



Shining Hill Estate Collection Inc.

Town File No.: OPA-2021-02, ZBA-2021-02, SUB-2021-01

1st Submission Comment Matrix

Last Updated: January 11, 2022

Town of Aurora – York Region – Other Agencies

#	Comment	Response	Action By
Town of Aurora – Planning and Development Services Rosanna Punit – Planner July 27, 2021			
Planning Comments:			
Draft Plan of Subdivision and general comments:			
1.	No access (driveway) to the St. Anne’s School via a public road located in the Aurora. The road access to the school block must comply with Engineering and Fire requirements.	An access block for the St. Anne’s School (Block 101) has been provided from Street B. The access complies with Engineering and Fire requirements.	MGP
2.	Provide Phasing of Plan of subdivision, if being phased.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision is not proposed to be phased at this time.	MGP
3.	The plan contemplates a future road connection to Newmarket. The Aurora lands must be able to function on its own, until such time as a decision is made on the lands in Newmarket.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to show a temporary turning circle on the Town of Newmarket side, which the applicant owns.	MGP
4.	A review of future trail connections/linkages to the Town of Newmarket lands will be required.	Acknowledged. The Conceptual Master Plan by MGP (November 18, 2021) provides a potential routing of the trails and connections to the Draft Plan.	MGP
5.	Laneway units (Lots 71 -88) do not comply with road width standard for lane product.	The laneway has been eliminated from the Draft Plan of Subdivision and replaced with a full local road right-of-way (Street E). The lots south of Street E (79 – 87) will be single detached homes that front onto St. John’s Sideroad and have rear garages accessed from Street E.	MGP
6.	Consider mixed building types (semis, townhouse), overall density should be compatible with surrounding low rise area	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to replace the midrise building with street townhomes.	MGP
7.	Block 94 (Trail head) to be accessible by the entire subdivision, currently as proposed, only “Laneway A” residents can access. It was discussed that the existing Dunin driveway may to be used as a walking trail connection to the future St. Anne’s school site. Provide trail access points throughout the plan.	We anticipate a trail to generally run through Block 98 as conceptually proposed in the master plan. Access to this trail can be achieved through the existing Dunin Estate gates on St. John’s Sideroad which will be maintained (Block 96), Street E, Block 98 Servicing Block and from Block 93 (SAS). Access to this trail is also contemplated from approved Phase 2. Access to the trail contemplated in the valleylands to the east of the draft plan is limited given the significant slopes but is anticipated near Block 97 Trail Head and from future development lands near St. John’s Sideroad and Yonge Street.	MGP
8.	A large number of trees are being removed to implement the development. Provide more protection of trees.	As per the Natural Heritage Evaluation, the significant woodlands (among other natural heritage features) will be protected along with their associated buffer within the 17.77 hectare of land identified as Natural Heritage System (Block 95). Additionally, as part of future development applications, the valleylands and natural heritage lands to the east of the Draft Plan will be defined and protected. Trees that are proposed to be removed within the developable portions of the draft plan have been surveyed, recorded and characterized and will be compensated for in accordance with Town policies, as outlined in the Arborist Report. Additional open space blocks have been added to the draft plan along the natural heritage system to provide for additional tree preservation opportunities and open space lands. Site grading that is necessary to construct function servicing infrastructure, stormwater management and park facilities make retention of existing trees within the development area not feasible. In addition to trees planted for compensation requirements, the community will include around 400 trees planted along the new streets, in private yards and park spaces.	MGP

#	Comment	Response	Action By
9.	Parkland dedication to be determined and finalized. Park must be un-encumbered to be acceptable for Town ownership (Official Plan policy 12.3.3 g).	Acknowledged. The proposed Neighbourhood Park will be unencumbered.	MGP
Draft OPA:			
10.	A portion of lands subject to the proposed OPA are located within an area currently identified as "Rural Area" on Map 8 the YROP. Bringing these lands into the "Urban Area" can only occur after completion of the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) by York Region.	Acknowledged.	MGP
11.	The applications did not address the small portion of the lands located at the southwest corner of the site along St. John's Sideroad. Please update the OPA, ZBA and draft plan of subdivision applications to include this area.	This portion of the lands is located within Phase 2 and is not subject to this application.	MGP
12.	The "Stable Neighbourhood" designation proposed does not comply with Town's Official Plan policies. A similar approach to the Phase 2 lands designating these lands Suburban Residential Two (SR-2) with site specific frontage and area.	The Suburban Residential Two (SR-2) designation is located within OPA 37 and as such, cannot be applied to these lands. It remains our opinion that redesignating to Stable Neighbourhoods is the most appropriate approach. A similar amendment was approved by the Town in the Highland Gate redevelopment. If the Town would like a new designation instead, we are open to revising the OPA accordingly.	MGP
13.	York Region has confirmed they will be approval authority for the OPA	Noted.	N/A
Draft ZBA:			
14.	Parking for the mid/high rise block to be determined once the plan is finalized.	The mid/high-rise block has been removed from the proposed development. The Draft ZBA has been revised to reflect the updated concept plan.	MGP
Urban Design Brief:			
15.	Overall density proposed requires further review from York Region with the MCR process and proposed targets.	Noted. As per comments from Council and the public, the mid/high rise block has been removed and replaced with townhomes lower the proposed density.	MGP
16.	Architectural Control Report will be a condition of subdivision approval.	Noted.	MGP
17.	Currently, no access to the trail system to be developed has been provided. Report to identify all trail connections and potential trails connections within the Town of Aurora, to the Town of Newmarket in co-ordination with Lake Simcoe Regional Conservation Authority (LSRCA).	See response to comment #7. Updated conceptual master plan with proposed trails and connections has been provided with this submission.	MGP
18.	Sidewalk connections to be discussed and examples to be provided (connections and widths, etc).	The Conceptual Master Plan illustrates the potential trail routing. Details regarding trails will be confirmed through future development phases. The preliminary landscape and planting plan by Schollen and Company (November 2021) / Conceptual Plan by MGP (November 18, 2021) provides further details with regards to sidewalk locations and connections to potential trails. As per the FSSR, a 3.0 metre wide multi-use trail is proposed on the east side of Street A. Connections to the future trail system can be provided in accordance with Town standards for sidewalks through Blocks 97, 99 and 101.	MGP
Public Meeting comments from June 8, 2021 Statutory Public Meeting:			
19.	See attached list of public comments to be addressed.	See response package to Town provided on August 20, 2021.	
Legal Services :n/a			
20.	Prior to entering into a development agreement with the Town, the submission of certain ownership/title information and land registration document(s) from the owner's solicitor is required, along with the owner's submission of a valid insurance certificate. For more information, please contact Janet Van Scheyndel, Law Clerk at 905-726-4743 or jvanscheyndel@aurora.ca Please review all of the department and agency comments, revise your plans accordingly and include a brief written explanation describing how each comment has been addressed (i.e. comment/response matrix).	Noted. See responses provided within this matrix.	Shining Hill Estates Collection Inc.
Town of Aurora – Planning and Development Services Bill Butler, P.Eng., Engineer, Development Services			

#	Comment	Response	Action By
May 18, 2021			
21.	Lane A was a dead end lane and it was proposed that the Lane be dedicated to the Town. Although the Lane is 9.2m proposed width and potentially driveways one side, it does not meet operational standards for snow removal, garbage pickup and maintenance. As well there is no turnaround at the dead end for safety the lane is proposed to join a trail head	The laneway has been removed from the proposed development. Only public roads, which meet Town engineering standards have been proposed. See response to Comment #5.	MGP
22.	Street B does not appear to meet Town standard for angle bend at the south end and could be an operational concern for maintenance	Street B has been designed per the Town Standards for angle bend. The updated draft plan includes additional annotation illustrating the proposed angles per the Town's standards.	SCS
23.	Street B at the north end has only a 15m ROW and uses the future Park Block 91 for boulevard services thus encumbering the block. All lands dedicated should be free of encumbrances	This portion of the road only has homes on one side and as such can support a narrow ROW. A cross section of this 15m ROW has been provided as part of the FSSR (Figure 6.4)	MGP/SCS
24.	Block 91 future Park Block has a proposed SWM tank which again encumbers the Block to be dedicated to the Town	The SWM tank has been removed from the park block.	MGP
25.	Services for Block 90, St Anne's School, are proposed to go through the future Park Block 91 again encumbering the land	Access and Servicing Block 101 will provide a connection for services to SAS not through the park block (Block 94)	SCS
26.	There is no access to future Block 90 as it only fronts a future road in the Town of Newmarket. The Town of Aurora does not have jurisdiction over Newmarket to create the block frontage	An access block for the St. Anne's School (Block 101) has been provided from Street B. The access complies with Engineering and Fire requirements.	MGP
27.	Water service is proposed from Aurora for Block 90 and as there is no proposed frontage in Aurora, water can't be billed	The water service for the St Anne's Block (Block 93) will be provided through Block 101 and provides an Aurora address for the St Anne's Block (Block 93) for billing.	SCS
28.	A slope stability report was provided. It is not correlated to the proposed lot and road fabric and the long term stable top of slope based on stable gradient may impact the proposed layout. This needs to be addressed	The geotechnical report and the slope stability letter have been updated to include an additional drawing showing the long-term stable top of slope line with cross-section locations overlaid on the draft plan.	Soil Engineers
29.	A sidewalk along SJSR frontage is required to connect the proposed Phase 2 sidewalk to Yonge Street	A conceptual alignment for a connection to the Phase 2 sidewalk to Yonge Street is being proposed to provided an intermin connection to Yonge Street along the north side of St. John's Sideroad until such time that SJS is reconstructed..	MGP/SCS
30.	A boundary water meter will be required at the Newmarket/Aurora boundary	The FSSR notes this requirement.	SCS
31.	A phase 2 ESA per the phase 1 page 34 report is recommended	Acknowledged.	Soil Engineers
32.	A storm sewer outlet is proposed to outlet into the creek within the Town of Newmarket. Aurora does not have jurisdiction to approve this location nor maintain it. Please relocate the outlet within Aurora	The storm sewer and headwall has been moved so that the hard infrastructure is located within the Town of Aurora. Grading and erosion protection for the outfall channel are necessary in Newmarket to convey runoff to the tributary based on the existing site topography.	SCS
33.	Both LSRCA and York Region require approval prior to Town approval	Noted.	
34.	The noise report identifies the need for attenuation on flankage lots along SJSR. Provide information that these lots have the appropriate width	The noise attenuation barrier is anticipated to be a 2.2 m high barrier which can be provided as a fence, therefore no additional lot width is required for a berm.	SCS/MPG/HGC
35.	A trailhead is indicated at the end of Lane A. Please identify how this functions as part of the Lane	The existing Dunin Estate gates along St. John's Sideroad are proposed to be retained within the buffer of the NHS and a new open space block (Block 96). This will provide an opportunity to create a trailhead (the existing gates) for a trail that is conceptually proposed within the natural heritage system block 95 and connect that trail to the proposed sidewalk/multi-use path along the north side of St. John's Sideroad.	MGP
Town of Aurora – Planning and Development Services Bill Jean, P. Eng. – Manager- Building Division/CBO March 22, 2021 Zoning			
36.	No comments at this stage of the development	Noted.	N/A

