Chair: Councillor Cober

1. INTRODUCTION OF ADDENDUM REPORTS

Any additional items not listed on the agenda would be identified for approval.
Motion to add the items to the Agenda.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda, if any Addendum Items - as amended.

3. DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

4. DETERMINATION OF COMMITTEE ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION

Committee Chair will ask each Council Member if he/she wishes to separate any item(s) for discussion.
Committee Chair will then ask if there are any persons present who wish to speak to any item(s) on the Agenda.

5. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE ITEMS NOT REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION

Motion to approve those items which were not requested to be separated. All of these are adopted with one Motion.

6. DEPUTATIONS

6.1 Altaf Stationwala, President & CEO
Mackenzie Health
Re: Annual Hospital Update

7. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REQUIRING SEPARATE DISCUSSION
Chair will direct Committee to the first item on the agenda list which has circled initials beside it. Members of the Public, then Council Members who requested to speak to the item will be invited to speak, and then the floor is open to discussion by Committee or Council.

## 8. NEW BUSINESS

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

### 10. AGENDA ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 - 68</td>
<td>JC DB JS BC DS AE SP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 10.1 Planning Department Report Number P-2019-13
Re: Applications for Official Plan Amendment OP-2016-03, Draft Plan of Subdivision 19T-06K01, and Zoning By-law Amendment Z-2016-07
Subject Lands: 2710 King Road; 13371 Jane Street; Part of Lots 7 & 8, Conc. 4
**Applicant/Owner:** Mansions of King Inc. c/o Joseph Chetti


[COW #1 - P-2019-13](#)

| 69 - 109 | JC DB JS BC DS AE SP |

#### 10.2 Planning Department Report Number P-2019-14
Re: Application for Official Plan Amendment, File Number: OP-2015-01
Application for Zoning By-law Amendment, File Number: Z-2015-03
Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision, File Number: 19T-15K02
**Applicant:** Bushland Heights Ltd.; Part of Lot 7, Concession 4; King City


[COW #2 - P-2019-14](#)

| 110 - 131 | JC DB JS BC DS AE SP |

#### 10.3 Administration Report Number ED-2019-02
Re: Schomberg Main Street Revitalization Strategy & Plan – Council Endorsement

a) That Administration Report No. ED-2019-02 be received;

b) AND THAT Council support an integrated comprehensive four pillar approach to Main Street Schomberg Revitalization under the purview of the Economic Development Officer in collaboration and with support from relevant Township departments/functions and community partners;

c) AND THAT Council endorses the Strategy document findings as presented on January 28th as Final;
d) AND THAT Council endorses the final action plan items contained herein as Appendix “A”;

e) AND THAT Staff provides a Strategy Implementation progress report to Council at the conclusion of the RED project funding in April 2020, and annually in April thereafter.

(To access Administration Dept. Report No. ED-2019-01, click on the following link:

COW #3 - ED-2019-02

132 - 137 10.4 JC DB JS BC DS AE SP

Clerks Department Report Number CL-2019-12
Re: Municipally Significant Events and AGCO Special Occasion Permits

a) That Report Number CL-2019-12 be received as information;

b) That Council enact By-law No. 2019-058, being a by-law to amend the Delegation of Council Powers and Duties to Staff of the Township of King By-law (2008-75), to delegate authority to the Township Clerk, or their designate, to designate events municipally significant for the purposes of an Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario Special Occasion Permit, provided that the requestor meets the definition and all of the criterion and standards required in the approved mentioned policy below.

c) That Council adopt the Events of Municipal Significance Corporate Policy (COR-POL-127) attached as Appendix ‘A’ to this report;

d) That Council enact By-law No. 2019-057, being a By-law to adopt the Municipally Significant Events Corporate Policy (COR-POL-127).

(By-law Numbers 2019-057 and 2019-058 have been prepared for Council’s consideration this evening)
COW #4 - CL-2019-12

138 - 145 10.5 JC DB JS BC DS AE SP

King Fire and Emergency Services Department Report Number FD-2019-02
Re: Fire Establishing and Regulating By-law

a) Report FD 2019-02 be received as information;

b) That By-law Number 2010-33, a By-law to Establish and Regulate the King Fire and Emergency Services Department be repealed;
c) That Council enacts By-law Number 2019-56, a By-law to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute an up-to-date Establishing and Regulating By-law for the King Fire and Emergency Services Department; and

d) That Council pass the necessary By-law on May 13, 2019.

(By-law 2019-056 has been prepared for Council’s consideration this evening)

COW #5 - FD-2019-02

King Fire and Emergency Services Department Report Number FD-2019-03
Re: Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus

a) Report FD 2019-03 be received as information, and

b) That M&L Supply, Fire & Safety being the lowest compliant bidder with a total bid in the amount of $152,960.54 (including taxes after rebate) and meeting the terms, conditions, and specifications of the Request for Tender: 2019 – T08 – “SCBA Units” be awarded the Contract to supply and deliver such equipment as described in the Proposal Submission of the RFT (Request for Tender)

c) That the Mayor and Clerk are hereby authorized to sign on behalf of the Corporation any necessary contracts, forms or other documents forming part of RFT 2019-T08.

COW #6 - FD-2019-03

Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Report Number PRC-2019-08
Re: Energy Management Plan Update – Reduction Targets & Partners for Climate Protection Program Adoption

a) That report PRC-2019-08 be received as information;

b) That Committee provide feedback on the planned Energy Management Plan Update reduction targets;

c) That Committee adopts the Council resolution to join the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Partners for Climate Protection Program;

d) That Committee directs staff to engage the Sustainability Committee for comments;

Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Report Number PRC-2019-13
Re: Award of Tender 2019-T07 – King Road Streetscaping
a) That report PRC-2019-13 be received as information; and

b) That Rafat General Contractor Incorporated, being the lowest compliant bidder (Tender 2019-T07) with a total bid in the amount of $7,780,446 (incl HST) be awarded the contract for construction of the King Road Streetscaping work.

Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Report Number PRC-2019-12
Re: Capital Project Update/Amendment – Museum Interior Renovations
a) That report PRC-2019-12 be received as information;

b) That Committee authorizes an amendment to the Capital Budget for the interior renovation of the King Heritage and Cultural Centre (KHCC) in the amount of $50,000.

Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Report Number PRC-2019-11
Re: Amendment to Capital Budget, Schomberg Community Hall – Renovation and Revitalization
a) That report PRC-2019-11 be received as information; and

b) That Council authorize an amendment to the 2019-2022 Capital Budget to accelerate the planned works for the Schomberg Community Hall; and

c) That approved 2019-2022 sources of funding be temporarily realigned between the Infrastructure Reserve and Tax Supported Capital Reserve.

NOTICES

Notices

Notices
Planning Department

RE: Applications for Official Plan Amendment OP-2016-03, Draft Plan of Subdivision 19T-16K01, and Zoning By-law Amendment Z-2016-07
Subject Lands: 2710 King Road; 13371 Jane Street; Part of Lots 7 & 8, Conc. 4
Applicant/Owner: Mansions of King Inc. c/o Joseph Chetti

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning Department respectfully submits the following recommendations:


2. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to provide an update with respect to the subject applications and the related upcoming LPAT proceedings. The subject applications propose to amend the Township’s Official Plan (King City Community Plan) and seek approval for related applications for Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment. More specifically, the subject applications propose to permit the development of 313 residential dwellings comprised of single detached lots and medium density residential units which may be either townhouse dwellings or low rise apartments.

A public meeting of Council with respect to the subject applications was held on November 28, 2016. Since that time, staff has had several working meetings with the applicant and external agencies including the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, to work towards revisions to the proposed development to address the concerns raised by Council, staff, agencies and the public. Revised materials have been recently submitted by the Applicant to the Township.

The notable revisions to the proposal consist of the following:

- The total number of single detached units has been reduced to 63 (previously 68);
- The alignment of Street A has been modified and shifted slightly to the east to respond to the conditions of the subject site (the adjacent property has been purchased by the Applicant);
- The depth of Buffer Block D (south of Lots 53 to 59, and north of Lot 60) has increased from 20 metres to 30 metres. Due to the increase in the depth of the buffer, the number of residential lots located between Street ‘A’ and the SWM Pond (Block C) has been reduced from four to three lots;
- The depth of Buffer Block G has increased to 30 metres (reducing the area of Medium Density Residential (Block B));
- Stormwater Management Pond Block C has increased in area to 0.93 hectares.
The Applicant has appealed the applications to the LPAT on the basis of the Township’s failure to make a decision on the applications. The Applicant has indicated that it intends to continue to work with the Township in advance of the LPAT hearing to revise the proposed development to continue to work towards addressing outstanding matters. The LPAT hearing for this matter is scheduled to commence on August 26, 2019.

3. **DISCUSSION**

Staff has been working with the Applicant since the public meeting of Council to resolve the matters noted at the public meeting and subsequently. The following is a summary of those issues relating to the subject applications. As outlined in more detail below, some of the major issues have been resolved while others remain outstanding. The issues include: (1) consideration for the Township’s Official Plan review; (2) residential density; (3) environmental buffers; (4) wetlands; (5) coordination with neighbouring development; (6) road connections to neighbouring lands; (7) medium density housing; (8) compatibility and transition; (9) hydrogeology and private well impacts; (10) agency and public comments; (11) need for environmental assessment; and (12) servicing capacity.

**Density and Population**

3.1 The proposed OPA and resulting increase in developable area and residential density must be considered in regard to implications to the overall planned population for King City and the Township as a whole, conformity with the Region of York Official Plan and consideration as an element of the Township’s on-going overall Official Plan review.

3.2 The density and population growth in King City being considered through the Official Plan review is based on seven units per hectare. The subject applications appear to have separated the medium density and low density residential calculations instead of aggregating the number of units and average density. Of particular note and concern is the medium density block. When considered separately the medium density block yields a proposed density of approximately 99 units per hectare; and the single detached residential lands yield a proposed density of approximately 4.5 units per hectare.

When the medium density units are considered together with the low density residential area, the overall development proposed by the subject applications yields a density of:

a) approximately 19 units per hectare, when calculated strictly in terms of total units relative to the gross developable area;

   **Total units:** 250 medium density units + 63 single detached units = 313 units

   **Gross Developable Area:** total area, 39.85 ha; minus environmental lands, 17.74 ha; and minus “other lands” not part of the application, 5.46 ha = 16.65 ha

   **Density:** Total units, 313 units / Gross Developable Area 16.65 ha = **18.8 units per hectare**

b) approximately 13 units per hectare, when calculated based on a single detached equivalency blending of the medium density units and the single detached lots;
Single Detached Lots: 63 units x 3.1 persons per unit = 195.3 persons

Medium Density: 250 units x 1.9 persons per unit = 475 persons

Total Population Yield: Single detached 195.3 persons + Medium density 475 persons = 670.3 persons

Total Single Detached Equivalent Units: 670.3 persons / 3.1 persons per unit = 216.2 SDE units

Gross Developable Area: total area, 39.85 ha; minus environmental lands, 17.74 ha; and minus "other lands" not part of the application, 5.46 ha = 16.65 ha

Density: Total SDE units, 216.2 units / Gross Developable Area 16.65 ha = 13 units per hectare

Both of the above are significantly greater than the densities contemplated through the Township's Official Plan review (7 units per hectare).

Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone

3.3 The subject applications also seek to amend the KCCP policies to permit a reduction in the minimum vegetation protection zone (MVPZ) adjacent to environmental features. The subject applications originally sought broader reductions of the MVPZ from 30m to 10m. Township staff expressed concern with respect to the reduction of the MVPZ as was proposed. Staff has been working with the Applicant to expand the MVPZ and there have been significant revisions to the applications in this regard. The draft plan has been revised to limit reductions to the MVPZ to "pinch point" areas. The Applicant continues to work with the TRCA to address their comments. Accordingly, conditions of approval have not yet been provided by the TRCA.

Wetland Feature

3.4 The identification and protection of a wetland feature in the north-central portion of the draft plan, as well as the status of this feature and its evaluation by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) have also been raised through the review of the applications. MNRF has confirmed that the wetland feature does not form part of the surrounding provincially significant wetland. As such, the determination for the treatment of this feature has been the subject of TRCA's review. The draft plan has been advanced by the Applicant on the basis of the removal and relocation of the feature to be contiguous with the other environmental areas of the plan. It is staff's understanding that the MNRF and TRCA do not object to the proposed removal and relocation of the wetland.

Coordination with Adjacent Lands

3.5 In light of the fact that discussion among the landowners within the study area has not resulted in a formal landowners agreement, Planning staff has been working with the applicant to ensure that the requirements of the King City Community Plan with respect to comprehensive planning for the broader surrounding area have been addressed and ensure
that the subject applications will not limit or impede development considerations for itself and/or the surrounding lands. In particular, staff has been working with the applicant to ensure that the submitted materials include consideration for the potential for a road connection between the subject lands and the lands located to the west (Bushland Heights) and, ultimately, towards Jane Street. The draft plan has been revised to include a road extension towards Bushland Heights for this purpose.

**Road Connections and Phasing**

3.6 The draft plan of subdivision proposes a road connection to the existing neighbourhood to the east by way of Manitou Drive. Should the Mansions of King development proceed without either of the Manitou Drive or King Road connection and in advance of the Bushland Heights road connection, Planning staff recommends that there be phasing limitations imposed upon the Mansions of King development to limit the number of homes constructed to approximately 40 units until such time as the road connection to Bushland Heights and Jane Street is made. This limitation would be required by way of Holding (H) provisions in the related site specific zoning by-law.

**Medium Density**

3.7 The subject applications have not proposed a specific development concept in regard to the type, form, layout, etc. proposed for the medium density lands. Planning staff has been working with the Applicant in this regard. The Applicant has, in general terms, proposed a five-storey, multi-unit residential apartment building for the medium density lands. Planning staff requires additional details in this regard in order to more fully understand and properly evaluate the proposal. This remains outstanding. In addition, as noted in item number 3.2 above, the overall form and size of the medium density residential development must also be considered in the context of the resulting density and population yield and associated limitations. The resulting unit yield may not be able to be accommodated from a density policy perspective.

**Transition to Existing Residential**

3.8 The review of the draft plan includes matters with respect to the compatibility and transition between the new and existing residential areas. This matter is particularly applicable to the northern and eastern boundary of the subject lands. Staff has been working with the applicant with respect to the design of the lotting within this area of the draft plan, and the potential for retaining existing vegetation which provides screening, and/or the provision of further landscaping (planting, fencing) enhancements. The draft plan has not been revised, particularly in the area adjacent to 32 Manitou Drive (Lots 4 to 8 of the draft plan) to address the concerns raised by the residents. The owner of 32 Manitou Drive is also a party to the LPAT proceedings and has met with Planning staff, together with their own Planner, to express their concerns. A copy of their submission to Council in this regard is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

**Hydrogeology and Private Wells**

3.9 The applications have also been reviewed with respect to hydrogeology and potential impacts to existing private wells on properties in proximity to the proposed development. Staff recommends that the private well monitoring requirements be addressed by way of a
condition of draft plan approval. The condition will ensure that the Applicant shall inspect, evaluate and monitor all wells within the zone of influence prior to, during, and after the construction has been completed. If the private well systems in the zone of influence deteriorate due to the servicing of the plan of subdivision, the Applicant will be required to provide temporary water supply to the residents upon notice by the Township and will be required to continue to do so while the involved parties work towards a resolution. A financial security shall be held by the Township until final assumption of the subdivision by the Township to guarantee the protection for the private wells.

**Agency Comments and Draft Plan Conditions**

3.10 Planning staff is in receipt of comments on the current revised applications from Burnside, the TRCA, and the Region of York. These agencies have not yet recommended conditions of draft plan approval. Planning staff is also in receipt of comments submitted by the Kingscross Ratepayers Association, including comments prepared by Hunter and Associates, dated April 29, 2019 (Appendix 2A and 2B). The TRCA, Region of York, the owners of 32 Manitou Drive, and Kingscross Ratepayers Association are also parties to the LPAT proceedings.

**Need for Environmental Assessment**

3.11 Township staff has sought further clarification from the Applicant with respect to the potential need for an Environmental Assessment (EA) process to be carried out for the main road and related infrastructure and bridge valley crossing proposed by the development. This further clarification has not yet been received. Upon receipt, staff will review the matter further.

**Servicing Capacity**

3.12 The allocation of servicing capacity to the proposed development would be considered as part of the final approval/registration stage of the plan of subdivision and concurrently with the lifting of Holding (H) provisions in the related Zoning By-law amendments. General phasing matters will be addressed by overall phasing plans which will be required as a standard condition of draft plan approval.

**Other Matters**

3.13 Various other matters of a more general and typical nature will be addressed by way of conditions of draft plan approval. It is recommended that Planning staff report back to Committee of the Whole in advance of the LPAT hearing to outline recommended conditions of draft plan approval, the recommended draft plan of subdivision, a draft OPA, and a draft zoning by-law for approval by the LPAT once the outstanding comments and issues have been addressed.

4. **INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE**

The recommendations of this report support the land use planning objectives of the Environmental Pillar, of the Township’s Sustainability Plan.
5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Township's legal and consultant costs associated with the LPAT appeal will be covered through the Planning Department's normal budget.

6. **CONCLUSION**

The applications have been reviewed by the Planning Department and other Township Departments and external agencies. Notwithstanding the appeal of the applications to the LPAT, the Applicant has been working with Planning staff towards revisions to the applications to address the concerns raised by Council, staff, agencies and the public.

Prepared and Recommended by: Gaspare Ritacca, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Planning and Development

Reviewed and Recommended by: Stephen Naylor, MCIP, RPP  
Director of Planning

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Figures**
1. Draft Plan of Subdivision, Revised February 2019

**Appendices**
1. Celeste Philips (on behalf of 32 Manitou Drive) submission  
2A. Kingscross Estates Residents Association submission  
2B. Hunter and Associates, April 29, 2019  
3. Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, April 26, 2019  
4. Region of York, June 21, 2018
April 26, 2019

Mayor Pellegrini and Members of Council
Township of King
2585 King Road
King City, Ontario
L7B 1A1

Dear Mayor Pellegrini and Members of Council

Re: Grace and Leo Yu - 32 Manitou Drive
Mansions of King Inc.

I represent Grace and Leo Yu, owners of a single detached dwelling located at 32 Manitou Drive, adjacent to the proposed development by Mansions of King Inc. (MOK). Grace Yu is a Party to the hearing scheduled by the Local Planning Area Tribunal (LPAT) for later this year.

In February, I, along with my clients, met with Township Planning staff to express concerns regarding:

- the lot fabric proposed by MOK which is significantly smaller than the Yu property;
- the request for buffer lands, as is proposed alongside lots to the north and south of the Yu property, but not adjacent to the Yu property;
- the difference in elevation of the MOK lands (topographically higher than the Yu property) and concerns regarding privacy and overlook.

I enclose a development concept that reduces the overall lot count for MOK by only one lot, provides buffer lands adjacent to the rear property line of the Yu property and helps to resolve concerns regarding privacy.

The provision of one large lot adjacent to the Yu property respects the existing character and lotting of the area. Additionally, if Council were to approve the MOK development, I would suggest that site specific zoning for the lot behind the Yu property could be used to limit the height of the new house to a single or 1 ½ storey dwelling.

In terms of precedent, the approach of designing similar sized lots next to existing larger lots was used for Mary Lake Estates. I have enclosed an extract of the Mary Lake plan showing the interface between the existing estate...
residential lots on Chelsea Lane and the new lots as proposed by Mary Lake Estates.

In summary, if Council is inclined to approve development of the lands owned by the Mansions of King, I would respectfully request consideration of changes to the lot pattern and site specific zoning as noted above.

Should you require further information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Celeste Phillips, MCIP RPP

Enclosures (2)
Copy:
Clients
S. Naylor
G. Ritacca
KINGSCROSS RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Gaspare Ritacca,
Manager of Planning and Development
Planning Department
King Township

May 2, 2019
Via email

Dear Mr. Ritacca,

Re: Mansions of King (MOK) subdivision applications for Official Plan (OPA) and Zoning by-law (ZBL) Amendments

Kingscross Ratepayers Association (KRA) represents residents within the Kingscross Estates neighbourhood (Kingscross). The MOK property shares boundaries with the Bushland Heights (BH) development property. The shared property lines follow very significant Key Natural Heritage Features and as a result MOK is sharing infrastructure services and roads with BH. This letter and the attachments address our concerns regarding the MOK applications. We will provide a separate letter regarding our concerns with the BH applications.

The MOK area is zoned Estate Residential as is the adjoining Kingscross area. Kingscross is serviced by private wells and septic systems. TRCA has said in the past that they would oppose municipal services – water, wastewater, stormwater infrastructure – due to the extensive ravines, wetlands and streams that are upstream of the MOK lands. The natural open areas and septic systems maintain the stream flows and wetlands and provide groundwater recharge.

Attached to this letter is a report prepared by Dr. Garry Hunter addressing both planning, construction engineering, hydrology and water recharge matters related to the MOK application.

KRA has serious concerns regarding this development application which can be categorised as follows:

1. Why should this land NOT BE developed with the density proposed?

The Eaton Hall—Mary—Hackett Lakes Wetland Complex is a 259 hectare area on the Oak Ridges Moraine which represents the largest wetland complex in southern Ontario. The proposed MOK development for a large block of 250 condominium units and 62 residential houses would be sited right beside the core area and terminus section of this very significant wetland and the East Humber River and its associated streams. The section of the East Humber River on the MOK property meanders with very steep unstable slopes down to the river. The river and the streams have a “Species At Risk”, Redside Dace. The area provides habitat for reptile and amphibian species. Painted, Snapping turtles and Milk snakes are indigenous species and have been seen frequently on neighbouring properties. At this time, turtles and frogs are busy laying their eggs
right now. The MOK development could interfere and or eliminate habitat for these species.

The development site is within the Oak Ridges Moraine, is on the Greenbelt and is within York Region’s Greenlands System. Arbitrary lines drawn on a piece of paper, a map of King City, fail to capture the undulating lands north of King Road, and should not mean that those lands should be aggressively developed with a density of 10 units per hectare. Such intensification will eliminate some wetlands (two vernal pools) and threaten the species dependent on such wetlands, streams, river and land. Such intensification, if tolerated, would be unique in King City.

The proposed 313 homes, 250 condominium units and 62 single family houses, raises the density to 10 units per hectare from what is permitted in the current OP/ZBL. The current zoning for the north part is 1 unit per hectare. This is much more appropriate zoning for such sensitive sloping lands. This is not an area where intensification should be allowed. There are no local amenities and no public transit. The local King City Go Train station parking lots are all full by 6:30 am so every home and condo unit will likely have at least two cars.

We note that in York Region’s February 2018 comments on the BH proposed subdivision development application:

technical study (policy 2.1.7). Development and site alteration is prohibited within the Regional Greenlands System and applications for development within 120 metres are required to submit an Environmental Impact Study (policy 2.1.9). A Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE), Oak Ridges

We are not aware that an Environmental Impact Study has been required by TRCA or the Township of King nor have such studies been undertaken for MOK. Given the ecological value and sensitivity of this land we cannot understand why such an evaluation has not been performed or required.

Of note are our concerns regarding the vernal pool wetlands to the north and east of MOK (on proposed Lot #’s 13 / 14 and 41/42). One is large at 0.5Ha. This is an obvious breeding ground for several species of frogs, turtles and maybe even salamanders. The MOK applicant wants to relocate this wetland. The frogs, turtles and salamanders all have it in their DNA to return to this site annually. By filling in this wetland their populations will likely be decimated.

The location of the second vernal pool wetland can be seen on the applicant’s topographical maps (lots 41/42). This wetland also serves as an amphibian breeding area. It has not been mapped, assessed or even identified by the MOK developer. Such an evaluation should be undertaken before this application proceeds.

Please see attachment 5 of Dr. Garry Hunter’s Report (attached) for location of the second vernal pool.

2. WATER SUPPLY: Adjacent private wells & onsite management

The daily water requirements of almost all of the adjacent properties to MOK are supplied by private wells. The development lands are hilly and mostly slope away from
Kingscross properties. The MOK developer’s plans include significant cut and fill operations. Cross section profiles are not provided. Thus, it can only be assumed that water runoff will occur down to the streams and the East Humber River. Once the site is developed that runoff could include road salt, oils, nutrients, herbicides, pesticides and or fertilizers that will degrade the wetlands, streams and the East Humber.

KRA is very concerned that where the groundwater is only 1 to 3 metres below the surface so the developer’s plans include temporary dewatering of the site and then permanent dewatering via basement sump pumps. The applicant is unable to meet predevelopment groundwater recharge numbers post development. The two vernal pools wetlands obviously provide significant groundwater recharge (Hunter Report) that will be lost forever if the larger vernal pool is relocated to the west of the applicant’s developable property. The other vernal pool wetland will also be filled in.

All of this raises very significant concerns about the impact of this intense development on sensitive lands proximal to Kingscross residents’ private wells. Some residents assume the developer will connect them to municipal water. The applicants “Condeland report” implies that this could happen since they will be bringing water in from both King Road and Manitou Drive “in a loop” that could also service Kingscross residences. What if Kingscross residents do not want water from Lake Ontario? What possible remedies are there for a dried-up poor water quality supply? What is the value of a home without water? What remedy is there if the aquifers dry up?

And what happens if the wetlands dry up? There is no condition that could address that impact.

None of this may trouble the developer because builder they are not. They may have sold the land and moved on before any new homes are built, sold and for which the Township has assumed responsibility.

It is obvious that this level of intense development should not be allowed on this land. No posted bond could cover the risks this development poses to groundwater, the wetlands and wildlife dependent on this land.

SO WHAT? WHAT ARE WE ASKING FOR?

Should the Township agree that the application proceed as described then there should be a covenant or stipulation on the approval that the MOK developer needs to initiate quarterly monitoring of private wells throughout all of Kingscross Estates now, with no restrictions on participation by residents regardless of their location, through 5 years after the build out. Reports should be shared with the Township and KRA. A bond of $16,000,000 should be demanded by the Township from the developer to be held in trust for those 5 years and released only when a conclusion of "no impact on local drilled wells is made by a certified well specialist".

3. "Manitou” Easement

The easement that becomes a road linking Manitou Drive and the MOK development site sits between two single family homes. The properties are homes to families with young children.
KINGSCROSS RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

The engineering challenges of opening up the Manitou easement are significant. In order to meet grade at Manitou Drive, the opening of the easement would require very significant cut operations and installation of 3-metre-high retaining walls against neighbour’s property. The cut operations will destroy or kill the more than 20 feet plus tall privacy pine trees on both neighbour’s properties. The engineering feasibility of opening the Manitou easement has not even been explored to our knowledge. The applicant’s drawings assume the easement will be opened. The Township needs to understand the risks it will inherit with the applicant’s road over the steep unstable slope down to the East Humber. That proposed road leads to the Manitou easement. But the applicants plan to place engineered fill ontop of the unstable slope to build a road on in order to get to the Manitou easement. TRCA will not allow retaining walls on unstable slopes so without that, guess who will assume the liability for this road? The Township risks are likely high facing climate change impacts with more frequent heavy precipitation events, that if the East Humber under high flow conditions meanders north at that point, the engineered fill could slide down the slope, block the river and cause flooding upstream. Does the Township wish to assume liability for that risk?

4. Traffic

The attached separate file contains our review and comments on the applicants Nextrans Transportation Study.

5. Lack of geotechnical assessment accuracy in submitted files.

We are very concerned that most if not all the documents submitted do not have engineering stamps of approval. The very challenging designs of the landform changes proposed could result in significant runoff and so far the applicants are unable to meet predevelopment water recharge amounts. The calculations are only best estimates in an effort to gain approvals. But once approved the final designs for complex structures such as the stormwater pond and the bridge will fall to another entity - the builder and once completed the entire liability will lie with the Township.

Given the risks involved we recommend that the Township’s engineering consultants review very carefully these plans to ensure the integrity of the calculations and designs. Again, please refer to our Dr. Garry Hunter Report.

In summary, for all of the above reasons we cannot support this high density intensification development on such sensitive lands. We are asking the planning department to recommend that Council deny this application and request a resubmission with much lower density that would protect the ecosystems and private wells. The applicant’s own transportation report states that Manitou Road is not needed for access. The traffic that would result from opening the Manitou Road is not acceptable. The communities only need to be connected with a trail system.

Respectfully submitted,

Ian Hilley and Mary Muter on behalf of the Kingscross Ratepayers Association
KRA Review of Nextrans MoK Transportation Study

The Nextrans Transportation Study for Mansions of King (MoK) states that a connection to Manitou Road is not required based on their development of 313 residential units but the plan of subdivision clearly shows a road connecting to Manitou. The 103 page Transportation Study devotes a total of about one page to the Manitou connection which is less than one percent of the total report.

One would expect a Transportation Study with three road connections to devote approximately a third of its space to each of the three roads. If the Manitou connection is not required and not detailed in the report, then it must be removed from the plan of subdivision. The report is giving a mixed message with its contradictions.

Both York Region and King Township have now indicated that they want the connection to Manitou. York Region comments – “Our continued position is that this proposed road connection should not diminish the need for the future roadway connection proposed to the east of this development. (meaning connection to Manitou).” Kingscross Drive is not a regional road but Keele Street is. Why would York Region comment on a road that is not in its jurisdiction, unless it foresees significant traffic from Manitou via Kingscross to Keele Street or vice versa.

The report’s authors estimate that 10% of the traffic will go north but offer no valid data to support their estimate. The 10% number apparently does not include the 90 Bushland Heights (BH) residents. The report fails to include the projected traffic from the adjoining developments including the 87 Mattamy homes being built north of Kingscross Estates and the proposed 1500 residential units just north and east of Kingscross.

Reality is that the number of residential units stated at 313 is incorrect. The actual number of new residential units having access to Manitou will be in the range of 2,000 and not 313 as can be seen in the following map of developments currently planned or under construction. Putting this into perspective, there are 170 estate lots in Kingscross Estates and connecting to Mansions of King via Manitou will provide access and a short cut on Kingscross Drive for an additional 2,000 residential units which is a twelve fold increase in potential traffic. The report ignores this likely scenario although York Region alludes to this situation with its recommendation for connecting to a road that is not in its jurisdiction.

The report includes a map of the future Magna traffic on King Road but the report ignores the new developments taking place north of Kingscross and the eventual dramatic increase in density along the 15th Sideroad between Keele and Dufferin and corresponding traffic that will have access to Manitou and MoK roads via Keele Street.

Residents from the two new developments on the 15th Sideroad will use Keele Street and according to the Nextrans report, 90% of the traffic will go south. Kingscross residents currently experience southbound traffic backing up during morning rush hour with approximately half of the cars waiting to turn right onto King Road and then to Hwy 400. With 1600 more residential units on the 15th, many of these drivers will take a shortcut through the new Manitou connection to avoid the backup on Keele. It is unavoidable. The report indicates that tens of thousands of cars currently use King Road now and this
number will only increase with the thousands of new homes being built in King City. The report appears to be silent on the current and projected numbers of cars travelling south on Keele and turning right onto King Road a portion of which will undoubtedly use Kingscross to Manitou to King Road.

