Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Canada Post		Canada Post will provide mail delivery service to the subdivision through centralized Community Mail Boxes (CMBs).	Acknowledged.
Canada Post		If the development includes plans for (a) multi-unit building(s) with a common indoor entrance, the developer must supply, install and maintain the mail delivery equipment within these buildings to Canada Post's specifications.	Acknowledged.
Canada Post		Please update our office if the project description changes so that we may determine the impact (if any).	Acknowledged.
Canada Post		Should this subdivision application be approved, please provide notification of the new civic addresses as soon as possible.	Acknowledged.
Canada Post		Please provide Canada Post with the excavation date for the first foundation/first phase as well as the date development work is scheduled to begin. Finally, please provide the expected installation date(s) for the CMBs.	Acknowledged.
Thames Valley District School Board		No comments.	Acknowledged.
Thames Centre Chief Building Official		No comments.	Acknowledged.
Thames Centre Fire Chief		No comments.	Acknowledged.
Thames Centre Director of Community Services & Facilities	DTL	Confirm that the amount of parkland they are offering is large enough, collectively, to be in compliance with our requirements.	Parkland being provided is 3.3% of total land area. Trails being provided are 2.3% of total land area. Together the total dedication is 5.6% of land area, which satisfies the required 5% land area dedication for parkland. It is noted that total land area also includes the two future development blocks to the north of Christie Drive.
Thames Centre Director of Community Services & Facilities	DTL	Please provide, in writing, what you will be providing in regard to parkland, specifically that you will grade and seed this land, along with clarification on whether you will be providing anything else for the parkland (amenities, etc.).	The parkland will be graded and seeded with a grass seed mix, per typical subdivision development requirements, and as to be specified in the future subdivision agreement. The Developer may discuss with the Municipality if additional voluntary donations will be provided in terms of playground equipment or other amenities the Municipality may desire.
Thames Centre Director of Community Services & Facilities	DTL	Please provide, in writing, what the finished surface will be for all trails.	It is intended that all trails will be asphalt per Engineering Design Standard Drawing R-1. This is also consistent with the recently approved Trails Master Plan.
Thames Centre Drainage Superintendent		No comments.	Acknowledged.
Thames Centre Planning Department	Zelinka	Please consider incorporating specific provisions within the R2-X zone for lots abutting roundabouts, to ensure appropriate lot design and functionality.	A revised Draft By-law has been included into the resubmission package

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Thames Centre Planning Department	Zelinka	The inclusion of archaeological site considerations along the I-5 corridor, specifically related to burial sites, is requested.	We are working with our consulting team, and the indigenous nations to define the limit of the cemetery blocks to be zoned I-5, special provisions will be required as part of the SDA. The refined limits have been updated on the resubmitted Draft Plan of Subdivision
Thames Centre Planning Department	DTL	The municipality will not accept trail land as part of the required parkland dedication. Cash-in-lieu of parkland will be required in these instances.	We question why trails are not being recognized as parkland. The Municipality's Parkland Dedication By-law provides for land dedication "for parks or other recreational purposes." In our view, trails constitute "other recreational purposes" and, as such, should qualify as parkland under the By-law.
Thames Centre Planning Department	DTL	Planning staff are supportive of applying a Holding (H) provision to Block 175, to ensure that site plan control is in place for the mixed-use component, including the commercial ground floor and associated elements.	Acknowledged.
Thames Centre Planning Department	CJDL	Please confirm with Public Works the proposed island shape/design to ensure compatibility with snow removal vehicle operations.	Discussions will be had with Public Works during detailed engineering design to confirm there are no concerns with the island shape. The final details will be worked through and approved during detailed subdivision design
Thames Centre Planning Department	DTL	Kindly identify the locations of the proposed 10.5m frontages within the R2-X zone.	This accounts for the roundabout single detached lots, where the frontage is smaller due to the angles on the lots as a result of the ROW requirements.
Thames Centre Planning Department	DTL	Please ensure that parking requirements for the R2-X zone are addressed and clearly demonstrated in the submission.	There are no additional parking requirements for the R2 zone. It is proposed that lots will conform to the requirement of the parent by-law with exceptions to the driveway width. It is proposed that parking will be accommodated with one space within the attached garage and one within the driveway
Thames Centre Planning Department	DTL	Planning is supportive of Option 1 for the roundabouts, which includes a 4.5m side yard setback for lots adjacent to roundabouts. Please confirm this is the preferred approach.	This is the preferred approach and the Draft Zoning By-law has been updated to include special provisions for roundabout lots.
Thames Centre Planning Department	DTL	Please confirm that the proposed building height of 11m complies with the Thames Centre zoning definition of building height—i.e., measured as the average from peak to eaves.	We have reviewed this and the request to increase the height was for the walkout lots where a 2 storey house would not be able to meet max height based on the definition.
Thames Centre Planning Department	CJDL	Planning staff request a single-lot overlay plan illustrating yard encroachments, to better visualize the front and exterior side yard setbacks for lots within the R2 zone.	This has been included as a stand alone document in the resubmission package.
Thames Centre Planning Department	DTL	Please provide additional details regarding driveway widths proposed for the street townhouse units in the R2 zone.	The proposed widths have been included on the zoning sketches provided in support of the application.
Hydro One		No comments.	Note that we are working they Hydro One to address the relocation and construction impacts of the existing plant along Christie Drive.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Enbridge	CJDL	It is Enbridge Gas Inc.'s request that prior to registration of the plan, the Owner shall make satisfactory arrangements with Enbridge Gas Inc. (Enbridge Gas) to provide the necessary easements and/or agreements required by Enbridge Gas for the provision of local gas service for this project. Once registered, the owner shall provide these easements to Enbridge Gas at no cost, in a form agreeable and satisfactory to Enbridge Gas.	We are working with Enbridge to address their requirements and relocation of existing plant to accommodate construction. This should be a condition of the Draft Approval
Sun-Canadian Pipe Line	CJDL	Sun-Canadian Pipe Line does not operate any facilities near 83 Christie Drive (File #39T-TC-2501 Z20-25). Sun-Canadian has no objections to this application.	Acknowledged.
