



7370 Centre Road, Uxbridge, ON

Second Submission

Agency Comments Response Matrix, May 2022



Comments Response Matrix
July 2021

[Table of Contents](#)

Region of Durham Comments.....	2
Township of Uxbridge Comments.....	2
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority Comments	2
Bell Canada Comments	2
Public Comments	2

1

**Region of Durham
Comments**



Region of Durham		Gary Muller	
June 21, 2021		Director of Planning	
		Email: planning@durham.ca	
No.	Comment:	Response by:	Response:
Region Official Plan			
1	<p>The subject lands are within Special Study Area 6 of the ROP. An amendment to the ROP is required to designate these lands for development, subject to the consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the amount and rate of development that has occurred in the area designated "Living Area"; and b) the availability of servicing capacity. Please be advised that an Amendment to the ROP has been applied for and is currently under consideration. Conformity details and a recommendation report will be provided through the ROP amendment process. 	MDTR	Noted.
Provincial Policy			
1	<p><u>Provincial Policy Statement</u></p> <p>Policy 1.1.3.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) states that land use patterns and within settlement areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses which, amongst other things: a) efficiently use land and resources; and b) are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the</p>	MDTR	Noted.



	<p>infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion.</p> <p>Policy 1.6.6.2 of the PPS states that municipal sewage services and municipal water services are the preferred form of servicing for settlement areas to support protection of the environment and minimize potential risks to human health and safety. Within settlement areas with existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services, intensification and redevelopment shall be promoted wherever feasible to optimize the use of the services.</p>		
2	<p><u>Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe</u></p> <p>The subject lands are identified as a designated greenfield area, as per the policies of the Growth Plan. Policy 2.2.7.1 of the Growth Plan states that new development taking place in designated greenfield areas will be planned, designated, zoned and designed in a manner that: a) supports the achievement of complete communities; b) supports active transportation; and c) encourages the integration and sustained viability of transit service</p>	MDTR	Noted.
Sanitary Servicing and Functional Servicing Report (March 2021)			
1	<p>Due to the topography of the land, a municipal gravity sanitary sewer is not available along the frontage of the subject property along Concession Road 6. Sanitary servicing to the proposed development will need to be made available on Centre Road at the south end of the 7370 Centre Road lands. The existing downstream sanitary sewer does not have capacity for the lands at 7370 Centre</p>	SCS	Noted.



	Road and other planned developments in the area. No foundation drains (foundation weepers) or roof leaders are permitted to connect into the sanitary sewer system, as per the Regional Sewer Use By-Law.		
2	<p>3.2 Proposed Sanitary Sewer System</p> <p>a) Indicate and provide proposed Phase 1 and Phase 2 population and projected sanitary flow separately.</p> <p>b) Show the Phase 1 and Phase 2 boundary on Figure 3.1.</p>	SCS	<p>a) As shown on Figure 3.1, the approximate population of the lands anticipated as Phase 1 is 361 and the approximate population of Phase 2 is 1670. Per the sanitary design sheet in Appendix G, the design flow associated with Phase 1 (Street J Single detached) is 6.6 L/s (38.9 – 32.3 L/s). The design flow of Phase 2 is 32.3 L/s.</p> <p>b) The approximate location of the phase boundary is immediately east of the Street "J" crossing of the NHS as shown on Figure 3.1.</p>
3	<p>3.3 External Sanitary Servicing</p> <p>a) Sanitary sewer mapping is from the Region of Durham, not Township of Uxbridge.</p> <p>b) The option for an inverted siphon under the culvert on Centre Road is not acceptable to the Region. There is an opportunity for a route that does not require a siphon and therefore no reason to service this land with a siphon. The flows from the proposed Phase 1 of the 7370 Centre Road lands would be exceptionally low and troublesome for a siphon to operate properly. Additionally, there are maintenance and reliability concerns with a siphon that don't exist for a typical gravity sanitary sewer.</p>	SCS	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Noted. Based on detailed topographic mapping, the proposed Centre Road sanitary sewer design has been revised so that the sanitary sewer passes overtop of the Centre road culvert and a siphon is no longer required.</p> <p>c) Noted. The phase 1 population is 361 as shown on Figure 3.1.</p> <p>d) Given the updated design of the Centre Road sanitary sewer such that a siphon is not required, please confirm if Options 1 and 3 are acceptable to the Region.</p> <p>e) Noted.</p>



	<p>c) Revise the Phase 1 population to 361.</p> <p>d) Option 1 and Option 3 were not reviewed and will not be commented on in detail as the Region does not support the proposed inverted siphon.</p> <p>e) Comments on the sanitary sewer design sheets are below under the heading Appendix G.</p> <p>f) This section of the report refers to HGL calculations; however, no HGL calculations were submitted with the report</p> <p>g) Based on the available capacity within the water supply system and the water pollution control plant noted above, it is premature for the Region to undertake a sanitary sewer flow monitoring exercise at this time. Many situations related to flow in the sanitary sewer may change over the time that it will take to address the other project needs.</p>		<p>f) A hydraulic grade line analysis was provided in Appendix G of the FSSR for Option 1 only.</p> <p>g) Noted.</p>
4	<p>3.4 Servicing Allocation</p> <p>a) As noted above, the Region hopes that the planned upgrades at the Water Pollution Control Plant in combination with future review of plant performance and flow data may permit a future increase in the service population of up to 16,480 without exceeding the rated capacity of 5,221 m³/day.</p> <p>b) If it is determined that the service population can be increased above 15,000, further analysis will be required by the Township and the Region to</p>	SCS	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Noted.</p>



	<p>confirm the amount of sewage capacity availability for the proposed development within the Uxbridge Phase 1 and Phase 2 lands. There is also no guarantee that this would be successful in getting all the way up to a new service population of 16,480.</p> <p>c) The Official Plan provides a population forecast of 16,480 for the Uxbridge Urban Area by 2031. There are no plans (i.e. capital budget items) for additional plant improvements beyond this population.</p> <p>d) If a higher population forecast is justified through the current Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process, a capital budget item for a Class EA to consider an expansion to the Uxbridge Brook WPCP would need to be added to the applicable Post-MCR Regional Development Charge Background Study.</p> <p>e) Currently the service population for this facility is limited to 15,000. If the upgrades to the WPCP prove to be successful, and the service population can be increased to include all or a portion of the 2031 forecast population of 16,480, there will need to be further discussion with the Township of Uxbridge on how this additional capacity can be allocated. That being said, with the Region not being in support of the proposed siphon option, the only way for the lands at 7370 Centre Road to be serviced will be through the Mason Phase 2 lands which is currently estimated to add</p>		<p>c) Noted.</p> <p>d) Noted.</p> <p>e) Noted. As outlined in response to 3b above a siphon is no longer proposed to service the site.</p>
--	--	--	--



	approximately 910 people to the service population.		
5	<p>4.0 Water Supply and Distribution</p> <p>a) The subject site is bisected by the Zone 1 and Zone 2 water pressure boundary of the water supply system for Uxbridge. Based on the Zone 1 top water level of 330.6m, the maximum road elevation within the Zone 1 boundary should be approximately 300m to ensure that the minimum static service pressure can be provided.</p> <p>b) Connection to the water supply system can be available to service the east parcel of land from the existing 300 mm Zone 1 watermain on Centre Road as shown in the functional servicing report. However, due to the number of lots proposed in this area a second Zone 1 water feed will be required for looping and security.</p> <p>c) The west part of 7,370 would need to be serviced by an extension to the Zone 2 water supply system. As noted above, the existing pumping station would need to be expanded to provide service to this additional population.</p> <p>d) Connection to the water supply system can be available from the existing 300 mm Zone 2 watermain on Concession Road 6 as shown in the functional servicing report. However, due to the number of lots proposed in this area, a second</p>	SCS	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) Noted. A second water feed connection will be made to the existing watermain on Bolton Drive to service the development.</p> <p>c) Noted.</p> <p>d) Noted. Options for additional looping will be explored with Region staff.</p>



	Zone 2 water feed will be required for looping and security.		
6	<p>Appendix G</p> <p>a) The sanitary sewer design sheet for the proposed development at 7370 Centre Road shows that the final section of sanitary sewer at Centre Road is +/- 97% full. All new sanitary sewer pipe should be designed to not exceed 80% capacity and all downstream sanitary sewer pipe must be equal to or larger in diameter.</p> <p>b) As noted above, Options 1 & 3 were not reviewed as the Region does not support the proposed siphon solution.</p> <p>c) The sanitary sewer design sheet for Option 2 & 4 show that the proposed Mason Phase 2 Land population is 800 and the most recent concept plan for these lands show a population of 910. The sanitary sewer design sheets should be revised to show this current population.</p> <p>d) Although referenced in the report, HGL calculations were not provided.</p> <p>e) Based on the severity of the surcharge in the existing sanitary sewer pipes as a result of servicing all of the 7370 Centre Road lands through the developed Mason Phase 2 lands, we do not expect that HGL calculations and sanitary sewer flow monitoring will be able to prevent the need to</p>	SCS	<p>a) Noted.</p> <p>b) As noted in response to comment 3b a siphon is no longer proposed.</p> <p>c) The sanitary design sheets will be updated to reflect the latest population estimates as part of an updated FSSR.</p> <p>d) HGL calculations were provided in Appendix G of the FSSR for Option 1 only.</p> <p>Noted.</p>



	replace long lengths of the downstream sanitary sewer system along this alignment.		
Transportation Impact Study (April 2021)			
1	The consultant states that the study will follow the Region’s TIS Guidelines and pre-consultation correspondence is included in Appendix A. A memo from the consultant states that the forecasting will be done for an assumed build-out year and five years post build-out. This approach is consistent with the Durham Region TIS Guidelines and Region staff responded in agreement. The TIS does not include forecasting and analysis for the 2023 buildout year, but only for the 2028 five-year horizon. Therefore, the study is not compliant with the TIS Guidelines.	Nextrans	Nextrans acknowledges and agrees that the Region TIS guidelines require the analysis for an opening year of 2023, however, given that this is a draft plan of subdivision, the ultimate traffic pattern will not be fully materialized immediately at the opening year. It will take several years for the traffic pattern to established. In addition, it is more appropriate to analyze and recommend transportation infrastructure improvements 5 year after the opening so that these improvements represent the ultimate conditions. Any improvements before 2028 could be a temporary and throw away costs, it will be replaced by 2028 improvements. Therefore, this analysis is appropriate and minimize disruption to the existing traffic on Regional and municipal roads.
2	The description of Regional Road 8 does not include the identification of the type of Regional Road arterial (Type B in this case).	Nextrans	Noted for future submission if necessary – no further action is required at this time
3	The consultant presents three figures to illustrate existing AM and PM peak hour traffic as counted (Figure 5), link and intersection traffic volumes for part of the study area after growth factors were applied (Figure 6), and a final set of adjusted traffic volumes for all study area intersections. The description of these adjustments is difficult to follow. For example, the consultant notes that a 50% adjustment factor has been applied to “all other intersections”, which	Nextrans	Noted for future submission with more clear descriptions – no further action is required at this time



	is understood to be a reference to several Centre Road intersections located north of Regional Road 8. However, the traffic movements at these intersections appear to be doubled (i.e. 100% increase). Notwithstanding, the resultant traffic volume estimates can be considered acceptable under the circumstances since they are higher than the counted volumes.		
4	The analysis of existing conditions is satisfactory except for the Regional Road 8/Centre Road intersection. The southbound approach of Centre Road at Regional 8 is shown to be a single lane shared for left and right turn movements but has a two-lane approach with separate left and right turn lanes. It is likely that the analysis results would have been similar or slightly better with the proper approach lanes, and they would have specifically highlighted any left or right turn operations (or operational concerns). Overall, the study area intersections are shown to operate satisfactorily.	Nexttrans	Noted for future submission if necessary – no further action is required at this time
5	The future horizon year for the study is stated to be 2028, which is five years beyond the anticipated 2023 build-out year. This omits forecasting and analysis for an opening or build-out year as required under the Region’s TIS Guidelines.	Nexttrans	As noted in earlier response, Nexttrans acknowledges and agrees that the Region TIS guidelines require the analysis for an opening year of 2023, however, given that this is a draft plan of subdivision, the ultimate traffic pattern will not be fully materialized immediately at the opening year. It will take several years for the traffic pattern to be established. In addition, it is more appropriate to analyze and recommend transportation infrastructure improvements 5 years after the opening so that these improvements represent the ultimate conditions. Any improvements before 2028 could be a



