

FROM
DATE

Sheldon Creek Developments Inc.
July 10, 2025

40-60 Emma St, Grand Valley Re-submission Comments, Site Plan Submission January 2025																				
No.	Department	Comment	Response																	
1	Sourcewater Protection	It is understood that the proposal under review is for a 5-storey, 24-unit multiple residential building and that the Site will be fully connected to municipal sewer and water services.	Noted; Education and Outreach Material to be included in approval package																	
2	Sourcewater Protection	Source Protection Water Quantity Information indicates that the Site is in a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA). A recharge area is considered significant when it helps maintain the water level in an aquifer that supplies a community with drinking water. However, it is noted that the information also indicates that the Site is located in an area currently assessed as not experiencing water quantity stress (i.e. is not located in a WHPA Q1 or WHPA Q2).																		
3	Sourcewater Protection	All three existing lots fall within an area designated as a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA). This is a measure of the underlying aquifer's vulnerability to adverse impacts on water quality based on factors such as depth of the aquifer, what sort of soil or rock is covering it, and the characteristics of the soil or rock surrounding it.																		
4	Sourcewater Protection	<table><tr><td colspan="2">Table 1: Source Protection Water Quality Information Summary</td></tr><tr><td>Assessment Parcel Address:</td><td>40, 50 and 60 Emma Street</td></tr><tr><td>Source Protection Area:</td><td>Grand River</td></tr><tr><td>Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA):</td><td>C; score 8</td></tr><tr><td>Wellhead Protection Area E (GUDI):</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Intake Protection Zone:</td><td>3; score throughout the site ranges from 1 to 4</td></tr><tr><td>Issue Contributing Area:</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Significant Groundwater Recharge Area:</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Highly Vulnerable Aquifer:</td><td>Yes; score is 6</td></tr></table>		Table 1: Source Protection Water Quality Information Summary		Assessment Parcel Address:	40, 50 and 60 Emma Street	Source Protection Area:	Grand River	Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA):	C; score 8	Wellhead Protection Area E (GUDI):	No	Intake Protection Zone:	3; score throughout the site ranges from 1 to 4	Issue Contributing Area:	No	Significant Groundwater Recharge Area:	Yes	Highly Vulnerable Aquifer:
Table 1: Source Protection Water Quality Information Summary																				
Assessment Parcel Address:	40, 50 and 60 Emma Street																			
Source Protection Area:	Grand River																			
Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA):	C; score 8																			
Wellhead Protection Area E (GUDI):	No																			
Intake Protection Zone:	3; score throughout the site ranges from 1 to 4																			
Issue Contributing Area:	No																			
Significant Groundwater Recharge Area:	Yes																			
Highly Vulnerable Aquifer:	Yes; score is 6																			
5	Sourcewater Protection	It should be noted that while the Site is in an area designated as both a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) and a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) there are no existing significant threats to drinking water on the Site.																		
6	Sourcewater Protection	In addition, based on the Vulnerability Score and the assumption that the activities and circumstances would be the same for all three existing lots, the applicable policies related to water quality are the same for all three lots.																		
7	Sourcewater Protection	Based on the proposed land use, activities and circumstances that are likely to exist in the future on the Site, the only potential Significant Drinking Water Threat would be the storage and handling of DNAPLs. Therefore, the only applicable policy in the SPP is DC-GV-CW-8.3 which states the following: "To ensure any existing or new handling or storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid ceases to be or never becomes a significant drinking water threat, where such an activity is, or would be, a significant drinking water threat, the Town shall develop and implement an education and outreach program to encourage the use of alternative products, where available, and the proper handling/storage and disposal procedures for these products."																		
8	Sourcewater Protection	It is therefore recommended that the Town of Grand Valley incorporate existing Education and Outreach materials as part of the approval package.																		
9	Sourcewater Protection	In addition, it is recommended that in the review process, the Town of Grand Valley should consider the fact that the Site is located within a SGRA and HVA and therefore request that Low Impact Development (LID) practices be implemented with the aim to protect both water quantity and water quality.	LID is not recommended on this site due to the nature of the existing the soils as the soils are of low permeability																	
10	Engineering	ZBA - The site does not have adequate snow storage. The report indicates that "snow storage will be provided on-site and is sufficient such that no parking spaces are lost". We disagree with this opinion. In the winter, trucking of snow will be required to be remove snow from the site. We expect parking to spots will be lost for temporary snow storage and there will be nuisances associated with the removal of snow. The area shown for significant snow storage is near the overhead hydro-line and there will be safety concerns for a snow pile that may provide close access to the existing overhead hydro lines. The report should be updated.	Revised snow storage area is shown. Conversations with Hydro One indicate a requirement of 10' clearance from the lines in order for maintenance to occur.																	

