

TRCA - Stephanie Dore	09-Aug-23	Development Planning	42	1	TRCA Pre-Consultation comments from November 2022 had identified that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required to be submitted to review and future Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for the subject lands. It should be noted that an EIS was not received as part of this application and remains outstanding. We understand based on our review of the TRCA Response Letter dated March 16, 2023 that R.L. Burnside and Martamy would be requiring a meeting with the TRCA to discuss next steps for this application. We look forward to any future meeting regarding the outstanding information which will be required to be received and reviewed prior to TRCA providing sign-off on the Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment applications.	Burnside	ES was submitted to Jamie Milnes on Thursday March 14, 2024 via email link. This email was prepared to the Terms of Reference sent to TRCA March 27, 2023 and approved by Steve Heuchert on April 4, 2019 (see Appendix A of EIS).
			43	2	Additional Materials: Please send the PCSWMM model for the water balance, the VO hydrology model for the SWM pond sizing and the appendix to the FSR directly to cheryljn.silvestri@trca.ca for review.	Burnside	The PCSWMM report will be circulated to the TRCA as part of the Draft Plan and FSR resubmission.
			44	3	Infiltration Gallery IG43 should be able to drain within 48-hours within the native soils. Please verify with an in-situ infiltration test at Detailed Design that the height of IG43 is adequate to allow for a 48-hour drawdown and provide supporting calculations (ref. TRCA's LID Guide Appendix C soil testing protocol).	Burnside	In-situ infiltration testing will be completed to support the detailed design of the subdivision.
			45	4	On Figure 10.3, it appears the bottom of the infiltration gallery is just above 180m elevation. When reviewing Figure 8 in the Hydrogeological Assessment (Burnside, 2013) it appears that the LID is located between the 185m and 180m contours. Before detailed design, the feasibility of the location of the infiltration gallery must be determined since TRCA requires a 1m separation from the high measured ground water level in order to verify that the LID measure functions as designed.	Burnside	Understood, a test pit will be completed to confirm high groundwater elevations and ensure 1m separation.
			46	5	The existing condition drainage areas on wetland G9 on Table 3.1 does not line up with the existing drainage area on Figure 3.2. Please revise to make areas consistent in the report and model.	Burnside	Drainage areas have been reviewed and revised to ensure consistency.
			47	6	On Figure 4.7, please include the contours and the full drainage area towards wetland UB as well to provide a relative visual.	Burnside	Figure 4.7 has been updated accordingly.
			48	7	On Figures 9.1 and 9.2, please also include the number of each category of house is proposed in the subdivision to verify that all roof areas are accounted for in the infiltration volume requirements.	Burnside	All roof areas are included in the infiltration volume calculations.
			49	8	To calculate the drainage area used to determine the unitary flow rates must be taken from the proposed drainage boundary draining to the pond as it fits within the DHCU 38 existing drainage area. The parcel west of Peter Matthews drive should be cut along the DHCU 38 line, as shown on Figure 3.1 in the FSR.	Burnside	The unitary flow rate has been calculated as noted, and the Regional Road drainage has been added to conform with the Regional EA upon discussion with City Water Resources reviewer.
			50	9	TRCA calculates a target discharge of 9.7 L/s for the 25mm storm event (0.6 L/s/ha x 16.19 ha). Please explain why drainage area outside of the development boundary was included in the Extended Detention discharge calculation.	Burnside	The discharge rate has been updated per above (0.6 L/s x 16.19ha).
			51	10	Additional details including a plunge pool and flow spreader will need to be submitted for the stormwater management pond outfalls at the detailed design stage. TRCA generally does not permit stormwater pond outfalls to discharge directly to the creek or at the top of steep valley slopes. The headwall should be located as low down the slope as possible, oriented downstream and if possible, above the 25 year floodline and outside of the 100-year erosion limit.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Deferred to detailed design.
			52	11	TRCA acknowledges that the proposed yearly runoff exceedance for UB of 7% would be considered as within the threshold for this feature. However, TRCA is requesting that further options to reduce this number be explored as part of detailed design for the LIDs.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Deferred to detailed design.