#	Comment	Response	Action By
Building Code			
37.	No comments at this stage of the development	Noted.	N/A
Town of Aurora – Operational Services Parks Division Gary Greidanus, OALA Landscape Architect May 19, 2021			
38.	We note that a significant number of trees (1,492) are proposed to be removed from the site to facilitate development. Vegetation management initiatives will be required to address tree removals, tree protection and preservation, and compensation plantings in accordance with the Town's Urban Forest Management Plan, specifically Policy C – Tree Removals and Compensation (sections 6.8 & 7.0), and Policy D – Tree Protection/Preservation (sections 5.0 & 6.0). These policies are available on-line at www.aurora.ca. Any proposed tree removals prior to execution of the development agreement will require Vegetation Management Agreement with the Town.	Acknowledged. Compensation for the trees that are required to be removed will be provided in accordance with the LSRCA's Ecological Offsetting requirements or the Town's compensation protocol. A Vegetation Management Agreement will be entered into with the Town.	Schollen / Beacon
39.	The Town of Aurora Trails Master Plan identifies a neighbourhood trail within the natural heritage system Block 92 extending east west beyond the draft plan lands. In order to facilitate future construction of this trail by the Town we request conveyance of this block to the Town at no cost and free of all encumbrances.	The conveyance of these lands will occur through the Draft Plan of Subdivision application (now block 95).	Shining Hill Estates Collection Inc.
40.	We request clarification with respect to Servicing Block 93 and question if this block could facilitate a trail connection to the adjacent natural heritage system Block 92.	The Servicing Block (now Block 98) is for a storm sewer and emergency overland flow. A trail connection through here is not recommended based on the elevation difference. Alternatively, a trail connection from Street E to the natural heritage system is feasible.	Schollen / SCS
41.	We note that Block 91 is designated as parkland. We note that existing trees are located within the northwest quadrant of the park which may significantly constrain the ability to provide a senior soccer field which has been contemplated. We also note that underground stormwater storage is proposed within the park block. Parkland should be conveyed free and clear of all constraints and encumbrances.	The underground stormwater management facility has been removed from the park block and relocated across the street in block 97. An underground stormwater management facility is proposed for Block 97 which will provide an opportunity for additional open space/parking/trailhead on the surface. The existing trees within this block will be required to be removed to accommodate the proposed soccer field. Appropriate compensation will be provided. Please refer to the response to comment 38.	Shining Hill Estates Collection Inc. / Beacon / SCS / MGP
42.	Landscape plans will be required through the development agreement process to address our minimum landscape standards in accordance with the Town's Landscape Design Guidelines, available on-line.	Noted. Landscape Plans will be provided as part of the detailed design stage.	Schollen
43.	Conditions of Draft Plan Approval to address the above comments will be provided at a later date upon confirmation of the final draft plan.	Acknowledged.	N/A
Town of Aurora – Planning and Development Services Michael Bat – Traffic/Transportation Analyst July 13, 2021			
Draft Plan			
44.	A Pavement Marking and Signage Plan must be submitted for the proposed development, please note the following general requirements: a) The Pavement Marking and Signage Plan must be prepared provided in accordance to the Town guidelines; b) New signs should be installed on the proposed utility / street light poles whenever possible in order to minimize the number of new u-channel; and, c) All signage must be installed in accordance to the applicable OTM Book standards.	A Pavement Marking and Signage Plan will be prepared in future submissions once the roadway rights-of-way have been finalized, as part of the detailed design of the roadway and other infrastructure (e.g., street light pole locations; driveway locations).	Dillon
45.	The applicant must obtain confirmation from Building Division that the proposed development satisfy the traffic related Zoning By-law requirements, including but not limited to: parking supply, parking space dimensions, drive aisle widths and loading space requirements.	See responses to the Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment comments provided by the Building Division.	MGP
46.	Sidewalk must be provided on the north side of St. John's Sideroad from the westerly property limit to Yonge Street.	See response to comment 65 below.	Dillon

#	Comment	Response	Action By
47.	Active transportation elements (i.e. pedestrian and cyclist facilities) must be provided for the proposed development.	A multi-use trail is proposed on the east side of Street A. Sidewalks are proposed on the west side of Street A, and will be provided on one side of local streets as per Town standards (other than Street "C", which does not require a sidewalk based on Town guidelines). Sidewalks will connect to the Neighbourhood Park, the proposed sidewalk on the north side of St. John's Sideroad, and the proposed trail system.	Dillon
48.	<p>Sightline Assessment must be completed for the proposed Street B (both north and south legs), Street C and Lane A, at the proposed Street A, using the following TAC calculations:</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>IDS = intersection sight distance (length of the leg of sight triangle along the major road) (m)</p> <p>Vmajor = design speed of the major road (km/h) tg = time gap for minor road vehicle to enter the major road (s)</p> <p>The time gap (for Case B1, left turn from stop) is 7.5 seconds for passenger car and 9.5 seconds for single-unit truck.</p> <p>For left turns onto two-lane highways with more than two lanes, add 0.5 seconds for passenger cars and 0.7 seconds for trucks for each additional lane, from the left, in excess of one, to be crossed by the turning vehicle.</p> <p>Acceptable mitigation measures must be provided to the satisfaction of Engineering Division, where required.</p>	Sightline analyses have been undertaken and are provided in the transportation addendum letter.	Dillon
Town of Aurora – Accessibility Matesusz Zawada, Accessibility Advisor April 12, 2021			
49.	No comments on the amendments, look forward to future applications	Acknowledged.	N/A

York Region Karen Whitney, MCIP, RPP – Director of Community Planning and Development Services June 4 th , 2021			
Proposed OPA and Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) Timing			
50.	<p>A portion of lands subject to the proposed OPA are located within an area currently identified as "Rural Area" on Map 8 the YROP. York Region's pre-consultation comments indicated that bringing these lands into the "Urban Area" can only occur after completion of the Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). We also indicated that receiving an application prior to the completion of the MCR process would be considered premature and not in conformity with the current ROP.</p> <p>York Region is actively addressing this matter as part of the MCR process. Given these applications includes lands currently identified as "Rural Area", we maintain the position outlined above. Given this, York Region is of the opinion these applications are premature, do not conform to the current YROP, and that any formal decision on these applications should be held in abeyance and not occur until completion of the MCR and approval of the new ROP, where conformity with the new Regional Official -Plan (ROP) will be determined at that time.</p> <p>In light of the above, we suggest there is the option of splitting consideration of the applications so that the lands currently within the Urban Area of the YROP can be considered now by the Town and York Region, with consideration of the lands outside of the Urban Area waiting until after approval of new ROP.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. We understand that the Region of York intends to redesignate this portion of the subject lands to "Urban Area" as part of the current MCR process and that the Draft YROP (released for public review and comment November 2021) indicates the subject lands as "Urban Area" on Map 1 and "Community Area" on Map 1A. It is our understanding of the Town may proceed with adoption of the applications prior to finalization of the MCR process and therefore provide formal input into the Region's MCR process regarding these lands. We also understand that the Region can partially approve the western part of the application that is already within the Urban Area (as authorized by the Planning Act to grant all or part approval). We understand the Region will not approve the remaining part of the applications until completion of the MCR.</p> <p>It is our intent to work through this development review process in stages. The first stage would be adoption of the OPA, ZBA and Draft Plan by the Town. The Region can then review and provide partial approval for those lands currently within the Urban Area. Subsequently, the remaining approval can be granted by the Region once the Minister has approved the York Region Official Plan which brings the remaining land into the</p>	MGP

