ZANDERPLAN
Your rural land planning experts

February 27, 2024

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

Melanie Knight, Senior Planner
Municipality of Mississippi Mills
14 Bridge Street, Box 400
Almonte, ON K0A 1A0

RE: 09-T-22006 Southwell Homes Subdivision
122 Old Mill Lane, Appleton
Municipality of Mississippi Mills

In response to the comments summarized in the County's letter dated December 13, 2023, I am pleased to offer the following responses in italics in the same order as the letter, and in addition to the attached responses and updated reports from the other professionals working on this project.

MUNICIPALITY OF MISSISSIPPI MILLS (comment letter dated November 13, 2023)

Planning Department

1. It is noted that a peer review of the submitted EIS has been completed by Jp2g on October 12, 2023, and the MVCA on October 25, 2023. The Municipality has no additional comments to add to the peer reviews and looks forward to reviewing the updated EIS reflecting the peer review comments. Please be advised that any recommendations from the EIS will be implemented through Draft Plan Conditions or as part of the Subdivision Agreement, as applicable.

Noted.

2. The Draft Plan indicates that Blocks 16 and 17 are Proposed Park Land; however, the Land Use Table indicates that Block 16 is a proposed addition to abutting parties. Please refer to attached plan provide clarification.

Block 16 is a proposed lot addition to an abutting residential lot at PIN 05109-0125, while Block 17 is proposed for park purposes to be added to the abutting parcels labelled as "not a part" on the Draft Plan which is owned by the municipality.

3. Be advised that further review of the slope stability study and an on-site inspection will need to be conducted before the Municipality can confirm that the parkland location will be acceptable.

Noted.

4. Please fully dimension Block 17, specifically the width of Block 17 where it abuts Block 20.

Dimensions have been added to the revised draft plan by Callon Dietz which is included in this submission.

5. Please be advised that any conveyances of land to the Municipality must meet the same remediation standards as the proposed residential lots. This will be further commented on in the above noted comment letter regarding site remediation.

Noted.

6. The Draft Plan indicates that Block 15 is to be a Private Road sold to abutting owners. Please clarify if this is the full extent of the width of the existing private road. Please advise if the abutting land owners are in agreement of the conveyance of the private road. Will the private road be conveyed accompanying a Joint Use and Maintenance Agreement? Will easements be required to maintain existing accesses?

Block 15 is being sold to the purchaser of Block 16, at PIN 05109-0125.

7. Please update the status of Block 19 to be conveyed to the abutting property owner. Has the abutting property owner confirmed a willingness to accept the conveyance? If not, please explain the purpose of Block 19 in the event it cannot be conveyed to the abutting property owner. The same comment applies to Block 16 if the intent of Block 16 is to be property conveyance to abutting property owner and not parkland (see comment 2 above).

The abutting property owners at PIN 05109-0059 have expressed interest in acquiring Block 19; in the event that they do not purchase this Block, it will become part of the park block.

8. As noted on the attached plan, please remove the redundant area of Lot 14 abutting the existing residential lot at 124 Wilson St. This can be achieved by realigning Block 20 (future street), include this redundant area as part of Block 20 or consider conveying the redundant area to the owner of 124 Wilson St.

The plan has been revised as requested, with the excess lands being added to Block 20 (future street).

9. Please realign Block 20 to intersect with Apple Street (William St) closer to a right angle.

No changes have been made to this street alignment; please see response comments from Novatech for rationale to retain the current configuration.

MUNICIPALITY OF MISSISSIPPI MILLS (comment letter dated November 19, 2023)

1. The Department understands that Lanark County is in the process of having the Hydrogeological Study peer reviewed. The Municipality is unable to provide any comments with respect to this study until such time that the results of this peer review are received and reviewed by Municipal staff.

Noted.

