



Commenting Agency	Comment Type	Item No.	Comment Package 2021	Agent Response (February, 2022)	PEC/ Reviewer Response	Agent Response (August, 2022)
PEC DS	Planning	1	Part III Section 1.3 of the County Official Plan contains policies for The Bay of Quinte Remedial Action Plan. The subject lands fall within the Bay of Quinte. Section 1.3.2 b) states that the protection of fish and wildlife and shorelines along the Bay of Quinte in as natural a state as possible. Please outline how the proposed applications are consistent with this policy.	The land adjacent to the shoreline will be zoned 'LSR-XX-Limited Service Residential' zone with special provisions. The top of bank has not been surveyed, therefore in accordance with the EIS, the proposed LSR-XX zone will stipulate that a 30m naturalized buffer shall be provided adjacent the 100 year flood line, and no alteration of the soil or vegetation is permitted within this area. In addition, a 6m building setback will be provided from the 30m buffer. No building permits will be issued within this buffer area. In response to concerns from Quinte Conservation, the area of infiltration for the level spreaders will not be located within this buffer area. The Drainage Plan prepared by Ainley Group has been revised to reflect this amendment.	Satisfied	
		2	Part II Section 2.6.3 of the County Official Plan states that where a multi-lot development containing six or more residential units are proposed to be development in the form of detached dwellings within a plan of condominium full communal servicing will be required where no municipal water service is available. The proposed development being proposed to be accessed and developed through a plan of condominium as such relief from this section is required	It is understood that the appropriate referenced section is Part III Section 2.6.4. In our opinion, this section was intended to apply to a traditional Plan of Condominium. This project is being developed by way of Plan of Subdivision which will create the 8 building lots. These lots are not Units within a condominium and therefore the detached dwellings to be constructed on these lots will not be "within a plan of condominium" as stated in the OP. Each owner of a lot on the plan of subdivision will however, also have an ownership interest in the common element condominium which will own the road. Therefore, Section 2.6.3 of Part III is not applicable to this application. This interpretation has been confirmed with Kirsten Musgrove, the solicitor for the project. It should be noted that when the 1993 PEC OP was adopted, alternative forms of condominium registration had not been formulated by the provincial legislation, and "condominiums" were wholly applied to traditional forms of condominium. All references in the 1993 PEC OP would have been for a traditional form of condominium registration.	Without a Plan of Condominium the proposed lots could not be created. Therefore, the project is being developed by way condominium and plan of subdivision.	Acknowledged. Relief from Part III, Section 2.6.4 is included as part of the OPA application.
		3	Part III 2.8.1 c) of the County Official Plan permits shoreline lots with water servicing from a dug or drilled well provided that an adequate supply of water for domestic use will be provided. Please outline how the proposed "dug wells" that act as shore wells will provide an adequate and safe supply of water.	Please refer to the Response from BluMetric. It is recommended that both filtration and ultraviolet sterilization be required for those lots serviced by shore wells.	Satisfied	
		4	Part IV Section 4.3.1 states that Shore Land Subdivisions shall be designed to avoid the completed development of the shoreline with single or multiple rows of lots. Please outline how the proposed row of 8 lots which consist of the entire shoreline is consistent with this policy?	The shoreline will not be completely developed with of a row of eight lots. Use is restricted such that 36m adjacent to the waterfront and regulatory floodplain will remain undevelopable. In addition, approximately 75m of the shoreline will be zoned to recognize the pioneer cemetery with no alteration permitted.	Yes, but the subdivision is a row of 8 lots which will have single detached dwellings. The entire shoreline will be used by the private owners of the 8 lots. Will the owners not use their waterfront?	Block 9 is proposed to be an Open Space/Cemetery Block and will be deeded to the municipality. It will include 80.7m of shoreline frontage and will have an area of 1.19 ha.