Middlesex County Engineer	Paradigm	The County of Middlesex will require a traffic impact study to determine the impacts at the intersection of Harris Road and Hamilton Road by the traffic generated by the proposed subdivision.	The intersection of Harris Road and Hamilton Road was included in the original TIS, and has been carried in the revised TIS included with the resubmission package.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	The UTRCA's policies do not support the fragmentation of hazard lands. The development limit for all lots and blocks, including blocks required for servicing should be outside of the erosion hazard limit, inclusive of the erosion access allowance. At this time the UTRCA is not satisfied with the Geotechnical Assessment. Please address our technical review comment G1 included in Appendix C and provide a revised Geotechnical Assessment.	A revised geotechnical assessment has been included in the resubmission package, addressing the UTRCA technical comments. Only open space blocks are proposed within the erosion hazard limit. All development blocks are proposed outside of the erosion hazard limit.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) has not adequately reviewed the impacts of the proposed development within and adjacent to the wetlands, specifically with respect to the Christie Drive extension and the proposed trail network. Please address our technical review comments E1 to E4 included in Appendix C and provide a revised EIS.	EIS updated to provide a detailed assessment of wetland-adjacent impacts associated with Christie Drive and the proposed trail network. Trail impacts are assessed by location (north, west, south), with mitigation emphasizing avoidance of wetland interiors, minimized disturbance widths, use of boardwalks or raised tread where required, and defined trail surfaces to reduce erosion and vegetation trampling. Christie Drive impacts and mitigation are addressed separately in Section 4.2.3.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	The Stormwater Management Report proposes controls to the 100-year storm and conveyance to the 250-year storm. The UTRCA strongly encourages controls to the 250- year storm. While controls to the 100-year storm is not preferred and does not reflect UTRCA's standard practice, it may be accepted in this case due to the local topography and drainage conditions. As part of this consideration, confirmation is required to ensure that the minor increase will not exacerbate flooding or erosion issues. Please address our technical review comment S1 included in Appendix C as part of the next submission. We encourage the Applicant to scope the analysis with UTRCA staff.	The proposed SWM design has been altered to ensure post development peak outflows are controlled to pre-development levels up to and including the 250-year event. A revised Stormwater Management Report has been included with this resubmission package.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Dry access should be provided to the Future Development Blocks (Block 192 and 193) across the conveyance channel during a regulatory (250-year) storm. At a minimum safe access must be demonstrated. The UTRCA will review access to the Future Development Blocks as part of the engineering submission as a condition of draft plan approval.	The original Stormwater Management Report, and the revised Stormwater Management Report, we have included hydraulic modelling of the proposed piped culverts below the roadway and trail accesses to the future development blocks (Blocks 192 & 193) to demonstrate that they will have dry access during the regulatory (250-year) storm event. It is acknowledged that this will be further reviewed by the UTRCA during the detailed engineering design process.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority		Various portions of the conceptual trails are identified within the regulated area and/or hazard lands. The detailed design of the trails and any required Technical Studies will be reviewed by the UTRCA through the engineering submission and/or through the Section 28 permit process. a. Erosion hazard - where possible trails are to be located at the outer extent of the erosion access allowance. In specific circumstances where the trail is proposed within the erosion hazard a Geotechnical Assessment will be required to the satisfaction of the UTRCA. b. Flood hazard - all watercourse/drain crossings for trails are to be design to convey the 250 year storm. If grading is required within the existing floodplain it must be demonstrated that the grading will not result in any downstream or upstream flooding and erosion impacts. c. Section 28 permit(s) will be required for trail and grading works in the regulated area.	Where possible, trails have been proposed outside of the erosion hazard limit. It is understood for any trails proposed within the erosion hazard limit, that a geotechnical assessment will be required to the satisfaction of the UTRCA as part of the detailed engineering design process. The original and revised geotechnical reports have preliminarily assessed these trails within the erosion hazard limit to confirm no overarching concerns, but will be further reviewed during detailed design. It is acknowledged that any work proposed within the UTRCA regulated area will require a Section 28 permit.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Our review of the Christie Drive extension will be scoped to the UTRCA's jurisdiction in keeping with Ontario Regulation 41/24 with respect to the wetland. Technical review of the Hydrogeological Assessment and Geotechnical Assessment related to the impacts of the road construction on the soils and groundwater will not be reviewed by our office.	EIS scope clarified to address wetland and natural heritage implications only. Hydrogeological and geotechnical matters are coordinated with the Functional Servicing Report, Stormwater Management Report, and Hydrogeological Assessment prepared by others.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	A Feature-based Water Balance Assessment may be required if future development proposes works within 30 m of a regulated wetland. UTRCA strongly recommends that the entire 30 m buffer be included within the proposed Open Space blocks to ensure that future development will not require a Feature-based Water Balance Assessment.	Acknowledged. All development is proposed outside of the 30m wetland buffer. There is only minor encroachment into the high-density residential block (Block 175), but that area already cannot be developed due to required zoning setbacks, so will be protected. Feature-based water balance assessment requirements are clarified and scoped specifically to the Tamarack Swamp, consistent with the Hydrogeological Assessment. Buffer inclusion within Open Space blocks is acknowledged and supported as part of detailed design.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Zelinka	A holding provision is proposed on a couple blocks to ensure an archaeological investigation is completed should any development be contemplated within the blocks in the future. These blocks are proposed to be zoned 'Environmental Protection (EP)'. Development is not permitted within the EP Zone.	This was proposed at the recommendation of Timmins-Martelle Heritage Consultants. Our understanding is that EP designation and zoning is no longer enough to satisfy the MTCS that the lands will not be developed.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Our preferred Sanitary Alignment is Alignment 1, identified on Drawing F8 of the Functional Servicing Report. The Alternative Sanitary Alignment 2 would require crossing the Rath Harris Drain valley, and the associated floodplain and erosion hazards, as well as a regulated wetland.	It is acknowledged that the UTRCA's preferred alignment is Alignment 1 (within the Christie Drive/Mill Road ROW). Through discussion with the Municipality, adjacent Developers and the local neighborhood community, there has been a strong push to pursue Alignment 2 (across the Rath-Harris Drain) to mitigate construction impacts, anticipated dewatering impacts, and road reconstruction costs. The revised Geotechnical Report, and the revised Environmental Impact Study (EIS), included with this resubmission, have conducted an assessment of the proposed Rath-Harris Drain crossing to confirm any adverse impacts can be mitigated. Avoidance is identified as the preferred approach. Where crossing is required, impacts are assessed through a dedicated Servicing Letter of Opinion (Vroom + Associates, 2025), appended as Appendix 5. With trenchless installation and recommended mitigation measures, no long-term loss of wetland function is anticipated.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Section 28 permit(s) will be required for any work within the Regulated Area. Works include but are not limited to general site grading, the Christie Drive extension, pedestrian trails, watercourse/drain crossings, and the installation of servicing and stormwater infrastructure.	Acknowledged.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	The proposed trail connection and watermain extension from Mill Court to the subject lands are proposed to be partially located within a property owned by the UTRCA. The UTRCA landowner comments will be provided under a separate cover.	