			temporary and throw away costs, it will be replaced by 2028 improvements. Therefore, this analysis is appropriate and minimize disruption to the existing traffic on Regional and municipal roads.
6	To estimate background traffic forecasts for 2028, the consultant has applied an acceptable 2% growth rate to estimate the general growth in study area traffic and added the traffic estimates for the completion of the residential development to the east of subject site (Mason Homes). The consultant assumes an 8% reduction in ITE residential trip estimates. The rationale for the adjustment factor should have been documented at this point in the TIS. Typically, the Region does not accept a reduction of the ITE trip rates unless the development is in a highly accessible location for transit (e.g. close to a GO Station or Rapid Transit route).	Nextrans	It should be noted that the reduction is very small, only 8% of non-auto traffic. This reduction is not solely related to transit but includes carpooling, active transportation, and most importantly working from home phenomenon. During the pandemic, there are many office workers are able and making very home improvements in order to work from home. This trend will continue in the future and is one of the best TDM measure and cost saving for both employees and employers. In addition, there are also a growth in service sector where residents will work at different time from peak hours. Carpooling will also be increased due to housing costs and gas price increases. It is Nextrans' opinion that this is a reasonable assumption. Even without this reduction, the existing road network is expected to be able to accommodate the site traffic based on Nextrans' intersection capacity analysis.
7	The analysis of the 2028 background traffic forecasts is satisfactory except for the Regional Road 8/Centre Road intersection due to the previously cited error in the lane configuration. Overall, the study area intersections are shown to operate satisfactorily.	Nextrans	Noted for future submission if necessary – no further action is required at this time
8	The consultant reviewed mode split information contained in 2016 TTS data and concludes that a reasonable non-auto modal split for this area of Uxbridge would be 8% of the trip generation for a residential development. This may be	Nextrans	Comment is noted. However, it should be noted that the reduction is very small, only 8% of non-auto traffic. This reduction is not solely related to transit but includes carpooling, active transportation, and most



	<p>a reasonable estimate for a future condition but is not validated by 2016 TTS information. The data shows that 3-4% of trips in the selected zones were made by transit, and this would be an appropriate adjustment factor. The consultant includes the TTS walk mode percentages as rationale for the higher adjustment factor. It should be recognized that the walk mode percentage in TTS data would be inflated in the AM peak hour as related to school trips, and as well, the ITE trip generation information is based on vehicle count data collected at residential subdivisions where it would also be expected that some walking trips (such as school trips) occur.</p>		<p>importantly working from home phenomenon. During the pandemic, there are many office workers able and making very home improvements in order to work from home. This trend will continue in the future and is one of the best TDM measure and cost saving for both employees and employers. In addition, there are also a growth in service sector where residents will work at different time from peak hours. Carpooling will also be increased due to housing costs and gas price increases. It is Nextrans' opinion that this is a reasonable assumption. Even without this reduction, the existing road network is expected to be able to accommodate the site traffic based on Nextrans' intersection capacity analysis.</p>
9	<p>The consultant also appears to imply that the TTS auto driver data represents single-occupant vehicle trips, as indicated by the comment that refers to the auto driver mode percentages (i.e. 69% in the AM, 77% in the PM) as representative of the private automobile being the major mode. While the latter would be true, the auto passenger mode should be added to auto driver to estimate the percentage of person trips by auto (i.e. 80% in the AM, 92% in the PM). It could be expected that peak hour auto passenger trips by taxi in this area of Uxbridge would be negligible.</p>	Nextrans	<p>Noted. However, even with 80% in the AM and 92% in the PM for the auto driver, the assumed non-auto of 8% is reasonable (100% - 80% = 20% in the AM and 100% - 92% = 8% in the PM). Nextrans used the lowest percentage which is 8%.</p>
10	<p>The site trip distribution is estimated by the consultant using TTS data and existing traffic patterns and is acceptable. The site trip assignment is shown in Figure 11 is acceptable, but it should be noted that approximately 10% of the peak direction trips (AM outbound, PM</p>	Nextrans	<p>Noted and will be included in the future submission if required. It should be noted that this assignment is based on the logical routing and transportation network equilibrium. This is also related to local trips to school or other discretionary trips. Since the percentage is</p>



	inbound) are assigned to Quaker Village Drive via Bolton Drive. These trips do not appear to have origins or destinations beyond Quaker Village Drive, so presumably they represent trips to/from two local schools. If this is the case, it should have been documented in the report.		very small, it will not impact the road network if it is rerouted to other intersections or roads in the study area. No further action is required at this time
11	The operational analysis of the 2028 total traffic forecasts is presented in Table 8. As previously noted, the Regional Road 8/Centre Road has an error in lane configuration. While the consultant states that all intersections would operate at acceptable levels of service, we note that the northbound movement at the Regional Road 8 / Concession 6 roundabout is shown to operate at level of service E and at 97% of capacity. This result should have been highlighted in the report as at least a future consideration for monitoring.	Nextrans	Noted. As the pandemic will alter the travel pattern in the future, it is appropriate to monitor this intersection in the future. Updated traffic count should be conducted once pandemic lockdown is fully lifted in the future. No further action is required at this time
12	The consultant assessed the potential need for traffic signals at the Regional Road 8 / Centre Road intersection using the total peak hour traffic forecasts and the “average hour” methodology contained in the Ontario Traffic Manual (Book 12). The consultant’s reporting does not seem to match the details of the analysis provided in Appendix G; however, the Region agrees with the consultant’s conclusion that traffic signals would not be justified according to this analysis. It is also noted that the consultant’s analysis has an error in that they appear to have used the signal justification criteria for roads with “2 or more” lanes (i.e. four or six lane roads). Regardless, the criteria for roads with “1” lane would yield the same conclusion.	Nextrans	Noted for future submission if required – no further action is required at this time



13	While primarily a Township responsibility, the Region agrees with the consultant’s conclusions that there would be acceptable sight lines at the proposed site accesses on Concession 6 and Centre Road, and that no auxiliary left turn lanes would be required on these roads. The consultant has not commented on the potential need for right turn lanes and this omission should be addressed.	Nextrans	Noted. It is Nextrans’ opinion that this is not an omission. The analysis indicates that a right turn lane is not required from delay, queuing and operational perspective. Additional lane will also increase the crossing distance for pedestrians and cyclists. It is Nextrans’ understanding based on various resident inputs from the public meetings conducted by the Town of Uxbridge, pedestrian and cyclist safety is a primary concern for this community.
14	The vehicle maneuvering diagrams prepared by the consultant and showing only the single-unit truck maneuvers at the intersections with the site accesses, are primarily of interest to the Township. It is noted that the reference to Figure 21 for the vehicle maneuvering diagrams is out of order with the other report Figures (several pages after Figures 15 to 20) and that a more rigorous review of truck movements should be conducted as the site plan is refined. This additional review would have to consider intersections that are internal to the subdivision as well.	Nextrans	Noted and will be included in the future site plan submission.
15	Figure 20 is incorrectly labelled as Proposed Internal and External Sidewalk Connections, which was Figure 13. The text and what the figure is depicting are the proposed traffic control types at intersections, and should be updated.	Nextrans	Noted and will be corrected in the future submission.
16	The consultant lists various TDM measures that represent the beginnings of a reasonable TDM plan. These measures include sidewalks, sidewalk and cycling connections to the site’s boundary roads, and preparation of a travel information package for residents. This section can include	Nextrans	Noted. This additional information can be included in the information package or letter to the residents.



	information that the Region can provide such as the dedicated signed “Smart Commute” carpool parking spaces at nearby community facilities such as the Uxbridge Arena and Community Centre, and Goodwood Community Centre as well as MTO and GO Transit carpool lots. In follow-up reporting as the site plan is refined, it will be necessary to identify a specific TDM plan for this subdivision and define the responsibilities for implementing that plan.		
17	The TIS has minor technical errors and omissions as noted above, however the conclusions of the report would essentially be the same if the deficiencies were addressed. Therefore, for the purposes of the applications, no further reporting is required by Durham Region at this time.	Nextrans	Noted. It is Nextrans’ opinion that the recommendations outlined in the report are based on sound technical analysis and justifications. Nextrans agrees that no further action is required at this time. These comments can be addressed in the future site plan application if necessary.
Waste Management			
1	<p>Comments provided are with respect to providing Regional residential waste and recycling collection services. The decision is based on <i>Technical and Risk Guidelines for Municipal Waste Collection Service on Private Property</i>, Schedule “P” of the Regional Waste Bylaw 46-2011.</p> <p>Lane width through the townhomes on Blocks 522-531 is below 6.5m. Waste collection service can be provided but would require service at the front door facing 6th Concession and on Street “B”. Residents would be required to bring waste and recycling/organic bins to curb at this location.</p>	MDTR	Noted. Refer to revised Draft Plan of Subdivision dated March 8, 2022

<p>If width is increased to 6.5m as per the Region’s Bylaw, a dead-end road is presented adjacent to Block 522 therefore eliminating access for rear lane service for Blocks 522-525 and lots 242-253 (Link Homes). Clear delineation of set out for these homes is required to determine service level and approval for Regional service.</p> <p>Refer to Ontario guidelines for all waste management for residents to ensure diversion of waste is planned. As per the Guidelines for Municipal Waste Collection service on Private Property found in Schedule “P” of the Regional Waste Bylaw 46-2011, roads must be 6.5m in width and a 13m turn radius. The road configuration enables the waste vehicle to move in a forward motion without reversing as per municipal waste collection guidelines. Builders are responsible for collection and disposal of all residential waste until the Region approves waste collection services. To receive approval, occupancy of homes must be >50% and vehicles must have access through the site without reversing or where builder’s material is still blocking access.</p> <p>Please note that on October 19, 2020, the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks introduced a draft regulation under the <i>Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016</i> that will make producers responsible for blue box programs’ operation including collection, as part of the Province’s full producer responsibility framework. Subject to the filing of the new regulation and</p>		
--	--	--



	amendments, Durham Region cannot confirm that it will be the recycling service provider for this development upon the completion of Durham Region’s Blue Box program transition, anticipated to occur in 2024.		
Transportation Planning			
1	In order to improve connectivity and integration of the subject lands to the existing neighbourhood to the south (Quaker Village), a north-south connection to Quaker Village Drive at Bolton Drive should be provided as a local road or, if not feasible due to the configuration of the stormwater management pond, an active transportation connection through the Township’s review. In the Uxbridge Official Plan (OP), Schedule A (Land Use and Transportation Plan, Uxbridge Urban Area) depicts a future local road northerly from the above-noted intersection to connect with an east-west local road in the Future Residential Area corresponding to Special Study Area #6 in the ROP. While the east-west road can be interpreted to fulfil the function of Street J in the draft plan of subdivision, there is no equivalent for the north-south local road to connect to Quaker Village Drive/Bolton Drive. Support for a grid (or modified grid) of local streets in Living Areas, and the integration of new development areas, is also emphasized through policies 8.2.1 f) of the ROP and 2.4.2.3 i) of the Uxbridge OP.	MDTR	Please to refer to revised Draft Plan dated March 8, 2022
2	Schedule B (Natural Heritage System and Supportive Uses, Uxbridge Urban Area) of the Uxbridge OP identifies a proposed trail connection from the existing trail west of Centre Road to the subject lands and an Open Space Node corresponding to the park in the draft plan of subdivision.	MDTR	An appropriate trail connection will be incorporated once comments from Uxbridge are recieved.



