

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
+Fire Services			
Robert Watson – September 22, 2021			
	Although not part of the zoning amendment, they will need to address the fire route and adequate water for this plan.	HPGI	Addressed. Water adequacy for firefighting purposes is confirmed in Section 2.3 of the enclosed Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report.
Enbridge			
Casey O'Neil – October 5, 2021			
	Thank you for your circulation. Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application however, we reserve the right to amend our development conditions. Please continue to forward all municipal circulations and clearance letter requests electronically to MunicipalPlanning@Enbridge.com.	HPGI	Acknowledged.
CP Proximity Ontario			
Crystal Watts – October 8, 2021			
	Thank you for the recent notice respecting the captioned development proposal in the vicinity of Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The safety and welfare of residents can be adversely affected by rail operations and CP is not in favour of residential uses that are not compatible with rail operations. CP freight trains operate 24/7 and schedules/volumes are subject to change. CP's approach to development in the vicinity of rail operations is encapsulated by the recommended guidelines developed through collaboration between the Railway Association of Canada and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The 2013 Proximity Guidelines can be found at the following website address: http://www.proximityissues.ca/ . Should the captioned development proposal receive approval, CP respectfully requests that the recommended guidelines be followed.	HPGI	Noted. Rail Proximity Guidelines and Recommendations will be incorporated in future Site Plan Application.
City of Pickering Sustainability			
Deepak Bhatt – October 29, 2021			
	We received the Zoning By-law Amendment Application S 09/21, submitted by S. Larking Development Inc. We have reviewed the application with reference to the Sustainability Checklist prepared by Humphries Planning Group Inc. Our comments on the Sustainability Checklist and the submitted plans are as follows:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development achieves the minimum points required by the City's Sustainable Development Guidelines and proposed to achieve Level 1 with 26 points. 	HPGI	Acknowledged. Additional points may be satisfied at detailed design stage when additional development details are confirmed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Sustainability Development Checklist, a number of items identified are to be included at a later stage of the site plan approval stage. The proponent and their planning consultant should be advised to provide details of the committed items and confirm the items listed to be included at a later phase of site plan approval. 	HPGI	Acknowledged.
Elexicon Energy			
Ed Johnston – January 7, 2022			
	Further to the referenced File # S06/21 Elexicon Energy Inc. has no objection to the proposed Site Plan Application to permit/construct of a workshop/supply yard, metal fabrication, heavy equipment machinery repair/sales shop, general purpose workshop and associated equipment parking, self storage, outdoor storage, and automobile service station.		
	The applicant or its authorized representative shall consult with Elexicon Energy Inc. concerning the availability of supply voltage, service location, metering, costs and any other details. These requirements are separate from and in addition to those of the ESA. Elexicon Energy Inc. will confirm the characteristics of the available electrical supply and will designate the location of the supply point to the applicant. Elexicon Energy Inc. will also identify the costs that the applicant will be responsible for.	HPGI	Acknowledged.
	The applicant or its authorized representative shall apply for new or upgraded electric services and temporary power service in writing. The applicant is required to provide Elexicon Energy Inc. with sufficient lead-time in order to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The timely provision of supply to new and upgraded premises; and/or 	HPGI	Noted.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	b) The availability of adequate capacity for additional loads to be connected in the existing premises		
	Please ensure that Elexicon's approved standards and clearance to be followed, for all structures, equipment, and people.	HPGI	Acknowledged.
City of Pickering – Engineering Services			
Richard Holborn – February 9, 2022			
	The Engineering Services Department has reviewed the above noted application and comment as follows: Please ensure the next submission includes a letter re-stating the City's comment, followed by an appropriate response, immediately afterwards, outlining how the proponent addressed the comment.	HPGI	Addressed. Comment Response Matrix has been included with this Resubmission.
Development Services			
General Comments			
1.	As per the Development Services User Fee Schedule, please provide payment in the amount of \$7,500.00 for the review of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSSR).	S. Larkin	Addressed. FSSR review fee delivered to the City of Pickering on September 3, 2024.
2.	Confirm all proposed construction works, including restoration requirements, within the Brock Road right-of-way is to the satisfaction of the Region of Durham.	HPGI	Addressed. No construction is being proposed at this time. All works required in the Regional R.O.W will be confirmed at Site Plan Stage.
3.	The applicant will be required to pay cash-in-lieu for the reconstruction of Old Brock Road across the frontage of their property to bring the road to a standard required for the development.	HPGI	Addressed. It is our understanding that the reconstruction of Old Brock Road has been included in the City's Capital Works Program. As such, it is our understanding that no cash-in-lieu requirements are required.
Site Plan			
4.	No comments.		
Conceptual Grading Plan			
5.	It appears that several areas of the site are proposed to drain towards Old Brock Road and Brock Road. All drainage is to be contained on the site.	Stantec	Addressed. Due to drastic grade differentials throughout the site, landscape embankments will be required at property line interface with the streets at some locations, as demonstrated on plan C-101. This is a conceptual grading plan for a zoning application based on a preliminary concept plan rather than a formal site plan. At detailed design, swales will be designed along property lines to ensure any drainage from any such embankments is captured and contained within the site drainage infrastructure. These details will be provided at Site Plan Application once a formal site plan is prepared. Driveways have been revised to ensure drainage is fully contained within site.
6.	The grading of the north entrance on Old Brock Road directs drainage from the road allowance into the site. A high point is required at the property line.	Stantec	Addressed. A high point has been introduced at property line along Old Brock Road.
Conceptual Servicing Plan			
7.	No comments.		
Transportation Impact Study			
8.	Section 4.1 states that the access on Old Brock Road meets sight distance requirements for a design speed of 50 km/hr. Please provide the calculations completed for the sight lines for the City's review.	Paradigm	Addressed. See enclosed response letter from Paradigm Transportation dated March 7, 2024
9.	Show the distance to the proposed driveway 3 on Old Brock Road, from Uxbridge Pickering Townline.		Noted. Site Plan is conceptual in nature. Driveway distance will be included on future Site Plan Application when development is confirmed.
10.	Table 5.1 Trip Generation shows the pass by trips for am and pm traffic. Please confirm how the trip percentage was calculated.	Paradigm	Addressed. See response letter from Paradigm Transportation dated March 7, 2024
11.	The proposed functional design lane widths for the proposed Brock Road access should be shown on the Site Plan and confirmed with the Region as Brock Road is under the jurisdiction of the Region of Durham.	Paradigm	Addressed. See response letter from Paradigm Transportation dated March 7, 2024
Preliminary Geotechnical/Hydrogeological Report			
12.	Field investigations were completed in 2016 and 2017. Provide a reliance letter to confirm the results of the investigations are still valid.	Stantec	Addressed. The Preliminary Geotechnical/Hydrogeological Report remain valid today. The site has not undergone any development or site alteration since the time of field investigations. A Reliance Letter will be provided at detailed Site Plan Stage.
Natural Heritage Evaluation Report and Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity Evaluation			

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
13.	Section 3.4.3.1 states that MNRF may require further assessments to determine presence or absence of protected bats. Please provide confirmation that no additional assessments are required.	Stantec	Addressed. Stantec completed bat acoustic survey June 2024 to record potential endangered bats that were listed as endangered after the submission of the Natural Heritage Evaluation Report (NHER). Please refer to the updated NHER provided with this resubmission.
14.	The site specific field investigations were completed in 2016. Provide a reliance letter to confirm the results of the investigations are still valid.	Stantec	Addressed. See enclosed updated NHE.
Water Resources Comments			
1.	The proponent has not addressed the City's erosion control criteria of, at a minimum, retaining the first 5mm of rainfall onsite. The City shall not accept deferring the exploration of various low impact development (LID) measures to the detailed design stage as indicated in Section 3.3.4 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSSR). The proponent must implement suitable measures given the site specific constraints identified in the Geotechnical/Hydrogeological Report i.e., high groundwater levels and soils of medium to low permeability. Functional design details and calculations must be provided.	Stantec	Addressed. The landowner has committed to achieving the 5 mm infiltration target. This will be achieved with proper supporting site percolation testing, stormwater design and calculations at the detailed design stage.
2.	The quality control criteria has not been sufficiently addressed. Provide specifications and functional sizing details of the proposed OGS units. As per Section 5.3.4 of the City's Stormwater Management (SWM) Design Guidelines, the proposed units must be Canadian ETV certified and tested for oil/fuel retention. Furthermore, provide a treatment train design sheet demonstrating how each measure contributes towards achieving the total quality control criteria for the entire site area.	Stantec	Addressed. The OGS Unit sizing has been provided in Appendix E. The site proposes to employ a treatment train approach through the use of both an OGS unit and dry pond. The overall water quality treatment strategy will be further assessed as part of detailed design.
3.	The FSSR proposes to control post-development flows to pre-development levels which does not address the quantity control criteria and is therefore not acceptable. The 2-yr through 100-yr post development flows, from the entire site area, must be controlled to the target storage and release rates as per the 2012 Duffins Creek Hydrology Update (DCHU) and Addendum: DCHU (2013). Please revise the design accordingly.	Stantec	Addressed. As outlined in the FSR, the proposed design will achieve a post- to pre- release rate target for the 2-year through 100-year design. The applicability of the TRCA unit-release rates are highly questionable for a site of this small scale. Furthermore, by the time flows reach the downstream rail corridor, the significantly large downstream wetland, on the east side of Brock Road, will have attenuated all runoff from this site to a similar condition as observed under present day. The approach taken for SWM quantity controls is very reasonable which matches or reduces post-development peak flows to pre-development levels for the 2-year through 100-year storm.
4.	The runoff coefficient applied to the post-development site for commercial land use has been underestimated. Please revise as per Table 9 of the City's SWM Design Guidelines and update the design accordingly.	Stantec	Addressed. The VO model has been updated with a commercial land use runoff coefficient of 0.90 as per the City of Pickering's SWM Design Guidelines.
5.	Provide time of concentration (Tc) calculations for the rural/undeveloped catchments, i.e., modeled using the CALIB NASHYD command, and the Old Brock Road catchment area.	Stantec	Addressed. Time of concentration was calculated following the City of Pickering's SWM Design Guidelines and the VO model updated accordingly. Calculations are provided in Appendix E.
6.	The uncontrolled runoff areas shown on the Conceptual Grading Plan are not reflected on the Proposed Drainage Area Plan and corresponding design. Please review and update the design accordingly.	Stantec	Addressed. This is a conceptual grading plan for a zoning application based on a preliminary concept plan rather than a formal site plan. At detailed design, swales will be designed along property lines to ensure any drainage from periphery embankments is captured and contained within the site drainage infrastructure. These details will be provided at Site Plan Application once a formal site plan is prepared. Driveways have been revised to ensure drainage is fully contained within site.
7.	The grading around DCBMH 106 suggests that the major system flows will overtop the adjacent curb and runoff uncontrolled to the Brock Road ditch. Revise the grading to demonstrate major system flows can be conveyed to the proposed pond.	Stantec	Addressed. The conceptual grading plan has been revised to demonstrate major overland flow at this location can be kept within the site and conveyed to the pond.
8.	Provide confirmation that the major system flows at DCBMH 103 can be conveyed to the proposed pond prior to overtopping the curb.	Stantec	Addressed. The conceptual grading plan has been revised to demonstrate major overland flow at this location can be kept within the site and conveyed to the pond.
9.	The City has concerns regarding the 150mm depth of the channel, adjacent to the majority of the proposed SWM pond. Include channel conveyance capacity sizing calculations demonstrating that the major system flows can be safely conveyed to the outlet.	Stantec	Addressed. Calculations confirming that the 150 mm channel has sufficient capacity have been provided in Appendix E.
10.	Provide a typical detail of the proposed channel. The channel geometry, major system flow depth and proposed surface cover must be labelled.	Stantec	Addressed. Typical detail has been added to plan C-101. As shown, flow depths are expected to be <50 mm deep.
11.	Adjust the grading to eliminate the acute angle where the Old Brock Road ditch outlets into the proposed channel.	Stantec	Addressed. The ditch orientation has been accommodated to reflect the existing low-point and flow contribution into the site from Old Brock Road. The project does not intend to re-grade