Traffic pattern for new developments shown with red lines

Section 2.3 of the report states: "The area surrounding the proposed development is serviced with dedicated walkways." This is a false statement as Manitou and Kingscross do not have sidewalks or dedicated walkways.

The report provides pages and pages of maps, intersection sketches and statistics for the two intersections at King and Jane Streets but provides absolutely nothing on the future impact on Manitou and Kingscross.

This lack of concern for the increase in traffic through Kingscross Estates is a blatant disregard for the existing residents and their safety on these narrow residential roads. It is incomprehensible that details on the third road has been omitted if the Manitou connection is to be considered.

It should be noted that the Transportation Study was written by Nextrans Consulting Engineers, which implies that it was done by a Professional Engineer. The two authors listed in the report do not appear to be Professional Engineers and the document has not been stamped by a Professional Engineer.

The report is obviously flawed as it underestimates the residential units that will utilize the new roads and ignores the negative impact that the increase in traffic will have on Kingscross Drive and Manitou Road. The report ignores the current condition of Kingscross and Manitou, roads without dedicated
walkways, and that these residential roads are not designed to handle a potential 12 fold increase in traffic. As the traffic report is not complete, one cannot rely on its conclusions with respect to the Manitou Road connection. The report must be rejected, and a new report prepared if the Manitou connection is not removed. It is requested that the new report be completed or reviewed by a professional engineer and stamped by that engineer in accordance with the rules set out by the Professional Engineers Ontario (PEO).

Submitted by John Hollick, P.Eng.

On behalf of Kingscross Ratepayers Association
April 29, 2019

Ms. Mary Muter
Kingscross Ratepayers Association
321 Kingscross Drive
King City, ON L7B 1J9

Re: Review of Mansions of King Inc. Proposed Residential Development
2710 King Road

Dear Ms. Muter:

This review of the Mansions of King residential development has been undertaken at the request of the Kingscross Ratepayers Association. The primary documents reviewed are listed in Enclosure No. 1. This review does not address the applicability of the proposed setbacks addressed in the TRCA comments or the design capacity of infrastructure required.

Copies of the TRCA Floodplain Map Viewer for the site area (Enclosure 2) and the proposed East Humber River Bridge Crossing (Enclosure 3 and 4) are enclosed as is a map of closed kettle (vernal pools) recharge depressions and catchments (Enclosure 5).

1.0 Regional Flood Line

The source of the Regional Flood Line presented by the Applicant is unknown. As presented on the Kuntz (March 6, 2019) Fig 1 Existing Conditions Map, the Flood Line does not conform with and has little to no relationship with the Applicant's fundamental topographic mapping. West of the Mansions property the Flood Line does not even embrace (straddle) the East Humber River channel. The source of the Regional Flood Elevation of 274.5 m asl (pg 10, Condeland March 1, 2019 Report) is unknown. This Regional Flood Elevation is less than 3 m above the East Humber River water level.

The Applicant’s Floodlines do not appear to conform to the TRCA Floodplain Mapping Map Viewer web site which carries a Disclaimer (Enclosure 2, 3 and 4):

"This website does not constitute a regulatory flood plain map as formally approved by a qualified Professional Engineer and TRCA ......and should not be relied on for the precise limits of the regulatory floodplain".

APPENDIX 2B
New regional flood line elevations and mapping must be prepared for the East Humber River and Tributaries prior to approval of this project. New flood elevations are required to support the bridge design, road grades, sanitary pumping station location and stormwater management pond designs.

Once the flood elevation lines are corrected there would be much better ability to properly assess the possible structural integrity of the stormwater pond and the bridge over the East Humber.

2.0 Hydrogeology Study and Source Protection

The Applicant’s September 2014 Hydrogeology study is now significantly out of date.

- The 2014 boreholes presented are geotechnical in nature, shallow and only BH6 appears to intersect the deeper Oak Ridges Aquifer Complex with top at or below about 275 m asl under this site.
- More than four years later, there is no extended term (multi year) groundwater monitoring (data logger) available.
- Additional Soil Eng boreholes established after 2014 are not integrated into the hydrogeology report. Additional piecemeal Soil Eng Reports were prepared on November 26, 2015; February 2018; February 26, 2018 and September 28, 2018.
- There is no determination if existing neighbouring lots in Kingscross Estates are serviced by communal water.
- There is no neighbour water well survey and direct correlation with the Ministry water well information database. There is no certification of nearby water well locations and look up of topographic ground elevations from the Regions digital elevation model (one meter contour interval) or direct survey.
- The water well survey does not need to extend to 500 m but should include all wells between the project development area and Kingscross Drive and Manitou Drive.
- The Applicant has not recognized the Approved Source Protection Plans and Vulnerability and Risk Management Assessments for King City Wells 3 and 4.
- There is no specific Oak Ridges Moraine hydrostratigraphic context provided.
- The Water Budget estimates are not current or consistent with the March 2019 Applicant reports.
- The estimates of post development imperviousness are out of date.
Until the local wells and local groundwater supplies are assessed and monitored it is difficult to assess the impact of this proposed development plan.

3.0 Oak Ridges Aquifer Complex

The Applicant’s Geotechnical Borehole Investigations and Studies (Soil Eng, February 2018) demonstrate that the top of the Oak Ridges Aquifer Complex at Borehole 201 is located at about 277 m asl and at Borehole 202 at about 275 m asl adjacent to Meander Belt Reach 1 (Stantec, October 18, 2016). Borehole 6 also intersected fine sand at 275 m asl (Soil Eng 2014).

Locally the East Humber River floodplain is eroded into in the top 3 or 4 m of this aquifer complex. The Oak Ridges Aquifer discharges to the East Humber River flood plain. The meandering stream and aquifer discharge undercut the high valley banks of Silty Clay and Silty Clay Till resulting in adjacent upper solifluction / colluvial slopes.

Similarly Soil Eng (September 28, 2018) BH 205 further downstream (September 28, 2018) encountered sandy silt at 268.1 m asl. No stable water levels after borehole completion are provided.

No baseline water quality is provided for the shallow watertable aquifer, Oak Ridges Aquifer Complex or for the deeper municipal pumping wells.

Until the local Oak Ridges Aquifer quantity and quality is properly assessed it is difficult to assess the impact of this proposed development.

4. Water Balance

The Applicant’s individual Reports are contradictory with respect to Water Budgets and Impervious Area estimates:

- Soil Eng (Sept 2014) estimated the New Residential Area at 14.4 ha and Tarandus (March 2019) estimated the Development footprint including roads, buffers and stormwater ponds at 14.8 ha (pg 6) and the Development footprint at 12.97 ha (pg 21).

- Soil Eng (Sept 2014) estimated the impervious surface at 40 % of its New Residential area (pg 32) or 5.8 ha. Tarandus (March 2019) pg 26 estimated the Impervious surfaces at 7.4 ha or 57% (based on the Development Footprint).
• Condeland (March 7, 2019) used a 14.1 ha total drainage area less area 502, 503, 508 & 509 for a 9.57 ha area and a 55% Impervious level.

• Therefore the five year old Soil Eng Report underestimates post-development runoff and overestimates the post development recharge (infiltration). Using Soil Eng (2014) methodology and adjusting the calculation, the recharge shortfall is 15,300 m³ versus the 10,000 m³ calculated by Soil Eng. This estimate does not include an upward adjustment for lost kettle basin recharge.

• However there is not clarity in the actual areas being used in calculations by either Soil Eng (2014) or Tarandus (2019). One might assume that Tarandus may be more up to date.

• The real infiltration deficit is likely approaching 20,000 m³. After considering the presence of silty clay soils at lower elevations, likely only about one-third of the existing recharge is compensated for by the Applicant’s Soak Away Pit Site Design.

Until these estimates are rigorously corrected, it is impossible to estimate the runoff and recharge values for this proposed development.

5.0 Geotechnical Soils

The Soil Eng September 2014 Report (pg 33) reported the presence of extensive natural fine sand near the site surface especially at higher elevation areas and that LID schemes were highly feasible. On detailed review of the 2014 Boreholes, this comment appears to apply only to BH8D, BH10 and BH11. The other Soil Eng Boreholes within the Development Footprint reported mainly surface silty clay and silt clay till.

However, the later Applicant geotechnical reports describe silty clay and silty clay till as the dominant soils at the site (Soil Eng February 2018). Natural water content of these soils varied from 12 to 41%. Coefficient of permeability was estimated at 10⁻⁷ cm/sec, percolation times at 75 to 100 + min/cm and runoff on 6% + slopes at 0.28. Natural surface soils are fissured providing for some in situ infiltration.

Soil Eng (February 2018) advises that the wet sand and silt will slough in steep cuts, run slowly with water seepage and boil under a piezomeric head of 0.4 m. These conditions should be anticipated in the stormwater management pond and pumping station excavation unless adequate deep borehole investigations to about 5 m below the infrastructure base are undertaken. Otherwise the stormwater pond and pumping station would be unstable.
6.0 Stormwater Management Pond

I am not aware that the Applicant has any full depth boreholes to about elevation 266 m asl or deeper within its March 2019 proposed Stormwater Pond Excavation Site to support its proposed design.

At BH 4 southeast of the Stormwater Pond Silty Clay was encountered to about elevation 271.4 m asl at borehole termination. West of the Stormwater Pond at BH 203 a sand deposit occurs from 275.7 to 272.6 depth, the water level in the sand deposit was reported at 275.7 m asl on borehole completion. At BH 3 water level was reported at 274.8 m asl. In BH 17, on the road floodplain crossing, Silty Clay was reported to 268.6 m asl at borehole termination, water level was 271.7 on completion July 10, 2014; on November 28, 2014 water level was reported at 272.8 m asl.

The proposed Stormwater Management site is constrained by steep slopes, unverified regional flood lines and proposed residential Lots 60, 61 and 62. The pond is deep with a proposed bottom elevation of 270.97 m asl. This pond depth may intersect the top of the Oak Ridges Aquifer Complex or other riparian sand deposits. This bottom elevation is below the water table, below normal river levels and below the Regional Flood elevation. The site is interpreted to be a groundwater discharge site.

The location and design details of infiltration trenches, trench overflows and emergency overflows and forebays are not shown on the available drawings. No consideration of existing groundwater levels in this groundwater discharge site is provided.

The Pond bottom as designed may be unstable due to ‘soil boil’ (quick sand) if sand deposits are encountered. The Applicant may require a shallower, larger, above watertable pond site with the resultant loss of one, two or all of Lots 60, 61 and 62. Storm sewer inverts and road vertical alignments may also have to be raised approaching the Pond.

There is no evidence that Soil Eng has provided recommendation for design of these infiltration trenches in this area of high existing groundwater tables. Without this information, these trenches cannot be characterized as infiltration galleries (pg 19 & 20, Condeland, March 7, 2019).

Two boreholes and groundwater monitors each with data loggers need to be installed within the proposed excavation footprint to at least 266 m asl. At least 15 months of water level monitoring is required. Without this information, the Stormwater Management Pond design and the Draft Plan allocation area is suspect.
7.0 Vernal Pools / Local Kettle Depression Wetland Features

The Applicant is proposing to eliminate the on site vernal pools / wetland closed kettle basin features at proposed Lots 13 and 14 and Lots 41 and 42 (Enclosure 4). These pools have no outlet and slowly recharge the water surplus to groundwater via relatively permeable sandy silts soil, fissures and decayed root tubes.

The Soil Eng (November 2015) Report on page 7 observed that the study area has downward vertical hydraulic gradients that suggest groundwater will recharge downward to depth. There does not have to be a direct hydraulic connection for recharge as contended by Soil Eng on page 8 of this Report.

Soil Eng (September 2014) estimated the Water surplus at 273 mm/yr for agricultural meadows typical of the vernal pool sites. All of this water surplus will recharge in these closed kettle depressions. **These existing closed kettle depressions with an estimated area of 1.54 ha will recharge about 4,200 m$^3$/yr or 4,200,000 L/yr.**

A newly constructed pond in disturbed soils as proposed will not duplicate this existing recharge function and therefore there will be a corresponding infiltration deficit.

8.0 Low Impact Design (LID) / Groundwater Recharge

The Applicant’s geotechnical consultant states ‘that in order to provide a stable subgrade for services and foundation construction the groundwater should be depressed at least one meter below the subgrade’. This is accomplished by temporary dewatering and permanently by basement sump pumps and utility trenches with sewer pipe infiltration. Sump pumps and utilities will in part intercept Soakaway Pit water with flow to the Stormwater Management Pond.

Review of the various Soil Eng Reports indicates that there are significant areas of low permeability silty clay surface soils on site. Only the higher part of the site (BH 8, 10 and 11) has silty fine sand deposits suitable for Soakaway pits which will recharge deeper groundwater. Many lots do not require fill.

The **LID systems proposed by the Applicant on the prevalent silty clay soils of the site will provide some stormwater peak runoff attenuation but only very minimal groundwater recharge.** The Applicant has not provided cut and fill depth and at grade soils mapping necessary to evaluate the actual backyard soil strata proposed for Soakaway pits.
Condeland (March 7, 2019, pg 24) base their LID Soakaway pits (infiltration) gallery design on an outdated total 10,000 m$^3$ infiltration deficit as determined by Soil Eng (2014). This estimate is based on a low impervious rate of 40% and did not recognize the existing infiltration available in closed upland kettle basins at Lots 13 and 14 and Lots 41 and 42 (see Enclosure 5). The adoption of urban street sections with curbs also reduces infiltration versus use of roadside grassed swales.

The Applicant’s current Low Impact Design is not credible or verifiable that post-development recharge is equal to pre-development recharge.

9.0 Landform Conservation

This site requires 143,500 m$^3$ of cut and 61,800 m$^3$ of fill (Condeland, March 7, 2019, pg 14) of varying depths up to 5 to 6 m. There will be a surplus of ‘cut’ of approximately 81,700 m$^3$, likely silty clay and silty clay till to be exported off site. At 22 tonnes per load for a triaxle straight truck this is equivalent to about 8,000 truck loads.

Tarandus (March 2019, pg 21) states the proposed development footprint is 13.0 ha (rounded) and the area of impervious surfaces is approximately 7.5 ha or 18.7% of the Total Site Area. As this is very close to the 20% of the total site area, the remainder of the total site area cannot be developed.

This proposed grading and soil export is excessive and should be reduced.

10.0 Street A Residential Building Heights

Residential building heights as proposed are likely to be about 12 m (11 + 1 m) or 40 ft above street grades with roof peaks at about 305 to 307 m asl on the upland parts of the site. The Applicant has not performed any visual analysis and assessment of buffering from the adjacent Kingscross development.

In other words, there is no consideration of the impact on the adjacent Kingscross Estates homes.

11.0 Significant Woodlands (Compartment 1a)

Kuntz (March 6, 2019, pg 7) describes Compartment 1a as a regenerating meadow and apple orchard with scattered medium size trees and tree generation. The majority of the tree regeneration is
composed of Apple species and Black Walnut. The density in August 2014 was 481 sph but size is not given. Kuntz incorrectly describes Compartment 1a as a plantation managed for production of fruits. Tarandus (March 2019, pg 15) correctly describes Compartment 1a (THDM2) as a naturalizing former apple orchard with tree species in this thicket dominated by apple and black walnut with occasional white ash and black cherry.

The Applicant’s combination Hedgerow 2 and 5 and ELC Unit THDM2 (Compartment 1a) require a current survey with additional plots as to Woodland status consistent with the Forestry Act and the Oak Ridges Conservation Plan and Technical Papers. The Applicant’s Woodland surveys undertaken in August 2014 are now nearly 5 years old.

Hedgerow 2 (0.58 ha) and Compartment 1a (4.27 ha) are contiguous with Hedgerow 5 and Significant Woodlands to the west (Kuntz March 2019, Table A, pg 10).

Additional assessment of Compartment 1a and Hedgerow 2 needs to be undertaken before development of this land is considered.

12.0 Access

12.1 Access from King Road

The proposed March 2019 King Road access requires a visually intrusive 50 m wide 7.5 m deep cut in the ORMCP Significant Woodlands at the East Humber River Valley south wall crossing. A gentler less intrusive valley approach is available by moving the roadway alignment further westerly on 'Other Lands Owned by the Applicant'. This revised alignment will also reduce the proposed vertical road gradient for improved winter travel. Just because the March 2019 proposed route may be engineered, it does not mean it should be.

12.2 Access from Manitou

The Applicant has not provided a preliminary design and grading for the proposed Street B Manitou access and how common lot line trees will be protected while at the same time imposing cuts and road drainage without retaining walls (Condeland February 2019 Fig 3.1 in Tandarus March 2019). Furthermore there is a broken horizontal curve in the matching with Street B.
12.3 Access from Jane Street (Bushlands)

The centreline of this street should be located at the mid point of the 'Required Combined Policy Buffer' lines at the common Bushland boundary. The Bushland Street may also have to be realigned to match. The approach to Jane Street on the Bushland property is very steep with difficult winter access.

13.0 Document Deficiencies

Throughout the documents reviewed, the contour map base and elevation labels are illegible with the exception of the ‘D’ size Condeland February 2019 Conceptual Grading Plans Fig 3.1 to 3.5 included in the Tarandus Updated Landform Conservation Plan (March 2019). These Tarandus Grading Plans reference other drawings as Sheets 05 to 08 of 13 (note 07 referenced twice). These other drawings have not been found or reviewed. Similarly, especially in the Condeland Reports, there are ‘orphan’ Figure and Drawing references. There is no detailed description of the proposed Stormwater Management Pond infiltration features.

No digital topographic file in a .dwg or equivalent format has been provided to permit independent preparation of a cut/fill map to evaluate in detail the actual at grade soil strata and infiltration capabilities throughout the site.

14.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Regional Flood Elevations and Lines have not been adequately established considering the potential adverse implications for the proposed East Humber River Bridge Crossing, the Sanitary Pumping Station and the Stormwater Management Pond.

2. The Applicant is proposing excessive cut and fill to create a development site in a hilly part of the Oak Ridges Moraine. Cuts and Fills vary up to ± 5 or 6 m depth and the volume to be exported from the site is about 80,000 cu m or 8,000 truck loads.

3. A cut and fill depth map is required with 0.5 m contour intervals to further assess the proposed excavation and filling required.

4. An at grade soils map based on geotechnical borehole results is required to assess probable Soakaway Pit and Infiltration performance.
5. A new detailed map of the proposed impervious surfaces is required to accurately assess the impervious surfaces proposed on this site and to support the necessary estimates of runoff vs infiltration.

6. The Applicant’s March 2019 residential design still has a groundwater infiltration (recharge) deficit in the order of 15,000 m³. Additional work is required to refine the calculations and resolve the deficit. Larger lot sizes may be required with roadside grassed swales.

7. The Applicant’s Stormwater Management Pond and Sanitary Pumping Station Site have not been adequately investigated to ensure that the soil bottom will be stable and not boil in this potential Oak Ridges Aquifer groundwater discharge site. The associated stormwater pond discharge infiltration trenches have not been investigated as to efficacy. A larger site may be required with loss of one, two or all of residential Lots 60, 61 and 62 and more.

8. An updated Woodland Survey with additional sample plots is required for contiguous Hedgerow 2, Compartment 1a and Hedgerow 5.

9. A visual assessment is required for the residential development proposed on the higher parts of Street ‘A’ with respect to the adjacent Kingscross Estates.

This Application should not be approved until the above work is satisfactorily completed and the outstanding issues resolved.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Garry T. Hunter, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.
President
Hunter and Associates

Enclosures: 1) List of Primary Documents Reviewed
2) TRCA Floodplain Map Viewer for the Site Area
3) TRCA Floodplain Map Viewer for the Proposed East Humber River Bridge Crossing (East)
4) TRCA Floodplain Map Viewer for the Proposed East Humber River Bridge Crossing (West)
5) Map of Closed Kettle Recharge Depressions and Catchments
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April 26, 2019

By Email Only

Mr. Gaspare Ritacca
Planning Department
Township of King
2075 King Road
King City, ON, L7B 1A1

Dear Mr. Ritacca:

Re: PL170998—Without Prejudice — Third Submission: Official Plan Amendment Application OP-2016-03; Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z-2016-07; Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 19T-06K01
2710 King Road and 13371 Jane Street
Part of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4
Township of King, York Region
(Mansions of King Inc.)

This letter acknowledges the receipt of and provides comments on the following:

- Draft Plan of Subdivision 19T-06K01, Part of Lots 7 and 8, Concession 4, Township of King, Regional Municipality of York, prepared by WND, dated February 2019

This revised draft plan of subdivision was submitted in support of Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 19T-06K01, Official Plan Amendment Application OP-2016-03 and Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z-2016-07, in the Township of King. The subject applications have also been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board/Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (OMB/LPAT) (PL170998) by the applicant for failure of the Township to adopt the requested amendment/or render a decision. The full list of materials reviewed in support of the revised proposal is provided in Appendix ‘A’.

Comments

TRCA staff has reviewed the submission and provides comments in Appendix ‘B’ as per The Living City Policies for Planning and Development in the Watersheds of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (LCP), as part of TRCA’s commenting role under the Planning Act; the Authority’s delegated responsibility of representing the provincial interest on natural hazards encompassed by Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS); TRCA’s Regulatory Authority under Ontario Regulation 166/06, Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses; our advisory role to the Town with respect to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP); and, our...
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Region of York, wherein we provide technical environmental advice.

**Overview of Comments**
While the submission provided did include a number of the outstanding studies and revisions have been made to the proposed limits of development, a number of comments remain. Key items which remain outstanding are:

i) Location of Stormwater Management Block ‘C’ in relation to the hazards and required buffers of the natural hazards and natural features;

ii) Preliminary functional design of Street ‘A’ crossing the significant valley utilizing TRCA’s Crossing Guidelines for Valley and Stream Corridors, 2015;

iii) Confirmation if a Class EA for the Street ‘A’ crossing the significant valley is required, and

iv) Addressing, to TRCA’s satisfaction, the Feature Based Water Balance and Site Water Balance.

**Recommendation**
Upon addressing the comments provided in Appendix ‘B’ to TRCA’s satisfaction, the authority will be in a position to support the approval of Official Plan Amendment Application OP-2016-03, Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z-2016-07 and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 19T-06K01.

TRCA staff encourage the appellant to address the comments provided below in advance of the experts meeting in order to facilitate the detailed discussion of the items and to move forward in supporting the proposed plan in advance of administrative timelines as per the LPAT procedural order.

The Owner is asked to provide TRCA with a letter detailing how each of our comments has been addressed. Four (4) copies of the revised drawings and one (1) digital and hard copy of all supporting reports are to be submitted.

TRCA staff reserves any further comments at this time, until we have had an opportunity to review the requested information. Please note that this letter is based on TRCA’s current policies and regulation, which may change from time to time. Any future development proposal would be subject to the policies and regulation in effect at the time of application.

**Fees**
The required response to these comments is the fourth (4) submission. As per TRCA’s Administrative Fee Schedule for Planning Services a 4th submission requires an additional fee of $7500.

We look forward to working with the Owner and the Township to resolve these outstanding issues. Should you have any questions, please contact me at extension 5307 or at cbonner@trca.on.ca

With regards,

Colleen Bonner, MES, RPP
Senior Planner, York Region Area Development Planning and Permits

Enclosure
cc: By Email
Robert A. Dragicevic - WND Associates Limited
Shannon Sigouin – WND Associates Limited
Duncan MacAskill - Manager Development Planning, York Region
Sameer Dhalla – Interim Director Development Planning and Permits, TRCA
Alison MacLennan – Senior Water Resources Engineer, TRCA
Maria Parish – Senior Planning Ecologist, TRCA
Don Ford – Senior Manager, Hydrogeology, TRCA
Ali Shirazi – Senior Geotechnical Engineer, TRCA
Appendix ‘A’ – Materials Received by TRCA March 22, 2019

- Draft Official Plan Amendment
- Draft Zoning By-Law
- Draft Plan of Subdivision prepared by WND and revised February 2019
- Application Comments Matrix prepared by WND, dated March 2019
- Servicing Analysis – Master Servicing Plan, prepared by Condeland Engineering., revised March 7, 2019
- Supplementary Geotechnical Investigation and Slope Stability Assessment, prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd., dated February 2018
- Fluvial Geomorphology and Meander Belt Assessment, prepared by Stantec, dated October 16, 2018
- Hydrogeological Study, prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd., dated September, 2014
- Preliminary Update Summary for Follow-up Hydrogeological Sutyd, prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd., dated November 26, 2015
- Preliminary Updated Summary for Follow-up Hydrogeological Work., prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd., dated February 26, 2018
- Revised Landform Conservation Plan., prepared by Tarandus Assoc. Ltd., dated March 2019
- Revised Natural Heritage Evaluation., prepared by Tarandus Assoc. Ltd., dated March 2019
- ORMCP Compliance Report, prepared by Tarandus Associates Ltd., dated February 2019
- Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan., prepared by Kuntz Forestry., revised March 6, 2019
- Existing Conditions, Proposed Draft Plan Consolidated Constraints & Opportunities Plan (Figure 1), prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., revised March 6, 2019
- Existing Conditions – Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (Figure 2), prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc., revised March 5, 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRCA</th>
<th>TRCA Comments June 12, 2018</th>
<th>Response - March 19, 2019</th>
<th>TRCA Response April 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Refer to responses below</td>
<td>A number of revisions have been provided. Refer to comments below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>Cover Letter - Limits of Development</td>
<td>A consolidated constraints and opportunities plan has been prepared showing staked shoreline, staked top-of-bank, long-term stable top-of-slope, meander belt, regulatory floodplain, significant woodlands, and woodlands. A required policy buffer line shows the greatest for most conservative buffer as per the policy requirements. The draft plan has been modified to respect the required policy buffer with the exception of roads, the stormwater management block, and a point near Lots 29 to 24. A greater than required buffer has been provided at the rear of Lots 2 to 4, 5, 16 to 19, 23, 26, and 30.</td>
<td>A number of revisions have been provided however there are items that remain outstanding that need to be addressed prior to acceptance of the proposed limits of development. Refer to the comments provided below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>Cover Letter -</td>
<td>Refer to responses below</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TRCA | Cover Letter - Significant Valleyland Crossing and Tributary Crossing | A. TRCA understands there are access constraints to the subject property, however the submitted reports do not fully address the proposed road off of King Road which proposes a span of the main branch of the East Humber River and Significant Valleyland and a crossing of a tributary of the East Humber River. | An Addendum to the NHE was prepared in late 2018 to address these relevant NHE issues. Information in that Addendum will be incorporated in the most recent NHE. | TRCA understands there are access constraints to the subject property. To address TRCA’s concerns additional information has been submitted.  
1. Revised NHE prepared by Tarandis, March 2019 addresses the proposed crossing of the East Humber River and tributary;  
2. Slope Stability Assessment Letter, prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd. Dated September 28, 2018 provided the outstanding information regarding the location of the Long Term Stable Top of Slope.  
However a few of the key items to address TRCA’s concerns have not been provided.  
3. A preliminary functional design of the Street A significant valley crossing has not been provided. Ensure a preliminary design which conforms with TRCA’s Crossing Guidelines for Valley and Stream Corridors, September 2015 is submitted for TRCA’s review.  
4. Confirmation if a Class EA for the Street A significant valley crossing will be required for the Mansions of King proposed development has not been provided.  
5. A meanderbelt analysis was submitted. Please see comments below.  
As such, the full extent of the natural features, hazard and appropriate buffers remains unconfirmed and TRCA does not have a position to support the limits of development at this time. |
| TRCA | Cover Letter - Street ‘C’ alignment | B. The NHE does not discuss or assess the proposed alignment of Street ‘C’. This is a recognized pinch point as it is bounded by the natural corridor to the North and East Humber River valley corridor to the South. TRCA requires the natural heritage and hazard features, and their associated buffers, north and south of Street ‘C’, be assessed to establish the road alignment which would have the minimal impact on the features and hazards. This would include a sensitivity analysis of the natural systems. | See previous comment | A sensitivity analysis of the proposed Street ‘C’ alignment was not provided. TRCA has reviewed the submitted information and established the following:  
1) 30m buffer has been provided to the Significant Woodlands to the North  
2) It appears a 10m buffer is being provided to the LTSTOS. Please confirm  
3) Upon approval of the meanderbelt study a 10m buffer is to be provided.  
Preliminary it appears a 16.2m buffer is being provided however acceptance of the meanderbelt study is required prior to acceptance of the development limit.  
Based on the above, it appears that the alignment is appropriate upon confirmation of item (ii) and (iii).  
It is TRCA’s understanding from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry that the main branch of the East Humber River is occupied by Redside Dace. Protection of Redside Dace habitat requires a 30m buffer from the meanderbelt. A meander belt analysis has been submitted but a number of comments are provided below. As such, the full extent of the natural features, hazard and appropriate buffers remains unconfirmed. |
<p>| TRCA | Cover Letter - The Significant Woodland (Block H) and Significant Valleyland (Block I and J) | C. TRCA finds the buffers provided to the Significant Woodlands (Block H) and the | See previous comment |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant woodland and Significant Valleys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have not been provided a consistent 30m buffer. The NHE states that the reduced buffers proposed is a result of the vegetation within these areas are less desiring of a 30m setback due to the monoculture, lack of diversity, sparse understory and groundcover. Compensations for the reduced buffers is proposed to occur through the ‘transfer of the central valleyland/wetlands and valleyland associated with the Eau Claire River to public ownership’. The rational provided for the reduced buffers does not conform with Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Technical Papers, with the objectives of the King City Community Plan or TRCA policy. While TRCA does entertain minor reductions in buffers in pinch point areas where reductions are unavoidable, the extent of buffer reduction proposed is extensive and is not supported. The dedication of Environmental Protected lands into public ownership is a standard request and normal practice and would not be considered compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Valleyland (Block 1) appropriate and in conformance with the ORMCP Technical Papers, the King City Community Plan and TRCA policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TRCA | Cover Letter - Infrastructure (Stormwater Management Pond, Pumping Station) | D. | The Stormwater Management Pond (SWM) Block ‘C’ is proposed adjacent to a Significant Valleyland. The geotechnical study provided has not established the Long Term Stable Top of Slope in this vicinity. In addition, the meanerbell analysis, as required by MNRF for protection of the SAR habitat, has not been identified. TRCA is open to minor encroachment into the required buffers to facilitate infrastructure, however without a full understanding of the extent of the hazard, the protection of SAR habitat, and the extent of the buffer encroachment proposed, TRCA is unable to support the proposed location of SWM Block. The Sanitary Pumping Station (Block ‘O’) is proposed within the 30m buffer from the Significant Valleylands. It appears to be located 10m away from the LTSTOS; however the meanerbell has not been provided. Again, TRCA is open to minor encroachment into the required buffers to facilitate infrastructure, however without a full understanding of the extent of the hazard, the protection of SAR habitat, and the extent of the buffer encroachment proposed, TRCA is unable to support the proposed location of Sanitary Pumping Station Block. |
| The meanderbelt has been established. Other items in this comment are addressed in this Submission. |
| The Stormwater Management Pond (SWM) Block ‘C’ is proposed extending over the LTSTOS and immediately adjacent to other natural hazards and features. While some encroachment into the 30m buffer is permitted as per the King City Community plan, the proposed location of Block ‘C’ does not conform with policy. A minimum of 10m buffer is required from all natural hazards and features. No grading is to occur within the 10m buffer. When addressing this comment please note that retaining walls immediately adjacent to the buffers are not supported. |

| TRCA | Cover Letter - Landform Conservation and Grading | E. | The subject site is morainal in nature with rolling hills and valley lands. Significant grading and filling is proposed throughout the subject lands and given the existing topography appropriate grading will be challenging. All efforts are to be made to reduce impacts to the landscape and minimize grading. TRCA will not support retaining walls within and immediately adjacent to the buffers/MVPZs or grading with the buffers/MVPZs. Full landscape cross sections throughout the entire site which clearly displays the extent of cut and fill ultimately proposed are required for review. |
| The amounts of cut and fill have been significantly reduced from those in the initial submission. There are no retaining walls proposed as part of the development plan. Cross sections have been provided and will again be included in the 2019 submission. |
| Addressed. TRCA has reviewed the Updated Landform Conservation Plan prepared by Tarandes, dated March 2019 and find it addresses our comment. |

| TRCA | - | - | In addition to the above, the majority of the technical comments TRCA provided on January 31, 2017 have not been addressed to TRCA’s satisfaction. Please refer to the comment matrix in Appendix ‘D’ |
| Refer to responses below |
| See comments below. |

| TRCA | Cover Letter - Recommendation | In light of the above, TRCA is unable to recommend approval of Official Plan Amendment Application OP-2016-03, Zoning By-law Amendment Application Z-2016-07 and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 19T-066C01 at this time. |
| Acknowledged |
The Owner is asked to provide TRCA with a letter detailing how each of our comments has been addressed. Four (4) copies of the letter and all revised plans and reports must be submitted to TRCA for our review. A digital copy of all materials is also required.

