

## **Class EA Master Plan Servicing Study – Port Albert QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**Please Note: Because of privacy concerns, any questions posted to this forum that include individual names or addresses has been blacked out.**

- Q1. What size is the proposed drainage pond to be built at the bottom of Huron Road and Ashfield?
- A. A final design for the stormwater detention facility has not been completed. However, based on preliminary calculations, the detention facility will be approximately 0.55 hectares (1.4 Acres). A preliminary layout is shown on the drawing titled “Proposed Catchments and Three SWM Pond Option”. See link in the Documents section.
- Q2. Do we have assurance that the existing public access to the beach will be recreated?
- A. The Township has indicated that a Public Beach Access will be incorporated into the design of the new storm water drainage outfall to be constructed at the westerly extent of the Ashfield Street road allowance.
- Q3. Will Ashfield St. from Sydenham St. be widened and paved? What is the projected direction of the road if so?
- A. As noted during the presentation, in order to upgrade road and drainage infrastructure in the west end of the study area to support potential development of existing lots of record in this part of the community, lots are required to front on a ‘Municipal Road’ and have an approved drainage plan. Upgrading Ashfield Street to an urban cross-section and installing the associated drainage upgrades, is one of the first projects identified for implementation. Ultimately it is the Township’s decision which project they decide to implement first. If selected, Ashfield (between Huron Street and Sydenham Street) would be reconstructed to a similar standard as the recent reconstruction on London Road. The road would have two lanes, one east bound and one west bound.
- Q4. BIGGEST CONCERN are the trees, including the very large, 100 year old tree, along Ashfield. Too cut that down would be a crime.
- A. Typically the issue of trees along a road allowance are addressed during final design, which has not been completed for the Ashfield Street section noted above. Road reconstruction would typically involve reconstruction of the boulevard to ensure that drainage is directed toward the road where the storm sewer inlets are located. The westerly extent of Ashfield is not located within the road allowance, therefore some realignment of the existing road surface will need to occur to ensure that the road is located within the municipally-owned road allowance, rather than on private property. We understand the concern related to the large tree adjacent to the current road surface. The Township is willing to investigate whether it is possible to preserve the tree during reconstruction of this section of Ashfield Street.

Q5. In the following response, "As noted during the presentation, in order to upgrade road and drainage infrastructure in the west end of the study area to support potential development of existing lots of record in this part of the community, lots are required to front on a 'Municipal Road' and have an approved drainage plan. Upgrading Ashfield Street to an urban cross-section and installing the associated drainage upgrades, is **one of the first projects** identified for implementation. Ultimately it is the Township's decision which project they decide to implement first. If selected, Ashfield (between Huron Street and Sydenham Street) would be reconstructed to a similar standard as the recent reconstruction on London Road. The road would have two lanes, one east bound and one west bound", you state **one of the first projects**. What are the specific projects? The projects have been mentioned in the light of the word projects, but there has not been any specific identification of "the projects".

A. The only other specific projects needed to address general road and drainage infrastructure deficiencies in the west end of the study area would be construction of the regional stormwater management facility and the improved outlet at the west end of Ashfield Street. Of course individual road construction, including drainage infrastructure, would also be required so that lots have frontage on a municipal road and drainage issues are addressed.

Q6. ACW Township is central to answering all questions posted. Why has the Township delegated these questions to BM Ross when the public asked September 07 that the township post and answer all questions themselves? This may include seeking input from BM Ross. How do I know where the answers to my questions are coming from? How do I know that the Township understands my view point if they excuse themselves from the communication or the learning opportunities that arise when seeking the answers? To ensure that the Township is taking leadership by promoting public confidence for their commissioning of the Port Albert Master Plan, can all questions posted to this BM Ross forum get added even if there isn't an immediate answer? Can all answers either cite the source or indicate that the Township is going to follow up publicly with the answer?