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
			within the Old Brock Road right-of-way at this location. This can be further reviewed/assessed at detailed design.
12.	Remove reference to the City of Toronto’s guidelines in Section 3.3.4.	Stantec	Addressed. There reference to the City’s Wet Weather Flow Management Guideline is relevant within GTA Municipalities and in the context of correlating annualized rainfall vs discrete precipitation events. Furthermore, the 5 mm criteria is what will be applied for water balance despite this reference, which will exceed the post-development to pre-development infiltration target (as outlined in the report).
SWM Pond			
13.	The design must be in accordance with Table 4.8: Dry Ponds (Continuous Flow) of the MOE’s SWMPD Manual (2003). Please revise the design to meet the minimum criteria.	Stantec	Addressed. The SWM pond has been designed in general accordance with Table 4.8 in the MOECC’s SWMPDM. While the development drainage area (3.20 ha) falls below the SWMPDM recommended minimum drainage area of 5 ha to a dry pond, the SWMPDM also states smaller drainage areas can be considered when the dry pond is part of a treatment train approach. There is an OGS upstream of the pond inlet and the pond outlets to an overland flow channel leading to the wetland. All runoff will continue to be directed through the dry pond and will discharge immediately upstream of the existing onsite wetland.
14.	Quantity control storage shall be provided in addition to extended detention requirements, i.e., stacked on top of the extended detention.	Stantec	Addressed. Quantity control storage has been stacked on top of the extended detention volume in the updated pond design.
15.	The design must be expanded to include impermeable lining requirements due to the significant and of excavation and high groundwater levels. Please provide supporting documentation from the geotechnical/hydrogeological consultant.	Stantec	Addressed. A preliminary Geotechnical Report was prepared in support of the Zoning By-Law amendment application, which generally characterizes the existing subsurface soils and groundwater conditions. The need for any potential SWM pond liner can be determined at the future detailed design stage.
16.	Provide functional design details and specifications for the control structure and emergency spillway.	Stantec	Addressed. See enclosed FSR for details.
17.	Revise the side slopes to 4:1 or flatter as per Table 4.8 of the MOE SWMPD Manual. Supporting recommendations must be provided by the geotechnical consultant.	Stantec	Addressed. Side slopes may be slightly steeper (3:1) than required in SWMPDM (4:1 or flatter). The side slopes have not been adjusted. This can be reviewed further at detailed design, if necessary.
18.	Based on the sediment forebay established lower than the main cell, the dry pond does not provide continuous flow. Revise the pond such that the forebay and main cell are designed at the same bottom elevation and separated by a forebay berm, which is a minimum 1m high, and complete with conveyance pipes, to provide continuous flow.	Stantec	Addressed. Sediment forebays are required for dry ponds. In order for the forebay to retain a permanent pool and allow TSS to settle out of the water column, then a small localized pool is required. The dry aftbay will still receive flows exiting the forebay micro-pool. The precise geometry of the dry pond can be further reviewed and confirmed at detailed design. The ability for a dry pond to function and service the proposed development concept is the objective for a Zoning By-Law Amendment application, which has been demonstrated.
19.	Include the extended detention drawdown time calculations in the Appendices.	Stantec	Addressed. Extended detention drawdown time calculations are provided in Appendix E.
20.	Include the stage-storage-discharge curve in the Appendices.	Stantec	Addressed. The stage-storage-discharge curve has been included in Appendix E
21.	Clearly delineate on the plans where the emergency spillway is located, including dimensioning the flow width. The functional design of the pond must demonstrate that the Regulatory event can be safely conveyed. Provide associated functional details and calculations.	Stantec	Addressed. Calculations sizing the emergency spillway have been included in Appendix E. The emergency spillway cross-section is also presented on Drawing C-101 (Conceptual Grading Plan).
22.	The proposed outfall’s perpendicular alignment to the channel is not acceptable. Please revise to provide a 45° maximum change in alignment.	Stantec	Addressed. A perpendicular outlet is often found in SWM/Drainage Design. A proposed rip rap outlet has been added to the drawings to ensure there will not be any erosive effects at the outfall. Further opportunity to refine the outlet can be explored further at detailed design.
23.	Revise the Dry Pond Quality sizing calculation, provided in Appendix E, to apply the entire post-development area, not the impervious area, when determining the required storage volume.	Stantec	Addressed. The calculation was revised for the entire controlled post-development area (3.16 ha). The revised extended detention/quality storage volume is 753 m3.
24.	Remove the reference to normal water level (NWL) from the Pond Sizing table included in Appendix E, as the proposed dry pond shall not be designed with a permanent pool.	Stantec	Addressed. The reference to a NWL has been removed from the Table in Appendix E
25.	The City recommends providing access to the sediment forebay.	Stantec	Addressed. The maintenance of the facility will be accommodated from the northern periphery of the facility. It is anticipated that excavators and haul trucks will clean sediment from the accessible location along the full northern extent of the proposed dry pond.
VO2 Model			

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
26.	Provide calculations supporting the 82% imperviousness used for the post-development site (Catchment ID 100).	Stantec	Addressed. The imperviousness was found from an area-weighted runoff coefficient converted to an imperviousness using the formula $TIMP = (C-0.2)/0.7$ from the City of Pickering's SWM Design Guidelines. This value has been updated to 96% using the revised runoff coefficient.
27.	The average slope parameter used for Catchment 100 does not reflect the proposed grading design. Please review and revise.	Stantec	Addressed. Slope parameter was updated to 4% for impervious surfaces in Catchment 100 to reflect the proposed grading plan.
28.	The modeling parameters for existing conditions and undeveloped catchments shall be in accordance with the parameters identified in Appendix A of the DCHU.	Stantec	Addressed. The modeling parameters provided in Appendix A of the DCHU are for the entire catchment - scaling them down to the site area results in unrealistic values. Reasonable values for model parameters were chosen or calculated by the VO software.
29.	In addition to the 25mm CHI, 2-yr and 100-yr events, provide modeling for the 5-yr through 50-yr events and the regional event.	Stantec	Addressed. The 5-yr through 50-yr events as well as the Regional event have been added to the VO model.
30.	The 12hr AES storm distributions have been updated as part of the DCHU. Please use the hyetographs provided in Appendix H of the DCHU.	Stantec	Addressed. The VO model has been updated with the DCHU 12 hr storm distributions.
31.	Provide a copy of the model for review.	Stantec	Addressed. A digital copy of the model has been enclosed with this submission.
Geotechnical/Hydrogeological Report			
32.	Provide functional design recommendations for the proposed dry pond, i.e., side slopes, berming, groundwater levels, impermeable lining requirements, impermeable trench plugs, etc.	Stantec	Addressed. The requested level of detail in this comment is more appropriate for a detailed design approval stage. It is reminded that this application is in support of a Zoning By-Law Amendment. Additional subsurface investigations will be undertaken at detailed design to ensure these considerations are specified prior to any onsite construction.
33.	Provide the soil infiltration rate corresponding to the in-situ hydraulic conductivity discussed in Section 5.13.	Stantec	Addressed. In-situ hydraulic conductivity testing will be conducted as part of detailed design and in locations identified suitable for infiltration measures to achieve the 5 mm target. The Owner acknowledges the need to meet a 5 mm infiltration target and will ensure that any proposed infrastructure at detailed design will be supported by location specific in-situ testing.
34.	The borehole logs for the boreholes in the proximity of the proposed SWM pond, i.e., BH 9, BH 11 and BH 12, have been omitted from Appendix C. Please provide.	Stantec	Addressed. The subject BH Locations are referenced on Figure 2 and Figure 3 of the Geotechnical Report.
35.	Expand the groundwater contours on Figures 2 and 3, provided in Appendix B, to encompass the area of the proposed SWM pond.	Stantec	Addressed. The groundwater contour mapping can only be interpolated within the portion of the site that has been equipped with onsite monitoring wells. This mapping can be expanded further at detailed design through the installation of additional Groundwater Monitoring Wells to support the site plan developed at that time.
Capital Projects			
General Comments			
1.	No comments.		
Traffic Comments			
2.	Show the proposed slow down and merging shoulder lengths on the Site Plan. Please confirm which guidelines were used to design these shoulders.	Paradigm	Addressed. See enclosed Traffic Response Letter dated March 7, 2024.
3.	Please confirm if a dedicated left turn lane is required on Old Brock Road for the truck traffic. Provide the calculations for the City's review.	Paradigm	Addressed. See enclosed Traffic Response Letter dated March 7, 2024.
4.	Show the existing and proposed access widths on Old Brock Road. Also show all the proposed radii.	Paradigm	Addressed. See enclosed Traffic Response Letter dated March 7, 2024.
Landscape & Parks Development Comments			
1.	As this property is the northern entrance into the Claremont Community, a gateway landscape feature of significance should be considered at the northern tip of the property as part of this development application.		Acknowledged. A Gateway Feature will be incorporated into the design at the Site Plan stage.
2.	Provide a tree inventory plan for the entire site, prepared by certified arborist. Compensation will be required for all tree loss in accordance with the City's Tree Inventory, Preservation and Removal Compensation Policy. A Copy is attached for your use.	Woodgrain Tree	Addressed. See enclosed Tree Inventory Report dated April 2024.
	The following comments shall be addressed with the site plan application.		
Development Services			
General Comments			

