

**40-60 Emma St, Grand Valley Re-submission Comments August 2024**

No.	Department	Comment	Response																
1	Sourcewater Protection	It is understood that the proposal under review is for a 4-storey 18-unit multiple residential building and that the Site will be fully connected to municipal sewer and water services.																	
2	Sourcewater Protection	Source Protection Water Quantity Information indicates that the Site is in a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA). A recharge area is considered significant when it helps maintain the water level in an aquifer that supplies a community with drinking water. However, it is noted that the information also indicates that the Site is located in an area currently assessed as not experiencing water quantity stress (i.e. is not located in a WHPA Q1 or WHPA Q2).																	
3	Sourcewater Protection	All three existing lots fall within an area designated as a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA). This is a measure of the underlying aquifer's vulnerability to adverse impacts on water quality based on factors such as depth of the aquifer, what sort of soil or rock is covering it, and the characteristics of the soil or rock surrounding it.																	
4	Sourcewater Protection	<p>Table 1: Source Protection Water Quality Information Summary</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Assessment Parcel Address:</td> <td>40, 50 and 60 Emma Street</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source Protection Area:</td> <td>Grand River</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA):</td> <td>C; score 8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wellhead Protection Area E (GUDI):</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intake Protection Zone:</td> <td>3; score throughout the site ranges from 1 to 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Issue Contributing Areas:</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Significant Groundwater Recharge Area:</td> <td>Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Highly Vulnerable Aquifer:</td> <td>Yes; score is 6</td> </tr> </table>	Assessment Parcel Address:	40, 50 and 60 Emma Street	Source Protection Area:	Grand River	Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA):	C; score 8	Wellhead Protection Area E (GUDI):	No	Intake Protection Zone:	3; score throughout the site ranges from 1 to 4	Issue Contributing Areas:	No	Significant Groundwater Recharge Area:	Yes	Highly Vulnerable Aquifer:	Yes; score is 6	Noted; Education and Outreach Material to be included in approval package
Assessment Parcel Address:	40, 50 and 60 Emma Street																		
Source Protection Area:	Grand River																		
Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA):	C; score 8																		
Wellhead Protection Area E (GUDI):	No																		
Intake Protection Zone:	3; score throughout the site ranges from 1 to 4																		
Issue Contributing Areas:	No																		
Significant Groundwater Recharge Area:	Yes																		
Highly Vulnerable Aquifer:	Yes; score is 6																		
5	Sourcewater Protection	It should be noted that while the Site is in an area designated as both a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) and a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) there are no existing significant threats to drinking water on the Site.																	
6	Sourcewater Protection	In addition, based on the Vulnerability Score and the assumption that the activities and circumstances would be the same for all three existing lots, the applicable policies related to water quality are the same for all three lots.																	
7	Sourcewater Protection	Based on the proposed land use, activities and circumstances that are likely to exist in the future on the Site, the only potential Significant Drinking Water Threat would be the storage and handling of DNAPLs. Therefore, the only applicable policy in the SPP is DC-GV-CW-8.3 which states the following:  <i>"To ensure any existing or new handling or storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid ceases to be or never becomes a significant drinking water threat, where such an activity is, or would be, a significant drinking water threat, the Town shall develop and implement an education and outreach program to encourage the use of alternative products, where available, and the proper handling/storage and disposal procedures for these products."</i>																	
8	Sourcewater Protection	It is therefore recommended that the Town of Grand Valley incorporate existing Education and Outreach materials as part of the approval package.																	
9	Sourcewater Protection	In addition, it is recommended that in the review process, the Town of Grand Valley should consider the fact that the Site is located within a SGRA and HVA and therefore request that Low Impact Development (LID) practices be implemented with the aim to protect both water quantity and water quality.	LID is not recommended on this site due to the nature of the existing soils as the soils are of low permeability																
10	Engineering	We have no objections to the application, subject to receiving the same from GRCA and HydroOne given the site's location.	Noted																
11	Engineering	We do note that the Town now has an adequate water supply to support this development as the Town's new well has recently been commissioned. Subsequent to the previous letter that was written, the Town is currently overcommitted in wastewater allocation due to significant increases in flow observed in 2023 which cause has yet to be determined, however is being investigated.	Noted																
12	Engineering	We believe the Town will be able to support this development so long as flows return to expected historical levels.	Noted																
13	Engineering	Additional comments provided under separate cover to be addressed through the site plan approval process.	Noted																
14	Engineering	Refer to red-marking drawings. We acknowledge comments that Owner will coordinate with Hydro One to accommodate the proposed works. Discussions with the adjacent property owner will also be needed.	Noted; Hydro One will be consulted. Discussions have been had with the neighbour to the South and will continue throughout the project.																