A. The Township of ACW retained the services of BMROSS to undertake the Servicing Master Plan Study on their behalf. This includes consultation efforts associated with the Class EA Master Plan process. Responses to the questions are drafted initially by BMROSS technical staff and are then reviewed and approved by the Township before being posted. We will strive to post the questions and answers as quickly as possible after they are received.

Q7. Has Ashfield St. been surveyed by a professional surveyor to determine the actual position and boundaries of the road? Specifically from where the road turns from paved to gravel. If so, have 'stakes' been placed to show the boundaries?

A. Ashfield Street has not been surveyed by an Ontario Land Surveyor (OLS). A survey would be undertaken as part of the engineering design process.

Q8. As a cottage owner I was not included in the survey. I would like to be part of the survey process. Especially since the entire project is based on the survey results. Will I be included?

A. The BMROSS website for the Master Plan has the questionnaire on-line. If residents still want to complete the questionnaire we can incorporate your responses into the final report summaries. The survey results were used to support the preliminary Master Plan recommendations, but additional information obtained through engineering investigations was also used in developing the plan's recommendations.

Q9. Will there be a review or revised edition to the Port Albert Master Plan? Since the majority (12 of the 22) property owners in the Huron Street South, Ashfield Street and Sydenham Street area did not receive the survey questionnaire and therefore were not included in the survey?

A. The current recommendations have not been finalized. The Township is looking for feedback from residents before confirming the report recommendations and finalizing the Master Plan.

Q10. Kelly and Dale will you kindly meet with us again to help clarify the many questions and misunderstandings that are going around?

A. There is going to be another public meeting held either later this fall or in 2020 to present the final recommendations and cost estimates before the Master Plan is finalized.

Q11. This question is directed to our Mayor. I think that ACW has identified the development of future lands along the unassumed township roads of Ashfield and Huron Streets as a specific township project. My question is specific to the plot of land that borders the Harvey Street ravine, running north to Ashfield Street and from 210 feet west of Sydenham Street to 210 feet east of Huron Street. If I owned this property in question, I would choose to keep it as revenue generating crop land, with its current property drainage flowing towards the Harvey Street ravine. Would ACW still proceed with the Ashfield / Huron Street road and drainage development and reroute this property drainage towards your proposed Ashfield Street ponding facility and outlet?

A. The decision of Council, including myself, would depend heavily on the recommendation of BM Ross as to where the land should be drained to.

Q12. This question is being directed to our Mayor for a response. We have gathered the facts as presented to us by ACW via public township meetings or public postings of information by the township. We requested to speak to a Councillor prior to us asking questions on this BM Ross forum. We wanted to give ACW the benefit of clearing up our possible misconceptions prior to airing our concerns on this BM Ross forum. [REDACTED], speaking on behalf of the township, denied our request for a meeting. He directed us to this BM Ross forum. We are trying to establish a dialog with our elected Councillor to discuss the very serious issue of how the township proposes to develop Port Albert. We are not being

vexatious or frivolous. We do not have any design on swaying public opinion, as can happen with a forum like this. Is it your opinion that we don't have the right to speak to our Councillor? Do you direct us to post all of our questions and concerns to this BM Ross forum? Is this BM Ross forum our only means of communicating to our township officials concerning the issues affecting our community?

A: Council encourages questions related to the project be directed to BM Ross for the benefit of the whole Port Albert community. BM Ross is working with Township staff to provide accurate responses to the questions raised.

Q13. This question is directed to all ACW Councillors. Councillors please post your independent answers along with your names with your answers. I attended the July 29 and September 07 public meetings and have read all of the information that ACW has provided to the public. From these meetings, I think I understand, that Port Albert is facing approximately \$10 million dollars in infrastructure repairs/upgrades over the next 20 years. I didn't gain any insight from any of our Councillors during either meeting, just the Mayor. Please provide to this forum, what each of you believe, is the name or title for each defined project that the township is considering. From your perspective as both ACW residents, as well as ACW Councillors, what do you recommend, as the order of importance, that these defined projects proceed, and why?

