

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

Department	Comments	Action/Comment
Accessibility July 25, 2022 Valerie Vicary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In accordance with the Accessible Parking By-law 2019-22, and based upon the illustrated 37 parking spaces, there needs to be a minimum of 2 accessible parking spaces. 2. According to the required 64 parking spaces (A-1), there needs to be a minimum of 3 accessible parking spaces – 1 Type A, 1 Type B, and one space that can be either Type A or B. 3. Please ensure that all accessible parking spaces adhere to requirements set forth by the Town's Accessible Parking By-law 2019-22. Parking signage and pavement markings are detailed in Schedule B and C of the By-law. As well, please detail the curb cuts required for a safe path of travel from the parking spaces to the main entrance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Two accessible spaces provided. 2. The site specific ZBL requires 37 parking spaces, resulting in a requirement for 2 accessible spaces, as provided. 3. Dimension of accessible spaces as shown on the plan exceeds town requirements. No revision required. Curb cuts were correctly shown on the plan reviewed by AODA. No revision required.

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

Department	Comments	Action/Comment
	<p>4. Aside from the above regulations and in regards to outdoor play spaces, please ensure that the owner is directed to O. Reg. 191/11 IASR s. 80.18, 80.19 and 80.20 for regulations that must be followed. As well, “better practice considerations” recommended by GAATES (section 2.5 – Outdoor Play Spaces) shall be cross-referenced with their design implementation.</p>	<p>4. The outdoor play area has not yet been designed. However, we note that Sections 80.18 to 80.20 of the Regulation do not apply to “small organizations” which are defined as “an organization with at least one but fewer than 50 employees in Ontario”. The proposed day nursery qualifies as a “small organization” and as such, the above requirements of O.Reg 191/11 do not apply. No Action required.</p>
<p>By-Law Enforcement September 11, 2022 Brent Lee</p>	<p>1. Line 6, to which this property fronts, is a collector roadway that will support a significant amount of growth in the south portion of urban Bradford, including: several new subdivisions, multiple elementary school properties and a long-term care facility for senior residents.</p> <p>2. Under the Traffic By-law, Line 6 is currently designated “No Stopping” in both directions, which means vehicles are not permitted to stop on the roadway for any reason, including temporary drop-off or pick-up of attendees.</p>	<p>1. Acknowledged</p> <p>2. Acknowledged</p>

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

Department	Comments	Action/Comment
	<p>3. Concerns exist within the Enforcement Division that the number of private parking spaces contemplated in this application is insufficient for the intended use, which may result in motorists using portions of Line 6 for temporary on-street parking and/or queuing on Line 6, in either the eastbound or westbound direction, while awaiting for the private parking lot to clear of vehicles. Either of these instances, whether on-street parking on Line 6 or queuing in lanes of traffic on Line 6 are not desirable and could create instances of traffic congestion, poor sightlines for incoming traffic, delays for emergency services and increased interaction between vehicles traversing Line 6 and pedestrians accessing the subject lands.</p> <p>4. In response to these and similar concerns expressed by other BWG Departments, the applicant submitted a Transportation Demand Management Plan to assist in managing the impacts of peak-hour traffic at the proposed site.</p> <p>5. Enforcement is requesting that adherence to the provisions of the TDM be included as site specific zoning standards or Site Plan Agreement conditions of the owner/operator.</p> <p>6. Enforcement can consent to the revised application, should the provisions of the TDM effectively prevent on-street parking on Line 6 and prevent on-street queueing on Line 6 during peak hours.</p>	<p>3. These concerns were addressed through the previous submission. No further action required.</p> <p>4. Acknowledged</p> <p>5. Acknowledged</p> <p>6. Acknowledged</p>

