



PLANNING  
URBAN DESIGN  
& LANDSCAPE  
ARCHITECTURE

10 March 2026

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

Dear Mr. Melanson;

**RE: BWDSB Site Plan Control – Comment Response Matrix**  
**Township File No.: SP2-25**  
**Our File: 24365A**

---

This letter is intended to address all comments received from Township of Southgate and other commenting authorities on the second Site Plan Control submission. Please do not hesitate to contact MHBC if you have any questions or concerns regarding any of the responses below.

	<b>Dustin Lyttle &amp; Sandeep Shrestha Triton Engineering Services Limited Municipal Servicing Assessment 22 September 2025</b>																								
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response																						
<b>3.0 Water:</b>																									
1.	<p><b>3.1 Reserve Capacity:</b> As indicated in the 2025 Reserve Capacity Calculations (RCC) for Dundalk, the current water system has a firm capacity of 2,817m<sup>3</sup>/day and a Max Day Demand (MDD) of 1,371m<sup>3</sup>/day. Resulting in a reserve capacity of 1,446m<sup>3</sup>/day equating the 1,630 ERUs.</p> <p>As per latest SSWMR, a water demand of 140 Liters/day/student has been applied which results in the total maximum water demand of <b>4.25L/sec (367 m<sup>3</sup>/day or 413ERU)</b> based on a 1,049-student school and a peaking factor of 2.5, while average day water demand is <b>1.7L/sec.</b></p> <p>Based on the above, the development scenarios considered will result in water reserve capacity as follows: <b>Table 1 – Water System Reserve Capacity</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="268 948 1016 1149"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Scenario</th> <th colspan="5">Reserve Capacity (ERUs)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Reserve Capacity (ERUs)</th> <th>Required</th> <th>Available (Pre-Site)</th> <th>Required (for Site)</th> <th>Remaining (Post-Site)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Committed</td> <td rowspan="2">1,629</td> <td>539</td> <td>1,090</td> <td>413</td> <td>677</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Future</td> <td>2,484</td> <td>-855</td> <td>0</td> <td>-855</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Scenario	Reserve Capacity (ERUs)					Reserve Capacity (ERUs)	Required	Available (Pre-Site)	Required (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)	Committed	1,629	539	1,090	413	677	Future	2,484	-855	0	-855	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.
Scenario	Reserve Capacity (ERUs)																								
	Reserve Capacity (ERUs)	Required	Available (Pre-Site)	Required (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)																				
Committed	1,629	539	1,090	413	677																				
Future		2,484	-855	0	-855																				
2.	<p><b>3.2 Supply Capacity:</b> As per latest SSWMR, a peak hour factor of 3.75 has been applied, resulting in a peak-hour demand of <b>6.37L/s.</b> The existing wells have a limited capacity, therefore, to ensure there is sufficient supply capacity redundancy in the event of a well being offline, we have assessed the ability of only Well D3 (13.7L/s) and Well D4 (18.9L/s) to supply water to the system (i.e. D5 off-line).</p>	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.																						

**Dustin Lyttle & Sandeep Shrestha  
Triton Engineering Services Limited  
Municipal Servicing Assessment  
22 September 2025**

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response																												
	<p>Based on the above, the peak-hour demand will impact the Dundalk water supply capacity as follows: <i>Table 2 – Water System Supply Capacity</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Scenario</th> <th colspan="5">Supply (L/s)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Supply Capacity (L/s)*</th> <th>MDD</th> <th>Available (Pre-Site)</th> <th>MDD (for Site)</th> <th>Remaining (Post-Site)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Current</td> <td></td> <td>13.66</td> <td>18.94</td> <td rowspan="2">6.37</td> <td>12.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Committed</td> <td>32.60</td> <td>17.31</td> <td>15.29</td> <td>8.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Future</td> <td></td> <td>27.49</td> <td>5.11</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>5.11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The above table represents a conservative scenario in which Wells’ D3 and D4 supply capacity is relied upon to supply the entire system. However, the Dundalk Water Tower and the storage within the well reservoirs will be able to buffer the short periods of high demand, and in the event of the tower being offline and the reservoirs not at their fullest, multiple wells will need to be operated simultaneously.</p>	Scenario	Supply (L/s)					Supply Capacity (L/s)*	MDD	Available (Pre-Site)	MDD (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)	Current		13.66	18.94	6.37	12.57	Committed	32.60	17.31	15.29	8.92	Future		27.49	5.11	0.00	5.11		
Scenario	Supply (L/s)																														
	Supply Capacity (L/s)*	MDD	Available (Pre-Site)	MDD (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)																										
Current		13.66	18.94	6.37	12.57																										
Committed	32.60	17.31	15.29		8.92																										
Future		27.49	5.11	0.00	5.11																										
3.	<p><b>3.3 Water Distribution:</b> <i>As-Proposed (Interim):</i> As proposed within the FSR, the school will connect to the proposed 150mm watermain on Street C. The Street C watermain will connect to the proposed 150mm watermain at Corbett St (Glenelg Phase 2A) to the west and the proposed 150mm watermain on Bradley St within Glenelg Phase 3 to the east.</p> <p>Additionally, 150mm watermain will be constructed on Street A from Bradley to Street E, and Street E from Street C to Street A</p> <p>Based on the above-described layout, the estimated available fire flow to the school <b>service</b> is expected to be 115.2 L/s. If we consider flow available to the site from the various mains</p>	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.																												

