

Response to Comments

355 Franktown Road, Carleton Place

March 28, 2024

Ms. Koren Lam

Senior Planner, Lanark County
99 Christie Lake Road
Perth, ON K7H 3C6

Via Email: klam@lanarkcounty.ca

**RE: Response to Technical Comments
355 Franktown Road – 2nd Review Comments
Draft Plan of Subdivision (File No, 09-T-23001)**

Dear Ms. Lam,

Fotenn is pleased to provide you with this letter detailing the responses to the comments received from the Lanark County and associated agencies on December 22, 2023 regarding the above-noted Draft Plan of Subdivision. Included in the submission are the following updated documents:

- / Site Plan, provided by PMA Architects, dated 8 February, 2024;
- / Urban Design Brief, provided by Fotenn and PMA Architects, dated 28 March, 2024;
- / Memorandum regarding the EIS, provided by CIMA, dated 27 March, 2024;
- / Memorandum of Understanding, regarding a future shared servicing agreement, provided by Keeper Co., dated 6 March, 2024;
- / Updated Geotechnical Report, prepared by EXP, dated 26 March, 2024;
- / Draft Plan of Subdivision, prepared by Annis, O'Sullivan, Vollebekk Ltd., dated 21 February, 2024;
- / Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by McIntosh Perry, dated 15 March, 2024;
- / Grading and Drainage Plan, prepared by McIntosh Perry, dated 15 March, 2024;
- / Site Servicing Plan, prepared by McIntosh Perry, dated 15 March, 2024;
- / Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, prepared by McIntosh Perry, dated 15 March, 2024.

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

Sincerely,



Tyler Yakichuk, MPlan
Planner

Town of Carleton Place

Overall Comments

- 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.

Coordination is underway between the owners of the subject property and the Coleman Central Subdivision as it relates to servicing the two properties. Please see the accompanying documentation which details their forthcoming agreement.

- 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.

It is our understanding the Coleman Central Subdivision is actively working towards becoming registered. Please see the accompanying document which details the forthcoming agreement between the two properties.

- 3 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.

Noted.

- 4 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?

Easement.

- 5 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?

Services will be connected between the commercial plaza and the remainder of the property.

Planning Rationale and Urban Design

- 6 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.

There are limited anticipated impacts to the existing uses. Proposed alterations to the existing development include the creation of a new access point of the site, located at the northern edge of the property, and a restriping of the parking lot. The parking lot will continue to provide the required number of parking spaces. The proposed fire access lane formalizes a laneway that presently exists. There are no anticipated changes in use or general function of the site. The provided Transportation Study supports the proposed changes to the circulation of the exiting developed area.

- 7 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 accompanying Urban Design Brief included in the resubmission.

- 8 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.

Cash-in-lieu of parkland is the preferred method.

- 9 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 proposed entrances to the subject property will provide for the preservation of the existing character of the street character by limiting site alteration.

Traffic Impact Study and Traffic Flow Design

- 10 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.

As depicted on the site plan, bollards have been included on the east-west fire access lane to restrict vehicular access to the proposed development from Franktown Road.

- 11 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.

A continuous sidewalk is illustrated on the site plan through the proposed accesses. A depressed curb will be illustrated at the roadway edge across the accesses.

Servicing and Stormwater Management Report

Sanitary

- 12 Prior to advancing this development, the Town has engaged in a consultant to complete a hydraulic grade line assessment to ensure that the existing downstream sewer network from these lands can accommodate the proposed flows and will ultimately determine when the sewer upgrade project will need to be completed.

Noted.

- 13 The sanitary structure table on drawing C102 has it identified as only having an outlet, however on the site servicing plan it appears to have a sewer run extending to the property line. The invert elevation should be shown within the table.

Please note that since the development proposes to connect to an existing sanitary stub rather than a structure, it has been noted on drawing C102 rather than in the structure table.

- 14 Should the sanitary connection from the existing strip mall to A-MH1A exceed 0.610m height difference from the invert to the bottom of the manhole, a drop structure will be required. As it is not indicated the size or inverts of this service.

Contractor will need to locate and verify depth of existing sanitary service prior to construction. Should the depth exceed 0.61m, an external drop structure will be installed.

- 15 A manhole should be installed at the northern property line upstream of manhole 103A.

A maintenance structure has been added up stream of manhole 103A. Refer to drawing C102 for further details.

Storm

- 16 Can the storm sewer alignment from Manhole 107 to the existing stub be altered so the manholes are within the roadway and not in the boulevard as shown below? The OGS structure could be relocated to Manhole 108. This would allow for proper access for cleaning of the OGS structure.

