

Response to Comments

355 Franktown Road, Carleton Place

September 8, 2023

Ms. Julie Stewart
County Planner, Lanark County
99 Christie Lake Road
Perth, ON K7H 3C6

Via Email: jstewart@lanarkcounty.ca

**RE: Response to Technical Comments
355 Franktown Road – 1st Review Comments
Draft Plan of Subdivision (File No, 09-T-23001)**

Dear Ms. Stewart,

Fotenn is pleased to provide you with this letter detailing the responses to the comments received from the Lanark County and associated agencies on April 11, 2023 regarding the above-noted Draft Plan of Subdivision. Included in the submission are the following updated documents:

- / Site Plan, provided by PMA Architectes, dated August 30, 2023;
- / Tree Conservation Report, provided by James B. Lennox Landscape Architects, dated September 6, 2023;
- / Lewis Street Profile (Servicing), provided by McIntosh Perry, dated September 1, 2023;
- / Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, provided by McIntosh Perry, dated September 1, 2023;
- / Lot Grading Plan, provided by McIntosh Perry, dated September 1, 2023;
- / Site Servicing Plan, provided by McIntosh Perry, dated September 1, 2023; and
- / Addendum to Environmental Impact Study, provided by CIMA, dates June 7, 2023.

Should you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Tyler Yakichuk, MPlan
Planner

1.0 Ministry of Transportation

- 1.1 Could you please verify with the owner/consultant why they are requesting a fire access lane to Franktown Road? Also, it was our understanding that all traffic movement would be from an internal road system.

The requested ingress / egress point at the south of the frontage is requested as a temporary fire lane until the abutting subdivision to the north is developed. Once developed, fire lane access will be achieved through the abutting subdivision and the temporary lane will no longer be used.

2.0 Municipal liaison / Bell

- 2.1 We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval:

“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. 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.”

Noted.

- 2.2 Upon receipt of this comment letter, the Owner is to provide Bell Canada with servicing plans/CUP at their earliest convenience to planninganddevelopment@bell.ca to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.

Noted.

- 2.3 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.

Noted.

- 2.4 If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.

Noted.

3.0 Municipal liaison / Bell

- 3.1 Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions.

Noted.

- 3.2 The applicant shall contact Enbridge Gas Inc.'s Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea60@Enbridge.com to determine gas availability, service and meter installation details and to ensure all

gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping (including, but not limited to: tree planting, silva cells, and/or soil trenches) and/or asphalt paving.

Noted.

- 3.3** If the gas main needs to be relocated as a result of changes in the alignment or grade of the future road allowances or for temporary gas pipe installations pertaining to phased construction, all costs are the responsibility of the applicant.

Noted.

- 3.4** In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, and any future adjacent developments, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas Inc. at no cost.

Noted.

- 3.5** Blasting and pile driving activities in the vicinity of Enbridge Gas Distribution and Storage (GDS) facilities require prior approval by GDS.

Noted.

- 3.6** The Blasting and Pile Driving Form, referenced in Enbridge's Third Party Requirements in the Vicinity of Natural Gas Facilities Standard, must be provided to mark-ups@enbridge.com by the Owner of the proposed work for all blasting and pile driving operations.

Noted.

- 3.7** In addition, a licensed blasting consultant's stamped validation report must be submitted to GDS for review if blasting is to occur within thirty (30) metres of GDS facilities. The request must be submitted a minimum of four (4) weeks prior to the beginning of work to allow sufficient time for review.

Noted.

4.0 Leeds, Grenville & Lanark District Health Unit (LGLDHU)

- 4.1 Consider the following as conditions of approval for the proposed subdivision:**

- 4.2** Build sidewalks on both sides of the new public roadway.

Please see the updated Site Plan which includes sidewalks on both sides of the public roadway.

- 4.3** Build protected bicycle lanes/paths, which should be segregated (e.g., with a physical barrier) from motor vehicle traffic, on the new public roadway.

The ROW of the public roadway is not wide enough to accommodate sidewalks on both sides, the roadway, and protected / separated bicycle lanes.

- 4.4 Include way-finding signage directing residents and visitors to local points of interest and essential amenities in Carleton Place.