			53	12	TRCA is concerned with the proposed infiltration gallery below groundwater level. It is understood that test pits are being undertaken at site to provide further clarity. Please note that the infiltration gallery may need to be relocated depending on the results to ensure that the desired infiltration is being achieved. Please TRCA Hydrogeology comments for further details.	Burnside	The infiltration gallery will be located 1m above the high ground water elevation confirmed via test pit.
			54	13	TRCA will provide comments on the enhancements, construction management and ESC plans as needed as part of detailed design review.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Deferred to detailed design.
			55	14	TRCA staff are recommending deferral of Application Nos. A 005/22, SP-2023-02 until such time that the comments below have been addressed. The next submission should be accompanied by a cover letter which identifies the requested revisions.	Burnside	Understood, cover letter to the LSRCA has been prepared.
Draft Plan of Subdivision Letter - Christina Celebre	23-Nov-23	Development Services/General Comments	56	1	The Owner shall satisfy all requirements, financial and otherwise, of the City of Pickering. This shall include, among other matters, the execution of a subdivision agreement between the owner and the City of Pickering concerning the provision and installation of services, grading, drainage and other local services and including the following: a) that the Owner satisfy the Director, Engineering Services respecting a stormwater drainage and management system to service all the lands in the subdivision, and any provisions regarding easements; b) that the Owner satisfy the Director, Engineering Services for contributions for stormwater management maintenance fees; c) that the Owner satisfy the Director, Engineering Services respecting submission and approval of a grading control plan; d) that the Owner satisfy the Director, Engineering Services respecting the submission and approval of a geotechnical soils analysis; e) that the Owner satisfy the Director, Engineering Services respecting the authorization from abutting land owners for all offsite grading; f) that the Owner satisfy the Director, Engineering Services respecting the construction of storm sewers, sidewalks and boulevard designs; g) that the Owner satisfy the City respecting arrangements for the provision of all services required by the City; h) that the Owner satisfy the appropriate authorities respecting arrangements for the provision of underground wiring, street lighting, cable television, natural gas and other similar services; i) that the cost of any relocation, extension, alteration or extraordinary maintenance of existing services necessitated by this development shall be the responsibility of the Subdivider; j) that the Owner convey to the City at no cost: i. any easements as required and; ii. any reserves as required by the City. k) that the Owner convey any easement to any utility to facilitate the installation of their services in a location(s) to the satisfaction of the City and the utility; l) that the Owner arrange at no cost to the City any easements required on third party lands for servicing and such easements shall be in a location as determined by the City and/or the Region and are to be granted upon request at any time after draft approval; m) that the Owner make arrangements with the City respecting a Construction Management Plan, such Plan to contain, among other things: i. details of erosion and sedimentation controls during all phases of construction and provide maintenance requirements to maintain these controls; ii. addressing the parking of vehicles and the storage of construction and building materials during servicing and house construction, and ensuring that such locations will not impede the flow of traffic or emergency vehicles on either existing streets or the proposed public street; iii. confirmation that the City's Noise By-law will be adhered to and that all contractors, trades and suppliers are advised of this By-law; iv. the provision of mud and dust control on all roads within and adjacent to the site; v. type and timing of construction fencing; vi. location of construction trailers; vii. details of the temporary construction access; n) that the Owner satisfy the City with respect to the provision of temporary fencing around the entire perimeter of the subject lands during construction, prior to the commencement of any works; o) that the Owner submit a boulevard street tree planting plan to the satisfaction of the City; p) that the Owner ensure that the engineering plans are coordinated with the streetscape/architectural control guidelines and further that the engineering plans coordinate the driveway, street hardware and street trees to ensure that conflicts do not exist, asphalt is minimized, and all objectives of the streetscape/architectural control guidelines can be achieved; q) that the Owner satisfy the City respecting the submission of appropriate engineering drawings that detail, among other things, City services, roads, storm sewers, sidewalks, lot grading, streetlights, fencing and tree planting, and financially-secure such works; r) that the engineering plans be coordinated with the architectural design objectives.	Burnside	Acknowledged. This aligns with the standard Draft Plan Conditions of Approval.
			57	2	Fencing will be required for lots and blocks that are: a) adjacent to or backing on to Open Space Lands; b) adjacent to or backing on to lands having conflicting zoning, such as Agricultural, Commercial or Recreational; c) as per the Noise Attenuation Report.	NAK Design Strategies (NAK)	Acknowledged. During detailed design, the requirements for fencing will be reviewed and incorporated, as required.