15	Engineering	There is a limited area for snow storage on the site. It is likely parking capacity will be reduced during the winter and snow removal off site is expected from time to time. This will have to be outlined in a future site plan agreement and area identified.	Additional snow storage area has been added to the site.																
16	Engineering	The revised development concept to a condominium corporation is noted. Inspection, maintenance and documentation of the storm drainage and treatment systems on the property will be the responsibility of the corporation through the site plan agreement.	Noted																
17	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: The rainfall intensity data should be from Fergus Shand Dam, AES station per Town Standards - partially addressed . The MTO rainfall data used in the analysis from the Fergus Shand Dam is outdated (i.e. 2010) and should be replaced with 2016 data from the Atmospheric Environment Service, which shows higher intensities. Refer to detailed comments for table for the 3-parameter ABC values</i>	Updated																
18	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: The Pre-Development Drainage Conditions should be revised to show the full extent of the upstream external drainage area identified as 1.01 ha in size and to show how it drains through the site. The Majority of the external area shown in the post development plan by-passes most of the site and drains north of the townhouse blocks (i.e. 0.70 ha in area Post-6) but the gading plan doesn't show any major conveyance swale to ensure it by-passes the rear yard of the townhouses. A catch basin west of the sidewalk in a block dedicated to the Town may be needed. Calculations to confirm that the 100-year storm can be conveyed through that area should be provided - Partially Addressed . The following drainage area-related issues remain:</i>	See below																
19	Engineering	1. Area Post 6 should not be combined in calculations with the developed areas Post 5, 5a and 7 because the sewer from this area connects downstream of CBMH7 where the orifice control is located. Area Post 6 should be an uncontrolled area with C=0.5 (per the background study) and should not be connected to the on-site storage pipe. Additional piping should be provided to by-pass the storage pipe and the OGS	Former Post-6 (Behind Building), now Post-7 and 103, are now uncontrolled with a c=0.5. This area bypasses the OGS																

20	Engineering	2. The portion of area Post 5 that drains to CBMH6 is no captured and controlled in the storage pipe since the orifice plate is in upstream CBMH7. It should be an uncontrolled area or the orifice needs to be relocated	New area Post-6 will drain uncontrolled to Emma Street, Post 1-5 are overcontrolled to account for this.
21	Engineering	3. Parts of area Post 5 at each driveway entrance will drain uncontrolled to Emma Street and not be captured in the storage pipe. The grading design should have reverse fall into the site from the streetline to contain the drainage on the property.	A high point was created at each entrance to avoid this.
22	Engineering	4. Drainage from areas Post 5 and 5a with C=0.95 should preferably be the only areas being controlled and treated through the OGS on-site. Area 7 could be diverted around the parking area to the north in a swale at the top of the retaining wall or connecting the sewer from C110 to CBMH8 relocated on Emma Street to the north of the driveway entrance	Post-1 (Formerly Post-7) is being directed towards the onsite storage as grading did not allow for drainage around the parking lot (and across the sidewalk (also not ideal and another structure should be placed before water crosses the sidewalk). A structure at this location is required to provide drainage behind the retaining wall and to collect foundation drainage. Alternatively, TICBMH3 could have been moved to the north but it was preferred to have the structure located at the downstream side of the site entrance. An additional structure on Emma Street was considered but would be for the Town to maintain, own and ultimately an additional asset was not considered worth it as the storage system can handle the minor flows from this area.