2. With respect to the response letter prepared by Paterson Group Inc. dated September 27, 2023, titled “Phase II Environmental Site Assessment – Response to

Stantec Peer Review" and the request to defer the majority of outstanding comments or unknown information as conditions of draft approval, the Department is of the opinion that the full extent of remediation on the subject property remains unclear and that additional investigation is needed prior to the Municipality considering the site suitable for residential use. The Municipality requests that a fully costed Phase 3 be provided prior to the application proceeding to draft plan approval, without this additional information, draft plan approval is premature.

A cost estimate for site remediation has been included in the Remedial Action Plan prepared by Paterson Group, and is attached to this re-submission.

3. Please be advised that the Municipality does not have a Brownfield Remediation Program and if residential development were permitted to proceed, all costs associated with remediation will be fully borne by the applicant.

Noted.

MVCA (comment letter dated October 25, 2023)

NATURAL HAZARDS (ADVISORY REVIEW)

The objective of MVCA's natural hazards review is to ensure that the control of *flooding* and *erosion* are not impacted by the proposed development. This includes impacts to wetlands, watercourses, slope stability, and unstable soils. **All wetlands**, **Mississippi River, Erosion Hazard**, and the **Flood Plain**, identified on the subject property, are relevant to MVCA's advisory review.

Unevaluated Wetland

Wetlands play an important role in providing hydrologic, ecosystem and human benefits. Specifically, in terms of hydrologic benefits, wetlands retain water during the spring freshet and storm events, allowing water to slowly release into watercourses, infiltrate into the ground to recharge groundwater, and to evaporate. When located along the shoreline of a watercourse/waterbody, wetlands also reduce the energy of moving water including boat wakes, and mitigate associated shoreline erosion. In summary, wetlands play an important role in flooding and erosion control. Wetland loss can result in increased flooding and erosion if not sufficiently mitigated.

We understand that the entire 0.04 ha unevaluated wetland is proposed to be eliminated, in order to accommodate an extension to Apple St. Please see the attached technical report for comments and recommendations (*MVCA Technical Review of EIS_Southwell Homes_Oct 2023).*

PSW

The subject property has frontage on a PSW. Part of this PSW is also the Mississippi River. And, a portion of the subject property is within the 120 m adjacent lands of this feature. Guidelines prepared in support of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) require that new development (including lot creation) and site alterations, within 120 m of a PSW, only be permitted if it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or ecological functions of the feature identified. An EIS has been provided with the subject application.

Please see the attached technical report for comments and recommendations (*MVCA Technical Review of EIS_Southwell Homes_Oct 2023).*

We note that (1) stormwater outlet is proposed to the northern PSW. A permit is required from MVCA to address flooding and erosion impacts, as part of MVCA's implementation of Ontario Regulation 153/06 (see below).

Permit requirement noted.

Waterbody

MVCA considers both direct and indirect impacts to watercourses and waterbodies, within the context of flooding and erosion. We note that (1) stormwater outlet has been proposed into the Mississippi River. Potential impacts are addressed as part of MVCA's implementation of Ontario Regulation 153/06.

Flood Plain

The flood plain marginally extends into the retained lands. To our knowledge, no development, site alterations or regrading activities are proposed within the flood plain.

Erosion Hazard

It is provincial policy that: *Development shall generally be directed to areas outside of hazardous lands adjacent to a stream and small inland lake systems which are impacted by flooding and/or erosion hazards* (Provincial Policy Statement 2020, Section 3.1.1.b). The document entitled *Understanding Natural Hazards* (Ministry of Natural Resources, 2001) was prepared as a guide to identify and provide direction and methods to address these hazards. As per the guide, *Erosion Hazards* include slopes which have the potential for erosion and/or instability due to their steepness and height i.e. steeper than 3:1 and higher than 3m. In order to assess a safe development setback from potential *Erosion Hazard*, a *Slope Stability Assessment* has been provided.

MVCA's Engineering Team has reviewed the *Slope Stability Assessment*. Please see the attached technical report for comments and recommendations (*MVCA Technical Review _SWMP & SSA_Southwell Homes_Oct 2023).*

We note that the *Limit of Hazards Lands Plan*, in the report, does not show the full extent of the *Limit of Hazard Lands (as marked by MVCA)*.