<b>Dustin Lyttle &amp; Sandeep Shrestha  Triton Engineering Services Limited  Municipal Servicing Assessment  22 September 2025</b>			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	adjacent to the site (i.e. 4 sides), utilizing the various hydrants, the total flow is 125 L/s.		
4.	<p><i>Upsized As-Proposed (Interim):</i>  If the watermain on Bradley, as described above, is upsized to 250mm the estimated available fire flow at school service connection is 127.6L/s. If we consider flow available to the site from the various mains adjacent to the site (i.e. 4 sides), utilizing the various hydrants, the total flow is <b>154L/s.</b></p>	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.
5.	<p><i>Upsized &amp; Expanded Layout:</i>  In order to determine eventual fire flow when Glenelg Phase 2 is built out, we have modelled the available fire flow at school service connection with the following noted changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 150mm watermain is constructed on Corbett St., Atchison Ave., Street C, Street B, and Street A within Glenelg Phase 2.</li> <li>• 150mm watermain is constructed on Street A within Glenelg Phase 3 from Street E to Corbett St. within Glenelg Phase 2.</li> <li>• 150mm watermain is constructed on Street D, Street E (east and west) from Street A to Street C within Glenelg Phase 3.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above-described layout, the estimated available fire flow at the school service 131.6L/s. If we consider flow available to the site from the various mains adjacent to the site (i.e. 4 sides), utilizing the various hydrants, the total flow is 164 L/s.</p> <p><i>Note: The estimated operating pressure in all scenarios at the school block service is 59 PSI.</i></p>	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.
6.	<p><b>3.4 Water Storage Capacity:</b>  Using the populations and demands described in the above section, the required fire flows and total storage requirements of the system have been calculated using Table 8-1 and Section 8.4.2 of the MECP Guidelines.</p>	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.

**Dustin Lyttle & Sandeep Shrestha  
Triton Engineering Services Limited  
Municipal Servicing Assessment  
22 September 2025**

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response																														
	<p>The calculated storage requirements of a water system and the impact of the proposed site-development are as follows: <b>Table 3 – Water System Storage Capacity</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Scenario</th> <th rowspan="2">Equivalent Population</th> <th colspan="5">Storage (m³)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Current Available*</th> <th>Required</th> <th>Available (Pre-Site)</th> <th>Required (for Site)</th> <th>Remaining (Post-Site)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Current</td> <td>4,261</td> <td rowspan="3">5,360</td> <td>1,598</td> <td>3,762</td> <td rowspan="2">295</td> <td>3,467</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Committed</td> <td>5,748</td> <td>1,928</td> <td>3,432</td> <td>3,137</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Future</td> <td>10,974</td> <td>3,938</td> <td>1,422</td> <td>0</td> <td>1,422</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Current storage available considers storage available at D3 and the Dundalk Water Tower.</p>	Scenario	Equivalent Population	Storage (m³)					Current Available*	Required	Available (Pre-Site)	Required (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)	Current	4,261	5,360	1,598	3,762	295	3,467	Committed	5,748	1,928	3,432	3,137	Future	10,974	3,938	1,422	0	1,422		
Scenario	Equivalent Population			Storage (m³)																													
		Current Available*	Required	Available (Pre-Site)	Required (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)																											
Current	4,261	5,360	1,598	3,762	295	3,467																											
Committed	5,748		1,928	3,432		3,137																											
Future	10,974		3,938	1,422	0	1,422																											