		Urban Area. We believe keeping the applications as they are is preferential to the suggestion to “split” the applications.	
51.	As part of York Region’s MCR current work, updated forecasts are being prepared and a land needs assessment being undertaken, consistent with the new Growth Plan projections and Provincial methodology. The Planning Justification Report (PJR), prepared by Malone Given Parsons, dated March 2021, indicates the purpose of the OPA application is also to help feed into the Land Needs Assessment being prepared as part of the MCR and that the goal of these applications is to indicate that the developable portions of the Subject Lands are to be brought into the Urban Area. The PJR further outlines the understanding that should the OPA application be adopted by the Town of Aurora, the final approval cannot occur until the new Region Official Plan as part of the MCR process is approved by the Province. However, we are of the opinion that Aurora Council can provide directional input to York Region with respect to these lands prior to making a formal decision on these applications, and that any formal decision on all these applications, should await finalization of the MCR process to ensure alignment of the Town’s land use direction for these lands and planning policy conformity, particularly with the YROP currently in force.	See response above.	MGP
General Comment			
52.	As these applications were submitted in advance of completion of the MCR, the PJR prepared in support of these applications refers to the current YROP (2010) but also has been prepared in the context of having the MCR completed. While it may be the intention to use the current YROP policies as a guide, not all YROP policies were assessed and addressed that are representative of the current regional planning policy context for these lands. Further, the PJR should be updated to demonstrate how these applications are in keeping with the planning and policy direction work done to date as part of the MCR. The PJR will ultimately need to be updated to assess and address conformity with the future ROP.	Please advise which policies have not been addressed. We have assessed the proposed development based on the understanding that these lands will be in the Urban Area, which is consistent with the work undertaken so far by the Region. We can update the Planning Opinion Report following the completion of the MCR if necessary.	MGP
53.	As mentioned above, about half of subject lands are entirely located within the Regional Greenlands System and contain a number of environmental features and associated hazard lands. The Regional Greenlands System identified in Map 2 of the YROP is conceptual and is intended to be identified more specifically in the local municipal official and secondary plans (policies 2.1.3 and 2.1.5). The YROP permits the boundaries of the Regional Greenlands System to be refined as outlined in policy 2.1.7, without the need for an amendment, as the result of an approved planning application where such a refinement is supported by the appropriate technical study. The PJR notes that the Shining Hill Phase 2 lands, which recently obtained approvals, are currently shown within the Greenlands System and within the Settlement Area of the ORM. While Map 2 of the YROP shows the Phase 2 lands in the Regional Greenlands System, it should be noted that these lands are subject to OPA 37 (Northwest Aurora Planning Area) where the natural heritage system was identified in more detail, and was approved by York Region in February 2001. Upon this refinement, development and site alteration is prohibited within the Regional Greenlands System and applications for development within 120 metres are required to submit an Environmental Impact Study (policy 2.1.9). Policy 2.1.10 also outlines uses permitted in the Regional Greenlands System. Any proposed development and site alteration on this site is also subject to Section 2.2 of the YROP-2010.	Similar to Phase 2, the Greenlands system limits are proposed to be refined as part of the development review process as supported by the concurrently submitted Environmental Impact Statement (prepared by Beacon Environmental), in conformity with the Regional policies.	MGP
54.	The YROP requires a minimum Vegetation Protection Zone of 30 metres for Key Natural Heritage Features located on the Oak Ridges Moraine including: wetlands, seepages areas and springs, fish habitat, permanent streams, intermittent streams, significant valleylands, significant woodlands, sand barrens, savannahs, tallgrass prairies and kettle lakes (policy 2.2.15). However, it also allows for the establishment of alternative minimum Vegetation Protection Zones (VPZ) within the “Urban Area”, where there are approved secondary plans, official plans, zoning by-laws and/or Master Environmental Servicing or Functional Servicing plans in place that have identified other standards than those identified in the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (policy 2.2.26). Policy 2.2.16 addresses vpzs outside of existing Settlement Areas.	Agreed, the ORMCP has itself similar provisions for alternate MVPZs subject to a study.	Beacon
55.	York Region relies on the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority (LSRCA) to review and provide comment on natural heritage matters related to the Regional Greenlands System and associated applicable provincial plans and defer to the LSRCA and their review of these matters. We understand the LSRCA is still in the process of undertaking their natural heritage review of these applications. York Region defers to LSRCA comments and requests a copy for our review and consideration once submitted. We note the Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE), prepared by Beacon Environmental, dated March 2021, utilizes the current YROP policies and schedules. The eastern portion of the subject lands are currently located within the “Whitebelt”/ “Rural Area”, off the ORM. As such, the NHE should be updated to reflect the applicable natural heritage policies of the LSPP for this area.	Noted.	Beacon
56.	As part of the MCR process, York Region is also undertaking an update to the schedules, including the Greenlands System and environmental features mapping. Any formal decision on these applications in advance of the MCR being completed and new ROP	As the Draft York Region Official Plan is not currently in force, conformity can only be demonstrated against the in-force York Region Official Plan.	Beacon

	approved is premature as conformity with the current YROP cannot be demonstrated. The NHE in support of these applications will need to be updated to demonstrate conformity with the environmental policies of the future ROP.		
57.	The PJR did not address the Natural Hazard policies of the PPS, 2020. LSRCA has reviewed the application through our delegated responsibility from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020. As stated in their letter dated April 29, 2021, it appears the floodplain limits for the western portion of site are still under review. The LSRCA indicated that conformity with the PPS has not been demonstrated until the floodplain review is complete and accepted. Until finalized, development, designation and zone limits may be affected. Please update the PJR accordingly.	It is our understanding the floodplain limits have been approved by the LSRCA through the detailed design of the Phase 2 development and are located outside of the proposed development. The final accepted flood lines are shown on the FSSR figures.	SCS
58.	The applications did not address the small portion of the lands located at the southwest corner of the site along St. John's Sideroad. Please update the OPA, ZBA and draft plan of subdivision applications to include this area.	These lands are located within the Phase 2 application and not within this application (the SWM Pond). As such it has not been included in this application.	MGP
59.	Confirmation is required as to the timing of the proposed St. Anne's School applications, the anticipated applications required, interim access and the project's overall phasing in relation to these applications given the approval timing identified above.	It is our understanding the St. Anne's will be submitted a site plan application by the end of the year. This is concurrent to the Zoning Bylaw Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications that have been already submitted. Access is intended to be provided through Street A and B to the St. Anne's School. St .Anne's intended to commence their inaugural school year as soon as development approvals are in place (2023).	MGP / Shining Hill
Draft OPA			
60.	Confirmation is required as to whether Schedules E and E1 need to be amended.	As per Policy 12.5.2a, the boundaries and extent of the Environmental Protection Area designation are approximate. Minor adjustments or refinements to these boundaries may occur through an Environmental Impact Statement or Natural Heritage Evaluation that demonstrates the appropriateness of the adjustment to the satisfaction of Council, in consultation with relevant agencies. Such minor adjustments or refinements will not require an amendment to this Plan. This would be the same approach for Schedule E1. As part of this application we have submitted a Natural Heritage Evaluation	MGP
61.	Confirmation is needed as to whether the OPA should remove the policy text of 16.15 from Section 16	Section 16.15 is not applicable to the Subject Lands. Section 16.14 is applicable. The OPA now also proposes to remove the policy text in addition to removing the reference on the Schedule.	MGP
62.	Confirmation is required as to why a portion of the lands currently designated as Supporting Area Open Space on the St. Anne's School site (Block 90) is proposed to be redesignated as Suburban Residential (SR-1).	This is a refinement to reflect the developable area of the St. Anne's School Block to clearly define their boundary. A significant portion of this area has also been proposed to be redesignated to Supporting Area Open Space from Suburban Residential. We can remove the refinements to the Supporting Area Open Space and Suburban Residential designations if necessary.	MGP
Zoning By-law Amendment			
63.	Please updated the draft ZBA to include a Holding (H) provision related to servicing for all residential zone categories as outlined in Infrastructure Asset Management's (IAM) comments in the attached memorandum.	The Draft ZBA has been updated.	MGP
Draft Plan of Subdivision			
64.	Confirmation is required as to how frontage and access is proposed to be obtained for Block 90 (St. Anne's School) as it does not appear to be shown on the Plan. Please revise the draft plan of subdivision accordingly.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to provide an access block for the school (Block 101) on Street B.	MGP
Transportation Planning			
65.	The Applicant is required to provide a multi-use path facility along St. John's Sideroad from the western limit of the Shining Hill development Phase 2, easterly to the Yonge Street and St John's Sideroad intersection. This facility will provide both future residents of	The applicant commits to providing active transportation connectivity along St. John's Sideroad between the subject site and Yonge Street.	Dillon / MGP

