Comment No.	Comment	Consultant	Response		
Municipality o	Municipality of Port Hope – Engineering Works Department				
1.	Works and Engineering is still not supportive of the 2 Stormwater management ponds. The Financial cost of Quarterly maintenance and 5–10-year cleaning will be greater than revenue being collected to complete this work for 38 lots, please find a different Stormwater management strategy.	D. G. Biddle Civil	As outlined in the email response received from Leslie Benson at the GRCA November 20, 2024, after discussions with the Municipality of Port Hope, they have agreed that two dry ponds are the best option for quantity control in the Osaca subdivision. To aid in quality control, an Oil/Grit Separator is included upstream of each dry pond. The OGS and dry pond will create a treatment train approach to provide quality control. As there was concerns over the frequency of cleaning required, the ponds have been oversized to include storage of an additional 20 years of sediment. The annual sediment loading was calculated using Table 6.3 of the MOE SWM Planning and Design Manual.		
Municipality c	f Port Hope – Parks, Recreation and Culture	1	r		
1.	Based on a review of the previous Draft Plan dated February 2024, the gross amount of land that would be included for calculation purposes is 11.842 ha. For the purpose of calculating parkland dedication, 5% of this amount would be 0.6 hectares, as per our last comments. The parkland included in this 3rd submission include block 41 Park at .393 ha. Has the gross amount been adjusted and how can the requested 5% of parkland dedication be reached? My concern with a small park will limit parking availability and on street appears to not be an issue and preference to optimize parkland and not mix between dedication and cash in lieu.	D.G. Biddle Planning	The park size has been increased to includes 0.603ha of land.		
2.	Previous comments indicated the need for safe parking at the parkland of on Street A and a safe distance away from County Road 65.	D.G. Biddle Planning	Dedicated parking area is available for the users of the park.		
3.	What is the vision for driveway access to Lots 11, 12 and 13? Will their access be to Street A and therefore 3 entrances directly facing a park? This is a safety concern.	D.G. Biddle Planning	The key-shaped lots and applicable driveway have been removed from the plan.		

Our File: 122049 – County Road 65 - Osaca 3rd Submission Comments

4.	Does this submission confirm the gratuitous conveyance of block 42 to the Municipality?	D.G. Biddle Planning	Yes; Block 42 is to be conveyed to the Municipality of Port Hope.
Northum	nberland County	·	· ·
1.	The County Requires a 1 foot reserve be put in place along the entire frontage along County Road 65 for this development except for where Street A is proposed, opposite of Mastwood Road, and this 1 foot reserve be deeded to the County of Northumberland free and clear of all encumbrances. This 1 Foot reserve can be part of the road widening lands where applicable.	IBW Surveyor	The legal plan has been updated to include the requested reserve.
2.	It shall be noted that the lands identified on the above-mentioned plan known as Block 46, shall be accessed by Street A across Block 42 and that no future access will be permitted on County Road 65. All measures to provide this legal access from Block 46 to Street A shall be put in place now to ensure safe future access.		To be negotiated with the County.
3.	Please update the draft plan showing the Road Widening section to include the 1 Foot reserve along the entire frontage along County Road 65 except where Street A is currently proposed for the County's review and comment.	D.G. Biddle Planning	The legal plan has been updated to include the requested reserve.
4.	After approval of the ZBA and Plan of Subdivision, the proponent would be required to obtain an Entrance and Setback Permit from the County of Northumberland Public Works Department, as well as any other required permits to complete any work within the County ROW.	Property Owner	Noted
5.	Greater detail will be requested regarding the Stormwater Facility proposed for Block 40 during the detailed design process for the discharge to the ditch system on County Road 65.	D.G. Biddle Civil	Noted
The Gan	naraska Region Conservation Authority		
1.	All previous comments have been satisfactorily addressed except the consultant continues to refer to orifice plates. Since the ponds will be assumed by the Municipality, the Municipality can decide whether they want the plates; however, the GRCA recommends tamper proof orifice controls. The ponding of the created drainage swale is right at the constraints line; however, it is outside of the lots and GRCA has no objection to that.	D.G. Biddle Civil	Noted. This submission still references orifice plates. Whether the municipality wants orifice plates or tamper proof orifice controls can be discussed further and confirmed through the detailed design process.
2.	The Infiltration Requirements referred to in Sect. 7.0 and listed as included in Appendix 1 were not included.	D. G. Biddle Civil	The map showing the infiltration location is illustrated on the coloured SD-2 plan included in Appendix 1. For