**4.0 Wastewater:**

7.	<p><b>4.1 Reserve Capacity:</b> As indicated in the 2025 RCC for the Dundalk WWTF the current system has a three-year average daily sewage flow of 1,215m<sup>3</sup>/day, resulting in a reserve capacity of 617m<sup>3</sup>/day equating to 745 ERUs.</p> <p>As per MECP Design Guidelines for Drinking Water Systems-2008 (MECP Guidelines), using 70 L/day indicates that the expected average daily sanitary loading from the site will be <b>1.7L/sec (147 m<sup>3</sup>/day or 166ERU)</b>, and assumes that the water used by the development, as discussed above, will be conveyed to the sanitary system.</p> <p>It is expected that after completion of the WWTF phase 1 expansion in 2025, the treatment capacity will be increased to 3,025m<sup>3</sup>/day. The Future scenario assumes the additional capacity from the WWTF expansion is available.</p> <p>Based on the above, the proposed development will impact the Dundalk WWTF reserve capacity as follows: <b>Table 4 – Sanitary Reserve Capacity</b></p>	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.
----	--	---------	---

Dustin Lyttle & Sandeep Shrestha Triton Engineering Services Limited Municipal Servicing Assessment 22 September 2025																														
#	Comment					Responder	Comment Response																							
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Scenario</th> <th colspan="5">Reserve Capacity (ERUs)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Available</th> <th>Required</th> <th>Available (Pre-Site)</th> <th>Required (for Site)</th> <th>Remaining (Post-Site)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Committed</td> <td>745</td> <td>316</td> <td>429</td> <td>166</td> <td>263</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Future</td> <td>2,188</td> <td>2,227</td> <td>-39</td> <td>0</td> <td>-39</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Scenario	Reserve Capacity (ERUs)					Available	Required	Available (Pre-Site)	Required (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)	Committed	745	316	429	166	263	Future	2,188	2,227	-39	0	-39		
Scenario	Reserve Capacity (ERUs)																													
	Available	Required	Available (Pre-Site)	Required (for Site)	Remaining (Post-Site)																									
Committed	745	316	429	166	263																									
Future	2,188	2,227	-39	0	-39																									
8.	<p><b>4.2 Wastewater Collection:</b> The proposed development will be serviced through connection along stub on Street C which will then eventually flow west towards Phase 2A and then southerly towards treatment plant.</p> <p>Based on the above, all downstream sewers are not expected to exceed 50% capacity. To further examine the potential effects of other properties being developed and ultimate build-out scenario of developments within and beyond the urban boundary was also assessed. Under this ultimate scenario (2045+), all downstream sewers are not expected to exceed 90% capacity.</p>					Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.																							
<b>5.0 Conclusion:</b>																														
9.	<p><b>5.1 Water:</b> Based on the above, the proposed development is expected to have adequate water pressure however is not expected meet the desired fire flows of 150L/s. To maximize available fire flows to the site, a 250mm watermain is required on Bradley Street within Glenelg Phase 3, all other mains can be 150 mm, with Street C connected to Glenelg Phase 2. This configuration will result in a total fire flow of 154L/s available at the site. Connection of Street A and buildout of Glenelg Phase 2 will improve total fire flow available to the school site to 164 L/s. However, nearby hydrant testing may be showing higher flows if the proponent does not believe the noted estimated available flows are sufficient for the proposed development.</p>					Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.																							

Dustin Lyttle & Sandeep Shrestha Triton Engineering Services Limited Municipal Servicing Assessment 22 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
10	<p><b>5.2 Sanitary:</b> Based on the above noted loading, there is sufficient capacity to convey and treat the expected sanitary flows from this development.</p> <p>The capacity of the existing wastewater treatment system is expected to meet the needs of the site.</p> <p>However, future expansion/modification to reserve capacities for both water and sanitary servicing might be required if all uncommitted developments come online.</p>	Crozier	Acknowledged.