Acknowledged.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Englobe	It is understood that a stable slope inclination of 2H:1V has been proposed for the site which is considered relatively steep. Please provide strong justification and/or supporting information. The UTRCA has concerns due to the known history of slope failures/highly erodible soils in areas of Dorchester.	Based on the results of supplementary analyses, the soil stratigraphy and the anticipated groundwater levels; we have recommended a stable slope profile of 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical. Drawings 2A, 2B, 3A and 3B present the relevant details of the cross-sections analysed for determination of the Long-term Stable Top of Slope. Drawings 2 and 3 present the location of the Long-term Stable Top of Slope (Riverine Erosion Hazard) on the site plan. For planning purposes, the long-term refers to a 100-year planning horizon. The adjusted erosion hazard limit (EHL) has been incorporated into the revised draft plan included with this resubmission to demonstrate that all development is proposed outside of the EHL.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Section 4.2 shows groundwater levels around 3.23m for borehole 10 which is in the vicinity of the proposed SWM pond. Please confirm if a liner is required and provide any design recommendations.	The revised Geotechnical Report has confirmed a liner is required for the SWM pond. Preliminary design information has been provided in the revised report and will be further reviewed during detailed engineering design. Discussed in section 6.9.1 of the SWM Report.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	It is understood from Section 4.2 that two groundwater level measurements were taken within 2 weeks between August and September of 2019. Please confirm that the seasonally high groundwater levels were also considered.	The revised Geotechnical Report & Hydrogeological Report include appendices which tabulate the groundwater level readings taken over the course of 3 years to demonstrate that the seasonally high groundwater level has been utilized for review of the development. Table 2 updated with new sets of water level readings.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Englobe	Please confirm that all potential failure modes were considered in the Factor of Safety analysis (shallow transitional, medium rotational, deep rotational), and all meet the minimum requirement of 1.4. Only one is shown in Table 7.	All slope analyses include shallow, medium, and deep rotational type slope failures in search of the most critical failure mode. This is presented schematically in Appendix E. We also analysed critical short-term elevated groundwater conditions. We added Table 4 to present this data in manner the best addresses UTRCA comments.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Englobe	The log for borehole 10 in Appendix C shows the groundwater level at approximately 2.25m below ground but is stated as 3.23m in the body of the report. Please confirm.	This has been corrected in the revised Geotechnical Report included with the resubmission package.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Englobe	Please confirm that the 8 cross-sections shown are considered critical sections of the corresponding slopes.	As summarized in Table 5, the slope at Section 5-5 was considered the critical slope section and was therefore selected for analyses.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Englobe	Please also include the 6m erosion access allowance on the detailed cross-sections.	Updated as requested
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Section 5.5 states that based on the findings of the analysis the proposed trail (in the vicinity of cross-section A-A') can be safely constructed without adversely affecting the long-term stability of the valley slope. No risk to life or property damage is anticipated. Please include decision on watermain as well as the trail.	The wording of the Geotechnical Report has been revised to indicate both the trail and the watermain can be safely constructed without risk to life or property damage.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	The UTRCA's flood event standard is the 1 in 250-year return period. Generally, for stormwater management, post-development peak flows are required to be less than or equal to pre-development levels for all design storms up to and including the 250-year event. In this instance, a minor increase in peak flows for the 250-year event is being considered as an exception. While this approach is not preferred and does not reflect UTRCA's standard practice, it may be accepted in this case due to the local topography and drainage conditions. As part of this consideration, confirmation is requested that the minor increase will not exacerbate flooding or erosion issues. The analysis must demonstrate that there will be no negative upstream or downstream impacts, taking into account the downstream receiving watercourses and ponds, as well as any watercourse crossings that may be affected by larger flows.	The proposed SWM design has been altered to ensure post development peak outflows are controlled to pre-development levels up to and including the 250-year event.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Please consider revising Figure 3 to improve clarity of the proposed post-development catchment areas, consistent with Figure 2 and the tributary areas legend.	Figure 3 has been updated to add colour-coding for the various post development areas and a summarizing table, similar to Figure 2.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	The UTRCA will defer the review of the Water Balance to the Municipality as it is understood all development is proposed outside of the 30m wetland buffer.	Acknowledged.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Please provide specifications and design sheets of the proposed OGS unit a.	It is not yet confirmed if an OGS will be required in the northerly development block for areas being directed to the proposed infiltration channel. When the northerly blocks are developed, the areas tributary to the channel will need to be reviewed to determine if an OGS is required and then subsequently sized.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	The UTRCA recommends directing only clean runoff to the wetland features.	Acknowledged. During detailed design, efforts will be made to ensure clean water is directed towards the wetland features.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Please ensure that the proposed plunge pool, emergency overflow path, and outlet are designed such that no erosion is expected along the ravine and Rath-Harris Drain.	Confirmed. These items will be explicitly looked at in further detail during the detailed design process to ensure no erosion potential.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Please note that most of the site north of Christie Dr and the southeastern corner are estimated to be within a significant groundwater recharge area. Consideration should be given during design of the SWM plan/infrastructure at the detailed design stage.	Acknowledged. This will be reviewed during detailed design.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Please confirm with Englobe if any pond liner is required due to the high groundwater levels, and if so, request geotechnical recommendations and adjust the pond design accordingly.	The revised Geotechnical Report has included specifications for the required pond liner. This will be further reviewed as part of detailed design.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	Please provide a Site Grading plan at the detailed design stage and ensure that all proposed grading and development is located outside of the greatest hazard extent (including erosion access allowance), as determined through the various technical studies.	Confirmed. This will be provided during the detailed design stage.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	At the detailed design stage please provide a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) drawing supported by notes, standards, inspection, reporting, monitoring, and maintenance signed, sealed, and dated by a P.Eng.	Confirmed. This will be provided during the detailed design stage.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	The EIS describes the northern wetland on site as being 'surface-driven', but that this should be confirmed by a hydrogeologist. However the Hydrogeological report confirms that there is groundwater flow from the development area to the wetlands, and that LID methods are required to support the feature-based water balance of the wetlands. While the UTRCA generally requires a feature-based water balance for developments within the Regulated Area, a water balance may also be necessary from a natural heritage perspective. We understand that a peer review of the EIS, with respect to natural heritage, is forthcoming.	The revised EIS has been updated to coincide with the Hydrogeological Report that a feature-based water balance has been completed to ensure the northerly wetland groundwater recharge is maintained.