A. ACW Council initiated this project. The order of construction, if and when, will be determined by development interest and upgrades to existing infrastructure.

Q14. The younger generation of current Port Albert residents can't afford to purchase housing in Port Albert's fast growing lakeside community real estate market. At the September 07 meeting, the Mayor's opening statements canvassed for Bruce Power employees to move to future development lands in Port Albert.

A. ACW Council recognizes that Port Albert is an inviting place to live. Initiating this review is the first step in addressing this opportunity.

Q15. Does ACW own industrial land to host the Nuclear Industry companies? If not, why not? Why hasn't the purchase of ACW owned industrial land been given a priority over promoting the development of unassumed township owned roads and drainage in the undeveloped Port Albert Master Plan footprint? Why do the children and grandchildren, we have raised in our own ACW communities, have to leave ACW to prosper?

A: ACW Council has identified Port Albert as an area with potential development opportunities to allow our youth to continue to live close to where they work.

Q16. I question the location of the storm water facility and drainage pond. There are three options as presented. The blue one being on the [redacted] property on Huron Street. The red one being on the [redacted] property Huron Street. The last option the purple one being on the [redacted] property on Ashfield Street. The first two options require taking land from families that have owned the land for generations. Upwards of 50 years. Why

take from them? The land owned by the [REDACTED] was ONLY purchased in 2015. In addition, their lot of land is the biggest.

Other than an extra cost because the [REDACTED] property is furthest from the outlet why is that not the logical location? Why take land handed down for generations if there is another choice? This is not the moral or ethical thing to Please tell me why the [REDACTED] property is not the right option to put the drainage pond on?

A. As part of the Class EA review process a range of alternative locations are typically considered before a preferred location and design is ultimately selected. The preferred choice is selected after evaluating the impacts associated with the different options. Your input is assisting in identifying those impacts. A preferred location for the stormwater facility will be identified prior to the next public meeting and before the Master Plan process is finalized.

Q17. This question is being asked of our Chief Building Officer. Without including inquiries from real estate agents in your reply, how many actual building permit application forms are on file from land owners within the BM Ross Master Plan defined study area for 2017 through 2019? Please dont include any permits that fall outside of the defined footprint in this Master Plan. Also can you break down the numbers by year?

A. Response Pending.

Q18. When will proper consideration be given in the correct manner for the following important issues? With each proposal of further/future development, important wildlife is increasingly under the threat of losing their habitat and having their established movement and routes curtailed. Families of Deer, packs of Coyote and Red Fox regularly cross the ravine West of the Port Albert drain and move across the land to the North. (Typically the undeveloped land East of Huron St. South, South of Ashfield St. and West of Sydenham St.) This is a common route for them to take as a corridor which helps them to limit their proximity to man as they move in their search for food and their efforts to maintain territory. Other animals seen using similar routes are Porcupine, Wild Turkey and species of Snake. In addition to this, the area described above is regularly used as a roosting location for local Canadian Geese populations. Eagles also nest in the trees alongside Ashfield St. at its Western end. Developing such zones without the proper studies being conducted in order to learn the full impact on this wildlife would be wrong. Are such studies going to be conducted? Which bodies will be making the studies?

A. When completing a Master Plan using the Class EA process, the proponent is required to inventory the environment to identify any sensitive species that may be impacted by the project. To determine what areas must be inventoried, we rely on input from federal and provincial agencies, various provincial and federal data bases, and input from project stakeholders. Based on input received from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) and from the Maitland Valley Conservation Authority (MVCA), the wooded areas located central to the study area, were previously identified and assessed. This is the first comment received regarding additional wildlife using the study area. Therefore, prior to

undertaking individual projects associated with the Master Plan, an ecologist will be retained to assess potential impacts to wildlife from implementation of the Master Plan.