TRCA staff reserves any further comments at this time, until we have had an opportunity to review the requested information. Please note that this letter is based on TRCA’s current policies and regulation, which may change from time to time. Any future development proposal would be subject to the policies and regulation in effect at the time of application.

TRCA

- Appendix B – Comments to be addressed (includes comments from 2017 which still need to be addressed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRCA Planning A</th>
<th>Comments matrix included with resubmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Constraints and Opportunities Plan is to be updated to ensure it reflects the following information to establish the limits of development. For clarity, please provide two separate plans: a) a plan with the subject lines superimposed on an aerial photo; b) a second plan reflecting 1m contours and no aerial photo. Additional information is required to confirm the extent of the significant features as per the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) (2017). Upon confirmation of the status and limits, the significant features are to be reflected on the Constraints and Opportunities plans. TRCA continues to support the King City Community Plan which requires a 30m buffer from environmental protection lands which contain significant natural features and hazards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Planning 2</td>
<td>Two separate plans have been provided as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 2 separate plans have been provided showing staked line, staked top-of-bank, long-term stable top-of-slope, meander belt, regulatory floodplain, significant woodlands, and woodlands. A required policy buffer line should be the greatest (or more conservative) buffer as per the policy requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The meander belt has been shown and a 30m buffer applied, with two exceptions including a “nursey park” - a stand of deciduous trees located on an abandoned tree removal, and on incorporation of a road to the adjacent property where the alignment extends onto a setback from the TRCA. These exceptions have been discussed with relevant agencies and it is our understanding that the agencies are accepting of these.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. These buffers have been applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The limit of development is clearly visible on the draft plan and parcel fabric is shown. Limit of development is also shown by the required tree protection fencing line on TIPP Figure 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRCA Planning A

- a, c, d) TRCA recognizes a number of revisions have been made to accommodate the 30m buffer from the features and hazards for lots. However, Block C (SWM Pond) extends over the LTSTOS and is immediately adjacent to the Regulatory floodplain and meanderbelt. While some encroachment into the 30m buffer is permitted as per the King City Community plan, the proposed location of Block 'C' does not conform with policy. See ‘Cover Letter’ comments A-E in the matrix above. A minimum of 10m buffer is required from all natural hazards and features for infrastructure. No grading is to occur within the 30m buffer.

For clarity purposes, please revise the ‘Required Policy Buffer (combined)’ line reflected on the Existing Conditions, Proposed Draft Plan Consolidated Constraints & Opportunities Plan prepared by Kunts Forestry, to show a 30m buffer from the staked line of the significant woodlands in the vicinity of Street A and Lot 59. As per new comment #36 the newly developed flood plain limit for the watercourse that runs from the East Hamper, under the driveway (Street ‘A’), towards King Road is to be reflected on the constraints mapping.
| TRCA Planning |  |  |  
|---|---|---|---|
|  | B. (2017 Comments) Based on the information that was provided, it appears the development encroaches into the natural features, natural hazards and MVPZs in several areas. Encroachment into the natural features and natural hazards should be avoided. Encroachments into the MVPZs should also be avoided, but may be considered in limited situations if appropriately justified and mitigated and compensation provided. However, the level of encroachment shown in this first submission is excessive and not in keeping with current policy. Furthermore, a desire for straight lot lines and streets is not sufficient justification for the encroachments currently shown. Greater effort is required to work with the existing environmental constraints and opportunities on the site.  
(2018 Comments) See comments A through E above. | See previous comment | See comments above. |
|  | C. The submitted NHE does not include a discussion regarding the proposed crossing or the potential impacts to the Significant Valley or tributary. In addition, the natural hazard of the LSTOS has not been established. Refer to comment 32 below. | The LSTOS has been established. Potential effects on the Significant Valley and associated tributary are discussed in this submission. Both the Slope Stability report and the LSTOS Geomorphic report are included in this submission. | The revised NHE has addressed TRCA's comments. The recommendations are to be included in the Detailed Design. |
|  | D. (2017 Comments) TRCA continues to recommend the preparation of a coordinated FS/DAS for the subject site and the neighbouring lands to the west. The FS/DAS would provide the foundation for the successful integration of this new community with the surrounding community and the natural environment. Matters such as stormwater management, water and sanitary servicing, transportation, trail connectivity, public open spaces, and transition to adjacent neighborhoods would be best addressed in a coordinated fashion with a full understanding of the opportunities and constraints in the area.  
(2018 Comments) Noted | Acknowledged | --- |
|  | E. (2017 Comments) As stormwater management, water balance and landform conservation, TRCA staff has only made general comments on those other aspects of the development proposal. Those additional comments can be found in Appendix 'A'. As a result, TRCA comments on future submissions may point out issues and concerns not acknowledged in this letter. However, it is hoped that we can set up working sessions with the Owner, consultants and Township to work through these issues in order to lessen the number of comments we may have on future submissions. | Acknowledged | --- |
|  | 1. See comments A through E above. |  |  |
|  | 5 (2017 Comments) The conceptual layout and grading for the Medium Density Block should be provided in the next submission.  
(2018 Comments) The Street 'C' alignment remains outstanding. See comment 23. | The Grading Plans include additional elevation for the Middle site. Street C now aligns with Bedwell's Plan in the West. | While the NHE has not been updated to include a sensitivity analysis regarding the alignment of street C, TRCA recognizes that a 30m Buffer has been provided from the Significant Woodlands to the North. An encroachment into South buffer for the road is proposed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRCA Planning</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th><strong>2017 Comments</strong></th>
<th>As Acknowledged in the cover letter, TRCA had previously asked that access options to the Mansions of King site be looked in detail at all potential access options traverse the natural system, be it from King Road, Jane Street or Manitou Drive. The preparation of a Functional Servicing &amp; Development Area Study (FS/DAS) was recommended by TRCA as the best means of doing this. Through such a process, the landowner group could jointly assess access issues, including the provision of safe vehicular and pedestrian access through the existing flood and erosion hazards and avoiding or mitigating potential impacts to the natural features. <strong>2018 comments</strong>: Appropriate access design remains outstanding. Please see additional comments throughout this response comments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Planning</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>2017 Comments</strong></td>
<td>The proposed road connection from King Road (Street A) traverses two watercourses: the East Humber River and a smaller tributary to the south. There are potential erosion and flood hazards associated with both crossings; but neither has been evaluated. In addition, the entire length of Street A from King Road to the East Humber River is within a valley/stream corridor that has not been discussed in detail in any of the reports. <strong>2018 Comments</strong>: Not addressed. Please ensure a geotechnical study which establishes the Long Term Stable Top of Slope is provided. Southerly Tributary: As per comment 26, Condeland has provided a Hydraulic Analysis. Please ensure all reports and assessments are coordinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Planning</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>2017 Comments</strong></td>
<td>The proposed road connection from Manitou Drive (Street A) identifies partial filling of a draw feature, the top of bank of which had been staked in the field with TRCA. Manitou Drive and other streets within the Kingscross Estates subdivision are also potentially subject to flooding based on TRCA’s estimated floodplain mapping. Therefore, the provision of safe access through both flood and erosion hazards needs to be assessed. <strong>2018 Comments</strong>: Not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Planning</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>2017 Comments</strong></td>
<td>The proposed road connection from Jane Street through the neighbouring lands to the west crosses Tributary B and then extends through the MVPZs of the features associated with the East Humber River and Tributary A. There is not enough information to assess whether or not this potential road connection impacts the natural features and natural hazards associated with both of those systems. Additional evaluation is required. <strong>2018 Comments</strong>: Refer to comment ‘B’ above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRCA requires comments provide on the meanderbelt study to be addressed prior to being in a position to support Street C alignment.

---

TRCA has reviewed the submitted information. Please see remaining comments provided.

---

We are not proposing any grading within the Regional Floodplain at the East Humber River Crossing. In addition we have completed a Backwater analysis of the tributary located north of King Road. These crossings provide safety a guess ingress to the development. Both areas are discussed in our report on Page 5 and Pages 25-27.

Our Geotechnical Consultant also addressed the Long term stability of Street A.

---

We are no longer proposing grading within the draw.

---

Addressed: Through a condition of the draft plan of subdivision, TRCA will require a geotechnical engineer and sign-off for long term slope stability be submitted to the satisfaction of TRCA, confirming the proposed grading into the buffer by Street B in the close proximity of the draw has no negative impact to the stability.

---

The lands to the west were examined only with the use of available aerial photography and observations from property boundaries and no on-site studies of natural-heritage features were undertaken by the AOK Consulting Team. Presumably, the consultant for the landowner will address relevant issues. It should be acknowledged that the Townsite and JNRCA have been...
<p>| TRCA Planning | 6. | (2017 Comments) It needs to be shown that the access routes are feasible and which of the options is preferred based on the environmental issues encountered. Social and economic factors should also be considered. (2018 Comments) Ensure comments A through C are addressed. | Comments have been addressed See comment A above. |
| TRCA Planning | 7. | (2017 Comments) Further to the above, Street A crosses a tributary of the East Humber River just north of King Road and then crosses the East Humber River just south of the proposed SWM Pond Block. The most southern tributary has been identified as intermittent by the consultants, but reports previously provided for this same feature south of King Road identify it as a permanent stream with an associated flood plain. The western top of bank of this feature has also been staked with TRCA staff and TRCA’s screening tools place Street A entirely within a valley corridor from King Road to the East Humber River. Street A also appears to be partially within a Significant Woodland and its associated MVPZ. Additional work is required to identify the natural features and natural hazards in this area. If further needs to be determined if Street A is crossing the natural system or running its entire length. The latter is discouraged. (2018 Comments) Geotech: The comment has not been addressed yet. Please refer to the new comments by TRCA regarding this submission. Although the comment has been acknowledged, however, the required supplementary slope stability assessment has not been conducted yet; | Just north of King Road, Street A crosses an HDE which discharges to a tributary of the East Humber River just west of where Street A also crosses the same tributary of the East Humber River. The HDE flows intermittently and NOT permanently. Street A is partially within both an existing driveway corridor and significant woodlands. Street A is crossing the natural system and is NOT running its entire length. The results of additional work done in relation to the woodlands adjacent to Street A are presented in the Knox Forestry Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan. Addressed. |
| TRCA Planning | 8. | (2017 Comments) The watercourse immediately north of King Road is Acknowledged as a depression with intermittent flow. The existing culvert will be replaced. It is not clear if that culvert will be replaced with a culvert of the same size or something different. No justification for the culvert size has been provided, either from and engineering of ecological perspective. Additional details are required for the crossing if this crossing continues to be pursued. (2018 Comments) Refer to Connel and report and comment #26. | Details provided Refer to comment #26. |
| TRCA Planning | 9. | (2017 Comments) A bridge crossing of the East Humber River is proposed that is 70 metres long and 12 to 14 metres wide. It will have no obstructions below the Regional Flood Elevation, which is Acknowledged as being approximately 274.50 metres above sea level. There are no conceptual drawings of the proposed bridge crossing. There are no figures illustrating the Regional Storm Flood Elevation associated with the East Humber River. There also appears to be filling in the flood plain. Limited justification for the bridge size has been provided, either from and engineering of ecological perspective. Additional details are required for the crossing and its approaches if this crossing continues to be pursued. | A Conceptual profile of the River Crossing is included in Appendix D which includes the Regional Flood Plain as confirmed by the TRCA. There is no filling proposed within the floodplain. At the detailed design stage both TRCA and MNRF requirements will be addressed. A preliminary design which conforms with TRCA’s Crossing Guidelines for Valley and Stream Corridors, September 2015 is submitted for TRCA’s review and has not been provided. Ensure that this plan is profile drawings are provided. <a href="http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/214493.pdf">http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/214493.pdf</a>. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRCA Planning</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>(2018 Comments)</th>
<th>(2017 Comments)</th>
<th>Street C is included in our plans and has been assessed by the Environment Commission.</th>
<th>Addressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Planning</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>(2018 Comments) Grading/filling is proposed in the MVPZs in many areas. This grading should be avoided and minimized to the extent possible. Retaining walls in or adjacent to the MVPZs should also be avoided. Minor grading/filling may be considered in the MVPZs in limited situations if appropriately justified and mitigated and compensation provided.</td>
<td>Grading within MVPZs are limited, no longer are proposing retaining however, as discussed there is grading within buffer areas for infrastructure purposes.</td>
<td>See comment A and D above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Ecology</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>(2017 Comments) Please update the natural heritage evaluation (NHE) and the proposed development plan based on the new information that the wetland within the northern section has been deemed a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF). Development and site alteration within this feature and its related minimum vegetation protection zone (MVPZ) is prohibited.</td>
<td>The small wetland feature in question has been deemed an &quot;MNRF Identified Wetland&quot; but it is not part of the PSW complex located elsewhere on and off site. In a February 2019 review of the TDO mapping maintained by MNRF, that wetland appears to have been removed from that mapping database. MNRF has stated in written correspondence that the deposition of that wetland feature will be left to TRCA and the Township of King. That correspondence has been provided to relevant agencies.</td>
<td>April 2019: TRCA has received the correspondence from MNRF stating the small wetland feature is not a PSW. In addition, the NHE has assessed the feature as per the ORMCP technical paper 1 (S4.1) and reflects that the feature is less than 0.5ha does not constitute or provide the features or functions for protection. A wetland relocation plan located adjacent to the NHS with a 30m buffer has been provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Ecology</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>(2017 Comments) Please note in Table C3.2.1 it appears that the 100 yr flow rate.</td>
<td>All post development flows are below the</td>
<td>New additional comments have been provided at the end of the matrix. Please ensure these are addressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TRCA Stormwater | 19. | (2017 Comments) | April 2019 Response: There is a discrepancy between the storage-discharge pairs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Stormwater Management</th>
<th>Stormwater Management</th>
<th>Stormwater Management</th>
<th>Stormwater Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
<td>Stormwater Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the 12 hr AES storm is 0.15 m³/s which exceeds the unit release rate of 0.15 m³/s. Please explore opportunities to reduce the flow rate to achieve the target release rate.

**(2015 Comments)** Please see the comment below with regards to the level of imperviousness used for the site. Once this issue has been resolved TRCA will confirm the pond has been appropriately sized to meet TRCA’s SWM criteria.

**(2018 Comments)** Impervious values have been checked and confirmed see Appendix B for area breakdown.

*Further, the permanent pool is sized for a site imperviousness of 55%. As noted below further details are provided to confirm this value as it appears low for this type of development.*

April 2019 Response: Calculations for TIMP and XIMP were provided however further clarification is needed as to what impervious value is associated with each land use type e.g. pavement, sidewalk, residential area. Further, it appears that the imperviousness excluded the roof areas. Please clarify why this was done and whether it is appropriate. TRCA recognizes that the roof areas are proposed to drain to infiltration trenches however they are sized for the 5 mm event and will not have an impact on the 2-100 yr storms. The SWM pond should accommodate for these roof areas.

*Further, as requested above please ensure the SWM pond block has an imperviousness value of at least 50%, not 25% as is currently modelled.*

Please also clarify whether the medium density block is required to provide on-site water quality control as it has been excluded from the permanent pool storage volume calculations. If so, this should be clearly indicated in the report. Please revise as necessary.

*Please also confirm that there are no external areas draining to this site that need to be conveyed through the SWM pond.*

April 2019 Response: Details have been provided to demonstrate that in existing conditions a catchment of over 6 ha was directed to the wetland where now 1.1 ha of uncontrolled roof top and back yard area is directed to the wetland. The calculations that were included to demonstrate feature based water balance also included areas that drain to infiltration galleries that will not directly feed the wetland.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM #10.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRCA Water Balance 24.</strong> (2018 Comments) TRCA requested a feature-based water balance be completed but the response letter indicates that this hasn’t been completed. This issue remains outstanding. <strong>NEW</strong> May 2018 Comment: Please confirm whether the Township of King will allow a Cultee system below the pond to provide additional storage. <strong>TRCA Water Balance 25.</strong> (2017 Comments) Please provide a figure and/or details to support the drainage areas assumed within the water balance calculations. Specifically, for the post-development conditions which assume approximately 6 ha of impervious area and 8.6 ha of pervious area within the ‘New residential area’. TRCA requires these details to be able to confirm the deficits in ET and infiltration and the increase in runoff that need to be mitigated. (2018 Comments) Appendix D contained I.D sizing calculations however, as per the above comment the water balance calculations have not yet been finalized and therefore the water balance targets have not been set. Please provide the requested figures and/or details to confirm the drainage areas assumed within the water balance calculations are correct. Further, please incorporate the above comment regarding the level of imperviousness of the site into the water balance to ensure appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. <strong>TRCA Water Balance</strong> 25. (2017 Comments) Mitigation measures have been suggested that include increased topsoil, infiltration trenches in the road ditches, and soak away pits in the rear lots. Calculations were provided to demonstrate the size of soak away pits required, but then only illustrated them on 3 lots. Please clarify what low impact development (LID) measures are proposed to mitigate the water balance deficits and demonstrate that they are feasible on this site (general location and sizing details). Please note if increased topsoil is to be used as a mitigation strategy, TRCA prefers that the soil be amended to increase infiltration potential. For assistance on amended soils please refer to TRCA’s guidance document at: <a href="http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ca/wphome/healthy-soil">http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ca/wphome/healthy-soil</a>. <strong>TRCA Water Balance</strong> 25. (2018 Comments) The response letter indicates that further work will be done to address the above comment. TRCA will review the water balance and mitigation measures when submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRCA Flood Plain Management 26.</strong> (2017 Comments) Please provide a hydraulic analysis for the water course crossings to demonstrate there are no increases in flooding as a result of the proposed roads. Please also demonstrate that there is safe access to the proposed development. (2018 Comments) It is Acknowledged that modelling was done for the tributary that runs along the proposed access road from King Road. Please provide a digital version of this hydraulic modelling. Further, please clarify why a flow of 12.6 m3/s was used when the hydrologic modelling shows 13.3 m3/s. Further, please provide modelling for the proposed bridge to confirm there are no increases in flooding during the 2-100yr and Regional storm. Please note that a flood plain map sheet will need to be created for use in TRCA’s flood plain. <strong>April 2019 Response:</strong> It has been clarified that the flow used in the model is 13.3 m3/s near the confluence with the East Humber and 12.6 m3/s is adjacent to the driveway. This issue is minor and does not need adjustment. Please clarify and provide the source of the geometry used to cut the cross-sections in the model. Please also revise the model such that the contraction and expansion coefficients for 2 sections upstream and downstream of the crossing are 0.3 and 0.5 respectively. Please also revise the low flow channel manning’s ‘n’ value to 0.035 as per TRCA standards or provide justification for the value used. The report notes that the modelling presents the existing driveway conditions and that the proposed driveway will have the same size culvert but the deck elevation...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Flood Plain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Flood Plain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Hydrogeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA Hydrogeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TRCA | Geotechnical | 34. | (2017 Comments) | Slope Stability Report: Further to the above, an assessment of the erosion hazard and impacts to safe access to the site were not completed for the Street A crossing of the East Humber River, the Street A crossing of the tributary just north of King Road, or any other proposed access to the site, either from the Jane Street or Manitou Drive. This assessment is required. (2018 Comments) The comment has been acknowledged; however, the slope stability analyses have not been completed yet. | Slope stability for Street A at the proposed bridge crossing at the East Humber River as well as the crossing just north of King Road have been analyzed, of which the analysis is presented in the “Slope Stability Assessment Letter for Proposed Stormwater Management Pond, Bridge, Abutments and Access Roadway,” Reference No. 1712-2001, dated September 29, 2018. | Addressed. All recommendations of the report are to be incorporated into the detailed design. |
| TRCA | Geotechnical | 35. | (2017 Comments) Draft Plan of Subdivision: The LISTOS line and the buffer applicable behind should be shown on the site plan to confirm that all development is also located behind the LISTOS with the applicable buffer. The buffer should be maintained vegetated and dry and grading into the buffer should be avoided.  
(2018 Comments) The comment has not been addressed yet. The LISTOS is required to be shown on the draft plan to confirm that every component of the proposed development (blocks, SWM Pond, Bridges/crossings, access roads, etc.) are safely located beyond the erosion hazard; | Addressed: The LISTOS has been incorporated onto the draft plan of subdivision. |
| TRCA | Geotechnical | 36. | (2017 Comments) Master Servicing Plan: The proposed SWM pond requires a slope stability assessment using the ground condition information to confirm a minimum safety factor of 1.50 is achieved. The shown side slope of 2H:1V is too steep for the pond. The embankments created as a result of the SWM pond and its facilities should be also reviewed by a geotechnical engineer. A stability assessment is required to confirm that the embankments are stable with a minimum safety factor of 1.50. This can be completed in the detailed design stage when further information on the pond is available.  
(2018 Comments) The comment has been acknowledged by the Proponent and the response is satisfactory at this stage. Supplementary stability analyses and geotechnical design are required to be completed at the detailed design stage for the SWM Pond including the side slopes and berms, once the detailed drawings are available.  
At the detailed design stage, for the berms higher than 2m, the geotechnical design is required to be an appropriate level for the dams against applicable loading conditions. The safety factor determined for the above cases needs to satisfy the minimum required by the Technical Bulletin (Geotechnical Design and Factors of Safety) of the Lake & River Improvement Act (LRIA).  
At the detailed design stage, the SWM Pond including the berms are also to be also properly designed to ensure that the seepage does not negatively impact the berm stability. The berm materials are also required to be appropriately specified so that the risk of seepage and/or soil piping be mitigated.  
At the detailed design stage, the geotechnical design is also to provide the specifications of the berms including the appropriate backfilling, subgrade preparations, construction methodologies and recommendations, specifications for liners, where applicable, etc. The cross-sections are to be reviewed by the geotechnical engineer and submitted as signed and sealed by licensed Professional Engineer. | Acknowledged. Addressed: It will be addressed through Detailed Design. |
<p>| TRCA | Geotechnical | 37. | (2017 Comments) Site Grading: Site grading should be reviewed by geotechnical engineer at the detailed design stage. A slope stability assessment may be required for the cuts and fills to confirm a minimum safety factor of 1.50 is met. | Acknowledged. Addressed: It will be addressed through Detailed Design. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRCA</th>
<th>Geotechnical</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2015 Comments) The comment was acknowledged by the Proponent. The response is satisfactory at this stage. Supplementary geotechnical review and assessments can be carried out for the site grading at the detailed design stage;</td>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>38. Based on the Draft Plan of Subdivision, it appears that the Blocks 60 to 63 as well as the Block C SWM Pond are also located close to the top of relatively steep slope, where the watercourse is meandering towards the slope. The Long-Term Stable Top of Slope (LTSTOS) is required to be determined in this area by geotechnical engineer within the supplementary slope stability report to confirm that the Blocks 60 to 63 as well as the Block C SWM Pond are also adequately located behind the LTSTOS line;</td>
<td>Refer to response to Comment 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>39. The submitted slope stability report for northeast corner (Reference No. 1712-S001; Dated February 2018) did not determine the LTSTOS for both banks of the bridge/culvert crossings within the Section 6.2, to ensure that the crossing abutments for both banks are located behind the LTSTOS (after applying both Toe Erosion and Stable Slope Allowances). This is required to confirm that the abutment of the bridge/crossing is not impacted in the long-term by both the toe erosion and slope instability. The slope stability assessment is required to be completed within the supplementary slope stability report for the crossing to delineate the position of the LTSTOS for both banks after applying appropriate toe erosion and stable slope allowances;</td>
<td>The stability of the bank at the bridge culvert crossings have been understood; as such the analysis is presented in the Slope Stability Assessment Letter for Proposed Stormwater Management Pond, Bridge Abutments and Access Roadway; References No. 1712-S001, dated September 28, 2018.</td>
<td>Addressed in principle. Please be advised that the statement in the second paragraph of Page 9 of 13 of the geotechnical report/letter regarding the north side of the watercourse is inaccurate, as the abutment may be also required to be placed behind the fluvial hazards (e.g. meanderbelt determined by fluvial geomorphologist) in addition to the floodline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>40. The Draft Plan of Subdivision shows an access from King Road to Street A. This access runs either close to or on to the slope. The slope stability analysis is required to confirm that the proposed access is located so that, it is not impacted by slope instability (minimum factor of safety of 1.50) and can as a result provide a safe access to the site and proposed development in the long-term. Additionally, the required earthworks to facilitate the proposed access including the embankments and cuts are to be studied to ensure that they also remain stable in long-term with a minimum factor of safety of 1.50.</td>
<td>Refer to response to Comment 34.</td>
<td>Addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>41. As per the supplementary slope stability report (Reference No. 1712-S001; Dated February 2018), the BH205 in the proximity of the crossing was not adequately deep and supplementary field investigations are also required to be completed in this area at the detailed geotechnical design stage for the above-referenced site;</td>
<td>Acknowledged.</td>
<td>Noted: The comment has been acknowledged to be carried out at the detailed design stage. The response to this comment is satisfactory at this stage. Further geotechnical reviews and assessments are deferred to the detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>Geotechnical</td>
<td>42. Based on the Draft Plan of Subdivision, it appears that the Blocks 60 to 63 as well as the Block C SWM Pond are also located close to the top of relatively steep slope, where the watercourse is meandering towards the slope. The Long-Term Stable Top of Slope (LTSTOS) is required to be determined in this area by geotechnical engineer within the supplementary slope stability report to confirm that the Blocks 60 to 63 as well as the Block C SWM Pond are also adequately located behind the LTSTOS line;</td>
<td>Refer to response to Comment 33.</td>
<td>Please see the TRCA response to Comment 33 above regarding the required buffer for the Block C SWM pond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRCA</td>
<td>NEW COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>See comment #23 regarding the Feature Based Water Balance (FBWB).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>TRCA notes that the Butternut tree has been determined not to be a hybrid. The proposed road access falls directly within the protected habitat. Please provide correspondence from MNRF/MECP regarding the approval of the road alignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>TRCA recommends confirmation be obtained from MNRF/MECP which supports stormwater discharge to an occupied Redside Dace habitat. If supported, please provide a preliminary stormwater outlet design to ensure the location is appropriate from an ecological context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Flood Plain Management</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>The newly developed flood plain limit for the watercourse that runs from the East Hunter, under the driveway (Street 'A'), towards King Road is to be reflected on the constraints mapping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomorphology</td>
<td>47.</td>
<td>It is noted in the meander belt with determination procedure that the 100 yr channel migration distance will be used to help determine the final belt width. No further references are made to this migration distance in the report. Please confirm what the 100 yr channel migration distance is and how it was used to determine the meander belt width. Further, this value is important for the design of the bridge crossing proposed for this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geomorphology</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Please confirm whether it is possible and/or necessary to extend the study limits to create more accurate reach delineations as this can affect the location of the meander belt. Please revise as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 21, 2018

Mr. Gaspare Ritacca
Manager of Planning and Development
Township of King
2075 King Road
King City, ON L7B 1A1

Attention: Mr. Gaspare Ritacca, Manager

Re: 2nd Submission – Request for Comments
Official Plan Amendment Application - OP-2016-03
(Mansions of King Inc. c/o Joe Chetti)
2710 King Road & 13371 Jane Street, King City
Township of King

York Region has completed its review of this 2nd submission of the above-noted Official Plan Amendment (OPA), Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) and draft plan of subdivision. The subject site is municipally known as 2710 King Road and 13371 Jane Street, and is located on the east side of Jane Street, north of King Road in the Township of King. The subject site is approximately 39.86 hectares in size.

Subsequent to York Region’s issuance of preliminary comments on OP-2016-03 dated November 24, 2016, the applicant has submitted these revised applications. We understand the revised applications propose to reduce the number of units from 318 to 314 residential dwellings comprised of 64 single detached dwelling lots and one block identified for medium density residential (250 units) for low rise apartments. A potential connection to the west to the proposed Bushland Heights lands to the west is now shown as Street ‘C’ and the developable area boundaries amended based on further study.

The Regional Municipality of York, 17250 Yonge Street, Newmarket, Ontario L3Y 6Z1
Tel: 905-830-4444, 1-877-464-YORK (1-877-464-9675)
Internet: www.york.ca
The revised OPA now proposes to amend the King City Community Plan:

1) To re-designate the subject lands from “Environmental Protection Area”, “Estate Residential 3 Area”, and “Low Density Residential 1 Area” to “Environmental Protection Area”, “Low Density Residential 1 Area” (with site specific special policies), and “Medium Density Residential Area” (with site specific special policies); and,

2) To permit a maximum gross density of approximately 5 units per hectare (from net density of 6 units per hectare) for the low density residential, and a maximum gross density of approximately 49 units per hectare (from net density of 43 units per hectare) for the medium density area of the draft plan; and,

3) To reduce the minimum Vegetation Protection Zone (VPZ) to 10 metres in some areas and to the satisfaction of Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and York Region.