Dustin Lyttle & Sandeep Shrestha Triton Engineering Services 22 September 2025			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
Previous Submission Comments			
11.	1.2 The proposed municipal infrastructure and features external and adjacent to the site are to be shown as per Township standards (i.e., anchor tee and valve, sidewalk crossings, etc.), revise accordingly. <i>Pending.</i>	Crozier / +VG	Acknowledged.
12.	1.5 Confirm and indicate the curb returns radius of the entrances and exits. <i>Increase the radius of both north parking lot along Street A and southwest parking lot (north side) along Street E to the commercial entrance/exit radius minimum (9.0m).</i>	Crozier / +VG	All architectural and engineering drawings updated to reflect changes to site plan.
13.	1.27 Profile grade of soccer field swales is to be a minimum 1.0% as feasible to avoid water ponding. <i>Pending, provide subdrain along the swale if it's not feasible.</i>	Crozier	Subdrain is provided where minimum slope of 1.0% not provided. See Drawing C101 (dated 12 February 2026) for changes.
14.	1.29 The top of foundation (TF) elevation is to be provided to confirm the minimum 0.15m separation from finished grade is achieved. <i>Pending, TF is to be 0.15m higher than the finished grade.</i>	Crozier / +VG	The minimum 0.15 m separation between top of foundation (TF) and finished grade is provided across the school building, where required. This minimum separation is not

	<b>Dustin Lyttle &amp; Sandeep Shrestha Triton Engineering Services 22 September 2025</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
			required (and is shown as 0m) where ramps are provided to meet the interior floor slab. Refer to Drawing C102 by Crozier (dated 12 February 2026) and Drawing A1.1 by +Vg (dated 4 March 2026).
Current Submission Comments			
15.	2.1 Please note, at a minimum, two connections to the existing water system (one at Glenelg Phase 2A and another at Bradley St) are to be provided prior to occupancy of the school.	Crozier / +VG	Acknowledged.
16.	2.2 Ensure details shown correlate on the applicable drawings. We note that the pavement structure, as indicated in Drawing C102, does not match that of Drawing C107A. Revise accordingly.	Crozier	Revisions made to Drawing C102 (dated 12 February 2026) as indicated.
17.	2.3 Revise the size of the watermain shown along Bradley Street extension to 250mm PVC. Refer to the attached Municipal Servicing Assessment.	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.
18.	2.4 Confirm the elevation of groundwater is indicated correctly. It appears that groundwater elevation is higher than the existing ground as per Cross-Section 2-2 within Drawing sheet 103. Revise accordingly.	Crozier	Seasonally high groundwater is data is informed by the hydrogeological assessment completed by SLR in 2023, which has been included as a separate document.
19.	2.5 Indicate maximum ponding elevations for each storm event within the stage-storage discharge table in Appendix E.	Crozier	Design storms added next to the elevation associated with the tank storage within Appendix E of the Servicing & Stormwater Management Implementation Report (February 2026).

	<b>Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1<sup>st</sup> submission</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
Ecology Comments			
20.	As per GRCA's condition for draft plan approval c), Completion of a revised Environmental Impact Study (EIS)	Crozier	Acknowledged.

Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1 <sup>st</sup> submission			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	demonstrating how GRCA policies 7.1.2 and 8.4.7 (or as amended) have been addressed with respect to Block 342 (Future ROW) will be required prior to clearance of GRCA's conditions for the subdivision.		
21.	Please provide more clarity on the graphs and values presented in Appendix D3 <i>Outlet 1 Wetland &amp; Outlet 2 Wetland Depth Comparison</i> of the Water Balance Report. Specifically, regarding changes in <i>Mean Depths</i> , which appear to be potentially significant at Outlet 1, for and changes in <i>Duration of Deficits</i> , which are substantially less for both outlets. Do these changes in <i>Duration of Deficits</i> translate to increased periods of inundation for these wetlands? If so, what is the magnitude of the change in inundation period and potential impacts on the wetlands?	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.
22.	If possible with existing data, more analysis should be provided on the sensitivity of the specific wetland vegetation communities to hydrologic change in the cases of the receiving wetlands for Outlets 1 and 2.	Crozier	Comment to be addressed as part of the next Glenelg Phase 3 Subdivision submission.
Engineering comments			
Please see below original GRCA comments, consultant responses (in blue) and current GRCA responses/comments (in red).			
23.	GRCA acknowledges that the feature-based water balance is now completed on a monthly basis. The water balance summary provided in the appendix of the Feature-Based Water Balance Memo (Feb. 2024) includes the % change between existing and proposed conditions (with mitigation) on an annual basis. Please provide the % change between existing and proposed conditions (with mitigation) on a monthly basis and comment on the impact of the mitigation measures to the wetland features. <i>C.F. Crozier &amp; Associates Inc. Response: Acknowledged. The SWM design, proposed mitigation measures, and FBWB results have been revised. Results have been presented on a monthly basis and discussion has been added to comment on the impact of the mitigation measures. Mitigation measures for the FBWB have been developed in coordination with the</i>	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).  Please see comment #1 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.

Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1 <sup>st</sup> submission			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>ecologist on file to limit impacts on the receiving wetlands. The FBWB Report should be read in conjunction with the Wetland Water Balance Impact Memorandum by SLR dated May 2025.</p> <p><i>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</i> We acknowledge that a revised calculation has been provided. However, additional clarifications (see comments below) are required for the feature-based water balance.</p>		
24.	<p>The results of the feature-based water balance show an annual infiltration deficit of 50% and 85% to Outlet #1 and Outlet #3, respectively. Outlet #2 and Outlet #4 show an infiltration surplus of 46% and 155%, respectively. The pre-development infiltration targets for each individual outlet should be closely matched and reviewed on a monthly basis.</p> <p><i>C.F. Crozier &amp; Associates Inc. Response:</i> Acknowledged. The SWM design, proposed mitigation measures, and FBWB results have been revised. In post-development (mitigation) conditions, infiltration targets are within +/- 10% for outlet #1, outlet #2, outlet #3 and outlet #4 overall. Results are also presented on a monthly basis.</p> <p><i>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</i> We acknowledge that significant improvements to the water balance have been made through the proposed mitigation measures. However, additional measures are still required at Outlet #1 and Outlet #2 to ensure that post-development infiltration matches or exceeds pre-development levels. Enhancing infiltration at these locations would help reduce post-development runoff, particularly at Outlet #2, where runoff is currently projected to increase by 161%.</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #2 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
25.	<p>The annual site water balance provided in the FSRSWM (Oct. 2023) shows a deficit of 51% between pre- and post-development (with mitigation) conditions. Further efforts should be made to closely meet pre-development infiltration targets for the site.</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p>

	<b>Grand River Conservation Authority</b> <b>Jessica Conroy</b> <b>14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1<sup>st</sup> submission</b>		
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p><i>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</i> This comment may be considered addressed if a clear justification is provided for the annual mitigated infiltration volume of 28,148 m<sup>3</sup>/year, attributed to the direct connection of the roof area to the drainage layer.</p>		<p>Please see comment #3 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
26.	<p>The feature-based water balance appears to assume that the winter months are January, February, and December. The annual water balance provided in the FRSWMM report (Oct. 2023) includes a note that states the winter months were assumed to be January, February, March, November and December. Please clarify this discrepancy and revise as needed.</p> <p><i>C.F. Crozier &amp; Associates Inc. Response:</i> Acknowledged. Please note that the feature-based water balance calculation method differs from the side-wide water balance calculation method. In the FBWB, PCSWMM calculates the winter months using continuous data and in the site-wide water balance, climate normals from Proton Station are used for the Thornthwaite method.</p> <p><i>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</i> Please confirm whether the same climate station was used for both the continuous and monthly datasets. Additionally, please explain the significant discrepancies observed during the winter months between the two data sets.</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #4 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
27.	<p>Please include in the report a summary of the seasonally high groundwater elevations across the site. Note that a minimum of 1 m separation is required from the bottom of proposed infiltration facilities to the seasonally high groundwater elevation in the location of each facility. Please demonstrate adequate separation between the seasonally high groundwater elevation and the bottom of the soakaway pits.</p> <p><i>C.F. Crozier &amp; Associates Inc. Response:</i> Acknowledged. The SWM design and mitigation measures have been revised. Soakaway pits are no longer proposed and roof areas across the Subject Site (as identified in Figure 6 of the FBWB Report)</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #5 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>

Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1 <sup>st</sup> submission			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>are proposed for direct connection to the drainage layer. Figure C5 in Appendix C5 presents a figure depicting the clearance from groundwater to the proposed grade for the Subject Site.</p> <p><b>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</b> Please provide detailed justification for the direct connection of roof drainage to the drainage layer without incorporating Low Impact Development (LID) measures, including all relevant calculations, assumptions, and supporting references. Additionally, please note that the GRCA requires a minimum 1.0 m separation between the bottom of each proposed infiltration facility and the seasonally high groundwater table at the specific location of the facility. This requirement does not refer to the clearance between the groundwater table and the proposed finished grade for the Subject Site, as depicted in Figure 5. Please revise the submission accordingly and provide the necessary supporting information.</p>		
28.	<p>In Appendix F, the sizing sheets for the Bioretention Facilities show the depth to groundwater as 4.38 m. Please confirm if this is with respect to the seasonal high groundwater elevation in the proposed location of the facilities.</p> <p><b>C.F. Crozier &amp; Associates Inc. Response:</b> Acknowledged. The SWM design and mitigation measures have been revised. For more information on the infiltration trench design within the School Block, please refer to the Servicing and Stormwater Management Implementation Report -BWDSB School (Crozier, January 2025). Figure C5 in Appendix C5 presents a figure depicting the clearance from groundwater to the proposed grade for the Subject Site.</p> <p><b>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</b> Please provide the seasonal high groundwater table in the vicinity of the 'direct roof connection to the drainage layer'. Additionally, please confirm if the plotted groundwater on the School Block infiltration fetchers profile represents the seasonal high groundwater table.</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #6 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>

Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1 <sup>st</sup> submission			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
29.	<p>The Proposed LID Plan (Figure 7) illustrates the approximate location of LIDs on the developed site. Are the LIDs on this plan accurately depicted as per their proposed sizes and amount required? Please confirm. It must be demonstrated that there is enough space allocated within the proposed draft plan blocks to accommodate the necessary LID measures to meet water balance targets.</p> <p><i>C.F. Crozier &amp; Associates Inc. Response:</i> Acknowledged. The proposed LID plan has been updated to reflect the revised SWM design and proposed mitigation measures. Roof areas illustrated on the plan have been depicted accurately based on roofs proposed for direct connection to the drainage layer. Furthermore, proposed infiltration trench areas within the school block are depicted accurately as proposed within the Servicing and Stormwater Management Implementation Report -BWDSB School (Crozier, January 2025).</p> <p><i>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</i> Based on updated information, GRCA has more specific comments on this matter (see comments 21 and 22 below).</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #7 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
30.	<p>The report needs to be signed and stamped by a professional engineer.</p> <p><i>C.F. Crozier &amp; Associates Inc. Response:</i> Acknowledged. <i>GRCA Response/Updated Comment:</i> We acknowledge that the Glenelg Phase 3A - Servicing &amp; SWM Implementation Report has been stamped by a professional engineer. However, the Civil Drawings Set has not been stamped by a professional engineer. Additionally, the Southgate – BWDSB New School Block Servicing &amp; SWM Implementation Report and relevant drawings within the report have not been stamped. Please provide stamped report and drawings in the next submission.</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #8 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
Comments on Servicing & SWM Implementation Report; Civil Drawing Set; Feature-Based Water Balance Report; Wetland Water Balance Impact Memo; and Geotechnical Investigation:			

<b>Grand River Conservation Authority</b> <b>Jessica Conroy</b> <b>14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1<sup>st</sup> submission</b>			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
31.	The report indicates that the entire Glenelg Phase 3 lands drain to five different outlets under pre-development conditions. Tile drains serve as intermediate receivers for Outlets 2, 3, and 4. It should be noted that tile drains are typically sized differently from conventional stormwater management infrastructure (e.g., storm sewers). For instance, some tile drains are designed to convey flows equivalent to 25 mm per hectare over a 24-hour period. The GRCA has concerns regarding the suitability of these tile drains as receivers for standard post-to-pre-development stormwater management flows. Please provide justification.	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #9 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
32.	The <i>Glenelg Phase 3 – Servicing &amp; Stormwater Management Implementation Report</i> does not include a description for Catchment INT-7.	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #10 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
33.	Please revise Figure 6B to remove features that pertain only to interim conditions (e.g., channels and 3:1 slopes).	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #11 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
34.	The velocity in the interim drainage channel has been calculated at 1.17 m/s. At this velocity, channel erosion protection may be necessary. Please either propose appropriate erosion control measures or provide justification for why such protection is not required.	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #12 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
35.	The calculated drawdown time of 53.9 hours exceeds the maximum allowable drawdown time of 48 hours, as specified	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p>

<b>Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1<sup>st</sup> submission</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
	in the MECP Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003). Please revise accordingly.		Please see comment #13 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
36.	Please provide the specific rectangular weir equation used to calculate the discharge, including all relevant parameters and assumptions.	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).  Please see comment #14 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
37.	A review of civil drawings C106B and C106E indicates that a clay liner or geosynthetic clay liner (GCL) is proposed up to the extended detention water level (517.05 m). However, the observed groundwater level is approximately 1 m higher than the top elevation of the proposed liner. This raises the potential for groundwater intrusion into the pond, which could reduce the available active storage volume. Please consider extending the clay liner or GCL above the observed groundwater level. Additionally, please confirm whether the plotted groundwater level represents a seasonal high groundwater condition.	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).  Please see comment #15 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
38.	Please confirm whether the proposed clay liner or geosynthetic clay liner (GCL) can withstand the anticipated groundwater pressure. Buoyancy calculations should be provided to support this assessment.	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).  Please see comment #16 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
39.	Please include additional water level profiles on the SWM Pond cross-sections, specifically for the 2-year, 5-year, 100-year, and Regional Storm events.	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).