Q19. The section of Ashfield St, that runs between Sydenham St. and Huron St. South is bordered by many trees including a magnificent Elm tree as well as Pear and Apple trees. These trees should be retained. They should not be destroyed. If Ashfield St. is to be widened then land should be used to the South for this expansion so as not to kill the trees and the wildlife which depend on them. If needed, this land could be expropriated as necessary from the [REDACTED] development. Is this solution for this part of Ashfield St. going to be reviewed and carefully considered?

A. If reconstruction of Ashfield Street is selected for implementation by the Township, a consideration of the trees along the perimeter of the roadway will be included in the engineering investigations for that project.

Q20. I have another question about this subdivision. Will there be limit to how tall the residences will be? When building a house near a lake, you'd like to have a water view and can imagine people will want to build up to see the water. Can you imagine this land with 3-4 story buildings...that's what it would take to get the view because of the height of the trees.

Just as a side note... on a certain street in my city there is a bylaw that any new buildings can't be higher than "x" feet off the ground, in effect, 2 stories. The developer wanted to add a third level, so he raised the surface of the ground around the house about the height of a story and then built his 2 story house on there, in effect making it a 3 story house. He found a loophole and used it, and the city couldn't do anything. This totally blocked all sunlight into his neighbours property and make the sight a total eyesore....

A. The VR1 zone policies, which can be found in the ACW Zoning By-Law at the following link: <http://www.acwtownship.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/ACW-ZBL-Consolidated.pdf> includes policies which would apply to new construction within this area. Section 18.5 of the VR1 zone includes the following policy: "Main Building Height (maximum) 9 metres"

As to ground elevations, typically a grading plan is required in conjunction with a new building permit application to ensure that site drainage conforms to the overall grading plan for the area and to ensure that site drainage will not negatively impact adjacent properties. If the grading plan does not conform, the building permit would not be issued.

Q21. Can you confirm that any new surveys sent in will have their data included in a revised Master Plan? Will the Master Plan be revised? Will the results be presented to us?

A. Yes, any new survey results will be incorporated into the final Master Plan report. The Master Plan has not been finalized. The results presented at the public meeting were preliminary and won't be finalized until the public consultation efforts are completed. There will be a second public meeting either later this fall or in 2020 where the final results and costs will be presented.

Q22. Please let me know the specific plan for funding and paying for the infrastructure projects (SWP pond locations, Roads, etc) for the proposed housing development at the corners of Ashfield and Huron roads. I want to know which property owners and or ACW township residents or developers are going to be paying for those infrastructure improvements. I live at [REDACTED] Beach road and do not feel that any of the properties on that road and Huron road in particular will be benefiting at all from this proposed infrastructure development and do not feel we should be in any way paying for this project. Please list the properties and or individuals ie: the developer of the subdivision who will be paying for this project and how much the proposed costs for each will be.

A. The funding approach has not yet been finalized but will be presented to residents before the Master Plan is finalized later in 2019 or in 2020.

Q23. My comment is that adding our survey responses changes the data input into the study and therefore changes the results. We would like to see the NEW results of the study. We would like another meeting with BM Ross at which the new study and results be presented. There is NO transparency in just including the responses and not qualifying them. Please can you confirm that we the public (and the taxpayers who are paying for the BM Ross study) will be presented the new information before the FINAL Master Plan be completed? Currently you are operating on false data!!! The study is incomplete.

A. As stated previously in the responses to Question 8, 9 & 21, the current Master Plan recommendations were not based solely on the responses to the questionnaire. Other information including the results of input from agencies, ACW staff, and the results of engineering investigations, were used to develop the preliminary recommendations. Prior to finalizing the Master Plan and holding another public meeting, input received from residents through new survey results and from feedback following the first Public Meeting, will be reviewed and assessed before the Master Plan is finalized. This new information will be included in any results presented at the next public meeting.

Q24. Was the Ashfield Ravine drainage problem researched primarily due to the expected increase in drainage (via Ashfield street) to this ravine, from the pending Wellington Street construction plan? If the Ashfield Street drainage plan were to not go forward, what effect would run-off from Wellington Street have on the ravine?