11	Engineering	ZBA - The parking study addresses typical usage but there could be peak times when the parking area is exceeded such as a special occasion. Emma Street (between Mill Street and William Street) is less than 8m wide and not designed for on-street parking. It does not have barrier curbs and gutters. For special occasions, if there is overflow king, vehicles will park over on the boulevard requiring additional maintenance in this area. As a result, Emma Street between Mill Street and William Street will require upgrades	The parking study indicates that adequate parking will be provided for residents and visitors of the development. It was recommended that a minimum parking rate of 1.25 residential parking spaces per dwelling unit and 0.25 visitor parking spaces per dwelling unit be provided for this site. Based on the proxy parking surveys conducted to determine a recommended minimum parking rate for the site, the average parking demand at similar residential developments was 0.99 spaces per dwelling unit. It was concluded that a parking rate of 1.25 spaces per unit allocated specifically for resident use for an apartment development would be an excess to the expected demand to account for the differing parking behaviour and vehicle ownership between one and two-bedroom units. Additionally, visitor parking (which would typically account for special events/occasions) is recommended to be provided at a rate of 0.25 spaces per unit. This is at the high end of commonly provided rates in other municipalities, which typically range from 0.15 to 0.25 spaces per unit. It is acknowledged that parking is currently permitted along Emma Street (with overnight restrictions during winter months). Barrier curb is proposed along the frontage of the site, so additional required maintenance due to any parking on the shoulder is not anticipated. However, if this remains a concern for the Town, parking restrictions may be implemented via signage on one or both sides of the roadway. Upgrades to Emma St will be dealt with through Site Plan process.
12	Engineering	ZBA - While there are some inaccuracies in the report, as part of this proposal, the development is proposing to install a sidewalk from Mill Street to the asphalt boulevard in place in front of the Barclay Trim and Mouldings. This remains a requirement and can be included within the site plan agreement	Sidewalk is shown as required
13	Engineering	ZBA - Water - there is sufficient water available for allocation to support this wite	Noted
14	Engineering	ZBA - Wastewater - the Town is currently overcommitted for sewage allocation due to an increase in wastewater flows. While investigations have resulted in some findings, none have resulted in a meaningful reduction. While many of the committed allocations are not yet built and likely will not be for several years, there is a risk in overcommitting if the source cannot be determined	Noted; discussed with Town Planner
15	Engineering	ZBA - We recently received comments from a neighbouring resident with regards to concern of nearby contamination. Criterium-Jansen Engineers should respond to this comment and provide an updated ESA report in conformance with O.Reg 153/04. We expect a Phase Two Assessment to be required.	The Phase 1 ESA revealed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions; of hazardous substances or petroleum products on the property which would indicate an existing release, a past release, or a threat of release of these substances in connection with the property. Therefore, no further investigation is warranted. Specifically, regarding the contamination from the Hydro One Distribution Station, remedial action was completed at our property, as shown in the report by Stantec dated Mar 15, 2015 and confirmation letter from Hydro One dated May 27, 2015 to previous property owner, submitted with this Response Matrix. Regarding the old co-op property, per our discussions with the Town, the Town has monitored the site in the past. Certificate of Withdrawal of Prohibition has also been included with resubmission package.
16	Engineering	ZBA - The traffic study indicates that 'the Client has discussed with the Fire Department and has come to an agreement to utilize development charges to pay for improvements to fire department services. This would include improvement equipment including a truck ladder that would accommodate taller developments. Details to be provided of any final arrangements that have been made and endorsed by Council.	Misunderstanding of conversation between Owner and Consultant. No arrangements have been made with the fire department or municipal staff
17	Engineering	SPA - Restrictions related to the snow storage area should be defined due to the proximity of the overhead power line. Due to the limited snow storage area available on the site, we would request the applicant to confirm with Hydro One whether any changes could be made so this area can be fully utilized for snow storage	Revised snow storage area is shown on revised site plan. Conversations with Hydro One indicate a requirement of 10' clearance from the lines in order for maintenance to occur.