			58	3	The City of Pickering's Fill & Topsoil By-law prohibits soil disturbance, removal or importation of material to the site unless a permit has been issued. No on-site works prior to Draft Plan Approval is permitted. A Fill and Topsoil Permit will be required should grading works proceed prior to a Subdivision Agreement.	Burnside	Acknowledged. We understand that all applicable By-laws must be adhered to.
			59	4	That the owner, through the approval of the Utility Coordination Plan for the location(s), is to enter into an agreement with Canada Post Corporation for the provision of community mailboxes including technical specifications and financial terms.	Burnside	Acknowledged.
			60	5	That the owner satisfy the City of Pickering with regards to the Development Services Engineering Review Fee, Residential Lot Grading Review Fee and Development Services Inspection Fees. Provide confirmation from Ministry of Environment Conservation & Parks (MECP) that they have no concerns with respect to endangered species.	Burnside	Acknowledged.
			61	6		Burnside	MECP no longer provides "site clearance" for Species at Risk. The subject lands were assessed for potential species at risk via background information review and field surveys thoroughly looked for SAR. Residue Date recovery and contributing habitat exists in the watercourses in the adjacent NHS. The setbacks for these habitats are respected by the development. In-water works are not proposed for this project. An aquatic assessment in the future will assess the SWMF 43 outfall, when the detail design is available. Several Butternut were identified in the study area, only two of these are Category 2 and protected by the ESA. The two Cat. 2 Butternut were registered to the provincial registry on September 21, 2021, and 15 Butternut seedlings were planted as compensation as per the regulations governing the Act. Candidate SAR Bat habitat was identified in trees being removed by the development. Leaf-off, Leaf-on, mist surveys, and passive acoustic surveys were undertaken to assess for the presence or absence of SAR Bats. It was determined that no SAR Bat habitat will be affected by the proposed development. All SAR studies, and MECP authorizations are detailed in the EIS.
			62	7	A cul-de-sac must be provided where roads are to be extended in the future. Indicate the cul-de-sac for Street 8, west of Sideline 22. A reference plan will be required to indicate the lands outside of the draft plan for the cul-de-sac.	Burnside	Acknowledged. During detailed design, the requirements of temporary turning circles will be reviewed and incorporated, as required.
			63	8	Review the location of Lane A where it abuts the Natural Heritage System (NHS). It appears as though the asphalt will be directly adjacent to the NHS. Provide a boulevard at this location for maintenance and snow storage.	Korsiak Urban Planning (Korsiak)	The subject street has been removed to address the comment. Refer to the revised Draft Plan.
			64	9	Ensure all corner roundings meet a minimum of 5 metres.	Korsiak	Confirmed.
			65	10	Confirm the daylighting triangles at Street 8 and Street 1 (adjacent to future Peter Matthews) are to the satisfaction of the Region of Durham.	Korsiak	The daylight triangles are per the Region Requirements, as confirmed by Peter Castellon. Dimensions will be included on the calculated M.P.N., 15 m x 15 m from the Region Draft Plan Conditions.
			66	11	Lane A was never considered in the Seaton Neighbourhood Plan and is located too close to the intersection with Peter Matthews Drive. We do not support the introduction of this lane at its current location.	Korsiak	The subject street has been removed to address the comment. Refer to the revised Draft Plan.
			67	12	Confirm all streets are numbered as per the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision. For example, Street 7 on the Draft Plan of Subdivision is labelled as Street 27 on several figures in the report and Street 5 and Street 6 are labelled as Street 6 and Street 7.	Burnside	Addressed. Street numbers have been updated to match the Revised Draft Plan. Please refer to Figures 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 9.4, and 10.2.
			68	13	The electrical supply company within the City of Pickering is Elexion Energy. Update Section 7.3 as required.	Burnside	Addressed. Please refer to Section 7.3.
			69	14	Additional cleanouts will be required for the infiltration gallery (IG43). On Figure 10.3, indicate the cleanouts on Section A-A.	Burnside	Addressed. Please refer to updated Sections A-A and B-B on Figure 10.3 showing additional cleanouts. Cleanout configuration will be optimized at the detailed design stage.