A. As part of the Master Plan investigations, all existing drainage outlets within the study area were examined to determine which outlet might be the most appropriate to utilize for an enhanced drainage outlet from lands within the central portion of the study area. The Ashfield Street outlet was selected due to its location, central to the lands requiring drainage, and due to elevations within the general study area. Drainage from lands located along the Wellington Street corridor will not discharge to the proposed outlet at Ashfield Street. A majority of drainage from Wellington Street will discharge to the Victoria Street Drain, while a portion of the south extent (south of the Ashfield Street intersection) will discharge to the Port Albert Drain (where it currently outlets).

Q25. Since there are many concerns voiced also about the Port Albert Drain Ravine Erosion, would a larger storm water management pond be required if that drainage was also diverted to the Ashfield drain?

A. The current preliminary design for the regional stormwater management facility was based upon diverting as much drainage as is feasible to the proposed outlet at the west end of Ashfield Street. A bigger pond is not required. The amount of drainage that can be diverted is limited by elevation. It is not possible to divert all the water that current discharges to the Port Albert Drain to the new outlet.

Q26. I have read that other municipalities use storm water management ponds for recreational purposes such as paddle boats and ice skating ponds. Is this an option with the planned Port Albert pond? Perhaps the beautiful 100 year old elm cited above could be incorporated into a recreational pond/park plan? We all want the best for Port Albert. I have been appreciative of the progressive beautiful improvements that have changed this village in the past 50 years. As many of the local families, like my own know, Port Albert was at one time the site of the ACW dump (which existed 50 years ago), so like this important environmental removal of the dump, it would be great to continue to see environmental improvements to our village.

A. The proposed SWM facility is called a 'wet pond' because a permanent water level is maintained at the lowest level of the pond. Following a rainfall event, the pond would fill up to the design level and then slowly lower over a number of hours to the permanent level. Use of the pond for paddle boats and ice skating is probably not possible due to the fluctuation in water levels, however a trail could be incorporated around the perimeter and bird boxes and other natural features could be included that would enhance the area for residents.

Q27. Will Huron Street South be brought up to standard with the equivalent drainage and infrastructure as Ashfield Street? If not, what are the reasons for not doing this?

A. If Huron Street South is selected by the Township to be upgraded, the affected road section would be designed to the municipal urban design standard, which would be the same standard used for the design of Ashfield Street.

Q28. Is there a reason that the Open Question and Answer Forum became a censored Question posting?

A. At the Public Meeting a resident requested that a forum be developed for posting questions on-line where questions and answers could be provided for all residents to view. This has been provided.

Q29. What is the expected turn-around time to view the submitted questions and responses?

A. As noted in the response to Question 6, responses to the questions are drafted initially by BMROSS technical staff and are then reviewed and approved by the Township before being



posted. We will strive to post the questions and answers as quickly as possible after they are received but cannot guarantee a specific timeframe for the process.

Q30. What are the specific sources used to create your presentation?

A. A number of sources were used in developing the presentation material, including engineering investigations conducted by BMROSS, survey results submitted to BMROSS, the Natural Feature Assessment completed by Dylan White Consulting, ACW Official Plan and Zoning By-Law, ACW staff inputs, and the knowledge and experience of the presenters.

Q31. Noting the presentation is point form for the presenters; where can we view the whole story for all the points listed in the presentation?

A. There is no additional documentation associated with the presentation.

Q32. Why do the news reports represent a message quite different from the message that was delivered at the September 7, 2019 meeting? The report can be read at: <https://blackburnnews.com/midwestern-ontario/2019/09/09/residents-attend-meeting-future-expansion-port-albert/#>

A. The presentation material was based upon BMROSS's understanding of the scope of the Master Plan Servicing Study being undertaken on behalf of the Township of ACW. We have no knowledge of the message delivered to the media following the public meeting.

Q33. How many properties are expected to be directly affected by this study results?

A. There are approximately 250 parcels located within the study area limits that could potentially be impacted by the study results.

