

Appendix 4 – Comment / Response Summary

Public Comments

The public provided both written comments and oral comments at the Public Meeting.

Planning Staff provide a summary of the comments and themes below with responses:

Traffic and Safety

Concerns with increased traffic on River Road East, and safety due to the curves in the road.

Response: A Traffic Impact Brief was prepared by Tatham Engineering in support of the proposed development, which found that the site is expected to generate 17 trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 20 trips during the weekday PM peak hour. As part of the Traffic Impact Brief Tatham Engineering analyzed the operations of the River Road East and Stonebridge Boulevard intersection under existing and future conditions. The results of Tatham Engineering's analysis indicate that the study area intersection currently provides excellent operations and is expected to continue to provide excellent operations through the 2028 horizon. Further, Tatham Engineering has noted that no improvements are required to accommodate the proposed development. In addition to the above, Tatham Engineering has reviewed the available sight lines along River Road East and Stonebridge Boulevard at the access points in the context of the TAC requirements for minimum stopping and intersection sight distances, and found that the available sight lines at each access are acceptable.

Land Value

Concerns regarding impact on land values.

Response: Hamount Investments Ltd. has provided the following response to concerns regarding impact on land values,

“While land values are not a primary factor in assessing the quality of a development's planning, it is commonly observed that new developments can indeed contribute to an increase in surrounding land values. However, good planning encompasses a broader spectrum of considerations, such as sustainability and community needs”

Environment

Concerns with the impact on the natural environment, and tree clearing on the subject lands.

Response: An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was prepared by Insight Environmental Solutions Inc. which found that the subject properties contain a Non-Significant Woodland and part of a Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF). Within the EIS Insight Environmental Solutions Inc. provides recommended mitigation measures to avoid impacts to natural heritage features, including woodland and Headwater Drainage

Features. The EIS concludes, that some unavoidable impacts will occur, however, if the proposed mitigation measures are followed, the impacts will be minimized and acceptable.

Stormwater Management

Concerns regarding drainage and potential leeching into a nearby drainage feature from the proposed stormwater management system.

Response: Following the April 11, 2024 Public Meeting Tatham Engineering provided the following response to the concerns raised regarding the Cultec system and the creek,

“Stormwater quality treatment provided consists of more than the Cultec system and includes catch basins with sumps, an Oil and Grit Separator designed to remove oils and most of the suspended solids and an isolation row in the Cultec system.

The bottom of the Cultec system is 1m above the groundwater. Infiltrated water will be filtered by the underlying sand.

The groundwater gradient is toward the Nottawasaga River and not the creek.

The Cultec system discharges to the creek 29m from the Town storm sewer inlet.

The quality of the water directed to the creek from the proposed site will far exceed the quality of the untreated municipal and private roadside drainage directed to the creek upstream of the site.”

Planning Staff advise that stormwater management will be addressed through the Site Plan and detailed design process.

Noise and Privacy

Concerns regarding noise, dust and dirt associated with the proposed development and loss of privacy. Would like to see a fence and greenery incorporated with the proposed development. Further to the above, Council Members sought clarification regarding the installation of privacy fencing.

Response: Any future development on the subject lands will be required to comply with the Town's Noise By-law. As part of the applicant's submission, civil engineering plans were provided including an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and details. The applicant's advised at the Public Meeting that dust would be addressed within the Erosion and Control plans. Planning Staff note that the subject lands are separated from the existing townhouses to the south along Savannah Crescent by open space lands with a width of approximately 13 metres, which contains the Stonebridge Trail Loop and trees. The Town does not require the installation of wood board fencing, as our standards only require black chain link fencing at those locations not directly abutting

existing residential lands. It is important that a sufficient level of visibility, light and openness is maintained for the existing trail in order to ensure natural surveillance as well as support active transportation. Based on the above, Planning staff are of the opinion that a black chain link fence would be preferable. Details regarding fencing will be addressed through the Site Plan and detailed design process.

Accessory Dwelling Units and Short Term Rental

Questions were received at the April 11, 2024 Public Meeting regarding accessory dwelling units, and whether they would be permitted within the proposed development. Additionally, questions were asked on whether short-term rental would be permitted.

Response: As per recent legislative changes to the Ontario Planning Act a maximum of three residential units are permitted within a rowhouse on a parcel of urban residential land, if no building or structure ancillary to the rowhouse contains any residential units. As the subject lands are designated 'Neighbourhood' and will be serviced with municipal water and sewer, accessory dwelling units would be permitted on the subject lands, subject to compliance with other applicable provisions (ex. parking). Planning Staff advise that short-term rental is not a permitted use within the R3-13 Zone.

Play Area

Members of Council sought clarification related to the lack of play space for the proposed development, at the April 11, 2024 Public Meeting.

Response: As each of the proposed units is proposed to include an outdoor amenity area, and each lot is to be a freehold townhouse, a shared "play area" is not required. Further, the subject land are located within an existing Plan of Subdivision. The Plan of Subdivision agreement (2008) outlined parkland and parkland improvement requirements, which the Applicant's note have been satisfied. The Applicant's have further identified that the subject lands are in proximity to a temporary ball hockey court located at Wally Drive/Stonebridge Boulevard, the Stonebridge Trail network, the Wasaga Beach Provincial Park – Beach Area 1, Mills Park and the Stonebridge community amenities (i.e. pool, community centre, etc.).

Lot Coverage and Setbacks

Members of Council sought clarification related to the proposed setbacks and increased lot coverages during the April 11, 2024 Public Meeting.

Response: Planning Staff have reviewed each of requested reliefs for Zoning By-law Amendment Z00324, and note that the proposed lot coverage, lot frontage and lot area provisions requested are similar to what is permitted for the townhouses to the south which are zoned R3-20. Please see the zoning analysis section of the Staff Report for further details regarding the applicants proposed zoning request(s).