See response to technical comments in the Slope Stability Assessment report from Paterson Group.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

The conceptual SWMP provided with the subject application has been reviewed by MVCA's Water Resources Engineer, with a focus on stormwater quantity management and natural hazards i.e. flooding and erosion. This includes consideration to hydrologic impacts to receiving watercourses and wetlands. As outlined in the review, the site development does not require quantity control where the post development flow outlets to the Mississippi River. However, in areas where the post-development runoff outlets to wetlands, the post-development flows should be controlled to pre-development levels for all storms, including 100-yr storms. An enhanced level of water quality protection (80% TSS removal) is proposed for the site development.

Refer to the attached *MVCA Technical Review _SWMP & SSA_Southwell Homes_Oct 2023,* for details and recommendations. In addition to the recommendations in the attached report, we also recommend the following:

• Incorporation of LID features;

• Discussion of the impacts of altering the hydrologic balance in the wetland by reducing the post development flows for the 5 and 100-year storm events. Mitigation measures should be included as necessary.

Novatech's response letter dated February 22, 2024 is attached to this re-submission.

MVCA ONTARIO REGULATION 153/06

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 1:100-year flood plain, a mapped Erosion Hazard, and their 15 m Regulation Limits; any interference, in and within the Regulation Limit (i.e. within 120 m), of a PSW; or for any alterations to the shoreline of a watercourse. For the subject property, a permit is required from MVCA for the following:

• Development between 30 m and 120 m of the PSW, resulting in interference within the Regulation Limit of a PSW;
• Development within the mapped Regulation Limit of an Erosion Hazard;
• (1) stormwater outlet to the river, resulting in an alteration to the shoreline;
• (1) stormwater outlet to the PSW, resulting in interference within the Regulation Limit of a PSW; and
• Apple St. extension, resulting in interference within the Regulation Limit of a PSW.

Note: Development is not proposed within the Regulation Limit of the 1:100-year flood plain.

Permit requirements noted.

MISSISSIPPI-RIDEAU SOURCEWATER PROTECTION

The subject property is not located within a protected area.

Noted.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Prior to moving forward, MVCA recommends the following:

1. Adherence to the recommendations in the attached *MVCA Technical Review _SWMP & SSA_Southwell Homes_Oct 2023;*
2. Adherence to the recommendations in the attached *MVCA Technical Review of EIS_Southwell Homes_Oct 2023;*
3. Incorporation of LID features into the SWMP;
4. Discussion of the impacts of altering the hydrologic balance in the wetland by reducing the post-development flows for the 5 and 100-year storm events. Mitigation measures should be included as necessary.

Response from Novatech dated February 22, 2024 is attached.

MVCA Technical Review Memorandum (October 25, 2023)

Watercourses and Wetlands

The site is adjacent to the Mississippi River and the Appleton Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW), herein referred to as northern PSW. A second PSW, also part of the Appleton PSW, exists in the southern part of the site, herein referred to as the southern PSW. On the northern end of this PSW, there is a pocket of unevaluated wetland habitat (Figure 5 and Figure 12). Section 4.4 and Figure 14 (2022) confirms that there is no surface connection between the northern and southern wetlands.

Figure 17 summarizes the constraints mapping, showing a 30 m buffer from the edge of all the

wetland areas as well as from the high-water mark of the Mississippi River.

The proposed development will not occur within 30 m of the northern PSW. The EIS (2022) also lists a number of impact assessment and mitigation measure notes, including the recommendation to remove the berm that is within 30 m of the northern PSW to allow for better connectivity of overland flows into the wetland. It is further recommended that this work be followed up with the re-naturalization of the disturbed area with appropriate native vegetation.