Wayfinding items are not the responsibility of private developers.

- 4.5 Include accessibility features (e.g., accessible pedestrian signals, tactile paving, etc.).

Accessibility features will be provided as required by building code.

- 4.6 Plant trees and install other amenities (e.g., street furniture, planter boxes) to create an inviting streetscape to maximize youth-, family-, and age-friendliness of the area.

Please see the updated Site Plan for tree plantings and locations.

- 4.7 Install traffic-calming infrastructure (e.g., speed bumps, curb extensions, street trees, pedestrian crossings, etc.) at strategic locations to improve the safety of these roads for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.

Please see the updated Site Plan for street trees that abut the public roadway.

- 4.8 Leave as many mature trees as possible and replace all felled trees by planting in a nearby area within the municipality.

Noted.

5.0 Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA)

- 5.1 The scope of the natural hazards review includes flood plain, wetlands, erosion hazards, and unstable soils. Organic Soils and the wetland (tall shrub swamp) are the only features that are relevant to MVCA's advisory review under Section 3.1 Natural Hazards, PPS.

Noted.

- 5.2 Wetlands are natural sponges, capturing and storing water after rainfalls and snowmelt. This water then helps to maintain stream flows and recharge shallow ground water during dry periods. When wetlands are removed, increased flooding and erosion results (The Economic, Social and Environmental Value of Wetlands).

Noted.

- 5.3 We understand that the wetland will be eliminated as part of the proposed subdivision. However, the EIS does not discuss any potential impacts. Given the importance of wetlands with respect to local flooding and erosion, we recommend that it be assessed in regard to the impact on adjacent features and flooding.

An amendment letter to the EIS has now been provided.

- 5.4 Due to the poor drainage and unstable characteristics of organic soils, they are not suitable for development. Therefore, development should be directed outside of these areas unless sufficiently mitigated. Soils mapping has identified organic soils in the NE end of the subject property. However, contrary to mapping, the on-site geotechnical investigation (Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (exp, June, 2021), did not identify these soils in

the two test pits that were dug in the NE end. We request confirmation that organic soils are not present on the entire property (see clip below from MVCA's GIS mapping).

As noted in Paragraph 5.1 of the geotechnical report, 150 mm to 450 mm thick layer of organic topsoil was encountered at the ground surface in all test pits inclusive of Test Pit 12 and 13 dug at the NE corner where 250 mm of organic topsoil was encountered at the ground surface. This is indicative of presence of organic soil in this area of concern and highlighted in comment 5.4

- 5.5** The conceptual SWMP provided with the subject application has been reviewed by MVCA's Water Resources Engineer, with a focus on stormwater quantity management. Potential flooding and erosion impacts to the receiving watercourse and ultimate receiving watercourse, the Mississippi River, have been considered. Refer to the attached MVCA Technical Review Memo for details.

Noted.

- 5.6** Pursuant to Ontario Regulation 153/06 - "Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses", written permission is required from MVCA prior to the initiation of any construction or filling activity (which includes excavations, stockpiling and site grading) within the flood plain or Regulation Limit of the flood plain; or for any alterations to the shoreline of watercourses.

Noted.

- 5.7** No MVCA regulated features have been identified on the subject property. The identified wetland does not meet the criteria (minimum 0.5 ha and hydrologic connectivity) of a wetland that is regulated by MVCA.

Regulated wetland is referring the wetland in the adjacent lands to the southeast of the site. Acknowledge that the wetland discussed on the site itself is not a regulated wetland by MVCA.

- 5.8** We take this opportunity to note that written permission is required from MVCA prior to any alteration to the creek on the adjacent lands, should a stormwater outlet to this creek be requested. Additional information in this regard has been requested in MVCA's review of the Stormwater Management Plan.

Noted.

- 5.9** Prior to moving forward, we request that the following be addressed:

- / MVCA's recommendations with respect to the SWMP (refer to the attached MVCA Technical Review Memo).
- / Discussion in the EIS regarding potential flooding and erosion impacts, as a result of eliminating the wetland identified on the subject lands.
- / Confirmation that organic soils are not present on the subject property.