The existing King City Community Plan policies for the subject lands permit a maximum gross density of 1 unit per hectare on the majority of the subject lands and 5 - 6 units per hectare on a small portion of the subject lands located immediately north of King Road.

These applications are now subject to an active appeal (Case No. PL170998) with the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT).

Regional Technical Review Comments
This submission was considered by staff from various Regional Departments. York Region now offers the following comments in addition to the Regional letter dated November 24, 2016:

Regional Planning
With respect to our previous comments on Growth Management (Chapter 5 – YROP), the letter response provided by WND dated February 28, 2018 references matters related to the City of Vaughan, not the Township of King. Please revise accordingly. In addition to the updated density calculations provided, please also include people and jobs per hectare calculations for the proposed development.

A portion of the subject lands are located within the Regional Greenlands System, is located on the Oak Ridges Moraine, and contains a number of Key Natural Heritage Features (KNHF), Key Hydrologic Features (KHF)/ Hydrologically Sensitive Features (HSF) and hazard lands. Since commenting on the 1st submission, York Region received a copy of the comments provided by the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), which at that time outlined a number of natural heritage and natural hazard concerns related to the proposed development. York Region is also in receipt of TRCA’s comments on this 2nd submission dated June 12, 2018 and a number of significant natural heritage and natural hazard concerns appear to remain outstanding and unaddressed that have the potential to impact the development limit, land use designation/ zone boundaries for this proposed development. While a number of revisions were made to the development proposal, we note the applicant continues to propose a reduction to the required vpzs to 10 metres in some areas. Any proposal must be in keeping
with the applicable Provincial, Regional and local planning documents, including but not limited to, Sections 2.2 & 2.3 of the YROP.

As York Region relies on the TRCA to review and provide comment on natural heritage matters related to the Regional Greenlands System and associated applicable provincial plans, we support the comments made by TRCA on this proposal to date. We request that any correspondence related to these matters be forwarded for further consideration as the effect of these comments may impact the proposed OPA, ZBA and draft plan of subdivision.

Transportation Planning
Transportation Planning staff in coordination with staff from Traffic Signal Operations, Development Engineering and YRT/Viva have reviewed the proposed OPA application along with the supporting Transportation Study (TIS) prepared by NexTrans dated February 2018. Transportation Planning staff have no concern with the OPA application, however, the following Regional comments shall be addressed with the next resubmission:

- The TIS provided is not consistent with the format and recommendations of York Region's Transportation Mobility Plan Guidelines for Development Applications (November 2016). We acknowledge that this study is an update to the previous study provided in February 2016; however, at a minimum the TIS shall include the assessment of transit and active transportation modes for the future total conditions. Recommendations and an implementation plan related to sidewalk connections, missing links, direct pedestrian and cycling connections to transit stops and existing active transportation facilities shall also be provided in the revised Transportation Study.

- The TIS shall include a detailed Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM). The TDM Plan shall include a TDM checklist that summarizes the programs and measures, estimated costs and responsibility of the applicant to implement TDM recommendations. Estimated costs for any items that are provided by the Region or the Municipality shall be identified as “TBD” (To Be Determined).

- The TDM Plan shall also include a TDM communication strategy, to assist York Region and the Township of King to effectively deliver the Information Packages and pre-loaded PRESTO Cards to residents. This strategy shall also include a physical location for distribution of the Information Packages and pre-loaded PRESTO Cards. The applicant is responsible for the coordination and for providing a venue for the distribution of PRESTO cards. Each event, approximately 2 hours of staff time, can serve approximately 50 residential units. The applicant shall coordinate specific event details with York Region/York Region Transit Staff allowing a minimum of 2 months’ notice.

- As per our previous comments, Transportation Planning generally supports the potential road connection, now shown as Street’ C’, to Jane Street as it provides for a finer grid road network and is in keeping with YROP policy 7.2.53, provided the requirements of
York Region’s Access Guidelines, and any environmental requirements outlined by the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) are met. Our continued position is that this proposed road connection should not diminish the need for the future roadway connection proposed to the east of this development.

- The TIS shall include a conceptual plan in conjunction with the future Bushlands Heights Project west of the development showing Street C connection to the Bushlands Height Project and ultimately to Jane Street.

- The TIS shall be revised to recommend both left and right turn lanes on King Road at the proposed access to accommodate turning traffic generated by the development.

Infrastructure Asset Management (IAM) Branch
IAM has reviewed the subject official plan amendment in conjunction with the Servicing Analysis - Master Servicing Plan (MSP) revised December 22, 2017 by Condeland Engineering Inc. IAM has no concerns with the approval of the OPA subject to the following:

Servicing Capacity Allocation
Residential development in the Township of King requires servicing capacity allocation prior to final approval. If the Township of King does not grant this development allocation from the existing capacity assignments to date, then the development may require additional Regional infrastructure based on conditions of future capacity assignment, which may include:

- Duffin Creek WPCP Outfall Modification – 2021 pending the outcome of the Class EA currently underway
- Other projects as may be identified in future studies.

The timing of the above infrastructure is the current estimate and may change as each infrastructure project progresses and is provided for information purposes only.

Municipal Servicing
A sanitary pumping station and forcemain is proposed to convey sewage from the subject development and the adjoining future development to the west (Bushland Development Inc.) to the municipal gravity system on King Road. Similarly, the proposed development is connecting to future Township of King watermain on King Road and existing Township of King watermain in the Manitou Drive right-of-way.

Should there be any change in the proposed servicing scheme, the Owner shall forward the revised Plan to York Region for review and record.

Ownership and Operation of the Proposed Sanitary Pumping Station
From the Servicing Analysis provided, it is not clear as to who will own and operate the pumping station. As such, York Region requires clarification over the ownership of the proposed pump station.
Impact on Regional Wastewater Servicing

King City is part of the Regional York Durham Sanitary System (YDSS). The existing King City Sewage Pumping Station was originally designed for a residential population of 12,000 persons to service the ultimate population per King City Community Plan in force at the time. As previously communicated to the Township, up to 14,000 persons and associated employment population may be serviced without any major capital upgrades to the pumping station. If the Town does not allocate servicing capacity to the subject development from within the 14,000 persons pool, the development may require additional Regional infrastructure, or new measures subject to conditions of future capacity assignment, which may include:

- Capital upgrades to the existing King City Sewage Pumping Station- timing or feasibility to be identified by future studies/assessments
- Other measures, such as servicing incentive programs subject to the future developments meeting program requirements

Water Resources

Water Resources has no concerns with respect to the proposed OPA and notes the site is located within Wellhead Protection Areas B, C, & D (WHPAs B, C & D) on the Oak Ridges Moraine, and is within a Recharge Management Area (WHPA-Q), partially within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) and Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA). For detailed comments this OPA and the related applications, please refer to the attached memorandum.

Summary

Given the potential for change to the OPA and draft plan of subdivision, we await resolution to the comments above in order to provide additional comments. Upon receiving the requested information outlined in this letter, we will continue our review and provide further comment on this application and the related draft plan of subdivision. York Region staff is available to provide assistance throughout this application process should it be required.

Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact Sara Brockman, Senior Planner, at extension 75750, or by email at sara.brockman@york.ca.

Yours truly,

Karen Whitney, MCIP, RPP
Director, Community Planning and Development Services

SB/
OP-2016-03 2nd Submission
Mansions of King Inc.

Attachments (1) 1. Memorandum, Technical Comments

c. Coleen Bonner, TRCA – by e-mail only
  York Region Review Team

YORK-#8454789
MEMORANDUM – TECHNICAL COMMENTS

Re: 2nd Submission - Official Plan Amendment Application - OP-2016-03
and Related applications Z-2016-07 & 19T-16K01
(Mansions of King Inc. c/o Joe Chetti)
2710 King Road & 13371 Jane Street, King City
Township of King

Regional Staff have reviewed the above noted applications, as well as the supporting
documents and provide the following comments. These comments are not an approval, are
subject to modification, and are intended to provide information to the applicant regarding
Regional requirements that have been identified to date.

Water Resources
Water Resources does not have any objections/concerns with the Official Plan Amendment
application as it relates to Source Protection policy subject to the following comments. Should
the proposal change and/or the application be amended, Water Resources will require re-
circulation for comment and/or approval.

Wellhead Protection Area
As the property is within a Wellhead Protection Area and within the Oak Ridges Moraine
Conservation Plan Boundary, under the YROP please note that there is a prohibition on the
following activities, listed below, on the site associated with the storage, manufacture or use of:

1. petroleum-based fuels and or solvents;
2. pesticides, herbicides, fungicides or fertilizers;
3. construction equipment;
4. inorganic chemicals;
5. road salt and contaminants as identified by the Province;
6. the generation and storage of hazardous waste or liquid industrial waste, and waste
disposal sites and facilities;
7. organic soil conditioning sites and the storage and application of agricultural and non-
agricultural source organic materials; and,
8. snow storage and disposal facilities.
Section 59
A Section 59 Notice from York Region's Water Resources group will be required prior to the filling of any future Planning Act or Building Code related applications.

DNAPL Prohibition
Dense Non-Aqueous Phase Liquids (DNAPLs) are prohibited within Wellhead Protection Areas B & C (WHPA-B & WHPA-C) under the Clean Water Act as they are considered significant drinking water threats.

Recharge Management Area
Please note the property is located within a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) and within a Recharge Management Area (WHPA-Q). As such, the CTC Source Protection Plan water quantity recharge maintenance policy will apply. The proponent will be required to maintain recharge as demonstrated through a hydrogeological study that shows the existing (i.e. pre proposed development) water balance can be maintained in the future (i.e. post proposed development). The CTC Source Protection Plan Water Balance Requirements document and TRSPA Water Balance Tool (https://trca.ca/conservation/drinking-water-source-protection/trspa-water-balance-tool/) should be consulted. The contact person for the scoping and review of the water balance for Source Protection Plan conformity is Don Ford at TRCA.

Low Impact Development (LID)
The owner is to be advised that Low Impact Development (LID) measures are encouraged to be applied to the site. As per York Region Official Plan policy 2.3.41, developments should maximize infiltration through integrated treatment approach techniques to minimize stormwater volume and contaminant loads. This should include, but not be limited to, techniques such as rainwater harvesting, phosphorus reduction, constructed wetlands, bioretention swales, green roofs, permeable surfaces, clean water collection systems, and the preservation and enhancement of native vegetation cover. The use of the following resource is encouraged: Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide and is available using the following link: http://www.creditvalleyca.ca/low-impact-development/low-impact-development-support/stormwater-management-lid-guidance-documents/low-impact-development-stormwater-management-planning-and-design-guide/

Dewatering
Should significant dewatering be required, a dewatering plan shall be prepared by a qualified person and submitted by the proponent to the Region's Water Resources Group for approval prior to excavation. If there will be water discharging to the Regional storm or sanitary sewer, it is recommended that the proponent consult with Regional Sewer use by-law group and obtain a dewatering discharge permit as necessary. Please contact the Sewer Use By-law group at SewerUsebylaw@york.ca or 1-877-464-9675.


**Construction Best Management Practices**

As the site is within Wellhead Protection Areas, Water Resources does encourage the use of best management practices during construction and post construction with respect to the handling and storage of chemicals (such as used oil, degreasers and salt) on site. It is strongly recommended that Risk Management Measures are put in place with respect to chemical use and storage including spill kits, secondary containment, a spill response plan and training.

**Salt Management**


If the proposed development includes a parking lot, Water Resources recommends following the Parking Lot Design Guidelines: [https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Shared%20Documents/reports/Parking-Lot-Design-Guidelines-Salt-Reduction.pdf](https://www.lsrca.on.ca/Shared%20Documents/reports/Parking-Lot-Design-Guidelines-Salt-Reduction.pdf)

**Transportation Planning**

In addition to the comments provided in the body of this letter, Transportation Planning staff in coordination with staff from Traffic Signal Operations, Development Engineering and YRT/Viva staff provide the following comments for information purposes.

**Preliminary conditions for subsequent development applications:**

Prior to final approval the Owner shall agree to:

1. Provide a basic 36 metres right-of-way for this section of King Road. All municipal setbacks shall be referenced from a point 18 metres from the centerline of construction on King Road and any lands required for additional turn lanes at the intersections will be conveyed to York Region for public highway purposes, free of all costs and encumbrances, to the satisfaction of York Region Solicitor.

2. Provide direct shared pedestrian/cycling facilities and connections from the proposed development to boundary roadways and adjacent developments to support active transportation and public transit, where appropriate. A drawing showing the conceptual layout of active transportation facilities and connections internal to the site and to the Regional roads shall be provided.

Please ensure that all internal streets have consistent sidewalk connections to Regional or arterial roads where transit may service the area.
3. Implement both left and right turn lanes on King Road at the proposed access to accommodate turning traffic generated by the development to the satisfaction of York Region. A detailed design drawing and cost estimates shall be submitted for Region review.

4. Provide a revised Transportation Study to address all comments related to the Transportation Study (TIS) prepared by NeXtrans dated February 2018 to the satisfaction of York Region.

5. Advise all potential purchasers of the existing Dial-A-Ride services available in this area. This includes current and potential transit services, bus stops and shelter locations. The Owner/consultant is to contact YRT/Viva Contact Centre (tel. 1-866-668-3978) for route maps and the future plan maps.

Region will provide further additional detailed comments/conditions once a revised TIS addressing all Regional comments is submitted for review.

Capital Planning and Delivery (Transportation)

For information purposes, as part of the Regional Capital Planning and Delivery Bridge and Culvert Rehabilitation program, the bridge on Jane Street, 150m north of King Road will be rehabilitated in 2020. As part of the rehabilitation, Jane Street will be reduced to a single lane and traffic will be managed with a temporary traffic signal located at the bridge. Should the timing of the development’s construction coincide with the bridge rehabilitation works, alternative haul routes avoiding the area should be considered.
Planning Department

Planning Report No. P-2019-14
RE: Application for Official Plan Amendment, File Number: OP-2015-01
Application for Zoning By-law Amendment, File Number: Z-2015-03
Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision, File Number: 19T-15K02
Applicant: Bushland Heights Ltd.; Part of Lot 7, Concession 4; King City

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Planning Department respectfully submits the following recommendations:


2. PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The purpose of this report is to provide an update with respect to the subject applications and the related upcoming LPAT hearing. The subject applications propose to amend the Township’s Official Plan (King City Community Plan) and seek approval for related applications for Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment. More specifically, the subject applications propose to permit the development of 88 single detached residential dwellings.

A public meeting of Council with respect to the subject applications was held on February 5, 2018. Since that time, staff has had several working meetings with the applicant and external agencies including the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, to work towards revisions to the proposed development to address the concerns raised by Council, staff, agencies and the public. To date, no revised materials have been submitted by the Applicant to the Township.

The Applications continue to propose the following:

- The proposed Official Plan Amendment proposes to amend the Estate Residential land use designation to Low Density Residential and increase the permitted density for the subject lands, as well as establish reductions in the required environmental buffers;

- The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision propose the development of a residential plan of subdivision consisting of a range of lot sizes for 88 single detached homes.

The Applicant has appealed the applications to the LPAT on the basis of the Township’s failure to make a decision on the applications. The Applicant has indicated that it intends to continue to work with the Township in advance of the LPAT hearing to revise the proposed development to continue to work towards addressing outstanding matters. The LPAT hearing for this matter is scheduled to commence on November 5, 2019.
3. DISCUSSION

Staff has been working with the Applicant since the public meeting of Council to resolve the matters noted at the public meeting and subsequently. The following is a summary of those issues relating to the subject applications. As outlined in more detail below, some of the major issues have been resolved while others remain outstanding. The issues include: (1) consideration for the Township’s Official Plan review; (2) residential density; (3) environmental buffers; (4) coordination with neighbouring development; (5) compatibility and transition, and reverse frontage lotting; (6) hydrogeology and private well impacts; (7) agency and public comments; (8) need for environmental assessment; and (9) servicing capacity.

Township’s Official Plan Review, Density and Population

3.1 The proposed OPA and resulting increase in developable area and residential density must be considered in regard to implications for the overall planned population for King City and the Township as a whole, conformity with the Region of York Official Plan, and consideration as an element of the Township’s on-going overall Official Plan review.

3.2 The density and population growth in King City being considered through the Official Plan review is based on seven units per hectare. The Planning Department’s calculation indicates that the 88 single detached units proposed by the draft plan equate to nine units per hectare (subject to confirmation of developable lands and buffer areas which has not yet been provided by the Applicant).

Environmental Buffers

3.3 The subject applications also seek to amend the KCCP policies to permit a reduction in the minimum vegetation protection zone (MVPZ) adjacent to environmental features. The subject applications continue to seek broad reductions of the MVPZ from 30 m to a minimum of approximately 12 m. Staff has been working with the Applicant to explore opportunities to revise the draft plan to expand the MVPZ. The draft plan continues to seek reductions to the buffers well beyond the approach which has been applied elsewhere in King City, i.e. limiting reductions to the MVPZ to necessary “pinch point” areas. In addition, the TRCA continues to identify that their comments (eg. environmental/development limits, stormwater management, etc.) have not yet been addressed.

Coordination with Neighbouring Development

3.4 In light of the fact that discussion among the landowners within the study area has not resulted in a formal landowners agreement, Planning staff has been working with the applicant to ensure that the requirements of the King City Community Plan with respect to comprehensive planning for the broader surrounding area have been addressed and ensure that the subject applications will not limit or impede development considerations for itself and/or the surrounding lands. In particular, staff has been working with the applicant to ensure that the submitted materials include consideration for a road connection between the subject lands and the lands located to the east (Mansions of King).

The draft plan of subdivision relies upon the connection with Mansions of King in order to achieve a second road access. Should the Bushland Heights development proceed in advance of the Mansions of King road connection, Planning staff recommends that there be...
phasing limitations imposed upon the Bushland Heights development to limit the number of homes constructed to approximately 40 to 50 units until such time as the road connection to Mansions of King is provided. This limitation would be required by way of Holding (H) provisions in the related site specific zoning by-law. In any event, regardless of which development proceeds first, the Bushland Heights development will require multiple road accesses (i.e. Jane Street AND Mansions of King).

Also in regard to adjacent properties, Planning staff has given consideration to the layout of the draft plan of subdivision and, in particular, with respect to the area in the north-west section of the draft plan where it abuts other existing properties fronting onto Jane Street to ensure that the proposed draft plan is designed in such a manner as to not preclude or limit the development opportunities of the adjacent lands by limiting their access to the future internal local roads. Minor revisions in this regard may be required to provide additional open frontage to Street “B”.

Adjacent Existing Residential and Reverse Frontage Lotting

3.5 The review of the draft plan includes matters with respect to the compatibility and transition between the new and existing residential areas. This matter is particularly applicable to the northern and western boundary of the subject lands. Staff has been working with the applicant with respect to the design of the lotting within this area of the draft plan, and the potential for retaining existing vegetation which provides screening, and/or the provision of further landscaping (planting, fencing) enhancements. The draft plan has not been revised to provide these changes.

3.6 The draft plan also proposes that the entire frontage of the subject lands along Jane Street will consist of reverse-frontage lots (i.e. lots which have the rear/amenity area of the lot backing on to Jane Street). The King City Community Plan prohibits reverse-frontage lotting in an effort to minimize the need for noise mitigation measures such as fencing and berms and the related maintenance and urban design concerns of such elements. Planning staff has been seeking revisions to the draft plan to address this matter.

Hydrogeology and Private Well Impacts

3.7 The applications have also been reviewed with respect to hydrogeology and potential impacts to existing private wells on properties in proximity to the proposed development. Staff recommends that the private well monitoring requirements be addressed by way of a condition of draft plan approval. The condition will ensure that the Applicant shall inspect, evaluate and monitor all wells within the zone of influence prior to, during, and after the construction has been completed. If the private well systems in the zone of influence deteriorate due to the servicing of the plan of subdivision, the Applicant will provide temporary water supply to the residents upon notice by the Township and continue to do so while the involved parties work towards a resolution. A financial security shall be held by the Township until final assumption of the subdivision by the Township to guarantee the protection for the private wells.

Agency and Public Comments

3.8 Planning staff is in receipt of comments on the current applications from the TRCA, and the Region of York. These agencies continue to identify significant outstanding matters to be
addressed prior to providing their recommended conditions of draft plan approval. Planning staff is also in receipt of comments submitted by the Kingscross Ratepayers Association, including comments prepared by its planning consultants, Hunter and Associates, dated February 5, 2018. The TRCA, Region of York, and Kingscross Ratepayers Association are also parties to the LPAT proceedings.

**Need for Environmental Assessment**

3.9 Township staff has sought further clarification from the Applicant with respect to the potential need for an Environmental Assessment (EA) process to be carried out for the main road, related infrastructure and valley/stream crossings proposed by the development. This further clarification has not yet been received. Upon receipt, staff will review the matter further.

**Servicing Capacity**

3.10 The allocation of servicing capacity to the proposed development would be considered as part of the final approval/registration stage of the plan of subdivision and concurrently with the lifting of Holding (H) provisions in the related Zoning By-law amendments. General phasing matters will be addressed by overall phasing plans which will be required as a standard condition of draft plan approval.

**Next Steps**

3.11 It is recommended that Planning staff report back to Committee of the Whole in advance of the LPAT hearing to outline the overall status of the Applications, any revisions submitted/proposed by the Applicant, and any further recommendations by staff based on the status at that time.

4. **INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE**

The recommendations of this report support the land use planning objectives of the Environmental Pillar, of the Township’s Sustainability Plan.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Township’s legal and consultant costs associated with the LPAT appeal will be covered through the Planning Department’s normal budget.

6. **CONCLUSION**

The applications have been reviewed by the Planning Department and other Township Departments and external agencies. The appeal of the applications to the LPAT is proceeding and the hearing has been scheduled to commence on November 5, 2019. The Applicant has not submitted any revised materials to the Township in order to address the concerns raised by Council, staff, agencies and the public.
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Mr. Gaspare Ritacca,  
Manager of Planning and Development  
Planning Department  
King Township  

May 3, 2019  
Via email  

Dear Mr. Ritacca,  

Re: Bushland Heights (BH) subdivision applications for Official Plan (OPA) and Zoning by-law (ZBL) Amendments  

Kingscross Ratepayers Association (KRA) represents residents within the Kingscross Estates neighbourhood (Kingscross). The BH property shares boundaries with the Mansions of King (MOK) development property. The shared property lines follow very significant Key Natural Heritage Features and as a result BH is sharing infrastructure services and roads with MOK. This letter and the attachment address concerns we have regarding the BH applications. We have provided a separate letter regarding our concerns with the MOK applications.  

The BH area is not currently zoned for the proposed density for good reason.  

Once joined to MOK it will be potentially be connected to Kingscross. Kingscross is serviced by private wells and septic systems. TRCA has said in the past that they would oppose municipal services – water, wastewater, stormwater infrastructure – due to the extensive ravines, wetlands and streams that are upstream of the BH lands. The natural open areas and septic systems maintain the stream flows, wetlands and provide groundwater recharge.  

Attached to this letter is a report prepared by Dr. Garry Hunter addressing both planning, construction engineering, hydrology and water recharge matters related to the BH application. The report from Dr. Hunter remains contemporary with the applications.  

KRA has serious concerns regarding this development application which can be categorised as follows and are summarised in Dr. Hunter’s report.  

1. Why should this land NOT BE developed with the density proposed?  

The Eaton Hall—Mary—Hackett Lakes Wetland Complex is a 259 hectare area on the Oak Ridges Moraine which represents the largest wetland complex in southern Ontario. The proposed BH development would be sited beside wetlands and the East Humber River and its associated streams. The river and the streams have a “Species At Risk”, Redside Dace. The area provides habitat for reptile and amphibian species. Painted, Snapping turtles and Milk snakes are indigenous species and have been seen frequently on neighbouring properties. At this time, turtles and frogs are busy laying their eggs.
right now. The BH development could interfere and or eliminate habitat for these species.

The development site is within the Oak Ridges Moraine, is on the Greenbelt and is within York Region’s Greenlands System. Arbitrary lines drawn on a piece of paper, a map of King City, fail to capture the undulating lands north of King Road, and should not mean that those lands should be aggressively developed. Such intensification will threaten the species dependent on such wetlands, streams, river and land. Such intensification, if tolerated, would be unique in King City.

The current zoning for this area is much more appropriate for such sensitive very sloping lands. This is not an area where intensification should be allowed.

We note that in York Region’s February 2018 comments on the BH proposed subdivision development application:

- technical study (policy 2.1.7). Development and site alteration is prohibited within the Regional Greenlands System and applications for development within 120 metres are required to submit an Environmental Impact Study (policy 2.1.9). A Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE), Oak Ridges

We are not aware that an Environmental Impact Study has been required by TRCA or the Township of King nor have such studies been undertaken.

2. Water

Dr. Hunter makes comments which are consistent with concerns he articulated in his companion report on MOK (attached). He raises concerns regarding the impact on groundwater recharge and runoff. He identifies inconsistencies in the Terraprobe water budget text calculations.

It can only be assumed that water runoff will occur down to the streams and the East Humber River. Once the site is developed that runoff could include road salt, oils, nutrients, herbicides, pesticides and or fertilizers that will degrade the wetlands, streams and the East Humber.

3. “Manitou” Easement

Given that it is proposed that BH and MOK are linked and that access to both can be achieved via either King Road or Jane Street. There seems little rationale to support a connection to the established neighbourhood of Kingscros.

4. Conclusion

We recommend that the Township’s engineering consultants review very carefully the development plans to ensure the integrity of the calculations and designs. The steep fall in grade across the BH property presents major challenges for the planned deep pipes for stormwater.
KINGSCROSS RATEPAYERS ASSOCIATION

Based on Dr. Garry Hunter's analysis we cannot support this high density intensification development on such sensitive lands. We are asking the planning department to recommend that Council not support this current application and request a resubmission with much lower density that would protect the ecosystems and avoid creating vulnerability of the acquifers that feed private wells in nearby neighbourhoods.

We wish to emphasise that Manitou Road is not needed for access given the in and out on Jane Street to BH, the planned road linkage to MOK and the entrance/exit on to King Road. The new neighbourhoods should be only be connected with established neighbourhoods with a trail system.

Respectfully submitted,

Ian Hilley and Mary Muter on behalf of the Kingscross Ratepayers Association
February 5, 2018

His Worship Steve Pellegrini
Mayor, King Township
2075 King Road
King City, ON L7B 1A1

Re: Preliminary Peer Review of Bushland Heights Proposed Residential Development
   on behalf of Kingscross Ratepayers Association
   Part W ½ Lot 7, Concession 4, Township of King (17.72 ha)
   Located in the King City Settlement Area at 13245 Jane Street

Dear Sir:

Bushland Heights has formally submitted a Development Plan Application for 88 residential lots plus an area in the northeast of the property designated for future use. Crozier (June 2017) in the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report allocated 22 lots (Total 110 lots) in this future use area. The now out of date Terraprobe (2015) Hydrogeology and Water Budget Report was based on a proposal for 126 single family residential dwellings. The Draft Plan shows a temporary cul de sac located in the northeast quadrant on other lands owned by the Applicant. The reasons for excluding this northeast quadrant in this Application is not apparent. Figures 1 and 2 are enclosed for illustrative purposes.

We have not been able to obtain a copy of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity Assessment and Landform Conservation Study prepared for this project but rather have relied on the summaries in the Planning Justification Report.

I also previously prepared a related Peer Review dated December 9, 2016 for the adjacent Mansions of King proposed residential development.¹

1.0 Regional Flood Limit

The Applicant has not provided a statement of areas for the upgradient catchments for the East Humber River Valley and its tributaries through the Bushland Heights Plan Area.

Neither the Mansions of King or the Bushland Heights projects have prepared a formal hydraulic analysis to determine the Regional Flood Line for the East Humber River Valley and the principal

¹ This report has been prepared by Mr. Garry T. Hunter, M.A.Sc., P.Eng. Mr. Hunter has been specifically recognized by the Ontario Municipal Board and/or the Ontario Superior Court of Justice as an expert in law and qualified to give opinion evidence as a Civil Engineer and in the fields of airphoto interpretation, geology, hydrogeology, hydro-geochemistry, the collection and mining of geographic data for hydrogeological purposes, stormwater management and solar shadowing. Mr. Hunter was Manager of the Oak Ridges Moraine Hydrogeology Study, a key component study which contributed to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2002) regulations.
local tributaries passing through the site. Beacon describe the East Humber as a major river within the Region. The Regional Flood line limits (plus 10 m setback) are required as a major component for protection of the valley watercourses; for establishment of development limits; for the location and design of sewage pumping stations, stormwater management pond and bridge conveyances and for prevention of backwater by roadway and other floodplain restrictions.

Street flooding in Kingscross Estates is known to occur under flood conditions for the East Humber tributaries upstream of the Bushland Heights Development. Backwater from valley infrastructure must be minimized.

Beacon (June 2017) as part of the Bushland Heights Natural Heritage Evaluation advises:

"in King City, OPA 540 (4.2.2.i) indicates that permanent watercourses are to be protected to a greater degree in the following manner:

n) Permanent and Intermittent Stream Corridor, waterbodies except for Kettle Lakes, and flood susceptible areas. The boundary of stream corridors shall be determined as the greater of:

(iv) the regulatory floodplain when the upstream drainage area is greater than 125 hectares and an additional minimum 10 metre buffer; (or)

(v) the predicted meander belt of the watercourse, expanded as required to convey the major system flows and an additional minimum 30 metre vegetation protection zone;

The upstream drainage area far exceeds 125 ha. The Mansions of King specified a flood elevation of 274 m asl for the East Humber River. However, based on the East Humber River valley character and subject to a formal flood study, I have estimated the Regional Flood Elevation to be in the order of 276 m asl.

2.0 Transportation Linkage

The Township of King Design Criteria and Standard Detailed Drawings (October 2016) s B2.00 Geometric Design Elevations (last updated August 2017) specifies a maximum roadway grade at 6% for minor collector and major collector streets.

The King Township Transportation Master Plan (Final) WSP, May 2015 in Exhibit E-1 shows the east-west street from Jane Street through the Bushland Heights and Mansions of King Development to Manitou Drive in Kingscross Estates and the north-south link generally within the Mansions of King lands to King Road as potential future linkages. The Bushland Heights Draft Plan proposal does not address this community linkage with the single exception of a Street E Temporary Turning Circle adjacent to the Mansions of King property.
The Applicant’s Transportation Impact Assessment (Lea August 2, 2017) considers only the August 8, 2017 proposed Bushland Heights Draft Plan 88 lots, not the Other Lands Owned by the Applicant, not the proposed Mansion of King Development and not the existing Kingscross Estates area proposed to be linked to this development. The Transportation Impact Assessment does not address vehicle exit stacking under winter conditions on the steep 6% Street A approach to Jane Street. Furthermore, Jane Street is a designated Highway 400 Emergency bypass which will periodically restrict practical access to Jane Street.