The road extension is proposed to pass within a few meters of the northern boundary of the southern PSW habitat, and will result in the loss of the entire unevaluated wetland (0.04 ha) that is currently within the road allowance (Figure 17). Historical activities within this road allowance have resulted in low quality wetland habitat. Portions of the adjacent southern PSW, greater than 5 m south of the road, are more functional habitats supporting amphibians and greater water depths. “While this area (the unevaluated wetland) to be impacted was not considered to be of high value, its removal is a permanent impact and offsetting is recommended.” The impact to the southern PSW and its adjacent lands has not been discussed.

The proposed storm water treatment is for enhanced treatment (80%) and will be released via two outlets to the river and one outlet to the Appleton PSW. The Stormwater Management Report by Novatech (April, 2017) shows that there will be increases in the flows to the wetland area for the 25 mm and 2-year storm events; and there will be decreases to the flows from the 5 year and 100-year events. With respect to the increase, the report references them as *slight,* concluding that the impact to the *PSW is expected to be negligible* and will be addressed at the detailed design stage. No discussion was provided on the decrease in post development flows during larger events.

The proposed location of the storm water outlet swale is shown in Figure 17. Section 5.3.2 of the EIS (2022) discusses that “the outlets from the stormwater management are to be designed to prevent erosion and transport of suspended sediments into the wetland.” The EIS also notes that an increase in sheet flow at the outlet has the potential to create hydraulic conditions that may help re-establish wetland plants in this area (page 78).

<u>Bowfin Conclusion</u>
The proposed development will occur on a former wooden mill and its associated lagoons. Much of the direct footprint of development will occur within these previously developed lands; and as such the habitat within the subject lands was not found to be significant. A minimum 30 m setback from the river and the PSW will be established.

The EIS further concludes that as the proposed redevelopment will not impact the woodland, wetland, or the river – the potential to impact listed species in adjacent lands is avoided.

The report lists mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts of the site’s construction

and use on the surrounding natural features. The report concludes that "provided the mitigation measures are applied, then it is anticipated that no negative impacts to significant features will occur."

MVCA recommends the following prior to moving forward. We note than many of these items were requested in MVCA's previous review letter dated to the County of Lanark, dated Oct 10, 2018 (County File: 09-T-15005).

Development Design

1. MVCA recommends that a permanent fence be erected to delineate the end of maintained yard area, and the commencement of the buffer zone which is to be unaltered.
2. MVCA recommends the incorporation of LID features into the site's drainage design to help maintain pre to post surface drainage to the wetlands.
3. MVCA concurs with the 30 m setback to the northern and southern PSW, provided the limit is clearly delineated so rear yard impacts do not extend into the buffer zone.
4. MVCA concurs with the EIS recommendation for an offsetting plan that evaluates the proposed loss of 0.04 ha of unevaluated southern wetland, prior to development.
   - This plan shall be prepared by the proponent, to the satisfaction of MVCA.
   - MVCA further recommends that the impacts to the southern PSW be addressed as part of the offsetting agreement.
   - A permit is required from MVCA for alterations within the 30 m buffer to the southern PSW.

Additional Information Requirements

1. Discussion, in the EIS and SWMP, on the impacts of altering the hydrologic balance in the wetland by reducing the post-development flows for the 5 and 100-year storm events.
2. A discussion on the relationship between seasonal high water in the river, the northern PSW, and stormwater outlet volumes, and how seasonal river conditions. How does outletting storm water to the wetland influence the wetland's condition? What are the potential impacts of adding storm water flows to the northern PSW while it is in a saturated, flooded, or dry season condition? If there are impacts, can they be mitigated?
3. Provide recommended mitigation measures to prevent yard creep into the wetlands and the steep river shoreline.
4. The EIS indicates that the southern PSW has a minimal buffer between it and the proposed road extension. It also highlights the threat of road salt run off but that the majority will be captured and processed in the stormwater swales.
   a. It is not clear if there will be roadside ditches on both sides of this east-west road to direct the snow and salt run off away from the wetland and into the storm water swales. It is also not clear how road run off, grading etc. directly beside the southern PSW will be mitigated.
   b. The EIS also mentioned that, under current site conditions, functional habitat

becomes present in the southern PSW, greater than 5 m south of the road allowance. Please discuss if this zone will be pushed further south once there is an active roadway at the north end of the wetland? If so, please recommend suitable mitigation measures.

