

# Summary of Outstanding Issues and Comments

## (Glenway) – Marianneville Developments Limited

Official Plan Amendment – D9NP1210

Zoning By-Law Amendment – D14NP1210

Draft Plan of Subdivision – D12NP1210

<b>Tree Inventory Report by York Urbanist (Peer Reviewed by Arbourvalley)</b>		
Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
With respects to the tree inventory, all significant trees are to be measured individually and exactly. Significant trees are to be measured at 1.4 metres. Significant trees on neighbouring properties and abutting municipal properties need to be identified.	Partially	York Urbanist is required to provide information on significant trees on neighbouring properties.
Tree Preservation Plan and Replacement Plan required	No	Tree Preservation and Tree Replacement Plans are required.

<b>Shadow Impacts by Zelinka Priamo (Peer Review by iPLANcorp)</b>		
Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Part of proposed Lot 168 to the immediate west would be impacted by proposed development.  Further assessment of the impact of the proposed apartment development on proposed detached, medium-density and existing development is required.	Partially	Revised submission required

## Parks and Recreation Assessment (Peer Reviewed by Town of Newmarket)

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Recommends two small parks be located near Blocks 166 and 167.	Partially	Under discussion Outstanding
Recommends that parks and green spaces be connected to new and existing housing through series of sidewalks and trails.	Partially	Under discussion Outstanding
Recreation and Culture Department prefers that large segments of parkland be located in close proximity to existing stormwater management ponds (blocks 169 and 170) and that a minimum of 5% of the land for parks purposes be provided in accordance with the Planning Act  Monteith Brown's letter informed that the area to the east of block 173 is underserved for parkland.	Partially	Under discussion Outstanding
Upcoming Parks Policy Manual should be considered.	Partially	Outstanding
Directions report recommendations regarding parkland requirements for North west corner of City	No	Needs to be addressed in next submission.

## Functional Servicing Report by Cole Engineering – Water Supply & Distribution System (Peer Reviewed by MMM Group)

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Report must address how connections will be routed through the proposed development to avoid conflicts.	Pending	Further information is required of the applicant.
Town does not permit private watermains to loop to municipal watermains.	Yes	The by-pass line will be removed and the proposed medium density block (no 169) will provided a single connection to the proposed or existing watermain.

		Plans need to be updated.
Issues regarding municipal or private watermains under municipal or private roads.	Partially	The Applicant will need to update plans to reflect changes to watermain configurations. Further, the Applicant needs to conclude direction for municipal watermain along south side of Davis Drive for water distribution between Crossland Gate and Street B.
Consultant should complete water distribution modeling of the proposed distribution to confirm the pressures.	Pending	Further information is required from the applicant.

### **Functional Servicing Report by Cole Engineering – Grading (Peer Reviewed by RJ Burnside and Associates)**

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
The retaining walls proposed in the stormwater management ponds are unacceptable and should be redesigned to allow the side slopes to conform to Town Standards.	Pending	Outstanding
Retaining walls proposed in some rear yards should be reviewed and minimized at detailed design stage.	Pending	Outstanding

### **Functional Servicing Report by Cole Engineering – Storm Drainage and Stormwater Management (Peer Reviewed by RJ Burnside and Associates)**

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Existing private ponds should be conveyed to the Town and designed to meet Town standards.	No	Ponds need to be designed to Town standards.  Applicant to provide additional information
Concern was expressed regarding the water levels proposed in the ponds and the impact the hydraulic grade line would have on foundation drains for the homes. All homes should be protected from flooding for major storm events.	No	Applicant required to provide further analysis.  Sump pumps are not permitted. Foundation drains will need to have gravity connections.  Cole is to provide a hydraulic grade line (HGL) analysis