3.0 Planning Justification Report

3.1 Secondary and Master Environmental Servicing Plans

Contrary to the usual common practice in York Region and elsewhere, no Secondary Plan or Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) has been prepared for the Bushland Heights, Mansions of King and other adjacent lands designated for development in the northeast and southeast King Road and Jane Street Area. Without these Plans the Application is not complete. Secondary Plan and MESP issues to be resolved include:

1) Common Regional Flood Limit and Setback Mapping in this East Humber River Valley setting.

2) Common Transportation linkages to King Road, Jane Street and Manitou Drive as envisioned in the King Township Transportation Master Plan (Exhibit E-1, WSP 2015). Details to be addressed include:

   • The adverse 6% grade (winter) approach to the Jane Street exit. Under winter conditions, the lower gradient Manitou Drive exit may be the most favourable for these East Humber River valley lands.

   • Inadequate proposed horizontal and vertical environmental alignments out of the East Humber River Valley to King Road on Mansions of King property. Partial relocation on adjacent lands needs to be considered (see enclosed Fig 1).

   • Adverse ‘cut’ to conform to existing right-of-way through Kingscross Subdivision to Manitou Drive.

   • Optimized functional horizontal and vertical alignment of these Transportation Linkages through the Applicant lands.
3) Sanitary ‘Sewer’ access to the main YDSS King City Pumping Station on King Road west of Keele Street including location of pumping stations and forcemains. Sanitary flows from these East Humber River Valley developments may require up to three pumping stations to reach the main YDSS gravity trunk sewer on Yonge Street.

4) Location and contingency plans for pumping station flooding and emergency overflows.

5) Common and consistent resolution of East Humber River Valley Natural Heritage Buffers and setbacks.

6) Proposals for Other Lands with development capability as owned by the Applicants (Bushland Heights and Mansions of King) and adjacent lands owned by others.

7) Provincial and Regional Growth Plan Conformity (Density at 50 residents / hectare).

8) Oak Ridges Moraine Plan Conformity (July 2017).

3.2 Bushland Heights Draft Plan of Proposed Subdivision

The proposed Bushland Heights Draft Plan of Subdivision is essentially a ‘flat paper plan’ which is dependent on extensive landform cut and fill grading and deep sanitary sewers to transform the existing East Humber Valley steep slopes to urban uses. Plan issues include:

- Conformance to 6% maximum vertical alignment with a functional soft approach -2% grade to Jane Street with flattening of the road profile through the intersections at Street B/C and Street D.

- Extensive filling will be required in the west part of the plan to achieve road grades conforming to Township Design Criteria. Fill slope transitions to native grades in the Heritage Buffer Zones may be an issue. More detailed grading plans, cross sections, development footprints and 3D visualizations are required for review.

- The termination of Street A (6% grade) in a T intersection at Street D creates an ‘unsafe’ intersection under adverse winter conditions. From a winter safety point of view, Street A and E should form a continuous horizontal alignment with stop signs on the local side streets not on the through linkage street. Plan revision should be considered.
The Applicant has proposed a deep sanitary sewer about 6 to 7 m below existing grade along Street E presumably to allow for servicing adjacent streets (Fig 2 enclosed). The deep sewer trench will interfere with shallow groundwater flow and natural seepage discharge to the adjacent Provincially Significant Wetlands and export groundwater infiltration including that from Low Impact Development (LID) Initiatives to the YDSS.

The proposed deep sewer trench along Street E is at a similar elevation to the East Humber River floodplain and perimeter seepage.

The Stormwater Management Low Impact Development Systems are highly engineered and require additional review. The piped storm sewers should be replaced by grass swales.

The Natural Heritage Buffer Zones do not recognize the East Humber River Valley Regional Flood Limits.

The Natural Heritage Buffers do not recognize potential slope stability along the East Humber Valley System especially in Block 106.

There are minor encroachments of the proposed Draft Plan into the proposed Natural Heritage Buffer Zones (Lucas Fig 17). Adjustments are required.

It is not clear if the buffer limits have been surveyed by an Ontario Land Surveyor and formally incorporated into the Draft Plan survey reference system.

Water wells on nearby Jane Street Lots at 13260, 13321, 13305, 13185, 13145 and 13295 should be considered for connection to communal water as part of this project. These wells are located in part in areas of High Aquifer Vulnerability. The Applicant’s Hydrogeology Report has not provided specific details on these private water supplies nor assessed the effects of development.

There is no formal specified use for other lands owned by the Applicant. There is no natural heritage justification for the location of Street D Temporary Turning Circle. There is no determination of Natural Heritage Buffers or proposal for sanitary servicing.

Similarly, there are no design details for the immediately adjacent Mansions of King Block B Medium Density Residential Area to assess the proposed Street E and Sanitary Sewer horizontal and vertical alignment suitability.
The Bushland Heights Application does not provide a conceptual design proposal for the Sanitary Pumping Station operational elevations to be located on Mansions of King lands. This is required to evaluate the proposed sanitary sewer invert elevations.

4.0 Landform Grading and Excess Fill Requirements

The origin of the Applicant’s contour elevations and centreline elevation on Jane Street is not clear. The Hunter contours and vertical alignment elevations are derived from the alternative York Region Open Data 2011 ‘1 m contours’ (Fig 1 and 2). At Jane Street these York Region contours are about 1m higher than the elevations utilized by Crozier. Contours may contain significant discrepancies in steep treed valley slope areas. These forested slopes for the most part are not surveyed in the Applicant Plan.

The Applicant has not provided cut and fill balance calculations and related mapping in support of its grading plan. The Applicant has not disclosed the quantity and quality of engineered fill required to reduce the existing steep Street A entrance grades to the Township of King 6% maximum vertical design criteria as shown in Crozier (June 2017) Fig 6 Preliminary Grading Plan and to install a gravity sanitary sewer collection and conveyance system to the proposed local sewer pumping station within the Mansions of King Area (Crozier Fig 5).

To illustrate the potential depth of cuts (and fills) required, Hunter has prepared a conceptual Street A/E vertical alignment Fig 2 considering the Township of King Design Criteria (August 2017). Hunter Fig 2 illustrates that the Street A existing ground east of Jane Street is a very steep 17%.

The Hunter Fig 2 shows the top (obvert) of the gravity sewer pipe at a minimum 2.75 m below the street elevation. The Applicant’s lower street elevation and much lower Sanitary Sewer invert elevation is also shown on this Figure. The Applicant may require the lower invert elevation to service the side streets and residential dwellings on lower ground. This deeper invert results in sewer trench depths 6 to 7 m below existing ground and below the site water tables.

The existing grade at Jane Street Centre Line is 293.0 m asl (Crozier 2017, Fig 5). The Crozier Street (Fig 6) and sanitary sewer (Fig 5) invert grades (from Crozier 2017) are provided for comparison purposes. Hunter has provided a softer -2.0% approach to the Jane Street Intersection. This leads to a higher Hunter vertical alignment of Street A all the way to the East Humber River tributary (EHTI).

The Applicant should prepare its own vertical alignment profile including the proposed Pumping Station Hydraulic Design. The Regional and 100-Year Flood Elevations should be considered in the Design.
A cut and fill depth map is required together with the volume, permeability and quality characteristics of any proposed imported fill to be engineered to facilitate street, dwelling and low impact development.

The Applicant’s Natural Heritage Evaluation (Beacon June 2017) and Hydrogeological and Water Balance Study (Terraprobe June 2015) have not considered the implications of building on fill on the western part of the development and deep fill footprints extending beyond the street right-of-ways and possibly into the Heritage buffer areas. The environmental effects of deep sewer trenches have not been considered. Slope stability and especially erosion may also be issues.

5.0 Natural Heritage Evaluation and Setbacks

The Natural Heritage Evaluations (Beacon 2017) has considered many of the regulated setbacks required by the Oak Ridges Moraine Plan (2002) and the various Upper Tier and Lower Tier Official Plans. However setbacks are not in conformity with the Township of King Official Plan.

However, the Applicant’s buffer setback Map (Beacon 2017, Fig 5) illustrates a fragmented series of buffers from natural features. Hunter Fig 1 for visual simplicity has presented an integrated approximate outer Natural Heritage (MVPZ) buffer limit for both Bushland Heights and Mansions of King (10 m setback). This Buffer Limit subject to Amendment of the Township of King Official Plan appears to be appropriate for setting development limits in Bushland Heights with the following notable exceptions:

1) No consideration of the Regional Flood Limit plus 10 m setback.

2) No consideration of possible roadway embankments extending outside the specified Street Right-of-Way. No consideration of the additional fill footprint and transition requirements.

3) No assessment of slope stability along the steep East Humber River Bank especially in Block 106 where the steep bank is about 9 m high.

4) No buffers from Natural Features have been shown in Street D Cul de Sac Temporary Turning Circle in the northeast quadrant.

5) Minor intrusions of development into the proposed Applicant buffer areas occur at a number of Lots (see also Lucas Fig 17).

6) No evidence is presented as to how the Development footprint considers Landform Conservation.
7) The Beacon Report has not been updated to the Amended Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (July 2017).

6.0 Hydrogeology and Water Budget Study (Terraprobe 2015)

The Terraprobe (2015) Report concluded for an earlier Draft Plan version that annual groundwater recharge would be reduced from about 27,000 m³ to 16,000 m³ (40% reduction) development and that runoff would be increased from 36,000 m³ to 85,000 m³ (240%). Terraprobe also concluded that 29,000 m³/year of clean rooftop runoff would be available for infiltration. However, the Terraprobe water budget text calculations are not consistent between s 3.13; 4.4 and 4.81 and Appendix H.

The calculations in the Tables do not ‘balance’ to the reported precipitation. Furthermore, the Terraprobe Appendix C April 2014 ‘Draft Plan of Subdivision’ with 125 residential dwellings is at variance with the Applicant’s Draft Plan of Proposed Subdivision dated August 8, 2017 with 88 residential dwellings.

Terraprobe in s4.5 has assumed that excavations for installation of sanitary sewer servicing will be completed within clayey silt with silt and sand. However, Terraprobe was apparently not aware that a part of the development may be constructed on ‘engineered fill’.

Terraprobe estimated the hydraulic conductivity of the onsite clay silt till at approximately $1 \times 10^{-6}$ m/s and that significant dewatering from open excavations would not be required (s 4.5). Terraprobe also considered that the site is not to be considered to be significant in terms of groundwater recharge due to the low permeability of soils encountered at the site. This comment is not rationalized with the Low Impact Development proposals in the Crozier report.

However, Terraprobe reports groundwater seepage in 9 of the 10 boreholes (to 6 m depth) installed on site upon completion of drilling. Utility installations will intercept this water table and seepage. Storm and sanitary services (infiltration) will convey this seepage off site to Lake Ontario. The Terraprobe Water Budget does not include a sewer infiltration component despite that an allowance is recognized in the Crozier sewer design (Appendix B). Low Impact Development infiltration as proposed may also be expected to be conveyed off site by the sewer systems and not reach the perimeter wetland seepage zones and the ‘small rivers coldwater habitat’ as described by Beacon.

The water level elevation on May 24, 2015 varied from 0.8 to 1.9 m. Water elevations varied from 274.4 (BH10) to 284.5 on May 24, 2015 (Note s3.11 Table Header Date error). These groundwater levels are well above the East Humber River floodplain and seepage levels. No seasonal groundwater monitoring has been provided for the more than two year period since boreholes were completed.
Terraprobe (pg 16, s3.11) advised that it is not possible to confirm the direction of groundwater flow on the property from the boreholes installed. Additional groundwater elevation data is required to confirm groundwater flow direction.

In summary, the Terraprobe Report has not addressed:

1) The direction of groundwater flow fundamental to impact assessment.

2) The issues of building on ‘fill’ soils on the western part of the site and on deep cut soils on the eastern part of the site as proposed by Crozier.

3) The maintenance of groundwater seepage to the adjacent Provincially Significant Wetlands in the face of 6 to 7 m deep utility trenches as proposed in the Functional Service Report for Street E (Crozier June 2017, Fig 5 and 6).

4) Internal errors and inconsistencies in its water budget calculations.

5) No sewer infiltration component (see Township of King Sewer Design Criteria, August 2017 and Crozier Appendix B).

6) Rationalization of its water budget and groundwater recharge estimates to the Conservation Authority Source Protection Water Budgets which took effect in December 31, 2015.

7.0 Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (2017)

The Applicant has not specifically and comprehensively addressed the provisions of ORMCP (2017) s 19(3) with respect to land in Settlement Areas of the Bushland Heights proposed Subdivision:

1. Sections 21 to 26
2. Subsection 27(3)
3. Sections 28 and 29
4. Subsections 30(1), (12) and (13)
5. The Table to this Part

Key unresolved issues are protection of the perimeter wetland seepage areas and keeping disturbance to landform character to a minimum. Sec 41, 43, 45 and 46 may also be applicable.
The Applicant has not addressed how perimeter sheet seepage to the Provincially Significant Wetlands and riverine coldwater habitat as identified in the Beacon Natural Heritage Report will be maintained and enhanced. Directing water to the Creeks from development will not compensate for loss of sheet perimeter seepage to the wetlands. The deep sewer system will also intercept part of the proposed Low Impact Development infiltration.

There is no evidence that planning design and construction practices have kept disturbance of landforms to a minimum on the developable area of this subdivision. The landform disturbed area of the August 8, 2017 Draft Plan (12.5 ha) is estimated at about 65% and based on the Crozier 50% impervious area estimate for the landform disturbed (developable) area the impervious area is about 35%.

8.0 Conclusion

Although the principle of development has been established for this Settlement Area, this Application is incomplete and has not demonstrated full compliance with the Oak Ridges Conservation Plan (2017) and derived Official Plan policies. A different form of development more consistent with Provincial Growth Plan density objectives to reduce the landform grading and impervious area proposed should be considered for this site.

Preparation of a Secondary Plan and Master Environmental Servicing Plan for the Jane Street and King Road Area is a priority before approval of a Draft Plan for the Bushland Heights (and Mansions of King) sites.

Yours truly,

Garry T. Hunter, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.
President
Hunter and Associates

cc: Kingscross Ratepayers Association

Encls: Fig 1 Overview Bushland Heights / Mansions of King
      Fig 2 Street A E Profile - Bushland Heights
April 25, 2018

BY E-MAIL (Gaspare Ritacca, gritacca@king.ca)

Township of King Planning Department
2075 King Rd., King City L7B 1A1

Attn: Gaspare Ritacca
Manager of Planning and Development

Re: Application for Official Plan Amendment, OP-2015-01
Application for Zoning By-Law Amendment, Z-2015-03
Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision, 19T-15K02
13245 Jane Street
Part of Lot 7, Concession 4
Township of King, York Region
(Bushland Heights Ltd., Developer: Milani Group)

This letter acknowledges receipt of the Official Plan Amendment Application OP-2015-01, Zoning By-Law Amendment Z-2015-03 and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 19T-15K02 to facilitate the development of a residential subdivision at 13245 Jane Street in the Township of King. Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff has reviewed the applications and the supporting materials listed in Appendix ‘B’ and offers the following comments.

Background
It is our understanding that the Owner has submitted official plan amendment, zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision applications to increase density, reduce the required environmental buffers and allow for varying lot sizes to facilitate the development of a residential subdivision consisting of 88 residential lots. In addition other lands owned by the applicant have been identified north west of the subject lands.

The subject lands are within the Humber River watershed. There are several natural features and hazards on or adjacent to the subject property, including but not limited to tributaries of the East Humber River which flow from the North and East side of the property and converge centrally before connecting with the main channel of the East Humber River south of the subject property. In addition, a Top of Slope, Regulatory Floodplain (engineered and estimated) and Provincial Significant Wetland (Eaton Hall – Mary – Hackett Lakes Wetland Complex) are present on the site. There are also potential species at risk (SAR), Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA), Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) and Well Head Protection Area – Quantity (WHPA-Q2).
Applicable Policies
The Living City
The Living City Policies for Planning and Development in the Watersheds of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (LCP) describes a “Natural System” made up of water resources, natural features and areas, natural hazards, potential natural cover and/or buffers. The LCP recommends that development, infrastructure and site alteration not be permitted within the Natural System. The LCP also provides policies for developing adjacent to, and in, the Natural System (where permitted), while minimizing impacts to, maintaining, and enhancing the functions of the protected Natural System. These policies also seek to integrate the natural and built environments, maximizing opportunities for ecosystem services from across the entire landscape. It is these policies that guide TRCA’s review of the subject application, along with those found in other Provincial and municipal plans, documents and guidelines.

TRCA staff has reviewed the above noted applications, and as per the LCP, provides the following comments as part of TRCA’s commenting role under the Planning Act; the Authority’s delegated responsibility of representing the provincial interest on natural hazards encompassed by Section 3.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014; TRCA’s Regulatory Authority under Ontario Regulation 166/06, Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses; our advisory role to the Township with respect to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP); and, our Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Region of York, wherein we provide technical environmental advice.

General Comments
Based on our review, TRCA staff has several comments which have been detailed in Appendix ‘A’. In general, we note the following major items with respect to the current submission:

A. Additional information is required about the natural features and natural hazards on the site, particularly where they may impact the limits of development or crossing locations.
   • The lands are subject to the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP), 2017 and are located within a settlement area. Further information is required to establish if the natural features present are significant, their limits and the Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone (MVPZ).
   • The OPA proposes significant reductions in the buffers to the environmental protection lands which contain natural features and hazards. TRCA understands that the Township of King requires a 30m buffer be applied to any environmental protection areas within the settlement area. TRCA continues to support the Townships requirements for conformance with the King City Community Plan.
   • Ensure that all natural features and hazards as per TRCA’s LCP and associated buffers factored into the limits of development accordingly. Refer to more detailed comments provided in Appendix B.
   • The natural hazards have not been evaluated in full. Clarification on the location of the Regulatory flood plain, meander belt and long term stable slope line associated with the tributaries and main branch of the East Humber River is required.

A plan showing all natural features, natural hazards and their associate buffers is required. This plan would show the existing constraints and opportunities on the site.

B. The Landform Conservation report is to be revised and to follow the ORMCP technical paper #4 to ensure proper conservation of lands. Significant grading and filling is proposed throughout the subject lands and given the existing topography appropriate grading will be challenging. All efforts are to be made to reduce impacts to the landscape and minimize grading. No grading is to occur within buffers. TRCA will not support retaining walls within and immediately adjacent to
the buffers/MVPZs. Cross sections throughout the site which clearly displays the extent of cut and fill ultimately proposed are required.

C. TRCA does not have a level of comfort that the site water balance will meet the post to pre requirements of the Clean Water Act or ensuring the natural features and functions will be maintained.

D. The submitted Natural Heritage Evaluation is lacking in a number of aspects to clearly identify the significant features, conclusions and recommendations appropriately.

E. TRCA requires the proposed stormwater management provide post to pre development controls as the site drains to tributaries of the East Humber River and not the main branch. In addition, a level of feasibility that LIDs can be achieved spatially in context with the final plan is required.

F. TRCA does not support the proposed crossing and cul de sac to the ‘other lands owned by applicant’ given there is no active planning act application presently proposed for these lands.

G. TRCA continues to recommend the preparation of a coordinated FS/DAS for the subject site and the neighbouring lands to the east. The FS/DAS would provide the foundation for the successful integration of this new community with the surrounding community and the natural environment. Matters such as stormwater management, water and sanitary servicing, transportation, trail connectivity, public open spaces, and transition to adjacent neighbourhoods would be best addressed in a coordinated fashion with a full understanding of the opportunities and constraints in the area.

H. It has come to our attention that a new culvert has been installed in the vicinity of the proposed southern crossing within the PSW and within the floodplain. This work occurred without a permit under Ontario Regulation 166/06. TRCA requires a site visit to establish the extent of impact and approach to address this issue.

As changes to the development limits requested above will impact other aspects of the project, such as stormwater management, water balance and landform conservation. As a result, TRCA comments on future submissions may point out issues and concerns not noted in this letter. However, it is hoped that we can set up working sessions with the applicants, consultants and Township to work through these issues in order to lessen the number of comments we may have on future submissions.

**Recommendation**


The applicant is asked to provide TRCA with a letter detailing how each of our comments has been addressed. Four (4) copies of the letter and all revised plans and reports must be submitted to TRCA for our review. A digital copy of all materials is also required.

TRCA staff reserves any further comments at this time, until we have had an opportunity to review the requested information. Please note that this letter is based on TRCA’s current policies and regulation, which may change from time to time. Any future development proposal would be subject to the policies and regulation in effect at the time of application.
Fees
By copy of this letter, the Owner is advised that these applications are subject to a $68,565 TRCA planning review application fee ($59,325 for a complex draft plan of subdivision application 10ha to 25ha plus a $105/unit fee at 88 units equaling $9,240). The Owner is asked to forward this fee to our office as soon as possible. It should also be noted that this project will be subject to a clearance fee at the time of clearance, which will be based on the fee schedule in effect at that time.

We trust these comments are of assistance. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Should you have any questions, please contact me at extension 5307 or at cbonner@trca.on.ca

Regards,

Colleen Bonner, MES, RPP
Senior Planner
Planning and Development
Extension 5307

c.c.: Glenn Lucas, gilucas@rogers.com
Sara Brockman, sara.brockman@york.ca
Appendix A: TRCA's Detailed Comments

TRCA staff offers the following comments to the applicant and consulting team:

Planning Staff Comments
1. Please see comments A through H in the cover letter.

2. Limits of Development
   a. Additional information is required to confirm the extent of the significant features as per the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) (2017). Upon confirmation of the status and limits, the significant features are to be reflected on a Constraints and Opportunities plan. TRCA continues to support the King City Community Plan which requires 30m buffer from environmental protection lands which contain significant natural features and hazards.

   b. Based on correspondence with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) the tributaries of the East Humber River are Redside dace contributing habitat and the main branch is occupied habitat. Ensure the analysis of the Headwater Drainage Features (HDF) is considered in establishing the contributing habitat. As per the Endangered Species Act, the meander belt plus a 30m buffer is required. Clearly identify the location of the meander belt for the tributaries, main branch and the 30m buffer on the drawing and updated the development limits accordingly.

   c. The following limits, buffers and aspects are to be applied to the natural features and hazards on and immediately adjacent to the subject lands as per TRCA’s LCP:
      i. Finalized Staked Top of Slope +10m buffer
         - Along the Western staked top of slope, please connect stakes 256 to 257 and 260 to 261 along the elevation of 275masl.
         - TRCA agrees with the connection of the Top of Slope stakes 271 and 273 at the southern farm crossing. Stake 272 may be removed.
      ii. Long Term Stable Slope Line +10m buffer
      iii. Finalized Staked Provincially Significant Wetland +30m buffer
      iv. Engineered Floodplain +10m buffer
      v. Meander Belt +10m buffer

   d. And finally ensure the following are included on the Constraints and Opportunities plan:
      i. Contour plan at 1m
      ii. Limit of Development based on the consolidated greatest constraint of the buffers
      iii. Proposed parcel fabric

   It is to be noted, upon confirmation of appropriate limits of development no grading or filling is to be proposed within the buffers.

3. As per item A above, significant buffer reductions to the lands identified as environmental protect under the King City Community Plan are proposed. Historically, reduced buffers have been acceptable at pinch point locations, however the extent proposed by this development is quite extensive and significant. TRCA does not support the reductions as proposed.

4. As per item B above, the Landform Conservation report is to be revised and follow the ORMCP technical paper #4 to ensure proper conservation of lands. The intent of the plan should be to minimize the amount of cut/fill and net deficit or surplus. All efforts are to be made to reduce impacts to the landscape and minimize grading. No grading is to occur within the buffers. TRCA will not
support retaining walls within and immediately adjacent to the buffers/MVPZs. Cross sections throughout the site which clearly displays the extent of cut and fill ultimately proposed are required.

5. A road, crossing and cul-de-sac are proposed to the other lands owned by the applicant. These lands are not presently subject to a development application. As such the road, crossing and cul-de-sac are to be removed from the subject application and the road is to terminate outside of the established limits of development.

6. Please reconfigure the cul-de-sac on the south of the property to reduce the footprint into any buffers.

7. Road alignment with Mansions of King – Ensure that appropriate road alignment with the Mansions of King subdivision to the East of the subject property occurs. TRCA recognizes there is a pinch point in this area between the north and south significant features. An assessment which evaluates the features, their sensitivity and how to minimize impact and encroachment into the buffers by the road is to be provided.

8. TRCA does not support a culvert crossing within the PSW to gain access to the east side of the subject lands. A bridge which is appropriately spans and conforms with TRCA’s Crossing Guideline for Valley and Stream Corridors, Sept 2015 is to be provided.

Natural Heritage/Ecology
9. It appears that the original breeding bird surveys did not use the standard Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas protocol. As a result the information provided may be incomplete. As such, TRCA requires the subject lands to be re-surveyed utilizing the Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas protocol.

10. It appears Headwater Drainage Features were not assessed in the initial field seasons. Please confirm the presence/absence of headwater drainage features on the property. Based on aerial mapping there are potential Headwater Drainage Features within the ELC units CUM1 and CUT1. Headwater Drainage Feature surveys are to be completed in the upcoming season ensuring the timing covers the Spring freshet. Ensure that the HDFs assessment discusses the potential contribution of these features to the Redside Dace habitat.

Updates required for the Natural Heritage Evaluation
11. Based on the fish community present TRCA agrees that a coolwater/coldwater fish community is more indicative for the area as described on page 19 of the NHE. It should be noted that the Humber River Management Plan is outdated and updated field studies are to be utilized to enhance environmental decisions.

12. On page 29 of the Natural Heritage Evaluation two tables are mentioned outlining Species of Conservation Concern and rare Oak Ridges Moraine vascular plants however only 1 of the two tables was presented. Table 2 is located on page 19 and provides fish capture information. Please provide the above noted missing table and any analysis required for it. Please clearly outline where these sensitive species occur onsite as their relocation may be a potential mitigation method.


14. Please include mitigation and enhancement measures to be included in buffer areas such as turtle nesting, snake hibernacula, bat boxes, log tangles in order to create a heterogenic ecosystem beneficial for multiple organisms.
Mr. Ritacca  
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15. Provide additional maps clearly outlining the staked feature limits and their required buffers. Currently, the Figures 4 and 5 of the Natural Heritage Evaluation difficult to clearly read. Please refer to comment 2 above and revise Figures 4 & 5 accordingly.

16. All buffer reduction areas are to be quantified and justification for the requested reduction provided. It does not appear apparent on Figure 4 or within the text on page 33-34 of the Natural Heritage Evaluation where woodlands have been identified as significant or not significant woodlands.

17. Figure 4: The dark green line appears to reflect the Significant Woodland A, which extends beyond the property line. TRCA requests that feature delineation be limited to the property proposed for development.

18. Clarify if the 30m Regulated Redside Dace Habitat line on Page 4 represents the meander belt or the 100 year erosion rate.

Oak Ridges Moraine requirements

19. Please clarify where the “other woodlands” exist on site as stated in section 5.3 of the NHE. Please provide a Significant Woodland Evaluation for the “other woodlands” on site that have not been deemed significant. Please note the description of significant woodlands on page 4 of the NHE is not comprehensive.

20. EHT1-1 and EHT-1 area not considered Significant Valleys as described on page 34. Please utilize the ORMCP Technical Paper Significant Valley definition to clearly demonstrate why these reaches do not meet Significant Valley criteria.

21. Page 35: Please clarify if the wetland or the woodland is considered Significant Wildlife Habitat as it is stated the woodland is Significant Wildlife Habitat but the paragraph discusses the wetland/pond in depth.

22. Page 36, Table 4: Significant Wildlife Habitat is stated as not designated, however on the preceding page it states “the only identified SWH is Amphibian Breeding Habitat (woodland).” Please clarify the conflicting information and update Table 4 in the NHE accordingly.

23. As per page 41, seeps have been identified on the property. Please map and identify where seepage areas exist and apply their corresponding buffers.

24. Demonstrate how the proposed development conforms to the Landform Conservation Area 2. TRCA does not support utilizing “Other Lands Owned by the Applicant” that may in future bring the entire property into conformity. TRCA evaluates the current proposed development as it is presented. Alternatively, the applicant can provide a development plan for the entire property at once and the required environmental due diligence.

MNRF requirements

25. Figure 4 Natural Heritage Features has a 30m dashed line indicating Regulated Redside Dace Habitat. As the two tributaries onsite are considered contributing Redside Dace Habitat by MNRF (as per correspondence dated January 19, 2015) those tributaries may have additional habitat and buffer requirements from MNRF. Please provide any MNRF correspondence in relation to this issue and ensure all MNRF requirements are presented and adhered to going forward.

26. As there are two potential wetland lines TRCA requests the applicant send the wetland survey to MNRF and work with MNRF to agree on a finalized wetland map layer that TRCA can formally
recognize. In addition, please update the mapping to include all wetlands that may have been removed but MNRF recognizes. TRCA understands that Beacon may not recognize these wetlands (page 24 of the Natural Heritage Evaluation) but MNRF is the regulating body and as such these features need to be mapped on the proposed development mapping with appropriate buffers.

27. Please consult with MNRF to see if they have requirements related to Savannah Sparrow and Eastern Wood Pewee.

28. Please provide any additional information that may have been obtained from an MNRF site visit in May 2017 or later as stated on page 32 in the NHE.

**Buffers & Limits**

29. TRCA does not support the reduction of buffers to Significant Woodland. The ELC unit has high quality species and the long standing presence of Eastern Wood Pewees (TRCA records).

30. In addition, appropriate bird surveys and turtle surveys have not been completed. As turtle surveys were not completed a statement stating no turtles were found on the property on page 41 is potentially inaccurate and thus the claim about reduced buffer sizes is based on limited information.

31. TRCA does recognize that consultation with MNRF regarding reduced buffers for Species at Risk are ongoing and look forward to future discussions. Please provide all MNRF correspondence.

32. On Page 41 please remove the sentence “these MVPZs are consistent with those required under the ORMCP, and King Township policy” as this is an incorrect statement.

33. As the consensus on buffer sizes has not been reached in the scientific literature the paragraphs on page 42 of the Natural Heritage Evaluation should be removed unless a thorough and complete literature review of both reduced and increased buffer sizes is produced to create a comprehensive assessment of the current literature.

34. On page 44 of the Natural Heritage Evaluation please remove the statement “In settlement area on the ORMCP and across the GTA 10m on dripline has become a standard buffer to protect significant woodlands from adjacent development” as it is inaccurate.

35. Please note there is a registered Heritage Site south of the property and it may influence some buffer requirements from the East Humber River Valley.

36. Please identify any potential outfall or storm water discharge locations if applicable as the EIS can identify preferred areas of discharge.

**Geotech**

37. A geotechnical study which assesses the Long Term Stable Top of Slope line (LTSTS) has not been provided. There are a number of steep slopes on the property. The heights of the slopes range from 3 to 6 m and the inclinations generally range from 1.2H: 1V to 2.7H: 1V and, as such, a supplementary geotechnical investigation/ slope analysis is required to accurately delineate the long-term stable top of slope. Moreover, the geotechnical report is to be stamped and signed by a licensed Professional Engineer.