23	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: The townhouse backyard drainage areas are to include half the townhouse roof area due to peaked roof construction. The runoff coefficients should be revised accordingly - outstanding.</i> Based on the revised development plan with a flat roof structure, the roof leaders are presumed to connect within the structure to the 300 mm diameter storm service shown on the Servicing Plan. Confirmation should be provided. Alternatively, roof leader downspout locations and an external collection system connecting to the storm service are to be provided.	As shown on the architectural plans, the roof water is being directed internally and through the building storm service.
24	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: The portion of drainage area Post-7 assigned a runoff coefficient of 0.90 appears low when accounting for all imperviousness surfaces. A breakdown of impervious area components (roof, driveway, sidewalk, road pavement) should be included in the report - outstanding.</i> The runoff coefficients and calculated flows are to be revised based on the rainfall data and drainage area comments above.	Updated
25	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: The inlet capacity of the new sewer system should be identified - outstanding.</i> The on-site catchbasins should be in sag conditions to capture the 100-year storm flows. The inlets should be redesigned along with the property line grades of the driveway entrances to create sag conditions. Calculations of the grate inlet capacities with a 50% blockage factor should be provided and compared to the 100-year storm uncontrolled flow rate from the site.	Entrances have been designed with a high point and fall into the site. A roll over gutter will be poured through the entrances to direct water towards the storm structures. Twin Inlets are included to capture the 100 year flow. All water drains to the south east corner of the parking lot where an additional structure has been included. Calculation are included in the report and are based on MTO rating curves. PCSWMM model includes structures as orifices as well. Any structure that exceeded the capacity of a 50% blocked twin inlet structure has been designed with a high capacity inlet grate (Stepcon 5103)
26	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: The structural integrity of retaining walls typically require control of surface water which would require collector swales and catchbasin inlets behind the wall. Please confirm whether this has been considered in the design of the retaining wall as no conveyance of surface water is shown to direct water away from the top of the wall - outstanding.</i> There is concern that the external drainage may impact the west side of the building, particularly with snow and ice build-up and during spring runoff conditions. A primary drainage swale should be provided near the top of the slope to divert external drainage to an additional storm inlet further into the property. The swale proposed 1.5m from the west side of the building should be considered a "back-up" or supplemental drainage system. Both should be sized for the total 100 year-flow that may come towards the structure. Runoff and swale capacity calculations should be provided	Additional swale added and sized appropriately.
27	Engineering	<i>Previous comments: the storm sewer design is to be revised based on the above comments. Refer to red-marked drawing comments - outstanding.</i> Revise the sewer design based on the comments provided in this review	Updated
28	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: notwithstanding the elevation difference between the foundation drain and the storm sewer, a 100-year hydraulic gradeline analysis is to be provided. The minimum HGL separation to the finished level 1 slabs of the townhouse blocks is 0.5m - outstanding.</i> The HGL analysis should be recalculated based on drainage area, rainfall data and on-site storage release rate comments provided in this review. The as-built trunk sewer information should also be used in the modelled William Street trunk sewer conditions as pipe lengths and slopes have changed from the design condition	The trunk sewer as-built data was updated based on on site measurements and survey data. The HGL analysis was updated
29	Engineering	<i>Previous comment: the CBMHs will be benched so there is limited quality control being provided. Further discussion is required on how quality control can be met in order to satisfy CLI-ECA requirements - outstanding.</i> The sizing of the proposed Stormceptor OGS unit should be reviewed based on removal of area Post 6 contributing to flows through OGS. CBMHs that do not have upstream sewers connected to them may have sumps, otherwise CBMHs should not have sumps which are ineffective during moderate or high flows.	The OGS calculations were updated and included in the report. Sumps are being provided in CBs; CBMHs will be benched.