		5	Please outline why Open Shoreland and Cluster Subdivision Concepts as outlined in Part IV section 4.3.2 of the Official Plan were deemed inappropriate for this site?	a) Open Shoreline Concept is not appropriate since the property is not located on either side of a public road. It is only located on the north side of County Road 7. Therefore, this concept is not applicable. B) Cluster Concept is not appropriate given the topography of the site and the need to protect the escarpment which is zoned 'Environmental Protection'. Therefore, back lots are not appropriate. In addition, a dense cluster of homes would not be in keeping with the rural character of the landscape.	a) This is by choice as the proponent is choosing to do a condo road. Why was a public road eliminated with lots on either side as an option? B) Ok regarding the topography. However, cluster subdivisions are to be 3-15 lots the proposal is 8, if a cluster is too dense how is the proposal not to dense for the rural character? Similarly, Treasure cove appears to have a cluster type development directly adjacent to the site.	As discussed and resolved at the July 5th, 2022 meeting with staff, Open Shoreland Concept is not appropriate given that the property is not located on either side of a public road. Construction of a public road parallel to the shoreline would not be practical given that the required shoreline buffer area and location of the escarpment would limit the buildable area. Similarly, the topography limits the ability to utilize the Cluster Concept and maintain the minimum density requirements of 0.8ha lot size. For these reasons and similar to most other Shoreland subdivisions in PEC, the Linear Concept was chosen.



Commenting Agency	Comment Type	Item No.	Comment Package 2021	Agent Response (February, 2022)	PEC/ Reviewer Response	Agent Response (August, 2022)
		6	Section 4.3.3 of the Official Plan states that new residential development in the shore land shall only be by a publicly maintained and assumed year-round road. The proposed application needs relief from this policy	a) Access to the new development is not from a private right-of way, which was the intent of this policy. B) Access to the condominium road and subdivision is from a publicly maintained and assumed road (County Road 7). C)The condominium road will be built in accordance with municipal requirements and will be assumed and maintained by the condominium corporation. d) As referenced in 3 above, when the 1993 PEC OP was adopted, registration of a common element condominium did not exist in the legislation. The intent of the OP is maintained in our opinion, however should the County feel that relief is required, it can be part of the OPA.	The lots are accessed by a private condominium Road not a publically maintained road. Relief is required	Acknowledged. Relief from Part IV, Section 4.3.3 is included as part of this OPA application.
		7	Part V Section 1.1.4 of the Official Plan states development by Plan of Condominium shall be permitted only on land where municipal and/or communal water and sewer services are to be provided. Relief from this section is required.	A Plan of Subdivision is proposed, not a Plan of Condominium. In accordance with Part V Section 1.1.2, where four or more lots are proposed, development shall be by Plan of Subdivision. Therefore, this section is not applicable.	Your clients applied for a Plan of Subdivision and Plan of Condominium. The lots are proposed to be accessed by a private condominium road, the lots could not be developed without a plan of condominium. Relief is required.	Acknowledged. Relief from Part V, Section 1.1.4 is included as part of the OPA application.
		8	Please note that Municipality will not take any responsibility of the Cemetery and it will be the responsibility of the Condominium Corporation to maintain	a) The Turner Hill Cemetery is a municipal cemetery pursuant to Bylaw No 3452-2014 and is already under care and control of Prince Edward County. Given that this is an inactive cemetery, it would appear that the obligations are not significant. The Certificate issued by the Bereavement Authority of Ontario confirms that Prince Edward County is the Operator of the Turner Hill Cemetery Licensed Site 03536 under License 3298026. An Operator of a Cemetery must be licensed under the Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002 and an owner of a cemetery has an obligation to ensure that the cemetery is operated and maintained by a licensed operator in compliance with the requirements of the Act.	a) Yes but your clients are proposing to create a new residential lot within the cemetery. If you would like municipal maintenance of the cemetery please revise Draft Plan to make lot 8 entirely Open Space and reduce the number of residential units to 7. Please provide a parking and access plan.	The Municipality of Prince Edward County is responsible for the cemetery as indicated by the Certificate issued by the Bereavement Authority of Ontario. Block 9 will provide the municipality access and parking to the cemetery without the need to cross private property. The lot line between lots 8 and 9 should be delineated with features such as a cedar rail fence, hedgerows or other natural features. This can be identified on a Landscaping Plan as part of the Subdivision Agreement. Further, Agreements of purchase and sale should indicate that the cemetery will be maintained in its natural state with minimal maintenance by the municipality. Finally, PEC may also be granted access over the common element road in Block 10
		9	Conditions will be outlined in the an agreement outlining the standards to which <i>the cemetery is maintained</i>	Acknowledged.	Acknowledged	
		10	The Prince Edward County Zoning By-law does not permit Residential Uses within certain distances of Cannabis Production Facilities. Please review the Cannabis Policies in the zoning by-law and outline in rationale how the proposed is consistent with these policies.	The Cannabis Bylaw, as drafted, does not reciprocally apply to the sensitive uses of land within the setback area. The Bylaw prohibits the use of the land for cannabis production within the prescribed setbacks but does not prohibit the use of land for sensitive uses such as residential uses within the prescribed setback area. The bylaw does not therefore appear to prohibit the residential development within the setback.	Satisfied	
	Lot Grading Plan	12	The Condominium Road shall be designed in accordance to Municipal Emergency Services to Private Roadways By-law 3121-2012 (See attached), specifically have a change in gradient of not more than 1 in 12.5 over a minimum distance of fifteen (15) meters.	The Condominium Road has been designed in accordance to Municipal Emergency Services to Private Roadways By-law 3121-2012. An access memo has been completed outlining the review of the access slopes, including a vertical curve assessment and recommend speed limits. The Access Memo, dated January 11, 2022 is included with this submission.	Satisfied	
		13	Confirmation required that driveway gradients between the Condominium Road and Building envelope can be constructed to accommodate emergency vehicles such as a fire truck.	The driveway gradients between the Condominium Road and building envelopes have been designed in accordance with By-law 3121-2012. In addition, a Fire Truck Turnaround detail has been included on the Lot Grading Plan.	Acknowledged, will be reviewed in greater detail during detailed design.	Noted - the plans provided are already considered full detailed design for the site plan/condo portion. It is expected that as part of the building permit process each lot will provide their own individual grading plans.