			additional information with respect to the nitrate dilution, refer to the DM Wills report.
3.	GRCA engineering finds the Erosion Hazard Assessment to be comprehensive, and engineering agrees with the Conclusions and Recommendations that there is no erosion hazard on site. Appropriate setbacks have also been applied to the draft plan.	D. G. Biddle Civil	Noted.
4.	It should be noted that the creation of the drainage swale will occur in the setback area to the woodland and wetland. This area should be restored and vegetated appropriately for stabilization. A more detailed plan shall be provided to the GRCA during the detailed design.	D. G. Biddle Civil	Noted. A more detailed rehabilitation plan can be provided through detailed design to address these concerns if necessary. It is to be noted that the drainage swale illustrated in the setback on the provided Lot Grading Plan, LG-1 is an existing water draw. This draw in existing conditions ponded and eventually spilled through lot 37. The creation of the berm through lots 36-38 only diverts the flow that had been ponding at the rear of these lots to the north side of Lot 38.
5.	The site is partially regulated by the GRCA. A permit will be required from the GRCA prior to any development within the regulated area.	Property Owner	Noted.
Canada Post			
1.	Canada Post has no objections for the proposed development.	Information	Noted.
2.	Detached and Townhouses dwellings: Will be serviced through Community Mailbox. The location of these sites are determined between my department (Canada Post Delivery Planning) and the Developers appointed Architect and/or Engineering firm.	Information	Noted.
3.	If the development includes plans for (a) multi-unit building(s) with a common indoor entrance, the developer must supply, install and maintain the mail delivery equipment within these buildings to Canada Post's specifications.	Information	Noted.
	Additional Developer Requirements: 1. The developer will consult with Canada Post to determine suitable permanent locations for the Community Mail Boxes or Lock box Assemblies (Mail Room). The developer will then indicate these locations on the appropriate servicing plans.	Information	Noted.
	2. The developer agrees, prior to offering any units for sale, to display a map on the wall of the sales office in a place readily accessible to potential homeowners		

File. 122049 – County Road 65 - Osaca 5 ¹⁴ Submission Comments	
that indicates the location of all Community Mail Boxes or Lock Box Assemblies (Mail Room)., within the development, as approved by Canada Post.	
3. The owner/developer will be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Community Mailbox locations prior to the closing of any home sales with specific clauses in the Purchase offer, on which the homeowners do a sign off.	
4. The Builder/Owner/Developer will confirm to Canada Post that the final secured permanent locations for the Community Mailboxes will not be in conflict with any other utility; including hydro transformers, bell pedestals, cable pedestals, flush to grade communication vaults, landscaping enhancements (tree planting) and bus pads.	
5. The developer agrees to include in all offers of purchase and sale a statement which advises the purchaser that mail will be delivered via Community Mail Boxes or Lock Box Assemblies (Mail Room). The developer also agrees to note the locations of all Community Mail Boxes or Lock Box Assemblies (Mail Room)., within the development, and to notify affected homeowners of any established easements granted to Canada Post to permit access to the Community Mail Boxes or Lock Box Assemblies (Mail Room).	
6. The owner/developer will agree to prepare and maintain an area of compacted gravel to Canada Post's specifications to serve as a temporary Community Mailbox location. This location will be in a safe area away from construction activity in order that Community Mailboxes may be installed to service addresses that have occupied prior to the pouring of the permanent mailbox pads. This area will be required to be prepared a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of first occupancy.	
 7. The owner/developer will install concrete pads at each of the Community Mailbox locations as well as any required walkways across the boulevard and any required curb depressions for wheelchair access as per Canada Post's concrete pad specification drawings 8. The developer agrees to provide the following for each Community Mail Boxes or Lock Box Assemblies, and to include these requirements on the appropriate servicing plans: (if applicable) 	