		<p>which shows all existing and proposed homes will be protected.</p> <p>Cole indicates that if the HGL analysis indicate that flooding of homes may be an issue a foundation drain collector system (FDC) will be considered. Cole is to confirm that a viable outlet exists for the FDC system.</p>
Need confirmation that the existing storm infrastructure is able to accept drainage throughout the site.	No	Applicant required to provide further analysis.
Proposed lots east of Ponds 8 and 9 conflict with existing storm sewers to the extent they are likely not developable.	No	Applicant to provide further analysis or provide greater detail on alternative layouts.
Location of discharge from proposed pond overflow weirs should be provided. Emergency overflow capacity must meet Town Standards (0.10 cu.m./s/ha.)	No	Applicant required to provide further analysis.
Quality control volumes must include existing upstream drainage.	No	Town will defer to LSRCA on this issue. Outstanding
Town will not permit any overland flow from public roadways to discharge overland across private lands.	Partially	<p>Cole agrees that overland flow will be directed through piping.</p> <p>Waiting on the revised report to verify.</p>

### **Functional Servicing Report by Cole Engineering – Sanitary Sewage (Peer Reviewed by RJ Burnside)**

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
The use of MH 110A as the critical hydraulic constraint is questioned. Confirmation that adequate capacity exists in the downstream sewers including the pumping station operated by the Region of York is required.	No	<p>IBI is carrying out an analysis of the downstream sewers for the Town.</p> <p>The Applicant is to address issues in IBI comments letter and determine what improvements are needed to the downstream infrastructure and enter into an agreement for those improvements to be made.</p>

		Applicant to provide confirmation from Region of York that adequate capacity exists to handle flows from this development.
--	--	--

<b>Traffic Impact Study by Cole Engineering Group (Peer Reviewed by R.J. Burnside &amp; Associates Limited)</b>		
<b>Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)</b>	<b>Is the issue resolved?</b>	<b>Required Next Steps</b>
All roads should be revised to conform to Town standards.	Pending	To be addressed in next submission.
Region should review primary intersections with arterial roads under their jurisdiction.	Pending	Intersection lane configurations, left lane turn configurations, left lane delays, sight distances, queuing and inconsistencies in recommendations, will be reviewed in conjunction with revised trip generation counts for proposed development.  Applicant to review and update in addendum study.
Traffic counts for Bathurst/David Drive and Bathurst/Sykes Road do not balance.	Pending	Applicant to update in addendum study.
Suggest a 10 year horizon.	No	Applicant to confirm the required horizon period with the Region.
Assumed growth in background traffic may be impacted by developments in the immediate area & the proposed Regional projects.	Pending	Waiting for the Region to confirm growth rate based on their transportation model.
Suggests that trip generation rates used for the single family units are too low for planning purposes and be revised upwards.	No	Burnside recommends the use of ITE rates.  Outstanding
TIS should take into account the most recent plans and confirm any impacts that the proposed development may have on proposed access to Davis Drive/Bathurst from Sykes Rd.	Pending	Burnside requires comments on impact to Sykes Road access to the external development.  Outstanding
Phase 2 development at Yonge Street not listed in the analysis.	Pending	Applicant to update in addendum study.

TIS needs to consider proposed works by the Region on Bathurst/Davis Dr.	Pending	Applicant to update in addendum study.
Proposed reduction in trips may result in an under-estimation of car trips in the area.	No	Directions needed if Applicant has to review Regions Class EA for Yonge Street rapid transit facilities and their EMEE/2 transportation model, and Towns Secondary Plan for Yonge/Davis area.
No quantification of overall daily traffic volumes or speeds have been provided to determine whether traffic calming should be a concern for the existing neighbourhood.	No	Cole outlines that this work is completed in an Internal Functional Design Study. Burnside states that the TIS should provide additional details to identify impacts of proposed development on the existing internal roads/neighbourhoods.  Outstanding
TIS has not taken into account all of the active developments in the study area.	No	Outstanding
TIS should confirm that it is consistent with traffic forecasts for development to the north of Davis Drive (Toth Subdivision, Ford Wilson Boulevard).	Pending	Outstanding