Q34. How many of these property owners have been spoken to directly, by phone or in person? (owners and not relatives of these owners)

A. In advance of the public meeting, property owners potentially impacted by the proposed stormwater pond and proposed Ashfield Street outlet were identified with the assistance of the Township. Four property owners were then contacted either by phone or in person to seek preliminary input on the possible pond locations. Approximately 97 residents were in attendance at the public meeting.

Q35. Who decided what property owners will be directly affected?

A. BMROSS technical staff, in consultation with ACW staff, identified the property owners that might be directly impacted by the proposed locations being considered for the stormwater management facility.

Q36. Who spoke to each of the property owners?

A. BMROSS technical staff spoke to or corresponded with the property owners that were identified.

Q37. Will you post a map identifying the properties that you expected to be directly affected by this possible "Development"?

A. We are unsure what 'Development' you are referring to in this question. Regardless, site specific information related to individual properties cannot be released due to privacy concerns.

Q38. In regards to your answer in Question 10.... Request that the next meeting be held no later than November or next spring so **ALL** have a **fair and equal chance** to attend. Many of us seasonal residents spread out during the winter months. In addition, request that the meeting be held on a weekend. Again so ALL have a fair chance to attend. Please post this comment.

A. It would be the intention of the Township to hold the next meeting on a weekend during the spring of 2020.

Q39. After reviewing the proposed catchment areas for the SWM Pond the logical location is in the site outlined in purple. The option that solely runs along Ashfield Street. That property has the biggest parcel of land available. In addition, is closest to the possible residential development to be built in the near future. As proclaimed by the owner of the property [REDACTED] The SWM Pond could serve **two uses**. First as a drainage facility and second as a "green space" for that community. With a new housing development of possibly 20 homes a "green space" of natural beauty as close as possible would be very beneficial.

A. As part of the Class EA review process a range of alternative locations are typically considered before a preferred location and design is ultimately selected. The preferred choice is selected after evaluating the impacts associated with the different options. Input through this forum is assisting in identifying those impacts. A preferred location for the stormwater facility will be identified prior to the next public meeting and before the Master Plan process is finalized. Utilizing the SWM facility as community 'green space' is definitely an option in the design of the pond.

Q40. What are the specific reasons why us the residents in the immediate area of Huron Street and Ashfield Street will benefit from the Port Albert Servicing Master Plan? Please qualify any answers with supporting documentation. This is a multi million dollar project and deserves the utmost investigation, research and attention. We are not taking about building a park for kids to play in.

A. When it comes to drainage, 'benefit' is the advantage on lands, roads, buildings or other structures from the improved flow of water. This results in better control of surface and subsurface water. When water is controlled, it diverts from its natural flow, preventing

adverse effects on lands such as ponding, erosion, etc. This means that there will be less water collecting towards Huron Street, and a proper outlet will be available to keep water from coming to your property.

The Master Plan simply sets out *how and where* water will go, *if and when* development is to happen. It ensures that adequate planning is put in place so that when development occurs, it can be completed with the least amount of negative impacts on neighboring properties.

Development is paid for by development, with landowners contributing where needed. At the next Public Information Session, information will be shared on the decided outlets, as well as how the infrastructure would be paid for, if and when development would occur.

Q41. After reviewing the three options for the Catchment and Drainage Pond locations it seems most logical to select the most furthest site located solely on Ashfield Street. The most significant reason that it is furthest from the very fragile erosion ridge and bluff. Anywhere along the frontage of Huron Street South is very sensitive. Added additional stress seems counterproductive when there are other options. If any of the two options located on Huron Street South are chosen will there be further studies carried out to determine what impact such a project will have on that area of the bluff? Will Maitland Valley Conservation Authority be called upon to study the area first?

A. Please see the answer to Q39 above regarding selecting a location for the regional stormwater management facility. As to involvement from MVCA, an on-site meeting was previously arranged with MVCA staff to review the project and preliminary plans. Once a location is finalized for the SWM facility, a Stormwater Management Report will be submitted to the MVCA for their review and approval prior to moving forward with a final design. In addition, a permit will be required for the MVCA for any engineering works that are located within their regulated area. This will include the new stormwater outlet at the west end of Ashfield Street and possibly the pond facility, depending on the final location selected for construction.