Our File: 122049 – County Road 65 - Osaca 3rd Submission Comments

	2049 – County Road 65 - Osaca 3 rd Submission Comments		
	- Any required walkway across the boulevard, per municipal standards		
	- If applicable, any required curb depression for wheelchair access, with an		
	opening of at least two meters (consult Canada Post for detailed specifications)		
Alderville	First Nation	1	
1.	As you may be aware, the area in which this project is proposed is situated within the Traditional Territory of Alderville First Nation. Our First Nation's Territory is incorporated within the Williams Treaties Territory and was the subject of a claim under Canada's Specific Claims Policy, which has now been settled. All 7 First Nations within the Williams Treaties have had their harvesting rights legally re-affirmed and recognized through this settlement (2018).	Information	Noted.
	In addition to Aboriginal title, Alderville First Nation rights in its Reserve and Traditional Territory and/or Treaty Territory include rights to hunt, fish and trap, to harvest plants for food and medicine, to protect and honour burial sites and other significant sites, to sustain and strengthen its spiritual and cultural connection to the land, to protect the Environment that supports its survival, to govern itself, sustain itself and prosper including deriving revenues from its lands and resources, and to participate in all governance and operational decisions about how the land and resources will be managed, used and protected.		
2.	Alderville First Nation is requiring a File Fee for this project in the amount of \$300.00. This Fee includes administration, an initial meeting, project updates as well as review of standard material and project overviews. Depending on the number of documents to be reviewed by the Consultation Department, additional fees may apply.	Property Owner	A cheque is included with this submission.
3.	Please make this payment to Alderville First Nation and please indicate the project name or number on the cheque. If you do not have a copy of Alderville First Nation's Consultation Protocol, it is available at: alderville.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/AFNProtocol2.pdf. Please note that the mapping in this document needs updating to reflect the Williams Treaties First Nations Settlement Agreement 2018.	Property Owner	A cheque is included with this submission.
4.	In order to assist us in providing you with timely input, please provide us with a Notice of Request to Consult containing relevant information and material facts in sufficient form and detail to assist Alderville First Nation to understand the matter in order to prepare a meaningful response. Guidance for giving notice	Property Owner/D.G. Biddle Planning	Noted.

Our File: 122049 – County Road 65 - Osaca 3rd Submission Comments

	19 – County Road 65 - Osaca 3 rd Submission Comments	1	1
	can be found on pages 11-12 of our Consultation Protocol. Based on the		
	information that you have provided us with respect to the notice of Zoning By-		
	law Amendment Application (ZB02-2023), Draft Plan of Subdivision Application		
	(SU01-2023), 5868 County Road 65, Port Hope, Alderville First Nation may		
	require a mutual agreement to establish a special consultation process for this		
	project. After the information is reviewed it is expected that you or a		
	representative will be in contact to discuss this matter in more detail and		
	possibly set up a date and time to meet with Alderville First Nation in person or		
	virtually.		
5.	Although we have not conducted exhaustive research nor do we have the	Information	Noted.
	resources to do so, there may be the presence of burial or archaeological sites		
	in your proposed project area. Please note, that we have particular concern for		
	the remains of our ancestors. Should excavation unearth bones, remains, or		
	other such evidence of a native burial site or any other archaeological findings,		
	we must be notified without delay. In the case of a burial site, Council reminds		
	you of your obligations under the Cemeteries Act to notify the nearest First		
	Nation Government or other community of Aboriginal people which is willing to		
	act as a representative and whose members have a close cultural affinity to the		
	interred person. As I am sure you are aware, the regulations further state that		
	the representative is needed before the remains and associated artifacts can		
	be removed. Should such a find occur, we request that you contact our First		
	Nation immediately.		
6.	Furthermore, Alderville First Nation also has available, trained Archaeological	D.G. Biddle	Noted. The archeological study has been completed
	Liaisons who can actively participate in the archaeological assessment process	Planning	and approved by the Ministry as previously submitted.
	as a member of a field crew, the cost of which shall be borne by the proponent.	5	
	Alderville First Nation expects engagement at Stage 1 of an archaeological		
	assessment, so that we may include Indigenous Knowledge of the land in the		
	process. We insist that at least one of our Archaeological Liaisons be involved		
	in any Stage 2-4 assessments, including test pitting, and/or pedestrian surveys,		
	to full excavation.		
7.	Although we may not always have representation at all stakeholders' and rights	Information	Noted.
	holders' meetings, it is our wish to be kept apprised throughout all phases of		
	this project.		
Blue Metric -	Hydrogeology Peer Review	1	1
1.	As per comments attached	D. M. Wills	Please see the addendum to the Hydrological Study
		-	attached.

