

12 June 2026

Kenneth Melanson, BA, RPP, MCIP
Director of Development Services
Township of Southgate
185667 Grey County Rd. 9, Dundalk, ON N0C 1B0

Dear Mr. Melanson;

**RE: 271 Main Street East, Dundalk – Comment Response Matrix
271 Main Street East Inc. – Zoning By-law Amendment
Township File Ref: C17-24
Our File: 22107A**

This matrix is intended to address all comments received from the Township of Southgate and other commenting authorities on the second submission of the Zoning By-law Amendment application. Please do not hesitate to contact MHBC if you have any questions or concerns regarding any of the responses below.

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
1.	The proposal represents a form of residential intensification generally supported by the County's policies and aligns with development appropriate to a Primary Settlement Area. The County OP supports intensification in all areas within settlement areas including the redevelopment of sites and encouraging intensification along arterial roads. Further, new residential developments are promoted at densities which efficiently use available servicing (subject to Section 8.9) and are appropriate to site conditions and existing patterns of development. Additional comments should be received from Township staff in this regard.	MHBC	Noted.

	Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
2.	<p>First submission: It is noted that an application for site plan approval will be required following any approval of the subject zoning application. After which, the applicant intends to request that the County of Grey consider an exemption to the standard Plan of Condominium process under the Planning Act.</p> <p>Second submission comment: Noted</p>	MHBC / Applicant	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Acknowledged"</i></p> <p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission: No further response.</i></p>
3.	<p>First Submission: The Official Plans would support residential development in this area. As per policy 3.5(5), a minimum density of 20 units per net hectare is required for new development. The Township Official Plan policies in Section 5.2.1.2(5) are more restrictive than the County's OP and would require a minimum density of 25 units per net hectare. In this case, the proposed density would be approximately 91 units per net hectare, which would significantly exceed the minimum density requirements of both OP's.</p> <p>Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.</p>	MHBC	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Acknowledged. The revised proposal provides a density of 77 units per hectare, which exceeds the County's and Township's minimum density requirements."</i></p> <p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission: It is noted that the revised proposal provides a density of 46 units per hectare, which continues to exceed the County's and Township's minimum density requirements."</i></p>
4.	<p>First Submission: Generally, staff encourage development to exceed the development density threshold as outlined in the County Official Plan, to promote the efficient use of land and infrastructure, and to guide more walkable, transit-oriented development. The Official Plans also provide general guidance around supporting a variety of housing types within designated settlement areas. It is noted that there is a particular need for entry-level housing that is attainable to first-time home buyers,</p>	MHBC / Applicant	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Acknowledged. The proposal is for condominium townhouses, which will provide an additional housing type to the community of Dundalk and will also provide more attainable housing opportunities for the Township. Given the condominium nature, exterior maintenance will be handled by the condominium corporation."</i></p>

Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	and the proposed development may have the potential to contribute towards this housing type. Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.		Response now, at 3rd Submission: The comment made at 2 nd submission remains accurate. It is noted that the proposal is seen as the 'missing middle' in terms of the type of housing available on the market.
5.	First Submission: While there are no 'Hazard Lands' indicated on the subject lands, the completed hydrogeological report indicates a highwater table across the site. The report provides design recommendations with regards to how to the development might proceed in a safe and appropriate way. The report indicates that site dewatering will likely be required at a construction stage. Furthermore, footings/foundations within 0.6 meters of the seasonally high groundwater table will require subdrains, which the report recommends directing to outlet to the municipal storm services. It is noted that the subject lands front onto Grey Road 9. As a general County policy, post-development flows shall not exceed pre-development flows onto the County's road (including stormwater systems). County staff would request further information from the applicant and consultant tam to ensure that the proposed development would not result in increased groundwater being directed onto the County's Road. Should this be problematic for the proposed design, the developer may wish to consider slab-on-grade units, if feasible. Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.	Crozier	Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "The buildings will be slab on grade. Ground water will not be directed to County Roads. Post development surface flow will not exceed pre development flows to the County Road." Response now, at 3rd Submission: The basements of each unit will be equipped with a sump pump that will discharge flows to the internal storm sewer system, which will control post-development flows to predevelopment flows. Basement floor elevations will be 0.5m above the high groundwater level, which has been accepted in new development across Dundalk and also noted in the Geotechnical Report (Green, April 2024). See further details in the Pre-catchment plan (ref: C103) and post-catchment plan (ref: C104) – both dated June 2026. Flows are summarized in Table 1 of the FSSWM report (dated June 2026).
6.	First Submission: The subject lands are located within a 'Wellhead Protection Area-D', per Appendix A of the County's Official Plan. Generally, further detailed comments	Crozier	Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Salt Management Plan (Crozier, dated 25 June 2025) provided as part of the submission package."

	Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>should be received from the Risk Management Official to determine if further considerations with the use or design should be addressed to protect municipal water reserves. Furthermore, the hydrogeological study indicates that the site should consider winter deicing methods that reduce the quantities of salt that enter into municipal water reserves. In that respect, the County would support the completion of a Salt Management Plan at a Site Plan Application stage as part of this development.</p> <p>Second Submission: Acknowledged. Additional comments should be received from municipal staff, and the local RMO, if required.</p>		<p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission:</i> Please see Salt Management Plan (Crozier, dated June 2026) provided as part of the submission package. It is understood that the County comment on the 2nd submission is directed to Township staff.</p>
7.	<p>First Submission: County staff have reviewed the completed Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Reports. Staff would recommend that further input on these studies be provided by the Saugeen Ojibway Nation, and other Indigenous partners who may have interest in reviewing and providing comments on this report.</p> <p>Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.</p>	MHBC	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission:</i> "SON provided written sign-off for the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Report on 6 February 2024."</p> <p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission:</i> The comment made at 2nd submission remains accurate.</p>
8.	<p>First Submission: 1. The proposed driveway widths are 5.75 meters, which have direct frontage onto the private 6-meter internal roadway. While this length is appropriate for smaller personal vehicles, many common varieties of pick-up trucks are greater than 6 meters in length. Staff have concerns about vehicles overhanging onto the small private road, and whether this will impede the movement of other vehicles (including waste</p>	Orchard Design	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission:</i> "Noted. From the back of curb to garage, length is 6.05 m. See Site Plan A1.01 (Orchard Design, dated 25 June 2025)."</p> <p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission:</i> The revised proposal provides for a driveway length of 6.23 m, allowing for longer vehicles to be parked without impeding on the internal road. See Site Plan (dated 12 June 2026).</p>

	Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>management and emergency services), and pedestrian safety across the site;</p> <p>Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.</p>		
9.	<p>First Submission: 2. It is recommended that some of the units be designed to be accessible to mobility users, noting the County's priorities around Age-Friendly community planning;</p> <p>Second Submission: Staff understand that the units will be multi-storey, and as such, will not be inherently accessible. Staff appreciate that the proposal offers a different type of housing that may be attractive to a variety of purchasers (i.e. those looking to downsize, young families, first time homebuyers, and working professionals). The location of the infill development is also within walking distance to community amenities and services (i.e. the grocery store, park, and community swimming pool are across the street and downtown is an approximately 300m walkable distance). Staff also acknowledge that the second submission site plan identifies a deep collection waste system, which can be more age friendly. Nonetheless, it is important to note that Grey County has adopted an approach to age-friendly community planning that involves all ages, not solely seniors, and would encourage the proponents to consider design elements that accommodate the needs of children and to support aging in place. For example, flexible and adaptable units with features that afford layout changes to fit the evolving needs of residents over time (i.e. separate built-in wall oven and cooktop with</p>	Applicant	<p>Noted. As noted with the second submission it is acknowledged that the multi-storey nature of the development would mean that the development is not inherently accessible.</p> <p>However, it is noted that external works, such as snow clearance and landscaping, will be handled by the condominium cooperation, making this a more attractive residence to those less abled.</p> <p>Additionally, future purchasers could opt-in to accessible upgrades/features to the units.</p> <p>Furthermore, the 3rd submission has been revised from 3-storey to 2-storey towns which reduces the number of stairs.</p> <p>This type of in-fill development offers overall reduced maintenance compared to regular detached homes.</p>

Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	unobstructed space underneath, zero threshold shower, space for side-by-side washer dryer units, etc.) and ensuring that a variety of users can safely maneuver the parking area (i.e. placing children in car seats, vehicles not encroaching into the private road, etc.).		
10.	<p>First Submission: 3. The County's OP encourages consideration of climate change mitigation measures through site design. This might include opportunities for semi-permeable pavement to reduce post-development runoff, heat pumps, solar panels, EV charging stations, etc.</p> <p>Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.</p>	MHBC	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "These matters will be addressed through the future Site Plan Control process."</i></p> <p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission:</i> The comment made at 2nd submission remains accurate.</p>
11.	<p>First Submission: 4. The County's OP recommends that all new developments integrate Dark Sky compliant lighting fixtures, in order to limit the impacts of light pollution</p> <p>Second Submission: Acknowledged. Staff would also encourage this item to be reviewed by way of the future site plan agreement.</p>	Applicant	Noted
12.	<p>First Submission: 5. Snow storage may still be a concern on the proposed site plan (particularly for individual driveway clearing), given the very limited area between the units for snow storage capacity.</p> <p>Second Submission: Staff acknowledged that the intent is to haul all snow off site. Operationally, however, staff are concerned that this may be challenging for future homeowners (i.e. snow will need to be removed from behind parked</p>	Crozier / Orchard Design / Applicant	The revised site plan provides for snow storage and salt management procedures will be incorporated into the management plan for the site. When those areas reach capacity the snow will be hauled and disposed of safely. Salt and snow management has been detailed in the revised Salt Management Plan (Crozier, June 2026).

Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>cars and from the front steps of each unit - where will this snow be placed?). Staff note that the Salt Management Plan indicates that snow will be aggregated on site and removed following snow events. The temporary snow storage locations should be indicated as such on the site plan.</p> <p>Staff encourage the inclusion of temporary snow storage location(s) and would also encourage that a notation be included on the approved site plan drawings indicating that all snow is to be hauled off site. In addition, it will be important for the future landscaping plan to consider the impacts of both snow and salt management and ensure plantings are native and salt tolerant.</p> <p>Further to above, staff appreciate that the units have weather protected access to each unit.</p>		
13.	<p>New: Staff understand that relief is requested from both the minimum play space and minimum amenity area provisions of the Township Zoning By-law. Further, the site plan indicates that each unit will have access to a backyard and a balcony as private outdoor amenity areas, as well as a 60m² common amenity area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is unclear where the common amenity area is located. Further clarification is needed. - The site plan indicates the balcony location in relation to the rear yard area, but each yard is not dimensioned. Is the intent that each condo unit will also own the rear yard associated with the unit? Please provide additional clarity. - Will the units have access to the rear yard through the garage? 	Orchard Design	<p>The revised architectural plans and elevations by Orchard Design (dated 12 June 2026) submitted with the 3rd submission no longer include balconies to the rear elevations, and the design has reduced from a 3-storey to a 2-storey development. The re-design of the Site has also resulted in the widening of the backyards, thereby improving on the living experience of all future residents and existing neighbours.</p> <p>The common amenity areas are located in the north-east and south-east corners of the Site. This, along with the semi-private play amenity space to the rear of both buildings, will be accessible to each unit. Doors will be provided from each garage to the rear yard for ease of access for lawn maintenance equipment.</p>

Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	Staff also note that the proposed amendment indicates a 1m planting strip, but it is unclear where this will be located (i.e. does the 1m planting encroach into each rear yard, effectively making each yard 3.11m by 4.7m?). Please provide additional clarity.		
14.	New: Drawing C102 indicates that there will be a retaining wall along the 3 of the property lines with a maximum height of 2 meters. Staff understand that a 1.8m privacy fence will be in addition to the retaining wall. Staff encourage the completion of a cross-section elevation drawing to better understand the relationship between the proposed development and the adjacent residential uses.	Crozier / Orchard Design	A street sectional (Orchard Design, 12 June 2026) accompanies the revised submission to help understand the relationship between the proposed development and the adjacent residential uses. Cross sections of the retaining wall have also been included (see ref: C107 Construction Notes and details 1 of 3, dated June 2026).
Transportation Services Comments:			
15.	First Submission: Road widening is not required. Second Submission: No further comment.	MHBC	Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Acknowledged." Response now, at 3rd Submission: No further response.
16.	First Submission: Following any approval of the subject application, the applicant shall apply to the County of Grey for an entrance permit, to permit a new entrance onto the County Road, if required. This may be listed as a condition of Site Plan Approval; Second Submission: No further comment.	Applicant	Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Acknowledged." Response now, at 3rd Submission: No further response.
17.	First Submission: The Drainage Plan appears to be adequate. Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.	Crozier	Noted. A revised post-development drainage plan (ref: C104, Crozier, dated June 2026) is now submitted with the subject submission. The main changes to this are to reflect the revised site layout.

Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
18.	<p>First Submission: Traffic letter appears to be adequate.</p> <p>Second Submission: No further comment.</p>	Crozier	Noted. A revised letter (Crozier, dated June 2026) is now submitted with the subject submission. The changes are simply to reflect the revised number of units and waste collection location.
19.	<p>First Submission: County Transportation staff share the above-noted concerns regarding any groundwater being diverted to the County's Road and would request further information in that request.</p> <p>Second Submission: No further comment.</p>	Crozier	<p>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "The buildings will be slab on grade. Ground water will not be directed to County Roads. Post development surface flow will not exceed pre development flows to the County Road."</p> <p>Response now, at 3rd Submission: The basements of the townhouse units will be equipped with a sump pump that will discharge flows to the internal storm sewer system.</p>
20.	<p>First Submission: At a pre-submission stage, County staff indicated support for an exemption to the County's centreline setback.</p> <p>Second Submission: No further comment.</p>	Crozier	<p>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Acknowledged."</p> <p>Response now, at 3rd Submission: No further response.</p>
Ecology Staff Comments:			
21.	<p>First Submission: Natural Heritage Comments: The property contains and/or is adjacent to fish habitat. It is Grey County staffs understanding that the proposed development will be located within adjacent to the features on previously disturbed lands. As such, it is Grey County Staffs opinion that the potential impact to natural heritage would be negligible and the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS) can be waived.</p> <p>Second Submission: No further comment.</p>	MHBC	<p>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Acknowledged."</p> <p>Response now, at 3rd Submission: No further response.</p>

	Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
22.	<p>First Submission: Natural Heritage Comments: Grey County Staff have reviewed the stormwater management plan, including the erosion and sediment control plan submitted by Crozier (April, 2024) and find it acceptable.</p> <p>Second Submission: Grey County staff have reviewed the updated plan and have no concerns.</p>	Crozier	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission:</i> "Acknowledged. A revised plan accompanies this submission (Crozier, 25 June 2025) which has been updated solely to address comments provided by other agencies."</p> <p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission:</i> Noted. A revised SWM and sediment control plan (Crozier, dated June 2026) is now submitted with the subject submission. The main changes to this are simply to reflect the revised site layout.</p>
23.	<p>First Submission: Natural Heritage Comments: It is Grey County Staffs understanding that the property contains protection areas that are subject to policies of the Source Water Protection Act. As such, the Risk Management Official of Drinking Water Source Protection should be tagged for comments on this application. The property does lie within an area designated as a significant groundwater recharge area that may influence highly vulnerable aquifers, as such, low-impact development and infrastructure is recommended</p> <p>Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is noted.</p>	Crozier	<p><i>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission:</i> "Acknowledged. A revised plan accompanies this submission (Crozier, 25 June 2025) which has been updated solely to address comments provided by other agencies."</p> <p><i>Response now, at 3rd Submission:</i> The pervious area coverage has increased. This along with the swales proposed along the side of the property will promote infiltration. Further details seen in Grading Plan (ref: C101, dated June 2026).</p>
24.	<p>First Submission: County staff would note that we are conceptually supportive of the proposed use, in order to facilitate an opportunity for attainable housing creation. That said, County staff have some further questions regarding the quantity of flows that will be directed to the County's Road (including through site dewatering), as well as some general questions about site design,</p>	Crozier	<p>A Site dewatering plan will be submitted prior to construction to the satisfaction of the County and Township. Post-development flows to the County Road are not being increased from pre-development flows. See Post-Development Drainage Plan (ref: C104, dated June 2026).</p>

	Cassandra Dillman, Intermediate Planner County of Grey 3 September 2025		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>as noted above. County staff would request additional follow-up with the applicants prior to a formal decision on this application.</p> <p>Second Submission: Response provided at second submission is understood. Contact Cassandra.dillman@grey.ca to arrange a meeting.</p>		

	Willie Cornelio, Sr. Analyst, Municipal Planning - Enbridge 11 September 2025		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
25.	Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.	Applicant	Noted.

	Jessica Conroy, MES, Pl. Resource Planner – Grand River Conservation Authority 3 September 2025		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
26.	<p>Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) staff has reviewed the above-noted Zoning By-law Amendment Application proposing to rezone the subject lands from Residential 3 Zone to a new Residential 3 Zone with a site-specific exemption to permit a condominium development of 24 stacked townhouses on the subject property.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p>	MHBC / Applicant	<p>It is noted that the 2nd submission was for 20 traditional townhomes and that the 1st submission was for 24 stacked townhomes.</p> <p>The revised submission (3rd submission) is for 12 traditional townhomes.</p> <p>However, the recommendation is noted.</p>

Jessica Conroy, MES, Pl. Resource Planner – Grand River Conservation Authority 3 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	GRCA has no objection to the proposed zoning by-law amendment application. A GRCA permit is required for the proposed works within the allowance to the floodplain.		
27.	Information currently available at our office indicates the subject lands contain the regulated allowance to floodplain located northeast of the property. A copy of our resource mapping is attached for reference.	MHBC	Noted.
28.	Due to the presence of the floodplain and its allowance, a portion of the subject lands are regulated by the GRCA under Ontario Regulation 41/24 (Prohibited Activities, Exemptions, and Permits Regulation). Any development or site alteration within the regulated area requires a GRCA permit pursuant to Ontario Regulation 41/24.	MHBC / Applicant	Noted.
29.	Based on our review of the submitted drawings, the proposed development will be partially located within the allowance of the floodplain located northeast of the subject property. Based on the existing elevations shown on the grading plan, the development will be outside of the floodplain, and GRCA has no concerns with the proposed development. GRCA has no objection to the proposed zoning by-law amendment. A GRCA permit will be required prior to construction.	Applicant	Noted
30.	Plan Review Fees: Consistent with GRCA's 2023-2025 approved fee schedule, this application is considered a 'minor' zoning by-law amendment. The owner will be invoiced in the amount of \$465.00 for the GRCA's review of this application.	Applicant	Noted