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

<p>Community Services Parks July 28, 2022 F. Jonkman, K. Shlemkevich</p>	<p><u>Landscape Plan L-1, LD-1, LD-2</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note on the Temporary Tree Protection Detail that the fencing is to be installed at a minimum of 1 m outside of the dripline for Tree #3 which is to be retained. 2. Revise tree protection fencing so as not to be located over hardscape. Please ensure drawings are coordinated with Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan. 3. Provide detail showing proposed earth bin type and size. 4. Provide a detail for the tactile plate and ramp installation ensuring that AODA guidelines are met. <p><u>Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TIPP)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please provide a revised Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan. The Plan attached at the end of the document is not clear with respect to the Plant Lists and Figure 1: Tree Preservation/ Landscape Plan legend. Additionally, it doesn't appear to reflect the same information as proposed in the Landscape Plan submitted by MSA. Please ensure that drawings are coordinated. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A note has been added to the Tree Protection Detail 2 on LD-1 which notes that fencing is to be installed a minimum of 1.0 m outside of dripline. 2. Tree protection fencing is not located over hardscape. Refer to updated Landscape Plan and Details and Tree Preservation Plan Figure 1 3. Detail has been added on Landscape Details LD-2 4. Details for the concrete ramp and tactile plates have been added to the Landscape Details LD-2 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Arborist has used the Landscape Plan as a base for the Tree Preservation Plan Figure 1. The drawings have been coordinated.
--	--	---

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Clarify what the pink line denotes that is located within the south-east quadrant of Tree #3 on the Plan. 3. Consider revising the name of the Plan at the end of the document from Landscape Plan to Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan. 4. Note on the Plan and on the Protection Fencing Detail that the tree protection fencing is to be installed at a minimum of 1m outside of the dripline for Tree #3 which is to be retained. It is understood that the location of the fencing will be adjusted in 2 phases to accommodate construction activities, however please ensure that the 1m buffer is followed where situation allows. 5. The Plan indicates that a French Drain is to be installed within the dripline of Tree #3 which is to be retained. Please revise the report to include how this will be installed while protecting the root health of the tree. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The pink line indicates the location for root sensitive excavation, refer to Legend on Figure 1, Tree Preservation Plan 3. The Tree Preservation Plan is identified as “Figure 1 Tree Preservation Plan” and referred to as “Figure 1” in the text of the Arborist Report. 4. A note has been added to the Tree Protection Detail 2 on LD-1 which notes that fencing is to be installed a minimum of 1.0 m outside of dripline. Refer also to Arborist Report and Figure 1, Tree Protection Plan. 5. Refer to revised Arborist Report and Figure 1, Tree Protection Plan
--	--	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