18	Engineering	SPA - No parking signs will be required on the East side of Emma Street	Updated. As shown on revised site plan
19	Engineering	SPA - based on the Parking Justification Study submitted, 6 spaces should be signd for visitors. These should be identified on site and shown on the site plan	Updated. As shown on revised site plan
20	Engineering	SPA - Snow storage and restrictions need to be better defined on the site plan. One are shown will cover the transformer and the other area is in close proximity to an overhead powerline	Updated. As shown on revised site plan
21	Engineering	SPA - our understanding is that this is an apartment not a condominium. Please confirm	Building is a condominium
22	Engineering	SPA - proposed signage locations should be shown on the plan	As shown on site plan
23	Engineering	SPA - A revised geotechnical report should be provided based on the current concept. The water level included in the geotechnical report was taken on August 24, 2023. Groundwater level measurements should continue in order that the final design be verified. SPring 2025 results should be provided in a revised report	Revised geotechnical report dated June 9, 2025 submitted
24	Engineering	SPA - We received comments from a neighbouring residnet who noted that they are aware of an artesian spring near the centre of the lands. There was no artesian spring identified within the geotechnical report. This site should be visited again for verification as that would have an impact on the design. CMT should be provided with a copy of the Site Screening Report for additional information. A hydrogeological investigation may be required depending on the findings.	Hydrogeology technical memo dated May 26, 2025 included in submission
25	Engineering	SPA - while former SWM comments have been addressed, they may require updating if there is a groundwater flow contributing to the site	No additional ground water concerns, spring or extra wet conditions will be handled by the foundation drain
26	Engineering	SPA - prior to finalizing the design, the mechanical engineer should complete the required analysis for the fire protection system. While based on modelling the distribution system should be able to provide the minimum 106.99 L/s required for 37 minutes, municipal water systems during a fire, can drop to a pressure as low as 20 psi. As the report notes, the mechanical engineer shall confirm the design and should complete a hydrant test to verify expected resolt. Backflow prevention will be required. Water meters for the domestic and fire lines will be required. Mechanical drawings will need to be provided which can be included within the site plan agreement	Refer to Hydrant Flow Test included in submission package. Based on hydrant flow test, the current municipal water main can provide 7319.50 gpm (461.788 L/s) at 20 psi. The water service meets the requirements. Working drawings, including mechanical design are in progress. Will be submitted at a later date.

27	Engineering	SPA - to address some of the CLI-ECA requirements for the storm sewer in Emma, the following will need to be added to the design brief:	
28	Engineering	1) Section on Source Water Protection and confirmation that the works are not considered significant drinking water threat. The Source Protection Information Atlas (SPIA) online can assist you with this task	Included in revised report
29	Engineering	2) For the storm sewer installation on Emma St to be authorized under the Town's CLI-ECA, the works have to improve the level of water quality control compared to what is currently provided. This will have to be addressed in the design brief	See revised report. Goss traps proposed on twin inlet catchbasins #2 and #4 and on catchbasin manhole #15
30	Engineering	3) Pipe data form	Included with resubmission package
31	Engineering	SPA - A storm sewer design sheet was submitted. As the design is based on PCSWMM, the storm sewer design sheet should use the data. Use the comment column to help explain why it was used rather than the typical rational method. This will help with record purposes for future understanding of the project design	Column added for PCSWMM data
32	Engineering	SPA - The connection method by coring and using a "flexible tee saddle" of the 525mm diameter storm sewer to the existing elliptical storm sewer is questionable. A substantial amount of the existing pipe wall would need to be cored out give the shape of the existing sewer. The details of a saddle product endorsed by concrete pipe manufactures and proposed for this purpose is to be submitted for review.	Revised, see drawings
33	Engineering	The use of a curb and gutter with a dropped curb cross-section to help contain the on-site drainage and direct it into the storm sewer inlets may not be compatible with the driveway grading design. Provide cross-sections through both driveway entrances at the most critical grading location, from the building face to the centerline of Emma Street. Show the vehicle access across the internal curb and gutter, sidewalk and Emma Street curb and gutter based on the steep driveway grades. If changes to the grading are necessary, consider any changes to containing post development flows on-site	Cross-sections included in revised drawing package
34	Engineering	SPA - Provide the calculation summary for the following zones:	
35	Engineering	1) The missing area from Zone #1 to Zone #6	Refer to updated Site Lighting Plan
36	Engineering	2) Property line and beyond that	Refer to updated Site Lighting Plan
37	Engineering	SPA - the Owner will be required to provide adequate streetlighting on Emma Street. Please follow up with Orangeville Hydro to confirm requirements as a photometric plan may be required. We can provide the applicant with the Town's contact under separate cover if required.	Pole light mounted to Orangeville Hydro Pole USC01. Refer to Roadway Lighting Plan
38	Engineering	SPA - the latest civil drawings for next submission should be in the background of the landscape plans to confirm no conflicts. The water service is shown in a different spot on the plan and it is likely the trees will need to be adjusted	Updated landscape plans show civil plans in background
39	Engineering	SPA - Trees are required to be planted at least 0.5m from the property line, preferable 1m. Please review tree locations	All the proposed trees are minimum 0.5m or more from P/L. Refer to updated landscape plan included with resubmission package
40	Engineering	SPA - Are there any other locations where trees can be planted (for example near the upper south property line)	Trees have been proposed at locations where there are no conflicts with underground or overhead services, and tree canopies of existing neighbouring trees