		14	A 10m drainage easement between County Road 7 and the Adolphus Reach is required to be deeded to the County to provide a stormwater outlet from County Road.	A 10m drainage easement has been added between County Road 7 and the Adolphus Reach.	Satisfied	
	Lot Grading Plan 2022 comments				A note for the right turning taper should be included. OPSD, material (gravel or asphalt), etc.	This is already on the detailed plans - see attached.



Commenting Agency	Comment Type	Item No.	Comment Package 2021	Agent Response (February, 2022)	PEC/ Reviewer Response	Agent Response (August, 2022)
					The septic system on Lot 5 is right against the property line of the drainage easement. The septic system should be setback from the drainage swale to allow for the min. 15 metre soil mantle around the septic system.	The western easement boundary within lot 5 is not the property line of the lot. The septic is not encroaching with the property boundary. It is expected that during the building permit stage lot specific plans will be prepared that will show the actual building footprints and septic system location.
					A note should be included on the Lot Grading Plan under the Road Design section regarding the right turning taper and OPSD.	There are already notes on the plans, these can be supplemented as necessary pending additional detailed drawing review comments.
	Environmental Impact Study	15	The EIS recommends a 30m setback from the top of slope of the escarpment feature. This location should be clearly marked on the lot grading drawing	The escarpment has been identified on the plans, and the 30m setback from the toe of the feature has been identified, the 30 m setback from the top of the escarpment is not within the site limits.	Satisfied	
		16	Please review and respond to the Peer Review Recommendations.	Please see Response letter from Ainley Group, dated January 27, 2022 and Revised Environmental Impact Study, dated January, 2022.	See GHD letter dated April 15, all comments resolved	
	Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment	17	The Archeological Report identifies a cemetery and sand pit on the property. This should be noted in the Phase 1 ESA.	Page 5 of the Phase 1 ESA prepared by BluMetric and which accompanied the submission, does identify the cemetery and former aggregate pit.	Satisfied	
	Archaeological Assessment	18	The limits of the cemetery should be defined on all future plans.	The limits have been added to the Lot Grading Plan.	Satisfied	
		19	The recommendations of the Archeological Assessments shall be followed.	Acknowledged.	Satisfied	
	Geotechnical Report	20	Please update lot grading and drainage plans should be updated with all site information	Please see revised grading plan prepared by Ainley Group.	Satisfied	
		21	Please Review and Respond to the Peer Review	Please see revised Geotechnical Report dated, January 27, 2022 prepared by Ainley Group and the attached Response to Peer Review comments located in the chart in Section 2.2 of the Peer Review.	Please review Jewel Letter dated May 12, 2022	The Jewell letter refers to long term maintenance of the road and recommends review during detailed design. As the proposed road will be a private condo element the maintenance will be outlined through the reserve fund study required under the Condo Act and is not part of the planning or detailed design components.
	Geotechnical Report 2022 Comments				Please have Ainley Group provide reasoning as to why the report is considered suitable for the proposed works to be constructed at this time.	It appears this comment is related to the previous geotech report that had some wording about the concept being preliminary. The updated report was circulated with the previous submission.