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
1.	This site is within the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) screening area. Written approval from TRCA must be provided to the City prior to Site Plan Approval being issued.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged.
2.	An easement in favour of the City will be required over the channel carrying drainage from Old Brock Road to the existing wetland. Provide a draft 40R plan with the detailed design. Any portion of pond pipe & headwall within the channel easement needs to be in its own separate easement. Relocate the septic bed to the south side of the property. The septic field or any part of septic bed should not be located in the easement.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged.
3.	The following plans will be required: Construction Management Plan, Erosion & Sediment Control Plan for each stage of construction, and Lighting Plans.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged.
4.	The following reports will be required: Noise Attenuation Report, Final Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Report.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged.
5.	Ensure the key plan is shown on all drawings.	S. Larkin	Noted.
6.	Review all text and avoid overlapping on all plans.	S. Larkin	Noted.
7.	All drawings are to be signed, dated, and sealed by a Professional Engineer.	S. Larkin	Noted.
8.	Include a reference to a City of Pickering Benchmark on all applicable drawings.	S. Larkin	Noted.
Site Plan			
9.	Provide a legend on the plan.	S. Larkin	Noted.
10.	Provide the designer's stamp with the signature and date.	S. Larkin	Noted.
11.	Provide a minimum of 450mm topsoil in all grass areas.	S. Larkin	Noted.
12.	Label the finish floor elevation (FFE).	S. Larkin	Noted.
13.	Show all existing and proposed utilities on Old Brock Road and Brock Road, and within the site (if any).	S. Larkin	Noted.
14.	Provide applicable site dimensions (e.g. entrance widths, road widths, curb radii, centerline of roadway radii, etc.).	S. Larkin	Noted.
Site Grading Plan			
15.	Provide details of the retaining wall. Any retaining walls over 1.0m in height must be designed by, and the installation certified by, a Professional Engineer. A 1.2m high barrier is required on top of the wall.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included in future Site Plan.
16.	Provide cross-sections through the retaining wall.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included in future Site Plan.
17.	Provide additional spot elevations at the entrances.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included in future Site Plan.
18.	Provide top and bottom of curb elevation information.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included in future Site Plan.
19.	Label all proposed curb radii.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included in future Site Plan.
20.	Grading at the south entrance on Old Brock Road is to be reviewed. A grade difference of 10% is too high.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. Adjustment to be made at Site Plan. Road elevation may change slightly with Capital Works re-construction of Old Brock Rd.
Site Servicing Plan			
21.	Provide a pipe crossing table. All pipe crossings are to comply with Ontario Building Code (OBC) requirements.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included in future Site Plan.
Water Resource Comments			
1.	Provide conveyance capacity details/calculations demonstrating that the site's major system flows can be safely conveyed to the proposed pond.	Stantec	Addressed. A site that collects 3.2 ha of contributing drainage area will not have any issues with overland drainage conveyance. This shall be confirmed at detailed design and can be supported with major/minor system hydrologic and hydraulic modelling.
2.	Due to a site area exceeding 2ha and sensitive receiving water feature, a sediment control pond shall be required during construction in accordance with the TRCA's ESC Guide (2019).	Stantec	Addressed. An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be prepared in support of future Site Plan Application. It is reminded that the Owner is applying for a Zoning By-Law Amendment only at this time.
3.	The design must be in accordance with the City's latest SWM Design Guidelines, updated in 2019, and accessible on the City's website. Update the reference in Section 3.1 accordingly.	Stantec	Addressed. The reference has been updated.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
4.	The proposed channel, pond emergency spillway, and pond outfall must be designed to withstand erosive forces. Provide supporting details and calculations.	Stantec	Addressed. Normal depth calculations have been provided to confirm that the vegetated swale has capacity to convey the external flows. The pond outfall will include rip rap protection at the outlet to mitigate any potential for erosion risk. A typical detail for the emergency spillway has also been provided on Drawing C-101.
5.	The proposed grades in excess of 4% and 8% along the proposed channel are steep and best efforts shall be taken to flatten the grade. Additional erosion protection measures may be required.	Stantec	Addressed. Grades along this portion of the channel are constrained by elevations at the septic bed, pond outlet, and the wetland. Calculations have been provided to confirm the channel can withstand the expected flow velocities along the longitudinal channel.
6.	Culvert sizing calculations are required for all new, replaced and/or altered culverts along the Old Brock Road entrances.	Stantec	Addressed. This is a highly conceptual site plan for a Zoning By-Law Amendment application. Culvert sizing and calculations will be provided at site plan application once a formalized site plan with finalized driveway locations is available.
7.	Provide the following notes on the Site Servicing Plan: a. This plan has been approved for the installation of a (insert oil-grit separator manufacturer name and model number) stormwater treatment unit as per the Engineer of Record's design. The oil grit separator specified by the Engineer of Record in the stormwater management report and on the approved site plan drawings cannot be substituted for a different model. b. The Owner shall provide the City of Pickering certification of the (insert oil-grit separator manufacturer name and model number) from the manufacturer upon installation. c. The manufacturer shall provide an operation and maintenance manual to the Owner and to City of Pickering. The Owner is to maintain the unit as per the manual and shall provide the City of Pickering with annual cleaning certificates. d. The owner shall provide the City of Pickering with the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) from the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks for the (insert type and size of unit). Should the Ministry determine that an ECA is not required for the site, correspondence from the Ministry shall be provided for the City's records.	Stantec	Acknowledged. To be included on future Site Plan.
Capital Projects			
General Comments			
1.	Construct a platform across the frontage on Old Brock Road for the future sidewalk at 2% slope from the edge of the road grade to the property line.	Stantec	The existing roadside ditches along Old Brock Road and Brock Road are not intended to be re-graded to maintain existing drainage patterns in accordance with ORMCP.
2.	The street lighting consultant is to provide the street lighting requirements on Old Brock Road.	HPGI	Addressed. Old Brock Road enhancements/upgrades are now included in the City capital budget and work plan.
Traffic Comments			
3.	A traffic signage plan will be required.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included on future Site Plan.
Landscape & Parks Development Comments			
1.	A detailed landscape plan will be required to be submitted at the Site Plan Approval stage.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. To be included on future Site Plan.
TRCA Comments			
Stephanie Dore – April 19, 2022			
	Thank you for the opportunity to review the above noted applications received on September 21, 2021. We have reviewed the submission and provide the following general and detailed comments (the latter are contained in Appendix I). TRCA staff are available to discuss this correspondence to assist the municipality and the applicant in addressing our comments.	HPGI	Noted.
TRCA General Comments			
	The following points summarize the key concerns of TRCA staff based on our review:		
	1. Additional information required as it pertains to the site's quantity and quality controls;	Stantec	Addressed. Additional information has been provided in the updated Functional Servicing Report.
	2. Request for a wetland water balance risk evaluation;	Stantec	Addressed. A risk evaluation has been prepared and provided in the updated NHE provided with this re-submission.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	3. Revisions to the Natural Heritage Evaluation.	Stantec	Addressed. See responses above regarding revisions to the NHE and updated assessments completed in June 2024.
Appendix I			
Planning Comments			
1.	TRCA staff request that the proposed zoning should include the Oak Ridges Moraine – Environmental Protection (ORMEP) zoning on the wetland and it's associated MVPZ.	HPGI	Addressed. Draft Zoning By-law Amendment will be updated to include ORM-EP zone over the existing wetland and 30-metre MVPZ.
Water Resources Comments			
2.	Quantity - It is noted that the "TRCA criteria were not used in support of the conceptual site design as they were deemed to be too conservative and given the conceptual site design already accommodates a post-development to pre-development peak flow reduction for all the storm events simulated." TRCA requires that the unit release rates be utilized for this development. Please update the pond design to adhere to the TRCA unit release rates. This will be required prior to detailed design to demonstrate how TRCA's quantity criteria can be met.	Stantec	Addressed. The overall quantity control strategy will be re-evaluated at detailed design. It is noted that the proposed quantity control strategy will achieve peak flow reductions for the 2-year through 100-year storm events. Refer to the updated Functional Servicing Report for further details.
3.	Quality - Typically, OGS units are utilized for areas up to 2 ha. Please provide OGS unit sizing calculations as TRCA has concerns the current approach may not achieve the required 80% TSS removal. We also recommend exploring additional measures such as filter units and other LID measures (eg. Infiltration)	Stantec	Addressed. Updated OGS sizing calculations have been provided in Appendix E.
Water Balance and Erosion			
4.	Please note that this site is located within the ORCMP, which means a best-efforts approach to match post development infiltration, evapotranspiration and runoff quantities must be demonstrated. Therefore, it is recommended that the applicant provide a discussion in the SWM report to describe on-site water balance under pre-development, postdevelopment (unmitigated), and post-development (mitigated) conditions.	Stantec	Addressed. Please refer to the Thornthwaite & Mather calculations provided. It is noted that the site consists of highly impervious soils with moderate slopes, which generally explains why the existing infiltration is lower than the broader watershed area. The overall water balance strategy will be re-evaluated at detailed design. The Owner acknowledges the requirement to achieve a 5 mm onsite retention/infiltration target.
5.	The pre-development water balance showing a 91 mm/yr of infiltration appears to be low. According to the TRCA water balance tool , the recharge is estimated around 350 mm/yr. Additionally, according to the Carruthers Watershed Report , Page 8, "For the adjacent Duffins basin, estimates of recharge through the Halton Till plain range from 125 to 200 mm/yr (IWA, 1994; Gerber, 1994)." Please provide justification for the values chosen or revise as necessary.	Stantec	Addressed. Please refer to the Thornthwaite & Mather calculations provided. It is noted that the site consists of highly impervious soils with moderate slopes, which generally explains why the existing infiltration is lower than the broader watershed area. The overall water balance strategy will be re-evaluated at detailed design. The Owner acknowledges the requirement to achieve a 5 mm onsite retention/infiltration target.
6.	Although detailed specifications are not required at this time, TRCA requires a level of feasibility that the proponent has considered all spatial requirements and the proposed techniques will achieve the required targets for all phases. Please provide confirmation that water balance and erosion targets can be met including volumetric sizing (in m3) and placement of any required mitigation footprints. When determining spatial requirements, please identify any areas of high ground water (elevations map/contours) and/or low infiltration where LID facilities could not be located.	Stantec	Addressed. The overall water balance strategy will be re-evaluated at detailed design. The Owner acknowledges the requirement to achieve a 5 mm onsite retention/infiltration target.
Wetland Risk Evaluation			
7.	Please complete a wetland water balance risk evaluation for the site to determine the sensitivity of the wetland and any further requirements. If a wetland water balance is required as per the wetland risk evaluation, then please refer to Wetland Water Balance Monitoring Protocol for monitoring guidance. If the wetland requires a continuous hydrological wetland water balance assessment, then TRCA can provide our DRAFT Wetland Water Balance Modelling Document.	Stantec	Addressed. The TRCA Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation has been completed and provided in a memorandum provided with this resubmission.
8.	Advisory: The wetland may require a certain amount of runoff (as determined from the risk evaluation/monitoring/ water balance assessment) to maintain the wetland's ecological function. There may need to be a flow split option for the outlet of this site.	Stantec	Addressed. The full existing site currently drains through the subject wetland and will continue to do so under the future (developed) condition. Given the site will be designed to satisfy quantity controls and water balance needs, the general hydrologic form and function of the wetland should be replicated under the post-developed condition. Further monitoring of the wetland will occur prior to detailed design, in accordance with the Risk Evaluation.
Erosion and Sediment Controls			