<p>Engineering July 20, 2022 Tom Wheeler</p>	<p>At this time Development Engineering does not object to the development applications being forwarded to Council for consideration. While there are still issues surrounding site servicing for this development that will need to be addressed, those can continue to be addressed as the file moves forward. With respect to the Zoning By-law Amendment specifically, please refer to comment No. C.36 below. All other provided comments can be addressed as part of the Site Plan Application.</p> <p>Refer to redline Engineering Drawings (D1, D2, ESC 1, GR1, S1, S2, SS1)</p> <p>C.1 Please include a line type in the legend of all drawings clearly indicating property line.</p> <p>C.2 Please note that a temporary construction dewatering plan may be required and a condition incorporated into the Site Plan Agreement, requiring it to be finalized prior to construction.</p> <p><u>Site Plan (A-1)</u></p> <p>B.4 Previous Comment: The proposed retaining wall along the south limits of the site shall have a minimum off-set of 600mm from the property lines. In the provided comment matrix it is noted that an agreement with Development Engineering to allow a 150 mm set back from the property line was reached. With whom was this discussed?</p> <p>C3. Updated Comment: While we have no objection to the proposed 150 mm setback of the retaining wall from the property line, a note should be added to the drawing stating “Retaining wall and all features, including footings, to be contained entirely</p>	<p>Refer to appropriate section, below.</p> <p>Redline comments have been addressed.</p> <p>C.1 Legend has been revised</p> <p>C.2 Acknowledged</p> <p>C3 A note has been added to the plans</p>
--	--	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>within the property limits. Any alterations to adjacent lands, due to retaining wall construction, shall require written permission from the adjacent land Property Owners prior to construction. Any disturbed areas on adjacent lands shall be restored to existing conditions or better.”</p> <p>C.4 We question the proposed location of one fire route sign (refer to marked up plan).</p> <p><u>Site Servicing Plan (SS-1)</u></p> <p>B.10 Previous Comment: “R Tank Storage Units” are shown on the drawing with no further details of these storage tanks provided. If a storage tank is being proposed as part of the storm sewer system then further detail related to this tank will be required including, but not limited to; detail drawings of the storage tank, location of emergency overflow to be shown on plan, details of tank inlet to be provided, etc. Additionally, if a storage tank is being proposed both the Functional Servicing and Storm water management reports will need to be updated to discuss the tank.</p> <p>C.5 Updated Comment: While we note manufacturer drawings have been provided on the detail drawing, they are blurred and becoming illegible. Also, site specific drawings have not been provided and should be included with the next submission for review and consideration. Further details should also be provided on the site servicing plan (refer to marked up drawing). It is our understanding that the proposed tank is to be an impermeable tank. To that end a proposal of how the R-Tank system will achieve impermeability should be detailed.</p>	<p>C4 Refer to updated Site Plan</p> <p>C5 Site specific details are included and a note regarding wrapping the tank in PVC to prevent infiltration has been added</p>
--	---	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>B.11 Previous Comment: Minimum cover of 1.2 m is not being achieved over several sewer runs (refer to marked up plan for locations). Insulation of these pipes will be required including a proposed insulation detail.</p> <p>C.6 Updated Comment: While we note sewer insulation is now being proposed, a proposed insulation detail has not yet been provided.</p> <p>B.14 Previous Comment: Sewer run information is noted as missing on several sewer runs. All sewer runs should at minimum show; length of sewer run, slope of sewer run, size of proposed pipe, and pipe material being proposed.</p> <p>C.7 Updated Comment: The proposed length of french drain connecting to STMMHB is missing.</p> <p>B.16 Previous Comment: Several 90-degree bends are being proposed in both the french drain and roof collector drain systems. Further details on how these proposed changes in pipe direction will be achieved is required.</p> <p>C.8 Updated Comment: While we note 90 degree pvc bends are being proposed, this is typically not acceptable under our design standards. As this falls within the private portion of development, this item will be subject to further review under the Ontario Building Code (OBC) and may not meet OBC criteria. You would be encouraged to resolve this matter now so as to avoid a system redesign.</p>	<p>C6 Pipe insulation detail has been added</p> <p>C7 The length of the French Drain has been added</p> <p>C8 The 90 degree bend has been removed</p>
--	---	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>B.18 Previous Comment: Connection of the 200 mm dia. roof drain collector system to the 200 mm dia. storm sewer system is being proposed with no maintenance hole. Further details on how this will be achieved is required.</p> <p>Additionally, at this location three separate sewer runs are connecting from different angles with no maintenance hole proposed. Further details on how this will be achieved is required.</p>	
	<p>C.9 Updated Comment: While we note 90 degree pvc bends are being proposed, this is typically not acceptable under our design standards. As this falls within the private portion of development, this item will be subject to further review under the Ontario Building Code (OBC) and may not meet OBC criteria. You would be encouraged to resolve this matter now so as to avoid a system redesign.</p>	<p>C9 The pipe size has been changed to 150 mm</p>
	<p>B.23 Previous Comment: As the proposed storm sewer pipe size is the same as the existing storm sewer mainline it is connecting to, a new manhole will be required at this connection point. A minimum drop across the manhole of 0.09 m will be required.</p>	
	<p>C.10 Updated Comment: The proposed storm sewer pipe diameter is greater than half the diameter of the sewer mainline it is connecting to. Town standards specify that a sewer connection pipe is to be a maximum of half the diameter of the pipe it is connecting to. Consideration should be given to connect the proposed storm sewer to EX STMH3.</p>	<p>C10 The pipe has been connected to EXSTMH3</p>
	<p>C.11 The referenced OPSD for the proposed connection to the existing sanitary sewer is for new sewer installation. Please update this item specifying an inserta tee to be used for this connection.</p>	<p>C11 A tee has been shown</p>

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>C.12 Has the proposed invert to the existing sanitary sewer on Line 6 been verified (ie. Has the existing pipe invert been confirmed at this location)?</p> <p>C.13 Sewer crossing information is missing at the proposed sanitary sewer crossing of the storm sewer on Line 6.</p> <p>C.14 A French drain pipe length is missing (refer to marked up plan).</p> <p>C.15 Further details of how the 200mm dia. perforated french drain pipe will connect to the 150 mm dia. pvc pipe east of STMMHB are required.</p> <p>C.16 It is noted that a horizontal bend is being proposed in the storm sewer run between STMHB and the existing storm sewer. Horizontal bends in sewers are not permitted under Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury design criteria.</p> <p>C.17 A 90 ° bend is being proposed in the fire watermain near the proposed fire hydrant. Consideration should be given to relocate this hydrant in line with the watermain (ie. Dead ended hydrant)</p> <p>C.18 Further site specific details for the proposed R Tank storage units are to be included on the drawing (refer to marked up plan).</p>	<p>C12 The sewer inverts have been taken from Town drawings showing existing manhole invert elevations. A note has been added to the drawing to confirm inverts prior to start of work</p> <p>C13 Crossing Information has been added</p> <p>C14 The length has been added</p> <p>C15 Details are provided</p> <p>C16 The line has been corrected</p> <p>C17 The 90 degree bend has been removed</p> <p>C18 Details have been added</p>
--	--	---