The project biologist is now at CIMA. Please see CIMA response letter dated February 23, 2024 and Novatech's response letter dated February 22, 2024 to address these comments.

MVCA Technical Review Memorandum (January 30, 2023)

SWMP

1. It is understood that the PCSWMM model used the SCS method with CN number in estimating the flows. Is climate change impact considered in post-development flow calculation, for example, a 25% increase in runoff coefficient when using the rational method?
2. Maximum storage of 13 m^3 and 20 m^3 is provided for outlets C1 and C2, respectively (as per Table 6.2). However, these values are labelled as 'required' volume in the calculation section provided in Appendix B (it is assumed that provided storage). Please provide calculations of the required storage volume for both outlets C1 and C2.
3. It is stated that the *proposed linear SWMFs will control post-development flows to the north PSW to pre-development levels for all storm events, except for a 25mm water quality event, as the impact of 4-5 L/s increase in flow to the wetlands is expected to be negligible.* What kind of water quality measure is proposed to treat the first flush flow to the wetland in reducing the TSS load?
4. The post-development drainage area plan shows the 100-year flood elevation as 119.8 m (interpolated from the topographic survey). However, MVCA completed a floodplain mapping study for the Mississippi River in 2019 (updated in 2022); per the study, the 100-yr flood elevation within the subject site is 124.8 – 124.82 m. Using the 100-yr flood elevation from the floodplain mapping study is recommended in designing the SWM plan.
5. Design details, capacity analysis of the roadside ditches, and proposed linear stormwater management facilities (in lots 5 and 9) are to be submitted in detailed design.

Please see Novatech's response to the Stormwater questions dated February 22, 2024.

Slope Stability report:

6. The slope stability study analyzed two cross-sections (A-A and B-B) as worst-case scenarios at the northwest portion of the site. However, a second slope area exists south of the B-B cross-section, within lots 4 through 7. Please discuss if this slope was considered in the stability analysis and the determination of the limit of hazardous lands.

7. The slope stability report states that *the existing ground surface across the site is generally level at an approximate elevation of 126 to 128 m*. However, the contour lines in SWM plans show lots south of B-B cross-sections have an elevation difference of 5-6 m. Please review and correct as required.

A revised Slope Stability Assessment was circulated on November 10, 2023, and MVCA responded in a Memo on November 29, 2023 that they had no further comments.

MRSSO comments (November 2, 2023)

Our office provides the following comments/advice that may be considered for Draft Approval:

- The sewage design flow for each dwelling shall not exceed 3000 litres per day. If the sewage design flow exceeds 3000 litres per day a recalculation of the cumulative nitrate impact will be required; or a Level IV treatment system with nitrogen removal would be required.

Noted.

- Individual water supplies (i.e. wells) and sewage disposal systems are owned, operated and managed by the owner of the property upon which the system is located.

Noted.

- Sewage system designs shall be based on specific site investigations to evaluate the suitability of local conditions on each lot. All sewage systems shall be designed, constructed and operated accordioning to Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code.

Noted.

- Homeowners must be advised that onsite sewage systems installed using a Level IV treatment system or Building Materials Evaluation Committee (BMEC) system require mandatory maintenance agreements. Level IV treatment systems may benefit the homeowner, depending on site-specific conditions, as the dispersal bed will be smaller allowing additional development on the lot (i.e. pools, shed, etc). As an added benefit, Level IV treatment systems will reduce the nutrient and contaminant impact on the groundwater.

Noted.

- The location of the dwelling, well and sewage system shall be in conformance with the "Lot development Plan, Drawing PH4398-1 dated April 8, 2022, by Paterson Group

Noted.

- Any changes to the location of the sewage system and well on individual lots will require an updated and approved "Lot Development Plan, Drawing PH4398-1" by Paterson Group prior to issuance of the Building Permit.