	<p>the Phase 2 and the subject application a facility to safely travel to the intersection of Yonge Street and St John's Sideroad. The applicant shall provide a detailed design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Walking and Cycling Connectivity to the intersection of Yonge Street and St John's Side Road will connect to the existing facilities on the east of Yonge Street. i. It should also be noted that based on the existing transit routes available in the area (provided in Figure 3 of the Transportation Study) that the nearest routes are accessed from the intersection of Yonge Street and St John's Sideroad. 	<p>The project team have undertaken initial field and desktop investigations of constraints and opportunities along the corridor. At this time it is possible that a sidewalk will be proposed (rather than a multi-use path), due to the constraints closer to Yonge Street (the limited width along the north side of the bridge over Tannery Creek; the proximity of the creek to the roadway farther to the west), the relatively low active transportation demand, and the temporary nature of the facilities (i.e., would be replaced when St. John's Sideroad is widened).</p> <p>It is anticipated that a functional design of this facility will be included in future engineering submissions for the subject site.</p> <p>In the longer term, it is anticipated that a permanent sidewalk and/or multi-use path would be part of the St. John's Sideroad widening.</p>	
66.	<p>As a minimum requirement York Region will require the applicant to make physical modifications to widen the eastbound approach of St John's Sideroad at Yonge Street and to provide a multi-use path. As such, it is recommended that a comprehensive design provided to extend the eastbound left-turn and right-turns lanes. This will provide physical capacity for interim growth prior to the widening of St. John's Sideroad and will reduce the likelihood that queues will extend through the Willow Farm Lane intersection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Table 11 did not include a summary for the Eastbound Right-Turn lane at the intersection of Yonge Street and St John's Side Road. Table 11 shall be updated accordingly. The design shall be provided to accommodate the queue identified by the Transportation analysis. b) Based on the results of Table 11, under the 2028 Future Total analysis, the Eastbound Left-Turns queues (87m) at the intersection of Yonge Street and St John's Sideroad will exceed the available storage of approximately 65m. A preliminary design shall be provided to demonstrate the proposed improvements to the eastbound approach. 	<p>A preliminary design has been prepared to illustrate a widening of St. John's Sideroad on the eastbound approach to Yonge Street. The eastbound left turn lane and the second eastbound through lane have been lengthened to the extent feasible while maintaining reasonable taper lengths, avoiding the culvert leading to Tannery Creek, and minimizing impacts to the environmental lands on the south side of the road. The proposed lane dimensions are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastbound left turn lane: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 61 m taper ○ 80 m storage • Eastbound second through lane: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 50 m taper ○ 90 m storage <p>Table 11 does not include details for the eastbound curb lane because it is a shared through/right turn lane rather than an exclusive right turn lane. The results for the eastbound through movement apply to both through lanes and account for right turns made from the shared lane.</p>	Dillon / SCS
67.	<p>The Transportation Study concludes that traffic signals are not warranted at St. John's Sideroad/Willow Farm Lane, therefore introduction of traffic signals will need to be approved by Regional Council. Please note that, if traffic signals are approved, that all construction costs and 10-year maintenance will be borne by the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Applicant will be required to provide an intersection design that demonstrates that the intersection will provide dedicated turn lanes, and pedestrian/cycling facilities on the north side of St John's Side Road. The intersection, pedestrian/cycling facilities shall be designed to Regional Standards. Given the westbound through volumes, the design shall provide two westbound through lanes, a westbound through and a through-right turn lane which continues through the intersection. The through-right turn lane shall taper back to one lane on the west side of Willow Farm Lane. b) It should be noted that there are existing sightline issues at this intersection. Therefore, the applicant shall address all of the sightline issues for this proposed intersection. This includes the provision of 15 m x 15 m daylight triangles. 	<p>Updated traffic signal warrants are discussed in the transportation addendum letter. Traffic signals are anticipated to be warranted (on the basis of the OTM Book 12 four-hour warrant) in approximately 2025 (i.e., by the third year of operations at the proposed school, depending on the pace of enrolment increases).</p> <p>A conceptual intersection design has been prepared that includes a westbound right turn lane and an eastbound left turn lane. An exclusive westbound right turn lane is proposed rather than a shared through/right turn lane. A second through lane is not required from a capacity perspective, and the limited length upstream and downstream from the intersection would yield limited benefits in terms of capacity.</p> <p>Details pertaining to pedestrian/cycling facilities on the north side of St. John's Sideroad are still under development (see item 65).</p>	Dillon

		15 m x 15 m daylight triangles will be provided on the north leg of the intersection. These are shown in the proposed draft plan.	
		No changes to the vertical alignment of St. John's Sideroad are proposed. The vertical alignment of the road is an existing condition at an existing intersection and is not affected by the construction of an additional leg on the north side of the intersection. The proposed installation of traffic signals will mitigate sightline concerns for motorists turning left onto St. John's Sideroad. In the longer term, the St. John's Sideroad widening project presents an opportunity to adjust the roadway profile	
68.	The applicant is advised that no direct vehicular access will be permitted to St. John's Sideroad from blocks 1, 80-88, 92 or 94.	Noted. Access is proposed to these blocks from within the draft plan – Streets B and E.	Dillon
Sustainable Mobility			
69.	A TDM Checklist shall be provided as per the Region's Transportation Mobility Plan Guidelines for New Developments (Table 13) and shall include a TDM Communication Strategy Outreach which shall identify a physical location for transit incentive distribution and sustainable transportation information. An associated cost of a rental venue for the outreach shall be provided if an on-site space is not available (e.g. condo lobby, meeting room) this can include a local community centre – a line item estimate of \$800 is recommended. The applicant is responsible for the coordination and for providing a venue for the distribution of incentives. Each event, approximately 4 hours of staff time, can serve approximately 150 residential units. The applicant shall coordinate specific event details with York Region/York Region Transit staff allowing a minimum of 2 months notice.	A TDM checklist has been included in the transportation addendum letter.	Dillon
Traffic Signal Operations			
70.	Signal Splits and Phasing diagrams for the Bathurst/St. John's intersection should not have gray bands. The splits should be updated to address this.	The grey bands are intentional and reflect the existing signal timings and operations. They have been left in place in the updated analyses. Further details are provided in the transportation addendum letter.	Dillon
71.	The minimum initial of 7 seconds for through movements used in the analysis for the Yonge/St. John's intersection is not consistent with the existing timing plans nor the Region's traffic signal operation standards. This should also be updated.	The minimum initial intervals have been corrected in the updated total future analyses (see transportation addendum letter). The existing and future background analyses were not adjusted because the revised parameter did not affect the results (the green intervals in question were already found to be extended beyond the updated minimum initial interval in the analyses).	Dillon
72.	Regarding the analysis for the proposed signalized intersection of Willow Farm Lane/Street 'A'/St. John's Sideroad: a) Minimum initial of 5 seconds is not consistent with Region's signal operation standards. b) Flashing Don't Walk time does not appear sufficient to accommodate pedestrian crossing in N-S direction.	The minimum initial intervals at this intersection have been increased to 10 seconds north/south and 20 seconds east/west. The flashing don't walk interval has been reviewed and adjusted. Further details and revised analysis results are provided in the transportation addendum letter.	Dillon
Transit			
73.	Existing YRT transit services operate on Yonge Street vicinity of the subject lands.	Acknowledged.	Dillon
74.	The applicant is advised to coordinate with the Town of Aurora to provide sidewalk facilities connecting from the internal road network to the Regional road network from Willow Farm Lane to Yonge Street.	See response to comment #65.	Dillon
Infrastructure Asset Management (IAM)			
75.	IAM has reviewed these applications in conjunction with the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSSMR) dated March 2021, prepared by SCS Consulting Group. IAM provides the following comments:	Refer to responses below.	SCS
Servicing Allocation			
76.	All residential development in the Town of Aurora requires servicing capacity allocation prior to final approval of the subject development. If the Town of Aurora does not grant allocation from the existing capacity assignments to date, the build out of the subject lands as proposed may require additional Regional infrastructure based on conditions of future capacity assignment, which may include: • Duffin Creek WPCP Outfall Modification – 2021 expected completion • Interim Solutions for Aurora, Newmarket and East Gwillimbury – 2021 and 2022 anticipated commissionings	Noted.	SCS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Reclamation Centre - 2026 anticipated commissioning pending outcome of the IEA Other projects as may be identified in future studies. <p>The timing of the above infrastructure is the current estimate and may change as each infrastructure project progresses and is provided for information purposes only.</p>		
Comments on the FSSMR:			
77.	<p>Municipal Servicing</p> <p>The FSSMR indicates that the proposed development is serviced by Town of Aurora wastewater and water infrastructure in the St. John's Sideroad right-of-way. However, it is IAM's understanding that the FSSMR will be further revised to verify the adequacy of the existing water system to maintain service levels, including fire flows. The Owner shall forward the revised FSR to York Region for review and record.</p>	A Watermain Hydraulic Analysis has been completed by Municipal Engineering Solutions and is included in the revised FSSR (Appendix H)	SCS
Zoning By-law Amendment – Holding (H) Provision:			
78.	<p>For all lands, the Holding (H) provisions of Section 36 of the Ontario Planning Act shall be used in conjunction with all residential zone categories in order to ensure that final plan approval and development of these lands does not occur until such time as the Holding (H) symbol is removed in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Planning Act. The Zoning Bylaw shall specify the terms under which Council may consider the removal of the Holding (H) symbol. Said terms shall include a minimum of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town of Aurora approves a servicing allocation to the development proposed on the subject lands that is not dependent upon the completion of any new infrastructure; or, York Region has advised in writing that the required infrastructure to support the capacity assignment associated with the development will be completed within a time period acceptable to the Region (usually 6 to 36 months depending on the complexity of the development) to permit the plan registration; or, The Regional Commissioner of Environmental Services confirms servicing allocation for this development by a suitable alternative method and the Town of Aurora allocates the capacity to the development. 	Noted and the Draft Zoning Bylaw Amendment has been revised.	MGP
Development Planning			
79.	<p>Regional staff encourages the proposed development to have an integrated and innovative approach to water management, be water efficient, and minimize stormwater volumes and contaminant loads and maximize infiltration through an integrated treatment approach (Policy 5.2.11). Staff also encourage the development to be designed to achieve energy efficiency levels that exceed the Ontario Building Code (Policy 5.2.20); to achieve 10% greater water efficiency than the Ontario Building Code (Policy 5.2.22); be designed to maximize solar gains, be constructed in a manner that facilitates future solar installations (i.e. solar ready) (Policy 5.2.26); and, incorporate green building standards, such as LEED®, ENGERGY STAR®, or other emerging technologies (Policy 7.5.12).</p>	<p>Refer to the FSSR for a description of the treatment train approach for stormwater management. The approach maximizes infiltration where feasible and provides innovative solutions to remove contaminants and minimize runoff volume.</p> <p>Shining Hill will explore energy efficiency building design options as part of the detailed design.</p>	SCS / Shining Hill
80.	<p>To promote sustainable new residential developments beyond Ontario Building Code requirements, the Region offers development incentive programs that benefit local municipalities and development proponents/applicants. The Sustainable Development Through LEED® (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) program provides water and wastewater servicing capacity assignment credits (up to 30 per cent) for new residential high-rise buildings four storeys or higher. The Servicing Incentive Program (SIP) provides water and wastewater servicing capacity assignment credits (up to 20 per cent) for new residential grade-related developments that are a maximum of three storeys in height. The applicant is encouraged to participate in this program and more information is available at www.york.ca/waterincentives.</p>	Shining Hill will explore these programs.	Shining Hill
Water Resources			
81.	<p>Water Resources staff provide the following comments as it relates to Source Protection policy. Should the proposal change and/or the application be amended, Water Resources will require recirculation for comment and/or approval.</p>	Acknowledged.	Golder
Recharge Management (LSRCA):			
82.	<p>The property is within the WHPA-Q (Recharge Management Area). As such the SGBLS Source Protection Plan water quantity recharge maintenance policy will apply. The proponent will be required to maintain recharge as demonstrated through a hydrogeological study that shows the existing (i.e. pre proposed development) water balance can be maintained in the future (i.e. post proposed development). The contact person for the scoping and review of the water balance is Shelly Cuddy at LSRCA. The approving body for compliance with the policy will be the local municipality.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. On a site-wide basis, average annual infiltration is estimated to increase by 3% as a result of the development with LID mitigation, as described in the Hydrogeological Investigation.</p> <p>The site-wide mitigated-post-development infiltration rate is therefore considered to approximate (i.e., is within +/- 10% of) pre-development conditions, and therefore no impacts to groundwater recharge are expected as a result of site development.</p>	Golder