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
9.	Please provide all relevant general ESC notes in accordance with the Erosion and Sediment Control Guideline for Urban Construction, December 2006 at detailed design. The most up-to-date guideline can be found at www.sustainabletechnologies.ca .	Stantec	Addressed. Relevant notes will be provided according to request on plans at Site Plan Application
Ecology Comments			
10.	The wetland on the site has yet to be staked by TRCA, however staff accept the limits as identified within the submission.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
11.	The NHE should address the changes on the site with respect to pre- to post-drainage conditions supporting the PSW immediately downstream. Please complete TRCA’s feature based water balance risk evaluation (2017).	Stantec	Addressed. The TRCA Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation has been completed and are provided in a memorandum provided with this resubmission.
12.	It is unclear whether any of the species that are regionally, locally and/or TRCA rare or uncommon are located within areas of proposed development. Please provide appropriate mitigation plans which may include transplantation where appropriate.	Stantec	Addressed. To be included at Site Plan stage. Natural Heritage/Landscape staff will provide appropriate mitigation plans for regionally, locally and/or TRCA rare or uncommon species.
13.	The design of the bioswale needs to incorporate elements such as dissipation pools, plantings, and natural channel design concepts.	Stantec	Addressed. There is no bioswale currently proposed. If contemplated at detailed design then your comments will be noted at that time.
14.	TRCA looks forward to reviewing landscape and restoration plans for the 30 m MVPZ, bioswale, dry pond and enhancements within the wetland itself.		Addressed. SWM/Surface Water/Landscape staff will complete restoration plans for the 30 m MVPZ, dry pond and enhancements within the wetland itself at Site Plan stage.
Conclusions			
	TRCA staff are recommending <i>deferral</i> of application No. A 09/21 until such time that the comments in Appendix I below have been addressed. The next submission should be accompanied by a cover letter which identifies the requested revisions.	HPGI	Addressed. Comment responses have been included with this resubmission.
Durham Region Comments			
Sara Hajsaleh & Valerie Hendry – April 26, 2022			
	We have reviewed the above noted application and offer the following comments with respect to Provincial Policies, the Durham Regional Official Plan (ROP), our delegated Provincial Plan review responsibilities, and comments pertaining to private servicing.		
Proposed Application			
	The purpose of the application is to facilitate the redevelopment of the subject lands municipally known as 5435, 5455 & 5475 Old Brock Road.	HPGI	Noted.
	The subject site currently contains a machinery sales and repair use, indoor/outdoor storage uses, a landscape storage/sales use, a single detached dwelling, and a temporary trailer. It is our understanding that the existing detached dwelling and the temporary trailer are proposed to be demolished and removed from the property.	HPGI	Noted.
	The purpose of the proposed rezoning application is to formalize the existing employment uses and to rezone the subject site to “ORM-M1 – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oak Ridges Moraine Industrial Zone” to permit the following uses: • Bakery • Business office • Creamery, dairy • Dry cleaning pressing or laundry establishment • Farm implement sales outlet • Garage • Light manufacturing or assembly of manufactured products • Printing or duplicating shop • Professional office • Railway loading facilities • Retail sales accessory to a permitted use • Service or repair shop • Warehouse or distributing depot • Construction workshop/supply yard 	HPGI	See enclosed draft Zoning By-law Amendment for complete list of proposed land uses.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metal fabrication • Heavy equipment machinery repair/sales shop • General purpose workshop and associated equipment parking • Self-storage • Outdoor storage • Automobile service station 		
Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)			
	The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) promotes efficient development and land use patterns to sustain the financial well being of the Province and municipalities over the long term.	HPGI	Noted.
	The PPS promotes opportunities for a diversified economic base, which includes maintaining a range and choice of suitable sites for commercial uses supporting a wide range of economic activities and ancillary uses and considers the needs of existing and future businesses.	HPGI	Noted.
	The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires Planning authorities to promote economic development by maintaining a range and choice of suitable sites for employment uses which support a wide range of economic activities, consider the needs of existing and future businesses, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure required to accommodate projected needs.	HPGI	Noted.
Oak Ridges Moraine 2017			
	The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan designates the subject site as “Rural Settlement” as a component of the “Countryside Area” designation within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Countryside Areas are intended to provide for an agricultural and rural transition and a buffer between the Natural Core Areas and Natural Linkage Areas and the urbanized Settlement Areas. Agricultural and other rural areas that support agriculture and the rural economy may be permitted in this designation. Small-scale commercial, industrial, and institutional uses may be permitted subject to the applicable policies of Section 40 of the ORMCP.	HPGI	Noted.
Natural Heritage and Hydrological Features			
	<p>The applicant submitted Natural Heritage Evaluation Report and Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity Evaluation prepared by Stantec and dated January 17, 2019. The report identified, the following key natural heritage in or within 120 m of the subject property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glen Major Wetland Complex Provincially • Significant Wetland • A small unevaluated wetland area (meadow marsh) • Significant Woodlands <p>The report opines that a minimal encroachment into the Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone (MVPZs) strategy will be utilized when developing the subject lands. Accidental damage to tree or vegetation will be replaced or restored with native species.</p>	Stantec	Acknowledged.
	The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) requires that a 30 meter MVPZ for all natural heritage features on the subject site in accordance with the ORMCP and their policies.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
	Stantec suggests a 30 m mitigation is sufficient to support the maintenance and restoration of natural self-sustaining vegetation within the minimum vegetation protection zone (MVPZ).	Stantec	Addressed. A MVPZ of 30m has been proposed for the wetland in the NHE.
Landform Conservation Areas			
	The subject site is within a Landform Conservation Area – Moderately Complex (Category 2). Policies 30(6), 30(9), 30(10), 30(12) and 30(13) of the ORMCP details certain requirements for development or site alteration in these areas.	Stantec/HPGI	Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR and Section 2.4 of FSR for Landform Conservation Area analysis.
	The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Stantec, dated January 17, 2019, provided some analysis of the slope of the subject site. Section 2.4 of the report indicates that 17.4% of the total land surface area contains slopes greater than 10%. The report opines that the slope of the subject site is	Stantec/HPGI	Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR and Section 2.4 of FSR for Landform Conservation Area analysis.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	below the minimum total land surface area of 20% that contain slopes greater than 10% and that the Landform Conservation policies do not apply as per ORMCP Ontario Technical Paper Series #4 – Landform Conservation.		
	Comments from the TRCA, dated April 19, 2022, state that the steps outlined in Section 5 of the Technical Paper must also be undertaken.	Stantec/HPGI	Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR for Landform Conservation Area analysis.
Regional Official Plan (ROP)			
	<p>The subject site is designated “Oak Ridges Moraine” within the Region of Durham Official Plan (ROP). The subject site is located within the Hamlet of Claremont. Hamlets are part of the Countryside Area designation in the Oak Ridges Moraine and are intended to provide opportunities for minor residential infill and small-scale industrial, commercial, and institutional uses. Any development or site alteration in a hamlet on the Moraine shall be in accordance with the policies in Sub-Section 9B of Regional Official Plan, area municipal official plans and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.</p> <p>Section 9B.2.3 of Regional Official Plan states that hamlets shall be developed in harmony with surrounding and may consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominantly single-detached housing, as well as community facilities. • Employment uses in accordance with the relevant policies in Sub-Sections 8C and 9B of the ROP; and • Commercial uses that meet the immediate needs of the residents of the hamlets and the surrounding rural area. 	HPGI	Noted.
	The proposed rezoning provides for a range of industrial and commercial uses, however, it appears the scale of the automobile service station use may go beyond serving the immediate needs of the rural residents and businesses of the Hamlet of Claremont.	HPGI	Addressed. The proposed development is Conceptual in nature. The subject application seeks to rezone the Subject Lands to bring them into conformity with the Official Plan designation for the site. Automobile Service Station use is permitted in the Hamlet Employment Designation.
Land Use Compatibility			
	The subject site is located within proximity to sensitive land uses (i.e. residential dwellings). The proposed zoning by-law amendment to permit several industrial uses may pose a land use conflict between existing sensitive land uses.	RWDI	Addressed. See enclosed Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study.
	For instance, the proposed metal fabrication use is characterized as a Class III within the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) D-Series Guideline. Class III uses are capable of raw and finished products with major annoyance and/or high probability of fugitive emissions such as noise, odour, dust and/or vibration.	S. Larkin	Addressed. Class III uses, including metal fabrication, are no longer being requested.
	The applicant shall provide the Region with a Land Use Compatibility Study to ensure major facilities and sensitive land use uses are planned and developed to avoid and/or minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects and minimize risk to public health and safety in accordance with the MECP D-Series Guidelines and Section 1.2.6.1 of the PPS. The report must address noise, odour, dust, and vibration matters to ensure that there will be no future conflict between the existing sensitive land uses and the proposed industrial uses on the subject site.	RWDI	Addressed. See enclosed Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study.
	At the cost of the applicant, the Region will require a peer review of the Land Use Compatibility Study at the applicant’s expense. The applicant will also be required to implement any recommended mitigation measures/warning clauses.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged.
Servicing			
	Development within hamlets shall be individually serviced with private drilled wells and private sewage disposal systems where groundwater quantity and quality permits, and in compliance with the standards of the Region and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
	The proposed Daily Sewage Flow for the proposed development will be greater than 10,000 liters/day. As such, the review and approval for the private sewage system must be completed by the Ministry of the Environmental, Conservation and Parks.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
	The applicant submitted a Hydrogeological Report, prepared by Stantec, dated January 17, 2019, to demonstrate that the existing and proposed uses can be accommodated by private servicing. However, the water usage required to support the proposed uses is inconclusive in the report.	Stantec	Noted.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Stantec, dated January 17, 2019, states that the proposed private well\ located at the northern part of the site will service the site for domestic and fire through a private water network. The domestic and fire loads are estimated to be 26,980 L/day.	Stantec	Noted.
	If the maximum daily water usage will be greater than 50,000 litres/day, the applicant will require a Permit To Take Water (PTTW) from the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
	If the maximum daily water usage is less than 50 000 litres/day and a PTTW is not required, the Region will require an updated hydrogeological report that examines the proposed water usage of the property and provides confirmation that the increased water usage at the site will not result in negative impacts to the quantity and/or quality of groundwater both on and off-site. This report will need to be peer reviewed by the Region's Peer Reviewer at the applicant's expense.	Stantec	Addressed. To be provided at detailed Site Plan stage.
	The Region will require further analysis to demonstrate that the proposed uses can be accommodated by private servicing to ensure conformity with policy 9B.2.13 of the ROP and the policies of the ORMCP.	Stantec	Addressed. To be provided at detailed Site Plan stage.
Natural Heritage Features and Hydrological Features			
	Schedule B, Map B-1d of the ROP identifies Key Natural Heritage Features and Hydrological Features on the subject site and adjacent to the Natural Core Area of the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan. The Region will require confirmation that the water resources quantity and quality controls, wetland water balance risk evaluation, and revisions to the Natural Heritage Evaluation are acceptable to the TRCA to ensure conformity with policy 10.B.2.7 of the ROP and policies of the ORMCP.	Stantec	Addressed. The TRCA Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation has been completed and provided in a memorandum provided with this resubmission.
Landform Conservation Areas			
	Schedule B -Map B4 of the ROP identifies landform conservation areas on the subject site. In accordance with policy 10B.2.15 of the ROP, an application for development or site alteration proposed in a landform conservation area shall be accompanied by the appropriate study as required by the ORMCP.	Stantec/HPGI	Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR and Section 2.4 of FSR for Landform Conservation Area analysis.
	The Region will require further analysis of the slopes on the subject site as indicated by the TRCA in their comments dated April 19, 2022, and the landform conservation area policies of the ORMCP to ensure conformity with the policy 10B.2.15 of the ROP and policies of the ORMCP.	Stantec/HPGI	Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR and Section 2.4 of FSR for Landform Conservation Area analysis.
Regional Works/Transportation Department			
	There appears to be a lack of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) content in the development and the Traffic Impact Study prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited, dated June 2019, based on the size and uses for this development. We suggest the following sections should be included:	Paradigm	Addressed. Addressed. See enclosed Traffic Response Letter dated March 7, 2024.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transit Overview – Include mapping and a description of the closest existing transit for the site (even if it is not within a 400m walking distance) and its connecting services and nodes. Also consider looking into potential future routes, and ensure the site has sufficient pedestrian facilities to access main roads (such as the Claremont By-Pass). 	Paradigm	Addressed. See enclosed Traffic Response Letter dated March 7, 2024.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active Transportation – Bicycle parking and facilities should be provided for larger buildings and the convenience store on the subject site. 	S. Larkin	Addressed. To be prepared at detailed Site Plan stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carpooling – Consider providing information to industrial plaza tenants on the benefits of carpooling (reduced commute costs, less parking required, offering corporate perks, etc). 	S. Larkin	Addressed. To be prepared at detailed Site Plan stage.
	The Region agrees with Brock Road Access Option 3 Right in/Right out/Left in via Separate Left-Turn Auxiliary Lane located 280 metres north of the at-grade rail crossing. A southbound right turn lane, as noted in the TIS, is also required at the proposed access on Brock Road. The left turns out movement will be restricted by a channelized island in the throat of the access. The concept design shown in the report is acceptable. The design should not restrict the sight distance to the north for vehicles exiting to the south.	Paradigm	Acknowledged.
	We agree with the geometric design dimensions provided in the report for the proposed southbound right turn lane and northbound left turn lane on Brock Road.	Paradigm	Acknowledged.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	The Region will require a set of engineering drawings for the required roadworks on Brock Road. The design of the auxiliary lanes is to follow Region of Durham guidelines, TAC and OPSD standards. The design speed to be used is 100 km/hr.	Stantec	Addressed. To be prepared at detailed Site Plan stage.
	The full cost of the design and construction of the roadworks on Brock Road is the responsibility of the applicant/developer.	Larkin	Acknowledged.
Preliminary Site Plan DWG A0.0			
	We agree with the concept of the channelized island in the throat of the access and will provide comments on the design during the review of the Brock Road engineering drawings. An additional right-of-way on Brock Road is not required from this property.	Paradigm	Acknowledged.
Development Charges/Servicing Agreement			
	The proposed development is subject to non-residential development charges that are due prior to issuance of a building permit. The applicant shall enter into a Regional Servicing Agreement for the proposed works within the right-of-way.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged.
Provincial Plan Review Responsibilities			
Soil and Groundwater Assessment Protocol			
	The applicant submitted a Phase One Environmental Site Assessment Update, prepared by G2S Consulting Inc., dated July 23, 2021 and in accordance with the CSA Standard Z768-01. The report opines that potentially contaminating activities (PCAs) identified within the Phase One study area, include gasoline and associated products storage tanks, chemical manufacturing, processing and bulk storage, and importation of fill of unknown quality.	Stantec	Noted.
	All ESA reports must be conducted in accordance with O. Reg 153/04 and the Region’s Soil and Groundwater Assessment Protocol. Reports prepared in the CSA standard will not be accepted. Accordingly, the applicant will be required to update the Phase One ESA report and submit a Reliance Letter and Certificate of Insurance so that the Region can rely on the information.	G2S Environmental	Addressed. See updated Phase 1 with Ont. Reg 153-04 dated July 23, 2024. Certificate of Insurance included.
Archaeological Site Assessment			
	The Region’s composite archaeological resources tool identifies the subject site as an area of archaeological potential. The applicant submitted to the Region a copy of a clearance letter from the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries indicating a Stage 1-2 Archeological Assessment of Claremont Business Park, dated December 23, 2015, has been entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports without technical review. The Region has no further comments on archeological matters at this time.	HPGI	Acknowledged.
	There are no further Provincial Plan Review Responsibilities applicable at this time.	HPGI	Acknowledged.
Conclusion:			
	Regional staff have reviewed the subject application and have identified several matters that must be resolved before the Region can comment on whether the application is in conformity with Regional and provincial policies. Further analysis of natural heritage and hydrological features, landform conservation areas, soil and groundwater assessment matters, and further information to support the proposed private servicing for the subject site must be addressed to the satisfaction of the Region. The Region also requests that a land use compatibility study be prepared to ensure that there are no land use conflicts between the proposed industrial uses and the sensitive land uses nearby.	RWDI	Addressed. See enclosed Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study.
City of Pickering City Development Department Isabel Lima – April 27, 2022			
	This letter is to summarize comments received to date with respect to the above-noted application for Zoning By-law Amendment, to formalize the existing industrial uses on the property and to permit the development of three new industrial buildings and a retail gasoline outlet with accessory retail and commercial uses. Materials and studies submitted in support of the application have been circulated to internal departments and external agencies for their comments. Below are comments and concerns identified by the City of Pickering’s City Development Department.	HPGI	Noted.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
City Development Department			
Conformity with the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan & Durham Region OP			
	The Planning Justification Report (PJR), prepared by Humphries Planning Group Inc., dated June 2021, does not provide sufficient rationale as to how the proposed redevelopment/land uses are considered “small-scale commercial or industrial uses” that do not require the construction of “largescale buildings and structures”, considering the proposal includes 1,287 square metres of existing industrial uses, a total of 1,590 square metres of new industrial uses, a total of 361 square metres of new commercial uses, a new gas station and truck fuel station, and a total of 176 new parking and loading spaces. Under the ORMCP, “major development” is defined as development consisting of the construction of a building or buildings with a ground floor area of 500 square metres or more.	HPGI	Addressed. See updated Planning Justification Report for analysis related to “small-scale” development
	The ORMCP also states that an application for a small-scale commercial or industrial use within a Countryside Area may not be approved unless the applicant demonstrates that the new or expanded uses will have no adverse impacts on surrounding agricultural operations and lands, or that such impacts will be minimized and mitigated to the extent possible. The submitted PJR does not address the proposal’s conformity to this policy.	HPGI/RWDI	Addressed. See updated Planning Justification Report and Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study for analysis related to “small-scale” development and compatibility. It should be noted that an Agricultural Impact Assessment has not been required.
	In addition, the Durham Regional Official Plan states that Hamlets within “Oak Ridges Moraine, Countryside Areas” are intended to provide opportunities for minor residential infill and small-scale industrial, commercial and institutional uses, serving the needs of the surrounding area. The submitted PJR does not address how each proposed land use will “serve the needs of the surrounding area”. In particular, staff do not consider a truck fuel station to be serving the needs of Claremont, considering the majority of the surrounding land uses are residential lots, agricultural lands or small-scale commercial uses (restaurants, retail stores, etc.).	HPGI	Addressed. See enclosed updated Planning Justification Report.
	With your second submission, please provide a revised Planning Justification Report that addresses the above-noted matters.	HPGI	Addressed. An updated Planning Justification Report has been enclosed with this submission.
Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan – Landform Conservation Areas			
	An application for development within a landform conservation area (Category 2) must identify planning, design and construction practices that will keep disturbance to landform character to a minimum, including limiting the portion of the net developable area of the site that is disturbed to not more than 50 percent of the total area of the site, and limiting the portion of the net developable area of the site that has impervious surfaces to more than 20 percent of the total area of the site. In addition, major development (“major development” includes the development of buildings with a ground floor area of 500 square metres or more) within a landform conservation area must be accompanied by a landform conservation plan and a development strategy that identifies appropriate planning, design and construction practices to minimize the disruption to landform character.	HPGI	Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR and Section 2.4 of FSR for Landform Conservation Area analysis. It has been determined that the Subject Lands do not meet the minimum criteria for a Landform Conservation Area and are exempt from the applicable policies.
	With your second submission, please provide a revised Planning Justification Report & Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report that addresses the above-noted matters.	HPGI	Addressed. See response above.
Existing Wetland and Associated Protection Zone			
	In accordance with the comments received from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, staff require the applicant to provide a revised draft zoning by-law that includes the “ORM-EP – Oak Ridges Moraine – Environmental Protection Zone” over the existing wetland and the associated 30 metre minimum vegetation protection zone.	HPGI	Addressed. The draft Zoning By-law Amendment has been revised to include ORM-EP zone over the existing wetland and 30-metre MVPZ.
Proposed Outdoor Storage			
	Based on the submitted draft zoning by-law, a request is being made to permit all uses on the subject lands to be carried on without an enclosed building or structure. Staff do not consider this request to be suitable or appropriate for the redevelopment of the subject lands, particularly when considering the number of residential lots surrounding the property. Staff require the applicant to propose appropriate restrictions for the proposed outdoor storage use, such as regulating the type and amount of outdoor storage permitted on the site, and regulate where outdoor storage may be located on the lot, as to not have a negative visual impact on the surrounding residential properties.	HPGI	Addressed. The draft Zoning By-law Amendment has been updated to provide guidance to regulate the location and amount of outside storage for the proposed uses.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>With your second submission, please also provide details regarding the type of outdoor storage expected to be on the lot. Based on a site visit completed in November of 2021, there are truck trailers, mobile trailers, shipping containers, construction vehicles, commercial trucks, aggregates and other equipment being stored outside on the property, the majority of which is stored along the Old Brock Road frontage, across the street from residential lots. Staff do not consider this type or extent of outdoor storage to be suitable or appropriate for the subject lands.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The proposed outdoor storage will be directly related to and accessory to the proposed uses which it serves. This is typical of employment areas which support industrial, warehouse and manufacturing uses and are normally incidental to those uses. The existing outdoor storage uses on the Subject Lands support a pre-existing operation which has occurred on the site since 1975. These uses were in existence prior to residential development and are sheltered from view from the Brock Road by-pass.</p>
Proposed Land Uses			
	<p>To facilitate the redevelopment, the applicant is proposing to rezone the lands from ORM-A Zone to ORM-M1 Zone, which would permit 14 new land uses on the property. The applicant is also proposing to expand the list of permitted uses to include another 8 land uses.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
	<p>Based on the submission materials, it is unclear how all 22 proposed uses will operate on the site and within each building. With your second submission, please provide details on the proposed uses for each existing and new industrial building.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The application does not seek to establish all proposed uses on the site. In support of the proposal, a Conceptual Development Plan has been prepared which illustrates a potential maximum build-out of the site with a mix of the types of industrial and commercial land uses which are proposed to be permitted through the subject zoning by-law amendment. The development scenario seeks to demonstrate how a combination of industrial uses could be <u>conceptually</u> deployed on the site in a comprehensive manner. The proposed uses are consistent with the uses already permitted in the Official Plan. The amendment seeks to bring the zoning into conformity with the Official Plan.</p>
Noise, Dust, Light and Odour Pollution			
	<p>Many area residents expressed concerns with increased noise and pollution as a result of the proposed development (see Comments Received from Area Residents, Attachment #1).</p>	<p>Jade Acoustics</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Preliminary Noise Report.</p>
	<p>Staff also have concerns with the proposed land uses as they relate to increased noise, dust, light and odour pollution. As outlined in Section 16.2 of the City's Official Plan, proposals for new land uses (including, but not limited to, commercial and industrial uses) that may introduce new sources of noise adjacent to sensitive land uses, or may introduce or increase existing light spillage, dust or odours, are required to complete a noise study and an appropriate dust, light and odour analysis. In addition, appropriate measures to mitigate adverse effects from the noise, dust, light or odours identified by the studies are required. Attenuation measures that are satisfactory to the City may include, but are not limited to, berming, fencing or buffering of separation distances between the respective land uses.</p>	<p>RWDI/ Jade Acoustics</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study and Preliminary Noise Report for analysis.</p>
	<p>With your second submission, please provide a noise study and an appropriate dust, light and odour analysis. The studies should provide recommended attenuation measures that are satisfactory to the City.</p>	<p>RWDI</p>	<p>Addressed. An Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study has been enclosed with this submission.</p>
Existing and Proposed Accesses			
	<p>Old Brock Road is identified as a local road within the Pickering Official Plan, designed to carry local traffic and provide access to individual properties, to other local roads and collector roads.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
	<p>As part of the proposed redevelopment, the two existing accesses from Old Brock Road are proposed to remain, and a third access is proposed at the north end of the site. In order to minimize the volume of traffic on a local road – and to address the concerns of area residents related to increased traffic – the applicant should explore opportunities to provide only one vehicle access from Old Brock.</p>	<p>S. Larkin</p>	<p>Noted. To be considered when a formalized Development Plan is advanced.</p>
	<p>In addition, opportunities should be explored to relocate the proposed truck fuel station to be accessed from Brock Road (Claremont By-pass). In its current proposed location, the fuel station is accessed from Old Brock Road, which will require large commercial trucks to travel along a local road through Claremont and create noise pollution for the residential lots.</p>	<p>S. Larkin / Paradigm</p>	<p>Addressed. The intention is for all trucks to enter the site off Brock Road. Southbound trucks will exit back to Brock Road. Northbound trucks will exit on Old Brock and continue north the Uxbridge Pickering Townline intersection as per the TIS reviewed/accepted by Durham Region. Site signage will be utilized indicating same.</p>
Other Revisions to the Draft Zoning By-law			
	<p>With your second submission, please submit a revised draft zoning by-law that addresses the following matters:</p>		