Q42. We are concerned about the quality of water that will be draining down the new proposed outlet. The possibility of contaminants from roads and farmland are a great concern to us who swim and enjoy the lake. Can you please outline the steps that will be taken to ensure that the natural environment is not negatively effected by the new drainage outlet? What kind of monitoring will be in place for the future as well?

A. There will be no agricultural runoff directed to the new stormwater facility, only runoff from residential development lands. The primary purpose of the stormwater facility is to improve the quality of water being discharged through the outlet to the lake. After a rainfall event, drainage runoff will be directed to the pond facility where it will be held allowing contaminants to settle out before being discharged. The pond will be designed in accordance with Ministry of Environment design guidelines as it relates to the quality of the discharge from the facility. An Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) must be obtained from the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks for the pond facility

who will review and approve the design prior to any work on the facility being implemented. The approval from the Ministry may include monitoring requirements. Ongoing maintenance of the facility would be completed by ACW staff including checking the pond after significant rainfall events:

- Check inlet/outlet for plugging
- Check for erosion
- Check vegetation

Monitoring of the accumulated sediment depth in the forebay should be done every few years.

Q43. Most developments in today's age are sensitive to incorporating green spaces into their plans. Preparing this area for future development what are the plans for incorporating green space? For example trees, native plants and flowers etc. Especially since the proposal is to cut down and remove all existing natural environment to bring in new roads etc. Please in detail outline the plan for incorporating green space. (other than the drainage pond).

- A. The locations of most existing unopened road allowances within the study area that could be developed are on lands currently utilized for agricultural uses, not natural environment areas. The Township has committed to investigating existing tree cover along Ashfield Street as part of the detailed design process to determine what could be retained and also investigate wildlife currently using the area (see responses to Questions 4, 18 & 19). The wetland area at the west extent of Market Street will also be preserved based on current wetland protection policies enforced by MVCA and contained within the ACW Official Plan.

When new development is proposed, a Plan of Subdivision application is submitted to the County of Huron for review (typically required for developments of 5 lots or more). As part of the review, the provision of green space would be evaluated on a site by site basis. A component of the planning review process requires that adjacent property owners be given an opportunity to provide input to the County on the application; concerns regarding the amount of green space provided could be submitted at that time.

Q44. How will the planning process consider the interactions of various hydraulic systems, and the downstream, beach-level implications of diverting water to the drains at the top of the embankment including:

- accounting for years of low lake levels
- considering run-off ponding at the outlets
- considering foreseeable implications for regulatory bodies beyond the immediate jurisdiction of the township?

- A. As part of the Class EA process, the current and design capacity of the Victoria Street drain will be investigated to ensure that the system has sufficient capacity to accept any drainage being directed to the existing outlet. This review will also consider the current uses of the drain upstream of the Master Plan study area and implications to the outlet at Lake Huron.

As to potential long-term management issues at the outlet associated with periods of low lake levels, input will be sought from the Maitland Valley Conservation Authority and from public works staff at the Township, on how to best address these concerns.

Q45. At the meeting it was mentioned that Council would be in communication with First Nations groups. I do not see anything mentioned on the site. What groups have been contacted and for what purpose?

- A. As part of the Class EA Master Plan process proponents are required to undertake a consultation plan to ensure that there is adequate input from interested stakeholders in the proposed project. This requires consultation with affected property owners, Federal and Provincial review agencies, and with First Nation and Métis communities. Project information has been forwarded to nine First Nation and Métis contacts located in general proximity to the project seeking input on the project.

Q46. Part of question 43 answer states "When new development is proposed, a Plan of Subdivision application is submitted to the County of Huron for review (typically required for developments of 5 lots or more)". It goes on to state "A component of the planning review process requires that adjacent property owners be given an opportunity to provide input to the County on the application".