Neala MacLeod Farley, Coordinator, Lands, Waters & Consultation Historic Saugeen Metis 15 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
31.	The Historic Saugeen Métis (HSM) Lands, Waters and Consultation Department has reviewed the relevant documents and has no objections to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment as presented.	MHBC	Noted.

Risk Management Office Grey Sable 3 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
32.	<p>From the information in the proposed by-law amendment to permit a 20-unit townhouse style condominium development on this property, it has been determined that neither section 57 (Prohibited Activities) or section 58 (Regulated Activities) applies on the above-noted property, pursuant to the <i>Clean Water Act, 2006</i>. However, it is should be noted that this property falls within the Wellhead Protection Area C(Score of 2) for the Dundalk Drinking Water System. As such, the storage of certain chemicals (greater than 25 litres) associated with wood working and metal degreasers are regulated. If either of these activities are planned for either of these properties, please contact this office.</p> <p>At this time, there are no policies that would apply to the activities identified in the application, under the approved Source Protection Plan for the Saugeen, Grey Sauble, Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Region (effective July 1, 2016).</p>	Crozier / Applicant	Noted

Dustin Lyttle Triton Engineering Services Limited 4 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Pre-Consultation Comments:			
33.	PC 1.1 – 1.2 <i>Addressed.</i>	Crozier	<p>Response at 2nd Submission to 1st Submission: "Individual water meters will be provided to each of the 20 units. The site will be considered as 20 users."</p> <p>Response now, at 3rd Submission: Individual water meters will be provided to each of the 12 units. The site will be considered as 12 users.</p>
34.	PC 1.3 Curb radii are to be noted on all plans as applicable (i.e. DWG No. A1.01). Curb radii are to be indicated and should be a minimum of 9.0m. <i>Pending, the curb radii within the site are to be increased to the extent feasible. The proposed layout will make entering and exiting the rear parking area difficult.</i>	Orchard Design	Curb Radii have been indicated on the revised site plan dated 12 June 2026. A truck turning plan is also included (dated 12 June 2026) accompanies the submission, and identifies how the waste collection vehicle will manoeuvre within the Site without concern. Emergency vehicles can enter the Site and back out onto Main Street where necessary. As it is confirmed that a waste collection vehicle is able to manoeuvre the Site without issue, it is expected that a standard personal vehicle will be able to enter/ exit the visitor parking area without concern.
35.	PC 1.4 – 1.7 <i>Addressed.</i>	Crozier	<p>It is noted that these comments related to details of the public sidewalk, the sanitary manhole and drainage plans.</p> <p>While there is no change to the proposal in this regard since the last submission revised plans are submitted to suit the revised reduced units. Drainage plans were revised to address changes in grading.</p>
36.	PC 1.8 Entrance location with respect to Owen Sound Street will need to be considered in the Traffic Impact analysis. Given the proximity to the intersection of Main St and Owen Sound St, the study should undertake a level of service analysis at the proposed	Crozier	As outlined in the 2025 and 2026 Traffic Letters which accompanied previous submissions, the proposed Site access is approximately 30 m (c/l to c/l) from Owen Sound Street. The access is aligned with the centre of the frontage and maximizes the