An addendum letter to the EIS has now been provided.

MVCA Technical Review Memo

- 5.10** The site drainage area provided in section 1.2 seems incorrect with the calculations and drainage area plans provided in the report. Please review and correct, as required.

Please note the site area is 1.34 ha, and the SWM area is 1.99 ha. The SWM area includes the existing strip mall which is not considered part of the site.

5.11 The pre and post-development area should include flow path directions.

Flow direction arrows have been included on the Pre- and Post-Development drainage area plans.

5.12 It is assumed that the allowable release rate from the subject site is a 5-year storm design flow and restricts flows above a 5-year storm on-site. Please confirm.

As discussed in Section 6.0 of the report, the post-development 5 and 100-year flows will be restricted to the pre-development 5 and 100-year flows.

5.13 It is unclear where the runoff ultimately discharges to. It is recognized that the future regraded Creek and the drainage area plan point to an existing pond. Please provide details of the flow path, including external flows (if any), to the ultimate discharge location.

The limits of the Site Servicing Plan has been revised to include the outlet to the regraded ditch. Please note the ditch is being realigned as part of the Coleman Central Phase 2 Subdivision. Refer to Coleman 2 plans for details on the proposed realignment.

5.14 With respect to comment above (#4), if the post-development runoff ultimately discharges to the future regraded ditch as part of Coleman Phase 2, excerpts from the report, including design details confirming the flow/drainage area of the subject site and mall, should be provided.

Please note the ditch is being addressed as part of the Coleman Central Phase 2 Subdivision. Refer to subdivision plans and reports for details. The site has been included in the ditch analysis. As noted in the 355 Franktown Servicing and Stormwater Management report, Post-development flows (including the mall) are being restricted to pre-development flows and treated prior to leaving the site and discharging to the ditch.

5.15 With respect to comment above (#4), if the post-development runoff ultimately discharge to an existing stormwater management area within the development, excerpts from the report, including design details confirming the flow/drainage area of the subject site and mall, should be provided.

Please note that flows from the development area and existing commercial plaza are accounted for within the Storm Sewer Design Sheet and SWM calculations. Stormwater runoff will be controlled on site and the flows will be directed to the realigned channel within the Coleman Central Phase 2 Subdivision at the respective pre-development 5 & 100-year rates.

5.16 It is noted that a new outlet to the Creek is proposed to accommodate flows from the proposed development. Please provide the location and design details of the new outlet to the Creek.

Drawing C102 now shows the storm pipes through the Coleman Central Phase 2 subdivision and the ultimate outlet to the ditch located southeast of the subdivision pond. SWM and storm sewer design sheets have been updated and included in Appendix G of the report.

5.17 Provide design details of the control weir structure at the landscape area with elevations; also provide ponding depth and extent on the grading plan.

Additional details for the weir within the depressed storage area have been included on the Lot Grading & Drainage Plan.

- 5.18** Please acknowledge that the design of the future realigned ditch in Coleman phase 2 has not yet been approved (comments are still to be addressed).

Acknowledged.

6.0 Carleton Place

Overall Comments

- 6.1** The application intends to connect to a proposed future street and servicing via the Coleman Central Subdivision. The Coleman Central Subdivision is not yet registered or constructed. This assumed connection makes the assessment of the 09-T-23001 file pre-mature and inconsistent with Section 51(24) of the Planning Act.

Talks are ongoing between the developers of the abutting subdivisions, which will include a servicing agreement, in advance of future development.

- 6.2** Staff are happy to provide initial comments on the submission, but as the civil design of Coleman Central is incomplete, we cannot provide fulsome comments on the availability of infrastructure as proposed in the Servicing Brief submitted.

Acknowledged.

- 6.3** It is also understood that the proponent is negotiating a private front-ending agreement with the owners of the Coleman Central Subdivision for up-sizing of sanitary, storm and water services to accommodate this development. This will need to be formalized prior to consideration of Draft Conditions as the outcome of negotiations will be implemented as a condition of Draft Approval.

Noted.

- 6.4** Development of the property is subject to contributions by a Core Service Cost Sharing Bylaw 62-2022. A copy of the bylaw is attached for reference and supplemental information can be made available upon request.