41	Engineering	SPA - Please confirm that the trees can be planted in close proximity to the Xstream storage system	Proposed trees have been removed
42	Engineering	SPA - An Operation & Maintenance Manual for the SWM system is required	Included with resubmission package
43	Engineering	SPA - There is a significant retaining wall. The wall is to be designed by a professional structural engineer and will require the engineer to certify the wall after construction. OBC compliant guards are required.	Per discussion with Carley Dixon, June 4, 2025, the retaining wall design will be required at building permit stage
44	Engineering	SPA - We understand discussions with the adjacent property owner (Barclay Trim and Mouldings) have taken place. Should there be any concerns, please advise. Final drawings should be shown to the Owner and Burnside can speak to the Owner if needed	Noted
45	Engineering	SPA - A cost estimate will be required for the proposed site works (excludes building) and separated between onsite and offsite works. This will be used to determine site plan securities	Outstanding; civil consultant in process of preparing. Will be submitted at later date
46	Engineering	SPA - refer to red marked up plans. Update drawings accordingly	Updated; Refer to revised civil servicing brief package; Additional notes below
			1. Xstream end elevation details are included in Appendix E
			2. T/W elevation for retaining wall corner at North end of parking lot is to remain at 460.75. Should be higher than grade
47	UGDSB	To support students walking to school, the Board encourages the construction of a sidewalk across the front of the development site to provide a safe walking connection to the existing sidewalk on Emma St. S., north of Mill St. W.	Sidewalk along the West side of Emma St S is shown on the plans. Connecting from Mill St W to just South of the last entrance into the development.
48	UGDSB	Additionally, please be advised that the Planning Department does not object to the application, subject to the following condition: - That Education Development Charges shall be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit(s).	Noted
49	DPCDSB	That the applicant shall agree in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to include the following warning clauses in all offers of purchase and sale of residential lots.	Noted
50	DPCDSB	"Whereas, despite the best efforts of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside of the neighbourhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighbourhood school."	Noted

51	DPCDSB	"That the purchasers agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, the residents of the subdivision shall agree that children will meet the bus on roads presently in existence or at another place designated by the Board."	Noted
52	Bell	No comments received	Noted
53	MTO	The proposed work within the Town Grand Valley is not located adjacent to a provincial highway or within MTO's Permit Control Area, and as such, does not require MTO review, approval or permits.	Noted
54	Enbridge	Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.	Noted
55	Dufferin County Planning	The servicing brief provided under the Official Plan Amendment (OPA 7) should be revised to reflect the new proposal of 24 units compared to that of the initially proposed 18 units. This is to ensure the sourcewater protection (subsection 5.4.2) and sewage and water systems (subsections 7.3.1 and 7.3.2) policies of the County Official Plan have still been conformed to.	Servicing Brief, submitted with site plan application, had been updated to reflect 18-unit building.
56	Dufferin County Planning	The County will also mention that a <i>woodland</i> is located on the subject lands, which would usually require an Environmental Impact Study (EIS). However, after discussions with the Town Planner on December 2, 2024, who indicated that the submitted Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) was satisfactory in place of an EIS, the County is accepting of the Town Planner's position on the VMP in place of the EIS.	Noted
57	Dufferin County Building Services	Label fire department connection on the exterior of the building on the Site Plan	Updated. As shown on revised site plan
58	Dufferin County Engineering	Th County Engineering division has reviewed the revised Zoning By-law Amendment for the proposed development and has no comments or concerns.	Noted
59	Dufferin County Waste Services	Waste Services has reviewed the application. It is noted that the developments will utilize Molok containers for waste collection, which we do not service. The building will be required to seek a private contract for the service	Noted
60	Canada Post	The owner/developer will provide each building with its own centralized mail receiving facility. This lock-box assembly must be provided and maintained by the Owner/Developer in order for Canada Post to provide mail service to the residents of this project. For any building where there are more than 100 units, a secure, rear-fed mailroom must be provided.	Noted; Not applicable to our development
61	Canada Post	The owner/developer agrees to provide Canada Post with access to any locked doors between the street and the lock-boxes via the Canada Post Crown lock and key system. This encompasses, if applicable, the installation of a Canada Post lock in the building's lobby intercom and the purchase of a deadbolt for the mailroom door that is a model which can be retro-fitted with a Canada Post deadbolt cylinder.	Noted
62	Canada Post	As per our revised National Delivery Policy, street level residences and businesses will also receive mail delivery at centralized locations, not directly to their door. For example: - extra mail compartments can be provided to accommodate these units in the main mailbox panel - if these units are not part of the condo then a separate centralized mail receiving facility/box can be set up by the developer at an alternative location.	Floor plans updated. Mailboxes location shown in entry lobby on ground floor. Refer to ASP-201
63	Canada Post	As the project nears completion, it is requested that the Developer contact me directly for a Postal Code as existing postal coding will not apply and new postal codes will be issued for this development.	Noted
64	Canada Post	The Developer's agent should contact a Delivery Supervisor – Orangeville Delivery Depot - 74 Centennial Rd, for mailroom/lockbox inspection and mail delivery startup	Noted
65	Fire Prevention	As discussed before, my only concerns are the height of the building and future buildings. GVDfD not having a ladder truck to properly mitigate a rescue in a fire situation on the upper floors.	Noted; We understand the Township already has a need to upgrade to a ladder truck and is not a specific requirement for this application.