	Hydrogeological Assessment	22	Please provide an outline on how the quality of water is going to be ensured as the Wells act as "Shore Wells".	Please refer to the Response from BluMetric dated January 27, 2022. It is recommended that both filtration and ultraviolet sterilization be required for those lots serviced by shore wells.	Acknowledged, further details may be required to be outlined in the Sub Agreement	
		23	The recommended setbacks between septic beds, shoreline and wells should be incorporated on the grading and drainage plan.	a) Please see Response from BluMetric. BluMetric recommends that the minimum separation distance between a shore well and the nearest septic system be 50 m b) Please see revised plans prepared by Ainley Group.	Satisfied	
		24	Please Review and Respond to the Peer Review.	Please see Response from BluMetric.	Please review Greer Galloway letter stamped May 12, 2022	Please see Blumetric's Response dated August 2, 2022
	Traffic Impact Study	25	Please modify the gravel shoulder to accommodate a right turning taper into the site according to OPSD. Road shoulders to slow down and yield is the typical operation of similar entrances	A right turn taper has been added to the plans.	Satisfied	
		26	The study should evaluate the requirement for guiderails along County Road 7 & internal roads due to steep slopes. Please update the study to reflect this.	Guiderails are not warranted in accordance with the MOT Roadside Safety Manual; the adjacent grades on County Road 7 are less than 4:1 and as such are recoverable. The internal laneway adjacent slopes are negligible as they follow the grade of the travelled lane.	Satisfied	
		27	Please Review and Respond to the Peer Review.	It appears this comment is a typo as there are no peer review comments on the TIS.	Satisfied	



Commenting Agency	Comment Type	Item No.	Comment Package 2021	Agent Response (February, 2022)	PEC/ Reviewer Response	Agent Response (August, 2022)
	Stormwater Brief	28	The catchment areas should evaluate any existing runoff from surrounding lands, specifically County Road 7, Such flows should be diverted into a 10m drainage easement in favor of the County over the subject lands.	Catchment area has been revised to include lands south of County Road 7. A 10m drainage easement has been added in favour of the County.	Satisfied	
		29	Please provide further review of major flows during a regulatory event.	Please refer to the SWM Brief, dated January 2022 prepared by Ainley Group.	<p>Under Section 3.0 of the report, it says the velocity of the swale for Area 2 is 0.364 m/s. The calculations in the attachment has the quantity velocity as 0.630 m/s.</p> <p>The discharge (m³/s) for Area 1/A and Area 2 in Section 3.0 of the report was calculated using SWMHYMO with Curve Numbers of 58, which is for pre-development conditions. These discharge values, 0.766 m³/s and 0.164 m³/s, are pre-development flow rates. This does not account for the developed areas, which based on Ainley Groups calculations, the adjusted Curve Number should be 64 and 62 for Area 1 and 2, respectively. The swales should be sized for post-development flows. Similarly, for Section 4.0 flow rates.</p> <p>Swale calculations were only provided for between lot 5/6 and lot 7/8. The roadside ditches provided in the typical lane cross section are to accommodate the flows being directed to the swales. The west side roadside ditches along the section of condominium road traveling north-south should accommodate the flows from Area A, while both sides of the section of condominium road traveling east-west (only the east leg of the T) should accommodate the drainage from Area 1. Based on section 3.0 of the report, these roadside ditches have been sized to accommodate the 100-year storm. There are no calculations provided.</p> <p>Is it also understood the cross culvert(s) have been sized to accommodate the 100-year flow. There are no calculations provided.</p>	Thank you for catching the error, the velocity previous included was the 25mm velocity. The chart has been updated to reflect the 100year velocity. Please see revised SWM report dated August, 2022.
		30	Relocation of the flow spreader on level ground above the floodplain in a location that is gently sloped.	Level spreaders have been relocated to be above of the floodplain setback.	Satisfied	
		31	Please Review and Respond to the Peer Review.	Please Review and Respond to the Peer Review.	Please review Jewell letter dated May 12, 2022	The Jewell letter refers to ensuring adequate sediment and control measures being in place during construction; we agree with this and would expect that to be a condition outlined in the final agreement document. It also outlines the need for the condo to have access over the drainage routes for maintenance; we agree with this and is why the detailed plans show the portions not within the roadway in easements. Note: similar to item 21 above the reserve fund study required under the condo act will address long term maintenance.