	<p>It is recommended that this connection should be reflected within Block 535 (Natural Heritage System) connecting to Street J where it curves from east-west to north-south.</p>		
3	<p>The two walkways (Blocks 539 and 540) connecting to the open space/drainage blocks in the Quaker Village subdivision provide additional connectivity but need to be widened for the Township to make them practical. The 3.0 m width shown would barely accommodate a typical concrete or asphalt walkway, let alone a setback and greenspace from the adjacent residential lots.</p>	MDTR	Please refer to revised Draft Plan dated March 8 th 2022

2

**Township of
Uxbridge Comments**



Town of Uxbridge		Jo Ann Merrick Administrative Assistant, Public Works & Operations/Development Services Office: 905-852-9181 x 202 Email: jmerrick@uxbridge.ca	
No.	Comment:	Response by:	Response:

3

**Lake Simcoe Region
Conservation Authority
Comments**



Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority		Jo Ann Merrick Administrative Assistant, Public Works & Operations/Development Services Office: 905-852-9181 x 202 Email: jmerrick@uxbridge.ca	
No.	Comment:	Response by:	Response:
Draft Plan			
1	<p>E1 100-Year Storm Event – Please demonstrate the 100-year storm event can be safely conveyed within the 2 watercourses associated with the proposed development, and the storm sewer under the proposed crossing.</p> <p>Please show the limits of the 100-year storm event on the draft plan.</p>	SCS	Additional information is required from the Township to confirm the outflow rates from the Quaker Village SWM Pond to the south of the proposed development before the conveyance of the 100-year storm event can be confirmed. The required calculations and floodline will be provided in the SWM Report at the detailed design stage.
2	<p>E2 Meanderbelt – Please demonstrate the proposed limits to development are outside LSRCA’s meanderbelt delineation (not including the setback) for the watercourse running diagonally through the site from north to south. Alternatively, a meanderbelt width analysis can be conducted. A 6m access allowance will need to be included in addition to the results from this analysis. Please show the limits of the meanderbelt delineation on the draft plan.</p>	MDTR	Noted. Refer to the revised Draft Plan.
3	<p>E3 Meanderbelt – A meanderbelt width of 18m was determined for the watercourse in the southeast corner of the site. Please show the limits of the meanderbelt width on the draft plan plus a 6m access allowance.</p>	MDTR	Draft Plan has been updated accordingly
4	<p>E4</p>	SCS	The grading of the site will be confirmed at the detailed design stage. Sloping within buffer



	<p>Slope Grading – It is understood there will be grading at the back lots of the cul-de-sac. Please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the grading be beyond the development limits? • What is the anticipated quantity of fill required, if any? • Be advised policy 4.2 or 4.3 of LSRCA’s Guidelines for the Implementation of Ontario Regulation 179/06 may be applicable (cut and fill analysis, slope stability assessment, etc). 		<p>setbacks will be reduced to the extent feasible while adhering to Township of Uxbridge requirements through measures including but not limited to alternative house design rear yard embankments, retaining walls, etc. Per the meeting with LSRCA staff on April 27, 2022 the updated draft plan will result in a reduction in embankment extents within buffer setbacks.</p> <p>The quantity of fill will be determined at the detailed design stage.</p>
--	--	--	--

Environmental Impact Study

<p>1</p>	<p>NH1 Section 8.5 As per Policy 2.3.15 in the Durham Regional Official Plan (Durham OP), development and site alteration are not permitted in key natural heritage and/or hydrologic features and their associated vegetation protection zones except for the listed exceptions. Similarly, Policy 2.3.3.3.iii.a) in the Township of Uxbridge Official Plan (Uxbridge OP), does not permit development in key natural heritage and/or hydrologic features. As per the Durham OP and Uxbridge OP, key natural heritage features include significant habitat of endangered species, fish habitat, wetlands, significant woodlands and significant wildlife habitat, and key hydrologic features include permanent and intermittent streams, wetlands, seepage areas and springs. Please revise the site plan to ensure all development and site alteration (including grading) is located outside the key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features, and their associated buffers on the subject property, such as the on-site wetland communities (MAM2-10, SWT2-5, MAS2-1, SWT2-2), intermittent streams (headwater drainage feature (HDF) 1, 2</p>	<p>Terrapex/MDTR</p>	<p>Street “A” is an appropriate road required to provide adequate transportation connections. The proposed road follows a similar pattern to the proposed Town road in the Township of Uxbridge’s Official Plan (Schedule A)</p> <p>Headwater drainage features are generally defined as “non-permanently flowing drainage features that may not have defined bed or banks; they are first-order and zeroorder intermittent and ephemeral channels, swales and connected headwater wetlands, but do not include rills or furrows.” (TRCA,2014) It is provided in the Wetland Function Assessment (WFA) carried out by Terrapex (2020), that features HDF2 through HDF4 are interpreted to not be influenced by groundwater, and as such, any water found in these features would be required to come from surface water sources. In contrast, HDF1 is understood to have</p>
----------	--	----------------------	--



	and 4), and the buffers to the significant woodland, wetlands, and watercourses.		groundwater influence, which may be permanent, and not ephemeral or intermittent. It is posited that this may remove this feature from the definition of an HDF, as provided above.
2	<p>NH2 Section 9.1 As per Policy 2.3.4.2 in the Uxbridge OP, a minimum naturally vegetated buffer zone of 30 m is required for both sides of watercourses. In addition, a minimum buffer of 15 m is required for wetlands to mitigate effects of urbanization. Please revise the site plan to ensure the correct buffer widths are provided to the key hydrologic features on the subject property. As per Comment #NH1 above, please ensure all development and site alteration (including grading) is located outside of these corrected buffer widths.</p>	GHD/MDTR	<p>Wetland buffer has been added to the draft plan.</p> <p>Buffer zone of 15m has been added for the watercourses.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The OP allows for flexibility which we have applied here. It is proposed that the minimum buffer be reduced to that which is typically applied by LSRCA although in many areas it is greater.</p>
3	<p>NH3 Section 6, Table 5 Please confirm whether a seep feature is present in the southwestern portion of the subject property, north of the houses on Galloway Cres. Photos of this area need to be submitted to the LSRCA or a site visit with the LSRCA should be scheduled to confirm the presence/absence of this key hydrologic feature.</p>	GHD	<p>The location indicated in the question is relatively proximal to the feature designated HDF1. It is provided in the Wetland Function Assessment (WFA) carried out by Terrapex (2020), that no groundwater seepage was observed on the subject property during site visits. As indicated in that report, groundwater in that area has an upward vertical gradient.</p>



4	<p>NH4 Section 7.4 As per Comment #NH1 above, wetlands, intermittent streams and seeps are considered key hydrologic features under the Durham OP and Uxbridge OP. Please update the site plan and associated catchment-based water balance to ensure the existing hydrologic inputs supporting these sensitive hydrologic features are maintained post-development.</p>	Terrapex/GHD	<p>As discussed in the conference call with the LSRCA (August 31, 2021), further updates to the catchment-based water balance will be provided with the forthcoming detailed designs. As indicated in the above comment, a catchment-based water balance will be provided for HDF1 through HDF4.</p> <p>Water balance calculations can be reviewed and appropriate mitigation measures recommended.</p>
5	<p>NH5 Section 4.3.5 Ensure all Endangered Species Act requirements are in conformity with Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks policy as it relates to the confirmed butternut habitat on the subject property and the potential species at risk (SAR) bat habitat in the treed areas of the subject property.</p>	GHD	<p>This is understood. GHD has addressed bats under separate cover and has taken responsibility for ensuring that the proponent is in conformity with requirements under the ESA regarding bat habitat and butternut tree regulations.</p>
6	<p>NH6 Sections 9.7, 9.9 The proposed development involves the removal of woodland communities (FOD4-A, FOD7-2, CUW1-A) which should be ecologically offset with on-site restoration as per the LSRCA's Ecological Offsetting Policy. This Policy can be accessed via the link: https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Pages/Ecological-Offsetting.aspx. As per the Policy, prepare an Ecological Offsetting Strategy providing the total area of the woodland feature including buffers that are proposed for removal and the total area of any locations proposed for woodland replacement. Ensure all remaining natural heritage areas are afforded the appropriate environmental protection through zoning. Please note offsetting/compensation plantings need to be located outside of buffers to natural heritage/hydrologic features as these</p>	GHD	<p>The proponent wishes to compensate for these losses and will complete an Ecological Offsetting Strategy to address the loss of woodland area and the requisite buffer.</p>



	<p>buffers are already required to be planted as per Policy 6.34 in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan. In addition, the proposed development must demonstrate conformity with applicable policies prior to proposing compensation for the removal of natural heritage features and hydrologic features. Compensation is not an acceptable mitigation measure to ensure no negative impacts to natural heritage and hydrologic features and their function.</p>		
<p>7</p>	<p>NH7 Section 9.8 Please delineate the general area of where the stormwater outfall will be located to ensure it will be outside of natural heritage and hydrologic features and their associated buffers.</p>	<p>SCS</p>	<p>The Wet Stormwater Management Pond (Figure 2.4 of the FSSR) headwall is anticipated to be located within the SWM Pond block. The outlet headwall will be relocated further east to allow for outflow to be conveyed by gravity to the proposed outlet without additional channel grading within the feature buffer. A plunge pool will be provided at the outlet headwall which will require additional disturbance of the buffer but will not disturb the feature. It should be noted that the feature buffer is disturbed under existing conditions due to agricultural activities and therefore the grading associated with the plunge pool will not negatively impact the adjacent feature.</p> <p>The Dry Stormwater Management Pond (Figure 2.5 of the FSSR) headwall is shown straddling the pond block limit and the feature buffer. The headwall location will be updated to be within the SWM Pond block in a future updated version of the FSSR. The outfall swale is required to convey flows to the proposed outlet and is located fully within the feature buffer. The location and depth of the outfall swale cannot be modified to the extent required to move it out of</p>



			the feature buffer due to grading and servicing restrictions. It should be noted that the feature buffer is disturbed under existing conditions due to agricultural activities and therefore the grading associated with the outfall swale will not negatively impact the adjacent feature.
8	<p>NH8 Section 9.5 Vegetation removal or alteration should take place from November 1 to March 31 to be outside of the breeding bird season (April 1 to August 31) and the breeding bat season (April 1 to October 31). Should any clearing be required during the breeding bird season, nest searches conducted by a qualified person must be completed within 48 hours prior to clearing activities. If nests are found, work within the area must cease until the nest has fledged, as per the federal Migratory Birds Convention Act.</p>	GHD	Understood.
9	<p>NH9 Section 3.1.1 Confirm which days the breeding amphibian surveys were conducted as Table 1 and Table 2 provide two different sets of dates (April 30, June 7 and July 27, 2019 in Table 1 and April 30, May 27, June 27, 2019 in Table 2). Please provide the completed amphibian survey sheets as an appendix.</p>	GHD	The correct dates are April 30, May 27, June 27, 2019.
10	<p>NH10 Section: Appendix A The meeting minutes in Appendix A were not revised to reflect LSRCA’s edits provided on September 3, 2020. Based on the information presented in the EIS (Beacon Environmental Limited, 2021), the following notes in the meeting minutes is considered outdated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note #1: the northeast wetland is connected to an intermittent stream (HDF4) and would no longer be considered a “low valued and marginal” wetland, 	GHD	Noted.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note #3: the south wetland is supported by surface overland flow from the western portion of the property and is not a result of blocked drainage from the southern Quaker Village subdivision. 		
Bat Habitat Assessment			
11	<p>NH11 Delineate the location of the proposed bat box on the revised site plan.</p>	GHD/MDTR	The bat box location has been shown on the site plan in an appendix attached with the response matrix. It is recommended on the east side of the berm for the southwest stormwater pond outside the buffer. This is an open location with good sunlight, near the forest edge, provides easy open area for access and is beside a water/food source.
Functional Servicing Report			
1	<p>E5 General Information Applicable Policies – Please note the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan policy 4.8DP and LSRCA’s Phosphorus Offsetting Policy are applicable.</p>	SCS	Noted.
2	<p>E6 Section 2.1 Phasing – The following is stated within the FSR “For the purpose of this FSSR, the portion of the proposed development west of the NHS and the portion of the development east of the NHS will meet quality control and erosion control individually for their respective development area. The quantity control, volume control, water budget, and phosphorus budget will be calculated based on the entire proposed development.” As a result of timing, each phase should provide and have measures in place to address each stormwater runoff control criteria outlined in Table 2.1. Please revisit the overall design to ensure each phase individually can achieve the SWM criteria.</p>	SCS	<p>The water budget and phosphorus calculations will be confirmed at detailed design once the extents and landuse for each of the phases are confirmed. As discussed with LSRCA staff on April 27, 2022, negotiations are ongoing regarding servicing allocation which will define the limits of the phases.</p> <p>A preliminary Phase 1 phosphorus budget calculation was prepared based on the 1st submission draft plan and LID design to confirm the associated P-budget. The calculations have</p>



			<p>been attached to this matrix. As shown, the Phase 1 phosphorus export is 4.46 kg/yr. The developed portion of the site will remove approximately 82% of phosphorus from post-construction runoff. The remaining phosphorus will be compensated as outlined in the LSRCA Phosphorus Offsetting Policy.</p> <p>A Phase 1 water budget will be provided in an updated calculation to be included in the detailed SWM Report at the detailed design stage based on the final landuse plan and Phase 1 extents. It should be noted that in Phase 1, runoff from the site west of the NHS will continue to convey runoff to the NHS and infiltrate runoff as under existing conditions and therefore no change in the hydrology of the NHS is anticipated relative to the western area. Infiltration LIDs are proposed throughout the Phase 1 development area and additional infiltration/evaporation will be provided by the proposed dry SWM pond/outfall swale. Should there be an infiltration deficit generated in phase 1, it will be compensated as outlined in the LSRCA Water Balance Recharge Policy.</p>
3	<p>E7 Section 2.1 Phasing – Please comment on the anticipated start / timing of Phase 2.</p>	SCS	The timing of Phase 2 is unknown at this time.