Area of Concern, Groundwater			
83.	The site is in an identified area of concern due to known high water table conditions and confined artesian aquifer conditions, which could have geotechnical implications with respect to construction activities including, but not limited to, dewatering (short-term or long-term), foundation construction, and building stability.	Acknowledged.	Golder
84.	As such, Water Resources recommends that any geotechnical and hydrogeological investigations undertaken by the owner evaluate the existence of any third party dewatering systems and take into account the fact that groundwater levels may currently be artificially depressed at the site due to third party permanent dewatering systems in the area. Because new development should not rely on the influence of nearby third party dewatering systems in its geotechnical and hydrogeological studies, any assessment for the subject site must account for third party dewatering systems in the surrounding area. It is recommended that the Owner arrange for a pre-consultation meeting with the applicable regulatory agencies, including the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) to assist in this process. Also, please note that the Environmental Monitoring and Enforcement group of the Environmental Services department should be contacted at sewerusebylaw@york.ca for a dewatering permit, if required.	Based on a review of available mapping on the Oak Ridges Moraine (YPDT-CAMC) Groundwater Management Tool (https://oakridgeswater.ca/), there are no active PTTWs located within 500 m of the site. As such, it is our opinion that the relatively shallow groundwater levels measured at the site as part of Golder's monitoring program conducted between November 2020 and November 2021 are not artificially depressed as a result of any nearby third-party permanent dewatering systems.	Golder
Dewatering Plan (DWP) Requirements:			
Due to the above-noted concerns, the following comments are provided and are to be addressed with the next submission, and prior to draft plan of subdivision approval:			
85.	The owner shall arrange, to the satisfaction of the Water Resources group of York Region, for the proper assessment, design, and supervision of temporary construction dewatering on the subject property. The assessment, design and construction of the construction dewatering system(s) shall be based on conservative estimates of groundwater levels given that current groundwater levels may be influenced by third-party groundwater control systems in the area.	As discussed in Section 7.0 of the Hydrogeological Investigation report, a detailed assessment of construction dewatering needs and potential impacts to receptors should be carried out at the time of detailed design and in conjunction with obtaining dewatering permitting from the MECP. The detailed assessment will consider the findings of the seasonal groundwater monitoring program at the site. Also see response to comment 86, below.	Golder
86.	The owner shall arrange, to the satisfaction of the Water Resources group of York Region, for the proper assessment, design, and supervision of permanent groundwater control (including dewatering and/or drainage) on the subject property. The assessment, design and construction of the permanent groundwater control system(s) shall be based on conservative estimates of groundwater levels given that current groundwater levels may be influenced by third-party groundwater control systems in the area.	Based on the current proposed development plan which includes underground servicing trenches to depths of 2 m to 6.5 m below grade, no permanent groundwater control is anticipated to be required at the site. We understand that this comment may have related to the former mid-rise development block and any associated underground parking structures, however the mid-rise block is no longer proposed.	Golder
87.	The Owner shall provide confirmation to the Water Resources group of York Region that they have received, where necessary, from Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), Permits To Take Water for the groundwater withdrawals associated with the temporary and permanent dewatering systems on the subject property as well as any discharge permitted associated with the subject property.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill / Golder
88.	The Owner shall undertake a Hydrogeologic Assessment for the design of the temporary and permanent groundwater control systems on the Subject Lands, to the satisfaction of the Water Resources group of York Region, to determine the adequacy of the existing proposed systems under conditions where third party groundwater control systems are not in place. The design of the groundwater control systems shall be based on true static groundwater levels and shall not rely on third-party groundwater control. The hydrogeologic assessment shall include an assessment of the local and regional hydrogeology of the area, including all relevant aquifer units.	Acknowledged. See response to comments 85 and 86 above.	Shining Hill / Golder
89.	The Owner shall assess the geotechnical recommendations for the subject site, in conjunction with the results of the Hydrogeologic Assessment outlined in iv. above.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill / Golder
90.	The Owner will be required to submit detailed engineering drawing for the building and permanent groundwater control systems to the Water Resources group for review and approval. This requirement will be a condition of draft plan approval.	See response to comment 86 above.	Shining Hill / Golder
Section 59:			
91.	A Section 59 Notice from York Region's Water Resources group is required prior to the filing of any future development or planning applications within Wellhead B and C.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill / Golder
Wellhead Protection Area (B, C & D) on ORM:			
92.	Prior to draft plan subdivision approval confirmation that none of the following activities will be occurring (storage, manufacture of materials or uses of) is required: c) petroleum-based fuels and or solvents;	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill / Golder

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) pesticides, herbicides, fungicides or fertilizers; e) construction equipment; f) inorganic chemicals; g) road salt and contaminants as identified by the Province; h) the generation and storage of hazardous waste or liquid industrial waste, and waste disposal sites and facilities; i) organic soil conditioning sites and the storage and application of agricultural and non-agricultural source organic materials; and, j) snow storage and disposal facilities. 		
Wellhead Protection Area (B, C & D) off ORM:			
93.	<p>Prior to Draft Plan of Subdivision approval, the Owner shall conduct and submit a Source Water Impact and Assessment Mitigation Plan (SWIAMP), to the satisfaction of the Region, to identify and address any potential water quality and water quantity threats to the municipal groundwater supplies. The SWIAMP shall be prepared by a qualified professional, to the satisfaction of Regional Environmental Services staff in the Water Resources group. The SWIAMP must follow the York Region document Guidance for Proposed Developments in Wellhead Protection Areas in York Region (October 2014). A SWIAMP is required for any of the activities listed below if they will occur on the site for the storage or manufacture of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. petroleum-based fuels and or solvents; b. pesticides, herbicides, fungicides or fertilizers; c. construction equipment; d. inorganic chemicals; e. road salt and contaminants as identified by the Province; f. the generation and storage of hazardous waste or liquid industrial waste, and a waste disposal sites and facilities; g. organic soil conditioning sites and the storage and application of agricultural and non-agricultural source organic materials; and, h. snow storage and disposal facilities. If a SWIAMP is not required, a letter prepared by a qualified professional will be required in its place stating that the above noted activities will not be occurring. 	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill / Golder
Recommended Best Management Practices			
Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Support:			
94.	For your reference the Oak Ridges Moraine (YPDT-CAMC) Groundwater Management Tool: https://oakridgeswater.ca/ can be accessed for geological data in support of geotechnical and hydrogeological analysis.	Acknowledged.	n/a
Construction Best Management Practices:			
95.	As the site is within a wellhead protection area, Water Resources does encourage the use of best management practices during construction and post construction with respect to the handling and storage of chemicals (such as used oil, degreasers and salt) on site. It is strongly recommended that Risk Management Measures are put in place with respect to chemical use and storage including spill kits, secondary containment, a spill response plan and training.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill / Golder
Salt Management:			
96.	<p>As the site is within a vulnerable area, Water Resources recommends the use of a contractor who is certified by Smart About Salt, and use of best management practices identified in the TAC Synthesis of Best Management Practices for Salt and Snow are followed: https://www.tac-atc.ca/sites/tac-atc.ca/files/site/doc/resources/roadsalt-1.pdf.</p> <p>If the proposed development includes a parking lot, Water Resources recommends following the Parking Lot Design Guidelines: https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Shared%20Documents/reports/Parking-Lot-Design-Guidelines-Salt-Reduction.pdf</p>	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill

107.	Mid/High Rise Block approx. 200 apts: If this project has plans for apartment buildings consisting of more than two adjoining units, sharing a common indoor entrance, the developer/owner must supply, install and maintain a centralized mailbox facility to Canada Post's specifications. Please see attached linked for delivery standards: http://www.canadapost.ca/cpo/mr/assets/pdf/business/standardsmanual_en.pdf	The proposed development has removed the midrise block.	Shining Hill
Municipal requirements			
108.	Please update our office if the project description changes so that we may determine the impact (if any).	The proposal has been revised as per the concurrently submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision.	n/a
109.	Should this subdivision application be approved, please provide notification of the new civic addresses as soon as possible.	Acknowledged.	n/a
Developer timeline, obligations and installation			
110.	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 at least 1 year in advance.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
111.	If applicable please ensure that any street facing installs have a depressed curb or curb cut. Contact Canada Post Corporation – Delivery Planning for further details.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
112.	Please ensure that any condominiums apartments with more than 99 units, incorporates a mailroom with rear loading lock box assemblies (mailboxes).	The proposed development has removed the midrise block.	Shining Hill
113.	Finally, please provide the expected first occupancy date and ensure the future site is accessible to Canada Post 24 hours a day.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
114.	It is recommended that the owners contact Canada Post as completion draws near so as to finalize the location and compartment they will be assigned to.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
115.	Please include Appendix A & B along with the developer timeline, obligations and installation within the subdivision agreement for this application. This particular development is subject to the Canada Post clearance letter for approval.	Acknowledged.	n/a
Appendix A			
116.	Shining Hill Estate Collections Inc. covenants and agrees to provide the Town of Aurora with evidence that satisfactory arrangements, financial and otherwise, have been made with Canada Post Corporation for the installation of Lockbox Assemblies as required by Canada Post Corporation and as shown on the approved engineering design drawings/Draft Plan, at the time of sidewalk and/or curb installation. Shining Hill Estate Collections Inc. further covenants and agrees to provide notice to prospective purchasers of the locations of Lockbox Assemblies and that home/business mail delivery will be provided via Lockbox Assemblies or Mailroom.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
Appendix B			
Additional Developer Requirements:			
117.	The developer will consult with Canada Post to determine suitable permanent locations for the Community Mail Boxes or Lock box Assemblies (Mail Room). The developer will then indicate these locations on the appropriate servicing plans.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
118.	The Builder/Owner/Developer will confirm to Canada Post that the final secured permanent locations for the Community Mailboxes will not be in conflict with any other utility; including hydro transformers, bell pedestals, cable pedestals, flush to grade communication vaults, landscaping enhancements (tree planting) and bus pads.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
119.	The owner/developer will agree to prepare and maintain an area of compacted gravel to Canada Post's specifications to serve as a temporary Community Mailbox location. This location will be in a safe area away from construction activity in order that Community Mailboxes may be installed to service addresses that have occupied prior to the pouring of the permanent mailbox pads. This area will be required to be prepared a minimum of 30 days prior to the date of first occupancy.	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
120.	The owner/developer will install concrete pads at each of the Community Mailbox locations as well as any required walkways across the boulevard and any required curb depressions for wheelchair access as per Canada Post's concrete pad specification drawings	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
121.	The developer agrees to provide the following for each Community Mail Boxes or Lock Box Assemblies, and to include these requirements on the appropriate servicing plans: (if applicable) (a) Any required walkway across the boulevard, per municipal standards (b) If applicable, any required curb depression for wheelchair access, with an opening of at least two meters (consult Canada Post for detailed specifications)	Acknowledged.	Shining Hill
Central York Fire Services Shane Stein April 29 th , 2021 OPA202102			

122.	CYFS has no objection to the proposed Official Plan Amendment for this application.	Acknowledged.	n/a
OPA202101			
123.	A minimum of temporary street signage must be in place to assist emergency responses prior to construction of buildings.	These items will be dealt with at the detailed design stage.	n/a
124.	All roads must be complete to a minimum base coat and be able to support emergency vehicles with site access acceptable to Central York Fire Services prior to any building construction.		
125.	Plans shall include provisions for emergency vehicle access to all structures to be maintained during construction.		
126.	Access to Blocks 90 and 89 for emergency vehicles shall be in accordance with Ontario Building Code for the proposed school (Block 90) and mid/high rise (Block 89) prior to any occupancy of such buildings.		
127.	Water supply for firefighting, including hydrants must be installed and operational prior to construction of buildings.		
128.	A schedule of Firebreak lots/blocks is to be submitted to Central York Fire Services for approval prior to construction of buildings. Builders/developers will not make application for building permits for designated firebreak lots/blocks without written release of firebreak designation from Central York Fire Services.		
129.	CYFS has no objection to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment Application for the above referenced file.	Acknowledged.	n/a
Hydro One Networks Inc. Dolly Shetty – Real Estate Assistant Land Use Planning April 8 th , 2021			
130.	We are in receipt of Application SUB-2021-01-162 dated March 19, 2021. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One's 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only. For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities' please consult your local area Distribution Supplier. To confirm if Hydro One is your local distributor please follow the following link: http://www.hydroone.com/StormCenter3/ If Hydro One is your local area Distribution Supplier, please contact Customer Service at 1-888-664-9376 or e-mail CustomerCommunications@HydroOne.com to be connected to your Local Operations Centre	Acknowledged.	n/a

Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority Dave Ruggle, BAA, MCIP, RPP – Planner II April 29, 2021		
Recommendation		
131.	We recommend these applications for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and draft plan of subdivision be deferred until such time as the LSRCA completes its review of the technical studies and reports	Acknowledged. n/a
Site Characteristics		
132.	Existing mapping indicates the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subject property is located within the Recharge Management Area (WHPA Q2) the subject property is partially within an area governed by Ontario Regulation 179/06 for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meander belt erosion hazard associated with two (2) tributaries of Tannery Creek; Apparent valleylands, characterized by steep slopes, associated with one (1) tributary of Tannery Creek; Riverine flooding during a Regional Storm Event associated with one (1) tributary of Tannery Creek; a Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) Non-Provincially Significant Wetland/Non-PSW and its associated adjacent lands. the area of the proposed development on site is within the Settlement Area Oak Ridges Moraine Significant Woodlands are shown on the subject lands Designated: Existing Major Institutional, Suburban Residential (SR-1), Core Area Open Space and Supporting Area Open Space Zoned Oak Ridges Moraine Rural General (RU-ORM), Rural (RU) and Institutional (I) 	Acknowledged. N/A
Delegated Responsibility and Statutory Comments:		
133.	LSRCA has reviewed the application through our delegated responsibility from the Province to represent provincial interests regarding natural hazards identified in Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement. Section 3.1 of the PPS relating to natural hazards generally directs development away from hazardous lands adjacent to rivers and streams and prohibits development and site alteration within the floodway. The development, as proposed, appears to be outside of the regulatory floodplain limits on the east limit of the development site. We understand the floodplain limits on the west portion of the site remains under review through a separate application. Conformity with the PPS will be demonstrated upon finalization of this review. A geotechnical and slope stability study has been provided wherein the conclusions support a 6m development setback from the top of stable slope. Conformity with the PPS has not been demonstrated until the floodplain review is complete and accepted.	It is our understanding the floodplain limits have been approved by the LSRCA through the detailed design of the Phase 2 development and are located outside of the proposed development. The final accepted flood lines are shown on the FSSR figures. SCS
134.	LSRCA has reviewed the application as per our responsibilities as a regulatory authority under Ontario Regulation 179/06. This regulation, made under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act, enables conservation authorities to regulate development in or adjacent to river or stream valleys, Great Lakes and inland lake shorelines, watercourses, hazardous lands and wetlands. Development taking place on these lands may require permission from the conservation authority to confirm that the control of flooding, erosion, dynamic beaches, pollution or the conservation of land are not affected. LSRCA also regulates the alteration to or interference in any way with a watercourse or wetland.	Acknowledged. n/a
135.	The subject site is partially regulated within an area governed by Ontario Regulation 179/06 under the Conservation Authorities Act. A permit from the Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority will be required prior to any development taking place.	Acknowledged. n/a
Advisory Comments		
136.	LSRCA is reviewing the application through our responsibilities as a service provider to the Town of Aurora in that we provide plan review services related to watershed planning, natural heritage, stormwater management and hydrogeology through a MOU as well as through our role as a public body, pursuant to the Planning Act. The proposed development meets the definition of “Major Development” as provided by the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan as well as the Phosphorus Offsetting Policy, accordingly, Designated Policies 4.8 and 6.40 of the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan will apply to this proposal. The proposal is also required to satisfy the Lake Simcoe Phosphorus Offsetting Policy.	Acknowledged. n/a
137.	Technical comments related to Stormwater Management prepared by Phil Thase can be found within the attached comment matrix. Please include a completed copy of the comment matrix as part of the next technical submission.	See responses to these comments in the matrix. n/a
138.	Several Natural Heritage features are located on or in close proximity to the site. Proposed development needs to meet the “no negative impact” test and demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts to the natural features and their ecological functions per Section 2.1 of	Acknowledged. Beacon

	the Provincial Policy Statement. A Natural Heritage Evaluation has been submitted to assess these features and determine an appropriate limit of disturbance/development footprint.		
139.	Technical comments related to Natural Heritage will be provided under separate cover once the review has been completed.	Acknowledged.	n/a
140.	<p>LSRCA has reviewed the application in terms of the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan, prepared under the Clean Water Act, 2006. The Source Protection Plan came into effect on July 1, 2015 and contains policies to protect sources of municipal drinking water from existing and future land use activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The subject lands are within the Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA-Q) and as such are subject to the policy LUP-12 and LUP 13 of the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan https://ourwatershed.ca/resources/reports-and-plans/source-protection-plan/ 	Acknowledged.	n/a
Summary			
141.	<p>Given the above comments, it is the opinion of the LSRCA that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency with Section 3.1 of the PPS has not been demonstrated (under review); Ontario Regulation 179/06 does apply to the subject site. A permit from the Conservation Authority will be required prior to any development taking place; The subject site is located within an area that is subject to the policies contained in the Source Protection Plan. The applications be deferred until such time as the LSRCA have completed the technical review of the submitted reports and studies. 	The above and revised reports address concerns raised and demonstrate consistency with Section 3.1 of the PPS. We acknowledge that a permit will be required from the CA prior to development and is within a Source Protection Plan area.	Beacon
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority - LSRCA First Submission Hydrogeology Review			
April 26 th , 2021			
General			
142.	<p>Re: Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>Groundwater level monitoring was undertaken between September 2020 and January 2021. Given the results of preliminary groundwater level monitoring, meeting the 1 m separation between the LID and water table may be challenging throughout the site. We agree with the report recommendations that groundwater level monitoring should continue. Determining the seasonally high water table is necessary to support the design of infiltration LID design and dewatering requirements.</p>	Groundwater level monitoring was conducted by Soil Eng. on September 29, 2020, and by Golder on eleven events between November 2020 and November 2021. Automatic data loggers were also installed in four monitoring wells [BH102, BH107, BH206-D (deep) and BH206-S (shallow)] on December 1, 2020, set to record every four hours and downloaded on November 12, 2021. It is recommended that the data loggers remain to continue monitoring seasonal groundwater levels through the detailed design stage for comparison to final grades and the inverts of LID measures.	Golder
143.	<p>Re: Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>A preliminary dewatering assessment has been undertaken, however it is recommended that this assessment be updated once spring groundwater levels have been obtained and site plan elevations have been finalized.</p>	Based on the groundwater level monitoring in 142 (above), the preliminary assessment considers inferred spring groundwater level conditions. As discussed in Section 7.0 of the Hydrogeological Investigation report, a detailed assessment of construction dewatering needs and potential impacts to receptors should be carried out at the time of detailed design and in conjunction with obtaining dewatering permitting from the MECP. The detailed assessment will consider the findings of the seasonal groundwater monitoring program at the site.	Golder
144.	<p>Re: Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>The tributaries surrounding the site have been identified as cold water within the hydrogeological investigation and shallow groundwater flow on the site is interpreted to flow in an eastern direction toward Tannery Creek, in a northeast direction towards the Tannery Creek North Tributary and in a south to southwest direction towards the Tannery Creek West Tributary and the pond and wetland.</p> <p>Although the site is surrounded by these features, no impact assessment on how the development may change groundwater/surface water inputs to these features was provided within the report. Please provide more information supported by the water balance assessment on</p>	A catchment-based water balance for these features has been provided in the revised Hydrogeological Investigation. A summary of the findings and discussion of potential impacts are summarized in Sections 6.2 to 6.6 of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation report.	Golder