Quinte Conservaition Comments		32 a)	The flow spreaders are located within the floodplain; they need to be relocated above the floodplain.	The Drainage Plan has been amended to identify the level spreaders above the floodplain.	Satisfied. However, Establishing turtle nesting area within a level spreader does not appear to be reasonable since this area will be subject to runoff from the road. Perhaps the nesting sites could be located along the top of the banks of the proposed drainage easements (above the designed high water marks).	The turtle nesting area on the backside of the vegetation strip (native sand on the shoreline side of the berm) was reviewed with the drainage engineer. The vegetation strip detail as shown on the lot grading plan has been moved outside of the floodplain and setback areas, and the configuration of the berm has been adjusted to ensure that the native sand material remains dry as part of the functionality of the berm. Any water within the drainage easement water will dissipate around the berm (not over).
		32 b)	The setback should be 36m from the top of bank and not the highwater mark.	The Draft Plan has been amended to provide a 36m setback from the 100 year floodline.	The EIS recommends a 30 m setback from the 100 year floodplain for structures plus a 6 meter amenity setback. QC Staff have no concerns with this setback from a flood hazard, erosion and slope stability point of view. Further, QC staff assume that private boathouses would not be permitted since the EIS did not include a discussion on this type of structure and potential environmental impacts.	Individual boathouses were not identified as part of the proposed development and as such were not evaluated as part of the EIS.
		32 c)	Slope stability for the shoreline may be required	Acknowledged	Acknowledged. QC Staff reviewed the slope stability section of this report which recommends a 36 m setback matching the setback in the EIS. Staff have no concerns with this setback	
		32 d)	Quinte Conservation will not issue permits for permanent structures within the floodplain.	This can be addressed within the Subdivision Agreement.	Acknowledged	



Commenting Agency	Comment Type	Item No.	Comment Package 2021	Agent Response (February, 2022)	PEC/ Reviewer Response	Agent Response (August, 2022)
		32 e)	Quinte Conservation has recommended that the Municipality contact the Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks to discuss the proposed wells.	Acknowledged	Acknowledged	
		32 f)	Assurance should be proved that loading of phosphorus from the septic beds to the adjacent water feature will not be an issue.	The Hydrogeology Technical Comments prepared by BluMetric indicate that given the large lot sizes and development density, a significant dilution of phosphorus will occur before reaching the Bay of Quinte. In addition, the large septic system setback distances from the well water supplies will also be protective of potential phosphorus loading to the Bay of Quinte	QC Staff have reviewed the technical review comments and would request more elaboration/detail regarding the impact of the proposed septic on the adjacent surface water.	Please see Blumetric's Response dated August 2, 2022
		32 g)	Permits will be required from Quinte Conservation prior to development, including construction or grading, within 60m of the Bay of Quinte.	Acknowledged	Acknowledged	
	Quinte Coservation 2022 Comments				The 100 year floodplain used in the report is 75.8. The updated floodplain is 76.08. A 15 meter setback is sufficient to avoid any potential wave uprush. Please have all future submissions reflect the 76.08 Floodplain	The flood elevation noted on the LG and Draft Plan has been updated.
					The 36 meter setback must be applied to septic systems and swimming pools.	Noted; we would expect that to be part of the building permit review for each individual lot grading plan.
					In regards to SAR staff recommend that the municipality request confirmation from the applicant/consultant that MECP has reviewed the EIS and has issued the necessary SAR authorizations under the Endangered Species Act.	As part of the EIS, the SAR authorizations/review are limited to the retainable Butternut locations on the site. A formal Butternut Health Assessmnet was completed for these trees, and was submitted to MECP on August, 27, 2021. Confirmatin and receipt of MECP was provided in the attached correspondence on September 16, 2021. MECP Review Notice is included with this submission. The response by MECP acknowledges the 30-day review period and notes that the proponent is eligible for the Butternut exemption (if required) 30 days following the Aug. 27, 2021 submisson.