Our File: 122049 – County Road 65 - Osaca 3rd Submission Comments

North South Environmental – Environmental Impact Study Peer Review				
1.		D. M. Wills/D.G.	Please move the conditions to the Subdivision	
	law Amendment, the following recommended draft plan conditions should be	Biddle	Agreement.	
	considered:			
	1. All rear yards abutting the natural heritage features and their buffers must		1. Noted.	
	have a chain link fence with no gates in order to prevent access the buffer			
	and the natural heritage features as part of protecting the function of the		2. LID measures have been implemented on site to aid	
	buffer and the natural features.		in the dilution of nitrate at the property line. These	
	2. Low Impact Development (LID) measures shall be identified to promote		galleries will also aid in the infiltration of water to	
	infiltration of water to maintain ground water levels and the hydrology of		maintain ground water levels.	
	adjacent natural heritage features (e.g., cold water creek that is supported			
	by ground water discharge).		4. Noted.	
	3. A detailed feature-based water balance shall be prepared with supporting			
	mitigation measures identified to ensure there are no impacts to the		5. Noted. Detailed landscaping plans can be provided	
	hydrologic function of natural features (namely wetlands and watercourse)		at the detailed design stage.	
	and their ecological functions.All drawings (e.g., Draft Plan, Plan of Subdivision, landscape plans, grading		6. A cross section has been provided for the existing	
	plants, etc.) shall use the term "buffer" rather than "setback" between the		water draw at the rear of lots 36-38. This section can	
	rear yards of the development and the natural heritage features.		be found on drawing LG-1, Section A-A.	
	5. A detailed landscape must plan be prepared that identifies the native plant		be found on drawing EG-1, Section A-A.	
	seed mix, cover crop seed type, and other details regarding seeding the		7. Noted. The Biddle plans have been revised to	
	buffer area that is intended to left in a natural, free-to-grow state.		include the water draw on all plans.	
	6. The grading plan must show the swale with dimensions and a cross section,			
	as well as the location and details for the outlet to the wetland.		8. Noted.	
	7. All drawings/plans shall depict the open channel swale behind lots 37 and			
	38.		9. Noted. A lighting plan can be prepared at the	
	8. In order to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species,		detailed design stage once the lot layout has been	
	construction equipment and machinery shall be cleaned in accordance with		finalized.	
	the Clean Equipment Protocol for Industry (Halloran et. al., 2013).			
	9. A lighting plan should be prepared to ensure street lighting is directed away		10. Noted.	
	from woodlands and wetlands in accordance with the guidelines from the			
	DarkSky Approved program to mitigate impacts of light on wildlife.		11. Noted.	
	10. All other mitigation measures recommended in the EIS must be			
	implemented (e.g., timing windows for removal of trees, sediment and			
	erosion control, etc.).			