	70	15	Provide a figure clearly detailing the proposed discharge location for the downspouts for each lot.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage.		
	71	16	An easement will be required for the outlet of the Roof Drain Collector from Street 9 (Street 3 on the Draft Plan). Depending on the size of the pipe, a separate block may be required for this outlet. Indicate the pipe size for the outlet to determine the requirements.	Burnside	Acknowledged. A 2.4m easement has been proposed and an agreement was made with the City with the understanding that access to the outfall would be through the NHS via a ramp constructed off of Nathaniel Hastings Drive. The sewer will be a 300mm pvc pipe and can follow the layout and construction methodology of a RLCB lead.		
	72	17	Easements will be required for any infiltration galleries located within the NHS.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage.		
	73	18	Confirm the location of storm sewers is coordinated with the most current design of the development to the south.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Storm sewers have been coordinated with the most current design of the development to the south. Please refer to Figure 4.5.		
	74	19	The location of maintenance holes along the road centreline is undesirable and should be relocated to the standard location.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Maintenance holes have been relocated to the standard location as outlined in the City of Pickering Engineering and Design Criteria for the Seaton Community. Please refer to Figure 4.5 for the revisions.		
	75	20	On Street 6, there is a rear lot catch basin (RLCB) proposed in the park block. The location of this RLCB will be reviewed at detailed design. This RLCB is to be located in the rear of the lot, not in the walkway.	Burnside	Addressed. The subject rear lot catch basin has been removed to address the comment. Please refer to Figure 4.5 for the revisions.		
	76	21	Indicate the 100-year capture point on the plan.	Burnside	Please refer to Figure 4.2 in the north-west quadrant of the site.		
	77	22	Provide a level area for the proposed fencing at the top of slope into the NHS. The top of slope should be offset a minimum of 0.6m from the property line.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at detailed design.		
	78	23	The lots backing onto the school block will not be permitted to drain onto this block. RLCB's are to be included in the design of the walkout/lookout lots on Street 1.	Burnside	Addressed. Grading has been updated to accommodate RLCB's in these lots. Please refer to Figures 4.1 and 4.5 for the grading revisions and addition of RLCB's.		
	79	24	Indicate the road centreline grade on the plan. All road grades are to be between 1% and 8%. The City requires a minimum grade of 3.0% around the longest curb on all bends in the road. Ensure there is sufficient road grade to achieve this requirement.	Burnside	Addressed. Road centreline grades have been added to Figure 4.1.		
	80	25	The plan provided does not include the lands which are subject to this application. Provide an updated plan with the next submission.	Korsiak	Addressed. Please refer to the enclosed Preliminary On Street parking plan.		
	81	1	It appears that the pre-development drainage area boundary delineated for SWMF 43 is incorrect. The pre-development drainage area boundary shall be defined by the sub-watershed catchment boundary (catchment 38) and development limits, excluding uncontrolled areas along the NHS. Revise Figure 3.1 to show the pre-development drainage area and revise the design accordingly.	Burnside	The pre-development drainage area for SWMF43 has been revised to reflect the entire pre-development drainage area including Peter Matthews. Please refer to the revised Figure 3.1.		
	82	2	The quantity and the erosion control target release rates must be based on the pre-development drainage area to the receiving catchment. Revise accordingly.	Burnside	The quantity and erosion control target release rates have been updated to be based on the pre-development drainage area as revised above.		
	83	3	The Section 9.4.1 of the SWM report indicates an increase of flows from a portion of the site area included in the design capacity of the existing SWMF44. This is not acceptable. The site grading shall be revised to eliminate flow exceedances.	Burnside	The site has been re-graded to limit the area directed towards existing SWMF44. Additionally, the updated area has been modelled in the addendum to the SWMF44 & SWMF25 SWM report submitted December 2023.		
	84	4	The post-development drainage areas shown on Figure 9.3 are not consistent with the areas shown in Table 1.1 and the Imperviousness calculations (Appendix H). Verify and revise accordingly.	Burnside	Addressed. Please refer to Figure 9.3, Table 1.1, and Appendix H for the revised post-development drainage areas and calculations.		
	85	5	Berms exceeding 2 metres in height must be designed by a geotechnical engineer with experience in the design of dams. Revise the statement regarding berm design in Section 9.1 of the FSR.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed during detailed design with an additional Geotechnical Report to support the design of the subdivision, SWMF and Berms.		