30	Engineering	Provide the calculation and evaluate its impact if the runoff coefficient is greater than 0.5 which had been applied to the area in the Design Brief dated August 2011 for the William Street Outlet Works	
31	Engineering	A. The proposed method to calculate the on-site storage release rate should be revisited. It should be based on the actual flow rates from the 5-year sewer design sheet in the Gamsby and Mannerow Report that determined the size of the William Street storm sewer. An area-based allowable rate from the proposed storage pipe can be calculated based on the incremental increase in the total 5-year flow divided by the contributing area (i.e. (517 L/S - 256 L/S)/2.37 ha). This method avoids inconsistencies or assumptions in rainfall intensities, time of concentration, etc. between the original sewer design and current data. The actual flow rate assigned to the receiving sewer from a contributing area should be used when available. For the 100-year release rate, an additional step will need to be taken to calculate the incremental increase in the 100-year flows at William Street from the 2.37 ha drainage area based on Gamsby and Mannerow 2011 design data. Then a similar calculation can be made to establish the 100-year allowable release rate per hectare. Once release rates from the storage pipe has been determined, an orifice or weir calculation would size the control device based on the structure depth/geometry. An acceptable approach to estimating required storage would be a Modified Rational Method calculation knowing the maximum release rate, which would then be input to an HGL checked in PCSWMM	Completed and calculations provided in the report.
32	Engineering	B. A stage-storage-discharge table for the storage pipe or tank is to be provided in the Servicing Brief. Also, a separate table summarizing the PCSWMM model results for the 5-year and 100-year storms for the storage tank is to be included. These tables are separate from the model input and output files.	Completed and calculations provided in the report.
33	Engineering	C. The catchment "% Imperv" values reported in the PCSWMM outputs is shown as 25% which does not reflect the coverage of some of the site areas or road allowance catchments. The percent imperviousness should be related to the C values shown on the drainage area plans.	Updated

34	Engineering	Drawing Comments:	Drainage Areas have been updated based on rough survey data upstream. Leeson St was evaluated for its ability to handle upstream flows. Do to asphalt degradation some of the properties on the west side of Leeson will flow down the asphalt curb and across the road crown (at approx 75 Leeson)
35	Engineering		ESC Plans revised based on comments
36	Engineering		General notes added to the servicing drawing
37	Engineering		Discussion with neighbours required for tree removal along North PL
38	Engineering		On site Structures are shown within the entrance to accommodate the storage chamber length. Others are spaced to allow for proper compaction around manholes and for constructibility of pipes. They are also at the low points to ensure stormwater is captured in teh 100 year storm event. These are dishd grates to ensure maximum capture. Entrances are extra wide to accommodate the fire truck lane requirements.
39	Engineering		Retaining wall drains and footing drains can be tied into CBMH11 and DI10 as necessary. Inverts as specified on drawints. These are designed above the 100 year HGL. Design by others.
40	Engineering	A calculation summary (Statistic) table should be provided indicating average, minimum, and maximum illuminance levels; and uniformity ratios of 'average to minimum' and 'maximum to minimum'. The values in the table should be presented in separate calculation zones as noted below and in accordance with the guidelines ANSI/IES RP-8-22: Parking Lots (several), Access Roads, Property Entrances, Property Line and beyond that	Statistic table added to Electrical Site Plan, SL1
41	Engineering	There is minimal site lighting aon Emma Street which was highlighted in the previous submission. We acknowledge the comment that electrical plans will be provided at final design review	Our electrical consultant advises that they do not typically light off the propperty as that would be the municipalities land and equipment. Normally municipalities would address their own roads via their own projects. Usually municiplities do not want light on the subject property to spill over the property line.
42	Engineering	The Applicant contacted the MECP and they did not provide any confirmation for permit requirements, however, advised that the applicant is responsible to adhere to the Endangered Species Act. The same will be noted in the site plan agreement	To be dealt with in site plan agreement
43	Engineering	We have no comments on the conclusions of the report and the summary of minimu noise abatement measures recommended by the noise consultant and will be incorporated into the site plan agreement	To be dealt with in site plan agreement
44	UGDSB	To support students walking to school, the Board encourages the construction of a sidewalk across the front of the development site to provide a safe walking connection to the existing sidewalk on Emma St. S., north of Mill St. W.	Sidewalk along the West side of Emma St S is shown on the plans. Connecting from Mill St W to just South of the last entrance into the development.