<b>Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1<sup>st</sup> submission</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
			Please see comment #17 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
40.	Please provide appropriately sized riprap at the SWM pond outlet to ensure erosion protection. Additionally, the use of a level spreader should be considered to help disperse flow and prevent concentrated discharge.	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).  Please see comment #18 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
41.	The Servicing & Stormwater Management Implementation Report (S&SWMIR) does not include a monitoring program. Please provide a detailed monitoring plan to verify the functionality of the proposed stormwater management strategy, including the performance of infiltration features.	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).  Please see comment #19 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
42.	Typical Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) drawings have not been provided. However, the Site Alteration Plan Stage 1 (C104A) and Stage 2 (C104B) appear to serve as ESC Drawings. Please confirm whether these drawings are intended to represent the ESC plans. Additionally, please address the following items related to ESC and site alteration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm whether the proposed SWM pond will function as a temporary sediment control pond during construction.</li> <li>• Provide details on how the temporary Hickenbottom inlet was sized.</li> <li>• Provide information on the sizing methodology for the sediment traps.</li> <li>• Include a dedicated ESC section in the Servicing &amp; Stormwater Management Implementation Report (S&amp;SWMIR) to present and discuss the above items.</li> </ul>	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).  Please see comment #20 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.
43.	The report indicates that 3.18 hectares of roof area are directly connected to the drainage layer, resulting in a total annual infiltration volume of 28,148 m <sup>3</sup> /year.	Crozier	This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).

<b>Grand River Conservation Authority</b> <b>Jessica Conroy</b> <b>14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1<sup>st</sup> submission</b>			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
	<p>Please provide comprehensive documentation supporting the proposed approach of direct connection of roof runoff to the drainage layer without the implementation of Low Impact Development (LID). This should include all relevant calculations, assumptions, and references—such as infiltration rates, seasonal high groundwater levels, available storage capacity, and any other pertinent factors. Additionally, please clearly explain the methodology used to derive the annual infiltration volume of 28,148 m<sup>3</sup>/year.</p>		<p>Please see comment #21 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
44.	<p>We acknowledge that significant improvements have been made to the water balance through proposed mitigation measures. However, additional measures are required at Outlet #1 and Outlet #2 to ensure that post-development infiltration meets or surpasses pre-development conditions.</p> <p>Notably, there is a substantial increase in runoff (161%) to the wetland at Outlet #2, along with a slight decrease in both runoff and infiltration to the wetland at Outlet #3.</p>	Crozier	<p>This comment has been addressed as part of the Glenelg Phase 3 Water Balance and Site Alteration submission (October 2025).</p> <p>Please see comment #1 in the provided Glenelg Phase 3 FBWB Comment Matrix, included as a separate document.</p>
<b>Comments on School Block Servicing &amp; SWM Implementation Report:</b>			
45.	<p>The School Block Servicing &amp; SWM Report frequently references that certain details will be provided during the detailed design phase. Please clarify whether the current submission represents a preliminary or detailed design and revise the report accordingly.</p>	Crozier / Applicant	<p>The School Block is currently at the Site Plan Application stage. The Glenelg Phase 3 development overall is in the detailed design stage with the intent to move to construction.</p>
46.	<p>The report indicates that two outlets—Outlet #2 and Outlet #4—are incorporated into the School Block design. Based on our review of the contour lines shown on the Pre-Development Drainage Plan (Figure 4), it appears that the entire School Block drains toward the west and northwest, specifically to Outlet #2. However, under post-development conditions, a portion of the School Block (Catchment POST-7A) drains toward Outlet #4. Please provide further clarification since the post-development drainage pattern does not match the pre-development conditions.</p>	Crozier	<p>The overall drainage pattern for Glenelg Phase 3 as a whole has been considered for matching post to pre-development drainage patterns. This allowed us to direct areas best suited to the individual wetlands and outlets, resulting in the most effective drainage patterns and minimizing impacts to the surrounding environment.</p>

Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1 <sup>st</sup> submission			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
47.	There is a discrepancy between the VO6 modeling files, and the output results and summary tables (Tables 1 and 2) presented in the School Block Servicing & SWM Report. Please revise accordingly.	Crozier	Acknowledged. This was revised at 2nd submission, and we can confirm there are no discrepancies between VO and the summary tables as part of the 3rd SPC submission.
48.	Please confirm the methodology used to calculate the stage-storage-discharge relationship for the ADS chambers.	Crozier	Stage-storage relationship has been determined through the ADS StormTech design sheet. The stage-discharge has been determined through relationship between head over orifice diameter and diameter size.
49.	Please provide an additional catchment area plan that includes the post-development Catchment 4.	Crozier	Acknowledged, refer to Figure 7 (dated 19 January 2024) of the FSR & SWM Report (dated 12 February 2026) for the overall subdivision post-development drainage plan.
50.	Please verify whether the interim conditions apply to the School Block.	Crozier	The School Block will be constructed under interim conditions. Under interim conditions all flows will be conveyed to the Glenelg Phase 3 SWM Pond.
51.	Please briefly clarify how the Chicago 3-hour and the 12-hour SCS Type II rainfall distribution were generated using Ontario Ministry of Transportation (M.T.O.) Intensity-Duration-Frequency (IDF) curves.	Crozier	Both Chicago and SCS Type II storms were derived from the MTO IDF look-up tool for the Community of Dundalk and converted by VO.
52.	Please expand Sections 5.6 and 5.7 of the School Block Servicing & SWM Report. Additionally, please provide a summary table detailing the following information for each proposed infiltration feature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feature ID</li> <li>• Preliminary dimensions (depth, width, length, and volume)</li> <li>• Infiltration rate</li> <li>• Preliminary top and bottom elevations of the infiltration gallery</li> <li>• Seasonal high groundwater elevation at each gallery location</li> </ul>	Crozier	A summary table (Table 4) has been provided in Section 5.5 of the revised FSR & SWM Report (dated 12 February 2026) to detail the features requested.

Grand River Conservation Authority Jessica Conroy 14 July 2025 – issued with regard to 1 <sup>st</sup> submission			
#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
53.	Please confirm whether the groundwater table shown on Drawing C103 represents the seasonal high groundwater level.	Crozier	The groundwater table represents seasonal high groundwater level.
54.	Please clarify the methodology used to demonstrate how the proposed infiltration features achieve an annual infiltration volume of 2,369 m <sup>3</sup> /year.	Crozier	The infiltration features have been designed to retain the 25mm storm event for the contribution area based on percent impervious. The trenches reduce excess runoff of area by 45% per the Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide by CVC and TRCA (2010).
55.	The <i>Southgate – BWDSB New School Block Servicing &amp; SWM Implementation Report</i> , along with the associated drawings within report, should be stamped and signed by a licensed professional engineer.	Crozier	Acknowledged
56.	<p><b>Plan Review Fees:</b> As stated in our first submission comments, GRCA charges a fee for its plan review services in accordance with the current approved GRCA Plan Review Fee Schedule. The fee required for our review of this draft plan of subdivision was a \$2,410 base fee in addition to a fee of \$1,255 per net hectare (excluding natural areas) to a cap of \$30,000. Based on the proposed 17.65 hectares to be developed, a total fee of \$24,560.75 is required.</p> <p>GRCA previously received payment in the amount of \$17,192 (70% of the total fee required prior to draft plan approval). At this time, the remaining 30% of the total \$24,560.75 fee is due. As such, the owner will be invoiced in the amount of <b>\$7,368.75</b> for the remaining 30% of the total fee required prior to draft plan approval. Please note that additional fees will be required for GRCA's clearance of draft plan conditions as well as for any required GRCA permit applications.</p>	Applicant	It is noted that the Bluewater District School Board is not responsible for fees associated with the wider Draft Plan of Subdivision. The fee associated with the Site Plan Control application for the school block was made (payable to the Township), including the requisite deposit.

<b>Becky Hillyer, Senior Planner County of Grey 9 October 2025</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Responder</b>	<b>Comment Response</b>
57.	Grey County Forestry and Trails, County Transportation, and County Ecology staff have reviewed the proposal and have no further comments beyond those comments shared through the formal subdivision process.	Applicant	Acknowledged.
58.	With regard to the conveyance of Grey County Rail Trail lands to the Township to facilitate access to the new school site, please be advised that County and Township staff are in the final phases of completing this agreement and anticipate the completion of this process shortly.	Applicant	Acknowledged.