	86	6	An imperviousness of 90% shall be used for the rear-lane townhouses and back-to-back townhouses. Revise the calculations accordingly.	Burnside	Addressed. The weighted percent impervious calculations (as well as the related calculations, modelling and report) have been revised based on this comment.		
	87	7	Further to the above, the proposed SWMF must have a liner installed to the maximum water surface elevation (100-year elevation). As such, the SWMF block imperviousness of 90% shall be used in the site imperviousness calculations.	Burnside	Addressed. The weighted percent impervious calculations (as well as the related calculations, modelling and report) have been revised based on this comment.		
	88	8	Recommendations regarding liner requirements shall be provided in Section 9.1 of the FSR.	Burnside	Acknowledged. The above requirement has been added to Section 9.1 of the FSR. Recommendations regarding liner requirements shall be addressed during detailed design with an additional Geotechnical report to support the design of the SWMF.		
	89	9	The Draft Plan shows that lots within Blocks 1, 2, 3, 15 and 17 have a frontage widths less than 12 metres, therefore front downspouts from these lots must be connected to the proposed storm sewer. Revise the drainage area and the design accordingly.	Burnside	Addressed. Wording has been added to Section 9.1.1 relating to storm connections in the proposed development. All lots that are not part of the Roof Drain Collector (RDC) network will be serviced with a storm connection to the mainline storm sewer. These roofs will be accounted for in the centralized infiltration gallery sizing, which will draw the required volume from the main cell of the proposed SWMF facility. An HGL analysis will be conducted during detailed design to ensure the 100 year HWL is 0.3 m below the proposed USF elevations.		
	90	10	In accordance with the Supplemental Report to Appendix C.1 of the Regional Municipality of Durham Central Pickering Development Plan Class EA Regional Services SWM Report (September 2014), drainage from the uncontrolled portion of Peter Matthews Drive shall be over-controlled in SWMF43. Revise the design accordingly.	Burnside	Addressed. The pre-development and post-development figures and calculations have been revised to reflect the above comment.		
	91	11	Revise the site grading to create a high point along Street 9 (south of the intersection with Street 1) to ensure flows division between the proposed SWMF 43 and the existing SWMF 44.	Burnside	See response to Water Resources Comment 3.		
	92	12	Specify the drainage area in the Wet Pond Permanent Pool calculations (Appendix H).	Burnside	Addressed. The drainage area has been added to the wet pond permanent pool calculations.		
	93	13	Show the cumulative quantity control storage (i.e., storage above the extended detention) in the Stage-Storage calculations (Appendix H).	Burnside	Addressed. The cumulative quantity control storage has been added to the Stage-Storage calculation sheet.		
	94	14	The Stage-Storage-Discharge calculations shall show the proposed orifice diameters (i.e., diameter in mm).	Burnside	Addressed. The orifice diameters have been shown in mm as well.		
	95	15	The discharge storage information (rating curve) used in Visual Otthymo (VO) modelling is incorrect, as it is not consistent with the Stage-Storage-Discharge calculations. The discharge storage information shall represent the functional design of the facility or shall be based on the target release rates (acceptable only for a functional design). In addition, the discharge-storage information above the extended detention elevation shall be used in the quantity control design/VO modeling. Revise the design accordingly.	Burnside	Addressed. Please see the revised model.		

	96	16	Time step of 15 minutes shall be used in the Visual Otthymo modelling. Revise accordingly.	Burnside	All storm events have a time step of 15 minutes. However, the VO model itself cannot have a DT of 15 minutes as it results in the following error "Warning: Storage coefficient is smaller than time step". This error can result in an underestimation of the peak flows according to the VO user manual therefore a DT of 1 minute was used which is consistent with the previous Mattamy Seaton projects completed by Burnside.
	97	17	A Geotechnical Investigation Report shall be submitted for review. The report shall provide recommendations for the proposed facility design and construction, including but not limited to a liner design, sub-drain requirements, side slopes, etc.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed during detailed design with an additional Geotechnical Report to support the design of the subdivision, SWMF, and berm.
