

Boynton Court Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning –Comments and Town Responses Matrix

Table 1: Agency Comments

Item #	Author	Comment	Responses and Revisions
1.	Grey County	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. County Transportation have no objections to the proposal but requested daylighting triangle 2. County Planning staff noted there were generally no concerns with the proposed development or zoning amendment, provided the development is of high-quality urban form, incorporating urban design standards to create an attractive, vibrant place supporting walking and cycling for everyday activities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and required daylighting triangle was communicated and forms part of the draft plan of subdivision. 2. Noted.
2.	Historic Saugeen Metis (HSM)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No objection or opposition to the application 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted.
3.	Grey Sauble Conservation Authority (GSCA)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No objections or concerns 2. Lands are not within a regulated area, no natural heritage or natural hazards identified. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted.
3.	Enbridge Gas/Union Gas	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requested that as a condition of final approval the owner/developer the necessary easements and/or agreements required for the provision of gas services for this project 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted and is included in the proposed Draft Plan Conditions
4.	Bluewater District School Board	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Request that as a condition of approval, the subdivision agreement contain requirement that Offers of Purchase and Sale a statement advising prospective purchasers that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. accommodation within a public school in the community is not guaranteed and students may be accommodated in temporary facilities, such as a portable classroom, a “holding school”, or in an alternate school within or outside of the community. b. school bus pick up points will generally be located on the through street at a location as determined by the Student Transportation Service Consortium of Grey Bruce. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. Warning Clauses can be added to the agreement. 2. Pedestrian needs are noted. Sidewalks will be contemplated as part of the Victoria Street reconstruction. Council can choose to have sidewalks on both sides of the road. Sidewalks are not requested at this time until the Victoria Street reconstruction to avoid the waste of removing infrastructure.

Boynton Court Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning –Comments and Town Responses Matrix

		2. Request that the development provide sidewalks and pedestrian linkages for safe walking routes for students to the school property and throughout the surrounding community and specifically request a sidewalk be provided along the south side of Victoria St in front of the cul-de-sac. to connect to the current sidewalk that runs along the east side of Alfred St. and that a street crossing be installed across Alfred St to connect the south side of Victoria St to the East side of Alfred St.	
5.	Hydro One	1. No comments or concerns.	1. Noted.

Boynton Court Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning –Comments and Town Responses Matrix

Table 2: Letters and Public Meeting Comments

Item #	Author	Comment	Responses and Revisions
1	Area Residents/ Public Meeting Comments	Concerns about the proposed drainage and Stormwater Management <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns note existing drainage issues with the properties on Orchard Drive and Thorncroft Court The application includes raising the site 1-1.5 metres and concerned about how that will affect current and future drainage on adjacent properties Concerned that there is inadequate Stormwater drainage capacity for the property Disagrees with the concept of a rear lot catch basin and concerned it contravenes the Thornbury West Drainage Master Plan Question about whether the updated ground water monitoring is available, noting the submitted report states this would be updated June/July 2020. Suggests that the development should be slab on grade because of water table issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Some of the issues may be improved with the drainage system for this proposed subdivision, since it seeks to take surface water originating off site and outlet to the municipal storm system. The proposal is to raise portions of the Subject Lands because the lands are lower than the road in some areas. The effect would be similar to other developments in the area, to allow for positive drainage. Adjacent lots on Thorncroft, for example, would actually be slightly higher than lots on the subject lands at build out. Stormwater concept has been reviewed and Development Engineering staff are satisfied that there is adequate stormwater management proposed. The rear lot catch basin is proposed to be maintained by the Town through an easement. The catch basin would intercept water to carry it to the municipal storm system. The concept has been reviewed by the authors of the Thornbury West Drainage Master Plan and the findings were that the proposal is consistent with that Master Plan. Additional Groundwater modelling information was completed and submitted to the Town. The submitted studies do not indicate slab on grade is recommended. Water table matters have been addressed. Town staff are satisfied with the submitted information and studies related to ground water levels. Surface water currently siting on the site will be appropriately drained away.