66	Fire Prevention	Also gaining access to the roof in a fire situation, and not having an elevated master stream in the case of fire..	Noted
67	GRCA	Please label the proposed floodplain limits in GRAD-1, SERV-1 and P&P1 to reflect the proposed grading work	Noted (this will be addressed prior to GRCA permit submission)
68	Hydro One	No comment received	In discussion with Hydro One, Hydro One Inc. has an unregistered easement on the section of property under the overhead hydro for occupational, cutting and access rights to their line for a width of 10 feet on each side of the centre line of the hydro line. The 10 feet clearance would need to be always kept clear.
69	DOCA/MCFN	The project should be proceeded by, at minimum, a Stage 1 archaeological assessment to determine the location's archaeological potential	Stage 1 Archaeological Background Study and Stage 2 Archaeological Property Assessment report has been submitted with the resubmission package. Refer to the stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Report
70	DOCA/MCFN	DOCA must be notified of, invited to participate in, and provided the opportunity to review this archaeological assessment, as well as any environmental assessments	Refer to Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Report
71	DOCA/MCFN	At its discretion, DOCA may request capacity funding from the proponent for its consultation and engagement activities relating to the project	Refer to Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Report
72	DOCA/MCFN	DOCA expects to be notified of any and all future project updates and/or changes	Refer to Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological Report
73	OPG	No Comment	Noted
74	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Having no high rise residential structures in the GVDfD catchment, are there provisions being made to provide our local fire brigade with a ladder truck to combat a possible situation at a five floor apartment?	We understand the Township already has a need to upgrade to a ladder truck and is not a specific requirement for this application.

75	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Town Connectivity - in the submitted support documents is a 'Parking Justification Study.' In the sidewalk and trail mapping study, it is correctly shown that Emma and William Streets in the area of the proposal are without sidewalks. Should this development appeal to young families or seniors these accesses should be considered for sidewalk installation. As well, the mapping erroneously omits the curb faced sidewalk on Emma between Mill and Amaranth, and includes a riverside trail loop at Hereward Park that the Town gave up maintaining in 208 and is no impassable	Sidewalk proposed along Emma St from Mill St to the neighbour to the South of development.
76	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Parking Provisions - Reducing the published requirement for two parking spots per residential unit will fill Emma Street with cars in the area of the proposed development. Any of the newest developments in town have had to meet the two car rule and all their available parking is full, always. Reducing that requirement to suit the developer is a very bad idea	Zoning approved for 18-unit design. 2-spaces per unit zoning requirement achieved
77	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Site conditions - I see by the provided landscape drawings that the open ditch along that section of Emma Street is to remain. If the current wet conditions (due to artesian spring) are just redirected into a redefined open ditch, it may be too wet to maintain regularly as is often the case with that section at present. Shouldn't a multi-million dollar land development warrant inclusion of curb and gutter with storm sewer along its frontage rather than sending groundwater and storm runoff into an open ditch	Refer to servicing brief and updated civil design package. The site will have curb and gutter along frontage. New storm sewers to collect storm water will be installed. In addition, two new rear-yard swales will be installed to catch run-off and direct through new sewer system
78	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Site conditions - No mention is made of the fact that the property is beside a Hydro One site that underwent an extensive and expensive site remediation a decade ago. Historically, Hydro One used an arsenic derivative spray to eradicate weeds and grasses on their transformer sites. They underwent a site remediation program that removed and replaced substrata at affected properties in their holdings and this was one of them. The area rectified included a plume crossing Emma Street into the old co-op property on the opposite side. The old Co-op property defaulted into the Town of Grand Valley's care as a result of abandonment due to pollution from spilled industrial chemicals. It has been under ground water monitoring study for around twenty years to see if the issue is going to self-remediate rather than the Town initiating an expensive site rehabilitation. These concerns should be addressed by a more thorough ground water sampling, testing for unusual carcinogens and chemicals before any multiresidential building is started	Refer to report by Stantec dated Mar 15, 2025 and letter by Hydro One dated May 27, 2025 regarding the remediation work that was completed at the Hydro One Distribution Station and our property adjacent to Hydro One's property.