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> include a provision that determines which lot line (west or east) shall be deemed to be the front lot line for the purposes of determining zoning by-law compliance; and 	HPGI	Addressed. See enclosed updated draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide a definition for the proposed land uses that are not already defined within Zoning By-law 3037, as amended. 	HPGI	Addressed. See enclosed updated draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
Preliminary Landscape Plans			
	As noted in the comments received from Engineering Services, the subject property is a key gateway to the northern entrance of the Hamlet of Claremont and the City of Pickering. As such, a gateway landscape feature of significance should be provided at the northern edge of the property, as part of this redevelopment application.	S. Larkin	Acknowledged. A Gateway feature will be designed/provided at the detailed Site Plan stage.
	In addition, along road frontages, significant landscaping is required to provide a street edge and to help soften views of parking areas. Site entrances and loading space areas should also be buffered with enhanced landscaping. Landscape buffers must be provided along any parking area that may be visible from the street. Trees, shrubs and other vegetation should be selected based on their tolerance to rural conditions, such as road salt or heat. Preference will be given to native species of the region of equal suitability.	HPGI	Noted. The Conceptual Development Plan establishes appropriate setbacks to allow for ample landscaping along the primary street frontages and street edges. A detailed Landscape Plan including native species lists will be provided at detailed Site Plan Stage.
	With your second submission, please provide preliminary landscape plans for the proposed redevelopment.	HPGI	Addressed. See response above.
Proposed Vehicle Stacking Lane			
	Please provide justification that the proposed drive-through facility associated with the restaurant use provides for sufficient vehicle stacking.	Paradigm	Addressed. See enclosed Traffic Response Letter dated March 7, 2024.
Existing Uses on the Site			
	In the submitted Planning Justification Report, it is noted that the machine shop and outdoor storage use (which occupy the existing industrial building on the lot that is proposed to remain) have existed on the property since 1975. Prior to adoption of the amending by-law to implement the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan in 2006 (being By-law 6640/06, which rezoned the property to ORM-A), the subject lands were zoned "A – Rural Agricultural Zone" under Zoning By-law 3037. By-law 3037 was passed by Council on August 3, 1965. At that time, the permitted uses within the "A" Zone included a detached dwelling, home occupation and various agricultural related uses.	HPGI	Noted. The Conceptual Development Plan contemplates the development of the Subject Lands for a three (3) phased development consisting of three (3) proposed industrial buildings, a retail gasoline outlet with an accessory retail establishment (restaurant), an associated car wash. These uses are consistent with existing permissions in the Official Plan. The proposal also seeks to formalize a pre-existing 1,287 square metre industrial building and contractors' yards use on the Subject Lands.
	During the statutory public meeting, a number of residents and Committee members raised questions regarding the legality of the current uses on the site. Based on the date of passing of the applicable by-laws, it would appear that the property owner began the operation of these businesses on the subject property illegally. With your second submission, please explain how the existing uses and outdoor storage on the site came to be. Please also provide documentation that shows that the existing uses have operated on the site since 1975.	S. Larkin	Addressed. See enclosed Sworn Affidavits.
Comments from Planning and Development Committee			
	The following is a summary of comments/questions received at the Planning and Development Committee Meeting held on December 6, 2021:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognizing that this is an interesting gateway, both into the Hamlet of Claremont and into the City of Pickering, will considerations be made to propose a more environmentally-friendly and sustainable development that is more innovative, such as electric vehicle charging rather than a gas station? 	HPGI	Addressed. The proposed Site Plan is conceptual in nature and seeks to demonstrate how the proposed uses could be deployed on the site in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. It is expected that any future fuel station development could support vehicle charging stations to reflect market needs at that time.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much water is expected to be used and drawn from the aquifer for this car wash? How often will the waste be carted away? Where will the waste water go? Have studies been completed to assess the water quantity in this location? 	Stantec	Addressed. A recycled wash system currently may use 30 litres per wash. The analysis has doubled that rate to 60-litres. The 10,980L/ day is at full operational efficiency for over 15 hours per day. The recycled water will have a soap component/ sludge that will be removed to Water Treatment Plant in Pickering. The rate of removal is to be determined. Hydrogeological testing has been completed to support the proposed water consumption.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the gas station be catered only to trucks, or will the gas station be available to other vehicles as well? 	S. Larkin	Addressed. The fuel station will serve both cars and trucks. A proper station for trucks to safely move does not currently exist in the area of north Pickering and the only gas station in Claremont has closed permanently. The proposed gas station has a demonstrated need.
Conclusion			
	With your second submission, please provide a cover letter indicating how each comment/concern outlined above has been addressed. The following materials are required to accompany your next submission:	HPGI	Updated reports, plans, and studies have been enclosed with this resubmission for circulation and review. A complete list of the submitted supporting documentation is contained in the accompanying Cover Letter.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matrix providing a written response to all comments received from the City Development Department, external agencies, internal departments, the public and Planning & Development Committee (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Planning Justification Report (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Draft Zoning By-law (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise Study with recommended attenuation measures (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dust, Light and Odour Analysis with recommended attenuation measures (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary Landscape Plans (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Grading Plan (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Transportation Impact Study (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliance Letters for the Geotechnical/Hydrogeological Report and Natural Heritage Evaluation Report (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Geotechnical/Hydrogeological Report (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Site Plan (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree Inventory Plan (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Natural heritage Evaluation (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Use Compatibility Study (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering drawings for the required roadworks on Brock Road (Claremont By-pass) (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Phase One Environmental Site Assessment (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reliance Letter (digital); 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certificate of Insurance (digital); and 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter of Verification stating that the documents submitted are in an accessible format (digital). 		
	The City may, at the time of a recommendation report to Council, require drawings in CAD or GIS format (compatible with either ArcGis Desktop 10.7.1, ArcGis Pro 2.6.1, or AutoCAD Map 3D 2018), and such files need to be georeferenced with a geographic coordinate system of: NAD83 UTM Zone 17N.		
Accessibility Standards			
	All studies, reports, plans or presentations that result from this project must meet the Province's <i>Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act</i> (AODA) Information and Communications Standards. A letter of verification stating that the documents submitted are in an accessible format and meet the AODA standards will be required. Please see the Accessible Document Checklist for Vendors attached to provide assistance on creating an accessible PDF document. Please arrange a meeting with City staff to discuss the above-noted comments prior to finalizing your second submission.	HPGI	Addressed. Matters related to accessibility standards and requirements will be addressed at the detailed Site Plan stage.
Comments Received from Area Residents			
Resident Comments/Questions → Pickering wants a fulsome response to each comment/concern			
	What is the proposed use of the 3 industrial building?	HPGI	Addressed. A complete list of proposed land uses has been included in the draft Zoning By-law Amendment.
	169 parking spots is huge – what kind of businesses require this much parking?	HPGI	Addressed. Parking has been established based on Zoning By-law requirements.
	This statement - 1.1.4.2 In rural areas, rural settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted." The subject lands are located within the Rural Settlement	HPGI	Addressed. The proposal seeks to implement the uses already permitted in the current Official Plan.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>Area of Claremont where rural residential predominately exists with a mix of service commercial/industrial uses. Approximately 400 metres south of the subject lands at the intersection of Old Brock Road and Hoxton Street, various industrial uses exist which include a S&T general sandblasting industry and various outdoor storage areas. Additional retail uses are located at Old Brock Road and Hoxton Avenue which includes a restaurant establishment and County Depot. Further south of the subject lands is the Claremont rural centre which contains further commercial and industrial uses mixed with rural residential. In building upon the rural character of Claremont, the regeneration and redevelopment of the subject lands introduces new industrial uses supported by commercial uses of the gasoline outlet and the accessory retail restaurant establishment. The proposed development meets the requirements of the Provincial Policy Statement through the provisions of services necessary to support the rural community without requiring the expansion of municipal services.</p> <p>I am confident that if you surveyed all residents of Claremont – not just those with 150M radius you would quickly find that the majority of residents like the Hamlet the way it is and are not remotely interested in this type of development. We live here because we enjoy the rural surrounding not because we want to live next to an industrial/commercial development.</p>		
	<p>Statement - The proposed development supports the Growth Plan’s policy direction by implementing additional economic opportunities within the Claremont rural area. The proposed gas station and accessory retail/restaurant uses will provide the opportunity to serve the local needs of the Claremont residents and existing businesses in the surrounding area including the future businesses generated by the proposed development. We already have a gas station in Claremont on one in Goodwood, we have three general/convenience stores and two restaurants– they do not deserve more competition.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The amendment been designed to provide flexibility in order to support a variety of business and economic activities. The proposed uses are already permitted in the Official Plan. The amendment will bring the zoning into conformity with the Official Plan</p>
	<p>Figure 6 Legend shows “Palgrave Estates” isn’t that in Caledon – what is this reference for?</p>	<p>Stantec</p>	<p>Noted. See updated Report.</p>
	<p>Statement - The development proposal introduces “population-serving” businesses such as the gas station and the retail establishment which will support the local population of the Claremont Settlement area and the travelling public.</p> <p>It seems to me that the gas station and retail establishment are there to create a placebo effect. The majority of the development is Industrial for the benefit of the landowner, not for the residents of the Hamlet. As already noted, – we already have a gas station and convenience stores.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The proposed Site Plan is conceptual in nature and seeks to demonstrate how the proposed uses could be deployed on the site in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. The proposed uses are already permitted in the Official Plan. The amendment will bring the zoning into conformity with the Official Plan</p>
	<p>I have concerns about noise and air pollution for our community and especially for the residents in close proximity.</p>	<p>RWDI/ Jade Acoustics</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Land Use Compatibility Study and Preliminary Noise Report addressing sensitive receptors.</p>
	<p>I would also be directly affected by the continuous noise of trucks braking or accelerating to enter or exit the premises as we are on a higher elevation to the East. I already hear the noise of the very large scale soil dumping that has been permitted, I assume, for the last several years further on the townline to the West.</p>	<p>RWDI/ Jade Acoustics</p>	<p>Addressed. See response above.</p>
	<p>In addition, more fast food convenience is more fast food litter for me to clean up on a weekly basis along the property line.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. All future buildings will be designed with appropriate garbage collection and meet all waste design standards.</p>
	<p>Given Claremont already has a newly renovated gas station to serve the immediate and surrounding community (and there is a further gas station at Coppins Corners) and in light of massive global conservation and climate initiatives to reduce/eliminate the use of fossil fuels, approval of such a zoning amendment would seem to be contrary to the interests of the Hamlet of Claremont, the Region, and out of step generally with where global initiatives are leading.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>The proposed gas station use is already permitted in the Official Plan. The amendment seeks to bring the zoning into conformity with the current Official Plan.</p>
	<p>Pickering’s ‘First Principle’ in its Official Plan Edition 8 is defined as: ‘to meet people’s needs while ensuring environmentally appropriate actions.’ The goals for the rural system are well enumerated in 2.19 and at their core is the protection of land as a vital resource for existing and future generations. Section 2.19 (b) in addition to encouraging agricultural and recreational uses indicates under (iv): ‘other compatible rural uses that contribute to the diversity of economic activities in the area.’</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Planning Justification Report for analysis related to “small scale” development and compatibility.</p>

