 8 homes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. 2. Property values are not addressed as part of this document or Staff Report. 3. Density comments have been commented on earlier in this document and in the Staff Report.
Matt Distefano	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposes the development with Concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage • Protection of trees • Sight lines and privacy • Construction debris and noise • Vernacular design • Fit with the long term urban plan for Thornbury • Property values • Adjustment on tax rates due to property value change • Independent legal and civil engineering reviews 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments have been addressed earlier in this document and in the Staff Report. Legal and Engineering reviews are completed by Town Staff or on behalf of Town Staff.
Catherine Milne	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requests notice and decisions on this development. 2. Concerned about impacts on town character. 3. Concerns about parking and traffic, no sidewalks, overflow parking, snow clearance, access, appropriateness of the Traffic Study provided. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledged. 2. Character has been addressed earlier in this document and Staff Report. 3. Concerns has been addressed earlier in this document and Staff Report.
Rob Robinson Kim Robinson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about destruction of enjoyment of personal property. 2. Concerns about traffic, parking, winter parking, snow storage, sightlines in and out at Alfred Street, emergency vehicle access, illegal parking (particularly in winter), lighting, loss of property value, removal of trees, impacts to aquifer, character, on-site signage. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledged. 2. Concerns has been addressed earlier in this document and Staff Report.
Peggy Holden	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identifying need for new sewer/water upgrades, doctors in our area (hoping the new housing will support staff housing) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New services will be installed on site. existing services will be used off-site. it being noted that

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Opposes development as Town does not have endless supply of resources. 	<p>some area road/servicing improvements are ongoing in the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Acknowledged.
Peter Butler Catherine Butler	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Opposes the development with concerns regarding road layout, traffic, availability of other development sites, property values, impacts of orchard use and potential for pesticides, impacts on aquifer. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns has been addressed earlier in this document and Staff Report.
Andrea Nicholls	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about the loss of an existing mature black walnut tree located on and adjacent to the site 2. Concerned about the proposed height and loss of privacy 3. What is the plan for greenspace? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landscape Plan indicates the protection of existing vegetation where possible. Additional plantings are required as a Draft Plan Condition 2. Height and loss of privacy have been addressed in this document and staff report. 3. Greenspace is intended to be provided on private lands, a draft plan revision has been proposed to incorporate visitor parking and the ability for additional tree plantings. Cash-in-lieu of parkland is recommended with those funds to be used to acquire parkland elsewhere in the town.
Stephanie James	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned with the location and size of on-site top soil stockpile. Removal of Black Walnut tree appears required and concerns with on-going dust. 2. Landscaping details have not been provided and are minimal greenspace is provided. Details on new tree planting and privacy fencing should be included. 3. Housing alignment does not match backyards of existing dwellings 4. Heights are too tall. Consideration to reduce permitted height from 9.5 metres to 8.0 metres is requested to match surrounding residential building heights. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern has been noted and will be considered further as part of the 1st engineering design submission. 2. Landscaping Plan requirements to be confirmed as a Draft Plan Condition 3. Housing alignments are difficult to achieve based on the existing density and lot size/layout of existing residential development. Revisions to the Draft Plan provided suggestions on rearranging the unit locations while also maintaining the minimum 17 units required to meet minimum required density. 4. Reductions in height were suggested, however the developer maintains the need to maintain the proposed height provisions of 9.5 metres (or 2.5 storeys)