4	<p>E8 Watershed Boundaries – As per section 2.2.1 of LSRCA’s guidelines every effort must be made to maintain existing watershed boundaries and drainage patterns. Pre-development drainage area 1.07ha (drainage area 102) is being reduced to 0.3ha in the post-development conditions (drainage area 207). Please revisit the proposed development design in the attempt to direct additional runoff into the north-east tributary.</p>	SCS	<p>As noted in the meeting with LSRCA staff on April 27, 2022, the existing wetland at the northeast corner of the site is being preserved in the updated draft plan. Rear yard and roof drainage will continue to be directed to the northeast outlet to the extent feasible.</p> <p>The final area to be conveyed to the existing outlet will be determined at the detailed design stage.</p>
5	<p>E9 Section 2.2.2 IDF Values – Please provide the Township of Uxbridge’s IDF values.</p>	SCS	<p>IDF values from the Township of Uxbridge are provided in Section 2.10.</p>
6	<p>E10 Section 2.4 Post-Development Catchment 203 – As per Figure 2.2 (Proposed Storm Drainage Plan) area 203 described within the text of the report does not match that shown in Figure 2.2. Please revise the necessary information for consistency.</p>	SCS	<p>The Catchment numbers in the report text have been updated to correspond to the numbers on Figure 2.2. Refer to the updated report text attached to this matrix.</p>
7	<p>E11 Extended Detention (Wet Pond & Dry Pond) – The Wet Pond’s and the Dry Pond’s extended detention volume should be computed using the runoff volume from the 40mm, 4-hour storm event prior to entering the pond / route reservoir command. Please revisit the required extended detention volume calculations and revise any necessary tables, control structures, report text, etc.</p>	SCS	<p>The extended detention volume calculations and SWM Pond multiple outlet design sheets have been attached to this matrix.</p>
8	<p>E12 Wet Pond Outlet – The proposed Wet Pond’s outlet will be directing flow (and additional runoff volume) into the intermittent tributary. Please clarify if there will be potential erosion concerns.</p>	SCS	<p>An erosion assessment will be performed at the detailed design stage to confirm if there are any limitations on outflow from the Wet Pond. An</p>



	Alternatively, the outlet could discharge directly into the tributary running in the south-east corner of the property. Please comment and / or adjust the design, if deemed necessary.		alternative outlet location will be proposed as necessary.
Geotechnical Report			
1	E13 Geotechnical Report – As per section 3.3.2 of LSRCA’s guidelines the geotechnical report is required to support the SWM facility berms (construction with the appropriate materials and compaction), slopes (side slope stability concerns / slope assessment), clay liners (if required), etc. Please ensure the geotechnical report outlines the requirements as per section 3.3.2 of our guidelines.	SCS	SWM Pond design recommendations will be provided in the detailed geotechnical report.
2	E14 Existing Centre Road Crossings – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please comment on the condition (structure, stability, erosion concerns, etc.) of the existing centre road crossings / culverts. Please verify and provide supporting calculations demonstrating which storm events the crossings can safely convey. Please clarify if they will overtop during less frequent storm events. If overtopping occurs, please state the anticipated depth of water on Centre Road.	SCS	The existing open bottom concrete box culvert at Centre Road is in good condition. The bottom of the channel through the culvert is a mix of stone and sediment. A photo report of the culvert has been provided attached to this response matrix. Conveyance capacity calculations will be prepared as part of an updated FSSR and at the detailed design stage to confirm the capacity of the existing culvert.
3	E15 Volume Control – LSRCA’s volume control criteria is to capture / retain / treat the volume computed by multiplying the impervious areas by 25mm (not to be confused with using the volume provided during the 25mm storm event as outlined on page 141 of the FSR). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please state the overall required volume to achieve LSRCA’s criteria (based on 25mm of runoff) 	SCS	The overall required volume to achieve the preferred LSRCA criteria will be provided in Section 2.5.3 of the updated FSR. The required and proposed Phase 1 and Phase 2 Volume Control Volumes will be provided in Section 2.5.3 of the updated FSR.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please state the required and proposed volumes for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 areas individually • Please consider additional measure to achieve the volume control criteria as only 6.4mm of runoff is being captured 		<p>As outlined in Section 2.5.3, opportunities to provide volume control provided are limited on the site. The volume control has been maximized to the extent feasible. Additional opportunities for volume control will be examined at the detailed design stage.</p>
4	<p>E16 Sanitary Sewer and Watermain Crossing – Please comment on the installation (i.e. tunnelling, open cut, etc.) of the sanitary sewer and watermain crossing on Street ‘J’ and the existing culvert on Centre Road.</p>	SCS	<p>The Sanitary crossing at Street ‘A’ (previously Street ‘J’) will be installed using open cut prior to installing the by-pass storm sewer. It should be noted that per the EIS this drainage feature is ephemeral and remains intermittent until it reaches Uxbridge Brook.</p> <p>The proposed Centre Road sanitary sewer design has been revised so that the sanitary sewer passes overtop of the Centre road culvert and so can be installed using open cut.</p> <p>The watermain will cross over the top of the by-pass storm sewer and Centre Road culvert and so can also be installed using open cut.</p> <p>The sanitary and watermain crossings of Street ‘A’ will be installed using open cut methods. It is noted that the sanitary sewer on Street ‘A’ is beneath the proposed culvert however the sanitary sewer will be installed prior to the</p>



			installation of the culvert so tunneling will not be required.
5	E17 ETV Vortechs System Sizing – As per section 3.3.4.1 of LSRCA Technical Guideline for Stormwater Management Submission (September 1, 2016) only oil / grit separators units verified and sized through the Canadian ETV (Environmental Technology Verification Program) are allowed. Please ensure the Vortechs units are sized according to ETV standards. Please submit supporting sizing calculations for both (Phase 1 and Phase 2) units.	SCS	Per the Township of Uxbridge 2016 design criteria, a Vortech unit is required for pre-treatment of stormwater runoff. Through conversations with the Vortech supplier, the unit has not been ETV certified. It should be noted that the unit is being used for pre-treatment of flows only and is not included as part of the quality control calculation for the development.
6	E18 Other Pollutants – Please include a section in the report on stormwater quality control (Other Pollutants) as per Sections 2.3.3 – 2.3.5 of the LSRCA SWM Technical Guidelines.	SCS	The FSSR has been updated to refer to quality control for other pollutants. Refer to the report excerpts attached to this matrix.
General Info			
1	E19 General Info – Please ensure that a complete response to each comment is to be provided with the next submission outlining how each comment has been addressed and where in the text of the report or appendices the comment has been addressed.	SCS	Noted.
2	E20 General Info – Please note that additional information has been requested as noted above for LSRCA to further review the application. Once this information has been provided, additional comments will be forthcoming.	SCS	Noted.
FSSR/Hydrogeological Investigation			
1	H1 The FSSR indicates the site area is 39.9 ha whereas the Hydrogeological Investigation indicates 40.3 ha. Please ensure site areas are consistent within all the reports.	MDTR/Terrapex	Noted. The site area is 39.97 ha (98.78 acres). Terrapex has confirmed with team, and will be updating with a site area of 39.9 ha
2	H2	Terrapex	Please find the appended cross sections.



	Please provide geological cross section(s), including elevations of grades and groundwater levels across the site.		
3	<p>H3</p> <p>The report notes that as a result of a site visit on August 22, 2019 no obvious groundwater-dependent features or seepage areas were observed on the site. an impact assessment on both the north-central and southeast features have not been included within the report. However, there is reference made regarding the assessment of wetland functions in a report by Terrapex (2020). This report was not provided with the 1st submission and therefore it's unclear if it adequately addresses the potential impact to both these features in post-development conditions. Please provide a groundwater assessment for all natural features on the site.</p>	Terrapex	<p>The Terrapex report provides a groundwater assessment of the following four features, to determine if features are functioning as groundwater headwaters or as surfacewater collection areas:</p> <p>(1) HDF1 (2) HDF2 (3) HDF3 (4) HDF4</p> <p>As indicated in the Terrapex report, only HDF1 (south-central property line) was found to have an upward vertical gradient from groundwater.</p>
4	<p>H4</p> <p>A water balance was completed for the entire site, however the FSSR indicates that the development will consist of 2 phases. As such, the water balance for each phase will need to be completed and addressed through each application separately.</p>	Terrapex	To be addressed at detailed design, per call with LSRCA (31Aug2021)
5	<p>H5</p> <p>A catchment-based water balance was provided for the watercourse at the SE corner of the site. The catchment used in the assessment appears to coincide with drainage catchment 101 from the FSSR and the general groundwater flow direction across the site. From the information provided it is unclear which drainage catchment supports the wetland at the north end of the site.</p> <p>A pre- and post-development catchment-based (a.k.a. feature-based) water balance is required for all features that will remain on the site and should include an impact assessment of changes to those features. Please clearly identify the drainage catchments for all natural features on the site and quantify the amount of groundwater/surface water which supports them.</p>	Terrapex	Additional FBWBs to be addressed, if required, at detailed design, per call with LSRCA (31Aug2021)



6	<p>H6 The majority of both groundwater and surface flows are shown to be directed to the wetland and water course at the southeast corner of site. There is no assessment on how the proposed infrastructure (e.g. large impervious stormwater management pond) may change local groundwater flow patterns or impact discharge (baseflow) or overland flow to these features. Please provide more information on how the flow to the features will be maintained post-development without having an impact on the current function.</p>	Terrapex	To be addressed, at detailed design, per call with LSRCA (31Aug2021)
7	<p>H7 Section 4.1 It appears some information regarding the climate data source has been omitted or accidentally clipped from the report. The annual average precipitation for Uxbridge Brook subwatershed is 892 mm/yr. which appears to vary from the rate used within the assessment. Please provide more information on the source climate data used in the water balance assessment, including: a) The source and period of record of the climate data used and why it varies from the annual average for the subwatershed; b) Source of ET or how it was calculated/determined; c) Rate of precipitation (i.e. mm/yr.); d) Rate of ET (mm/yr.) based on each land use type (e.g. SWM pond, forest, grass, impervious areas); and e) Annual surplus (mm/yr.) based on each land use type</p>	Terrapex	<p>a. The report (Beacon, 2021) sources historical Environment Canada data available for Uxbridge West weather station located approximately 5 km northeast of the subject property, using an average of three years (2018 through 2020) for the estimates. Precipitation volumes were used from 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020 to compensate for incomplete datasets from the weather station.</p> <p>a. The report calculates the evapotranspiration using the Penman-Monteith Evapotranspiration (FAO-56 Method). Local solar radiation, incoming solar radiation, sunset hour angles, and solar declination conditions were sourced from the National Aeronautical and Space Administration Langley Research Center (NASA 2018) to estimate the</p>



			<p>monthly site-specific evapotranspiration rate.</p> <p>a. Based on the information sources above, the rates of precipitation (mm/month/m² and mm/year/m²) are as follows:</p> <p>Jan: 60.2 Feb: 55.6 Mar: 40.7 Apr: 129.7 May: 80.8 Jun: 42.4 Jul: 78.6 Aug: 79.1 Sep: 22.2 Oct: 75.6 Nov: 85.1 Dec: 67.1 Year: 597.2</p> <p>a. Evapotranspiration is calculated by the footprint and global position of the area, and is not based on land use (except perhaps albedo), in accordance with the Penman-Monteith Evapotranspiration (FAO-56 Method). The sources above provided the following variables to determine the ET/m²:</p> <p>Mean Daily Temperature Incoming Solar Radiation</p>
--	--	--	---