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>Section 13.12 sets out further specific goals with respect to the Hamlet of Claremont including: ‘encourage opportunities enhancing the historic village of Claremont....providing the historic character of the village and neighbouring residents are respected.’</p> <p>The proposed uses and development density of the site do not meet the first principle of the Official Plan, nor specifically Sections 2.19 or 13.12.</p>		
	<p>The gas station requires a zoning amendment because of the ORM-A designation. A zoning amendment to permit a gas station with 6 pumps plus truck refueling on the highly sensitive ORM lands would be incompatible with ‘environmentally appropriate actions’. Claremont already has a new and appropriately sized gas station which serves its needs and the travelling public. It doesn’t need another gas station to compete with the existing one nor do we need a third gas station with truck refueling within 7 kilometres.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See response above re: gas station use.</p>
	<p>It is important to note that this proposal was formulated many years ago before the existing Claremont gas station was completely refurbished to current industry standards. Since then the level of environmental consciousness and concern has risen dramatically and citizens the world over are demanding climate action from world leaders. Pickering will need to do its part. Approving a zoning amendment to allow more fossil fuel convenience is not only inconsistent with the Official Plan but it would be a regressive step. Together with an automated car wash, the potential employment impact would be only one from such a decision! Not, I suggest, the intention behind a ‘Hamlet Employment’ designation.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. A gas station use, if implemented, would be required to satisfy all TSSA safety standards and regulations.</p>
	<p>The Planning Justification Report indicates that the ORMCP is not an issue because landform slopes greater than 10% are less than the 20% threshold – 17.4% according to the applicant’s consultant. This should be separately assessed by an independent consultant retained by Pickering at the applicant’s expense given the variables, assumptions and judgments made in such a determination being as close to the threshold as they are. The extent of the proposed development which would increase the percentage of impervious surfaces from under approximately 15% to greater than 70% based on the drawings shown is certainly not enhancing the character of the village. The runoff from the entire property, being largely paved over, especially salt during winter will significantly degrade the ORM-EP wetlands to the south notwithstanding the inclusion of a settlement pond. Given the proposed huge increase in impervious surfaces from largely plowed fields currently to asphalt and additional buildings, simple logic would dictate that run off control will be inferior to what exists today notwithstanding the comments of the consultant and the remedial actions they propose. And these are ORM-A designated lands.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR and Section 2.4 of FSR for Landform Conservation Area analysis. It has been determined that the Subject Lands do not meet the minimum criteria for a Landform Conservation Area and are exempt from the applicable policies.</p>
	<p>As well, a total of 169 parking spaces are proposed – 90 in the first phase - which is out of character for, and inconsistent with, a rural Hamlet such as Claremont, not in keeping with small-scale industrial/commercial development, and inconsistent with the goals for rural communities.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See response above re: parking.</p>
	<p>In addition to 169 parking spaces, the proposed zoning amendment seeks approval for additional outdoor storage, self-storage, equipment parking, supply yard as well as metal fabrication. This would also generate little in the way of hamlet employment, significantly alter the character of the hamlet and offer little industrial diversity to the community. The residents of Claremont would receive little to no direct benefits from these activities. The outdoor ‘equipment storage’ is also likely to become a larger junk yard than it is today.</p>		<p>Addressed. Outdoor storage is generally regarded as an accessory use to permitted employment/industrial uses. The application seeks to implement the industrial uses contemplated in the Official Plan.</p>
	<p>The applicant proposes some associated retail activity which I have assumed to be a fast food type establishment related to the gas station. This would compete directly with the two existing and struggling restaurants in town as well as the ancillary convenience store services offered by the existing gas station and the Claremont General Store – a fixture for more than a century. This proposed activity would detract from, not preserve or enhance, the historic character of the community. In fact, such development could ‘hollow out’ the commercial footprint around the existing four corners to say nothing of the additional litter that would be discarded in the ditches close by. Part of my weekly schedule already includes clean-up of fast food trash along my property line. The amounts would be magnified significantly if such an outlet were allowed. The inclusion of a fast food outlet in an industrial type mall is not compatible with enhancing the historic village of Claremont especially when next to nothing proposed in the submission benefits the residents directly. It surely might</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The site has been planned to support industrial/employment uses and limited retailing in accordance with the current Official Plan.</p>