Manhole 107 has been located within the boulevard so that maintenance vehicles can park along the side of the road, and maintenance can be performed with minimal disruption to traffic and workers safely out of the road. If the Town would prefer this structure to be located within the roadway, it will be relocated on the subsequent Servicing Plan.

- 17 How does the parking garage and entrance drain?

Approximately half of the parking garage entrance will be sloped towards the future municipal road, and the remainder will be collected by a trench drain at the entrance to the underground parking garage. The trench drain will be conveyed to the storm sewer. Internal parking garage drains are to be directed to sanitary. Please refer to the mechanical plans for the underground parking garage drainage design.

- 18 Confirm how the parking garage and building are being directed into the storm sewer. The storm water management report indicates that the buildings (B1 and B2) are restricted via ICD, however there is a 150mm storm service that connects to the proposed roadway that would not be restricted by and ICD within the storm pond or the temporary DICB.

Runoff from the roof of the proposed buildings will outlet to surface before being collected by a series of a catch basins. Collected runoff will discharge to the proposed stormwater management area, and then be restricted by a 180mm orifice at the inlet of DICB5. Foundation drainage will be conveyed to the unrestricted 150 mm diameter storm service.

- 19 0.3m separation between the underside of footing and the 100-year hydraulic grade line within the storm sewer will need to be confirmed with the servicing report. It is the Town's preference to have this separation provided with a storm sewer service in lieu of sump pumps.

Please note that based on the results of the HGL analysis, sump pumps will be required to provide 0.3m separation from the 100-year hydraulic grade line. Please refer to the PCSWMM results included in Appendix 'G'.

20 CB1 and CB2 appear to be missing from the structure table.

Structure tables have been revised to include CB1 and CB2.

21 Storm manhole 111 should be installed at the property line and not north of the property line.

Storm manhole 111 has been relocated inside of the property line.

Water

22 Valve to the condominium site should be located at the property line.

A water valve has been included at the property line of the Condominium site.

23 The watermain was not illustrated on Lewis St. beyond the Condominium site. How will the Townhomes be serviced?

Drawing C102 has been revised to include a watermain to the townhouse block.

24 Insulation details should be added to the plans as there appears to be limited horizontal separation between the watermain and CB1.

Watermain Notes on drawing C102 specify thermal insulation of watermains at open structures as per City of Ottawa Standard W23.

25 The public works department believes the existing watermain along Franktown Road north of Findlay Ave is 200mm and not 300mm. Please confirm the adequacy of fire flows with the revised sizing.

The water model has been revised to consider the existing watermain within Franktown Road as 200mm. Please refer to Appendix 'C'.

26 All watermain valves are to be right-handed operating valves to provide consistency among municipal valves for future operation by Public Works.

Noted. Watermain Notes on drawing C102 have been revised to indicate that all watermain valves are to be right-handed operating valves.

27 Confirm the size of the proposed water service for the existing commercial building.

The size of the proposed water service to the existing commercial building has been included on Drawing C102.

28 2 valves should be added to the drive aisle from Franktown Road.

Please note the internal watermain on the private site has been revised.

Miscellaneous Site Design

29 Grading between 2 sidewalks along the south portion of the eastern condominium building exceeds 3:1 slope.

Please note that planting beds with landscaping walls will be included between the top and bottom of the stairs. The landscaping walls will be sized to ensure that 3:1 slope is not exceeded.

- 30 The two northern most townhouse driveways are both designed under the minimum slope allowed. The Town has a minimum driveway slope of 2% and a maximum of 6%.

The front of the townhouse block has been raised to ensure that driveway slopes will fall within a range of 2-6%.

- 31 Swale slopes should be increased to a minimum of 1% to prevent ponding.

All proposed swales with slopes below 1.5% will contain subdrains to ensure that ponding does not occur.

- 32 Applicants will need to provide proposed grading along Franktown Road if the intent is to fill in the roadside ditch to ensure there will be no drainage issues with the proposed sloping from back of curb to edge of pavement as noted on the plans.

Grading details have been provided along Franktown Road to demonstrate positive drainage towards the existing municipal ditch northwest of the site.

- 33 Proposed road structure for the new drive aisle was not provided.

Pavement structure has been included on drawing C101.

- 34 Comment Carried Forward from Initial Comments: Confirm trees are not located over proposed services. 1.5m minimum separation is required, 2.5m separation is desirable.