			<p>Local Albedo (includes variation for snow months) Wind Speed Atmospheric Pressure Actual Vapour Pressure Solar declination Sunset hour angle Extraterrestrial Radiation Clear Sky Solar Radiation Net shortwave solar radiation Net outgoing long-wave radiation</p> <p>The estimated rate of evapotranspiration (mm/month/m²) for each month as follows:</p> <p>Jan: 29.2 Feb: 29.1 Mar: 58.5 Apr: 61.6 May: 79.6 Jun: 103.5 Jul: 120.2 Aug: 106.0 Sept: 41.0 Oct: 48.9 Nov: 33.5 Dec: 20.2 YEAR: 731.3</p> <p>a. There are actually three answers for this question, because of the way it is calculated. The following are included below, for completeness:</p>
--	--	--	--



			<p>a. Total run-off, including snowmelt surplus from the previous month</p> <p>a. Total run-off, including snowmelt surplus from the previous month, and with frozen snow held until the next month</p> <p>a. Total run-off, with no consideration for stored surplus</p> <p>For the purposes of the water balance estimates, the three estimate parameters provide a range where: a) is most conservative, b) is most 'realistic', and c) is most simplistic.</p> <p>Please see attached tables for runoff data listed.</p>
8	<p>H8 Table 6 Table 6 provides a breakdown of land use types used within the pre-development water balance assessment. It appears these areas maybe based on a figure in another report (Beacon, 2020) which is not include here, therefore it is unclear how each land use type corresponds to the subject site. Please provide a pre-development figure clearly indicating all land use types used within the water balance assessments.</p>	Terrapex	Please find the appended figure from Beacon, 2020.
9	<p>H9 Table 7 Table 7 provide a breakdown of impervious/pervious areas as sourced from the FSSR (SCS, 2020). Please provide an additional preliminary breakdown (to be further refined at detailed design) of the types of land uses (e.g. roads, driveways, roofs, parks, lawns, NHS, stormwater ponds, etc.) along with a post-development figure clearly indicating all land use types.</p>	Terrapex	To be addressed, at detailed design, per call with LSRCA (31Aug2021)



10	<p>H10 It was noted that infiltration factors of 0.5 and 0.6 were used within the assessment however it is unclear which areas they correspond to and if the same factors were applied to both pre- and post-development conditions. Please provide a breakdown of pre- and post-development areas in which the infiltration factors correspond to.</p>	Terrapex	Please see attached tables breakdown of pre- and post development areas in which the infiltration factors correspond to.
11	<p>H11 Table 8 The post-development water balance results reported in Table 8 do not match the table within the appendix. Please amend as appropriate.</p>	Terrapex	Please see Table 8 (Beacon, 2021), referring to the Global Site-Specific Water Balance should read as follows, as indicated in Appendix D of the same report.
12	<p>H12 Both the FSSR and balance assessment indicate the stormwater management blocks (203 and 205) are 50% pervious. However, the elevations shown on FSSR Figures 2.4 and 2.5 indicate both ponds are several metres lower than the groundwater levels (obtained from the closest monitoring wells BH7 & BH11). Ponds intercepting the water table should have an impermeable liner which would make them 100% impervious within the water balance assessment. Please clearly show pervious/impervious areas on a water balance figure as noted above and adjust the water balance calculations as necessary.</p>	Terrapex	This will require input from the FSSR team, and will be addressed in detailed design releases
13	<p>H13 Table 9 Table 9 notes that infiltration-based LIDs will increase infiltration by 99,363 m³/yr. There is no information on how this volume was determined. Preliminary calculations on BMP sizing within the FSSR shows that approximately 1/3 of the infiltration deficit can be mitigated through the various infiltration trenches proposed for the site. Please provide more information including calculations demonstrating how much infiltration is achieved by each LID.</p>	Terrapex	As requested, this will be outlined in greater detail in the next release.
14	<p>H14</p>	Terrapex	This will require input from the FSSR team, and will be addressed in detailed design release



	<p>It was indicated that downspout disconnection will be utilized to offset some of the infiltration in post-development conditions. LID guidelines (CVC, 2012) indicate that for C & D type soils, up to 25% of runoff from roof areas can be considered as additional infiltration if specific LID parameters are met. Please identify:</p> <p>a) the area(s) of where downspout disconnect is being applied in the water balance assessment;</p> <p>b) the quantity of mitigation achieved; and</p> <p>c) how these LID criteria will be met</p>		
15	<p>H15 Three infiltration tests were completed at Bh6, Bh7 and BH11 indicating rates of 42 to 49 mm/hr. Once the site plan has been confirmed further testing will need to be conducted at the location(s) and bottom elevation(s) of all proposed infiltration - based facilities.</p>	Terrapex	To be addressed, at detailed design, per call with LSRCA (31Aug2021)
16	<p>H16 Example cross sections have been provided for infiltration LID (i.e. Rear yard infiltration trenches), however it is unclear how these relate to the soils and the seasonally high groundwater levels across the site. Please provide cross sections of all proposed infiltration LIDs including proposed ground elevations, highest groundwater elevations, dimensions and materials.</p>	Terrapex	This will require input from the FSSR team, and will be addressed with detailed design release

4

Bell Canada Comments



Bell Canada June 08, 2021		Ryan Courville Manager - Planning and Development Email: planninganddevelopment@bell.ca	
No.	Comment:	Response by:	Response:
1	<p>We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval:</p> <p>“The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada.</p> <p>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>The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.</p> <p>It shall 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 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>	MDTR	Noted.



	<p>To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations.</p> <p>Please note that WSP operates Bell’s development tracking system, which includes the intake of municipal circulations. WSP is mandated to notify Bell when a municipal request for comments or for information, such as a request for clearance, has been received. All responses to these municipal circulations are generated by Bell, but submitted by WSP on Bell’s behalf. WSP is not responsible for Bell’s responses and for any of the content herein.</p>		
--	--	--	--

5

Public Comments



Public Comments		Gary Muller	
June 21, 2021		Director of Planning	
		Email: planning@durham.ca	
No.	Comment:	Response by:	Response:
Region of Durham Public Meeting – September 7, 2021			
1	Scale and scope - Uxbridge is a small historic town - 588 homes is too large to maintain small town community	MDTR	Noted.
2	Lack of infrastructure - including limited road space - there are already numerous problems with traffic congestion through main arteries (Toronto St, Brock St) - only one grocery store - one small market	MDTR	The development application includes a Traffic Impact Study by Nextrans Engineering that assesses the capability of the existing road network to accommodate the forecasted traffic within acceptable operations levels.
3	Limited downtown parking	MDTR	Noted.
4	Rapid development of new townhomes on Elgin Park Dr, Reach street and Brock St, Cemetery road, Mill street which will significantly impact congestion and increase strain on limited infrastructure	MDTR	See comment 2 above.
5	Water treatment and sewage capacity. - Town water is already of poor quality	MDTR	Development of the property minimizes land consumption and servicing costs by making efficient use of vacant land in an area where servicing can be provided with extensions to existing infrastructure, with the final determination on a viable sanitary servicing capacity solution to be



			determined through the development review process.
6	<p>Noise pollution</p> <p>As a 30 year resident of Uxbridge, I have watched this town expand and green space disappear. While I appreciate that development must move forward, we have accommodated many new developments in the past several years and at present. It is important to consider the impact a development of this size will have on the quality of life of existing residents and the ability for the town to absorb the influx of demand on existing services.</p>	MDTR	Noted.
7	<p>What is the proposed make up of the subdivision? That is will it be comprised of single family homes, duplexes, town homes, condos, apartments an/or other?</p>	MDTR	The proposed development consists of 506 dwelling units (462 single family dwellings, 44 townhouse dwelling units), a park, two stormwater management ponds, a community housing block and public roads.
8	<p>Will Any buildings more than 4 storeys high? Is there a height restriction?</p>	MDTR	Community Housing Block may exceed 4 storeys. See Town’s Zoning By-Law-18-19 for single-detached, semi-detached, and link dwellings. The maximum height of buildings are 10 metres in Residential Second Density (“R2”) Zones.
9	<p>Does the plan include any commercial business allowance and if so, where? Are any already in the proposal or in the works?</p>		There are no commercial uses proposed for this development.
10	<p>Similary, will there be any new schools/daycares in this subdivision?</p>	MDTR	There are no schools/daycares proposed in this development. *May



			change based on School Board comments
11	Will green space be preserved? In particular will the existing walking trail and creek and any of the trees that exist behind my property at 7 Bolton Drive be preserved or will homes or other development replace these?	MDTR	Green spaces have been preserved. The residential development is integrated appropriately with the natural environment, the NHS feature behind properties on Bolton Drive is intact and in fact, enhanced with the creation of a public park adjacent to the NHS to create physical and visual connections to the NHS. *May change
12	Will there be any parks and playgrounds in the proposed subdivision and if so, where?	MDTR	There is 2.60ha public park proposed centrally within the property, adjacent to the NHS.
13	I see that the report indicates there are concerns with the projected population exceeding the capacity of the regions water pollution control plant and water supply. Is it safe to assume this will be sufficiently addressed before approval is granted?	MDTR	See comment 5 above.
14	I would also want the questions from the LSRCA to be sufficiently addressed by the applicant.	MDTR	Multiple discussions have taken place with LSRCA and appropriate measures have been taken to comply with pertinent environmental policies. See Environmental Impact Study.
15	This is a large increase in population. Did the transportation study include study of the existing roads in town and are there any concern of excessive congestion on the streets in town?	MDTR	See comment 2 above. The Transportation Impact Study examined existing road capacity in and around the subject property and no congestion concerns were identified.

16	I am lucky at 7 Bolton to back onto the area designated as a Natural Heritage area. However, there are other residences on Bolton that under this proposal would have new homes directly behind them. I feel I should ask for their benefit, if any consideration can be or was given to the possibility of eliminating the 43 units that are proposed directly behind them, thus retaining some green space behind them as well.	MDTR	There is ample green space in the development, including the existing retained NHS features, a new 2.6 ha public park, and two SWM ponds to meet the recreational needs of the community.
17	Hello, I am a long-time resident of Uxbridge who has recently become aware of an attempt to amend zoning by-law 81-19, which would allow a 558-unit subdivision to be built in 7370 Centre Road. I wish to make it known that I oppose this for both personal and practical reasons.	MDTR	Noted.
a	Firstly, relating to my personal reasons, the idea of more townhouses in Uxbridge is an idea I do not abide, as I find the vast majority of these kinds of construction projects to be either unpleasant to look at or incredibly invasive to other areas of the town. I don't enjoy the prospect of looking out my back window and seeing into someone else's bathroom, to put it bluntly.	MDTR	The proposed development adheres to good planning principles. The planned design represents a logical and efficient street pattern given the configuration of the property to achieve a compact urban form through the provision of modern homes. Further, the subject property is located within the Urban Area (Schedule A) within the Official Plan. These lands are designated for future growth and development within a phased growth management strategy.
b	On the topic of practical reasons, I feel that the added stress to the towns sewer systems that would come from these new buildings would either result in a complete renovation of the existing sewer system (meaning more construction costs), or a sewage overflow that would result in the renovation anyway.	MDTR	See comment 5 above.
c	Furthermore, given Uxbridge's status as the Trail Capital of Canada, it would stand to reason that people coming to walk these trails would	MDTR	There is convenient pedestrian access to the NHS and public park. Trail



	expect a great deal of natural beauty, something jeopardised by a new set of residential properties. I feel this would negatively impact tourism for the town, which, in turn, would also cause issue for the numerous local restaurants and businesses within the town, many of which rely on tourism to meet their yearly financial goal.		connections are maximized within the proposed development.
d	Overall, I feel that amending Zoning By-Law 81-19 for the sake of this construction project would cause long term damage to the township of Uxbridge as a whole, and that it should remain as it is for the foreseeable future	MDTR	See comment 17a above.
18	Underground Water Sources - Waste Water/Sewage Management A water pumping and reservoir station is operated by Durham Region on the east side of Concession 6, just south Bolton Drive, and north of the Uxbridge Historical Centre at #7239, and appears to be a main water supply for Uxbridge. Although one of the highest elevations of land in our municipally also known as Quaker Hill, it appears to be a main underground water source drawn from the natural underground water wells and springs in this high level land area.	MDTR	Noted.
a	Have hydrologic tests performed to date been comprehensive enough to ensure the quantity and quality of natural underground water sources are present to support the additional proposed households in the draft plan of subdivision? and further,	MDTR	Please refer to the Functional Site Servicing Report.
b	Do geologic tests confirm that natural underground aquifers will not be disturbed or compromised with excavations normally associated with housing development construction?	MDTR	See comment 18a above.
19	The Uxbridge Brook Water Pollution Control Plant operated by Durham Region situated on Concession 7 (Durham Regional Road #1), just south of #129, appears to be the only wastewater / sewage processing facility in Uxbridge. Our municipal and regional governments have long since communicated this facility is operating at near maximum capacity with	MDTR	See comment 5 above.