79	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Site conditions - Speaking of the old Co-op property, it defaulted into the Town of Grand Valley's care as a result of abandonment due to pollution from spilled industrial chemicals. It has been under ground water monitoring study for around twenty years to see if the issue is going to self-remediate rather than the Town initiating an expensive site rehabilitation. These concerns should be addressed by a more thorough ground water sampling, testing for unusual carcinogens and chemicals before any multiresidential building is started	The Phase 1 ESA examined potential contamination and did not find evidence of contamination on this property. And per our discussions with the Town, the Town has monitored the site in the past.
80	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Landscape Plans - The latest version of proposed landscape drawing still do not include any provision for an onsite playground or outdoor common area for residents	The detailed design of the landscaping is discussed at the site plan stage which is not a public process. Everyone has a balcony/patio. Due to reforestation of property and slope of property, no amenity space provided.
81	PUBLIC - 69 Leeson Street South	Landscape Plans - The latest landscape plans include removal of most of the trees on the property. Along the West property line is a long standing fence row of mixed trees that would certainly compromise property line fences by their removal. As the only buffer between these properties and the monolith that is proposed, I and my neighbours, heartily oppose their removal.	Trees to be removed to accommodate grading. Replacement trees have been proposed at locations where there are no conflicts with underground or overhead services, and tree canopies of existing neighbouring trees
82	COUNCIL - Minutes	Councillor Latam sought clarification regarding increased density and reduction of parking. Mr. Kluge provided clarification, stating that the proposed density is 75 units per hectare, whereas 50 units per hectare is required. Additionally, 2 parking spaces per unit are required under our zoning by-law, and the applicant is requesting a reduction to 1.58 spaces per unit.	Noted
83	COUNCIL - Minutes	Councillor Jonker inquired as to number of bedrooms per unit.	The building will consist of 20 two-bedroom units and 4 one-bedroom units

84	COUNCIL - Minutes	Councillor Jonker expressed concerns regarding the appropriateness of a 5-storey residential building in this location and inquired of the applicants as to the motivation for a 5-storey residential building.	<p>Provincial Planning policy requires that municipalities provide for a range and mix of housing that efficiently use land and resources, and optimize existing and planning infrastructure and public service facilities. The proposed development is located centrally in Grand Valley where access to existing public and personal services, shopping, parks, school, and community centre is ideal. The sites location relative to the available built environment of central Grand Valley supports a denser population. Similarly, increased population located centrally in town supports businesses located in Grand Valley's commercial core.</p> <p>Provincial policy also requires planning authorities provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities to meet projected needs of current and future residents of the regional market area by permitting and facilitating all housing options required to meet the social, health, economic, and wellbeing requirements of current and future residents, and permitting and facilitating all types of residential intensification, including the development and redevelopment of underutilized land, development and introduction of new housing options within developed areas, and redevelopment which results in a net increase in residential units. The proposed development represents residential intensification on an underutilized site within the developed area of Grand Valley. It also introduces a housing type less common in the Town which will serve the housing needs of a different demographic than what is currently provided in the community. The supporting materials for the application have demonstrated that this site can adequately accommodate the number of residential units being proposed. The proposal is therefore consistent with Provincial policy direction.</p> <p>At the County level, the majority of urban development is directed within the existing 3 urban settlement areas (Grand Valley, Shelburne, Orangeville). The County promotes development that efficiently uses land, resources, infrastructure, and public services through compact urban forms, and a mix of land uses and appropriate densities. The County also encourages opportunities for redevelopment, revitalization and intensification in appropriate locations and of a scale and character of development that is compatible with the community. The Proposed Development is appropriate for the property. Due to the topography of the surrounding area, its height does not impose on surrounding residential uses that sit higher topographically than the development site. The development is therefore compatible with the surrounding area context. Infill development is to be encouraged within the built up area which this proposal achieves.</p> <p>Additional detail regarding the planning policy and justification is provided in the Planning Justification Report prepared by GSP Group.</p>
85	COUNCIL - Minutes	Mayor Solomon inquired as to whether a fire ladder truck was required for this application. Mr. Kluge advised a fire ladder truck is not a specific requirement for this application.	Noted Mr. Kluge's response
86	COUNCIL - Minutes	Deputy Mayor Rentsch stated he is not in support of the proposed increase in density or reductions in parking and request the applicants complete a shade study. His comments included that direction was not provided by Council to the applicants to increase density and stated these were comments from a certain Member of Council.	The reduction in parking is justified through detailed study completed by CGH transportation which was included as part of the complete submission package. A shade study is provided to address concerns around shading. Of note, the shade analysis shows minimal evening shade impacts to some residential neighbours during the winter months. Impacts during summer, spring, and fall are negligible or non-existent during daytime hours. Refer to ASP-305 and ASP 306 for additional cross-section and shadow study
87	COUNCIL - Minutes	Councillor Dart stated he is not in support of the proposed 5-storey residential building in this location. His comments included the Town can get by with what we have for fire services. He stated he was not in support of reduced parking and expressed concerns regarding the slope to the neighbouring properties, commenting that upper units would look into current Taylor Drive residences.	A cross section of the area is provided to address this concern. Due to the slope of the area, it shows that the building will not have an imposing effect on neighbouring properties at the rear of the development site as the existing homes sit higher topographically than the proposed development. The proposed height fits appropriately within the existing massing of the area.