Public Comments	Public Comments	33	Please outline how proximity of the Cemetery to the Wells could impact the wells	Please see response from BluMetric. Given that the last internment for the cemetery occurred in the early 1800's, it is BluMetric's opinion that the cemetery has exceeded its contaminating lifespan and there are no contaminants of concern posed by the cemetery	Acknowledged	
		34	Please review the floods of 2017/2019 and outline how they could impact the proposed development and what is being proposed to ensure flooding does not negatively impact the site.	The regulatory flood limits and associated setbacks are identified on the grading plan. During home construction, lot specific grading plans will be required and site grading to ensure positive drainage will be provided.	Acknowledged	
		35	There was concern regarding stormwater runoff into the Bay of Quinte, coupled with the response to Quinte Conservation's Comments in this regard please outline the quality controls proposed to control the runoff	Please refer to the SWM report, and original review comments from Quinte Conservation and Jewell outlining agreement with the quality control measures to be implemented.	Acknowledged	
		36	Please outline how flooding could impact the Septic Systems and how this is proposed to be avoided and not cause impact.	BluMetric understands that the reported seasonal flooding is a result of drainage issues that will be addressed through the lot grading plans. If high water table conditions persist after planned drainage improvements, fully raised septic system design will be necessary to ensure a minimum 0.9 m separation distance between the bottom of the absorption trench and underlying seasonal high water table	Acknowledged	
PEC Environmental Advisory Committee		37	It is not clear which provides the greater protection – is the 100-year flood line further inland than the top of the bank? For clarity we would suggest that the 36m setback be measured from the more inland of the 100 year flood line and the top of the bank.		Quinte Conservation provided comments on the second submission last Friday May 6, 2022 . In these comments QC Staff noted having no concern with the 30 metres setback from the 100 year floodplain plus the 6 meter amenity setback.	

Commenting Agency	Comment Type	Item No.	Comment Package 2021	Agent Response (February, 2022)	PEC/ Reviewer Response	Agent Response (August, 2022)
		38	We have concerns over development on the current flood plain and certainly over what is likely to be the new flood plain. The new QC flood plain maps are due shortly and are likely to show an increased elevation of some 30cm from the current flood plain as evidenced by the floods of 2017 and 2019. With final site plan approvals likely to come after that date we believe the proponent should be cautioned as to the possibility of this occurring and thus building permission under the current layout may not be granted. This is also of concern as the wells are shore wells and flooding could bring about content contamination from Adolphus Reach. QC also pointed out that they do not review guideline compliance on surface water supplies and that the municipality contact the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) to discuss the proposal. Has this been done?		Satisfied. a) Quinte Conservation Staff have noted that the 100 year floodplain used in the applicants report is 75.8 and The updated floodplain is 76.08. This will be required to be reflected on all future submissions. B) In regards to reaching out the MECP regarding wells yes this has been done they noted they do not comment on Subdivision applications. The Official Plan permits shore wells and the Hydrogeological assessment is being peer reviewed	The flood elevation noted on the LG Plan and Draft Plan has been updated.
		39	We are concerned that the buffer and shoreline will lose protection over the years. Mown lawns would almost certainly bring about herbicide/pesticide/fertiliser leaching into Adolphus Reach and could have an impact on the water quality of the shore wells while removal of vegetation could have a negative impact on both erosion and storm water quality and flow into the Reach. The introduction of specific absolute requirements in the final approval could ensure protection. We support QC's suggestion that instead a communal dock be employed, particularly given both QC's and the County's limited capacity to enforce mitigation measures. Similarly, in Ainley's response to the EIS peer review concern about protection of the turtle nesting area, a reliance on future unknown property owners to do the right thing is insufficient – there should be safeguards built into final approval.		Satisfied. The shoreline buffer and associated requirements would be outlined in the Special Provisions section of the Subdivision Agreement. The agreement would be registered on the title of the lands and would be required to be followed.	
		40	The BluMetric response to the hydrogeological peer review raises some questions. They were unable to comment on the possibility of seasonal well declines but suggested that confirmatory yield testing could be performed during the summer months. Given the County's stressed aquifers, this must be required. They also commented on the need for raised leaching beds to ensure that the bottom of the trench be at least 0.9m above the highwater table, rock or soil with a percolation time of more than 50 minutes. Given the variability of the water table dependent on precipitation, raised bed septic should be employed from the outset.		Please respond	Please see Blumetric's Response dated August 2, 2022
		41	We note that no written Terms of Reference were supplied for the EIS. As the EAC has noted previously, a written Terms of Reference should be provided at the outset. Without one there can be no validated confirmation that all items have been covered.		Noted	
		42	We are aware that blue-green algae is a recurrent summer problem along the shore of this property. Given the potential toxicity to both humans and animals we wonder whether this has been taken into account in the treatment of shore well water?		Please respond	Please see Blumetric's Response dated August 2, 2022
		43	Finally, given that this property abuts the traditional fishing waters of the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte (MBQ), we are surprised that there did not appear to be comments from MBQ. Were they sought?		Satisfied. MBQ was circulated and have indicated they have no further comments at this time.	