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>C.19 A cross sectional reference to the location of the roof collector pipe connection detail is to be provided. How this proposed detail will function is unclear.</p> <p>C.20 Please provide appropriate dimensions in the provided french drain detail.</p> <p>C.21 Cross Sectional Drawing 1-1 shall be updated to show the 0.15 m setback from the retaining wall footings to the property line.</p> <p><u>Grading and Drainage Plan (GR-1)</u></p> <p>B.28 Previous Comment: Drop curb is being proposed at several locations along the proposed filter trench / swale raising question as to how the filter drain / swale will function. Further explanation/ justification required.</p> <p>C.22 Updated Comment: Is ponding in the parking lot anticipated in a 100 year event? If so please indicate the ponding limits and anticipated ponding elevations on the drawing.</p> <p>B.29 Previous Comment: A 0.9 m elevation difference between the proposed grade and retaining wall has been noted at the south west corner of the site (refer to marked up plan for location). Explain how this will be managed.</p> <p>C.23 Updated Comment: For further clarification the proposed top of wall elevation (223.06) is 0.9 m below the finished grade elevation (223.96) at this location. We are assuming this to be a typo that should be corrected.</p>	<p>C19 The detail has been cross referenced</p> <p>C20 Dimensions have been provided</p> <p>C21 The setback has been shown</p> <p>C22 Extent of ponding has been shown</p> <p>C23 The grades have been corrected</p>
--	---	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>B.30 Previous Comment: The proposed retaining wall exceeds 1.0 m in height at several locations. As such a separate design of the retaining wall, signed and sealed by a Licensed Professional Engineer, will be required. Additionally, a noise fence is being proposed on top of the retaining wall and a detail drawing should be provided for this item.</p> <p>C.24 Updated Comment: While we note that structural retaining wall drawings and acoustical fence drawings have now been provided, the acoustical fence drawings indicate the posts as requiring to be set in 1.5 m concrete footings. If the posts are to be set directly into the retaining wall the Structural Engineer will have to certify the wall has been designed to accommodate for the anticipated wind loading from the fence. Also the retaining wall drawings should be updated to show the fence as being set into the retaining wall.</p> <p>B.32 Previous Comment: French drain and infiltration systems are shown adjacent to the retaining wall and the building, creating wet areas around footings of those structures. In time, this will potentially compromise structural integrity of the footings and foundations. We request that either proper separation be provided or a structural engineer or a geo-scientist review the design and certify that the drainage system will not impact the structures in anyway during time.</p> <p>C.25 Updated Comment: While we note a polyethylene liner is now being proposed for the french drain system, the infiltration system still remains a concern. Also, dimensions of the proposed infiltration and french drain systems should be provided (refer to marked up plan).</p>	<p>C24 Refer to retaining wall drawings S2. MSA has also removed the footing from the acoustic wall as it is to be on the wall attached as per detail 4 on LD-1.</p> <p>C25 A note has been added regarding a PVC liner for the storage tank. Dimensions have been added</p>
--	---	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p><u>Erosion & Sediment Control Plan (ESC-1)</u></p> <p>B.33 Previous Comment: While a sediment trap and temporary swale have now been shown on the plan, further details related to both of these items is still required (refer to marked up plan for specifics). Also, proposed works are still being shown on the plan and should be removed. Finally, overland flow routes have not been indicated and should be shown on the plan.</p> <p>C.26 Updated Comment: While we note a detail for the sediment trap has been provided, site specific elevations and dimensions are still missing from the detail. Also, the plan indicates that the sediment trap connects to STMMHA. As this is a proposed maintenance hole please provide construction phasing for this proposal. If the sediment trap is proposed to discharge to the existing storm sewer system a temporary discharge application form will be required to be submitted.</p> <p>C.27 The location of the proposed construction entrance mat is to be shown to scale on the drawing at the appropriate dimensions indicated on the Town Standard Drawing.</p> <p>C.28 The location of the proposed concrete washout area is to be shown to scale on the drawing at the appropriate dimensions indicated on the Town Standard Drawing.</p> <p>C.29 Under the notes section of the drawing a note is to be added stating “A street sweeping program is to be implemented to the satisfaction of the Town. Details of said program shall be provided to the Town for review and consideration prior to construction.”</p>	<p>C26 Dimensions and elevations have been shown. Phasing has been noted</p> <p>C27 The mat is to scale</p> <p>C28 The concrete washout area has been shown to scale and dimensioned</p> <p>C29 A note has been added</p>
--	---	---