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>benefit and provide additional convenience to Uxbridge/Goodwood/Port Perry residents travelling to or from but this shouldn't be Pickering's concern.</p> <p>A farmer's market selling local produce by contrast would potentially employ a much greater number of people and be consistent with supporting the agricultural and local tourism base. Such an alternate land use if it had been proposed, would have been a win for the community.</p>		
	<p>My residence is on a higher elevation such that I already hear the din of the traffic on Brock Rd. or the dumping taking place further to the West on the Townline. With the addition of an entrance on the Brock Road for refueling, I would be doubly exposed to the noise of heavy trucks braking and decelerating entering from the North or accelerating uphill northbound leaving the proposed gas station given the prevailing westerly winds. This would be a significant additional adverse development of ongoing intermittent noises, morning, noon and night. It would not be a temporary feature during construction as alluded to. I read nothing to say any studies had been carried out on what would be very negative and permanent environmental, health and social effects affecting myself and similar neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Land Use Compatibility Study which demonstrates that the proposed uses will not create any adverse impacts to surrounding sensitive land uses.</p>
	<p>The proposed development does little: (a) to directly benefit the residents of Claremont; (b) for the creation of 'compatible' rural uses to agriculture or recreation or (c) add in a meaningful way to local employment opportunities. Rather it would compete with established and valued local businesses in the village thereby damaging the overall interests of residents and the present character of Claremont.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The development proposal seeks to establish employment/industrial uses which would provide for new job opportunities in Claremont and attract new business and industries.</p>
	<p>Nothing in this application would bring distinction to one of the principal gateways into the village from a planning perspective except in negative ways. It's an application for maximizing financial return to the extent possible on existing ORM-A lands with little consideration for 'protecting and enhancing the cultural and natural heritage of the rural area'. 196 parking spaces is what a big box store would require. That is not what you should first encounter entering an 'historic rural village' community. And further, by way of a zoning amendment for these ORM-A lands, the applicant is seeking to also establish a duplicative and environmentally moribund business. There is no good land use planning rationale for it. Such a zoning amendment should not be approved.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The proposal seeks to establish uses already contemplated in the current Official Plan as well as pre-existing uses that have existed since 1975.</p>
	<p>Given these lands are designated Hamlet Employment, I suggest it behooves Pickering Planning and Council to encourage more compatible uses for, and services provided from, such important 'gateway' lands in ways that would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. directly benefit the residents of Claremont and make them more locally self-sufficient; 2. protect a substantially larger part of the lands from development; and 3. meaningfully enhance the historic character of the village of Claremont. 	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See response above. Compatibility has been confirmed by the Land Use Compatibility Study which accompanies this resubmission.</p>
	<p>At its core, the goal of the rural system is: the protection of land as a vital resource for existing and future generations'. That is a quote from the Official Plan. The development proposes to make impervious surfaces for the majority of the site save for the settlement pond, small wetland and septic bed in an area with a steep slope at the south end. It is also not clear, for example, how the extra water and salt run-off in particular from the additional lanes on the By-pass or from the totality of the impervious surfaces on site will be captured except ultimately in the wetlands.</p>	<p>Stantec</p>	<p>Addressed. This concern relates to the Region of Durham's Road allowance and not the land of the applicant.</p>
	<p>The Traffic Impact study did not assess the proposed 169 parking spaces on site. This is an extraordinarily large number, highly visible and out of character. Some big box stores provide less parking. The ORMCP also encourages the reduction of impervious surfaces.</p>	<p>Paradigm</p>	<p>Addressed. Parking has been established using the Zoning By-law requirements for industrial/commercial uses.</p>
	<p>25% of the traffic generated from the proposed development is expected to go south from the site on Old Brock through the residential community. Speed is already a problem. What traffic calming measures are proposed? Will the additional truck traffic generated from the site be permitted to go through the village?</p>	<p>Paradigm</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed response letter from Paradigm Transportation dated March 7, 2024</p>
	<p>With respect to the Hydrogeology Report, it indicates that test pumps will determine if there is local interference with other wells. Wouldn't a more sensible approach be to first prepare a well impact assessment prior to any development approvals?</p>	<p>Stantec</p>	<p>Addressed. All protocols and standards contained in the Ontario Water Resources Act will be followed.</p>

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	It wasn't clear to me whether the water used from the proposed car wash was to be stored in underground tanks and re-used or trucked off site and is this really feasible? And what if there is insufficient capacity, does it end up in the ORM-EP designated wetlands?	Stantec	Addressed. It is a controlled closed system with system water held in tank (s) and re-used. There is no capacity issue and the effluent/by-product does not overland flow offsite.
	The consultant's report indicated that noise and dust were only temporary problems during the construction phase. However, trucks travelling southbound and using engine braking down the hill entering the site from Brock Road, or changing gears leaving the site heading northbound will create significant daily intermittent noise problems, morning, noon and night that will affect those residents particularly on higher elevations (East, West and North) as well as existing single family home residents living across from the proposed 3 exits on Old Brock. A Noise report should be prepared to assess these sensitive receptors especially with the intensity of industrial uses proposed for the site.	Jade Acoustics	Addressed. See enclosed Preliminary Noise Report for complete analysis including recommended noise mitigation measures to satisfy Ministry of Environment requirements.
	<p>Re: Planning Justification Report prepared by Humphries Planning Group Inc. Policy Analysis</p> <p>q) In 4.3 Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan 2017, on page 15, in paragraph 3, who monitors and maintains the Oil/Grit Separator mentioned in line 2? Please advise.</p> <p>And, in the same paragraph is written that quality control of the proposed development "will cumulatively exceed the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation, and Parks water quality treatment requirements for Level 1 (80% TSS Removal Efficiency)." Who will monitor the water quality and report findings of the monitoring to the residents for comment? Please advise.</p> <p>r) In 4.4 Region of Durham Official Plan 2017, on page 18, in paragraph 3, is stated a Permit to Take Water would be a requirement. Such a permit required from a Director appointed by the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks under the Ontario Water Resources Act Regulation 387é04 is specified when anyone is taking more than 50,000 litres per day. From the Executive Summary under Water on page I of the Functional Servicing And Stormwater Management Report, previously referenced, and referred to in this paragraph, the proposed development domestic and fire water loads are 26.980 liters per day and 3000 (US Gallons per minute) respectively. Not allowing for the carwash water load. The proposed fire water load being almost impossible to calculate on a volume per day basis. What then will be the proposed daily pumping rate, in litres per day, for the large proposed well referred to at the end of this paragraph when all of the proposed Phases of the proposed development are completed?</p> <p>And, how many of the "onsite supply wells" also referred to in this paragraph will be drilled?</p> <p>As well, what will be the proposed source of water for the proposed water storage tanks?</p> <p>In the same paragraph it is stated "test pumps will confirm if any private well interference". How exactly will private well interference be determined and will the results of the tests be available to the public for comment? Please advise. And, in the same paragraph it is stated that if there is private well interference mitigation options will be required. What exactly are all of the mitigation options which might be required and will all of those mitigation options be explained to the public thoroughly enough for the public to understand and comment on the options? Please advise.</p> <p>Also, in 4.4, referenced above, on page 19, in paragraph 1, is stated the Natural Heritage Evaluation, included with the Supporting Documents, previously referenced, notes indirect impacts resulting from construction such as noise and dust generation that are expected to be "short term". What is the Applicant's and the Humphries Planning Group's definition in weeks, months or years for "short term"?</p> <p>And, who will monitor the effects of the indirect impacts on the residents along with their loss of enjoyment of their property since the proposed development is proposed to consist of 3 Phases, as indicated on the Site Plan.</p>	<p>Stantec</p> <p>Stantec</p> <p>Stantec</p> <p>Stantec</p> <p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The oil grit separator is maintained by the owner.</p> <p>Addressed. Any responsibility to monitor the proposed stormwater management facility will be at the discretion of the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). The Owner will be responsible to ensure that any prescribed monitoring is undertaken.</p> <p>Addressed. Once 10 ,000L per day on septic is exceeded a permit is required from MOECP who monitor thereafter. The 26,980 litres accounts for the car wash using 10,980litres. We are forecasting 23,000 litres will remain under the capacity of 50,000 litres per day. On-site tanks are proposed to handle water storage which may be used for fire-fighting. Excess daily water may be diverted to storage in tanks.</p> <p>Addressed. Only 1 well will exist on the north end of the property. No permit is required under 50,000L per day.</p> <p>Addressed. We will have approximately 20,000litres of water per day excess to fill these tanks through time.</p> <p>Addressed. A Well contractor will set up a pump test of the new on site well. Identified nearby properties who wish to participate will have their wells monitored to check for fluctuations in their wells while the pump test is on. Solutions to any problems will be implemented. Regular practice in Ontario. The well installation report will be located in the Provincial wells database.</p> <p>Addressed. No development phasing schedule has been determined at this time. The proposal seeks to implement zoning on the Subject Lands in conformity with existing permissions in the current Official Plan.</p>

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>I have read the Traffic Impact Study prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited dated June 2019 and would challenge the authors Eugene Chartier and Gary Pappin to do three tests and then state they still stand by their recommendation that the proposed Brock Road access should be permitted. Simply, over the next week, when Brock Road is dry, set-up safety cones in the proposed location of the Option 3. Rent a Daimler Smart Car, starting at Albright Road, carefully enter onto Brock Road southbound in front of an aggregate hauler fully loaded with a fully loaded pup, that has not been advised what you are doing, accelerate to the 100 kilometers per hour speed, for which your study claims it has allowed, when you pass the Uxbridge/Pickering Townline, put on your right directional signal and try to turn into your simulated Option 3 access. Then, when the weather permits, do it during a snow storm. Then, when the weather permits, do it during an ice storm. As North and South America are in a La Nina cycle, this Winter, Claremont will experience higher than average precipitation so you will have lots of opportunities to experiment with a proposed Brock Road access during snow and ice storms. Please let me know the results of these tests of your recommendation.</p>	<p>Paradigm</p>	<p>Addressed. The Region of Durham has jurisdiction over Brock Road and has accepted the proposed entrance location. In accordance with the TIS it has been determined that this location is the most appropriate from a traffic operations and safety perspective.</p>
	<p>Re. Guidelines for New Developments in Proximity to Railway Operations – May 2013</p> <p>CPR respectfully requests that the recommended 2013 Proximity Guidelines be followed for this development.</p> <p>In section 2 of the Guidelines // Common Issues and Constraints, page 16 of the Guidelines states that the most significant constraints related to railway proximity can be broadly categorized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate communication 2. Lack of understanding and awareness of rail/municipal proximity issues 3. Absence of comprehensive or consistent development review <p>In section 2.1.1 Train Derailments, on page 18 of the Guidelines is made clear the importance and value of setbacks, berms and safety barriers / crash walls. None of these safety mitigations are present along the branch railway line operating in Claremont. Figure 2 on page 19 indicates how these mitigation measures would be arranged in new residential development. Since we have existing residential and commercial development along the rail line the City of Pickering needs to develop a plan and a schedule in consultation with the railway operator for the implementation of these safety measures before any further development takes place.</p> <p>In section 2.1.2 Crossings, on page 19 is stated that both Transport Canada and the railways strive to reduce the number of atgrade crossings. Due to the potential of considerable increase in population of Claremont should the Claremont Developments project proceed. And, with the growth in urban Pickering and communities to the north occasioned by the increase in immigration to Canada along with the Provincial guidelines to municipalities to accommodate population growth, the volume of traffic crossing the railway line on Brock Road would likely increase. Given the geography of this crossing along with the desire to reduce at-grade crossings, a grade separation bridge crossing may well become necessary, as it did on Brock Road south of Taunton Road. Could a grade separation bridge crossing be constructed here and still safely accommodate the proposed Brock Road entrance to and exit from the site? Please advise.</p> <p>In section 3.2//Consultation with the Railway, on page 26 since the writer of the Phase One Environmental Site Assessment Update misidentified the railway with crossings on both Brock Road and Old Brock Road approximately 150 meters and 520 meters respectively south of the southern boundary of the proposed site as belonging to CN. Did the Update’s author recognize the error and consult with CPR as required by the</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. Proximity Guidelines and Requirements will be followed once development is confirmed.</p> <p>Addressed. Not applicable.</p> <p>Addressed. Not applicable.</p> <p>Addressed. The Hamlet Employment Area is compatible with the CPR Spur Line. The guidelines primary emphasis relates to new residential uses or conversions of industrial lands to residential along rail lines. The proposal does not seek to establish any new residential uses.</p> <p>Addressed. See response above.</p>