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	The EIS states that a 30 m setback from the Tamarack Swamp boundary has been maintained, however the open space block with the proposed trail is within 30 m of the wetland. Additional detail about the trail should be provided, showing the proposed location of the trail within the block, the width of the trail, the type of surface and extent of grading.	The revised EIS has been updated to include discussion on trail construction and mitigation of impacts within the vicinity of the natural features surrounding the site. Additional details can be provided through the detailed design stage.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	CJDL	The Functional Servicing Report contains a Trail Plan that shows a "Potential Ravine Crossing Trail to Adjacent Boardwalk Development". This is not discussed in the EIS. Any trails or boardwalks in this area would require a permit from UTRCA, with supporting technical studies to demonstrate no impact to flooding or erosion related to the wetland and the watercourse.	The revised EIS has included a memorandum within the appendices of the report to discuss the trail across the ravine in this area and required mitigation measures to ensure no adverse affects. Proposed trail alignments have been reviewed using the updated plan. The EIS clarifies where trails abut or traverse regulated areas and identifies circumstances where boardwalks or raised tread would be required based on soil moisture and wetland conditions. Additional details can be provided through the detailed design stage.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Englobe	Removal of 0.35 ha of wetland (SWM2) is proposed for the development of the Christie Dr road extension. This removal should be compensated for, at a location to be discussed with the municipality and UTRCA. The area of indirect impact from the road should also be considered. As noted in section 4.2.3 of the EIS there will be long-term impacts from the road construction and use. This should also be reviewed from a hydrogeological perspective.	The revised EIS and Hydrogeological Report have assessed the proposed impact of the Christie Drive roadway and have included mitigation measures, where required, including proposed compensation plantings within the area of the site.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	2.3 Slope Stability Rating For Consideration 1 – This Section refers to the Technical Guide of the River and Stream Systems: Erosion and Hazard Limit, by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR Guide). It is suggested that the current date of this document be provided for additional reference.	Current date (2002) updated in the report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	2.4 Proposed Development Recommendation 1 – This section references a Draft Plan dated August 2023. The current Draft Plan is dated 24 June 2025. It is recommended that this section be updated for the content of the current plan and the date referenced be revised accordingly.	Revised accordingly Current Draft Plan
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	2.4 Proposed Development For Consideration 2 – The drawings in the appendices illustrate the scope of development is to include single family residential units (the bulk of the development) but also medium-density and high-density residential blocks. Could the authors consider clarifying if the content of the report is intended to apply to all components of the residential development, in consideration of the subsurface conditions reported and reflecting the design recommendations for foundations provided in Section 6.2 may limit the development of medium-density and high-density residential structures.	Revised accordingly Current Draft Plan
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	3.1 Field Program For Consideration 3 – Typos and Grammar: The authors may consider reviewing Bullet 2, Sentence 2 (use of borehole or boreholes) and Bullet 3 (use of borehole or boreholes).	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	3.1 Field Program For Consideration 4 – Bullet 7 references backfilling the boreholes with bentonite. For purposes of clarity, could the authors consider editing this line to reference only the boreholes without monitoring wells were backfilled as described.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	3.2 Laboratory Testing For Consideration 5 – Typos and Grammar: There are mixed upper case and lower case letters in Table 1 and Paragraph 1, Sentence 3 (“list . . are”) and Paragraph 2, Sentence 1 (“boreholes log”).	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	3.2 Laboratory Testing Recommendation 2 – Paragraph 1, Sentence 2 refers to Atterberg Limits laboratory testing though there is no indication of this testing be completed. Assuming this testing was not completed, this reference should be removed from this paragraph.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	4.1 Soil Conditions For Consideration 6 – Borehole 12-19 includes reference to a stratum of predominantly clay soil. Although this is the only reference to this soil, could the authors consider including it in the soil conditions section.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	4.1.2 – Sand Recommendation 3 – Sentence 3 characterizes the sand as having a loose to dense relative density based on the N-values obtained from the Standard Penetration Tests. The Canadian Foundation Engineering Manual (CFEM) references the unit for Relative Density as a percentage and the unit for Compactness (for cohesionless soils) as a description (loose, compact, dense, etc.). It is recommended that the authors consider referencing the condition in the context of Compactness for this purpose or change the unit referenced to a percentage if characterization in terms of Relative Density is preferred (reference Table 4.3 in CFEM). This would apply to similar characterization in the following section describing the Silt stratum encountered in the boreholes.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	4.2 Groundwater For Consideration 7 – Paragraph 1, Sentence 3: The statement regarding minimal variation in the levels recorded in the monitoring wells is acknowledged. However, as stated in Sentence 4, there was additional data collected subsequent to the September 13, 2019 readings provided in Table 3 in this section. For purposes of understanding and convenience, would the authors consider including the additional groundwater depth/elevation data to the geotechnical report (perhaps as an attachment in the appendices) or could the most recent monitoring data (16 / 09 / 2022) be added as an additional column to the table.	Groundwater level measurements Table 2, updated with recent data
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	5.1 Erosion Hazard Limit For Consideration 8 – For purposes of background information for the reader, it is suggested that reference be provided in this section to the classification of the hazard as an Apparent System (e.g. well defined valley system), consistent with that explained/described in the UTRCA Policy Manual.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	5.2 Toe Erosion Allowance For Consideration 9 – In Table 4 there is a single asterisk at the end of the table title but there is no explanation provided as to what the asterisk refers to.	Revised accordingly (now Table 3) Removed asterisk
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	5.2 Toe Erosion Allowance Recommendation 4 – Paragraph 2: The conclusion in the paragraph references the site conditions described in Section 2.1. However, the information in Section 2.1 does not include a description of the Type of Material present (Column 1 in Table 4) or the Bankfull Width (Right hand side of Table 4) on which the conclusion is based. It is recommended that this information be referenced in or included in this paragraph to support the conclusion provided.	Revised accordingly (now Table 3) Removed asterisk