<b>Environmental Site Assessment – Phase 1 by Cole Engineering (Peer Reviewed by R.J. Burnside and Associates)</b>		
Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Missing analysis with respect to whether the tributary of Ansnorveldt Creek constitutes a 'sensitive' area.	Pending	Applicant will update Section 3.3.8 in the final report to address the nature of the watercourse flowing through the site.
Site contains areas of filling shown in borehole logs and air photos which is contrary to statements made in the EA.	Pending	Historical land owner has indicated that no fill has been placed on the Site. Materials described as "fill materials" have been moved from on-site sources during development of the site.  To be confirmed
Site model should include interpreted groundwater flow directions.	Pending	Applicant to include new cross sections for groundwater flow direction in Phase One Conceptual

		Site Model.
Phase 1 Report is to be completed as per O.Reg. 153/04 as amended by O.Reg. 511/09.	Pending	Final report to be completed to adhere to the requirements and latest amendment to the regulation.

<b>Environmental Site Assessment – Phase 2 by Cole Engineering (Peer Review by R.J. Burnside and Associates)</b>		
Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Borehole logs are “draft”, a Hydrological Investigation undertaken was not referenced.	Pending	Applicant to finalize borehole logs and provide signatures on final report.
No sieve data was provided.	Pending	Applicant will provide pH results from borehole in final report.
Shallow groundwater divide was indicated in the Phase 1 ESA but ignored in Phase 2.	Pending	Figure in the final report will be updated to illustrate groundwater flow direction for the northwest portion of the Site.
Presence of a water course through the site was shown on Figure 2 but ignored in the rationalization.	Pending	Applicant will include this in the discussion in the final submission.
Presence of fill identified in the 2011 borehole logs was not discussed.	Partially	Applicant to include a discussion on the subject in the final report.
Phase 2 Report is to be completed as per O.Reg. 153/04 as amended by O.Reg. 511/09.	Pending	Final report to be completed to adhere to the requirements and latest amendment to the regulation.
The reports need to be suitable to support a Record of Site Condition for each parcel being developed	Pending	Applicant to prepare Record of Site Condition.
The Town should be included as party that is able to rely on the Phase 1 and 2 reports.	Pending	Applicant to prepare final Phase 1 and 2 Reports.

<b>Planning Justification Report by Zelinka Priamo</b>		
Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Additional information required on the interrelationship with the proposed planning options for the Yonge Street Corridor Urban Growth	No	Outstanding

Centre		
Revisions required to address design issues regarding private/public road connects, park and trail facilities, conformity with OP.	No	Outstanding
Additional analysis of community facilities required.	No	Waiting on analysis.
Additional information regarding the interrelationship between these lands and the remaining lands to the West.	No	Waiting on analysis.
Additional information requested regarding proposed zoning standards for proposed uses	No	Outstanding
Report to be updated to address outcomes of resolution of other issues and response to public comments as required.	No	Response to public comments recieved

## Environmental Impact Statement

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
<p>The application is within 50 metres of a Woodlot designated part of the Town's Natural Heritage System. We will require a scoped <i>Environmental Impact Study</i> that addresses the impact, if any, of the proposed development on the identified Woodlot.</p> <p>This is in keeping with the requirement outlined in the Town's Official Plan policy 9.0 and 9.2 Policy 9.2 states, "Development and site alteration are not permitted on lands adjacent to a Meadow, Woodlot or Wetland as depicted on Schedule B, Natural Heritage System, unless</p>	No	Waiting on report



<p>the ecological attributes and function(s) of the adjacent lands have been evaluated through an EIS and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on natural features or ecological functions. Adjacent lands are considered to be those lands within 50 metres of a Meadow, Woodlot or Wetland. The requirements for an EIS are found in Section 9.4.”</p>		
---	--	--

<b>York Region District School Board, Planning &amp; Property Development Services</b>		
Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
<p>The York Region District School Board identifies the need for an elementary school site to accommodate new development in the northwest quadrant of Newmarket. A site has been identified along Davis Drive with interior access off of Street B. Due to the land configuration, the site identified is not ideal and the Board will continue to pursue other sites that better meet their needs. Should a better site be secured, the School Board will withdraw its Glenway site request. The proposed location is within Blocks 171, 172 and lots 123, 124 and 125. The School Board has indicated support for dual zoning for these lands to allow the reuse of the site without a further planning approval if the site is not acquired for a school.</p> <p>The York Catholic District School Board reviewed the without prejudice offer and states that they have no comment or objection to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Requirements have been identified. School Board will notify the Town if they determine an alternate site location.</p>