Boynton Court Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning –Comments and Town Responses Matrix

2	Area Residents/ Public Meeting Comments	Concerns related to Sidewalks and Traffic <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Notes the lack of sidewalks on Victoria Street. Are the installation of sidewalks on Victoria and Alfred being considered? Disagrees with the submitted Traffic Opinion Letter and feel it needs to be updated. Feels Town infrastructure is not adequate to accommodate the development and notes the poor condition of Victoria Street south of Alice street, as well as lack of curb and gutters and sidewalks on Victoria Street south of Alfred street. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Sidewalks will be considered as part of the reconstruction of Victoria Street south of Alfred Street, in the future. The Traffic Opinion Letter has been accepted by Development Engineering staff. The road network is adequate to handle traffic from an additional 18 dwellings. The portion of Victoria Street at Alice Street is planned for reconstruction. More information about that project is available on the Town's website https://thebluemountains.ca/thornbury-west-phase-1.cfm?is=3 . As noted above, Victoria Street sidewalks will be considered as part of future reconstruction.
3	Area Residents/ Public Meeting Comments	Concerned about Results of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Phase 1 assessment states some contamination on the property related to the former agricultural use and how is this being adequately addressed to protect neighbouring properties from contamination. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Phase 1 ESA notes that some material will need to be removed as part of clean up on the site. Phase 2 will need to be completed and a Record of Site Condition (if required) filed with the Ministry of Environment, Parks and Conservation. These requirements are included in the Draft Plan Conditions.
4	Area Residents/ Public Meeting Comments	Concerns related to neighbourhood character and compatibility: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Feels the proposal would be more in keeping with surrounding lots if the plan was for single detached bungalows noting many of the adjacent existing homes bungalows Concerned about how this proposal fits in with the existing character of the neighbourhood and whether it is consistent with the Town's Community Design Guidelines. Concerned about the potential negative visual impacts of higher buildings adjacent to bungalows, specifically related to raising the site to accommodate drainage. Concern the development would have a negative impact on value of surrounding properties. This Plan therefore calls for the site to be raised almost two meters above the existing grades on Thorncroft and Orchard tower over the Thorncroft and Orchard lands 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> While bungalows are located on some of the adjacent lots, the proposed bungalow style semi-detached units will be similar in character to adjacent housing. The proposal seeks to blend with the surrounding neighbourhood by having the semi-detached units adjacent to the single detached units and by having the townhouse units adjacent to the County Road. The revisions to semi-detached units were done to accommodate the minimum density required by the County of Grey Official Plan. The proposed setbacks, height and built form are similar to adjacent housing. The proposal is consistent with the Town's Community Design Guidelines. Taller buildings are not proposed adjacent houses and zoning permissions will be similar to the adjacent housing. Raising the site to accommodate positive drainage will be similar to grade of the properties on Thorncroft Court and other developments.

Boynton Court Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning –Comments and Town Responses Matrix