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	5.5 Review of Watermain Interconnection and Trail For Consideration 10 –Typos and Grammar: Could the authors review Paragraph 1, Sentence 1 for grammar.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.1 Site Preparation Recommendation 5 – Paragraph 9: The potential for consolidation of the prevailing soils under the application of load from engineered fill is acknowledged. It is recommended that a general estimate of the potential magnitude of settlement be provided for a typical, average, or representative thickness of engineered fill, and an approximate timeline for the settlement to occur be provided. This information will assist the designers in understanding potential adverse effects in this respect and in completing the design and preparing the construction specifications.	Already discussed in paragraph 8 of the revised geotechnical report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.2.1 Spread Footing Foundations Recommendation 6 – Paragraph 1, Sentence 1: The sentence refers to construction of foundations on “approved native silt subgrades”. The recommended depths/elevations for placement of foundations shown in Table 8 correspond to the native silt in some of the boreholes but correspond to native sand (the predominant soil type shown on the borehole records) in other boreholes. It is recommended that this sentence be edited to reference both the silt and sand strata.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.3 Site Classification for Seismic Site Response Recommendation 7 – It is inferred that the authors used the SPT method for the Site Classification assessment. However, the boreholes terminated at a maximum depth of 14.2 m (the OBC requires an assessment to a depth of 30 m) and the N-values obtained from the SPTs to the maximum termination depth achieved do not appear to support a conclusion of Site Class C as stated. Any additional geology information used in the assessment to support the conclusion stated should be referenced. Alternatively, the authors may consider recommending Shear Wave Velocity testing to determine/confirm the Seismic Site Classification.	Revised accordingly Updated to current code requirements Recommended Site Class D (XD). Recommend a site specific MASW test be considered to determine the Site Designation for this site. The project structural engineer can advise if an in-situ shear wave velocity measurement (such as MASW test) is advantageous for the subject project.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.4 Slab-On-Grade Construction For Consideration 11 – Paragraph 1, Sentence 1: Consistent with previous discussion and recommendations in the report, the native founding soil could consist of either native sand or native silt.	Revised accordingly Updated the bearing stratum. Updated both to 98 percent SPMDD.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.4 Slab-On-Grade Construction For Consideration 12 – Paragraph 2, Sentence 5: It is inferred that the 95% compaction reference applies to the “granular fill base” material and not to the “clean earth fill” as clean earth fill placed as engineered fill on the project is to be compacted to 98% (Section 6.1 Site Preparation).	Revised accordingly Updated the bearing stratum. Updated both to 98 percent SPMDD.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.5 Basement Drainage For Consideration 13 – In the absence of reference/recommendation for waterproofing and/of an under-slab drainage system, it is inferred that all basement floor slabs should be established above the elevation of the prevailing ground water table. Could the authors add a comment to this section in this respect.	Revised accordingly. It is recommended that basement floor elevations be maintained at least 1 m above the highest anticipated groundwater level to reduce the risk of seepage and hydrostatic pressure.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.7 Site Servicing Recommendation 8 – Paragraph 1, Sentence 2: The sentence states that the invert elevation for municipal services is expected to be in the clayey silt till. The authors may wish to consider adding the predominant soil types of sand and silt to this statement given the conditions shown on the borehole records.	This has been addressed in the revised Geotechnical Report.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.7.1 Bedding For Consideration 14 – Typos and Grammar: Paragraph 1, Sentence 1 references fill material although fill material is not shown on the borehole records.	Revised accordingly. Updated the paragraph to reflect all applicable bearing stratum.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.7.1 Bedding Recommendation 9 – Paragraph 1, Sentence 1: Same comment as Recommendation 8 above regarding the anticipated soil type; This sentence refers to the presence of clayey silt till at the base of the service trenches. The authors may wish to consider adding sand and silt to this statement given the conditions shown on the borehole records.	Revised accordingly. Updated the paragraph to reflect all applicable bearing stratum.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.8.1 Subgrade Preparation Recommendation 10 - Paragraph 1, Sentence 1: Same comment as Recommendation 8 above regarding the anticipated soil type; This sentence references the presence of clayey silt (predominantly) beneath the ground cover. Could the authors consider adding sand and silt to this statement given the conditions shown on the borehole records.	Updated the paragraph to reflect all applicable bearing stratum and updated to be consistent with Table.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.8.1 Subgrade Preparation For Consideration 15 - Paragraph 5: This paragraph refers to driveways/access routes and parking areas, suggesting a possible commercial development context. For consistency and clarity, can the authors review and confirm that the wording is consistent with that used in Table 10 in Section 6.8.2 Asphalt Concrete Pavement Design, referencing “Streets, Driveways and Multi-use Trails”, if and as applicable.	Updated the paragraph to reflect all applicable bearing stratum and updated to be consistent with Table.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	6.8.2 Asphalt Concrete Pavement Design Recommendation 11 - Paragraph 1, Sentence 2: The sentence recommends 95% compaction for fill to grade in the areas of planned roads. This appears to contradict the statement in Section 6.8.1 that requires the upper 1 m of backfill beneath areas of pavements to be compacted to 98%. Can the authors please review and edit if and as appropriate.	Updated both to 98%.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	For Consideration 16 – The scope of development shown on the drawings and outlined in the geotechnical report includes a stormwater management pond. If the scope of services for the geotechnical investigation and associated report included addressing the stormwater management pond, design and construction recommendations should be provided regarding containment berms, inlet & outlet structures, infiltration rates and/or requirement for a liner, slope and erosion protection, and access road. If the scope of services for the geotechnical investigation did not include addressing the stormwater management pond, it is suggested that a statement be included in the report in that regard.	Added a note for both considerations.
Stantec (Geotechnical)	Englobe	For Consideration 17 – The scope of development shown on the drawings and outlined in the geotechnical report includes medium-density and high-density residential blocks (see Comment for Consideration 2). If the scope of services for the geotechnical investigation included addressing these blocks, the authors should consider including discussion and recommendation regarding possible multi-level underground infrastructure (basements or parking levels), temporary construction shoring requirements, bath-tubbing or permanent drainage infrastructure, and higher bearing reactions and resistances or alternative foundation systems if warranted. If the scope of services for the geotechnical investigation did not include addressing the medium-density and high-density blocks, it is suggested that a statement be included in the report in that regard.	Added a note for both considerations.
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	2 Hydrogeological Study Methodology - The scope of the study was found to be suitable for the scale of the proposed development on municipal services.	Acknowledged.
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	2.2.3 Guelph Permeameter Analysis - The test pit locations where the Guelph Permeameter tests were completed are not shown on the drawings.	Test pits locations were added to Drawing 1 of Appendix A
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	3.1 Stratigraphy - The stratigraphy was found to consist of 0.2 m to 0.5 m of topsoil underlain by sand with variable silt content. The depth of the sand unit was determined from local Water Well Records and found to range from 20 to 55 m below ground surface (BGS). One exception was BH12-19 where 2.0 m of peat was found at surface.	Acknowledged.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	3.2 Hydraulic Conductivity and Design Infiltration Rates - Hydraulic conductivity values ranged from 1.2 x 10-5 m/s to 1.3 x 10-4 m/s. Infiltration rates were estimated to range from 1.3 to 57.3 mm/hr across the Site, for a geometric mean of 27.8 mm/hr. A safety factor of three was applied to these rates when calculating the Design Infiltration Rate. These results are consistent with sand having varying amounts of silt. Clarification is required on whether horizontal hydraulic conductivity estimates obtained from the monitoring wells were converted to vertical hydraulic conductivities prior to converting these values to an infiltration rate. The vertical hydraulic conductivity of a soil can range from an order to two orders (for clay-based soil) of magnitude lower than the corresponding horizontal hydraulic conductivity. If horizontal hydraulic conductivity estimates were not adjusted, the estimated infiltration rates from these values will be higher than expected, which could have implications on LID infiltration facility design.	Section 3.2 recommends the use of Guelph permeameter for infiltration rates estimation. Guelph permeameter test execution was considered representative of conditions that could occur in an open channel like the one considered in the concept at current time.