	minimal expansion capabilities. What mechanical enhancements or expansion has occurred at this water pollution control plant that would allow for an additional hookup of 588 household units without jeopardizing the efficiency and integrity of the current waste water/sewage processing facility?		
20	<p>Number of Homes - Disproportionate</p> <p>If this proposed Plan of Subdivision proceeds unchanged, this will be the largest housing development that Uxbridge has experienced in its history. I realize that high density housing usually translates into more affordable housing.</p>	MDTR	Under the Durham Regional Official Plan, greenfield areas shall be developed to achieve an overall density of 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare. The proposed development achieves a density that exceeds the required residents and jobs per hectare. Therefore, the proposed development meets Official Plan policies and is proportionate.
a	Is it reasonable to allow such a high number of housing units to be compressed into an disproportionately small parcel of land which to me is the historical outlook over Uxbridge?	MDTR	The parcel of land is 39.97 acres, there is ample room for a housing development of this nature.
b	Does the proposed Bridgebrook Corporation Draft Plan of Subdivision, fulfill the criteria of “Good Planning” and does it complement the Quaint Idyllic Culture of Uxbridge?		The Draft Plan of Subdivision represents good planning as it provides for a compact built form with appropriate forms of housing. The proposed development is consistent with, conforms to and complies with all applicable Provincial, Regional and Municipal planning documents and is in the public interest. Please see Planning Justification Report for more information.

21	<p>We knew at some point that a subdivision would be developed north of us and we had no issue then and now regarding this as long as things are done correctly. There is now currently a walkway proposed to go in behind our house, Block 539. This is also a very narrow section of green space and also on a steep hill. Trees would be removed and privacy would be lost with people looking into our properties. Security would now also be an issue. This would affect 19 homes with the creation of the block 539 walkway. The block 540 walkway has always been proposed and would only affect 6 homes and is a wider section of green space. There is no objection with this trail as we all have known about this for a long time. This has been laid out in the Town Of Uxbridge Active Transportation Plan dated January 2014.</p>	MDTR	Noted.
a	<p>Nextrans transportation study has failed to recommend a better walkway than the ones proposed. There should be a trail installed between lots 189 and 113 and then goes through the drainage section to Bolton Dr. All residents assumed this would be a road but nothing has been proposed. It's ridiculous this space is not being used for a walkway. A trail should come through here and cross onto the east side of Quaker Village Dr. This would mean only one road crossing at this three way stop and a continuous walk with no more road crossing on the way to the two public elementary schools.</p>	MDTR	Noted. New draft plan from March 8 th 2022 reflects changes made
b	<p>I realize this is only the planning stage but common sense needs to be used here. To have the block 539 walkway put in so close to the block 540 walkway and the sidewalks to be installed along 6th concession to connect Bolton Dr is a waste. This greenspace has never been proposed for a walkway and needs to be removed from this development plan.</p>	MDTR	New draft plan from March 8 th 2022 reflects changes made
22	<p>Environmental - we are adjacent to farm land on the west side of 6th Concession and Bolton and provide natural drainage to the farm acreage across the road. As a result, the water table is quite high, 6-inch holes will tap the water table on our property, which would be the</p>	MDTR	See Functional Site Servicing Report.



	<p>same as any excavation in the adjacent property, causing harm and deviation of our water supply impacting the well systems of many residents adjacent to this land.</p> <p>Prior reports done by the developer have even stated that the current waste water facility cannot accommodate this development.</p>		
23	<p>Density - the proposed rezoning of the subject lands outlines a plan for 588 second and multiple density dwellings which will translate to at least 588 family units, 1176+ cars (x2), over 2300+ new residents utilizing sewage facilities and roads that would literally clog our roadways and our water treatment plant. This will be on top of the other developments already in progress in Uxbridge.</p>	MDTR	See comments 5 and 17a above.
24	<p>Community Services overload – Uxbridge is currently expanding with more than four different communities being built as we speak. With an addition of 588 more houses, is the region willing to step up and support a new elementary and high school to support the families? Is the region willing to increase the police presence to support the increase in crime that will 68 come with a population increase? And is the region going to step up and support the increase demands placed on the cottage hospital?</p>	MDTR	Noted.
25	<p>Proposed Pathways – proposed pathways also have a direct impact on the homes in Quaker Village, particularly between Alsop and Galloway. This designated greenspace is a swale with vegetation that handles the rainwater to prevent erosion and mudslides between the two streets. Pathways in these areas would hinder the very reason they were created, potentially having devastating effects on all properties involved.</p>	MDTR	Noted.
26	<p>North Durham is not immune to the urban sprawl that is turning small Durham towns into gridlocked, high-density metropolises. Growth does help the economy but is the region going to step up to spend the many</p>	MDTR	See comments 17a and 20 above.



	hundreds of millions it will take to help Durham North, specifically Uxbridge, with the sewage, environmental, health care, crime and education, etc., issues that comes at the expense of this growth. I trust the Region and Township to address these concerns prior to the consideration of the proposed rezoning.		
27	Can you please send me all of the information regarding this development and keep me on the list for future updates?	MDTR	Noted.
28	A: The subject site is rural. This site is farmland, the land grows crops every year. Our farmland is disappearing!	MDTR	Noted.
29	Where is the sewage going from 588 units? Three years ago the town sewage allocation was at 600 units. 200 units were reserved for downtown. The other 400 were to be used for phase 1 developments and infill. As of right now houses are being built at Winding Trails development, south Cemetery Road, Montgomery Meadows, and two developments at Countryside Park on the east side of town. No more effluent can go into the Uxbridge Brook (Lake Simcoe Protection). Are we looking at the Big Pipe coming to Uxbridge? Is this development on Centre Road an MZO decision?	MDTR	The proposed development will be subject to the existing capacity of the Uxbridge WPCP. The capacity of the existing sanitary system is being studied to determine the system opportunities for accommodating this development.
30	B: Infrastructure (Roads) Centre Road is already busy with traffic for Quaker Village, Mason Homes, Glen Acres, and the Ognibene homes from many years ago. The Arena is on the corner of Brock Street and Centre Road; try making a left turn from Centre Road to Brock Street! Ball Road and most of Centre Road have no shoulders. That leaves most of the traffic going onto the 6th Concession.	MDTR	See comment 2 above.
31	C: If this development goes, the floodgates are open!	MDTR	Noted. See comment 17a above.



	<p>Uxbridge is surrounded by the Green Belt and the Oak Ridges Moraine, and sits in a valley. It is the Trail Capital of Canada. The signs at the entrances to Uxbridge say 'Welcome to Uxbridge -- a Green Belt Community. People move out of cities to come to Uxbridge, they pay high taxes for a quality of life. We are farm country, agriculture is the largest business in Durham Region. Are we looking to become a Stouffville or Newmarket?? This is not how you grow communities, this is how you ruin them. When David Crombie heard of the new MZO, he resigned as Chair of the Ontario Green Belt Council. At a time we should be protecting the environment, we keep building - building in places that in my opinion we shouldn't be. There are thirty six Conservation Authorities in Ontario; it appears that maybe the name Authority should be replaced by the word Consultant. As you can see I am not in favour of this development; I foresee that If this goes ahead on the west side of Centre Road, it will then go on the east side, and then north of Ball Road on both sides. So much for your Green Belt community, and so much for protecting the Green Belt, so much for supplying food, e.g.Farm to Table.</p>		
32	<p>My Questions:</p> <p>1. The afore cited excerpts of the Durham Region’s official plan seem like a lot to be amended based on the third party documents submitted by the developer. According to Beacon’s Evironmental Impact Study section 4.2.1 Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment, Head Water Drainage Feature Number 1 is classified as followed:</p> <p>Hydrology Classification- Valued</p> <p>Riparian Classification- Important</p> <p>Fish & Fish Habitat Classification- Contributing</p> <p>Terrestrial Habitat Classification- Contributing</p>	MDTR	Noted.



	<p>Management Recommendation Conservation</p> <p>Yet HDF 1 is left off of Table 5. Summary of Key Functions and Attributes, but the table includes features that were assessed as Riparian Classification- Limited</p> <p>Terrestrial Habitat Classification- Limited</p> <p>Management Recommendation- Mitigation</p> <p>Why was HDF1 left off table 5?</p>		
33	<p>2. How can the natural heritage features present on the property be retained, protected and enhanced, with the exception of:</p> <p>The tributary HDF1 and associated wetland and treed areas at the southern limit of the property, which provides ephemeral drainage, is partially tiled, and drains to an existing catchbasin at the southern extent of the property. This drainage feature was assessed with a management recommendation of Conservation and is proposed for removal with replication of function? What’s the point of recommending it be conserved just to propose it be removed?</p>	MDTR	Noted.
34	<p>3. According to the regions official plan.</p> <p>Section 4 Housing 4.2.4 Regional Council shall require at least 25% of all new residential units produced within each area municipality, to be affordable to low and moderate income households.</p> <p>What is the market price per unit that meets this criteria?</p>	MDTR	Noted. This will be determined further in the development process.
35	<p>4. From section 12.1.3 of The Regional Plan.</p> <p>An amendment to this Plan to designate these lands for development shall be subject to the consideration of the following:</p>	MDTR	Noted.

Bridgebrook Corp. – First Submission
 7370 Centre Road, Uxbridge, ON
 File Numbers: File No: OPA 64, ZBA 2021-01, SPA 2021-01

	<p>a) the amount and rate of development that has occurred in the area designated "Living Area"; and</p> <p>b) the availability of servicing capacity.</p> <p>Developments are already underway in Uxbridge on Brock St. East, Cemetery Rd., Reach St. and Elgin Park Dr. Given the rate of development already occurring in the designated "Living Area" does it not seem inappropriate to amend Special Study area 6 at this time?</p>		
Township of Uxbridge Public Meeting – October 25, 2021			
1	<p>That the Concession Road 6 frontage of the lands be revised such that an open space / landscape block be provided to assist with the interface between agricultural lands west of Concession Road 6 and the subdivision. We note that a similar treatment was implemented in the development to the immediate south of the Bridgebrook Corp. lands (i.e. along Concession Road 6 north of Bolton Drive).</p> <p>That a warning clause be placed on title advising future residents of the adjacent, ongoing agricultural operations and that noise, dust and odour from these operations may occur.</p> <p>That, should Regional and Town Council approve the Bridgebrook Corp. applications, it be stated in the Council decision documents that said approval does not restrict in any way forward existing and / or future farming operations, including the construction of new barns/ facilities on our client's lands.</p>	MDTR	Noted
2	<p>We knew at some point that a subdivision would be developed north of us and we had no issue then and now regarding this as long as things are done correctly. There is currently a walkway proposed to go in behind our house, Block 539. This is also a very narrow section of green space and also on a steep hill. Trees would be removed and privacy would be lost with people looking into our properties. Security would</p>	MDTR	Addressed in Comment 21 of previous section



	<p>now also be an issue. This would affect 19 homes with the creation of the block 539 walkway. The block 540 walkway has always been proposed and would only affect 6 homes and is a wider section of green space. There is no objection with this trail as we all have known about this for a long time. This has been laid out in the Town Of Uxbridge Active Transportation Plan dated January 2014. To have the block 539 walkway put in so close to the block 540 walkway and the sidewalks to be installed along 6th concession to connect Bolton Dr is a waste. This greenspace has never been proposed for a walkway and needs to be removed from this development plan.</p>		
3	<p>As longtime residents of Uxbridge and Quaker Village we were disheartened to learn of the planned development between Concession 6 and Centre Road. Quaker Village currently has just over 300 homes and it is inconceivable to imagine a development that is double the density. 588 units multiplied by an average of 4 family members per unit is 2352 additional residents. We understand that the township currently does not have the sewer and waste management capacity to handle a development of this magnitude, however, if the rezoning is approved, once the sewers are approved the developers will be able to proceed without any additional permission or community engagement.</p> <p>We love Uxbridge. The nature, the charm of our community, and small town atmosphere. It is both a privilege and a blessing to raise our family here. This type of build would result in displacing the animals that live in these fields, destroying crops and forests, taking away the sweeping views and breathtaking sunsets to replace with 588 homes, 2000+ people, over 1000 additional vehicles travelling along both the 6th Concession and Centre Road. The noise pollution, the added congestion to Toronto street, grocery stores, schools, parking lots - all</p>	MDTR	Acknowledged.