88	COUNCIL - Minutes	Councillor Latam inquired as to the affordability of units	While these units will not meet the provincial definition of affordable housing, the proposal introduces a new built form in the community that will fill the needs of a demographic less represented in the current housing options in Grand Valley. This is valuable to the Town and community as it provides the opportunity for residents to choose housing that is suitable for them.
89	COUNCIL - Minutes	Councillor Dart inquired as to price range for the units.	Units will range in price and will depend on a number of factors including timing of approvals, and construction, and market factors at the time of sales.
90	COUNCIL - Minutes	Councillor Latam requested engineering comments include clarification on whether lay-buys in front of Emma Street will be installed as the site plan provided is unclear. Mr. Kluge advised clarification would be sought from the Town's engineers.	Design includes street widening on Emma Street. This will allow for on-street parking on the West side of Emma Street. No parking on east side.
91	COUNCIL - Minutes	Council Latam inquired as to whether the number of stories would affect the units' prices.	Additional units leads to construction efficiencies and economies of scale which has the potential to be reflected in future unit prices.
92	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	What I am opposed to is how that plan was quietly escalated into a 5-storey, 24-unit apartment building - far beyond the scale originally proposed. While an Official Plan Amendment (OPA 7) was approved for an LB-unit, 4-storey version, the latest increase in height and density was pushed forward without a new OPA, and with only one public meeting held at 11:00 AM on a weekday - a time that excluded many working residents.	The Official Plan Amendment redesignated the land from Downtown Commercial to Urban Residential. The Official Plan outlines policies related to land use, urban design, access, circulation, and servicing but does not stipulate site specific heights or densities. The proposed zoning by-law amendment addresses these items which is a public process. Statutory public process in accordance with the Planning Act have been upheld.
93	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	Council approved Zoning By-law Amendment Z01-2025 for 24 units and 5 storeys - even though it quietly escalated far beyond what was publicly discussed under OPA7.	Council has not approved the 5-storey proposal.
94	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	But Site Plan Approval is where the technical risks live - and they are serious	Site plan approval is not a public process and will be reviewed by Town staff and their consultants to ensure the development meets the policies and regulations required to approve a safe and desirable development.

95	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	Drainage from Post-6 and Post-7 bypasses stormwater treatment entirely, This runoff comes from the rear slope, directly beneath existing homes. According to the Consolidated Comment Table (Jan 9, 2025), other areas were "overcontrolled" to compensate - but that's not the same as treating the actual flow.	This is a site plan issue and will be dealt with through site plan process. The response matrix referenced was relating to specific comments from the previous submission and should be read in conjunction with the latest report and revised drawings which included upgraded rear yard swales and associated twin inlet catchbasins; two swales are provided on the west side of the proposed building. The stormwater areas to the west of the proposed development at 40-60 Emma Street are 100 to 103 and Post-7. Leeson street was thoroughly reviewed to understand how much water it can handle and what water might make its way through neighbouring properties like 73 Leeson and onto the proposed development lands. A rear yard swale at the top of the hill, along with high capacity double inlet catchbasins was included for in the latest design. Further, a swale just west of the building is included with its own double inlet catch basin. These swales were designed for the 100 year storm and inlet capacities are based on these 100 year flows and 50% blockage. In addition, an overland swale along the south side of the building is provided as a backup to these swales. All of this is discussed in the servicing brief and associated calculations have been provided. The over-control discussed is in relation to the volume of stormwater. The site overall after development has been designed to release less water to Emma Street and eventually the William Street storm sewer than what is being discharge prior to any development. Treatment is being provided to hard surface areas that would contribute sediments to the storm sewer system. The only area that is bypassing this treatment is post-6 which is quite small and will not be used for snow storage which is a major contributor to sediments. As mentioned in the letter the treatment is oversized for the site which ensures appropriate quality control of stormwater leaving the site.
96	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	There are no Town-owned drains or catch basins behind the retaining wall - only a swale, which developers refused to upgrade.	This is a site plan issue and will be dealt with through site plan process. The latest report and revised drawings include upgraded rear yard swales and associated twin inlet catchbasins; two swales are provided on the west side of the proposed building. The condo will be responsible for maintaining.