**Scope of work**

38. The scope of work for the geotechnical study is as follows:
a. A topographical survey is required to illustrate the slope features including existing top of slope, contours of the slope, toe of the slope, watercourse, etc;

b. Boreholes should be drilled to determine the native soil stratigraphy;

c. In-situ and lab tests should be carried out, to identify the soil stratigraphy encountered throughout the entire slope, and to determine the soil strength parameters required for slope stability analysis;

d. Piezometers should be installed in select boreholes to measure groundwater levels. Groundwater levels should be measured right after the boreholes are drilled and when the groundwater levels have stabilized in the piezometers;

39. The location of the long-term stable top of slope should be determined as follows:

a. A sufficient number of cross-sections based on the topography (e.g. slope height and inclination) and slope features that represent the critical slope conditions, obtained from the detailed and accurate topographical information, should be analyzed;

b. Long-term stable slope allowances (setbacks) should be determined and correctly incorporated into each cross-section to delineate the long-term stable top of slope for each cross-section. The minimum acceptable safety factor is 1.50;

c. Slope stability analysis utilizes the limit equilibrium method of slices to calculate the long-term stable slope inclination in the different strata throughout the slope. The Bishop, Spencer or Morgenstern-Price methods can be used for the slope stability analysis. The slope stability analysis should be performed by using either SLIDE or SLOPE/W;

d. Any stabilization effects of existing retaining structures on slopes should be ignored when delineating the long-term stable top of slope.

40. The cross-sections, methodology, parameters and test results should be presented in the report. The cross-sections should clearly show both the toe erosion and long-term stable slope allowances as well as the long-term stable top of slope on the tableland and the setback from the existing top of slope. The long-term stable top of slope line should also be shown on the site plan.

**Water Quantity**

41. The site drains to tributaries of the East Humber River, please control post-development to pre-development levels. It is imperative that we respect the tributaries and provide flow controls.

42. Confirm and demonstrate that there will be no external drainage areas through the subject site.

**LID Design (Water Quality, Erosion Control)**

43. Please note that while detailed specifications are not required at this time, the functional SWM design is to provide confirmation that all criteria can be met. TRCA requires a level of feasibility that the proponent has considered all spatial requirements and the proposed techniques will achieve the required targets. Please resubmit and provide confirmation that the water quality and erosion control targets can be met including volumetric sizing and placement of any required mitigation footprints.

44. Please demonstrate that the mitigation measures proposed will achieve the required 80% TSS removal. Should it be of assistance, a new tool has been released on the STEP website to help with

**Floodplain Management/Development Limits**

45. Provide updated Engineering HEC-RAS modeling for the reaches through the subject site based on site specific base mapping. In addition, provide details of the basemap used for the HEC-RAS model for the subject site. TRCA will utilize the HEC-RAS model and associated floodplain mapping in our Floodplain Mapping program once approved by TRCA Engineering staff. Ensure the standards identified in TRCA’s SWM guideline are achieved. Should you have any questions about this guideline, please contact Mike Todd at mtodd@trca.on.ca.

46. Please note that while full details for the hydraulic analysis can be confirmed at detailed design, the modeling is required at this time to determine the development limits. It would be advantageous to complete all the modeling at this time, therefore provide a hydraulic analysis for the watercourse crossings to demonstrate there are no increases in flooding as a result of the proposed roads. Also demonstrate that there is safe access to the eastern side of the proposed development.

47. Please illustrate and label the flood line on all relevant drawings and agreed upon development limit.

48. Please verify if cutting and filling works within the Regional floodplain are proposed. If so, an incremental cut fill balance is required.

49. Provide details how the runoff will connect to the receiving watercourse.

**Hydrogeologic Study and Water Balance**

50. This site is within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan (ORMCP) boundaries, as well as subject to the WHPA-Q source water policies. As such, a water balance is required. Please explore all opportunities to provide measures for mitigation of infiltration (recharge), evapotranspiration and runoff impacted by the development and provide the location, details and supporting calculations demonstrating the pre-development conditions will be met during post-development conditions. Please explore all opportunities to meet the water balance for all components of the water balance.

51. There appears to be discrepancies between the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report and the Hydrogeologic Study and Water Balance. Please review the list below and revise as necessary:
   a. The drainage areas do not match between the two reports.
   b. The Terraprobe analysis indicates that the SWM Strategy involves 3 SWM Ponds, whereas the FSSR denotes the SWM Strategy is with LIDs only.
   c. The Terraprobe analysis indicates that the groundwater level is shallow and will not effectively provide infiltration, however the SWM strategy in the FSSR does not discuss the Terraprobe analysis and does not stipulate the water level.
   d. The number of dwellings does not agree between the two reports.

52. Please include discussion within the FSSR summarizing the findings of the water balance report, and demonstrate how the mitigation measures proposed will meet the requirements noted above in Comment#50.

53. The report is to be amended to include a discussion on the adjacent wetlands, and the potential impact of the proposed development. Ensure that the site water balance parameters established are reasonable and that the natural features (wetland, watercourse, significant woodland and valley) will be maintained post-development.
54. The shallow depth to groundwater suggests low recharge, but given topographic differences across the site, infiltration measures should be possible. The hydrogeologic mitigation recommendations in the report are not sufficient to meet the REC-1 policy of the CTC Source Protection Plan. Additional mitigation measures and infiltration targets are to be provided at this time.
Appendix B: List of Materials Reviewed

December 5, 2018 Submission:

- Application to Amend the Official Plan, Zoning By-law and Approval of Draft Plan of Subdivision
- Draft Zoning By-law, Official Plan Amendment
- Draft Plan of Subdivision dated March 1, 2017
- Property Survey
- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Crozier & Assoc. Dated June 2017
- Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Terraprobe, dated August 7, 2015
- Hydrogeologic Study and Water Balance, prepared by Terraprobe, dated June 19, 2017
- Natural Heritage Evaluation, prepared by Beacon, dated June 2017
- Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity Assessment, prepared by Lucas & Assoc. August 2017
February 9, 2018

Mr. Gaspare Ritacca, MCIP, RPP
Manager of Planning and Development
Township of King
2075 King Road
King City, ON  L7B 1A1

Re: Official Plan Amendment Application - OP-2015-01
(Bushland Heights Ltd.)
Part Lot 7, Concession 4
13245 Jane Street, King City
Township of King

York Region is in receipt of the above noted preliminary Official Plan Amendment (OPA) application. The subject site is municipally known as 13245 Jane Street, and is located on the east side of Jane Street, north of King Road in the Community of King City. The subject site is approximately 12.54 hectares in size. In addition to the OPA, the owner has also submitted applications for a zoning by-law amendment and draft plan of subdivision.

The purpose of this OPA application is to facilitate a proposed residential plan of subdivision consisting of 88 single family residential dwelling lots, natural heritage block, natural heritage buffer blocks, municipal roads and a Jane Street widening block, by amending the King City Community Plan:

1) To re-designate the subject lands from “Estate Residential 3 Area” and “Environmental Protection Area” to “Low Density Residential 1 Area” (with site specific special policies) and “Environmental Protection Area”;
2) To permit a maximum net density of approximately 9 units per hectare; and,
3) To establish reductions in the required minimum vegetative buffers.

The existing King City Community Plan policies for the subject lands permit a maximum gross density of 1 unit per hectare in the existing Estate Residential 3 Area designation. A maximum
Proposed Official Plan Amendment

OP-2015-01

gross density of 5 to 6 units per hectare is permitted in the current Low Density Residential 1 Area designation. These applications are proposing a net density of 9 units per hectare. The Draft King Official Plan: One King (November 6, 2017) is looking to designate the subject lands as “Low Density Residential Area”, “Special Development Area 4”, and “Natural Heritage System”. The maximum density permitted in the Low Density Residential Area of the new draft King OP is 7 units per gross hectare. Higher densities may be considered subject to satisfying specific policies. The Special Development Area policies require a Comprehensive Development Plan prior to any applications proceeding on these lands.

The proposed development would result in a net density (excluding Natural Heritage System and buffer lands) of 41.5 persons per hectare.

Planning Policy Context
The subject lands are within the “Settlement Area” designation as per the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan and are designated “Towns and Villages” on Map 1 of the York Region Official Plan - 2010 (YROP-2010). Map 2 shows a portion of the subject lands within the Regional Greenslands System. A watercourses (East Humber River and tributaries) and wetlands Provincially Significant Wetlands (Eaton Hall Mary-Hacket PSW) are located the subject site (Map 4), as well as a woodland (Map 5). The site is within Wellhead Protection Areas B, C & D (WHPA-B, C & D) (Map 6), an Area of High Aquifer Vulnerability (Map 7), a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (Map 13), a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (Map 14), and within Recharge Management Area (WHPA-Q) based on current mapping. Jane Street is a Regional Road with a planned street width of up to 36 metres (Map 12). The lands are also within a Category 2 Landform Conservation Area (Figure 1).

Regional Planning Comments
The YROP-2010 contains a number of policies which seek to guide the development of healthy, complete communities in all Settlement Areas. YROP-2010 Policy 5.2.14 requires that the designated greenfield area achieve an average minimum density that is not less than 50 residents and jobs per hectare combined in the developable area. Further, Policy 5.2.15 states that approved secondary plans within the designated greenfield area that are not completely built should be re-examined to determine if 50 residents and jobs per hectare in the developable area can be achieved. Through the “One King” process, we recognize that King Township is undertaking a municipal comprehensive review for a new official plan and secondary plans, which includes the King City Community Plan. These minimum densities, along with the densities proposed, will be reviewed accordingly in the context of King City and the Township’s growth management strategy. As such, we recommend the Planning Justification Report be amended to clearly address as to how the densities and associated population proposed by this OPA is in keeping with the growth management initiatives for King City outlined in the current King City Community Plan, as well as those proposed through the “One King” process to date. We also recommend the Planning Justification Report be updated to provide the following information/ clarification:
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- More detailed information is required regarding the gross density calculation of this proposal.
- The proposal is based upon a coordinated approach with the adjacent lands to the east (Mansions of King) as it is relying on street and servicing connection from these lands. Confirmation is required as to the status of the Street E connection with the adjacent lands to the east. Previous plans circulated to York Region for the Mansions of King application did not show the Street E connection, although we understand that that possibility was being explored and provided comment on a potential connection. Please also see comments below from Transportation Planning regarding Street E.
- Clarification is required as to “the range of housing” being proposed as part of this proposal (p. 17).
- Please update the report to address all applicable policies of the YROP-2010, including but not limited to, Chapters 2 and 5.

Part II, Section 2.2 of the Draft OPA needs to be amended to reflect the number of residential units (88 units) to the proposed, not 126.

Another objective of the YROP-2010 is the delivery of water and wastewater services in a safe, sustainable, and fiscally responsible manner. To this end, new development occurring within the ‘Towns and Villages’ designation is required to proceed by way of comprehensive secondary plans based on, among other things, the availability of water and wastewater services (policy 5.6.22). See comments from Infrastructure Asset Management below.

As mentioned above, a portion of the subject lands are located within the Regional Greenlands System. The Regional Greenlands System identified in Map 2 of the YROP-2010 is conceptual and is intended to be identified more specifically in the local municipal official and secondary plans (policies 2.1.3 and 2.1.5). Furthermore, the YROP-2010 permits the boundaries of the Regional Greenlands System to be refined, without the need for an amendment, as the result of an approved planning application where such a refinement is supported by the appropriate technical study (policy 2.1.7). Development and site alteration is prohibited within the Regional Greenlands System and applications for development within 120 metres are required to submit an Environmental Impact Study (policy 2.1.9). A Natural Heritage Evaluation (NHE), Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity and a Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan, have been submitted in support of this OPA application.

The YROP-2010 requires a minimum Vegetation Protection Zone of 30 metres for Key Natural Heritage Features located on the Oak Ridges Moraine including: wetlands, seepages areas and springs, fish habitat, permanent streams, intermittent streams, significant valleylands, significant woodlands, sand barrens, savannahs, tallgrass prairies and kettle lakes (policy 2.2.15). However, it also allows for the establishment of alternative minimum Vegetation Protection Zones (VPZ) within ‘Towns and Villages’, where there are approved secondary plans, official plans, zoning by-laws and/or Master Environmental Servicing or Functional Servicing plans in place that have identified other standards than those identified in the Oak Ridges
Moraine Conservation Plan (policy 2.2.26). The applicant is proposing encroachments into the VPZs in some areas.

York Region relies on the TRCA to review and provide comment on natural heritage matters related to the Regional Greenslands System and associated applicable provincial plans. We understand that TRCA is still in the process on conducting their review of this application. We defer to the TRCA and their review of the Natural Heritage Evaluation in determination of the appropriateness of the VPZ intrusions; however, we encourage the applicant to explore opportunities to further avoid these areas and/or reduce the encroachments. We also recommend that the Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity Report be updated to clearly outline how the proposed development conforms with all of the applicable policies as per 18 (3), including 19 (3) & 31 (4). York Region requests that a copy of TRCA comments be provided for our review and further comment as the effect of these comments may impact the proposed OPA and related draft plan of subdivision.

Regional staff encourages the proposed development to have an integrated and innovative approach to water management, be water efficient, and minimize stormwater volumes and contaminant loads and maximize infiltration through an integrated treatment approach (Policy 5.2.11). Staff also encourage the development to be designed to achieve energy efficiency levels that exceed the Ontario Building Code (Policy 5.2.20); to achieve 10% greater water efficiency than the Ontario Building Code (Policy 5.2.22); be designed to maximize solar gains, be constructed in a manner that facilitates future solar installations (i.e. solar ready) (Policy 5.2.26); and, incorporate green building standards, such as LEED®, ENERGY STAR®, or other emerging technologies (Policy 7.5.12).

Regional Technical Review Comments
The proposed OPA application was considered by staff from various Regional Departments. The following comments have been provided with respect to this application:

Transportation Planning
Transportation Planning staff in coordination with staff from Traffic Signal Operations, Development Engineering and YRT/Viva have reviewed the proposed OPA application. Based on their review, they have no objection to the proposed OPA application subject to the following:

- That the draft OPA be amended to include the following policy:
  
  x.x A vehicular connection shall be implemented to connect to the adjacent development on the east side (Mansions of King) by extending Street E.

The following comments have also been provided with respect to the Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) prepared by LEA Consulting dated August 2017:

- The TIA is not consistent with York Region Transportation Mobility Plan Guidelines for Development Applications (2016). Please revise the TIA accordingly.
The proposed development is proposing a full move access onto Jane Street. However, no improvements/turn lanes are recommended to accommodate development traffic from both operational and safety perspective. This section of Jane Street currently has a two lane cross-section with a posted speed limit of 70 km/h. An exclusive southbound left turn lane and an exclusive northbound right turn lane are required at Jane Street/Proposed Access intersection to accommodate turning vehicles in and out of the proposed development.

- Street E is proposed to be a cul-de-sac at the east end of the proposed development. However, the Region recommends the OPA includes a policy requiring the protection of an interconnection between the subject development and adjacent development to the east (Mansions of King). This interconnection should be coordinated, assessed and described in the TIA. A conceptual plan shall be included in the TIA to show the interconnection. In addition, the site plan drawings should be clearly marked for protecting a future vehicular interconnection.

- The TIA shall include a conceptual design drawing showing the access improvements and turn lanes at the access onto Jane Street to the satisfaction of York Region.

- The TIA shall include a drawing showing the locations of the pedestrian/cycling facilities internally and connections to the adjacent roadways.

Our above noted comments shall be addressed prior to providing further comments on the related development applications. Additional comments may be provided once an updated study is submitted for our review.

**Infrastructure Asset Management (IAM) Branch**

The IAM Branch of the Environmental Services Department advises that the residential development proposed with the application will require water and wastewater servicing allocation from the Township of King. If the Township of King does not grant this development the required allocation from the Region’s existing capacity assignments to date, then the development may require additional infrastructure based on conditions of future capacity assignment, which may include:

- Duffin Creek WPCP Outfall Modifications – 2021 pending the outcome of the Class EA currently underway
- Other projects as may be identified in future studies.

The timing of the above infrastructure is the current estimate and may change as each infrastructure project progresses and is provided for information purposes only.

Based on our desktop review of the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report (FSR) prepared by C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc., dated June 2017, it is our understanding that
the wastewater and water servicing are provided through the proposed "Mansions of King" subdivision located adjacent to the subject development. The wastewater will ultimately be discharged into York Region's King City Sanitary Pumping Station (SPS) located near Keele Street and King Road. This pumping station was originally designed to service the Community Plan residential population of 12,000 persons and associated employment. The additional increase in population from the ongoing OPAs in King City, including the subject development, will have a potential impact on the capacity of the King City Pump Station and associated linear infrastructure. Although minor impacts may be manageable through the ongoing water conservation programs and Infiltration and Inflow Reduction Strategy, significant increase in population beyond 12,000 persons may require an upgrade of the King City Sewage Pumping Station.

As such, further confirmation is required as to how the proposed development associated with this OPA addresses the comment above.

**Water Resources**

Water Resources has no concerns with respect to the proposed OPA and notes the site is located within WHPAs C & D on the Oak Ridges Moraine, and is within a WHPA-Q (Recharge Management Area), partially within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) and SGRA.

As the property is within a Wellhead Protection Area and within the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan Boundary, under the Regional Official Plan please note that there is a prohibition on the following activities, listed below, on the site associated with the storage, manufacture or use of:

-  petroleum-based fuels and or solvents;
-  pesticides, herbicides, fungicides or fertilizers;
-  construction equipment;
-  inorganic chemicals;
-  road salt and contaminants as identified by the Province;
-  the generation and storage of hazardous waste or liquid industrial waste, and waste disposal sites and facilities;
-  organic soil conditioning sites and the storage and application of agricultural and non-agricultural source organic materials; and,
-  snow storage and disposal facilities.

A Section 59 Notice from York Region's Water Resources group may be required prior to the filling of any future development or planning applications.

Should the proposed development include bulk fuel or bulk chemicals within the HVA, a Contaminant Management Plan (CMP) will be required prior to future Draft Plan of Subdivision approval, for Water Resources review and approval.

Please note the property is partially located within a SGRA and entirely within the WHPA-Q. As such the CTC Source Protection Plan water quantity recharge maintenance policy will apply. The
water-source-protection/trsppa-water-balance-tool/) should be consulted. The contact person for the scoping and review of the water balance for Source Protection Plan conformity is Don Ford at TRCA.

The owner is advised that Low Impact Development (LID) measures are encouraged to be applied to the site. As per York Region Official Plan policy 2.3.37, developments should maximize infiltration through integrated treatment approach techniques to minimize stormwater volume and contaminant loads. This should include, but not be limited to, techniques such as rainwater harvesting, phosphorus reduction, constructed wetlands, bioretention swales, green roofs, permeable surfaces, clean water collection systems, and the preservation and enhancement of native vegetation cover. The use of the following resource is encouraged: Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide and is available using the following link: http://www.creditvalleyca.ca/low-impact-development/low-impact-development-support/stormwater-management-lid-guidance-documents/low-impact-development-stormwater-management-planning-and-design-guide/

Should significant dewatering be required, a dewatering plan shall be prepared by a qualified person and submitted by the proponent to the Region for approval prior to excavation. If there will be water discharging to the Regional storm or sanitary sewer, it is recommended that the proponent consult with Regional Sewer use by-law group and obtain a dewatering discharge permit as necessary. Please contact the Sewer Use By-law group at SewerUsebylaw@york.ca or 1-877-464-9675.

As the site is within a wellhead protection area, Water Resources does encourage the use of best management practices during construction and post construction with respect to the handling and storage of chemicals (such as used oil, degreasers and salt) on site. It is strongly recommended that Risk Management Measures are put in place with respect to chemical use and storage including spill kits, secondary containment, a spill response plan and training.

As the site is within a vulnerable area, Water Resources recommends the use of a contractor who is certified by Smart About Salt, and use of best management practices identified in the TAC Synthesis of Best Management Practices for Salt and Snow are followed: http://tac-atc.ca/en/bookstore-and-resources/free-resources-and-tools/syntheses-practice

Summary
Given the potential for change to the OPA and draft plan of subdivision, we await resolution to the comments above in order to provide additional comments. Upon receiving the requested information outlined in this letter, we will continue our review and provide further comment on this application and the related applications. York Region staff is available to provide assistance throughout this application process should it be required.

Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact Sara Brockman, Senior Planner, at extension 75750, or by email at sara.brockman@york.ca.
Should you have any questions or require further information, please contact Sara Brockman, Senior Planner, at extension 75750, or by email at sara.brockman@york.ca.

Yours truly,

Karen Whitney, MCIP, RPP
Director, Community Planning and Development Services

SB/

c. Coreena Smith, TRCA – by e-mail only
York Region Review Team
1. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

   Administration respectfully submits the following recommendations:

   a) That Administration Report No. ED-2019-02 be received;
   b) AND THAT Council support an integrated comprehensive four pillar approach to Main Street Schomberg Revitalization under the purview of the Economic Development Officer in collaboration and with support from relevant Township departments/functions and community partners;
   c) AND THAT Council endorses the Strategy document findings as presented on January 28th as Final;
   d) AND THAT Council endorses the final action plan items contained herein as Appendix “A”;
   e) AND THAT Staff provides a Strategy Implementation progress report to Council at the conclusion of the RED project funding in April 2020, and annually in April thereafter.

2. **PURPOSE:**

   The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the final Schomberg Main Street Revitalization Strategy and Implementation Plan based on the revisions and refinements received and incorporated from the DRAFT reported and presented to Committee of the Whole on January 28th, 2019, [CLICK HERE for Administration Report No. ED-2019-01.](#)

3. **BACKGROUND:**

   Council supported proceeding with this project and entering into a contribution agreement with the Province of Ontario passed on March 19th, 2018. This project received $52,000 of Rural Economic Development (RED) Grant program funding over two years with completion scheduled for end of March 2020.

   Administration Report No. ED.2019-01 was presented to Council on Monday January 28th seeking Council’s support in principle for: the Strategy document findings; an integrated comprehensive four pillar approach to Main Street revitalization and that the draft implementation and action items prepared to date be communicated and shared with stakeholders for comment and further input and refinement.
The following Vision Statement and three Strategic Themes/Goals were developed and are in place to guide this project effort.

**Vision Statement**

*Schomberg Main Street is the heart of a vibrant village that takes pride in its agricultural heritage.*

*A walkable, picturesque destination for residents and tourist alike, Main Street has maintained its historic quality, while offering a mix of local services, unique shops, restaurants and beautifully preserved homes.*

3 Strategic High Level Goals Structured Around 4 Economic Pillars

- **Attract People** through increasing the annual days of activation (2019 – 100 to 2022 – 250) and driving awareness of Main Street as an excellent place to shop dine or visit.

- **Attract More Business** that fits Main Street Focus

- **Enhance Quality of Place** through enhancing physical design & appearance and through strengthening the existing business base.

74 draft action items coinciding with each one of the four pillars of downtown/main street revitalization efforts were developed and presented in the January 2019 Report to Council. April 1st, 2019 commenced the 2nd year of this RED funded project and also marks the milestone of transitioning from strategy development into plan implementation. It is critical that this project is in alignment with Council and the Township’s four year work plan and budget process; strategic priorities and that there are adequate resources to ensure an effective and sustainable implementation beyond the RED funding concluding March 31st, 2020.
4. DISCUSSION & ANALYSIS

Since the draft strategy and proposed action items were reported and presented to Council in January, significant progress has been made in working with the Main Street Project Team, business and community stakeholders. In February the nine action items pertaining to the Agricultural Fair Society/Fairground were withdrawn at their request, citing their limited resources were required to focus on their upcoming 169th Annual Fair and their “Bridge the Gap” fundraising efforts.

The EDO and project coordinator have also met and corresponded with every department referenced in action items to secure support, identify concerns and align and leverage work plans and budget resources for effective execution of Plan. The emphasis on internal education and communication with respective Township departments and functions has been instrumental in aligning multiple projects to ensure strategic planning and execution with the goals of this main street revitalization project in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>36**</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** inclusive of 15 Core Areas Parking Study (CAPS) recommendations.**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 65 Action Items are being proposed as going forward for implementation within the short, medium and long term. Significant progress has been made across all four pillars. Refer to Appendix “A” of this report for goals, action items and current status. Action items pertaining to Physical Design pillar inclusive of improvements & maintenance must rely on the resources (personnel and budget) of other departments and functions to execute.

Effective leadership and implementation will require some adaptations in how certain projects are approached. For example, the third high level goal of enhance quality of place is currently beyond the day to day oversight and purview of the Economic Development function. In order to achieve the big picture goal of Main Street Schomberg as a vibrant viable destination for residents, businesses and visitors alike, the management of several operational programs and future planned capital projects will need to be aligned and prioritized to support this project. Some of these existing programs and proposed capital projects include but are not limited to:

- Streetscaping & Beautification program,
- Street Banner Program,
- Sidewalk and street sweeping/snow clearing maintenance schedules,
- Green P and on street parking stall & road pavement marking maintenance schedules;
- Lions Parkette design & proposed capital project improvements;
- Main Street typology design & proposed capital project improvements;
• Schomberg Community Hall planned capital improvement upgrades and enhancements.

5. INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE:
Developing and implementing a downtown revitalization strategy and action plan for Schomberg's Main Street will address a significant number of goals and objectives articulated in King's Sustainability Plan. They include but are not limited to: Village Vitality & Prosperity; Local Economy; Tourism Advancement & Promotion; and a Sense of Community.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:
Funds to undertake the management, marketing & promotion and street activation for year two of this project along with the RED grant funding has been allocated and approved in the Economic Development programs budget for 2019.

The breadth of resources (Human, Financial and Capital) associated with executing many aspects of the Final Action Plan referenced herein have yet to be quantified and/or incorporated into the Township's departmental business plans through 2022. As staff refines the 2020 Op-Ex forecast and considers amendments to the Cap-Ex Budget program (2020-2022) it is reasonable to expect staff to develop and present a multi-year fiscal forecast that may support the Schomberg Main Street Revitalization Strategy and Action Plan.

7. CONCLUSION:
For long term success, vitality and village prosperity, Main Street Schomberg needs a unique and strategic approach that is specific to Schomberg and embraces its heritage roots and the deep engagement of its community. Staff recommends Council endorses the Strategy & Implementation Plan and follow a comprehensive four pillar approach to revitalizing the historic commercial core of Schomberg, under the management of the Economic Development Officer in collaboration with businesses, property owners, community groups and other Township departments.