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	3.3 Groundwater Elevations, Flow Direction - The April 29, 2020 groundwater levels are referenced and contoured in Drawing 2. This section would benefit from further discussion, including: 1. Confirmation that the April 29, 2020, groundwater levels are representative of the high groundwater table. 2. Explicitly stating the groundwater flow direction is in a northeasterly direction as opposed to just referencing Drawing 2. 3. A discussion on the depth to the high groundwater table beneath the Site. This discussion will aid in the analysis of whether high groundwater levels will be a problem for basement foundations or site servicing throughout the Site. 4. A discussion of the mini-piezometer data with respect to surface water features and wetlands. Are these features groundwater recharge or discharge features? Do they need groundwater inputs originating from the Site to maintain their function.	Added to section 3.3
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	3.4.2 Nitrate - Stantec agrees with the statement that changing the land use from agricultural to residential is likely to lower nitrate concentrations in groundwater over time.	Acknowledged.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	3.5 Pre-Development Water Balance - The pre-development water balance resulted in an average infiltration rate of 248 mm/year. Stantec agrees that this infiltration rate is likely to be conservative. The pre-development water balance shows annual infiltration of about 63,637 m3/yr, which is consistent with the proposed development area and average infiltration rate.	Acknowledged.
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	3.6 Post-Development Water Balance - The post-development water balance shows an infiltration deficit of about 40,253 m3/yr or approximately 63% of the pre-development infiltration, which is consistent with a development of this size and density.	Acknowledged.
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	3.7 Comments on LID measures - The proposed LID measure consists of an open channel located on the northern side of Christie Drive. Stantec requires clarification on how water would be conveyed to this channel. Further clarification is also required on whether infiltrating stormwater at one location would maintain the from and function of all the surface water features and wetlands surrounding the proposed development. A decentralized LID measure such as rear lot swales would be preferred. A pre- and post-development feature-based water balance for the surface water features and wetlands should be performed to help in assessing the most suitable LID strategy for the Site. Stantec agrees that only high quality water from rooftops and green spaces be infiltrated. Runoff from roadways should be directed to the stormwater management pond. Stantec also agrees that a post-development groundwater monitoring program be implemented at the Site.	Acknowledged.
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	4 Dewatering Assessment - Englobe states that no basement foundations would be constructed below the high groundwater table as drainage would be problematic and Stantec agrees with this statement. Some preliminary dewatering rates were calculated for site services and construction of the stormwater management pond. Stantec recommends that these dewatering rates be revisited during detailed design and confirmed with pumping from open test excavations so the contractor can develop an effective dewatering plan. Englobe suggests that a Category 3 Permit To Take Water would be required; however, recent amendments to the permitting requirements indicate that the construction dewatering can be completed with an Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR).	Update to section 4.3

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	5.1 Water Users - Englobe recommends that residents on private wells located within the predicted dewatering zone of influence be notified prior to the start of dewatering and that the contractor be prepared to deal with any groundwater interference complaints. Groundwater interference complaints should be handled by a qualified professional.	Residents within the proposed dewatering zone of influence will be notified prior to the start of dewatering and the contractor will be prepared to deal with groundwater interference complaints. Englobe will be consulted to ensure that all construction methods will be in accordance with the future EASR filing, if required.
Stantec (Hydrogeological)	Englobe	In summary, there does not appear to be any hydrogeological constraints that would prevent this development from proceeding as proposed. As part of detailed design, Stantec recommends that the dewatering assessment be revisited to confirm pumping rates and predicted zone of pumping influence. During detailed design a decentralized LID strategy should be developed in an effort to match pre-development recharge and maintain groundwater levels across the Site as close to pre-development levels as possible.	Acknowledged.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	The EIS addresses the necessary components of the scoped assessment and identifies natural heritage features including woodlands, wetlands (provincially and locally significant), as well as significant wildlife, fish, and species at risk habitat; however, there are some substantial gaps in information or analysis within those sections that should be included for completeness and accuracy. Their inclusion will also make the proponent aware of their potential responsibilities prior to, during, and post-construction.	The EIS has been revised to address all technical comments provided.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	The EIS does not mention that it is supporting a Zoning Bylaw Amendment and Official Plan Amendment. Furthermore, existing zoning is also not discussed under the policy section. This is covered under the Planning Justification Report but may warrant inclusion in the EIS.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Please clarify where the Significant Valleyland designation was obtained.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	It appears that the Christie Road extension is excluded from the draft plan of subdivision provided in Figure 5 but is discussed throughout the EIS and in a few places regarding impacts. Please clarify requirements for impact assessments and mitigation measures for the roadway from a policy perspective. If required, the test of no negative impacts has not been adequately demonstrated for the Christie Road extension.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Notwithstanding the comment above, Section 1.1 states: The small isolated patch of Woodland in the center of the subject lands is not designated Natural Heritage, nor is the vegetation within the Christie Drive roadway extension. This statement fails to recognize the Environmental Area designation for the roadway extension on the Municipality OP and what this entails.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Similarly, Section 1.2.2 identifies proposed impacts to FOD5 and SWM2 “surrounding” Christie Drive. What does it mean to be Natural Heritage vs. Environmental Area (i.e., Group C features)? What is permitted (or not)?	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 1.3.1 - There is no context regarding the SAR designations. The designations shown are federal designations, but the report does not discuss provincial designations of these species. If it did, it would indicate that the mussel is THR, not SC. There is a low likelihood of impacts with the recommended mitigation measures, but it still bears mentioning if for no other reason than to show it was considered.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 1.3.1 - Despite that the section includes information on the designations of the local municipal drains, it doesn’t direct the reader to a more fulsome discussion on how the Drainage Act and the Fisheries Act interact, which is quite relevant to this project. If the SWM pond is to outlet into the Rath-Harris Drain, the Drainage Superintendent needs to review the designs and sign off on them since each municipal drain is an engineered watercourse that, by law, is to be kept consistent with the designs unless otherwise agree upon (i.e., changed) by the local Drainage Superintendent.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 1.3.1 - Specifically, not in Section 1.3.1, but also nowhere else in the report does it discuss the Fisheries Act approval process in detail. Section 5.1 presents various considerations, with the ultimate conclusion that “As long as recommended mitigation measures are followed, we do not anticipate any harm to fish or aquatic habitat”. The first concern with this is that in Section 1.2.5, the report indicates the creation of a plunge pool and slope projection will be necessary at the outlet. That means work below the high water mark, which usually requires submission of a Request for Review to DFO to determine if there are Fisheries Act approvals required, none of which is mentioned. The second concern with the statement is that the legislative bar is not set at “harm” to fish and fish habitat. The requirement is that there is no or low likelihood of death of fish and/ or harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (HADD) of fish habitat. A more detailed discussion considering all these items should be provided.