45	UGDSB	Additionally, please be advised that the Planning Department does not object to the application, subject to the following condition: - That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Noted
46	DPCDSB	That the applicant shall agree in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to include the following warning clauses in all offers of purchase and sale of residential lots.	Noted
47	DPCDSB	"Whereas, despite the best efforts of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside of the neighbourhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighbourhood school."	Noted
48	DPCDSB	"That the purchasers agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, the residents of the subdivision shall agree that children will meet the bus on roads presently in existence or at another place designated by the Board."	Noted
49	Bell	No comments	Noted
50	MTO	The proposed work within the Town Grand Valley is not located adjacent to a provincial highway or within MTO's Permit Control Area, and as such, does not require MTO review, approval or permits.	Noted
51	Enbridge	Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.	Noted
52	Dufferin County Planning	The Township shall ensure that the conclusions and recommendations outlined in theEnvironmental Noise Report are implemented at either the SPA stage and/or prior to finaloccupancy.	Noted
53	Dufferin County Building Services	Label fire access route(s), fire hydrant, and fire dpartment connection on site plan	Site plan has been updated
54	Dufferin County Building Services	Label R12 turning radius for fire route(s).	Site plan has been updated
55	Dufferin County Building Services	Provide floor plans which have a minimum of 15% of all residential suites which have a Barrier Free Path of Travel as per Sentence 3.8.2.1.(5) and (6).	Floor plans updated. One unit per floor plan is designed to be Barrier Free
56	Dufferin County Engineering	Th County Engineering division has no comments, and we defer the engineering review to the Town of Grand Valley.	Noted
57	Canada Post	The owner/developer will provide each building with its own centralized mail receiving facility. This lock-box assembly must be provided and maintained by the Owner/Developer in order for Canada Post to provide mail service to the residents of this project. For any building where there are more than 100 units, a secure, rear-fed mailroom must be provided.	Noted; Not applicable to our development
58	Canada Post	The owner/developer agrees to provide Canada Post with access to any locked doors between the street and the lock-boxes via the Canada Post Crown lock and key system. This encompasses, if applicable, the installation of a Canada Post lock in the building's lobby intercom and the purchase of a deadbolt for the mailroom door that is a model which can be retro-fitted with a Canada Post deadbolt cylinder.	Noted
59	Canada Post	As per our revised National Delivery Policy, street level residences and businesses will also receive mail delivery at centralized locations, not directly to their door. For example: - extra mail compartments can be provided to accommodate these units in the main mailbox panel - if these units are not part of the condo then a separate centralized mail receiving facility/box can be set up by the developer at an alternative location.	Floor plans updated. Mailboxes location shown in entry lobby on ground floor. Refer to ASP-201
60	Canada Post	As the project nears completion, it is requested that the Developer contact me directly for a Postal Code as existing postal coding will not apply and new postal codes will be issued for this development.	Noted
61	Canada Post	The Developer's agent should contact a Delivery Supervisor – Oakville Post office – 2420 Speers Rd Phone number 905-338-1199 X 2002, 2003 for mailroom/lock box inspection and mail delivery startup.	Noted
62	Fire Prevention	As discussed, my only concerns are the height of the building and future buildings. GVDFD not having a ladder truck to properly mitigate a rescue in a fire situation on the upper floors.	Noted
63	Fire Prevention	Also gaining access to the roof in a fire situation, and not having an elevated master stream in the case of fire..	Noted
64	GRCA	No comment received	No comment received. Site plan application to be circulated to agency

65	Hydro One	No comment received	No comment received. Site plan application to be circulated to agency
66	PULBIC - 73 Leeson Street South	Expressed concerns regarding the stability of the slope and whether the proposal would create excess water on his property	This property is upstream of the development. Although grade changes are proposed, fall away from 73 Leeson is provided along with swales to capture water. No changes to stormwater are expected at 73 Leeson Street.
67	PULBIC - 73 Leeson Street South	Expressed concerns that the proposed break wall could create damming issue and increase water to property	This property is upstream of the development. Although grade changes are proposed, fall away from 73 Leeson is provided along with swales to capture water. No changes to stormwater are expected at 73 Leeson Street.
68	PULBIC - 73 Leeson Street South	Expressed concerns regarding the proposed location stating the residents would be near a trim and moulding shop and may not be appropriate for residences	Environmental