It is being recommended that Council endorse this report and final goals & action items articulated in Appendix A.
8. ATTACHMENTS

Appendix "A" – Goals & Action Items – Main Street Revitalization Strategy

Prepared and Submitted By:

Jamie Smyth
Economic Development Officer

Recommended By:

Daniel Kostopoulos
Chief Administrative Officer
Goal 1: Enhance Quality of Place through enhancing physical design & appearance, and through strengthening the existing business base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Short/Medium /Long Term</th>
<th>Lead (L) Support (S)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>1. Make Economic Development the municipal lead for managing and activating Main Street</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>King Township</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design</td>
<td>2. Allocate $45K from Ontario Main Street Revitalization Initiative as a base budget for significant investment in streetscaping in 2019. Under consideration is street furniture and public art celebrating Schomberg heritage and improving gateway appearance. Leverage other funds where available.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>Completed by September 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Budget completed &amp; includes: Crosswalk art &amp; installation, Bicycle repair station, Commemorative gateway garden at old railway station site, Brick wall art at 1 Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design</td>
<td>3. Update Village Design Guidelines to reflect Main Street Strategy. Update Section 4.2.6 Lighting section includes design standards for illuminating parking lots to enhance pedestrian safety (Core Area Parking Study - CAPS). Create a 3 dimensional visualization of Main Street from Dr Kay to Church Street.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>L - Planning S - Economic Development</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>TBD - within Planning budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium/Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design</td>
<td>4. Participate in design work for Main Street streetscaping.</td>
<td>Design - Short term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development L - PRC</td>
<td>Design - 2019/2020</td>
<td>NA – within PRC budget</td>
<td>Brooks McIlroy to do design, Ec Dev to assist in their briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Street/Public Realm</td>
<td>5. Map out locations for benches including design to complement heritage identity/enhance activation locations – core area.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Cost not covered by RED</td>
<td>Can augment base furniture with wrap (Alpine Graphics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Street/Public Realm</td>
<td>6. Map out locations for banner poles including pole design to complement heritage identity/enhance activation locations. Include Main Street from Highway 9 to 27 and Dr Kay Drive.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA – within PRC budget</td>
<td>Locations mapped out and handed to PRC. Hardware to be installed May. New banners printed and to be hung early May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Street/Public Realm</td>
<td>7. Identify strategic placement of planters including planter design to complement heritage identity/enhance activation locations – core area.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA – within PRC budget</td>
<td>Planter map provided to PRC. May not have adequate number planters for 2019 – will assess following installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Street/Public Realm</td>
<td>8. Identify strategic placement of waste receptacles including design – core area.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA – within PRC budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Street/Public Realm</td>
<td>9. Implement a Main Street specific banner calendar &amp; installation schedule for banners. Banners to focus exclusively on Main Street activations. Include Main Street from Highway 9 to 27 and Dr Kay Drive.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA – within PRC budget</td>
<td>Complete. Hardware &amp; summer banners to be installed beginning of May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>10. Improve winter maintenance for the Green P parking lot and Main Street. – (CAPS)</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - PRC</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA – within PRC budget</td>
<td>Needs to be linked to parking lot improvement and local development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>11. Annual on &amp; off street public parking stall maintenance, such as line painting and repairing/replacing signage, should be completed. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – EPW S – PRC</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>NA – within EPW Budget</td>
<td>Working with EPW reroad painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>12. King to install a larger signage for the Green P lot as per the requirements outlined in OTM Book 8: Guide and Information Signs document. Signage should be installed along Main Street, north and south of the Core Area, to direct traffic to the Green P lot. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - EPW S - PRC</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>NA – within EPW Budget</td>
<td>Looking into revised signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>13. Designate the parking lot at the Arena as public parking. Allow wayfinding for public parking Parks Depot on Western Avenue. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>L - EPW S - PRC</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Working with EPW for Green P sign Working with PRC for wayfinding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>14. Add one accessible parking space in front of the Canada Post Office, where existing on-street parking is available. Add signage and pavement markings to clearly demarcate the space. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - EPW</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>NA – within EPW Budget</td>
<td>Working with EPW re road painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>15. Off-street parking lots should be brought up to AODA standards, existing accessible parking spaces should be painted and signed. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L - By-Law Enforcement Services</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>NA – within EPW Budget</td>
<td>PRC considering upgrading arena lot with accessible space at corner 2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>16. Work with private property owners to move toward AODA compliance, using the CIP Grant program to assist with the associated costs. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L - By-law Enforcement S - EPW S – Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>17. Explore opportunities to acquire permission for public parking at businesses with under-utilized parking lots (e.g. RONA on Main Street). This would be a low cost measure to increase the public parking supply (CAPS)</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development, S - Planning</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>18. Install signage along Main Street notifying drivers of the 3-hour maximum duration between 8am and 6pm. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L – By-Law &amp; EPW</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>19. One by-law officer should enforce the Core Area during typical commercial business hours (between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday). (CAPS)</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L – By-Law</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>20. Maintain existing cash-in-lieu rate for Schomberg. Although no cash-in-lieu fees have currently been collected, any future collected fees should be used to maintain Green P lot and fix damaged bumpouts. King Township should reserve the right to decide whether or not the cash-in-lieu program is acceptable for a given development. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Planning S – Economic Development</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>22. King to develop and distribute education and awareness materials for businesses located in the Core Area that addresses the importance of on-street parking for businesses and overall health of the Core Areas, encourages business owners to coordinate off-street parking with other neighbouring businesses (shared-use agreement) and to encourage businesses to share the online map with their customers (e.g., link to map on website) (CAPS)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Communications S - Economic Development</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Parking</td>
<td>23. Explore the opportunity with Canada Post to remove the median that is separating the Green P lot from the Post office lot to combine both into one large and open lot. Designate spaces for Post Office use only through the use of signage. Reconfigure the new parking lot to provide the most amount of parking spaces. Install lighting throughout the parking lot. (CAPS)</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L - EPW S - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design – Public Realm</td>
<td>25. Create and manage communications of a maintenance schedule for Main Street including street sweeping, flower installation etc that coordinates with events and themes.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S – PRC S - Roads</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRC has coordinated works, including seasonal banner install with major events. Banner policy to be updated to reflect Main Street approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design – Public Realm</td>
<td>26. Make Main Street a focus in 2019/2020 for beautification &amp; streetscaping program including Northeast corner of Dr Kay Drive &amp; Main Street to enable a unique gateway approach to this area.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S – PRC</td>
<td>Design - January 2019 Execute - 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Summer banners completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design Street/Public Realm</td>
<td>27. Provide Main Street core with free wifi</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S – IT/PRC</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Bell quote received Securing Vianet quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium/Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design – Lions Park</td>
<td>28. Ensure Lion's Park improvements take into consideration Destination Development Association's best practices for creating a gathering space/plaza. Incorporate river into design and include an activation area.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – PRC</td>
<td>Design – 2019</td>
<td>NA – Park improvements included in 2019 budget</td>
<td>Design being done by Thinc design. One passive design and one active design being considered. Design to include electrical. Community consultation planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design – Community Hall</td>
<td>29. Reenergize the Schomberg Community Hall to become a focal point of Main Street, Bring day-to-day management of Community Hall underneath Economic Development and PRC. Assign a location in the Community Hall for Main Street activations &amp; initiatives.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L – PRC</td>
<td>May 2020</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Will take place upon completion of interior renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design – Community Hall</td>
<td>30. Improve the Community Hall to be up to building, fire and accessibility code including application for accessibility grant for second floor. Once the hall is renovated, have it designated as a heritage building.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – PRC</td>
<td>Complete by May 2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Hall to be closed June 1 2019 for interior renovations. Outdoor access restrooms under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium/Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>31. Create a pop up shop program for vacant spaces including a booking schedule and lease terms. Meet with owners of vacant space to secure agreement and lease terms. Recruit pop-up vendors that match with the 4 activation themes and economic areas of opportunity.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S – Planning S – By-Law Property Owners</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Program developed. 357 Main Street participating. Opportunity on destinationschomberg.ca Ad placed on Kijiji.ca and shared on Schomberg Community page. Showing April 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>32. Ensure every restaurant, bakery and the Community Hall are Ontario by Bike certified.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Properties</td>
<td>33. Approach every CIP qualifying property owner to ensure they are aware of the incentives available to them. Work with them to facilitate application and approval process.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development – Main Street Coordinator</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design - Properties</td>
<td>34. Create program to dress window of vacant storefronts. Focus on displays that tie into Main Streets 4 activation themes.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>35. Create Main Street Business Management Committee consisting of 5 businesses/property owners and 2 community group representatives (SVA, KCC). Committee to meet quarterly with objective of providing oversight to Main Street progress.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>A number of business/property owners have expressed interest Final team to be assembled once action items are approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>36. Create Main Street Ambassador Program consisting of engaged community members and organizations. Ambassadors to promote and champion Main Street initiatives to help “make things happen”.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Members of project leadership team supportive and happy to take on this role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>37. Within King Township, assemble a business concierge and planning team to facilitate improvements and approvals for commercial and mixed use properties.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design</td>
<td>38. Amend the sign by-law to restrict mobile signs (see definition 25. in By-Law) within the core area of Schomberg.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – By-Law</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Attract People through increasing the annual days of activation (2019 – 100 to 2022 – 250) and driving awareness of Main Street as an excellent place to shop, dine or visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Short/Medium /Long Term</th>
<th>Lead (L) Support (S)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design</td>
<td>39. Change wayfinding on Highway 9 and Highway 27 to blue tourism “A” Attraction with signage to Historic Main Street. Secure CCT funding.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design</td>
<td>40. Add wayfinding sign to northeast corner of Dr. Kay and Main Street.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - PRC</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>41. Convert <a href="http://www.schombergmainstreet">www.schombergmainstreet</a> from project website to consumer facing website. Include an online map of available on-street and off-street parking locations. King to develop. Update on experienceking.ca</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>NA – within RED funding</td>
<td>Approved to proceed – conversion underway. All project related content migrated destinationschomberg.ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>42. Give assigned staff person role of Downtown Coordinator. Include in job description role as single point of contact for all community groups’ events impacting Main Street.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S - Planning S - Clerks S - By-Law S - EPW S - Fire &amp; Emergency Services</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Salary incorporated into Ec Dev budget</td>
<td>Job description published. Applications now closed and beginning interview process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development – Community Hall</td>
<td>43. Work towards an all year weekly Farmer’s Market/Local Makers/Artisans Shoppe located at the Community Hall. Secure vendors and assign the Downtown Coordinator to act as Manager. Develop marketing materials to support, including a website and vendor solicitation documents.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S - PRC S - Vendors</td>
<td>January 2019 – opening June 2019 &amp; ongoing</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Current Farmer’s Market managers want to remain biweekly. Hall not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>44. Create promotional material for the Farmer’s Market, rooting it in tradition. Build dedicated website or make it a focal point within <a href="http://www.schombergmainstreet.ca">www.schombergmainstreet.ca</a>. January – April use as vendor recruitment tool, April – December use as promotional tool.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SchombergFarmersMarket.ca purchased and website underway Schombergmainstreet.ca to be converted into consumer facing website April/May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>45. Secure alignment with Community groups on calendar of community events (which will act as the foundation for Main Street themes &amp; activities) and Townships role in extending the themes for longer periods of activation.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S - SVA, Schomberg Street Gallery</td>
<td>December 2019 – January 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>All Community Groups on committee aligned with calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>46. Create a 2019 Calendar with a minimum of 100 days of programming that focus on themes and activities versus single day events. Create a 2020 Calendar with 150 days of programming.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Current calendar has 102 days of activation – heavily weighted to Q4 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion/Physical Design</td>
<td>47. May – August - Adopt Spring/Summer theme annually for Main Street. Align business décor with the annual theme, as well as street beautification. 2019 theme – Love of Nature. Plan plantings, bee demonstrations, etc. Link to annual Garden Tour.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>Within RED activation funding</td>
<td>Banners completed. Exploring purchasing bee hotels and having them painted to complement new garden installation. Looking into business specific bird feeders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion/Physical Design</td>
<td>48. September – Adopt Art theme annually for the month of September. Use existing Street Gallery banners. On non Street Gallery weekends, bring in street artists, wood carvers, potters etc. Sidewalk chalk. Encourage artists to occupy pop up locations.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S – Schomberg Street G</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Within RED activation funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion/Physical Design</td>
<td>49. October - Adopt Scarecrow theme annually for the month of October for Main Street. Use all 25 scarecrow banners. Align business décor with the theme, as well as street beautification. Create significant scarecrows on all public property on Main Street.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S – SVA S – LRA &amp; Historical Society</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Within RED activation funding</td>
<td>Proposing Lloydtown Rebellion scarecrow re- enactment in Lion's Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion/Physical Design</td>
<td>50. December – Become known for holiday spirit by extending festive theme from A Main Street Christmas through month of December. Utilize Lions Park for a 4 week light sculpture. Include activities such as ice carving on weekends.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S - SVA</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Within RED activation funding</td>
<td>Planning a 4 week snowglobe selfie station and photo contest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Design – Lions Park</td>
<td>51. Create activation schedule and plan to ensure Lions Park becomes a continually evolving and interesting destination for the community and visitors. Explore pottery wheels, chainsaw woodworking, giant chess, jenga etc.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S - Clerks</td>
<td>May 2019 – December 2019</td>
<td>Within RED activation funding</td>
<td>Summer activation kit developed. Plan to activate alternate Saturdays to farmer’s Market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>52. Create a 4 year Main Street volunteer program for high school students led by Downtown Coordinator. Student responsibilities to increasing over time (e.g. from cleaning to building scarecrows to ambassadors walking in period costumes)</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development S - PRC</td>
<td>Planning January – June 2019 Launch September 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>53. Leverage relationship with Central Counties to secure matching funding.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L - Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Have met with CCT re funding for wayfinding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>54. Compile a comprehensive history of Schomberg, including key stories, properties and events. Secure old photographs that could be used for enhancing the sense of place. Explore storytelling and bringing local stories and residents to life for visitors. Drive social media popularity with “fun facts” – Hurricane Hazel, movie locations etc.</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development S – Historical Society</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Will accelerate railroad history to allow for commemorative plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Action Item</td>
<td>Short/Medium /Long Term</td>
<td>Lead (L) Support (S)</td>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>55. Develop On This Spot or matching app materials to promote Main Street as a &quot;walkable heritage site&quot;</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>First stop to be gateway garden and interpretive plaque at old railway station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Promotion</td>
<td>56. Increase promotion of Main Street and Schomberg Cycling Routes (Village Roundabout York Loop, Greenbelt Route) to cyclists.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management - Church</td>
<td>57. Work with Emanuel Presbyterian Church (313 Main Street) to develop a concert series experience in collaboration with the restaurants on Main Street.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unpluggeonmain.ca website built First concert scheduled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Goal 3: Attract More Business that fit with Main Street’s focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Short/Medium /Long Term</th>
<th>Lead (L) Support (S)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>58. Measure and track traffic on Main Street. Develop system to track postal codes to measure impact on trade area. Include postal code collection during major events.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Data to be collected during Street Gallery Analysis to be provided by CCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>59. Establish a tracking system to measure the number of businesses and jobs on Main Street. Include business mix analysis. Track the number of jobs on Main Street by Full time, part time and temporary.</td>
<td>Short Term &amp; Ongoing (annual)</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Tracking system established and posted on project portion of destinationschomberg.ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>60. Work in advance to remove barriers – permitting, parking, building codes, signage, licensing, façade improvements for subject vacant properties. Develop a concierge approach to act as a single point of contact for new businesses wanting to locate on Main Street.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Management</td>
<td>61. Assemble Business Attraction team that includes a Recruiter, SVA rep, Ec Dev, Real Estate Agent, Banker, Council Member &amp; Property Owner if there is a specific subject property.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>EDO &amp; coordinator actively making connections between property owners and interested parties for several properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AGENDA ITEM #10.3

**Marketing & Promotion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Short/Medium /Long Term</th>
<th>Lead (L) Support (S)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Economic Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Short/Medium /Long Term</th>
<th>Lead (L) Support (S)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63. Create an updated Schomberg Community Profile. Profile to include all of Schomberg.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>L – Economic Development</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Within Ec Dev Budget</td>
<td>To be completed in 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Create a Development Opportunities brochure, to include quick statistics such as demographic profile, catchment area, current listings.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Within Ec Dev Budget</td>
<td>To be completed in 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Create a Main Street specific investment profile.</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Within Ec Dev Budget</td>
<td>To be completed in 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short Term – begins in 2019  
Medium Term – begins in 2020 – 2022  
Long term – begins 2023 & afterwards
1. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Clerks Department respectfully submits the following recommendations:

a) That Report Number CL-2019-12 be received as information;

b) That Council enact By-law No. 2019-058, being a by-law to amend the Delegation of Council Powers and Duties to Staff of the Township of King By-law (2008-75), to delegate authority to the Township Clerk, or their designate, to designate events municipally significant for the purposes of an Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario Special Occasion Permit, provided that the requestor meets the definition and all of the criterion and standards required in the approved mentioned policy below.

c) That Council adopt the Events of Municipal Significance Corporate Policy (COR-POL-127) attached as Appendix ‘A’ to this report;

d) That Council enact By-law No. 2019-057, being a By-law to adopt the Municipally Significant Events Corporate Policy (COR-POL-127).

2. **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to seek authority for the Township Clerk, or their designate, to designate events as municipally significant, in accordance with the draft corporate policy.

3. **BACKGROUND:**

The Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario (AGCO) administers the Special Occasion Permit (SOP) program, which allows for the sale and service of alcohol on special occasions, such as cash bars at weddings or private receptions, as well as larger scale events that are open to the public, such as charity fundraisers and community events.

There are three types of special occasions for which a permit may be issued. The scope of this report is only with regard to that of **Public Events**.

- **1) Private Event**: For events where only invited guests will attend. These events cannot be advertised and there can be no intent to gain or profit from the sale of alcohol at the event.
- **2) Public Events**: For events that are open to the public. Public events can be advertised and allow for fundraising/profit from the sale of alcohol. (Subject of this report)
• 3) Industry Promotional Events: For events held to promote a manufacturer's product through sampling. There can be no intent to gain or profit from the sale of alcohol at the event.

Public Event permits can be issued for events of “municipal significance”.

In order to be deemed an event of municipal significance, the applicant requires a designation by the municipality in which the event will take place. SOP applications for a municipally significant Public Event must be accompanied by either a municipal resolution or a letter from a delegated municipal official (i.e. municipal clerk) designating the event as municipally significant.

The Township, through various Council resolutions and hosted activities, has over the years recognized the following historic events within King as municipally significant:

- Schomberg Fair
- King City Craft Beer and Food Truck Festival
- Nobleton Victoria Day Fair and Parade
- Kettleby Canada Day
- King Volunteer Appreciation Event
- Inaugural Council Meeting
- Soupfest
- A Main Street Christmas

4. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS:

Delegation to the Township Clerk

Staff are recommending that when a request is made to the Township requesting that an event be declared municipally significant, the Township Clerk or designate be given the delegated authority to issue a municipally significant designation letter provided the requestor meets the definition and all of the criterion and standards required by the Events of Municipal Significance Corporate Policy.

Events of Municipal Significance Corporate Policy

Staff is recommending the approval and adoption of the Events of Municipal Significance Corporate Policy (COR-POL-127). The purpose of this policy is to establish a clear framework and consistent approach for the Township Clerk to declare events as municipally significant as requests are received.

Definition of an Event of Municipal Significance

The AGCO does not define what a municipally significant event is, but rather leaves the interpretation to be defined by each municipality. Clerks staff conducted a review of other municipal policies, and consulted with the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Department to develop the Township’s own definition.

The following criterion must be met in order for the Township Clerk to declare an event municipally significant without the necessity for council approval:

- The public event is advertised to the general public;
- The public event enhances or promotes a local community asset (e.g. heritage feature, local park, local community group); and
The public event has direct local community significance and promotes the Township's social, cultural and economic development while adhering to municipal by-laws and ensuring public safety at all times.

Events Not Deemed Municipally Significant

The Township Clerk is not obligated to designate any event as municipally significant and may refer the declaration request to Council in the form of a Clerks Department Report. In addition, should the Township Clerk not deem an event as municipally significant, the requestor may request that the declaration request be brought forward for Council's consideration.

5. INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE:

The Township of King's Integrated Community Sustainability Plan was formally adopted by Council on April 2nd, 2012. The Plan is an overarching guiding document that is based on common values, priorities and community aspiration.

This report supports the Socio-Cultural pillar of the plan and the theme of The Arts and Sense of Community. Events deemed as municipally significant will contribute to the economic and social vitality of the Township of King by attracting visitors.

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There is no fee contemplated for this process, at this time, given that most public events that are municipally significant are either organized by the Township or by community organizations with direct local economic and tourism impact. There are no other financial implications arising from the approval of this report.

7. CONCLUSION:

Staff is recommending that Council authorize the authority for the Township Clerk, or their designate, to designate events as municipally significant in accordance with the corporate policy.

8. ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 'A' - Municipally Significant Events Corporate Policy (COR-POL-127)

Prepared By: Denny Timm, M.P.A
Manager of Legislative Services

Submitted By: Kathryn Moyle
Director of Clerks/By-law Enforcement and Township Clerk

Bonnie Catania
Administrative Clerk
1 PURPOSE STATEMENT

1.1 The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines and criteria to designate a public event as a Municipally Significant Event for the purpose of applying for a Special Occasion Permit under the Liquor License Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.L.19, as amended, for the sale and service of alcohol at a public event.

2 POLICY OBJECTIVE

2.1 The objective of this policy is to streamline the approval process through delegated authority and to declare municipally significant events based on clear and consistent criteria.

3 APPLICATION/SCOPE

3.1 This policy shall apply to any event organizer seeking designation of a public event as municipally significant for the purpose of applying to acquire a Special Occasion Permit under the Liquor License Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.L.19, as amended.

4 DEFINITIONS

4.1 Municipally Significant Event: are events open to the public, have predetermined opening and closing dates and times and:

- advertises to the general public;
- enhances or promotes a local community asset (e.g. heritage feature, local park, local community group); and
- has direct local community significance and promotes the Township’s social, cultural and economic development while adhering to municipal by-laws and ensuring public safety at all times.

4.2 Special Occasion Permits (SOP): are permits issued by the Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario for the sale and/or service of beverage alcohol at special occasions/events. An SOP is needed anytime alcohol is offered for sale or served anywhere other than in a licensed establishment or a private place (for example, a private office or a residence).

4.3 AGCO: Alcohol and Gaming Commission Ontario.

5 DELEGATED AUTHORITY

5.1 The Township Clerk, or their designate, has delegated authority by By-law #2019-056 to declare events as municipally significant.

6 DECLARING AN EVENT MUNICIPALLY SIGNIFICANT

6.1 Requests must be submitted in writing to the Township Clerk a minimum of 30 or 60 days prior to the event, depending on the event size, as outlined below:
6.1.1 30 days before the event is to take place, if it is expected that fewer than 5,000 people will attend the event; or
6.1.2 60 days before the event is to take place, if it is expected that 5,000 people or more will attend the event.

6.2 Written requests to the Township Clerk must include information about the public event including:
   6.2.1 Organization Name;
   6.2.2 Contact Information;
   6.2.3 How the event fits the definition of Municipally Significant as defined by this policy;
   6.2.4 Any other information requested by the Township Clerk.

6.3 The Clerks Department maintains a list of municipally significant events as resolved by Council, and as amended from time to time.

6.4 The Township Clerk is responsible for issuing a letter to the requestor declaring the event as municipally significant only if it meets the above criteria.

7  CIRCULATIONS

7.1 Before an event is declared municipally significant, the Township Clerk will circulate the event information for comments to applicable departments and/or external agencies where appropriate.
   7.1.1 Exception: Events listed and maintained by the Clerks Department (historic events of record) do not need to be circulated for comment or review.

7.2 The Township Clerk will take into consideration any comments received by departments or agencies prior to declaring an event municipally significant.

8  EVENT NOT DEEMED MUNICIPALLY SIGNIFICANT

8.1 The Township Clerk is not obligated to designate any event as municipally significant and may refer the declaration request to Council in the form of a Clerks Department Report or, may refer the requestor to partner with a charitable/non-profit organization or seek a caterer's endorsement under their qualifying umbrella.

8.2 Should the Township Clerk not deem an event as municipally significant, the requestor may request that the declaration request be brought forward for Council's consideration. Council's decision will act as the final decision.

9  CONDITIONS

9.1 The Township Clerk may review requests to determine if there are any risks
The Township Clerk has the authority to attach conditions to a declaration to mitigate any risks that may be related to an event.

10 RELATED DOCUMENTATION

10.1 O, Reg. 389/91: Special Occasion Permits under Liquor Licence Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.L. 19

10.2 AGCO Website - https://www.agco.ca/alcohol/special-occasion-permits-public-event

10.3 Municipally Significant Events Procedure – CLK-PRO-116

11 APPROVAL AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>2019-057</th>
<th>Township Clerk</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

King Fire and Emergency Services respectfully recommends that;

a) Report FD 2019-02 be received as information;

b) That By-law Number 2010-33, a By-law to Establish and Regulate the King Fire and Emergency Services Department be repealed;

c) That Council enacts By-law Number 2019-56, a By-law to authorize the Mayor and Clerk to execute an up-to-date Establishing and Regulating By-law for the King Fire and Emergency Services Department; and

d) That Council pass the necessary By-law on May 13, 2019.

2. **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with an updated Establishing and Regulating By-law for the provision of Fire Protection Services within the Township of King.

3. **BACKGROUND:**

The purpose of this report is to advise Council on the recommended changes to our current Establishing and Regulating By-law that regulates the King Fire and Emergency Services Department. The Establishing and Regulating By-law is a general expression of Council’s wishes regarding the provision of fire protection within the Township of King. The primary issues addressed in an Establishing and Regulating By-law may include policy direction in the following areas:

- General functions and services to be provided
- Goals and objectives of the department
- General responsibilities of members
- Method of appointment to the department
- Method of regulating the conduct of members
- Procedures for termination from the department
- Authority to proceed beyond established response areas; and
- Authority to effect necessary department operations
Certain issues are best addressed through the By-law requiring an approved policy:

- Appointment subject to the approved hiring policies of the Corporation
- Establish a fire department training program, and conduct training for all members in accordance with the approved training program; and
- Develop an approved fire department promotional policy

The recommended changes will fall under three areas: Administrative Housekeeping, Terms and Conditions of Employment, and Core Services (Emergency Response and Training).

4. **ANALYSIS AND PROPOSAL:**

Fire and Emergency Services has identified the following areas that required updating: Administrative Housekeeping, Terms and Conditions of Employment, and Core Services (Emergency Response and Training).

**Administrative Housekeeping:**

A full review of the Establishing and Regulating By-law document was completed to include the following items:

- Update the document’s language to reflect what is noted in the Fire Protection and Protection Act
- Incorporate, where appropriate, any references to National Fire Protection Association standards that the Fire Department deems necessary to be followed
- Measurable service levels that can be reported to council on an annual basis (if required); and
- Composition to represent the level of service to be provided as outlined throughout the the By-law (Fire Master Plan and Fire Underwriters Survey used as guiding documents)

**Terms and Conditions of Employment:**

Under the 2010 By-law (By-law 2010-33) a change was made to the mandatory retirement age which was previously established back in 1999 as being age 60 (By-law 99-124). In 2010 the retirement age was re-established to age 65 with the following recommendations:

**Current:**

5.4 Although not a recommended practice, firefighters who wish to remain active past the firefighter's sixty fifth birthday may do so only with both the concurrence of a Medical Practitioner and the department, and must complete semi-annual medical examinations as prescribed by the department in intervals no greater than six months.

This practice has served our municipality very well, but it did not address the capacity and level of expectations to which the firefighter was expected to perform too – i.e. structural firefighting, rescue, etc. In the next paragraph (under recommended changes) it will identify to what level and age the firefighter will perform to (up to age 65: Operations – active fire suppression duties), as well as a non-operations position (support position – public education, pre-fire planning, training) age 65 to 70 followed by full retirement.
Recommended changes:

5.4 Firefighters who wish to remain past their sixty fifth (65) birthday in a non-operations position (non-active firefighting position) may do so only with both the concurrence of a Medical Practitioner and the department, and must complete semi-annual medical examinations as prescribed by the department in intervals no greater than six (6) months. Once the firefighter reaches age seventy (70) they will be required to retire from all active duties within 3 months of their seventieth (70) birthday.

5.5 At the discretion of the Fire Chief, retired members who wish to remain involved in an honorary/social capacity (with their respective station) may do so in a voluntary capacity where the commitment/expectation levels are established via the volunteer firefighters association. There is no remuneration in this role/capacity. The retired member would be required to have VFIS Insurance (Volunteer Fire Insurance) that covers the retired member during participation in social/charity events.

Core Services:

The Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997 (FPPA) requires the municipality to provide public education and fire prevention services [2. (1)(a)] and other services according to needs and circumstances. In essence, Council decides upon the level of service they are willing or able to provide the community. This is establishing the balance between the “needs” and “wants” of the fire department and community. Two (2) areas that have changed substantially are the following: Emergency Response and Training.

Emergency Response:

Emergency response now includes Integrated Response Teams - a cooperative response with Police and Paramedics to events intended to address threats to public safety (active attackers) while simultaneously mitigating loss of life through coordination of emergency first responders allowing each of the tri-services to maximize their effectiveness.

Large animal rescues, hazardous materials incidents, and rope rescues are now becoming more and more common. The administration of Naloxone (Narcan) for opioid overdoses has become the newest demand for our emergency service with the implementation taking place later on this month (May 2019).

Training:

In 2014, the Office of the Ontario Fire Marshal and Emergency Management (OFMEM) transitioned from the Provincial Firefighting Standards to the North American Standard of NFPA (National Fire Protection Association). This standard provides consistency throughout the Ontario Fire Service. This is the standard in which both career and volunteer firefighters train and are now certified to. The same goes for Instructors, Company Officers, Fire Inspectors, and Public Educators. All of our current and/or future staff members train and are now certified to the NFPA Standards. The language in the By-law needs to reflect said change to NFPA.

5. INTEGRATED COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLAN:

Updating our existing Establishing and Regulating Bylaw ensures relevancy with our current Fire Master Plan. These changes will ensure that our staff members are well trained, well-
coordinated, and well prepared for when responding to emergency situations throughout the municipality. Through socio-cultural, we will continue to promote health, wellness, and safety of our residents through public education and prevention programs.

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial implications attached to this proposal.

7. **CONCLUSION:**

With the adoption of a new by-law, our Municipal Council can remain confident that their local fire service is working, operating, and providing services within the scope of the newly adopted Establishing and Regulating By-law for King Fire and Emergency Services. This by-law confirms that policy decisions are current with industry standards and are relevant which is very important to the municipality when demonstrating due diligence. This by-law is being recommended as "best" practice for our municipality while providing fire protection services throughout the Township of King.

Appendices:

Appendix “A” Core Services

Appendix “B” Vision, Mission, Values Statement

Appendix “C” The Fire Department Organizational Chart

Prepared and Submitted By:

James Wall,

Fire Chief / CEMC
APPENDIX "A" - CORE SERVICES

1. FIRE PREVENTION

1.1 Fire Prevention Statement: The key to actively reducing the threat to the lives and property of our residents due to the adverse effects of fire is an active and efficient fire prevention and public education program.

1.2 Inspections arising from complaint, request, retrofit, self-initiated and/or from fire investigations shall be provided in accordance with the Fire Protection & Prevention Act and policies of the Fire Prevention Division.

1.3 New construction inspections and plan reviews of buildings under construction in matters respective of fire protection systems within buildings shall be conducted in accordance with the applicable By-law and operating procedures.

2. FIRE SAFETY EDUCATION

2.1 Distribution of fire and life safety information and public education programs shall be administered in accordance with the Fire Protection & Prevention Act and policies of the Fire Prevention Division.

2.2 A residential occupancy fire safety awareness program shall be ongoing.

2.3 Smoke and carbon monoxide alarms for residential occupancies shall be provided to those in need.

2.4 Fire and life safety communiqués shall be distributed on social media networks and through the media on a regular basis.

3. FIRE SUPPRESSION

3.1 Fire suppression services shall be delivered in both an offensive and defensive mode and shall include search and rescue operations, forcible entry, ventilation, protecting exposures, salvage and overhaul as appropriate.

3.2 Emergency pre-hospital medical care will be provided such as defibrillation, standard first aid, CPR, symptom relief, at the Emergency First Responder level.

4. EMERGENCY RESPONSE

4.1 Integrated Response - A cooperative response with Police and Paramedics to events intended to address threats to public safety while simultaneously mitigating loss of life through coordination of emergency first responders allowing each of the tri-services to maximize their effectiveness.

4.2 Special technical and/or rescue services shall include performing vehicle rescue using hand tools, air bags and heavy hydraulic tools as required, large animal rescue to department policies and protocols, and water/ice rescue services up to and including the Operations Level. Rope rescue and hazardous materials response will be performed up to the Operations Level. The above services shall only be attempted when available resources including staffing are permitting.
4.3 Confined space rescue, trench rescue, HUSAR, and other highly specialized technical and/ or rescue services shall not be provided by King Fire and Emergency Services (KFES) beyond the awareness level or recognized level of training.

5. TRAINING

5.1 The Fire Fighter I and II programs meet the knowledge and skill requisites established by the NFPA 1001 Standard for Fire Fighter Professional Qualifications along with any other related industry training standards and reference materials that may be used as reference guides for departmental training as approved by the Fire Chief. All training will comply with the Occupational Health and Safety Act and applicable provincial legislation.

5.2 Apparatus that are equipped with a fire pump: the training program meets the knowledge and Job Performance Requirements (JPRs) established by the NFPA 1002 Standard for Fire Apparatus Driver – Operator Professional Qualifications Chapter 5.

5.3 The Fire Officer program meets the knowledge and skill requisites established by the NFPA 1021 Standard for Fire Officer Professional Qualifications.

5.4 That the Fire Inspector programs reference the knowledge and skill requisites established by NFPA 1031 Standard for Professional Qualifications for Fire Inspector and Plans Examiner.

5.5 That the Fire and Life Safety Educator programs reference the knowledge and skill requisites established by the National Fire Protection Association Standard on Fire and Life Safety Educator, Public Information Officer, Youth Fire-setter Intervention Specialist and Youth Fire-setter Program Manager Professional Qualifications NFPA 1035.

5.6 The Fire Instructor program meets the knowledge and skill requisites established by the National Fire Protection Association Standard for Fire Service Instructor Professional Qualifications NFPA 1041.


5.8 The Emergency First Responder Program includes certification in Basic Life Support (BLS) Health Care Professional (HCP) CPR (C), WSIB Standard First Aid and medical delegation/direction/oversight and Quality Assurance for SAED, symptom assist and epinephrine auto injector use. The training follows the guidelines and recommendations set by The Heart and Stroke Foundation of Ontario, the Workers' Safety and Insurance Board of Ontario (Regulation 1101) and the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (CPSO) in accordance with Central East Prehospital Care Program.
APPENDIX "B" - VISION, MISSION, VALUES STATEMENT

Our “Vision”
“King Fire and Emergency Services’ pursuit of excellence will not end. We will become the most highly trained, adapted and prepared fire service in Ontario, Canada and North America.”