	how the proposed development will potentially impact the surface drainage, infiltration/recharge and groundwater flow that supports these features.		
145.	<p>Re: Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>Three water well records have been found for wells on the east side of the site and it was noted that the condition of these wells is unknown at this time. Mapping shows the wells are located at the eastern development boundary, however water well records are known to have inaccurate coordinates therefore they may be outside the proposed development boundary. Every effort should be made to locate and decommission existing wells in accordance with O.Reg. 903.</p>	Acknowledged.	Golder
Water Balance			
146.	<p>Re: FSSR & Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>The FSSR indicates a development area of 13.87 ha whereas the total site area within the water balance assessment is 141,000 m² (14.1 ha). Please ensure a consistent site area is used within both documents.</p>	The areas in the assessments have been coordinated.	SCS/ Golder
147.	<p>Re: FSSR & Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>Both reports indicate blocks 89 and 90 (mid/high rise & school) will undergo a separate site plan application. Given the specific site plans have not been provided within this application a post-development water balance assessment cannot be accurately undertaken and therefore these blocks should be removed entirely from the water balance assessment which will be required under subsequent planning applications.</p>	Note that a mid-rise block is no longer proposed. While we agree that the school block will undergo a separate site plan application, it is a block in the subdivision that needs to be created through the subdivision process. Therefore, it must be included in the studies to establish the criteria when it proceeds to the Site Plan control stage. The site specific details will be provided at the detailed design stage (site plan control) stage for the school block.	SCS/ Golder
148.	<p>Re: Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>The water balance does not provide an assessment of tributaries, wetland and woodland features on and/or adjacent to the site. It remains unclear which catchment(s) support the features on or near the site and if the drainage volumes to these features will be maintained post development. Please provide a catchment-based water balance assessment to quantify the amount of infiltration/runoff that is required to mitigate the change in drainage patterns as a result of the proposed development. The water balance should provide the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A figure that clearly indicates pre- and post-development drainage areas as shown within the water balance calculations. 2. Quantify the amount of water (runoff/infiltration) that will be contributing to each feature pre- and post-development. 3. Demonstrate how pre-development runoff to each feature will be maintained; and 4. Demonstrate how the infiltration deficit is being mitigated throughout the site and if groundwater flow patterns are expected to change as a result. 	A catchment-based water balance for the features, including corresponding drainage area figures, are provided in the revised Hydrogeological Investigation. A summary of the findings and discussion of potential impacts are summarized in Sections 6.2 to 6.6 of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation report.	Golder
149.	The post-development water balance is based on estimated percentages for impervious areas. These areas should be updated/confirmed at detailed design once more accurate information can be ascertained.	Acknowledged. The imperviousness of each land use type is consistent with the Proposed Storm Drainage Plan prepared by SCS, as outlined in Section 5.1.2 of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation Report.	SCS / Golder
Mitigation			
150.	<p>Re: Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>A number of infiltration LIDs have been proposed throughout the site. However, without knowing the pre-development runoff/infiltration volumes within each catchment it cannot be determined whether the proposed plan will provide the necessary mitigation ensuring no impact to the surrounding features. See comment #7 - once a catchment-based water balance assessment has been undertaken and the target infiltration vs runoff volumes are quantified they should be used to determine if the proposed mitigation plan is adequate.</p>	A catchment-based water balance for these features has been provided in the revised Hydrogeological Investigation. A summary of the findings and discussion of potential impacts are summarized in Sections 6.2 to 6.6 of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation report.	Golder
151.	<p>Re: Hydrogeological Investigation</p> <p>Depths and soil descriptions have been provided for all Guelph Permeameter test locations, however the site will have significant grading and there is no information on how each of these tests corresponds to the elevations/soils of the proposed infiltration facilities. Please provide additional information relating the location/elevation of each test to the elevation and soils in which the infiltration LID will be situated.</p>	As noted in Section 7 of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation report, it is recommended that additional soil infiltration rate testing be conducted once LID locations and grading plans are determined during detailed design.	Golder

152.	Re: Hydrogeological Investigation 5 Guelph Permeameter tests were conducted throughout the site to obtain preliminary infiltration rates which were used in the initial LID design. Given the number of LID locations, variability in soils, and elevations, it is recommended that further testing be completed once LID locations and grading plans are finalized to fill in gaps of where no testing was done.	As noted in Section 7 of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation report, it is recommended that additional soil infiltration rate testing be conducted once LID locations and grading plans are determined during detailed design.	Golder
153.	Re: Hydrogeological Investigation Please provide a location figure of all proposed infiltration facilities and correlating infiltration test locations.	A figure showing the location of the proposed infiltration facilities is presented on the LID Plan prepared by SCS (included in Appendix B of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation report). The infiltration tests were carried out adjacent to monitoring wells BH101, BH102, BH105, BH106 and BH206, as indicated in Section 3.6 of the revised Hydrogeological Investigation report; refer to the Proposed Development Plan, Figure 2B, for the location of these monitoring wells relative to the layout of the proposed development.	Golder
154.	Re: Report (FSR & SWM) Please provide a copy of the VO6 hydrology model for our records.	A link to download the VO6 hydrology model is provided in the FSSR in Appendix C.	SCS
155.	Re: Report (FSR & SWM) It may be more efficient to provide erosion control, in addition to peak flow control, for Catchment EXT1 in the proposed end-of-pipe SWM facility for Outlet 5. Please include options/feasibility to provide Erosion Control for the drainage from the SAS site and/or explain constraints.	Runoff from Catchment EXT1 is proposed to go to the underground SWM facility at Outlet 5. The facility will provide erosion control for that catchment.	SCS
156.	Re: Report (FSR & SWM) Proposed Rear Yard Infiltration Trenches should be within a municipal easement and accessible for inspection and maintenance. Please discuss with LSRCA staff prior to resubmission.	As discussed with LSRCA staff, the rear yard infiltration trenches are proposed to help achieve water balance, volume control, and phosphorus removal. Since they are not proposed to provide water quality (TSS removal) or quantity control, no easements are required. Further, it is currently standard practice that the LIDs will be noted in the ECA and the ECA will include a condition that requires a clause in the subdivision agreement where the homeowners will be made aware of the LIDs on the individual lots	SCS
157.	Re: Report (FSR & SWM) 1. It is recommended that the School Block be separated from the Proposed Conditions Phosphorus Calculations as this will be completed through Site Plan Control as noted in Section 2.3 of the Report. If included, please provide additional information in the Report to demonstrate that the proposed low intensity loading for the School Block complies with the Land Use Descriptions for the MOE Tool as outlined by Hutchinson Environmental Science Ltd. 2. The Proposed Conditions Phosphorus calculations utilize the removal for Perforated Pipe Infiltration/Exfiltration systems, however it appears that that proposed infiltration systems will be generally Infiltration trenches. 3. The proposed Phosphorus removal rates for infiltration will be subject to confirming that a 4. 1m separation from the seasonal high groundwater table has been achieved and facilities are designed in accordance with MOE and LID Guidelines.	1. Per discussions with LSRCA, the school block will be included in the Proposed Conditions Phosphorous Budget with a high intensity loading. At this stage (Draft Plan Approval) the school block will be shown as having 100% Phosphorus removal as it will be required to comply with the LSPOP at the Site Plan control stage, which requires 100% phosphorus removal. A site specific phosphorus budget and details of how the proposed Site Plan will be in compliance with the LSPOP will be provided at the Site Plan control stage. 2. The phosphorus budget calculations have been updated. 3. We have located infiltration LIDs where 1m separation to the seasonally high groundwater can be achieved. Where this cannot be provided the LIDs have been designed as filters.	SCS
158.	Re: Report (FSR & SWM) Please include information related to 1m separation to the seasonal high groundwater table for the proposed Infiltration facilities.	Golder Associates has prepared a comparison between the proposed ground elevation and the observed seasonally high groundwater level which we have used to inform the location of LIDs. Refer to the FSSR.	SCS