Noted.

- Sewage system approvals are required prior to the issuance of Building Permits

Noted.

- Property owners must be notified that water softener and iron filter discharge must not be directed to the onsite sewage system.

Noted.

Jp2g Consultants Inc – EIS Peer Review (letter dated October 12, 2023)

CIMA's response letter dated February 23, 2024 is attached and addresses the peer reviewer's comments.

Stantec Consulting Ltd – Hydrogeology and Terrain Analysis Peer Review (letter dated December 4, 2023)

Paterson Group's updated Hydrogeological Assessment and Terrain Analysis Report dated January 31, 2024 and their letter response to the peer reviewer's comments are attached to this re-submission.

Stantec Consulting Ltd – ESA Peer Review (letter dated September 15, 2023)

Remedial Action Plan dated February 14, 2024 is attached to this re-submission.

Enbridge Gas Inc (letter dated December 19, 2022)

Comments noted.

WSP for Bell Canada (email dated December 20, 2022)

Comments Noted.

Hydro One (email dated January 2, 2023)

Comments noted.

Mike Baker, neighbour comments sent to County staff (undated)

- Apple St seems a bit narrow to handle additional traffic beyond a few additional houses. Is the subdivision being designed with the Old Mill Lane entrance as the "main" entrance that residents are expected to use most of the time?

The subdivision is designed with one through street which will provide access to both Old Mill Lane and Apple Street.

- Will additional traffic control measures be implemented at the Old Mill Lane/Wilson/bridge intersection? This intersection is already a bit dangerous with only Old Mill Lane having a stop sign and most Northbound drivers not realizing that going straight through the intersection onto Old Mill Lane should actually be treated as a left turn since the Westbound vehicles coming off the bridge don't have a stop sign.

Novatech Engineering completed a Transportation Impact Statement to evaluate the potential for road and traffic impacts on nearby streets; the report concluded that the low volume of traffic that is expected to be generated from the 14-lot subdivision is not anticipated to have any significant impacts on nearby streets, and no road improvements to nearby streets are recommended.

Appleton resident comments (no name provided) sent to County staff (January 17, 2023)

1. Government regulations **-** The description of the property indicates that it is an area that already has numerous Ontario government/ Mississippi Mills government restrictions and protections for the area. The restrictions include Protected Wet Lands, Environmental Hazard and Protection. I understand that these restrictions are important for the area due to the history of the property with respect to past hazards related to the old Textile/Woolen mill which was located directly on the property that is being considered for a sub-division. These hazards included a ground holding pond that for many decades was used as a dumping site for coloured dyes and other by-products of the textile industry. In addition, the fire in 2007 that destroyed the building and its contents may have caused other pollutants to enter the ground. I recall that some homes in Appleton were evacuated because of concerns about PCB's being released into the air as a result of the fire. Has the ground in the immediate area of the old mill been recently tested for cancer causing pollutants such as PCB's and for chemicals used in the textile industry? I assume that any new homeowners in the subdivision will be advised of the pollution history of the Textile Mill prior to purchasing lots.

The subject property has gone through extensive analysis and testing, as demonstrated in the supporting Environmental Site Assessment and Hydrogeology Reports. Some minor site remediation is required to complete the clean up on the site.

2. Additional Pollution - How many dwellings are expected to be built on the 14 lots? It is assumed that this would mean septic systems/beds and wells required for each dwelling. Has a study been completed to determine whether the proposed development will have an adverse effect on the local water table used by existing local homeowners and whether there is enough land to safely support the number of new septic beds that will be required.

The subdivision includes fourteen lots for single detached dwellings. The supporting studies including the Hydrogeological Assessment and Terrain Analysis have evaluated the soils and groundwater conditions and concluded that there is adequate water quality and quantity to meet the needs of the proposed dwellings without having an adverse impact on nearby properties.