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p><u>Site Lighting (SL-1)</u></p> <p>C.30 A potential conflict with a proposed street tree has been noted (refer to marked up plan). Please review and advise if relocation is required.</p> <p><u>Retaining Wall:</u></p> <p>C.31 All provided drawings are to be updated to show a minimum of 0.15 m setback of retaining wall footings from the property line.</p> <p><u>Functional Servicing Report</u></p> <p>C.32 Any conflicts with utilities within the municipal right-of-way that arise from the design will require the Owner to consult with the appropriate agency to obtain concurrence and approval of the relocation. Any conflicts that require relocation and are supported by the responsible agency, must be reflected in Grading Plan and be complete in coordination with the Town of BWG and the respective utility agency at Owner's sole expense.</p> <p>C.33 Appendix 1 of the report references a fire flow test that was carried out on the existing municipal watermain on April 6, 2022. Please provide the corresponding results of the referenced test.</p>	<p>C30 The tree has been moved slightly. The species selected has a pyramidal crown. Refer to updated landscape plan</p> <p>C31 All drawings have been revised to include a note that footings are to maintain a minimum 0.15 m setback from the property line.</p> <p>C32 Acknowledged</p> <p>C33 The FSR has been updated to include the hydrant flow test results</p>
--	---	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p><u>Transportation Study</u></p> <p>B.40 Previous Comment: Table 4 – Sighting Distance Review indicates that a minimum of 125 m of sightline is required, and the distance to the nearby signalized intersection to the east is approximately 50 m and 85 m for east and west driveways, respectively. The report concludes that sightline distance is sufficient, when according to the Table 4 sightline to the intersection at the east is not. How is a left turn movement from the site safe, particularly for the east driveway?</p> <p>C.34 Updated Comment: While we note the east driveway is now a right out only, minimum sightline distances are still not being met to both the east and west driveways.</p> <p>B.41 Previous Comment: Diagram provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most southerly parking spot is dysfunctional based on the Diagram • Garbage truck turning analysis is not complete. Based on the provided EarthBin User Guide, the garbage bins are to be dumped into the garbage truck by a front end loading mechanism. The diagram must show the maneuver is possible. Additionally, the location of the garbage bins must be barrier free. The current plans show the bins near parking spots and can be blocked by parked cars. <p>C.35 Updated Comment: While the bin has been relocated, the vehicle maneuvering diagram does not assess this operation as indicated in the response matrix. Also, based on the updated AutoTurn Maneuvering Diagram, the proposed most southerly parking space still appears to be dysfunctional.</p>	<p>C34 Refer to Traffic Response Letter for detailed sightline analysis</p> <p>C35 Refer to updated Autoturn Analysis</p>
--	---	---

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>B.42 Previous Comment: In order for Development Engineering to support a rezoning of the property the number of spaces must be increased or the number of students reduced. The following are three (3) scenarios that we could support the rezoning under:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The currently proposed 30 parking spaces (including 2 spaces for carpooling) would allow for 108 students with the requirement of additional Transportation Demand Management features to be undertaken on the site. 2. The proposed 140 student base would require 37 parking spaces with the requirement of additional Transportation Demand Management features to be undertaken on the site. 3. The proposed 140 student base would require 40 parking spaces with no requirement for additional Transportation Demand Management features to be undertaken on the site. <p>C.36 Updated Comment: We note scenario 2 from our previous comment has been chosen, however the total 37 provided parking spaces appears to include the required additional Transportation Demand Management features (ie. Carpool and drop off spaces). We are prepared to accept the inclusion of the TDM spaces within the 37 provided spaces, however additional TDM clauses will be inserted in the Site Plan Agreement to cover additional or specific requirements, including but not limited to specific staff parking locations, additional signage, etc.</p> <p>C.37 The report is to be updated to include the signature / seal of a Licensed Professional Engineer in the Province of Ontario.</p>	<p>C36 Acknowledged.</p> <p>C37 Signature/Seal included</p>
--	--	---