159.	Re: Figure 2.3 Please provide additional information to demonstrate that the proposed Storm Outlet Headwalls will comply with Section 3.3.2 of LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions, 2016.	The headwall locations have been updated to comply with LSRCA Technical Guidelines and further grading information has been provided on Figure 5.1 .	SCS
160.	Re: Report (Appendix C1 & C2) 1. The provided VO6 output appears to have column formatting issues (e.g., Mass Storm tables). Please review and revise accordingly. 2. The 12 hour SCS Type II distribution does not appear correct. Please review and ensure the distribution is as per Appendix C, Section 10 of the LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions, 2016.	The VO6 model files has been provided instead of a PDF of the output. The 12 hour SCS Type II distribution has been updated per Appendix C of the LSRCA Technical Guidelines for Stormwater Management Submissions.	SCS
161.	Re: Report & Figures 2.5,2.8,6.2 6.3,6.4,6.5 6.7, 6.8 The Report should include additional information/summary tables to demonstrate that the preliminary designs of the proposed Infiltration or filtration SWM/LID facilities are in compliance with the applicable facility design guidance (i.e., MOE and LID Guidelines).	A table has been provided that outlines the applicable criteria for the proposed LID's, and how the design is meeting the criteria.	SCS
162.	Re: Figure 5.1 Please provide additional information in the Report to demonstrate that the proposed active storage provided in the Superpipe or Underground storage is above the 100 year floodline of the adjacent watercourse.	Invert or bottom elevations have been added to show that the superpipes and underground stormwater storage facility are entirely above the 100 year floodline of each adjacent watercourse.	SCS
163.	Re: Report & Figure 5.1 Based on discussions with LSRCA Staff, it is understood that the Floodplain related to Phase 2 for the Tributary of Tannery Creek to the west/southwest is still under review. Please discuss with LSRCA staff prior to resubmission.	The approved regulatory flood line for the Tributary of Tannery Creek to the southwest of the site has been shown on Figure 5.1 .	SCS
Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority - LSRCA First Submission Natural Heritage Review Jessica Chan June 15 th , 2021			
164.	Re: NHE Provide rationale why the southern lot located at the end of Lane A cannot accommodate the significant woodland buffer as it is identified as the Natural Heritage System in the Overall Conceptual Plan dated March 8, 2021.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to remove the residential lots outside of the significant woodland buffer.	MGP
165.	Re: NHE The outfall and associated 'Construction Disturbance Area' proposed in Encroachment Area B needs to be relocated outside of the dripline of the significant woodland.	A 10 metre buffer from the dripline has been provided at a minimum near Lots 63-66 and Servicing Block 98.	SCS
166.	Re: NHE The development limit/ 'Construction Disturbance Area' shown in Figure 4 needs to be relocated outside of the wetland buffer in the area west of Encroachment Area C, where it straddles the ORM Boundary line. An average 10 m woodland buffer and average 15 m wetland buffer should be provided in this area to accommodate the pinch point area in Encroachment Area C.	Near Lots 58 and 59, a 6 metre buffer has been provided from the dripline. 10 metres from the dripline and 15 metres from the wetland is difficult to accommodate in this location as there is a pinch point between two natural features and accommodating such would result in an irregular development plan, inefficient use of land and cause issues with vehicular sightlines along Street B. The encroachment has been compensated for by providing additional open space buffers to the NHS through Blocks 103 to 109.	Shining Hill/SCS/MGP
167.	Re: NHE The encroachment into Newmarket lands for the outfall proposed in Encroachment Area D is not supported as this area was not assessed in the provided NHE (Beacon Environmental Limited, March 2021). Please ensure this outfall is located outside of natural heritage features (e.g., significant woodland, wetland, significant valleyland, etc.)	The outfall proposed in Encroachment Area D has now been relocated south to be within the Town of Aurora lands (see Figure 2.3 from the submitted FSSR by SCS)." The additional area outside of this application will be included in the application for the Newmarket lands. For this application the outfall will be shown only to the study area boundary.	Beacon/SCS

168.	A catchment-based water balance is required to assess how the existing drainage conditions and moisture regimes may be impacted by the proposed development. Once Golder has completed its monitoring works, demonstrate how current hydrologic inputs will be maintained post-development to continue supporting the watercourse and wetland communities on the subject property.	See updated reports by Golder, SCS and Beacon.	Golder/SCS
169.	Ensure all Endangered Species Act requirements are in conformity with Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks policy as it relates to the confirmed barn swallow habitat (active nest) that was removed during the breeding bird season and the removal of potential SAR bat habitat for the proposed stormwater infrastructure in Encroachment Area E. Please provide the results of the bat snag survey conducted on May 6, 2020.	Agreed. Please note that it is unknown whether or not the nest was active at the time of removal. Bat survey results will be included.	Beacon
170.	The subject property is located in Ecoregion 6E, therefore the Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules for Ecoregion 6E should be used rather than the Schedules for Ecoregion 7E.	Noted. See updated EIS.	Beacon
171.	Although development is not proposed within the western significant woodland, it should be noted that this woodland provides confirmed significant wildlife habitat (SWH) in the form of amphibian breeding habitat (woodland), terrestrial crayfish habitat, special concern and rare wildlife species habitat for the Eastern wood-pewee, and candidate SWH in the form of bat maternity colonies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amphibian breeding habitat (woodland) is confirmed by the presence of one or more of the listed newt/salamander species or two or more of the listed frog species with at least 20 individuals or two or more of the listed frog species with Call Level Code of 3. As the Eastern newt was observed in the western woodland, this woodland is considered confirmed SWH in the form of amphibian breeding habitat (woodland). Terrestrial crayfish habitat is confirmed by the presence of 1 or more individuals of the listed crayfish species or their chimneys in suitable meadow marsh, swamp or moist terrestrial sites. As crayfish chimneys were observed in a White Cedar Mineral Coniferous Swamp (SWC1-1), the western woodland is considered confirmed SWH in the form of terrestrial crayfish habitat. 	We do not agree with the technical thresholds for SWH suggested by the MNRF, although we do agree that there is potential SWH. This is guidance for municipalities. In several municipalities this guidance has been taken and amended to make more scientific sense. For example we would propose that a higher threshold of chimneys be applied and that the chimneys be closed (i.e., occupied). Regardless, this makes no difference to feature as it is being protected.	Beacon
172.	Although development is not proposed within the eastern valley corridor, it should be noted that this significant woodland also provides confirmed SWH in the form of special concern and rare wildlife species habitat for the Eastern wood-pewee, and candidate SWH in the form of bat maternity colonies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate habitat for bat maternity colonies is determined based on the number of large diameter (>25 cm DBH) trees per hectare (>10 trees/ha), not the size of the woodland. Therefore, the eastern significant woodland may be providing candidate SWH in the form of bat maternity colonies. 	See above. All regulated species under the ESA will be addressed in accordance with that regulation.	Beacon
173.	Provide the call codes for the green frog, American toad and gray treefrog observed during the amphibian surveys to determine whether significant wildlife habitat in the form of amphibian breeding habitat (wetland) is present on the property	We will provide the calling codes, but please see the comments above regarding SWH thresholds.	Beacon
174.	Please note policies 6.32-6.35 in the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan are applicable in settlement areas and to the subject property.	Acknowledged.	Beacon
175.	The proposed development involves the removal of woodland (FOM and CUP3) and wetland communities (MAM2) which should be ecologically offset with on-site restoration as per the LSRCA's Ecological Offsetting Policy. This Policy can be accessed via the link: https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Pages/Ecological-Offsetting.aspx . As per the Policy, prepare an Ecological Offsetting Strategy (EOS) providing the total area of the woodland and wetland feature including buffers that are proposed for removal and the total area of any locations proposed for woodland and wetland replacement. Ensure all remaining natural heritage areas are afforded the appropriate environmental protection through zoning. Please note treed areas that are not considered woodland communities (e.g. hedgerows, landscape trees) are to be compensated as per the Town of Aurora's Tree Removal and Compensation Policy.	Acknowledged. Shining Hill will provide an Ecological Offsetting Strategy (EOS) as a condition of approval	Beacon/Shining Hill
176.	Provide appropriate mitigation measures (e.g. transplantation) for the rare and uncommon species located outside of the protected feature limit that may be impacted by the proposed development (i.e. early goldenrod, smooth aster, arrow-leaved aster, Virginia stickseed, black walnut, wild bergamot, and common evening primrose).	All of these species, although designated rare or uncommon are actually frequently encountered and in some cases are quite common (e.g., Black Walnut). Others are protected in sufficient numbers in protected areas or buffers, and yet others do not lend themselves to transplantation (again Black Walnut). Beacon will prepare a summary by species for further discussion.	Beacon
177.	Revise the Arborist Report to exclude the trees in the FOM and CUP3 communities from the Town's compensation requirements as these trees needs to be offset as per the LSRCA's Ecological Offsetting Policy.	The Arborist Report has been revised to exclude the trees in the FOM and CUP3 communities.	Beacon
Rogers York Outside Plant Engineering March 19 th , 2021			
178.	We have reviewed the proposed area and do not have any comments or concerns at this time.	Acknowledged.	
Town of Newmarket Meghan White, MCIP, RPP – Senior Planner, Development			

April 21, 2021			
179.	Newmarket has not established any urban uses on the adjacent lands to date. An OPA application has been received to convert the lands adjacent to the subject lands from environmental protection to urban designations. It is anticipated to be a lengthy process involving numerous stages, currently only the principle of development is being considered.	Acknowledged.	n/a
180.	We note that the plan contemplates a future connection to Newmarket, until such time as a decision is made on the lands in Newmarket, the plan in Aurora should be able to function on its own in terms of servicing (water, sanitary, and storm), grading, transportation, road connection, trail connection, future parks, open space, etc.	The proposed plan functions on its own in terms of servicing, grading, transportation, etc...	MGP / Shining Hill