Dustin Lyttle Triton Engineering Services Limited 4 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	access, including an assessment of any impacts to this existing intersection. <i>Pending, consider aligning the entrance further away from Owen Sound St. to reduce the potential for conflicts.</i>		<p>available spacing for the proposed units. Less than 1 m of queueing is forecasted for the Site access and conflicts are not anticipated.</p> <p>The previous Traffic Opinion supported the previous proposal for 20 units. Please see updated Traffic Opinion letter (dated June 2026) which reflects the reduction in unit numbers to 12.</p>
37.	<p>PC 1.9 Based on the general arrangement provided the amount of snow storage area designated appears insufficient. Arrangements for hauling snow off-site may need to be detailed in the FSR. Snow storage is not to be placed such that its melt will run onto neighbouring properties. <i>Pending, the current design does not allow for any temporary storage of snow. This will result in snow being pushed onto Main St which is not acceptable. Confirm how snow will be temporarily stored, without melting onto neighbouring properties, or impeding emergency vehicle access.</i></p>	Crozier / Orchard Design	<p>The 40% reduction in the number of units has resulted in adequate space for snow storage towards the east of the property and has additionally allowed for the provision of an area of lawn in front of each unit where snow from driveways and walkways can be accommodated. In the event of extreme snowfall any excess snow will be trucked off-site which is common practice in similar condominium sites. The snow removal trucks will have adequate room to manoeuvre on site, with the same movements expected as is shown for the waste collection vehicle.</p> <p>Snow storage areas and snow melt are discussed in Section 5.4 of the revised FS&SWM Report (Crozier, June 2026) and in the revised Salt Management Plan (Crozier, June 2026)</p>
Pre-Detailed Design Advisory Comments:			
38.	a) Ensure all inverts are shown to match the profile shown. (i.e. storm inverts don't match with profile in Dwg C102B). <i>Pending, existing storm sewer inverts do not match with the elevation shown along the axis of the profile in DWG 102A.</i>	Crozier	Existing storm pipes have been adjusted in the profile on revised Drawing C102B (dated June 2026) to match inverts.
39.	b. – f. <i>Addressed.</i>	Crozier	It is noted that these comments related to drainage details.

Dustin Lyttle Triton Engineering Services Limited 4 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			Revised plans are submitted to suit the revised reduction in units and revised grading at the back of the townhouse units.
Current Zoning Amendment Comments:			
40.	The site plan (DWG A1.02) is to clearly show the proposed retaining walls, as shown on the Civil Engineering DWGs.	Orchard Design	Please see revised Site Plan (dated 12 June 2026) which now includes the location of the proposed retaining walls.

Victoria Mance 4 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
41.	In previous email correspondence before the initial application and following the first public meeting, the Township has expressed concern with the density of the project exceeding. The property has about .26 hectares in area which with the original 24 units proposed places the density at ±94 units per hectare, which is well above the 50 units per hectare limit for medium density. Please refer to section 5.2.1.2 (10) of the official plan as the revised proposal while reduced in density may still have compatibility issues relative to the Township Official Plan. The Township provides the following comments based on the submitted application:	MHBC	Please note that the revised proposal is for 12 units, which is a reduction from the 1 st and 2 nd submission which proposed 24 and 20 units respectively. The density of the Site now proposed is 46.22 or 47 units per hectare.
42.	Affordable Housing and Attainability: The second submission identifies the proposed development as providing “affordable” price point for the community of Dundalk; however, it does not clearly demonstrate compliance with the Township’s Official Plan affordability definition outlined in Subsection 3.4.3. Further clarification is required to determine whether the proposed residential units qualify as affordable under the following:	Applicant	The development is not designed as ‘affordable housing’ but rather aims to provide a missing middle option to purchasers. In general townhomes are for sale at a lower price-point than single family detached homes and this being an in-fill townhome development makes them inherently more attainable than single family homes. This is seen as the ‘missing middle’ in terms of the type of housing available on the market.

Victoria Mance 4 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>i. Homeownership options that are 10% below the County's average resale price or under 30% of gross household income.</p> <p>ii. Rental options that are at or below the average market rent or similarly under the 30% income threshold</p>		
43.	<p>Affordability Incentives: To further support affordable housing delivery, the Township may consider fee waivers or reduced development standards (e.g., lot area, yard setbacks, parking) where affordability commitments are confirmed. The second submission proposes planning reliefs but does not indicate whether the applicant intends to pursue these Township incentives in exchange for meeting affordability targets. Staff request confirmation on whether the applicant is willing to explore affordability commitments to qualify for Township incentives.</p>	Applicant	Noted. The proposal is not intended as 'affordable housing'. The proposal offers 'attainable housing' seen as the 'missing middle' within the housing market.
44.	<p>Residential compatibility: The second submission proposes a decreased density from 24 units to 20 units, standard townhouse units rather than stacked townhouse units, four (4) separated buildings consisting of five (5) units, an increased interior side yard setback to provide backyard amenity space and second storey balconies, and the inclusion of total lot amenity area. Further clarification is required to determine the following:</p>	MHBC	The revised proposal is for 12 standard townhouse units within 2 buildings; having 6 units each. See below responses to comments.
45.	<p>i. Township planning policy supports intensification and encourage a variety of housing types. Providing only 3-bedroom units increases the building footprint and decreases the amount of landscaped space and amenity space available. The current design does not account for integrating any existing mature trees into the overall design.</p>	Crozier/ Orchard Design	The revised proposal is for 12 units, whereas previous 20 units was proposed, reducing lot coverage to approximately 32% which is less than the maximum permitted by Zoning, and increasing the landscaping and amenity area. It is considered that the 3-bedroom units are well suited to the Town and with the reduction of units, the provision of 3-bedroom units is the most viable option for the build-out of this Site.