	98	18	The Infiltration Gallery calculations (Appendix I) refer to the in-situ infiltration testing completed by DS Consultant on September 4, 2018. A copy of the testing results/letter must be provided in the next submission package.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed during detailed design.
	99	19	The functional servicing and grading plans shall show an overland flow route for major system flows and a storm sewer connection for minor system flows for the future school site.	Burnside	Addressed. Please see the revised functional servicing and grading plans.
	100	20	The proposed outfall shall be located at elevation of 179.00m to provide gravity drain for maintenance works.	Burnside	Acknowledged. This comment will be addressed during the detailed design stage.
	101	21	The proposed sanitary trunk sewer shall be located outside of the SWMF block.	Burnside	Addressed. Please refer to Figure 4.5 for revisions to the proposed sanitary trunk sewer.
	102	22	Show the proposed control structure on all relevant drawings and figures. Control structures should be located within the access road.	Burnside	Partially addressed. The structure has been moved to be within the access road. However, control structure details will be provided at the detailed design stage.
	103	23	The access road grades shall be shown on all relevant drawings and figures.	Burnside	Acknowledged. This comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage.
	104	24	All hazard limits and appropriate setbacks shall be shown on the Functional Grading Plan.	Burnside	Addressed. Please refer to Figure 4.1 for the revisions.
	105	25	Due to a large size, split a digital copy of the FSSR into two separate files: the report file and the appendices file.	Burnside	Acknowledged.
	106	26	Results of the berm slope stability analysis (i.e., designed factors of safety vs. minimum required factors of safety) must be provided in a berm design report completed by a geotechnical engineer. Refer to Table 8 in City's SWM Design Guidelines.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
Water Resources/Comments to be Addressed at Detailed Design	107	27	The Hydrogeological Assessment Report - Seaton Neighbourhood 19 (R.J. Burnside, August 2013) does not provide sufficient level of details for the detailed design of the subject development. The groundwater assessment at the locations of the proposed SWM facility and infiltration system shall be completed and results shall be provided in the report.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
	108	28	A vehicle access road must be provided to the proposed outfall (HW).	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
Capital Projects/General Comments	109	1	Lane A is in close proximity to the Peter Matthews/Street 1 intersection. Confirm that vehicle queuing on Street 1 will not impact access to Lane A.	Korsiak	The subject street has been removed to address the comment. Refer to the revised Draft Plan.
	110	2	At detailed design, ensure that all pedestrian crossings are located at controlled intersections.	BA Consulting Group (BA)	Acknowledged.
Capital Projects/Traffic Comments	111	1	As per the Preliminary Transportation Review dated March 24, 2023, prepared by BA Group, the City of Pickering finds it acceptable to revisit the traffic report prepared for the Phase 2 lands to lift the holding provision. The consultant will provide all the additional details, including operational analysis, once the curb and driveway locations are available.	BA	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
	112	2	There is a future park and school south of Street 5. Confirm if pedestrian crossings are required. The pedestrian crossing locations must be provided as per the Ontario Traffic Manual Book 15 requirements.	BA	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
	113	3	Confirm the proposed traffic controls and show on the plans.	BA	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
	114	4	Show the proposed pavement widths on the plans.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
	115	5	A proposed pavement markings and a signage plan will be required.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
	116	6	Provide the proposed road cross-sections.	Burnside	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage of the development.
Capital Projects/Landscape & Parks Comments	117	1	The Seaton Neighbourhood Plan indicates recreation trailheads on the north side of the development, on both sides of Sideline 22. Indicate these future trailheads on your plan.	Korsiak	Addressed. Refer to the revised Draft Plan.
	118	2	The Seaton Neighbourhood Plan indicates a vista block/trailhead at the north end of Street 2 and not at the east end of Street 4. Relocate as per the Seaton Neighbourhood Plan.	Korsiak	Addressed. Refer to the revised Draft Plan.
	119	3	A concept plan has been prepared by the City as a guideline for preparing a facility fit plan for the park block that is shared with the development area to the south. (See attached)	NAX	Acknowledged.
	120	4	Provide facility fit plans for the neighbourhood park and trailhead/vista blocks.	NAX	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage.
	121	5	Provide boulevard tree planting plans, landscape plans and a landscape cost estimate with subsequent submissions.	NAX	Acknowledged. Comment will be addressed at the detailed design stage.