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	C.38 Appendix B - Vehicle Maneuvering Diagram is to be updated to analyze a fire truck maneuvering within the proposed fire route. Acceptance of the proposed designated fire route will be subject to acceptance by the Town Fire Department.	C38 Refer to updated autoturn analysis. We note that Fire and Emergency Services provided sign off on the plan and fire route on Aug 20, 2021.
Finance July 12, 2022 Ian Goodfellow	There are no outstanding invoices on this property. Therefore, there are no objections at this time regarding the Applications for Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Approval (Day Care)	No Action Required
LSRCA June 26, 2022 Shawn Filson 905-895-1281 x 229 S.Filson@lsrca.on.ca	1. LSRCA has no objection to approval of the Zoning Amendment. Water Balance offsetting in the amount of \$7,033.40 is owed subject to LSRCA's water balance review of the Site Plan Application. I understand the Applicant may wish to hold off on payment of the water balance until the zoning is approved. From our perspective, this is acceptable. We can hold off on water balance payment until zoning is approved but the water balance will be a condition of site plan approval	Refer to Payment Receipt dated October 24, 2022 from LSRCA
Planning Oct 17, 2022 Brandon Slopach	<u>Outdoor Amenity Space</u> 1. Please provide permission/confirmation from an approved director that the proposed outdoor amenity space is acceptable prior to execution of Site Plan Agreement.	1. Disagree. The Site Specific By-law is sufficient to police the play area. The Ministry will reduce the licensed capacity of the centre if

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p><u>Traffic and TDM Plan</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff are requesting that a TDM Plan be submitted to the satisfaction of staff and that all TDM measures be implemented via the Site Plan Agreement. Please share a draft version for Staff review. 2. An extra parking space was generated in the front yard through refinement exercise. Please confirm that this is functional and does not create issues. Staff suggest installing no parking signs in required spaces to accommodate garbage pick up and loading during required timeframes 3. Update signage portion of site plan (see attached markup) 4. At the September 20, 2022, Council Meeting, Council members asked that Staff explore the possibility of lay-by lanes Line 6 to further support potential queuing concerns. Staff have internally discussed and weighted the pros and cons. The conclusion was that pursuing lay-by lanes on this section of Line 6 may produce more negative consequences than positive outcomes and will not be pursued at this time. 	<p>play space is deemed insufficient. BWG must allow the Ministry licensing process to operate as intended. No action.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to TDM letter prepared by CGE, and as revised per Town Comment 2. No parking signs are shown on the site plan as reviewed. When drawing was revised in CAD it was found that there was no additional parking space produced. No action required. 3. Refer to updated site plan 4. No Action
--	---	--

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p>5. Revisions per Planning Redline Site Plan Markup</p> <p>6. Label all front yard parking for 10 minute drop off. Reduce number of carpool spaces to one and relocate to side of building</p> <p>7. Please ensure all applicable plans are updated to reflect alterations</p> <p><u>Site Plan Agreement Conditions</u></p> <p>1. Provide owner company name for purpose of agreement. Along with individual name, title, address, phone number, email address, for notice and signing.</p> <p>2. Provide mortgagee name for purpose of agreement. Along with individual name, title, address, phone number, email address, for notice and signing (as applicable).</p> <p>3. Provide populated Schedule B (Plans, Drawings and Reports)</p> <p>4. Provide Cost Estimates of Works and Securities for inclusion in Schedule D.</p>	<p>5. Refer to revised Site Plan</p> <p>6. Refer to revised Site Plan</p> <p>7. Refer to updated Plans. All Plans have been coordinated.</p> <p>1. Refer to Owner Information Sheet</p> <p>2. Refer to Owner Information Sheet.</p> <p>3. Refer to completed Schedule B</p> <p>4. Cost estimates have been provided. Refer also to completed Schedule D</p>
--	---	---

Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan (File D14-20-13 and D11-20-17)

	<p><u>Other Comments</u></p> <p>1. Please ensure that the next submission contains a response matrix which provides a response outlining how the above noted comments have been addressed and/or where to find the applicable information as to how the comment has been addressed. Numbering should correspond to the comment numbers above.</p>	<p>1. Refer to this response matrix</p>
--	--	---