3. Safety **–** As you know, the main road through Appleton village does not have any pedestrian sidewalks which is already a serious safety issue for people walking in the area and dealing with local vehicle traffic. The addition of a sub-division that is planned to be accessed through the center of Appleton will significantly increase pedestrian and vehicle traffic and raise the safety risk even higher for people walking their dogs or simply going for a stroll. This is a real local concern. I suggest that Lanark/Mississippi Mills administrators take a walk in the heart of the village (particularly in winter) to get a feel for how dangerous it can be and how the proposed sub-division will only exacerbate an existing serious safety issue. The center of Appleton is a really small, tight area that has not been designed to take on the traffic needs of a subdivision.

Novatech Engineering completed a Transportation Impact Statement to evaluate the potential for road and traffic impacts on nearby streets; the report concluded that the low volume of traffic that is expected to be generated from the 14-lot subdivision is not anticipated to have any significant impacts on nearby streets, and no road improvements to nearby streets are recommended. The new street in the subdivision will be designed to include a paved shoulder on one side to accommodate pedestrian traffic.

4. Summary Please consider the above written comments as a formal response to your referenced consultation request. I would like to be advised of any public meetings that may be held and would like to be notified of any formal decisions.

Email to County staff from Ian F. Morrison (February 11, 2023)

Thank you for your response.
I am in full support of this project.
I am trying to ensure I have access to the acre of land at the back of my property.
As outlined in the email below the access was removed last fall.
I plan to apply for severance of this lot and before getting a survey and whatever else is needed to accompany my application I would like some understanding of the effect the change in access might create.

It is understood that Mr. Morrison owns the parcel of land at PIN 05109-0055. This lot will gain frontage on the new street in this plan of subdivision.

Submission from Alison Ball and Peter Hicks (dated January 16, 2023)

The submission includes the following summary recommendations:

Provide a public forum for Appleton residents to get answers to questions related to the technical documentation and the development process. For example, hold a public open house with technical experts, municipal planners and the developers.

Provide studies, before the zoning is changed and the property is sold, which show that the soil and ground water of Block 19 are not contaminated.

Replace the private Old Mill Lane with a new municipal road to the west of 116 and 104 Old Mill Lane for access to the houses on Old Mill Lane, the hydro dam and a new waterfront park.

Move the access road south.

Create a parking area for the new park and for other village visitors to the north of the access road (resulting in a narrower strip of property beside 116 Old Mill Lane; i.e., Block 19).

Create a new multifunction waterfront park along the entire river edge of the site, create a new municipal road to access the park and create a parking lot at the side of the access road.

Implement traffic calming measures in and around the village before construction begins.

Designate Apple Street as the primary access road to the site and upgrade before the construction begins, if necessary.

Add the locations of existing well and septic systems of properties surrounding the well and septic system plan for subdivision. Consider the undeveloped residential lots on Apple Street. Specifically, verify that the well and septic systems planned for Lot 12 are distanced appropriately from those on existing properties on Apple Street.

Ensure that the wells are located appropriately from road-related contamination (salt, spills, etc.); e.g., the well for Lot 10 appears to be located on the road, the wells for many of the lots are at the edge of the road (Lots 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11) and other wells are very close to the road.

Ensure that wells are located appropriately from the main Natural Gas supply line, which goes through the site; e.g., the proposed well locations for Lots 8, 9, 10,11 and 12 appear to be very close to the supply line.

Ensure that the well and septic system plans for Lots 8, 9 and 10 consider the creek and the wetland buffer zone.

Ensure that the well is decommissioned before Block 19 is sold.

Ensure that all waste is removed from the former textile mill disposal site and, if the soil beneath is contaminated, clean-up the site before development begins.

Require pre and post excavation studies (including photographs) on walls and foundations of nearby residences.

Ensure that runoff prevention is in place before and during the construction.

Ensure that runoff is managed so that it doesn't degrade the fish spawning grounds.

Maintain trail access to the unopened road allowance between Concessions 9 and 10.

Recommendations are duly noted.

Should you require any additional information, please don't hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully,

Tracy Zander, M.Pl, MCIP, RPP