Confirmed. Please see accompanying plans and studies that identify the location of plant material and servicing infrastructure.

- 35 Comment Carried Forward from Initial Comments: Municipal right of way limits not clearly shown adjacent to the townhomes and condominiums. Site triangles will need to be provided for the Townhome property lines.

Please see the accompanying Site Plan which identifies the noted items.

- 36 Erosion and Sediment control plans will also have to be created to comply with the Town's C.L.I. E.C.A.

An Erosion & Sediment Control Plan (Drawing C103) has been included with the revised submission.

- 37 Comment Carried Forward from Initial Comments: Ensure that Landscaping, C.U.P., and Illumination plans are all submitted.

Provided as part of the Site Plan.

- 38 Site plans need to remove the sidewalk along the North side of the roadway connecting to Coleman Central phase 2.

Noted. The sidewalk has been removed.

- 39 The Town is not in a position to provide further review of the subdivision application until the servicing proposal for the Coleman Central Subdivision is reviewed and accepted. It is understood that the Coleman Central proponent is in contact with the applicant of this file and the applicant is encouraged to follow up with the adjacent developer regarding coordination of projects.

Please see the accompanying Memorandum of Understanding signed by all parties developing in the abutting area.

Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority

- 1 Please include background excerpts from the governing report providing design details of the ditch analysis and new outlet to the Creek, as noted in responses 5.14 and 5.16 in the Response to Technical Comments letter (dated September 8, 2023). The subdivision documents referenced in section 5.1 of the report could not be found in the Appendix.

A dynamic PCSWMM model (results included in Appendix 'G'). was created for the Chicago 3-hour 100-year storm scenario. The storm sewer system underwent redesigning to ensure efficient flow conveyance and adherence to design specifications for acceptable Hydraulic Grade Line elevations. With the updated storm sewer design, no junction (catch basins or manholes) will exceed the allowable ponding depth of 30cm. Drawing 101 from the Coleman Subdivision design package has been included in Appendix 'G', detailing the design of the outlet.

- 2 Appendix 'B' for pre-consultation notes is referenced in section 6.5 of the report. Pre-consultation notes could not be found in Appendix B. Please review and correct.

The reference to pre-consultation notes has been removed from the Servicing Report.

- 3 Please demonstrate that a freeboard of 0.3m between the 100-year water elevation and the overflow elevation is provided in the dry pond (refer to section 8.3.11.5 of the City of Ottawa's Sewer Design Guidelines (2012)).

The depressed surface storage area has been revised to provide 0.3m freeboard above the 100-year ponding elevation.

- 4 Based on information provided in the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), prepared by Bowfin Environmental Consulting, dated August 2021, part of a wetland extends into the north side of the proposed site and further offsite to the north. It is understood that the portion of the wetland within the site will be removed as part of the proposed development. Please include a description of the wetland drainage, drainage path, and any local flooding potential.

Please see the accompanying EIS memorandum provided by CIMA.

- 5 Section 6.5 indicated that offsite areas (A3 and B5) will outlet to the storm sewer within Lewis Street at full buildout conditions. It is not clear from the report that the downstream stormwater system within Lewis Street has adequate capacity to capture the flows from A3 and B5. There may be a concern of creating backwater or ponding that will be directed to the proposed site without positive drainage and sufficient storm outlet. Please review the downstream stormwater system for capacity and confirm that the Coleman Subdivision agrees to accept external flows from A3 and B5 to the ultimate discharge point within their development.

Please note the proposed storm sewer travels through a public right of way and future pond block to the storm outlet. However, the neighbouring developer has been approached and an agreement for construction

of the outlet is being prepared. Please refer to Appendix 'G' where the HGL analysis and storm sewer design sheet demonstrate adequate capacity within the storm network up to the ultimate discharge point.

Ministry of Transportation Ontario

- 1 The Ministry of Transportation has no comments, what they are proposing is part of the master plan.
Noted.
- 2 Since the proposed development is located within our area of control, therefore the development would need to submit a Building and Land Use application which they can apply on line at www.hcms.mto.gov.on.ca
Noted.

Lanark District Health Unit

- 1 Unfortunately we are unable to provide further comments from our original submission at this time for that deadline.
Noted.

Enbridge

- 1 Enbridge Gas does not have changes to the previously identified conditions for this revised application(s).
Noted.

Hydro One

- 1 We are in receipt of your Plan of Subdivision application, 09-T-23001 dated January 30, 2023. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time.
Noted.

Bell

- 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 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.

- 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.

- 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.