	<p>so a developer and builder can line their pockets and then leave this town a little worse for wear.</p> <p>Development is inevitable. 588 units does not showcase responsible growth, it's showcases greed and a lack of investment in the overall community and its residents.</p> <p>We urge the town to oppose these applications.</p>		
4	<p>I am writing to register my opposition to the above application to rezone the property named in this notice.</p> <p>My reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the property is not within the urban area • there is no sewage capacity within the current facility • there is no traffic solution proposed for the current problems found daily within the Township • the current developments within Uxbridge are suggested as "infill" or " intensification" as suggested in the Provincial Policy statement. I find this a misreading of the policy statement. There was no intent to have little towns and villages like Uxbridge be "intensified" no matter how large the ego of the Mayor or Councillors. The Region of Durham made serious errors when planners suggested that this was the intent of the policy statement. 	MDTR	Please see Nextrans report in relation to traffic. Please also refer to the answers given within the matrix
5	<p>We are very opposed to this proposal for 3 key reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity: Uxbridge does not have the capacity for this - and building the capacity would completely ruin the reason why residents like ourselves love Uxbridge. This will disrupt roads, school systems, playgrounds, etc. • Green space: This subdivision will ruin one of our favourite walking areas in this part of town (we live in Glen Acres). There is a trail on this proposal; as well, many residents like us enjoy 	MDTR	Capacity: The proposed development will be subject to the existing capacity of the Uxbridge WPCP. The capacity of the existing sanitary system is being studied to determine the system opportunities for accommodating this development.



	<p>the beauty of nature along Centre towards Ball. How can we be the trail capital of Canada when we needlessly destroy green space?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uxbridge lifestyle: Uxbridge has beautiful, small town charm because it is a beautiful small town. <p>Such expansions will change that. It is unwelcome.</p>		<p>Green space: A public park will be provided and natural heritage features will be protected</p>
6	<p>While I understand Uxbridge needs to meet density/growth requirements and we are limited in the amount of developable land we have access to, given this circumstance, smart planning and consideration need to be taken given lack of land we have to work with. Uxbridge is not a comparable location to Town's such as Whitby, Ajax, Oshawa, Pickering which have much higher densities and the necessary infrastructure to accommodate population growth. Uxbridge already has limited community amenities and infrastructure making a development like this with such a high density unimaginable. In my opinion, Uxbridge is in need of greater public recreation centres, parks, and community gathering areas. It is unfair for the existing residents to have to sacrifice more and share space when it is already limited. I think that 588 Units is far too much for this piece of land and I would like to see more of a mixed use of space as-well as a larger designation to community space. Based on the draft plan of subdivision, it seems extremely cookie cutter in design and to meet the characteristics of the neighbourhood, I think a wider variety in lot sized and home types would better complement the existing developments. An additional 588 units is a significant increase and when you compare this to Quaker Village with roughly 300 Units on a larger area of land, I think this development should be roughly 2/3 the size of the current proposal with roughly 350-400 units, to give a wider variety of home types and community amenities A common theme through the infill developments in-town and now this proposed development is a lack of community amenities. While there is a need to grow in Durham region,</p>	MDTR	<p>Noted. Proposal has gone from 588 unit count to 506. Refer to revised draft plan from March 8th 2022</p>



	this type of development with comparatively high densities to the existing community is not the solution and should not be permitted.		
7	Lack of infrastructure to support an influx of people : water, food, amenities ect	MDTR	Infrastructure is expected to be upgraded to accommodate growth within Uxbridge
8	Disruption to the peaceful living which we all moved here/ live here for	MDTR	Noted.
9	<p>I have read through the executive summary and if taken at face-value, it would appear to be a good plan. Minimal impact on traffic; our infrastructure could handle the in excess of the 500 new dwellings and the people that would live in these dwellings add minimal, if any, impact to the environment.</p> <p>In reality, we are in a crisis mode with the residents and infrastructure we currently have.</p> <p>I will only mention that had the right planning been done prior to the "big dig" on Brock St Uxbridge residents would not be saddled with major overrun costs.</p> <p>In non-Covid times on any weeknight trying to get to the stores on Hwy 47 in a nightmare. Worse on the weekends. Add another 600 - 700 cars into this mix and you have bedlam.</p>	MDTR	Noted.
10	I used to work in Stouffville in the 80's and 90's and it has changed so much that that long term residents are unhappy where they live now. It would be a shame to see that happen to Uxbridge. I have lived here since 1967 and will be moving further north next year.	MDTR	Noted.
11	1. Density - the proposed rezoning of the subject lands outlines a plan for 588 second and multiple density dwellings which will translate to at least 588 family units, 1176+ cars (x2), over 2300+ new residents	MDTR	The Nexttrans Traffic report accounts for such estimates and allows for them.

	utilizing sewage facilities and roads that would literally clog our roadways and our water treatment plant.		The Uxbridge WPCP is expected to be upgraded to accommodate growth within Uxbridge.
12	Water & Sewage - the area proposed is widely known to not be supported by any current water management system, and the current infrastructure is not capable of supporting more residential growth	MDTR	The Uxbridge WPCP is expected to be upgraded to accommodate growth within Uxbridge.
	Road Safety- Concession 6 is arguably a dangerous, narrow road that would border the western edge of the proposed residential area. It is known for high speeds of commuters who are circumventing going through Uxbridge itself. The roundabout at Regional Road 8 is known for accidents, and the intersection at Cone. 6 and Davis Drive is worse. The additional traffic from the proposed homes will lead to more and serious accidents.		Noted.
13	School Capacity- Quaker Drive Public school is full! And the buses already coming into Uxbridge make the town almost impassable during school opening and closing hours.	MDTR	Noted.
14	The Town of Uxbridge will become overcrowded with the building of subdivisions and will lose its character and rural environment, green space will be destroyed, animals will be displaced, and the town will become overcrowded and commercialized if we allow the building of subdivisions. In addition, there will be increased pollution and vehicular traffic. The town and its area will become overcrowded. Moreover, the Town's infrastructure doesn't support such an increase in population. If we allow such a subdivision, more will be built in Uxbridge, destroying the Town and what it is supposed to be. I lived in the Town of Ajax and the same thing occurred there. We left to get away. As such I vehemently oppose the redesignation.	MDTR	Noted.
15	3) Water treatment and sewage - these 588 new high density homes will lead to more than 2,350 new residents {588 x 4 avg people per	MDTR	The waste water treatment facility has already been set to be upgraded to



	household) utilizing drinking water and sewage facilities that would literally drain and clog our existing water treatment facilities already strained under the current resident population. What investment does the builder propose to make to the water treatment facility in order to support their proposed new development?		accommodate the growth within Uxbridge
16	This proposal to build a 588-unit residential subdivision on such small lots within the Town of Uxbridge will change the character of our rural town by adding over 2000 individuals and 1000 vehicles to the town from this one development. This development will have a significant impact on the town's sewer, water, roads, traffic management, surface water management, snow removal, fire, hospital, policing and schools.	MDTR	The Uxbridge WPCP is expected to be upgraded to accommodate growth within Uxbridge.
17	Climate change impacts should be considered with the 588-unit high density development. Uxbridge is surrounded by hills with the older part of Uxbridge sitting in the lower portion of the bowl along with the municipal wastewater treatment facilities for Uxbridge. If this area was hit with a severe rain event such as occurred in September 2021 in the northeast of the US, Uxbridge would probably have severe flooding with the wastewater treatment facilities being overwelled by the flooding along with the various water holding ponds in Uxbridge. This high density 588-unit development proposed for the upper west side of Uxbridge will result in significant run-off water flowing east to the lower areas of Uxbridge adding to a potential environmental disaster for the Lake Simcoe watershed.	MDTR	The Environmental Impact Study addresses issues such as this.
18	Traffic management changes will be necessary on the 6th concession at the development, Davis Drive, Bolton Drive, Hwy 47 and Durham 23. Traffic management changes will be necessary on Centre Road at the development, Bolton Drive and at Brock Street. Traffic management changes will be necessary throughout the town. The existing residents	MDTR	Noted.



	of Uxbridge should not be on the hook to fund these changes to traffic management in the Town of Uxbridge resulting from this development.		
19	The "Natural Heritage System and Buffer" should be extended west up to the 6th concession and then north along the 6th concession to conform to the Quaker Village layout for drainage and green space.	MDTR	Drainage has been accounting for within the Functional Servicing Report. A 2.6 ha park is dedicated for Green Space/Parkland.
20	The density of this development should be reduced and walking, and bike trails should be incorporated into the plan similar to Quaker Village and the development east of Centre Road.	MDTR	Density meets minimum development requirements as prescribed by provincial policy.
21	<p>As taxpayers and residents of Uxbridge, we are very concerned about the size of this proposed sub-division. We live on Concession 6, across the road from the planned subdivision, imagining an additional thousand vehicles (considering most single family homes have 2 cars now), is very concerning. Will there be any inquiries about the impact on Uxbridge's present infrastructure? Schools? It doesn't appear like the Uxbridge trail system has been incorporated into the plan to extend up to the 6th Concession in a similar way that it was in the subdivisions south of Center Rd. We also note the buffer zone on the north end of Quaker Village was also not in this proposed sub-division plan, which provides a natural setting along the 6th Concession.</p> <p>We moved to Uxbridge over 30 years ago, because of its rural, pastoral, small-town beauty. It's so disappointing seeing it change more and more into a congested, city-like scape that has eroded our beautiful farmlands.</p> <p>Please consider carefully what will be sacrificed if this development is allowed to proceed as proposed.</p>	MDTR	The proposed development meets current provincial policies and constitutes good planning

22	<p>It is heartbreaking to me that this beautiful, rural area could potentially become a subdivision to so many homes. I moved to Uxbridge in 1989 because it was a quaint small town surrounded by farmland and nature ... A. subdivision of 588 homes will add we!! over a thousand vehicles on roads that were not built to handle them. The pollution, noise, dust and disruption will go on for months or years, rural homes in the area will have their wells affected. Where will the kids go to school? My kids went to QVPS twenty years ago and there were portables even then. The town has grown a lot recently, leave Centre Road alone. Farmland is disappearing everywhere, once paved over, we will never get it back. What about sewage and water capacity? I thought Uxbridge didn't have to capacity for such a development. Everything doesn't have to be about money.</p>	MDTR	<p>The Uxbridge WPCP is expected to be upgraded to accommodate growth within Uxbridge.</p>
23	<p>I agree farm land is one of the important issues and we have to look at the accumulative effects of taking away farm land and how this will affect us in the future. When you look to the south of us particularly Stouffville you realize we have to protect the farm land we have because we will be feeding the masses one day to the south.</p>	MDTR	<p>Noted.</p>
a.	<p>Another issue is will all of these homes be smaller and not the huge sq ft homes we see being built today? Will these homes be LEEDS homes, energy conservation in every way so they are contributing less to the climate problems we are encountering today and smaller homes are more affordable to the average household.</p>	MDTR	<p>Homes will range from 11m-13.4m frontage, and be built to green standards.</p>
b.	<p>And what about the most interesting suggestion of thinking outside the box, a subdivision of homes that do not drive cars into the main part of this development but have a parking location at the entrance. Imagine the air could be cleaner than other locations, less chance of idling their vehicle, and the installation of electricity would encourage electric cars for this living area.</p>	MDTR	<p>Noted.</p>