## Central York Fire Services

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Central York Fire Services has advised that Street B is a long dead end street A secondary emergency egress from Street B. Perhaps through Block 169 or 170 is required. A truck turning template on drawing for an Aerial Fire vehicle is required to show maneuvering from Street B both southbound and northbound onto Street C and along Street A both southbound and northbound at 90 degree turns at Lots 34 and 51.	Yes	Revisions to draft plan. Additional comments will be provided once more details are known regarding the siting of structures and access roads for the development proposed on the blocks on the plan.

## Functional Servicing Report by Cole Engineering Group (Reviewed by LSRCA)

On June 14, 2013 the LSRCA provided comment to Cole Engineering letter of response to the LSRCA's letter dated July 27, 2012. The bulk of the June 14, 2013 comments were requests for further information from Cole (please consult LSRCA comment letter for further details).

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Flow targets in Section 7.2 are to be based on more conservative pre-development flows. LSRCA requires some degree of over control for outlet #2. Available capacity for both outlets should be demonstrated and discussed with the Town.	No	Outstanding
A rating table is to be developed for each existing facility based on a current site survey to verify existing conditions/flows.	No	Outstanding
Demonstrations that the weir and receiving system has the conveyance capacity to accommodate the 100 year uncontrolled flow from the facilities.	No	Outstanding
The pond overflow should not be directed through the rear-yard of the proposed lots as noted for Pond 9.	No	Outstanding
There does not appear to be any details with respect to the existing overflow for any of the ponds.	No	Outstanding

Demonstrate impacts to Pond 4B should the connecting pipe to 4A be blocked.	No	Outstanding
The permanent pool storage volume calculations must include external drainage areas or a separate pipe system can be provided from each facility.	No	Outstanding
The forebay sizing calculations for Pond 4 do not appear to include calculations for the existing inlets. Further Pond 4 forebay appears to be quite close to one of the existing inlets.	No	Outstanding
Demonstrate how the proposed ponds will be accessed for maintenance.	No	Outstanding
Fig. 2-1 identifies proposed development on Street D however the report and storm drainage fig. 7-1 and 7-2 do not appear to address this area.	Yes	Resolved
Report did not appear to address SWM requirements for the proposed lots 1-6 on Fig. 2-1.	No	Outstanding
Proposed pond block figures are to include the following for further review: 1. Some spot elevations within the ponds, existing/proposed ROW and lots to demonstrate grading, overland flow and overflow routes. 2. Overflow outlet locations and flow routes with spot elevations.	No	Outstanding
Applicant is requested to submit a water balance.	No	Outstanding

### Hydrological Investigation by Cole Engineering Group (Reviewed by Genivar, on behalf of the LSRCA)

A June 3 email by Sara Brockman of the LSRCA informed that the applicant has not provided any response to these comments/issues. There is still an issue of outstanding fees that needs to be addressed by the applicant.

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
The report does not include sufficient images to demonstrate future conditions and propose site alternations.	No	Outstanding

The report does not demonstrate proposed future grades or potential changes to drainage catchments resulting from re-grading.	No	Outstanding
The report does not illustrate where proposed development infrastructure may be placed below the water table, if necessary, and affect existing groundwater flow system or water balance.	No	Outstanding
The location of the main aquifer unit in Section 2.5 is inconsistent with the observations based on data presented in the borehole records and cross-sections. Additional work recommended.	No	Outstanding
Figure 9A is not supported by borehole information.	No	Outstanding
Recommends that the interpretation of Figure 10 be revisited to take into account the surface water divide.	No	Outstanding
There is no discussion on how the proposed site development will affect vertical hydraulic gradients.	No	Outstanding
Some inconsistency in values used for Table 4.	No	Outstanding
Need confirmation on whether the groundwater values in Table 2 are compared to a standard for potable or non-potable.	No	Outstanding
Section 2.5.4 does not provide justification for selective sampling of the monitoring wells to characterize groundwater conditions.	No	Outstanding
Shallow groundwater samples do not illustrate whether there may be other potential contaminants in the groundwater flow system.	No	Outstanding
The Water Balance summary in Section 4.0 could use additional information to provide a better understand of potential changes to the water balance to be confident that the proposed mitigation will be effective.	No	Outstanding