Victoria Mance 4 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			A Landscape Plan has been provided showing the location of proposed trees (Crozier, June 2026).
46.	ii. Further detail regarding intended landscaped areas and privacy screening where proposed units will overlook the home to the west which may be fully account for policies in 5.2.1.2 (10) (e) in particular regarding built form and adequate buffering.	Crozier/ Orchard Design	The proposal has been revised from 3 to 2 storeys in height to better integrate with the existing neighbourhood. A privacy fence is to be installed to provide adequate buffering. A Landscape Plan accompanies the submission (Crozier, June 2026) showing proposed treed and landscaped areas.
47.	Alignment with Community Design & Servicing: Access, connectivity, and infrastructure alignment are key evaluation criteria for this development. While the second submission addresses most required studies (Stormwater Management, Traffic Impact, Salt Management Plan, etc.), clarification is still requested in the following areas:	MHBC	See response to comments below.
48.	i. Confirmation of snow storage and maintenance plans for the complex and residents clearing their own driveways.	Crozier	Snow storage areas have been added as a result of the reduction to 12 townhouse units. Further details have been provided in the Salt Management Plan (Crozier, June 2026).
49.	ii. Further detail regarding the alignment of driveway access on to Main Street East. The central driveway into the site creates a left hand turn conflict with the Owen Sound Street/Main Street intersection. The entrance location proposed will require removal of mature trees along the street. If the existing driveway were deemed to be the preferred entrance, could your design be modified to as illustrated generally in the adjacent sketch? Unit size and density may need to be decreased but only end walls would face the house to the southwest.	Crozier	Per the revised Traffic Opinion Letter (dated June 2026), the Owen Sound/Main Street intersection is 30 m (c/l to c/l) from the Site access and less than one car is forecasted to be queued at the Site access and conflicts are not anticipated. Consideration regarding the sketch below were taken, however the general location of the units remained the same. As a result of the 40% reduction in the number of units proposed, and as a result of the redesign of the site where the driveways serving the two units nearest to the site entrance have been moved away from the entrance, traffic queuing, while not previously

Victoria Mance 4 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			<p>considered a concern is further reduced, providing more space for exiting and entering the site.</p> <p>The redesign of the site has further provided adequate space to plant large calliper trees along the street frontage. Please see the Landscape plan (dated June 2026) for reference.</p>
50.	<p>iii. The proposed front yard setback limits vehicle cueing space for residents waiting to access Main Street. Even one vehicle waiting on-site to enter traffic will block the driveway for the most northerly units. Further detail should be provided regarding the reduce front yard setbacks and posed impacts to traffic entering and exiting the site. Vehicle cueing can be increased with a design similar to that shown above.</p>	Crozier	<p>There is approximately 10.5 m from the public sidewalk to the first internal driveway. This will accommodate at least one vehicle fully. Additionally, the peak hour delay for egressing vehicles is 10 s. Neighbours can pause for 10 s to clear internal queuing should two cars be leaving simultaneously.</p> <p>Please see response to comment #49 above for further support and context.</p>

Public Comments from Public Meeting 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
51.	<p><i>Donalou Langdon</i> noted that a previous proposal for six units was denied, and allowing 20 now seems unfair to the former owner. She also raised concerns about spring runoff, increased traffic, and the lack of age-friendly design, particularly for seniors in the area.</p>	Applicant / Crozier	<p>The revised proposal is for 12 traditional townhomes. Infill proposals such as this have far more support as a result of provincial and Town policies than in previous years.</p> <p>While not specifically designed for people with lower-mobility, the townhomes will be part of a condominium cooperation that will take on exterior works such as snow clearance and landscaping –</p>