On Sept 26, several concerned citizens met with our Mayor and Township Department Heads, to discuss the [redacted] proposed new housing development on land situated west of Sydenham, east of Huron, north of Harvey and south of Ashfield. The meeting included discussion on road and drainage development and the sharing of these costs amongst surrounding land owners (everyone benefits in some way). The townships position on the [redacted] development is it is not considered a "new" development as it is already a subdivision. The [redacted] would not be required to submit a Plan of Subdivision to the County of Huron for a planning review for their 16 (+) lot development. The opportunity for adjacent property owner input to the County would not happen as the development is not considered "new". Adjacent property owners would not be contacted when the zoning hold is released from the [redacted] property. Housing construction will begin with no adjacent landowner input. The Townships position conflicts with the answer to Q43 about opportunities to provide input. It raises further questions concerning the Townships cutting of the "review of municipal and sanitary water servicing issues" from the BM Ross Master Plan Study Scope. This appears to be in conflict with the Township of Ashfield-Colbourne-Wawanosh Official Plan requiring communal water and sewage on "new" developments of 6 or more lots. It is fair to assume that land owners are going to share road/drainage costs for the development of the Ashfield Street infrastructure proportionate to their benefitting land base. Owners of the lands east of Huron and north of Ashfield will be facing substantial costs as they have the biggest land base along the Ashfield Street drainage area. As an adjacent property owner, I am concerned that the largest land base owners will be forced to develop their lands to recoup costs. Following the same township position, this area would also not be considered a "new" subdivision and would not be subject to County Plan of Subdivision review. Once the Ashfield Street Drain is in place and Ashfield, Arthur and Colborne Streets are developed, the potential addition of 50 (+) houses west of Sydenham

Street with 50 private wells and 50 private septic systems does not seem a suitable approach to development within our “developing” lakeshore community.

1. Water and sewage are forefront in any future development planning along the Lake Huron shoreline. Why was water and sewage cut from the scope of the Servicing Master Plan footprint that directly affects this shoreline?
  2. What other developing lakefront community allows the potential of this many new private wells and septic systems without the requirement for communal or municipal water as well as communal or municipal piped and treated sewage systems?
  3. Who can we contact to confirm the Townships position that subdivision development west of Sydenham Street is indeed not “new” and not subject to the requirement for a developer to submit a Plan of Subdivision to the County of Huron for a planning review?
- A. There is no proposed development by any one individual. There are a number of properties that have the potential for development. In order to develop the properties, the relevant roads would need to be constructed to municipal standard, as no building permits will be issued for properties not fronting on a municipal road. Once the road has been constructed, and drainage issues have been addressed, the developer could then apply to have the holding zone lifted.

The reason a Plan of Subdivision is not needed is because the lot fabric already exists on title. If, for whatever reason, the owner of land doesn't like the way the lot fabric is laid out, they can apply to have the lot lines changed through a Plan of Subdivision. The Lot Fabric has been in place since around 1840, or earlier, when Port Albert was first surveyed.

The only difference between a development on this property vs. a vacant lot in another area of Port Albert (say on Wellington Street) is that it doesn't front onto an Open Public Road. Once a road has been constructed to the Township's standards (at the developer's expense), then they can apply to have the holding zone lifted and THEN a residence could be built. To address resident's concerns, the Township has agreed to notify adjacent property owners if an application to remove the holding zone is received on a vacant parcel within the future development area.

In regards to water and sanitary servicing for Port Albert, this will be reviewed in more detail prior to the next public meeting and finalization of the Master Plan process. It was noted at the September public meeting that no evidence of problems with existing water and sanitary servicing was identified during initial EA investigations (residents' questionnaire and feedback from agencies). A high level review of costs associated with providing municipal water and sanitary servicing to the entire community will be examined prior to finalizing the Master Plan. Based on this information, the Township will need to decide whether to pursue full municipal servicing for Port Albert as part of the Master Plan process.