			<p>4. There is little evidence that development of vacant lands at a similar or slightly higher density has any impacts on property values of adjacent lands. It is generally understood that there is a positive impact on property value as a result of build out of underutilized lands adjacent to a built up area.</p> <p>5. This has been addressed in section 1, question2. The areas to be raised are low lying and the site is only proposed to be raised to allow for positive drainage and will look similar to Thorncroft Court. The Thorncroft lots will likely be slightly higher overall. The heights of new dwellings will likely be similar to adjacent houses on Thorncroft and Ashbury Court.</p>
5	Area Residents/ Public Meeting Comments	<p>Concerns related to Tree Protection and Retention:</p> <p>1. Concerned with the appropriate protection of the mature trees, specifically those at the rear of the Orchard Drive properties and adjacent to the subject lands and how these will be protected from damage if the development proceeds. Concerns include how the proposed swale will impact the trees – too much or not enough water at the roots, digging for drainage and basements near tree roots.</p>	<p>1. Concerns are noted. Draft Plan Conditions include the requirement for a Vegetation Assessment and Vegetation Management Plan by a qualified consultant. Measures to protect the trees from damage from the development will be incorporated into the Subdivision Agreement.</p>
6	Area Residents/ Public Meeting Comments	<p>Concerns related to growth:</p> <p>1. More development will mean an increase in demand for services, note many streets show signs of extensive base failure and warrant reconstruction</p> <p>2. Concerned about potential for uncontrolled and rapid growth overwhelming Council, staff and residents. Noted recent increased usage of parks, roads and stores</p> <p>3. Note that the development is likely to attract younger families but notes that Beaver Valley School has experienced significant student enrollment and questions future capacity of the school</p>	<p>1. The subject lands are designated for growth as Community Living Area. Services demands are reviewed annually based on current needs.</p> <p>2. Covid-19 has increased usage of many facilities, parks, beaches and so on as part-time residents and visitors spent more time outside of the city in 2020. Staff understand the concern for rapid growth. However, this particular subject parcel was a designated parcel for growth as noted above.</p> <p>3. The public School Board provided comments as part of the circulation of this proposal for the public meeting. Capacity of the school and growth needs is reviewed by the school boards regularly as they plan their future classroom and school needs.</p>

Boynton Court Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning –Comments and Town Responses Matrix

7	Area Residents/ Public Meeting Comments	Concerns related to density <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comparison with the cul-de-sac developments nearby it looks like the density would be nearly double of those areas. Concerned the number of units would cause snow removal and storage, garbage removal and on-street parking issues. 2. Density should be similar to Ashbury Court, Thorncroft Court, Pyatt Avenue. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Snow removal and storage, garbage and street parking are all reviewed as part of the development proposal. The design of the street and driveways has considered these matters. 2. Densities of some of the surrounding streets may be lower, but these areas were designed at a different time under a different policy regime. These lower densities are not consistent with current Official Plan policies approved by County and County of Grey.
8	Area Resident / Post Public Meeting Concerns	Concern regarding effects of Communications Infrastructure at the Water tower <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern about potential impacts to children that would potentially living of the Townhouse units of the communications infrastructure on the Water Tower that would make the site in the field of the radiation as per Health Canada, and subject to Guideline 6. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The network antennas located at the Water Tower operate in same spectrum ranges as standard WiFi. These are within the unlicensed spectrum and not subject to Guideline 6.
9	Area Resident / Post Public Meeting Concerns	Additional Drainage and Stormwater Management Comments <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to the proposed cross lot swales and feels these are poor planning of overland drainage and should be rejected. Concern that these swales will be modified after the lots are developed. 2. Request to sit down with staff to review the drainage plans with more detail. 3. Concerned municipal infrastructure is not adequate to handle Stormwater and additional traffic. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The rear yard and side yard swales are a proven and standard drainage concept in neighbourhoods. The swales that would be crossing rear yards are proposed on specific lots to deal with water entering the site from Thorncroft Court properties. The proposal aims to improve overall drainage for this immediate area on the long term. 2. Staff did go over the drainage concepts with the resident over the phone, as it was not possible to meet with residents due to Covid-19. It is noted that the drainage and stormwater management at this point in the proposal is conceptual only, but a proof of concept has been demonstrated. If the draft plan of subdivision and zoning are approved, the developer will have detailed engineering designs completed. It was explained that the rear yard swale would intercept water before leaving the property and at this location, would be captured through the municipally maintained catch basin that also outlets into a drain to the municipal stormwater system via

Boynton Court Proposed Subdivision and Rezoning –Comments and Town Responses Matrix

			<p>easement. This improves the current situation where water from adjacent lots spill onto the subject lands with no outlet.</p> <p>3. The Stormwater concern is addressed in Item #1, Answer #3. Additional traffic and condition of roads are addressed in Item #2, Answer #2 and #3.</p>
--	--	--	---