Public Comments from Public Meeting 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			<p>thereby offering a lower-maintenance lifestyle option for future occupants.</p> <p>Runoff away from existing adjacent properties was minimized as much as possible and is less than the runoff currently directed towards those areas.</p>
52.	<p><i>Samantha Gillingham</i> echoed concerns regarding waste management, safety for children, seniors, and the Mennonite community, as well as the lack of amenities and snow removal. She also noted that the existing infrastructure is insufficient to support the proposed development and noted concerns about the potential increase to calls for emergency services.</p>	Applicant/ Crozier	<p>Careful consideration of the best and cleanest waste management option was given, resulting in the use of "Earth Bins". Waste management will be through private collection. The reduction to 12 units decreases waste produced.</p> <p>A privacy fence is to be installed around the perimeter of the site that wraps around to the front edge of the buildings, providing privacy and safety from Main Street for future occupants.</p> <p>With the 40% reduction in density since the previous submission, there is increased space within the site to provide for snow storage and increased amenity space. The Salt Management Plan (Crozier, June 2026) discusses snow management in more detail.</p>
53.	<p><i>Tomas Roeder</i> expressed that the units are not age-friendly, noting seniors would struggle with multiple flights of stairs. He felt 5–6 units would be more realistic, while 20 is excessive. He also raised concerns about hydro and water capacity, stating Dundalk’s infrastructure is already strained, with nearby residents experiencing service issues. Additionally, he noted a lack of amenities to support future residents.</p>	Applicant / Crozier	<p>The revised proposal is for a 2-storey development of 12 units, resulting in less stairs.</p> <p>While not specifically designed for people with lower-mobility, the townhomes will be part of a condominium cooperation that will take on exterior works such as snow clearance and landscaping – thereby offering a lower-maintenance lifestyle option for future occupants.</p>

Public Comments from Public Meeting 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
			<p>With the 40% reduction in density since the previous submission, there is increased space within the site to provide for amenity space.</p> <p>Per the latest 2025 Dundalk Reserve Capacity, there is capacity within the sanitary and water system to support infill development. Allocation from the system will be requested at a future date.</p>

Councillor Singh Soares Public Meeting 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
54.	Inquired about the amenity space requirements and whether further consideration could be given to reducing the number of units.	Applicant	Further consideration to the reduction of units was seriously taken into account and implemented with the the revised proposal for 12 units of 2-storeys, a reduction from the previous proposal of 20 units of 3-storeys.
55.	Expressed concerns regarding the viability of parking, insufficient side and front yard setbacks, increased traffic, and the overall intensity of the proposed development.	Applicant / Crozier	<p>Each unit will offer future residents two parking spots, which meets the requirement in the Zoning by-law. Additionally, with the reduction of units to 12, this has improved the setbacks allowing for visitor parking to be increased to 4 spaces, with 1 space being accessible. The reduction of units to 12 has also resulted in the availability of a front lawn area for each resident.</p> <p>The previous Traffic Opinion supported the previous proposal for 20 units. See revised Traffic Opinion letter (June 2026) reflecting the reduction in units.</p>

Councillor Shipston Public Meeting 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
56.	Concerns regarding the number of visitor parking spaces, snow removal and salt management, and requested an explanation of the deep collection waste system.	Applicant / Crozier	<p>Visitor parking has been increased to 4 spaces, with 1 space being accessible.</p> <p>The revised site plan provides for snow storage and salt management procedures will be incorporated into the management plan for the site. When those areas reach capacity the snow will be hauled and disposed of safely. Salt and snow management has been detailed in the Salt Management Plan (Crozier, June 2026).</p> <p>The site will implement EarthBin® which offers discreet, space-saving, and eco-friendly bins that reduce costs, emissions, and collection frequency. The ones proposed for this Site are the 'on ground bins' and more information can be found at earthbin.com</p>

Deputy Mayor Dobreen Public Meeting 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
57.	Query about the price point and condominium fees for the units, which had been identified as affordable.	Applicant	The development is not designed as 'affordable housing' but rather aims to provide a missing middle option to purchasers. In general townhomes are for sale at a lower price-point than single family detached homes and this being an in-fill townhome development makes them inherently more attainable than single family homes. This is seen as the 'missing middle' in terms of the type of housing available on the market. Price point to be determined.

Deputy Mayor Dobreen Public Meeting 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
58.	Raised concerns shared by neighbouring residents regarding parking availability, snow removal, and the layout of the units in relation to aging in place.	Applicant	<p>Each unit will offer future residents two parking spots, which meets the requirement in the Zoning by-law. Additionally, visitor parking has been increased to 4 spaces, with 1 space being accessible.</p> <p>The revised site plan provides for snow storage and salt management procedures will be incorporated into the management plan for the site. When those areas reach capacity the snow will be hauled and disposed of safely. Salt and snow management has been detailed in the Salt Management Plan (Crozier, June 2026).</p>

Councillor Rice 24 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
59.	Inquired about Dundalk's water and waste servicing capacity.	Crozier	The Township's Engineer, Triton, in their 2025 Reserve Capacity, includes information related to the water and wastewater capacity for Dundalk, as summarized in the Servicing and SWM Report (Crozier, June 2026), showing that there is capacity, and upgrades to the wastewater treatment plant are underway.