Noted.

- 6.5** Depending on the timeline of the construction process, a turning circle may be required at the dead-end road in front of the townhouse block if construction is not completed by the time there is occupancy in the condominium buildings or townhouses.

Please see the updated Site Plan, which includes the proposed temporary turning basin.

- 6.6** Proposal refers to the addition of a fire access lane at the rear of the mall providing interim access for the development lands to the west. Is this parcel and deeded access proposed to be created by the plan of subdivision? Or a subsequent easement via consent?

It is proposed to be included as part of the Plan of Subdivision application.

- 6.7** The existing commercial plaza is serviced by septic. Will the proposed development seek easements across Block 1 to connect the commercial plaza to the proposed sanitary services in the new public street?

The existing commercial plaza will be switched to a sanitary service lateral connected to the proposed sanitary servicing. Easements will be provided as required for the proposed services.

Planning Rationale and Urban Design

- 6.8 The Planning Rationale does not thoroughly review the existing development contained within Block 3 on the Draft Plan and the impact that the new lotting fabric will have on the existing uses conformity with the Development Permit Bylaw. This needs to be amended prior to final review.

Block 3, of the submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision includes the existing development occupying the subject property. Specifically, this includes a strip mall and associated parking and drive aisles. The Planning Rationale included did describe the existing condition of the subject property. However, if this was not satisfactory, please review the accompanying updated Site Plan, which indicates the proposed fire access laneway, and identifies the existing building location and associated parking. Additionally, other studies, such as the Transportation Impact Study and Civil Engineering Reports, offer further technical information on the development contained within Block 3.

If further information is necessary, please include as part of the next round of technical comments.

- 6.9 An Urban Design Brief has not been included in accordance Section 6.13 of the Town's Official Plan. This document is required prior to final review and should include the design of both modified existing and proposed new uses occurring on the site.

Please see the Urban Design Brief prepared as part of the original submission. The document includes all materials referenced within the Urban Design Brief Terms of Reference, and specific materials requested were coordinated through correspondence with Carleton Place planning staff. Should further materials be requested, please include the request as part of the next round of technical comments.

- 6.10 The Planning Rationale does not include a proposal for how parkland dedications will be satisfied. The report needs to be amended to provide a position on preferred dedication.

Parkland dedication (or Cash-in-leu) will be ideally coordinated through direct correspondence and negotiation with Planning staff. Fotenn is happy to initiate these conversations as soon as possible with all necessary parties.

- 6.11 Page 18 of the Planning Rationale includes a statement regarding the appealing entrance to and front the property fronting on the Mississippi District Thoroughfare. This statement should be explored further to demonstrate how the entrance satisfies the Official Plan. Alternately, the Town will be proposing modifications of the landscaping and pedestrian infrastructure as a condition of the re-configuration of the driveways.

The entrance fronting the Mississippi District Thoroughfare is part of the existing development on the subject property. The entrance represents an existing condition that is consistent with the character and maintenance of commercial entrances fronting Mississippi District Thoroughfares.

Traffic Impact Study and Traffic Flow Design

- 6.12 While not intended by the development, the proposal includes the design of a throughstreet/fire lane which will undoubtedly become a cut-through for local traffic. A modified Planning Justification report will be required to assess how potential for through-traffic will be eliminated by design. This may be done through the Development Permit Application.

The TIS has been updated to discuss the temporary emergency connection to the mall parcel. Cut-through traffic will be prevented via knockdown bollards.

- 6.13** Please clarify ingress and egress via entrances onto Franktown Road as well as through the private parking lot both short term and long term.

The TIS has been updated to address and clarify site access. The TIS has been updated to address and clarify site access.

- 6.14** No turning radii are shown from the new entrances off Franktown.

Please see the updated Site Plan, which includes turning radii on entrances.

- 6.15** The southern access lane is noted as an emergency access lane but seems to be providing vehicular access to both the mall and subdivision. The TIS however only shows right in only movements off of Franktown Road with no left in movements or egress movements. How is control of this intersection being planned? How is egress from the mall and subdivision being controlled? Franktown is much closer than Coleman and will become a desired route.