Department and Agency Comments

Town departments and external agencies provided comments for the proposed development:

Wasaga Distribution Inc. (WDI)

The proposal will have to be run through WDI's distribution model, to confirm the capacity to support the development based on proposed and future loading requirements.

Enbridge Gas Inc.

Does not object to the proposed applications.

Simcoe County District School Board (SCDSB)

Provided comments noting concerns on the impact of the development proposal on the board's ability to provide elementary pupil accommodation in the Town of Wasaga Beach. SCDSB notes the need for a new public elementary school(s) in the east area of Wasaga Beach to alleviate accommodation pressures created by new development in the area. SCDSB requests that the proposed development be subject to a secondary plan process. SCDSB requests that the applicant consider how students requiring busing will be accommodated as the current configuration does not include an appropriate pick up/drop off location. SCDSB notes that they may not be able to support future planning applications proposing new residential development unless additional lands are designated and prepared for future school sites. Further to the above, SCDSB has provided standard conditions to be included within an agreement.

Response: Notwithstanding the above, the Town is currently engaged in a process with the Simcoe Muskoka Catholic District School Board, a developer and the Province to secure a K-12 school in the east end of Town.

Canada Post

Provided standard comments with regard to service type and location; municipal requirements; developer timeline and installation, etc.

County of Simcoe

The County has provided comments on solid waste management, and note the following:

"The County of Simcoe is not obligated to provide curbside waste collection services to residential dwelling lots or units accessed by private condominium roads. However, the County may be able to provide waste collection services where the private condominium road has been designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the County of Simcoe Multi-Residential & Private Road Waste Collection Policy and waste collection design standards, to the satisfaction of the County of Simcoe..."

“It appears from the submitted site plan that the roads can be constructed as per County engineering standards in order to offer waste collection services. However, there are several areas of concern where revised planning would be required in order to provide adequate accessibility and turn around for collection vehicles...”

Further, the County has provided an advisory clause to be included within the Subdivision Agreement if the private road cannot be designed to meet the County’s standards.

Response: Within the Planning Justification Report, Hamount Investments Ltd. notes that radii have been added to the Site Plan for the County to confirm if they can service the proposed development. However, if the proposal does not meet the County requirements, waste will be privately collected. The Applicant has advised in their most recent comment response matrix that based on Tatham Engineering’s Truck Turning Plan and County of Simcoe’s cart collection requirements, that it appears that the proposed development could be adequately serviced by the County’s waste collection vehicles. Further discussion will be required during the Site Plan and detailed design process between the applicant, County and the Town with regard to waste management.

Town GIS

Comments regarding the street naming process and required materials was provided.

Response: The Applicants have provided a proposed street name and alternate street names, which have been shared with the Town’s GIS coordinator.

Bell Canada

Standard comments and conditions provided.

Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)

The MECP had questions regarding the date that leaf-off surveys were completed, and if an assessment for the presence of leaf clusters suitable for SAR bats was completed.

Response: Hamount Investments Ltd. confirmed within the Comment Response Matrix dated June 7, 2024 that leaf off surveys were completed during a site visit on April 12, 2023 and that during the site visits on June 1 and October 5, 2023 suitable leaf clusters were searched for, but none were observed.

Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA)

The NVCA has advised that comments remain outstanding. The NVCA mapping for the property illustrates a flood and meander erosion hazard features associated with two reaches of Sturgeon Creek, which runs along the east side and rear property lines, extending into the majority of the lot area. As such the property is largely regulated pursuant to Ontario Regulation 41/24 the Authority’s Prohibited Activities, Exemptions

and Permits Regulation. A permit will be required from the NVCA prior to construction or grading on the subject lands.

The NVCA has provided a number of Natural Hazard related engineering comments, which they note must be addressed in order for them to support the Zoning By-law Amendment or Site Plan Control applications.

The NVCA has concerns with the Flood Study prepared by Tatham Engineering, specifically the NVCA notes:

“1...The catchment presented in the Flood Study is much smaller than the NVCA’s regulatory model for the same tributary and results in much smaller flow generation; NVCA’s Regulatory model includes a larger area to the south and west (total catchment of 74 hectares). Please demonstrate how a smaller catchment size was determined for this study. Existing NVCA model files for the tributary can be made available through a data request.

2. Please provide the hydrologic and hydraulic modelling files prepared in support of this Flood Study in the next submission. Additionally, please confirm what IDF parameters were used to generate flows.

3. Please add the flood hazard limit and 6-meter access allowance to applicable site plans.”

Further to the above, the NVCA has concerns regarding stormwater management. Specifically, the NVCA recommends:

“4... that a comprehensive stormwater management review for the property is deferred to the Town, as the outlet for the proposed stormwater management design ties in to existing Town infrastructure.”

Moreover, the NVCA requires confirmation on how much fill is required to prepare the lot grading for the proposed site plan, and whether any fill placement is proposed within the limits of the floodplain.

In addition to the above, the NVCA has provided additional comments related to stormwater management, water balance, groundwater, erosion and sediment control and fill management that the NVCA notes are to be addressed prior to site plan approval.

Response: The Applicant’s have provided a response to the NVCA comments within the submitted Comment Response Matrix dated June 7, 2024. At the time of writing this Staff report, second submission comments have not been received from the NVCA although they are anticipated shortly. Planning staff note that these concerns can be addressed through the Town’s site plan approval process and the NVCA’s development permit process.

Town of Wasaga Beach Public Works Department

Draft Public Works comments have been reviewed by Planning staff. Planning staff are looking for confirmation that comments have been finalized, which appears to be the case.