## Sanitary Sub-Trunk System Hydraulic (Reviewed by IBI Group)

Subsequent to the IBI report there was some dialogue with Cole regarding it. IBI has not been provided a response by the applicant

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
Infiltration I/I values from RVA Sanitary Sewer Study are 0.70 L/s/ha. It	No	Outstanding

is estimated that this would add approximately 30 L/s to peak flow determined by Cole.		
The RVA study is based on a storm during Sept 13, 2006 in which 100mm fell. This storm should be considered further when discussing the monitored flow data that included storm events up to 48 mm.	No	Outstanding
The RVA Study indicated 30 basements were flooded in the above storm. It should be identified if those basements were within the Western sub-trunk or West Central trunk.	No	Outstanding
The RVA study was based on spatial distribution of census data and non-residential land use. This should be considered in the Cole report.	No	Outstanding
No comment was given by Cole Engineering on the impact of increased flow on the MH704 to MH727 section of the Town sewer.	No	Outstanding
There is a need to undertake an up-to-date analysis of the sewer system, to determine surcharging levels and any needed remedial works to accommodate development. This is to be carried out by Cole.	No	Outstanding
Analysis of the West sub-trunk should take into account all proposed and possible future development within this sewershed.	No	Outstanding

## Region of York – Preliminary Comments

The Region has not been provided a formal response letter to date on the matters provided below. Robert Patridge had met with Cole Engineering earlier this year to discuss transportation matters.

Original Issue Identified by Review Agent(s)	Is the issue resolved?	Required Next Steps
<b>OPA Comments</b>		
Should the ToN adopt the OPA and draft approval of DPoS, the Region of York requests the DPoS be subject to the attached Schedule of Pre-Considerations and Schedule of Conditions.	To be dealt as conditions of approval	

<b>Water Resources</b>		
All development the subject property should adhere to the Wellhead Protection Policies outlined in Section 7.3.39 and 7.3.45 of the YOP.	No	Outstanding
Should “de-watering” be required, York recommends a dewatering plan be prepared by a qualified professional.	Pending	Outstanding
<b>Detailed Subdivision Comments</b>		
Trips rates are approximately 40% lower than those published in the ITE Trip Generation Manual and approximately 8% lower than those applied to the proposed apartment use in the same study area. Region requires clarification.	No	A conversation with Robert Partridge on June 5, 2013 informed that the Region will be providing an additional comment to the applicant. The comment will address the Region’s requirement to align their proposed access road (“Street B”) with the future minor collector proposed in Schedule C of the Town OP north west of Eagle and Davis. Mr. Partridge is to provide this requirement in writing in the near future.
Further information required regarding modal split for senior living, office commercial and retail commercial uses.	No	Outstanding
Consideration should be taken to assess a longer term study horizon year given the resulted trip generation estimates.	No	Outstanding
Trip distribution shall be specific to each type of land uses.	No	Outstanding
A summary of the queuing analysis under the future total traffic conditions shall be included to assess whether estimated queuing lengths for critical movements can be accommodated within available storage length and/or spacing at the signalized intersections.	No	Outstanding
The TDM program must include the additional measures listed by the Region as per Condition No. 7 for final approval.	No	Outstanding



<b>Water Servicing</b>		
Proposed water system based on servicing from Newmarket West pressure district is not acceptable. Subject lands are to be serviced by Newmarket Central pressure district, unless demonstrated that this is not possible.	No	Outstanding
Local area municipality must grant servicing capacity allocation to the development, within the limit of the Region's capacity.	No	Outstanding
Staff request that all residential lands be subject to various restrictions (i.e. Holding "H" zone) to ensure that the water and wastewater are available prior to occupancy.	No	Outstanding