The TIS has been updated to address and clarify site access. No direct access to Franktown Road is to be provided for residents. The emergency access lane is temporary and will be closed after construction of the parcel to the north is complete.

- 6.16** The parking lot for the mall has been reconfigured significantly. It is unclear whether access to the rear north portion of the mall will be maintained. What will the fire route be for the mall? The turning radii within the circulation aisles in the mall seem very tight. The new southern access to the mall parking lot should be relocated to the east to line up with the drive aisle at the front face of the mall.

The mall access configuration has been driven by feedback from the MTO. Upon completion of construction activities for the parcel to the north, the temporary lane to the south will be closed and the northern mall access location will remain. The drive aisle connecting to the lane has been shifted to the east in line with this comment.

- 6.17** The Town needs more clarity on the proposed roadways. The entrance off Franktown Road is not designed to municipal standards and will more than likely be used by residents for Coleman Central phase 2. Further discussion needs to be completed if this will be a municipal roadway or a private drive aisle.

The TIS has been updated to address and clarify site access. No direct access to Franktown Road is to be provided for residents, who will use the new local road network to access Nelson Street East.

Environmental Impact Study and Tree Conservation Report

- 6.18** Any site alteration or vegetation removal will require a Class 1 Development Permit prior to undertaking.

Noted.

- 6.19** A tree inventory is required to identify the number of trees on the site that exceed 200mm DBH and will need to be removed. The inventory should also include the species type, size, health index and reason for removal of the trees.

Please see the accompanying updated Tree Conservation Report, which identifies species, size, health, and reason for removal of the trees.

Servicing and Stormwater Management Report

Sanitary

6.20 The Servicing Plan seems to indicate excessive depth on the sanitary sewers (over 5.5 m) and watermain. The cover calculations on the three top items in the watermain table appear to be incorrect.

Please note sanitary depth has been revised throughout the proposed development. The watermain cover has been revised to correctly reflect top of pipe elevations.

6.21 It is stated that the allocation to this development combined with the Chadha development immediately to the north will exceed allocated capacity by 3.27 L/s and that the proposed sewer upgrade will have sufficient residual capacity to accommodate this overage. This will need to be reviewed and provided as an addendum to the report.

Please note that adequate capacity will be available within the downstream sanitary network.. Coordination is underway between the town and adjacent developments on external infrastructure upgrades downstream of the proposed and adjacent developments. Excerpts from the Coleman Central Phase 2 Servicing Report have been included in Appendix 'D' demonstrating that the proposed infrastructure upgrades will result in sufficient capacity for the estimated sanitary flows.

6.22 Confirm how the 2nd western condominium (Building A) is serviced for sanitary, storm and water.

Buildings A and B will have shared servicing through the underground parking garage.

6.23 Sanitary drainage drawing to be provided to assist in evaluating the design.

A sanitary drainage figure has been included with the revised submission.

6.24 Confirm the daily residential demand per capita. Design sheet illustrates 350L/day, but demand total parameters indicate 280L/day.

Sanitary calculations have been revised based on a per capita demand of 280 L/day.

6.25 Confirm if the proposed sewer within the municipal road allowance will be constructed with this development. Proposed sanitary sewer design does not meet cleansing velocities and slopes will need to be increased which will affect sewer elevations within the on-site sewer.

The sewer is proposed within the municipal road up to the limits of the property line. Please note sanitary slopes have been revised to increase flow velocities to meet cleansing velocity requirements.

6.26 It is recommended to increase on-site sewer slopes to assist in increasing the cleansing velocities.

Sanitary sewer slopes have been raised to increase flow velocity to meet cleansing velocity requirements.

- 6.27** The servicing report Summary 8.0 indicates a total of 2.93L/S of peak wet weather flow, however the design sheet indicates that 3.51L/s will be the anticipated flow from the condominium and mall site and 6.02 L/S from Chadha Lands. Please revise the report.

The servicing report, sanitary demand, and sanitary sewer design sheets have been revised to indicate the correct sanitary flows.

- 6.28** Sanitary stub connection west of MH 207A illustrates and elevation of 129.56, but on the Submission 3 plans of the Coleman Central Phase 2 is indicates the stub elevation of 129.49. please confirm the elevation.