97	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	The Town has declined all responsibility for slope drainage or infrastructure failure - pushing that risk to a future condo corporation. When something fails, neighbours like me will be the ones dealing with the consequences.	The site plan approval process and agreement will include for maintenance of these swales and structures. Should the condo fail to keep up with maintenance the Town will have the agreement in place which would allow them to do the work on the owner's behalf. This keeps the expense on the condo and out of tax payers hands.
98	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	The geotechnical testing was done in June - well after spring runoff and before fall saturation, No testing occurred when the slope is actually under stress	Refer to comment above. Water level measurements taken in May 2025. Revised Geotechnical and Slope Stability Report provided, dated June 9, 2025 and Hydrogeology Technical Memo dated May 26, 2025 included with resubmission.
99	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	Confirmed endangered species on-site (Little Brown Myotis). Tree clearing occurred in March - days before the April 1 no-cut window - and yet no independent monitoring was required or confirmed.	There is no permit required from the Town to remove the trees. No permit from the Ministry was required if the tree clearing took place before March 31, 2025, so as not to interfere with nesting. Refer to ecologist reports and emails from MECP regarding process previously sent to the Town planner
101	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	If Council pushes this site plan through without full accountability for slope safety, runoff control, and habitat protection the Town will be signing off on risk it has already refused to own.	Site plan application/process will be reviewed by Town staff and their consultants to ensure the development meets the policies and regulations required to approve a safe and desirable development.
102	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	The proposed height of 18.24m exceeds the zoning limit by over 6 metres, and no new OPA was triggered for that change.	The Official Plan does not regulate building heights. The Zoning by-law amendment currently before Council requests increased building height.
103	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	Stormwater runoff from the rear slope - directly behind my property is being rerouted. Key areas like Post-6 and Post-7 will bypass the site's stormwater filtration system. According to the consolidated comment Table (January 9, 2025), engineers noted that Post-6 and Post-7 would bypass treatment and stated that other areas were "overcontrolled" to compensate. That does not change the fact that runoff from the slope behind our homes will flow untreated - during spring thaw, summer storms, and fall rains.	This is a site plan issue and will be dealt with through site plan process. Refer to response to comment #95.
104	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	The Town has stated that slope drainage and infrastructure maintenance will fall entirely to a future condo board, not the municipality.	The site plan approval process and agreement will include for maintenance of these swales and structures. Should the condo fail to keep up with maintenance the Town will have the agreement in place which would allow them to do the work on the owner's behalf. This keeps the expense on the condo and out of tax payers hands.
105	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	An endangered bat species, the Little Brown Myotis, was confirmed on-site. yet tree clearing occurred in March - just days before the April 1 no-cut deadline under ESA guidelines.	There is no permit required from the Town to remove the trees. No permit from the Ministry was required if the tree clearing took place before March 31, 2025, so as not to interfere with nesting. Please refer to previous ecologist reports and emails from MECP regarding process
106	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	I understand that the Town may not have the staff or resources to monitor every slope, catch basin, or retaining wall which makes it even more important to get this right at the approval stage - not when something fails behind our homes.	Town staff review these in detail at the site plan stage which is not a public process. This is reviewed at this stage; engineered design is required;
107	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	I'm not here to fight progress. I'm here to ask; can we do this in a way that respects the land, the law, and the people already living here?	The Planning Justification Report, prepared by GSP Group outlines how the proposed development makes efficient use of the land and represents good planning for the current and future needs of the community. The process has followed legislated requirements under the Planning Act.
108	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	The fact that council allowed this expansion to proceed without a new OPA may be legally defensible precedent - but it isn't ethically defensible. It damages public trust, and it sets a dangerous precedent for every future intensification project in this community.	The Official Plan does not impose restrictions on height and density therefore the revised proposal did not trigger a new Official Plan Amendment. The Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment which requests permissions for increased height and density has not been approved by Council. A statutory public meeting was held on Feb 25, 2025 to receive the application. It will be brought forward to Council with Town staff recommendation for a vote to approve or refuse the application in the future.
109	PUBLIC - 73 Leeson Street South	For that reason, I am also formally requesting that council consider introducing a new Zoning By-law Amendment to reverse or modify ZBA Z01-2025. This amendment enabled a building far beyond what was contemplated under opAT, and it did so without a new official Plan Amendment or adequate public consultation. A corrective by-law could help restore the original intended scale and rebuild public trust	Z01-2025 has not been previously approved by Council. The Zoning By-law Amendment before Council requests these approvals. The Statutory public process in accordance with the Planning Act has been upheld entirely. A statutory public meeting was held on February 25, 2025 and a public Council decision meeting will be held in the future.