Our “Mission”
King Fire and Emergency Services dedicate our being to the residents, visitors and businesses of the Township of King. We will promote, educate and demonstrate fire and emergency safety to our customers with the goal of proactively reducing the response need of our service.

Our “Values”
“Above all, King Fire and Emergency Services staff is proud and honoured to serve; we hold Duty, Trust and Honour as our guiding principles.”

- Duty - Devoted to our customers
- Trust - Confident in firm belief
- Honour - Integrity and respect

King Fire and Emergency Services' staff are critical to our success. Everything we do, we do so as a team and our team is driven by our values. King Fire and Emergency Services' customers are critical to our team’s success. We are customer focused; we teach, we plan, we prepare and we respond wanting to exceed our customer’s expectations. We are empathetic and sensitive to the needs of each and every customer realizing that those involved in an emergency situation did not want to be in that position in the first place. Quality customer service is our signature and it exemplifies our Mission.

In the event a customer requires the services from our department we will respond to that need, mitigate and safely return with 100% customer satisfaction. Our daily activities and forward thinking will take us from “THAT” fire service to “THE” fire service.
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF KING
REPORT TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Monday, May 13, 2019

Fire and Emergency Services
Report FD 2019-03
RE: Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus

1. RECOMMENDATIONS:

King Fire and Emergency Services respectfully recommends that;

a) Report FD 2019-03 be received as information, and

b) That M&L Supply, Fire & Safety being the lowest compliant bidder with a total bid in the amount of $152,960.54 (including taxes after rebate) and meeting the terms, conditions, and specifications of the Request for Tender: 2019 – T08 – “SCBA Units” be awarded the Contract to supply and deliver such equipment as described in the Proposal Submission of the RFT (Request for Tender)

c) That the Mayor and Clerk are hereby authorized to sign on behalf of the Corporation any necessary contracts, forms or other documents forming part of RFT 2019-T08.

2. PURPOSE:

The purpose of this report is to advise Council on the results of the Request for Tender: 2019 – T08 “Request for Tender – “SCBA Units” which closed on May 08, 2019.

3. BACKGROUND:

Through the 2019-2022 Budget and Business Plan process, it was recommended that all of our in-service training SCBA (Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus) be replaced with the most current NFPA edition (2018). The current training SCBA and air cylinders (15 SCBA and 45 air cylinders) would be replaced with fifteen (15) new SCBA plus fifteen (15) spare air cylinders. The new breathing apparatus would be placed into service and the 2005-2006 breathing apparatus would be sold as surplus as part of this replacement initiative.

4. ANALYSIS AND PROPOSAL:

Under the 2019-2022 Annual Budget and Business Plan process, it was recommended to replace our current fifteen (15) training breathing apparatus and spare air cylinders. With the direct assistance of the Purchasing Coordinator, a Tender was developed for the purchase of the replacement Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus. The proposal for the new SCBA was advertised on bidsandtenders.ca and closed on May 08, 2019. A total of 2 sets of documents were picked up with 2 bids being submitted by closing. The recommended bid from M&L Supply, Fire & Safety met the required specifications.
The results of the submitted bids are summarized in the table below:

| Bidder #1 - M&L Supply, Fire & Safety (including HST before rebate) | $169,855.95 |
| Bidder #2 - Dependable Emergency Vehicles (including HST before rebate) | $172,672.87 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Vendor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidder #1 - M&amp;L Supply, Fire &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus</td>
<td>$169,855.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST Rebates</td>
<td>($16,895.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost, net of HST rebates</td>
<td>$152,960.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Capital Budget (2019)</td>
<td>$ 160,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **INTEGRATED COMMUNITY SUSTAINABILITY PLAN:**

King Fire & Emergency Services remains committed to the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan by making sure that our current and future acquisitions of respiratory protection (SCBA) remains cost effective, reliable, and in-service for the next 5 to 10 years. The on-going care and maintenance of this equipment will become part of our current respiratory program which falls under the Annual Budget and Business Plan (Finance pillar).

6. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

King Fire & Emergency Services was approved to acquire self-contained breathing apparatus through the 2019-2022 Budget and Business Plan process. The projected budget for this project was $160,000.00 which was funded through taxation. M&L Supply, Fire & Safety submitted a successful Bid of $152,960.54 (net of HST rebates). The recommended bid meets the terms, conditions, and specifications of the Request for Tender: 2019-T08 “SCBA Units”.

7. **CONCLUSION:**

Replacing our current self-contained breathing apparatus (training SCBA and air cylinders) will ensure that our Municipality is continuously complying with current industry standards (NFPA – National Fire Protection Association) as well as best practices. By remaining with the same brand of Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus, it helps support previous investments such as; staff training, SCBA maintenance, and repairs.

Prepared and Submitted By:

James Wall,
Fire Chief, CEMC
1. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Parks, Recreation & Culture Department respectfully submits the following recommendations:

a) That report PRC-2019-08 be received as information;

b) That Committee provide feedback on the planned Energy Management Plan Update reduction targets;

c) That Committee adopts the Council resolution to join the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Partners for Climate Protection Program

d) That Committee directs staff to engage the Sustainability Committee for comments;


2. **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to advise Committee on the department’s efforts to both update the Energy Management and Conservation Plan for municipal infrastructure, to receive feedback on potential targets for energy and greenhouse gas reductions and join the FCM-ICLEI (Local Governments for Sustainability) Partners for Climate Protection Program.

3. **BACKGROUND:**


This regulation replaces Ontario Regulation 397/11 titled Energy Conservation and Demand Management Plans. It was enacted under the now repealed Green Energy Act, 2009. The requirements for broader public sector energy planning and reporting by Ontario agencies are identical to those under the former Regulation 397/11.
Under Ontario Regulation 507/18, all public agencies are required to report annually on energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The agencies are also required to prepare and make public an updated five-year energy conservation and demand management plan. The first update is due in 2019.

In early 2019, the Township successfully obtained a grant from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM); Climate Change Protection Program to fund the hiring of a Climate Change Coordinator to update the Township's Energy Management Plan, along with the development of a Climate Change Action Plan. The Climate Change Coordinator has since been compiling our 2012 energy data used in the previous Plan, compiling 2018 energy data for benchmarking, reviewing the previous Energy Management Plan and setting updated targets in line with current energy trends, new technology and feasibility.

It was at the recommendation of both FCM and the 2012 Integrated Community Sustainability Plan under action items and deliverables (3.1) that the Township of King join FCM's Partners for Climate Protection Program. The York Region is currently a member of this program among over 300 other municipalities across Canada.

4. **ANALYSIS:**

The Energy Management Plan Update will help the municipality continue the process of managing utility uses (e.g. electricity and natural gas) and related costs, building off the previous municipally approved plan from 2015. It will identify best practices and energy-saving opportunities, evaluate results by comparing similar facilities across the province, assist in setting goals by providing a benchmark and thus allow staff to measure improvements over time.

The Township has over 30 facilities and buildings, some of which date back to the mid 1800's. While electricity is supplied as a standard through Hydro One, heating is a composite of natural gas and electrical systems. The municipality also has additional infrastructure that will be assessed and evaluated for possible reduction methods including, but not limited to streetlights and fleet.

**Energy Management Plan Targets**

In preparation of the updated plan, the first step is assessing past goals and targets to better reflect King's vision for the future and our energy conservation needs based on the previous plan, present day climate change and Ontario's changing energy landscape.

At this point, the statistical data related to the municipality's energy consumption has been compiled along with various options for energy reduction being contemplated. Committee and staff must now identify how to pursue the following reduction targets, which are representative of the current update of the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan:
• 35% Energy reduction in corporate facilities measured by energy intensity (ekWh/ m²) by 2030*
  o Implementation of Building Automation Systems
  o Conversion of light fixtures
• 30% Reduction in Corporate Energy Emissions (Kg of eCO₂) by 2030*
  o Conversion to energy efficient mechanical and electrical systems
• 2% Energy Reduction in Emissions (Kg of eCO₂) per year over the next 5 years*
  o Conversion to energy efficient mechanical and electrical systems
• 5% Reduction in Greenhouse Gas emissions from municipal fleet over next 3 years
  o Introducing electric vehicles into the fleet, where applicable
• 80% Reduction in corporate Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Kg of eCO₂) by 2050*
  o Introduction of net metered renewable energy (ex. Solar)

* based on a 2012 Energy Baseline

The reduction targets noted above represent attainable industry standards, that if implemented will support tangible energy management improvements in King through 2050. Staff looks for direction now to set these initial DRAFT targets, recognizing that financial implications need to be understood and inform future budget commitments to enable achievement.

While some reductions will be achievable through efficient operating measures, development of standard guidelines and procedures, etc., a large portion of the updated recommendations will relate to infrastructure investments and renewable energy resources.

FCM Partnership

By joining the FCM Partners for Climate Protection (PCP) Program, King Township would have access to numerous valuable tools, such as the PCP Milestone Tool that would enable King to better forecast energy trends based on our own energy data. By joining the FCM PCP Program, King Township would be agreeing to a number of targets similar to ones outlined above. These guidelines and targets can be found in Appendix ‘A’. The PCP program requires member municipalities to create, adopt, and complete a GHG inventory and forecast, setting a GHG reduction target, developing a local action plan, implementation, monitoring and reporting results. These requirements of membership are already being compiled and completed by the Climate Change Coordinator who is partially funded by FCM, in order to complete the Energy Management Plan Update and later in 2019 the Climate Change Action Plan.

Next Steps

Staff will incorporate feedback received from Committee and plan on attending the next Sustainability Committee meeting for further comment should the recommendations of the report be approved. Once all new information is compiled and incorporated, where applicable, PCP Program approval will be sent to FCM for confirmation and staff will begin completion of the report and bring the updated report back to Committee for final
approval no later than June 29, 2019 in order to ensure compliance with Ontario Reg. 507/18.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The short and long term financial implications are unknown at this time as they are determinant on the feedback given by Committee and through the correspondence received from the Sustainability Committee, however it should be anticipated that an increase in the investment in energy management initiatives will be required. As staff develop the final emergency management plan it will include a financial framework associated with any recommendations set forth for Committee’s consideration.

As with any proposed change in service level; staff will prepare a ‘program change’ request as part of the 2020 Operating Budget for Council’s review, consideration and approval that will incorporate the rigor of a business case justification that supports the following framework:

- Annual energy management initiatives that are aligned with Council priorities.
- Long-term energy management strategies
- Establishing the fiscal capacity (e.g. property taxation, short-term / internal and/or long-term / external debenture financing) to support short, mid and long-term energy management initiatives
- Parks, Recreation & Culture annual service and facility priorities.
- Validation of the direction proposed through ongoing consultation with community stakeholders and general public.
- Investigate all opportunities to access government / industry grants

6. **INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE:**

The recommendations of this report support the following goals and strategies of the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan:

a) The Financial Pillar: Financial Sustainability is supported through the improvement of management of Township finances and assets

b) The Environmental Pillar: Support energy efficiencies and safety in all of our buildings and encouraging energy conservation, recommendation to join the Partners for Climate Change Program under action and deliverable items (3.1)

7. **CONCLUSION:**

The targets presented provide a basis for where we are and gives general direction on how to begin the movement towards energy efficiency. The next step is to define the path to get there.
Council Resolution to
Join the FCM–ICLEI (Local Governments for Sustainability)
Partners for Climate Protection Program

WHEREAS it is well established that climate change is increasing the frequency of extreme weather events and posing other risks, such as drought, forest fires and rising sea levels, which present serious threats to our natural environment, our health, our jobs and our economy;

WHEREAS the 2016 Paris Agreement, signed by more than 190 countries, including Canada, committed to limit the global temperature increase to below two degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit this increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius, in order to avoid the most severe climate change impacts;

WHEREAS local governments are essential to the successful implementation of the Paris Agreement;

WHEREAS Canada’s cities and communities influence approximately 50 per cent of national greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and can drive systemic low-carbon practices, including: building high-efficiency buildings, undertaking building retrofits and developing district heating; building active transit, electric vehicle infrastructure and electrified public transit; implementing near-zero GHG waste plans; and delivering high-efficiency water and wastewater services;

WHEREAS investments in these types of measures also reduce operating costs, help municipalities maintain and plan for future community services, protect public health, support sustainable community development, increase community resilience and reduce a community’s vulnerability to environmental, economic and social stresses;

WHEREAS a number of government and international and national organizations have called for greater cooperation among all stakeholders to meet reduction targets, including Canada’s Big City Mayors’ Caucus, which supports binding GHG emission reduction targets at the international, national and city levels, action plans that cut emissions, identification of risks and mitigation solutions, and regular municipal GHG emissions reporting;

WHEREAS the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) and ICLEI–Local Governments for Sustainability have established the Partners for Climate Protection (PCP) program to provide a forum for municipal governments to share their knowledge and experience with other municipal governments on how to reduce GHG emissions;

WHEREAS over 300 municipal governments across Canada representing more than 65 per cent of the population have already committed to reducing corporate and community GHG emissions through the PCP program since its inception in 1994;

WHEREAS PCP members commit to adopt a community GHG reduction target of 30 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030, in line with the Government of Canada’s target, and to adopt a corporate GHG reduction target that is similar or more ambitious, and to consider adopting a deeper community and corporate emissions reduction target of 80 per cent by 2050;

WHEREAS the PCP program is based on a five-milestone framework that involves completing a GHG inventory and forecast, setting a GHG reduction target, developing a local action plan, implementing the plan, and monitoring progress and reporting results;
WHEREAS PCP members commit to carry out the five-milestone framework within 10 years of joining the program and to report on progress at least once every two years;

WHEREAS PCP members accept they can be suspended from the program — subject to prior notice in writing by the PCP Secretariat — in the event of non-submission of progress reports within the established deadlines;

BE IT RESOLVED that the municipality of __________________________ endorse the Government of Canada's commitment to the Paris Agreement to limit global temperature increase to below two degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit the global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius; and

BE IT RESOLVED that the municipality of __________________________ review the guidelines on PCP member benefits and responsibilities and then communicate to FCM its participation in the PCP program and its commitment to achieving the milestones set out in the PCP five-milestone framework;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the municipality of __________________________ appoint the following:

a) Corporate staff person
   (Name) __________________________
   (Contact number) __________________________
   (Email address) __________________________

b) Elected official
   (Name) __________________________
   (Contact number) __________________________
   (Email address) __________________________

to oversee implementation of the PCP milestones and be the points of contact for the PCP program within the municipality.

______________________________ Signature

______________________________ Date
The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) says in its 2014 *Fifth Assessment Report* that warming of the Earth's climate system is unequivocal and that "the IPCC is now 95 per cent certain that humans are the main cause of current global warming."

The IPCC concludes this warming is caused primarily by increased atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide released from burning coal, oil and natural gas and from cutting trees and clearing land for agriculture and development.

The IPCC has a high degree of confidence that the following climate-related impacts are occurring or will occur over the next century in North America:

- More frequent hot and fewer cold temperature extremes, resulting in longer and more frequent heat waves.
- More frequent and intense extreme precipitation events.
- Thawing of permafrost, causing greater emissions of greenhouse gases and leading to disruptions to infrastructure and the traditional ways of life in northern communities.
- Melting of glaciers and polar ice, causing sea level rise in over 70 per cent of coastal communities.
- Increased risk of extinction for a large fraction of terrestrial, freshwater and marine species, undermining food security in many regions.
- In urban areas, increase risks for people, assets, economies and ecosystems including risks from heat stress, storms and extreme precipitation, flooding, landslides, air pollution, drought, water scarcity, sea level rise and storm surges.
- In rural areas, impacts on water availability and supply, food security, infrastructure, and agricultural incomes, including shifts in food production areas.

Under business-as-usual scenarios, the IPCC has high confidence that global surface temperature is likely to exceed two degrees Celsius by the end of the 21st Century.

The IPCC observes that warming resulting from human influences could lead to abrupt or irreversible impacts, depending on the rate and magnitude of climate change, and that the more human activities disrupt the climate, the greater the risks.

Under a stringent emission reduction scenario, the IPCC concludes that surface warming could be kept under two degrees Celsius, which would reduce the risks and impacts of climate change.
1. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

   The Parks, Recreation & Culture Department respectfully submit the following recommendations:

   a) That report PRC-2019-13 be received as information; and

   b) That Rafat General Contractor Incorporated, being the lowest compliant bidder (Tender 2019-T07) with a total bid in the amount of $7,780,446 (incl HST) be awarded the contract for construction of the King Road Streetscaping work.

2. **PURPOSE:**

   The purpose of this report is to recommend that Committee award Tender 2019-T07 for construction of the King Road Streetscaping work as identified in this report.

3. **BACKGROUND:**

   Over the past number of years the Township has been investing in improvements to the core areas of our villages. Significant projects have been completed in both King City and Nobleton and this tendered project represents another transformative section of work. The King Road works, spanning from 2585 King Road to Dufferin Street will end the current cycle of construction for streetscaping while design will continue for the Schomberg Main Street project and the section of King Road from 2585 King Road to Jane Street during the current four year capital budget cycle.

   Following budget approval in January 2017, the design component of the streetscaping projects in King City began. Staff worked through the Regional approval process including the application and approval for funding through two Regional granting streams – The Municipal Streetscaping Partnership Program (MSPP) and the Pedestrian and Cycling Municipal Partnership Program (PCMPP). The 2019 budget included funding for the construction of these works. Based on these approvals, staff prepared the required
procurement documents. The document was posted on bidsandtenders.com and closed May 6, 2019. Proposals were received from four (4) pre-qualified vendors.

All four (4) proponents met the terms, specifications and conditions of the document with no alternatives or substitutions noted.

4. **DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS**

The King Road project is the largest streetscaping endeavor to date for the municipality covering just over three (3) kilometres of area. The program will feature a number of elements including but not limited to:

- Sidewalk replacement and widening, with decorative banding
- A multiuse path
- Decorative poles (for banners and flowers); and
- Tree planting

Additionally, a dedicated left-hand turn lane and right-in deceleration lane along with the required road widening for the King Township Municipal Centre (@ 2585 King Road) are included in the design and contract. Staff also included the required underground infrastructure for future traffic lights at this location should the Region approve the municipalities request to install them as per the Council resolution from the April 1, 2019 Township C.O.W. meeting.

Staff, in conjunction with representatives from the engineering and landscape architect firms that completed the design ensure the submissions conformed with the tender document and any associated addendums.

As the tender price is within the approved budget, staff is recommending the award at this time.

5. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The 2017 Capital Budget included the funding for the design ($200,000) and 2019/2020 Capital Budget included the construction ($8,000,000) for streetscaping works along King Road (2585 King Road to Dufferin Street).

Based on the submission received from Rafat in the amount of $7,780,446 (including HST) for completion of defined scope of works, this project is within the approved 2019-2022 Capital Budgets.
The project will be funded through a combination of reserves, regional grants (MSPP and PCMPP) and development charges within the 2019-2022 Capital Budgets. Details of which are outlined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor / Contractor</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rafat General Contractors</td>
<td>King Road Construction</td>
<td>$7,780,446.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks McIlroy/Burnside</td>
<td>Design Fees</td>
<td>$373,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook McIlroy/Burnside</td>
<td>Anticipated Contract Admin Fees</td>
<td>$373,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HST Rebates</td>
<td></td>
<td>($848,117.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost, net of HST rebates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,178,329.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approved Budget (2018-2020)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,200,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should Committee approve award of the contract to Rafat, construction will begin in June 2019 and is projected to be completed in Fall 2020.

6. **INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE:**

The continued investment in the streetscaping initiatives throughout our cores supports the following elements of the ISCP:

**ECONOMIC PILLAR THEME 1: Village Vitality and Prosperity**

1.1 Maintain and revitalize King Township’s villages.

4.2 Leverage and promote our natural assets for attracting eco-tourism and recreation/nature-based tourism.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PILLAR THEME 4: Transportation**

4.3 Make King’s villages more walkable and improve connectivity between subdivisions, parks, schools, businesses and other amenities.

7. **Attachments:**

Appendix ‘A” – Project Renderings

**Prepared and Submitted By:**

Chris Fasciano
Director, Parks, Recreation and Culture
Appendix ‘A’ – Project Renderings
1. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Parks, Recreation & Culture Department respectfully submits the following recommendations:

a) That report PRC-2019-12 be received as information;

b) That Committee authorize an amendment to the Capital Budget for the interior renovation of the King Heritage and Cultural Centre (KHCC) in the amount of $50,000.

2. **PURPOSE:**

This report is required for purposes of requesting authorization from Committee to amend the 2019 Capital Budget by way of an increase to the total project budget and associated sources funding by $50,000 for the KHCC interior renovation project.

3. **BACKGROUND AND PROPOSAL:**

As staff reported to Committee in April 2018 (Report PRC-2018-11) the Township received a grant through the Canada Cultural Space Fund via Canadian Heritage to renovate the interior of the school house at the KHCC.

Grant funding was used to convert the old school room into a space for multi-purpose exhibits and a permanent exhibit on the history of King Township. The grant also includes funds for the provision of a lift or elevator to make the space accessible.

The project was added to the 2018 capital budget as per the recommendations of the Report # PRC-2018-11 and work has been on-going since.

**Building Conditions**

At the time when the previous report was submitted, staff were aware of some issues that would affect the projects budget including, but not limited to issues with structural elements of the room (framing, sub floor), the removal of designated substances, a lack of insulation in the walls and poor work from previous renovations. More recently, the project has encountered additional issues including rotten structural beams and the discovery of structural elements built in the past that were never properly removed.
The previous budget for the project increased to $300,000, up from the $225,000 submitted as part of the grant application and staff is recommending the additional increase at this time to finalize the project.

The project, as revised, will be funded from a combination of the grant, the Fawcett Bequest Fund and the 2018/2019 approved operating budgets. A copy of the detailed financial breakdown can be found within the financial section of this report.

**Project Update**

The project has been delayed from the original timeline for various reasons (building conditions, staffing absences) but is nearing completion. A soft opening is expected before June 30, 2019 with a formal event in the fall.

While the History of King Township exhibit will be open to the public, staff will continue to work with key interested stakeholders to ensure the final product is one that King can be proud of for years to come.

4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

As previously reported, the project budget was approved at $300,000. This was to be funded through a combination of funding available from the Fawcett Bequest, the Canada Cultural Spaces fund and the annual tax supported facility improvements operating budget managed by the Parks, Recreation & Culture Division.

Due predominately to additional structural issues identified to date, the cost to complete an amended scope of work is forecast to reach $350,000. The incremental project cost is proposed to be funded from a reallocation of the annual tax supported facility improvements in the approved 2019 operating budget.

In the event that additional funding from the Fawcett Bequest is made available based upon final reconciliation of costs and previous contribution commitments, operating budget however, without that funding being fully identified at this time it would be prudent to ensure the full $50,000 is made available from tax supported sources.

The following chart identifies the various sources of funding that will be used to support the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project - Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Museum Interior Renovations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada Cultural Spaces Fund</td>
<td>$ 98,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation - Fawcett Bequest Fund</td>
<td>$ 90,000 - $ 116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE:**

Understanding that our cultural heritage is one of our greatest assets, this project is a tremendous opportunity to integrate the heritage of King into a defined space while continuing to allow the site to transform into a functional cultural centre, freeing up other spaces to increase programming and opportunities for other functions.

*Prepared and Submitted By:*

Chris Fasciano  
Director - Parks, Recreation & Culture
1. **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Parks, Recreation & Culture Department respectfully submits the following recommendations:

a) That report PRC-2019-11 be received as information; and

b) That Council authorize an amendment to the 2019-2022 Capital Budget to accelerate the planned works for the Schomberg Community Hall; and

   c) That approved 2019-2022 sources of funding be temporarily realigned between the Infrastructure Reserve and Tax Supported Capital Reserve.

2. **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this report is to inform Committee on the Enabling Accessibility Grant Funding in the amount of $100,000 recently awarded to the Township from the Federal Government, and to secure authorization to modify the approved 2019-2022 capital budgets to accelerate the works associated with the Schomberg Community Hall to complete these works within the required grant timeline.

3. **BACKGROUND AND PROPOSAL:**

Works for the Schomberg Community Hall were identified in the 2019-2022 Capital Budget program. The program includes restoration of all areas of the facility and the provision of an elevator to ensure the building is made accessible for all users.

As noted in the 2018 DRAFT Facility Services Master Plan, Community Halls were originally designed as community gathering spaces, located in central areas of the various villages and communities throughout the Township to bring people together. They were historically used for small scale community events and private rentals (showers, stag and doe celebrations and birthday parties) and community programs.

While other small scale facilities have continued to decline in usage year over year, the Schomberg Community Hall defies this trend showing an increase in usage every year through the evaluation period 2014-2018.
Staff have been undertaking the evaluation of Community Halls as per recommendation 18 of the DRAFT Facilities Master Plan presented in July 2018 and need to report back to Committee with a formal report covering all community halls. Given the evaluations conducted to this point, showing continued increased usage, the location of the facility in the heart of Main Street Schomberg and the newly available grant funding, staff recommend an investment in the hall as part of a revitalization strategy with the intention that the facility continues to thrive as a community hub.

**Capital Improvements**

As identified within the 2019-2022 Capital Budget program, in alignment with the DRAFT Facilities Master Plan and the 2014 Structural and Accessibility Audit there are major works required to revitalize the hall including structural improvements, accessibility needs and renovations/updates to the interior finishes (kitchens, bathrooms, flooring, painting, etc.).

**Enabling Accessibility Fund**

The Enabling Accessibility Fund (EAF) provides funding for eligible capital projects that increase accessibility for people with disabilities in Canadian communities and workplaces, creating more opportunities for people with disabilities to participate in community activities, programs and services, or access employment opportunities.

The terms of the grant includes a federal contribution of $100,000 towards the installation of an elevator in the facility and must be spent between May 13, 2019 and May 13, 2020. Staff has already completed all applicable authorization forms and will be executing the funding agreement, subject to Committee approving the recommendations of this report.

**Facility Closure and Impacts**

Presently, the proposed closure of the facility is from June 2019 to June 2020, subject to the approval of this report and associated recommendations. This closure will result in the cancellation of numerous rentals that were made prior to the municipality being notified of the available grant funding.

Staff is working with the various facility users to mitigate these situations by re-locating to other municipal facilities within close proximity however, there will be impacts for several community events that have come to rely on use of the Hall such as:

- Schomberg Street Gallery – Fall 2019
- A Main Street Christmas – Winter 2019
- Schomberg Agricultural Fair – Spring 2020

Staff plan to meet with the organizations to inform them of the circumstances and work to find a solution to assist with the delivery of their programming during the service disruption.
4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

The 2019-2022 Capital Budget identified the Schomberg Community Hall renovation project and allocated $1,000,000 in funding for these works, although the timing was originally slated for 2020-2021.

Due to the award of the federal grant and stipulated timelines for completion as a condition of accepting the grant funding, the project timeline must be accelerated. As such, staff is recommending advancing the project to begin in 2019 and achieve substantial completion in 2020, with the primary source of funding being reserves.

The following table outlines the project budget and funding areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project - Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Schomberg Community Hall Renovations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Accessibility Fund</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Reserves</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While funding from the infrastructure reserve is proposed as a temporary source of funding to support acceleration of the project, the approved sources of funding for the 2020 Capital Budget will be realigned as a means of replenishing the infrastructure reserve by way of a contribution from the tax supported capital reserve.

5. **INTEGRATED SUSTAINABILITY PLAN LINKAGE (ICSP):**

The recommendation of this report predominately supports socio-cultural goals and strategies of the Integrated Community Sustainability Plan, specifically encouraging and supporting an active lifestyle; and providing places and spaces for the community to meet, socialize and enjoy recreational activities.

It also links to the financial goals as it relates to finding opportunities for costs savings and/or efficiencies in municipal spending — in this case, the acquisition of grant funding to offset tax supported funding. Additionally, the investment in infrastructure assists in the Townships asset management portfolio, extending the lifecycle of the facility.

**Prepared and Submitted By:**

Chris Fasciano
Director - Parks, Recreation & Culture
Notice of Meeting

Monday, May 13, 2019

Re: Committee of the Whole, Closed Session

Council of the Corporation of the Township of King will hold a Committee of the Whole, Closed Session on: Monday, May 13, 2019 following the Council/Committee of the Whole 6:00 p.m. meeting.

1. Motion to move into Closed Session pursuant to Part 5, Section 39 of the Procedural By-law Number 2018-60 to consider the following items:
   i. Part 5, Section 39, Subsection 39.1(c):
      Proposed or Pending Acquisition or Disposition of Land
      Parks, Recreation and Culture Department Verbal Report
      Re: Land Acquisition Matter
   ii. Part 5, Section 39, Subsection 39.1(e):
       Litigation or Potential Litigation Affecting the Municipality
       Re: Litigation Matters, Direction Required with respect to LPAT Hearings
       (Bushland Heights, Mansions of King Inc.)

2. Approval of Closed Session, Confidential Reports
   i. Committee Closed Session Confidential Report of April 15, 2019

Kathryn Moyle
Director of Clerks/By-law Enforcement
Township Clerk
NOTICE OF MEETING

AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee of the Corporation of the Township of King will hold an Audit Committee Meeting to review, discuss and receive the Report to the Audit Committee – Draft 2018 Audited Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 2018.

Monday, June 10, 2019 at 5:00 p.m.

In the

Council Chambers

2585 King Road

King City, ON

Kathryn Moyle
Director of Clerks/By-law Enforcement
Township Clerk
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF KING

NOTICE OF MEETING

Clerks/By-law Enforcement Department
Re: Private Tree By-law Review

Council of the Corporation of the Township of King will consider a staff report and
DRAFT Private Tree By-law for opportunity to receive comments on:

Monday, June 10, 2019
In the
Council Chambers
2585 King Road
King City, ON

There will be a recommended period of time (2-3 months) to receive comments
and encourage community feedback and engagement, with a future by-law for
Private Trees within the three (3) communities only (King City, Nobleton and
Schomberg), to be considered later into the fall of 2019 (subject to feedback
received).

Information and copies of the staff report will be available for review at the
Township of King Municipal Offices at 2585 King Road or on the Township web-
site at www.king.ca as of Thursday, June 6th, 2019.

Kathryn Moyle
Director of Clerks/ By-law Enforcement
Township Clerk
NOTICE OF SPECIAL COUNCIL PUBLIC PLANNING MEETING

A Special Council, Public Planning Meeting will be held on:

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2019 - 6:00 p.m.

In the
Council Chambers
2585 King Road
King City, ON

The purpose of this Special Public Planning Meeting is to accommodate a necessary Planning Meeting regarding the following:

(i) Planning Department Report
Draft Official Plan
Owner/Applicant: The Township of King

Kathryn Moyle
Director of Clerks/ By-law Enforcement
Township Clerk
We invite you to participate in our Mayor’s Annual Golf Tournament Mexican Fiesta Thursday, July 11, 2019 Nobleton Lakes Golf Club To register please visit www.king.ca