Please note the stub elevation at the Coleman Central Phase 2 connection has been revised to 129.49.

Storm

- 6.32** USF will need to be confirmed for the condominiums as well as the townhomes to ensure there is a 0.3m separation from the 100-year hydraulic grade line.

Please note that foundation drainage for the proposed townhouse blocks will be provided via sump pumps.

- 6.33** Confirm why H-MH2 is directly connected to the existing MH106. There should be an additional manhole added where H-DICB5 connects to the 600mm sewer.

The storm servicing layout has been revised so there is no longer a connection between H-MH2 and MH106.

- 6.34** Emergency overland flow routes not established on the plans.

Emergency overland flow routes have been included on the revised Lot Grading & Drainage Plan.

- 6.35** Proposed storm sewer slopes within the Coleman Central phase 2 are indicated as 0.14% but the proposed development indicates a 0.13% slope. Please revise plans.

Storm sewer slopes have been revised to match the Coleman Central Phase 2 drawings.

- 6.36** Top of grate elevations within the Coleman Central phase 2 and 355 Franktown Road do not match for Rear yard catch basins 272 and 271.

Top of grate elevations have been revised to match the Coleman Central Phase 2 drawings.

- 6.37** It would be the Town's preference to have a swale drain to a rear yard catch basin and avoid the rear yards draining over the retaining wall and conveyed to the municipal storm sewer. A catch basin could be added within the right of way to avoid an easement.

Retaining walls are no longer proposed in the rear yard of the townhouse block.

- 6.38** Confirm the 100-year elevation as noted within the proposed retention area. The 5-year elevation and 100-year are the same at 133.47.

Drawings notes have been revised to correctly identify the 5-year ponding elevation.

- 6.39** Storm sewer pipes within municipal right of way are designed to almost full capacity during the 5-year event. Should lands north of Chadha develop or future roadway be constructed, there is no residual capacity left in these pipes. Please revise pipe slopes and/or diameter to accommodate 5-year storm to 85% capacity to provide flexibility with future drainage. This will also allow for some flexibility with the installation of the pipes.

Please note that the storm sewer design sheet included with the previous submission was based on sizing for the uncontrolled 5-year flow. As both 347 and 355 Franktown Road will be controlled to match existing release rates, runoff in the pipes within the future municipal road will be downstream of the controls and have sufficient available capacity. The storm sewer sheet has been revised to consider available capacity within the proposed storm sewers based on the controlled release rate leaving 347 and 355 Franktown Road.

Water

- 6.40** Hydrant specification within the municipal road allowance to be Canada Valve – Century Hydrant or Clow Brigadier Hydrant complete to be yellow with a threaded connection, Storz connections will not be permitted.

Noted. The watermain section of the Site Servicing Plan has been revised to include hydrant requirements.

- 6.41** Bottom of flange elevations not illustrated on the drawings.

Bottom of flange elevations have been included for all hydrants within the site.

- 6.42** Confirm if the extension of the watermain along Franktown Road will be completed with this development or future. There is no reinstatement illustrated on the plans.

Watermain extension along Franktown Road is not proposed as part of this development. The drawings have been revised to remove all references to the extended watermain.

- 6.43** It will be the responsibility of the Developer's contractor to perform any watermain connection(s) required. This shall be completed in the presence of a designated municipal water operator and the selected contractor shall prove to the satisfaction of the Town that they are competent to perform the works prior to initiating construction.

Noted. The Watermain section of the Site Servicing Plan has been revised to include this note.

- 6.44** Once this watermain is connected from Coleman Central Phase 2, the automatic flushing chamber in front of Block 24 can be removed as it will no longer be a dead-end run. The flushing unit could be utilized on the dead end toward at the Chadha lands property line.

Please note a flushing chamber is proposed to be installed at the tie-in with 347 Franktown Road. The servicing plans have been revised to indicate the location of the flushing chamber.

Miscellaneous Site Design

- 6.45** The Town will not be providing garbage collection curbside for 96 units. Private collection will be required.

Noted.