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>Guidelines? If so, please provide a copy of the results of the consultations. If not, when will the consultations occur and when will the update be revised to include the results of the consultations and have them made available to the public for comment? Please advise for both.</p> <p>In section 3.4//Noise Mitigation .1 Guidelines page 28 the first bullet point paragraph indicates the requirement for a site-specific noise impact study and 3.4.1.1 Avoiding Adverse Noise Impacts through Good Design page 29 outlines the importance of good design. We could not locate the results of such a study with any of the Supporting Documents nor was there any mention of design practices with respect to adverse impacts of railway noise for the proposed development. When will the results of a noise impact study and the details of site design features of the project that will avoid adverse noise impacts be provided and made available to the public for comment? Please advise.</p> <p>In section 3.5//Vibration Mitigation .1 Guidelines pages 33 and 34 as we could not locate a reference to the results of a vibration impact study in any of the Supporting Documents when will the highly recommended vibration impact study be provided and made available to the public for comment? Please advise.</p>		<p>Addressed. Not applicable.</p>
	<p>"The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) designates the subject lands as" "Countryside Area – Rural Settlement". Small-scale commercial and industrial uses are permitted in Rural Settlement Areas, provided the use does not require large-scale modifications of terrain and/or vegetation, or large-scale buildings and structures:. How does this proposal conform to this requirement? These buildings are large with some exceeding 500 sq meters. This proposal is large scale modifications to the property which is not permitted and should not be permitted.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See updated Planning Justification Report for "small-scale" analysis.</p>
	<p>"The Plan states that an application for a small-scale commercial or industrial use within a Countryside Area may not be approved unless the applicant demonstrates that the buildings and structures will be planned, designed and constructed so as not to adversely affect the rural character of the Countryside Areas and the ecological integrity of the Plan Area. In addition, the applicant must demonstrate that the new or expanded uses will have no adverse impacts on surrounding agricultural operations and lands, or that such impacts will be minimized and mitigated to the extent possible".</p> <p>I have read all of the reports provided. I fail to see how the applicant has ensured that there will be no ecological impacts and the scale of this project WILL IMPACT THE CHARACTER OF THE HAMLET. You will be bringing in a significant increase in road traffic, noise, smell and garbage to the Hamlet. How can the residents of the Hamlet quality of life not be adversely affected?</p>	<p>RWDI/ Jade Acoustics</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study and Preliminary Noise Report for analysis.</p>
	<p>The ORMCP identifies the subject lands as being within a Landform Conservation Area (Category 2). An application for development within a landform conservation area (Category 2) must identify planning, design and construction practices that will keep disturbance to landform character to a minimum, including limiting the portion of the net developable area of the site that is disturbed to not more than 50 percent of the total area of the site, and limiting the portion of the net developable area of the site that has impervious surfaces to more than 20 percent of the total area of the site. In addition, major development ("major development" includes the development of buildings with a ground floor area of 500 square metres or more) within a landform conservation area must be accompanied by a landform conservation plan and a development strategy that identifies appropriate planning, design and construction practices to minimize the disruption to landform character. The applicant's proposal will be assessed against the provisions of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan during the further processing of the application.</p> <p>When you assess this proposal against this criteria it completely fails. The proposal appears to exceed the limits outlined for net developed area on this site and impervious surface amount will be exceeded.</p>	<p>Stantec/ HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See Section 7 of enclosed PJR and Section 2.4 of FSR for Landform Conservation Area analysis. It has been determined that the Subject Lands do not meet the minimum criteria for a Landform Conservation Area and are exempt from the applicable policies.</p>
	<p>The Durham Regional Official Plan designates the subject lands as "Oak Ridges Moraine Areas – Countryside Area". Small-scale commercial and industrial uses are permitted within the Countryside Area. This proposal is not small-scale in nature. It is requesting that not only cars be able to be refueled but class A trucks as well.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The City of Pickering Official Plan designates this area as Hamlet Employment. The uses in this application are permitted in the Official Plan. The Hamlet Employment designation permits for manufacturing, assembly, processing of goods,</p>

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>This is too much and too large a traffic for this quiet hamlet. It will adversely change the character of the Hamlet and quality of life for local residents in the Hamlet.</p>		<p>service industries, research and development facilities, warehousing, storage of goods and materials; Offices, limited retailing associated with an industrial operation; Automotive uses; Existing residential uses, home occupations. The application seeks to implement uses already permitted in the current Official Plan.</p>
	<p>The Pickering Official Plan designates the subject lands as “Rural Settlements – Oak Ridges Moraine Rural Hamlets”. This designation provides opportunities for redevelopment and infilling within the existing hamlet boundary, permitting a variety of uses including residential, employment, commercial, community, cultural and recreational. Further it states that "the retail gasoline outlet will not adversely affect the safe and convenient movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic".</p> <p>If this proposal is allowed to go through IT WILL adversely affect the convenient and more importantly the safe movement of local traffic and pedestrians. I have lived in Claremont for over 15 years. There are alot of dog walkers that use Old Brock Rd everyday including myself. Mixing trucks and pedestrians is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>I would encourage staff to come up to the Hamlet and try pulling out onto Brock Rd going south from Townline Rd during the busiest times of the day. Vehicles routinely travel in excess of 100 km per hour down Brock Rd including fully loaded dump trucks that are speeding due to being paid by the load. You literally have to put your car accelerator to the floor in order to safely speed up to enter Brock Rd at times. The proposed exit on Brock Rd is on a downhill with a curve in it. I can't think of a more unsafe location for this proposal.</p> <p>My concern is that should the proposal be allowed to go through it is almost assured a horrible accident will take place here.</p>	<p>Paradigm</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed response letter from Paradigm Transportation dated March 7, 2024</p>
	<p>It will adversely affect the livelihoods of well established businesses within the hamlet that already offer the same products and services that will be offered through this proposal. A number of local businesses within the Hamlet have made significant investments in their businesses in recent years. By bringing in corporate companies offering the same services or products this will surely cause economic hardship for existing local business.</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>How does it make sense to put another gas station in a small hamlet that already has a newly renovated gas station?</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. See above response re: gas station use.</p>
	<p>I am concerned that living next to this will have an adverse effect on my property value. How can the local property owners be assured that this will not adversely affect their property values?</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. Not applicable.</p>
	<p>Large trucks are extremely noisy both when they accelerate and when they use their air brakes due to the release of compressed air. There are homes directly across from the proposal. This will significantly affect our quality of life. I have had to listen to over 100 dump trucks per day rolling down my road from Brock everyday for the past 4 years due to a soil disturbance permit. I can assure you that you can hear them coming all the way from Brock Road in your home regardless of whether you are in your basement or not. The noise is extreme. This proposal will only continue this noise pollution for our neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Jade Acoustics</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Preliminary Noise Report for analysis.</p>
	<p>How is this proposal beneficial for a rural community that already has most of the services contained in the proposal?</p>	<p>HPGI</p>	<p>Addressed. The proposal seeks to establish employment/industrial uses that will provide additional job opportunities and diversify the employment land base</p>
	<p>The proposed gas station will be visible from my residential dwelling. Gas stations are known for emitting gasoline vapours which are toxic and tends to accumulate in the soil. There are many reports regarding this.</p>	<p>RWDI</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study for details related to noise, odour and dust impacts.</p>
	<p>Close to 100 people walk along this section of Old Brock Road everyday, without sidewalks and lights. Having three main entrances and large vehicles coming in on the side that is a 40 km zone, and there is an 80 km zone on the other side, has no benefit to any residents. This is also a major cycling route. This is impacting safe movement within the Hamlet.</p>	<p>Paradigm</p>	<p>Addressed. See enclosed TIS for details related to traffic.</p>

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	The uses that already exist on the property should be grandfathered in under the current zoning. No additional industrial uses should be permitted on the property.	HPGI	Acknowledged.
	What studies have been done around the proximity to live stock and the wetlands?	Stantec	Addressed. See enclosed updated NHE Report.
	What studies have been done to see what effect this will have on our roads? Considering the roads are already in terrible shape.	HPGI	Not Applicable. Road maintenance/upkeep is the responsibility of the municipality/Region.
	What does a car wash and this type of industrial use mean for our water? Everyone is on well water. This water is clean. What kind of pollution is going to be going into our water, with regular car wash and industrial uses dumping their dirty water back into the land.	Stantec	Addressed. See enclosed FSSR for details related to water requirements.
	What considerations are being taken to regulate the traffic, the light and the sound pollution?	Paradigm	Addressed. See enclosed response letter from Paradigm Transportation dated March 7, 2024.
	You can't build a gas station within 100 feet of a school, but you can build one within 100 feet of homes where children live? This does not seem ethical.	RWDI	Addressed. See enclosed Air Quality & Land Use Compatibility Study for details related to setback requirements.
	With the current use as it is, there is noise from 5 AM to after 10 PM everyday. It is so loud that it wakes our children up. How much worse is the noise going to be, without proper infrastructure or berms along Old Brock Road?	Jade Acoustics	Addressed. Addressed. See enclosed Preliminary Noise Report for analysis and recommended mitigation measures.
	How do I know that these shops won't bring sand blasters, air compressors, and more heavy equipment to the site? This is already happening now and it is not currently permitted under the zoning.	HPGI	This proposed uses and their associated definitions are provided in the enclosed draft ZBLA. If approved. The rezoning will only permit for those uses to operate on the Subject Lands.
	Is there supporting evidence that the machinery and sales repair shop has been consistently operational from 1975 since the land registry office only dates back to 1974 and S. Larkin Developments did not take possession until 2008?	S. Larkin	Addressed. See enclosed Sworn Affidavits.
	I believe at this point, there should be more than enough compelling evidence as to why both the rezoning and development should not take place. There has been no support from residents, no care or consideration taken by the current owner and I strongly support the comments made during our meeting that further permitted uses should be stripped from title. This being said, myself and the concerned members of the community would also like to see any by-laws, non conforming businesses or actions that are in breach of current regulations to be upheld! Including but not limited to the removal of motor homes, cranes, tractors, oil tanks, Rv, barrels, fork lifts, front end loaders, metal, debris, inoperative vehicles, mechanical parts, tractor trailers, appliances, and anything else decaying on the property immediately removed. The owner should also be held liable for any destruction and soil contamination that is a direct result from neglect to the land.	HPGI	Addressed. The application is supported by a number of technical studies which demonstrated that the proposed uses are appropriate for the Subject Lands. The application seeks to establish uses already permitted in the current Official Plan.
	<p>I would also like to draw attention to the property connecting to the South known as 5359 Old Brock Road that is registered under Claremont North INC. Which in fact is the same owner as S. Larkin Development Inc. I believe that this is relevant in this particular situation in that it creates a pattern of neglect and disregard towards the city, the town and the bylaws that we support.</p> <p>By 2017 you can see the same loader used on the adjacent property has commenced work knocking over many trees.</p> <p>By 2019 Dump Trucks had started moving dirt regularly and more land is cleared.</p> <p>During Covid was when we really started to see things change. The slopes of the land changed, more fill brought on the property, with truck after truck destroying the road. In addition, the run off from the property at times floods the road, and runs into the wetlands across the road.</p> <p>Now, my kids can hardly pedal down the road despite your attempts to repair potholes as they are quickly destroyed from the heavy equipment, large trucks and sheer disregard to the efforts being made. They now have loads of dirt in and out regularly, storage facility, dumpsters, more trucks, trailers, containers, sitting on this property.</p>		Addressed. S. Larkin Development Inc. is not the same owner as Claremont North Inc.

AUGUST 2024

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	Not having access to city records, I am unaware with what permits were pulled or how this business was registered, can you please confirm that this was done legally? I would like to know what can be done to stop the destruction, neglect and ignorance that is happening all around by this owner. Residence are frustrated and have had enough.		