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	In Section 1.3.3. “Environmental Area” is discussed under Group A Features. Please clarify if this is correct?	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 1.4.4 states: The UTRCA regulation limit is 30 m from wetland boundaries and watercourses (in this case municipal drains). Any proposed development within the 30-meter setback is subject to CA review and approval. It is our understanding from the EIS that development is not proposed within 30 m of wetlands but is proposed within regulated areas. Therefore, the EIS should support consultation with UTRCA re: permitting due to the presence of regulated areas the subject lands.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Although the EIS states: With reference to section 4.1.8 of the PPS, we do not anticipate any direct negative or unalterable impacts to the Natural Heritage feature on-site or its ecological functions as the vegetation on site is low quality, and for reasons noted in Section 4, there will be minimal direct or incidental impacts on the surrounding Natural Heritage area - it appears that the EIS does not provide enough analysis to demonstrate no negative impacts to ecological functions on the adjacent features, particularly as encroachment on a Significant Woodland and lack of setbacks in some areas are proposed.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	There is little discussion about the County Official Plan policies and designations.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 2.2 states: As previously mentioned, there are "Natural Hazard" lands to the southwest, north, and southeast. These slopes require erosion hazard setbacks. A geotechnical study (Englobe 2024) demonstrated that a 6 m setback from top of stable slope is recommended in all areas. Where is adherence to this setback identified? The draft plan of subdivision shows a 6 m dripline setback to the north and a 30 m wetland setback throughout. However, there does not appear to be a setback in the south in the area circled (open space block behind lot 160 in cul-de-sac)	This has been addressed within the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Various details on wetlands are provided in Section 2.4 followed by: This should be confirmed by a hydrogeologist. It is unclear why this has not been confirmed with a hydrogeologist during the preparation of the EIS and the supporting Hydrogeological investigation report referenced that was authored by Englobe (2024). This resurfaces again in Section 4.4.2 where input from a hydrogeologist is critical to demonstrate no impacts.	This has been addressed within the revised EIS to include coordination with the Hydrogeologist for the site.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 3 Biological Attributes - A comprehensive multi-season and multi-year field survey program was implemented for flora, fauna, herptiles, and aquatic habitat.	Acknowledged.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 3 Biological Attributes - Confirm what type of agricultural field comprises the bulk of the subject lands. This is relevant to discussions on Bobolink later in the EIS.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 3 Biological Attributes - Tables 2 and 3 state that the Floristic Quality Index (FQI) is provided. Which column is the FQI? Also please clarify what CC and CW are.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 3 Biological Attributes - Please clarify how communities were classified as “high-quality” or “low-quality.”	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 3 Biological Attributes - Was a background review completed to guide the field program?	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 3 Biological Attributes - Feature numbering on Figure 2, (e.g., Figure A, B, C) is very helpful. However, Mill Pond, the western pond and the irrigation pond are mentioned throughout the EIS but do not appear to be shown on Figures for clarity.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Section 3 Biological Attributes - “Given the proposed removal of the western pond, both ponds were inspected for turtle activity”. Please clarify where turtle basking surveys were completed by labelling the ponds on the map or through ELC community codes.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Significant Wildlife Habitat - There appears to be some inconsistencies in species designations between Section 3.2 (e.g., Barn Swallow [THR/THR]) and elsewhere in the EIS.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Significant Wildlife Habitat - Species designated as Special Concern are included under the Species at Risk heading although they are correctly identified as not having protection under the ESA and are also addressed under Species of Conservation Concern for Significant Wildlife Habitat.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Significant Wildlife Habitat - One Eastern Wood-Pewee location was determined to be an anomaly due to the small, isolated, and poor-quality nature of the small woodland patch in the middle of the fields (and shown on Figure 11). Although this conclusion is likely true, a more detailed analysis of significance is recommended because, per COSEWIC 2012: Generally, size of forest fragments does not appear to be an important factor in habitat selection (Stauffer and Best 1980; Blake and Karr 1987, Robbins et al. 1989, Freemark and Collins 1992; Desrochers et al. 2010). However, the species is known to occur less frequently in woodlots with surrounding residential development than in those without houses (Friesen et al. 1995; Keller and Yahner 2007). Eastern wood-pewee (Contopus virens): COSEWIC assessment and status report 2012 - Canada.ca	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Significant Wildlife Habitat - Confirm the size of the woodlot to the north to subsidize the area-sensitive woodland breeding bird analysis where Pileated Woodpecker, Yellow-bellied Sapsucker, and Red-breasted Nuthatch were observed.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Significant Wildlife Habitat - It is unclear if SWH for overwintering turtles is considered present or absent based on the discussion provided. At one point it is stated it is SWH but then later discussed in detail how it is poor quality, have existed for only a short period of time, and anthropogenic. Please confirm the final list of SWH in the unlabeled summary table prefaced by: Heritage features noted below.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Species at Risk - “Six Bobolink (COSEWIC: Threatened, COSSARO: Threatened) individuals, four males and two females, were observed within the agricultural crop. Although no nesting indicators were observed, the behaviour was indicative of nesting birds. However, the ESA (2007) O. Reg. 242/08 states that "Clause 9 (1) (a) the Act does not apply to a person who kills, harms or harasses a bobolink or an eastern meadowlark while carrying out an agricultural operation." Please note that the ESA has been updated such that “harass” has been removed from Clause 9. Additionally, the proposed subdivision does not fall under the agricultural exemption and is potentially a misleading statement. What actions are proposed to compensate for the loss of large areas of Bobolink habitat to facilitate the proposed subdivision?	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Species at Risk - It is agreed that Butternut will not likely be impacted at a 20 m setback. However, confirmation of butternut health status through a health assessment or that the development is located outside the critical root zone may be helpful.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Species at Risk - It is our understanding that the MECP has been contacted regarding an overall benefit permit for Black Ash. Seven trees >1.37 m height or 8 cm dbh are within the proposed road construction area. Are any else proposed for removal? Were health assessments completed on these trees to determine which are protected? What are the different colours on Figure 12?	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Species at Risk - Are Blanding’s Turtle expected to occur in the Study Area? If so, why was the Blanding’s Turtle protocol Survey Protocol for Blanding’s Turtle (Emydoidea blandingii) in Ontario not implemented?	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Species at Risk - Bat species at risk are mentioned with timing mitigation measures (see Impact Assessment and Mitigation) but impacts to habitat are not discussed. Has the ongoing consultation with MECP regarding black ash included butternut, Bobolink, or bat species at risk?	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - The tree cutting window provided in Recommendation #1 should be extended from March 15 (if Small-footed Myotis may occur) to November 30th (for migratory bats). This is consistent with recent consultation with MECP.