- 6.46** The private entrances to private roadways and access points from the municipal road should be separated by a continuous curb and sidewalk through the private entrance i.e. the curbs are not to wrap into the private roadways.

Please see the updated Site Plan which includes continuous curb and sidewalks through private entrances.

- 6.47** The Town needs more grading information for the townhome blocks. Driveway slopes not illustrated and appear to have reverse grade.

Additional grading information has been included for the townhouse blocks.

- 6.48** Parking garage ramp to be minimum 2%.

Please see the updated Site Plan, which indicates the parking garage ramp has a 5% grade change.

- 6.49** TWSI need to be included at curb ramps.

TWSI have been included on the Lot Grading & Drainage plan to match the updated Site Plan.

- 6.50** Please provide details on the sidewalk being installed through the entrances to both the parking garage as well as the outdoor parking area.

The proposed sidewalks are to be depressed to match flush with the proposed asphalt as shown on the grading plan.

- 6.51** Confirm trees are not located over proposed services. 1.5m minimum separation is required, 2.5m separation is desirable.

Confirmed.

- 6.52** Swale that connects to the storm pond will need a rip rap spill way to assist in avoiding erosion.

Rip-rap had been added at the outlet of the swale within the stormwater management area.

- 6.53** Municipal right of way limits not clearly shown adjacent to the townhomes and condominiums.

Please see the updated Site Plan, which identifies the ROW limits.

- 6.54** Work will need to be completed to remove and reinstate the existing entrance off Franktown Road, currently there is no detail provided.

Reinstatement details have been added for the proposed entrance from Franktown Road.

- 6.55** Proponent will be required to receive a development permit for tree removal.

Noted.

- 6.56** The storm and sanitary servicing within the municipal road allowance will fall within the Town's Consolidate Linear Infrastructure E.C.A. The proponent will need to fill out and submit the appropriate forms.

Acknowledged.

- 6.57** Ensure proposed retaining wall is designed appropriately, is equipped with an appropriate guard for safety purposes and meets all Ontario Building Code requirements as applicable.

Noted.

- 6.58** Plan and profile drawings not included for the sewer, water and roadways that is being constructed within municipal right of way. This will need to be provided to adhere to the Town of Carleton Place's C.L.I. E.C.A.

Plan and profile drawings have been provided for the sewer, water and roadways constructed within the municipal ROW.

- 6.59** On the Site Plan the snow storage area is noted as being a hard surface amenity space, but on the Lot Grading and Drainage Plan it is noted as being a stormwater retention area. Please clarify.

Please note the snow storage area is west of the stormwater retention area. Please refer to the updated Site Plan.

- 6.60** Ensure that Landscaping, C.U.P., and Illumination plans are all submitted with the Development Permit Application.

These plans will be provided in the next submission.

- 6.61** Grading along the northern property line appear higher than existing grades and will need to be altered until the northern development is constructed. There may need to be an interim retaining wall or 3:1 Grading onto private property with the respective owner's permission.

A temporary turning circle and temporary 3:1 grading (along with a temporary DICB) have been proposed on the adjacent property. Proof of owner permission will be provided and an R-Plan for the turning circle will be prepared.

- 6.62** Confirm if the existing swale along the south property is going to be maintained or will the neighboring property drain onto the roadway and swale will be filled in.

No grading is proposed beyond the property line to the south. Existing grading and drainage will be maintained.

- 6.63** It appears the grading at the property line is being raised on the south/east portion of the pond. Grading should tie into adjacent property.

Please note that grades along the property line have been derived from the elevation points within the topographic survey. A note has been included on the Lot Grading & Drainage plan indicating that existing grades should be matched at the property line.

- 6.64** The following reports and studies have been reviewed and no comments or requests for clarification are required:

/ Phase I - Environmental Site Assessment

- / Phase II - Environmental Site Assessment
- / Stage I and II Archaeological Assessment

Noted.

- 6.65** The Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation indicates that further reports are required. Please confirm when this can be expected.

Additional test pits will be completed once trees are cleared, however we don't anticipate any significant change to the recommendation of the geotechnical report as the results of the additional work which main purpose is to gather additional data on the depth of organic and bedrock throughout the site.