<p>Taking farmable land, that is able to sustain the entire population of Uxbridge is not taking care of our planet. It is not leaving a legacy for the ones coming behind, it is not teaching our children and youth that sustaining our Earth Mother is important. They will be very angry with us for not doing more to respect what we have been given. We need to change our ways for the children coming behind us.</p> <p>I understand we also need places to live. There are places in town that could be put to better use. We do need parks and places for our children to experience nature but we need to have a vision with a sustainable future. Our young ones deserve that!!</p> <p>I live in town. I am still on well and septic. I wonder how long it will stay clean and viable. I know our water table has gone down since we moved her over 20 years ago.</p> <p>Our roads are already busy at all times of the day. I have waited over 5 min many times to turn left off Cemetery Road in the middle of the day. With COVID protocols being lifted, the traffic has gotten heavier and heavier.</p> <p>With more houses, traffic will only get worse and so will the pollution. That is not good for our health either. I have been trying to walk more but the noise and smell of vehicles is a deterrent especially on the main roads. I have almost been hit more than once by big trucks and people in a hurry at the lights at Toronto St and Brock. I always watch for what is coming and not slowing down. I try to avoid crossing there now.</p> <p>People outside of Uxbridge come here to shop because it is a small town and stores aren't as busy (their words). Great for our businesses but creates more traffic. Traffic comes through heading to cottage country. Do they stop?? I don't know know. Maybe they stop at Tim Hortons or McDonalds which doesn't help our smaller businesses. Is</p>	<p>MDTR</p>	<p>The Nextrans Traffic Report accounts for this and accommodates for expected traffic.</p> <p>An Environmental Service Report has been completed and outlines any impact on the environment and how to protect it as well.</p>
---	-------------	---

	<p>there enough infrastructure in place to accommodate all the new that will need to be put in place? Those take resources too.</p> <p>My taxes have gone up a lot in the last few years and I have not benefited. I am all for being community and helping others out but developers should be paying not community. I, personally, can not afford any higher property tax and am looking at selling. Someone will buy my place, likely rip it down and put up 2-3 houses. At least no farmland will be damaged in the process.</p> <p>As a concerned person who lives on this land, I ask you to take into consideration the Land, Water, Animals, Air and all that shares this space with us. We all need the resources the Earth provides to surviveincluding you who make decisions.</p>		
	<p>My belief was that we were guarded being on moraine land, being a small agricultural community. Subdivisions of this scale do not in any way suit this township nor the reason I moved to Uxbridge 16 years ago. The traffic that will ensure from such a large scale project and the destruction of very usable arable land, denotes lack of appreciation for any sort of environmental protection that should not be negated. Density alone will negatively impact wildlife and residents in the immediate area but also the greater town with traffic. Growth is not always positive. Being identified as the trail capital does not match large scale builds such as this.</p>	MDTR	Noted.
	<p>We have grand children attending Quaker Village School. Despite what the township is claiming, to add 588 families with children, would severely compromise the quality of education the children would receive. As with our stores, the line ups for check out are already ridiculous. The traffic on our town roads make what should be a quick trip to a gas station or store, one that requires way more consideration to venture out.</p>	MDTR	Noted.



	<p>This amount of traffic will create nightmares on our roads for those commuting to their places of employment. I assume the GO (train) public transit will also be expanded from Stouffville to Uxbridge? It would have to, although again creating an undesirable, larger city 'feel'. With the significant rise of gas prices to come, combined with the increase in traffic as mentioned, the GO trains (not buses), must unfortunately be considered in this equation.</p>	MDTR	Noted.
	<p>I am concerned this is a further example of urban sprawl expanding into Uxbridge. The additional subdivision of people will remove more water from the moraine , add more waste to the Uxbridge brook and , add more pollution to the township. Further it will increase the carbon footprint of Uxbridge while many are looking at ways to reduce the climate affects.</p>	MDTR	An Environmental Service Report has been completed and outlines any impact on the environment and how to protect it as well.
	<p>The impact of this additional subdivision will lower the enjoyment of those living in Uxbridge . It will further affect the health of the residents as they deal with more traffic problems , and the increased density in grocery stores, and places of business. Further the added number of people visiting our natural areas will increase the noise level and lower the health benefits as well as reduce the biodiversity as wildlife leave.</p>	MDTR	Noted.
	<p>The idea of turning this huge piece of our best farmland in to houses borders on criminal insanity and may probably have dire consequences.</p> <p>The sewage from that piece of land would go north to Lake Simcoe which by all standards is heavily polluted already. There is plenty of land available which is not used for growing our much needed food.</p> <p>Our neighbours and us are totally against this insanity of 588 units, a small city, on that piece of the finest farmland in Uxbridge.</p>	MDTR	Sewage has been addressed in the Functional Servicing report and conversations have been had with the Lake Simcoe Conservation Authority in regards to this.



	<p>1. The lack of any kind of natural buffering between the existing residential subdivision (Alsop/Galloway/Bolton) and the proposed development to provide visual screening, noise abatement and general privacy;</p>	MDTR	Buffers have been added to the new Draft Plan
	<p>2. The lack of any designated school or commercial land (neighbourhood store) within the development to enhance and promote "walkability" for its future residents;</p>	MDTR	Noted.
	<p>3. The elimination of trees in the two existing "open space / drainage" areas (as identified on the draft plan of subdivision) located just east of Alsop and just east of Galloway. Based on the Transportation Impact Study, this open space is to be utilized for sidewalk and cycling connections from the proposed development to the existing sidewalk on the south side of Bolton Drive. I suggest these areas are not properly identified as "open space" as they are well treed and will require major grading changes to allow a connecting trail of some type. Who will own and maintain this connecting trail;</p>	MDTR	Trails will be dedicated as public open space to the municipality
	<p>4. Why a sidewalk and cycling connection, similar to what is noted in point 3, is not proposed at the two locations identified as "drainage", which could connect Block 535 on the draft plan of subdivision to Bolton Drive. There is an identified existing trail within the proposed subdivision, near its south-east corner, that seems to be overlooked as a connection point to Bolton Drive for pedestrians and cyclists;</p>	MDTR	Density has been reduced to 506 total units in the new draft plan.
	<p>5. The overall plan is too dense, with 588 residential units proposed, which equates to a density of 11.74 dwelling units per acre, based on my rough calculations;</p>	MDTR	Noted



	<p>6. In general, the plan does not match the existing road network, lot fabric or densities of the existing surrounding subdivision(s); for example - my immediate neighbourhood equates to a density of 3.5 dwelling units per acre, based on my rough calculations;</p>	MDTR	Existing road network and lot fabric has been changed in the new draft plan
	<p>7. Anyone traveling from or to the proposed subdivision will need to do so using either Centre Road or the 6th Concession;</p>	MDTR	Correct. Those roads are adjacent to the subdivision.
	<p>8. The townhome blocks proposed along the 6th Concession frontage (the extreme west boundary of the site) will create a wall of "bricks and mortar" with absolutely no breaks other than the two local roads (Streets "E" & "J") where they intersect the 6th Concession;</p>	MDTR	Changes to the townhome blocks in question have been made in the new draft plan.
	<p>The two proposed intersections on the 6th Concession are under designed and suggest shared traffic lanes for all directions of travel, including for northbound and southbound traffic on the 5th Concession. For example, a motorist traveling southbound on the 6th Concession, travelling from Davis Drive through to the roundabout at Durham Road 8 will need to potentially stop and wait behind a motorist attempting a southbound left turn from the 5th Concession to the subdivision, while waiting for a break in northbound traffic, at either Street "E" or "J". This will lead to the potential for rear end collisions for southbound traffic on the 6th Concession and increase the need for motorists to use the shoulder to bypass any waiting traffic. This situation is very similar to what occurs now at the intersection of Bolton Drive and the 6th Concession;</p>	MDTR	The Nextrans Traffic report addresses issues such as these
	<p>10. The additional two intersections on the 6th Concession will create a total of three intersections (including Bolton Drive) on this section of road, within about 415 metres (the two proposed intersections are separated by</p>	MDTR	Noted.



	approximately 160 metres). The 6th Concession is currently a two-lane rural cross section with narrow shoulders;		
	11. The current signalized intersection of the 6th Concession and Toronto Street is congested at most times and creates long delays in the southbound direction as there is no separate right turn lane or left turn lane. More traffic generated by this proposed development will exacerbate that situation. I am aware there is a roundabout planned at this intersection in the future and suggest this project should be completed sooner than later;	MDTR	Please refer to the Nextrans traffic study.
	12. The need for school buses to pick up and drop off students within the proposed subdivision leading to more traffic on Centre Road and the 6th Concession (see point 9);	MDTR	See above comment
	13. The lack of any sidewalks or consideration for sidewalks on the east side of the 6th Concession between Bolton Drive and the roundabout, along the museum grounds property;	MDTR	Noted.
	14. The lack of sewage capacity of the Township's current sanitary waste treatment facility and how the sanitary sewage from the proposed development will be allocated and accommodated for in what may be an at capacity municipal facility;	MDTR	The proposed development will be subject to the existing capacity of the Uxbridge WPCP. The capacity of the existing sanitary system is being studied to determine the system opportunities for accommodating this development.
	The potential for flooding of the existing residential lots bordering the south property boundary of the proposed subdivision (from the north to the south) during major storms. Based on the available storm water management report, an infiltration trench is proposed at the southern boundary of the proposed subdivision which will minimize this potential, but is it enough? More pavement and hard surface create more and faster runoff;	MDTR	Please refer to the above comment and the Functional Servicing Report.



	<p>Firstly, relating to my personal reasons, the idea of more townhouses in Uxbridge is an idea I do not abide, as I find the vast majority of these kinds of construction projects to be either unpleasant to look at or incredibly invasive to other areas of the town. I don't enjoy the prospect of looking out my back window and seeing into someone else's bathroom, to put it bluntly.</p> <p>On the topic of practical reasons, I feel that the added stress to the towns sewer systems that would come from these new buildings would either result in a complete renovation of the existing sewer system (meaning more construction costs), or a sewage overflow that would result in the renovation anyway. Furthermore, given Uxbridge's status as the Trail Capital of Canada, it would stand to reason that people coming to walk these trails would expect a great deal of natural beauty, something jeopardised by a new set of residential properties. I feel this would negatively impact tourism for the town, which, in turn, would also cause issue for the numerous local restaurants and businesses within the town, many of which rely on tourism to meet their yearly financial goal.</p>	MDTR	<p>Please refer to the above comment.</p> <p>This plan meets provincial policy requirements and constitutes good planning.</p>
	<p>As I reside in Glen Acres, specifically 44 Jonathan Street which is to the S.S.East of planned development and at a lower elevation, i am concerned about the effect it may have on the quaiity and quantity of my water supply.</p> <p>At present I have a drilled well from which I draw my water. Most recent test shows the quality of water to be in excellent condition. No contamination. The amount of water available to me has been endless in the 30 plus years I have lived here, even when some neighbours were affected by dewatering taking place in the downtown area.</p>	MDTR	<p>An Environmental Impact Study has been completed to ensure no impact is made on others, as well as a detailed Functional Servicing Report.</p>
	<p>We have concerns about:</p>	MDTR	<p>Please refer to the revised draft plan dated March 8th, 2022, the Nextrans</p>



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our well being affected. 2. The location of one of the plans road. Which, would be exiting directly across from our house, causing all lights directly into our home. 3. The look of the town houses planned, right along the 6th Cone. Plus the crime that comes with town homes. 4. The depreciation of our property value. 5. The increased volume of road traffic on the already busy 6th Cone. of which no speed enforcement is enforced. (usually 80 to 100 km) 		<p>Traffic study, and the Functional Servicing Report.</p>
	<p>The land at municipal address 7370 Centre Road is important natural land and constructing 588 homes on this land will significantly impact the rural and natural beauty of Uxbridge. Most people that live in Uxbridge choose to live here because of the natural beauty and lack of development.</p>	<p>MDTR</p>	<p>Noted. Draft plan dated March 8th, 2022 decreases the unit count.</p>
	<p>A significant development of 588 home in one area will cause increased pressure on roadways, and decreased enjoyment and property values for those living close to and affected by the significant increase of traffic.</p>	<p>MDTR</p>	<p>Noted. Draft plan dated March 8th, 2022 decreases the unit count.</p>
	<p>This vast expansion will bring irreparable damage to an environmentally sensitive area which is on the edge of the Moraine deposit. We further urge Council to prevent all forms of urban sprawl which is devouring green areas and contributing to the acceleration of our CURRENT CLIMATE CRISIS.</p>	<p>MDTR</p>	<p>Please refer to the Environmental Impact Study.</p>



Bridgebrook Corp. – First Submission
7370 Centre Road, Uxbridge, ON
File Numbers: File No: OPA 64, ZBA 2021-01, SPA 2021-01

Hydro One

No Comments

Township of Uxbridge Fire Department

No Comments