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - It is understood that one Pileated Woodpecker was noted during the breeding bird surveys. Please confirm that no evidence of Pileated Woodpecker nesting was identified within the proposed road allowance expansion as these nests are protected year-round under the Migratory Birds Regulation.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Please confirm setbacks. Earlier in the EIS it was stated a 6 m setback is required for hazards, the site plan shows 6 m setbacks on the woodland in the north. But not in the southeast. There is a distance ranging from 0-6 m between the development envelope and the dripline of the Significant Woodland features on the periphery of the site. It is recognized in the EIS that these edges are primarily young but also that 10 m is a typical significant woodland setback. Justify the differences in setbacks.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Recommendation #4 states that pond filling should occur outside of the breeding season (spring and summer, March - August) to protect amphibians. However, an amphibian and reptile salvage is also recommended. Please clarify that winter removal is not recommended.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Typically, a 10 m buffer is required for significant woodlands. However, a reduced buffer size is possible if a net ecological gain can be shown for the Study Area (i.e. compensation, invasive species removal, habitat creation, enhancements, etc. Please clarify the source of this guidance.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Monitoring tree health is included in Recommendation #15. Are there any other monitoring recommendations included in the EIS? What about vegetation plantings, erosion and sediment controls, stormwater management, invasive species?	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Statements throughout the EIS regarding water balance do not appear to incorporate details from the Functional Servicing Report or the Hydrogeological Report. “This should be confirmed with a hydrogeologist” should not be a recommendation but instead be completed at this stage. For the 46.22 ha subject lands, 51.2% drain to the Rath-Harris Drain in the southeast, 18.7% contributes to the northern wetland, 9.1% to the westerly wetland and the remaining 21% outlet to Shaw Drain…Given that the SWM design focuses on conducting flow to the Rath-Harris Drain, this matches pre-development conditions”. It is unclear how these conflicting statements will result in matching pre-existing conditions. The FSR states: without any mitigation measures, the groundwater infiltration could potentially be reduced to approx. 37% of pre-development levels.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - The test of no negative impacts to adjacent features with respect to water balance have not been achieved in the EIS. Recommendation #17 acknowledges this lack of conformity and Stantec supports the requirement for a detailed water balance that matches pre- and post-development of timing and delivery. This also has implications for Fisheries Act approvals. If there is a change in water balance, including flows feeding either of the watercourses or any of the wetlands, there are potential negative impacts to fish and fish habitat that would need to be documented in reporting or application forms submitted to DFO.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Recommendations regarding the requirement of LIDs, runoff buffer strips, and water quality and quantity control of the stormwater management facility that outlets to the Rath-Harris Drain are suitable and appropriate.	Acknowledged.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Corridor size and connectivity impact assessment neglects to consider the Christie Road extension.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (Natural Environment)	Vroom & Associates	Impact Assessment and Mitigation - Due to the location of Christie Road within a wetland, additional measures are recommended, including reptile/amphibian road crossing structures under the roadway, to maintain connectivity and mitigate road mortality.	This has been addressed in the revised EIS.
Stantec (FSR)	CJDL	Additional watermain connections should be considered for full build-out. Currently supply and looping are both proposed at the eastern limit of phase 1, only providing a single source of water for development west of the proposed looping connection from Mill Court. Consider timing for future looping from Harris Street. The size of the first phase will be limited due to the single existing connection point.	Upon build-out of the northerly development block, it is anticipated that watermain interconnection on the north side of Christie Drive from Mill Court over to the stub on Street 'D' will be completed, allowing for greater redundancy that the single source feed at the east limit of Phase 1.
Stantec (FSR)	CJDL	We suspect the Thames Centre Engineering Standard sanitary per capita flow should read 230L/Cap/day, not 350L/Cap/day, per other references in the standard. Confirm with Municipality and revise the report as applicable.	The sanitary per capita flow within the Functional Servicing Report and sanitary design calculations has been revised to 230 L/Cap/Day as requested.
Stantec (SWM)	CJDL	Hydrogeological report speaks of the possible need for a pond liner but makes no recommendations. It is our opinion that the pond be lined and given that the pond bottom is below the high-ground water elevation, consideration be given for the possibility of that liner to float. Please have the liner designed by a qualified person. This can be done as part of detail design.	Confirmed. The pond liner requirements have been specified within the revised Geotechnical Report and will be incorporated into the detailed design of the SWM pond.
Stantec (SWM)	CJDL	The model schematics in the SWM Report are not labelled for component parts, please label the schematics appropriately.	Component labels have been added to the model schematic.

Agency	Consultant	Comment	Response
Stantec (SWM)	CJDL	Model outputs in the SWM Report seem to be cutoff in certain sections, with rows and columns of data missing. Please check and confirm that all data was submitted.	The modelling result outputs have been updated to avoid any cutoff data.
Stantec (SWM)	CJDL	While we are in agreement that the overages to the Tamarack Swamp are minor in nature, efforts should be made during detail design to intercept and infiltrate the minor flows of the rear lots so that the peak flows are more in line in the minor events. Otherwise, the Scoped EIS should speak to the minor increases and expected impacts.	Confirmed. Efforts will be made during detailed design to evaluate infiltration of rear yard runoff for lots backing on to Tamarack Swamp. Hydrologic modelling results are incorporated into the EIS. Minor increases in 2–5 year storm events and slight decreases in larger storms are interpreted in the context of absolute flow magnitude, wetland sensitivity, and groundwater support. Changes are concluded to fall within acceptable tolerance ranges with no anticipated impact on wetland hydroperiod or function.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	Clarify the extent of wetland boundaries used and confirm whether boundaries were field-verified by an ELC-qualified ecologist.	Wetland boundaries were determined through soil sampling (Oakfield tube) and vegetation analysis conducted by an ELC-certified ecologist (Paul O'Hara) in coordination with Vroom + Associates. The delineated boundaries were reviewed and confirmed on-site with UTRCA Ecologist Tara Tchir in May 2020 and represent the agreed-upon wetland extent based on OWES criteria.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	Assess Christie Drive construction impacts on adjacent slopes and hydrology to the Tamarack Swamp and Rath-Harris Drain corridor.	Expanded hydrologic and abiotic impact assessment added for Christie Drive, including evaluation of shallow soil moisture continuity, potential interception of lateral interflow, salt spray effects, and construction-phase disturbance. Mitigation measures to maintain lateral flow, limit wicking, and protect wetland function are provided.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	Confirm and justify setbacks and buffers from wetlands and hazard lands, including Christie Drive and servicing crossings.	Wetland sensitivity and drivers clarified. Buffers and setbacks are confirmed based on feature sensitivity, regulatory context, and findings from the Hydrogeological Assessment. Christie Drive and servicing crossings are assessed with feature-specific mitigation rather than reliance on setback alone.
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority	Vroom & Associates	If sanitary crossing through SWT3 proceeds, provide mitigation and restoration plan.	Sanitary crossing impacts assessed in a dedicated Servicing Letter of Opinion (Vroom + Associates, 2025), appended as Appendix 5. Recommended trenchless construction, restoration measures, and monitoring are provided, and no long-term loss of wetland function is anticipated.