G R E E R
GALLOWAY
CONSULTING
ENGINEERS

1620 Wallbridge Loyalist Road
R.R. #5
Belleville, Ontario
K8N 4Z5

Telephone
(613) 966-3068

Facsimile
(613) 966-3087

E-mail
Belleville@greergalloway.com

September 6, 2023

The Corporation of the County of Prince Edward
P.O. Drawer 1550
332 Main Street
Picton, ON
K0K 2T0

Attn: Matt Coffey
Planning Coordinator, Approvals
Development Services Department

RE: File Number Z-38-22
Trae Resort, 2353 County Road 7 – Ward of North Marysburgh
Application for Zoning By-law Amendment
Responses to Peer Review Comments

Phase One Environmental Site Assessment

1. Under section 3.3.1 it is noted that Google Earth Satellite Imagery dated 2015 was reviewed, however Table 2 notes 2017.
   A. The typo has been corrected.

Water Supply/Sewage Treatment

2. Note: understood that the Conservation Authority is still able to peer review reports including water balance? Will/can this be peer reviewed by Conservation Authority?
   A. Responses to Quinte Conservation comments provided under separate cover

3. Section 3.3 notes the soil is an Ameliasburg loam overlaying bedrock and exhibits good drainage. Based on the Geotech report conducted, it seems like the soil is mostly clayey soils. Does this soil type impact the drainage/infiltration?
   A. The site specific soil conditions will govern drainage/infiltration not the soils mapping. We found that the oil were more clayey than the mapping would suggest although drainage was still good over much of the property - likely due to the thin overburden and the effects of macrostructures such as desiccation fractures.

4. The report has 2 appendices; Appendix A - well records and Appendix B - fire flow calculations. Section 3.3 and section 6, note there should be 3 appendices; Appendix A - detailed description of soils, Appendix B - well records, and Appendix C - fire flow calculations. There seems to be an appendix on a detailed description of soils missing.
   A. The description of soil conditions is contained in the soils report in Appendix A.

5. It is understood an ECA is required for the development. In addition to the ECA, will this development still be required to meet D-5-4?

A. The ECA process supersedes Guideline D-5-4.

6. It is understood the year-round pool is expected to provide water for fire protection.
   A. This is the planned approach.

7. It is understood that the amount of water needed to supply the site is unlikely to be obtained through conventional groundwater supply wells. Two options for water are mentioned; extension of Municipal services or surface water taking. It is noted that extending Municipal services impractical. A Permit to Take Water maybe required for the surface water taking. Until it is confirmed that the site is permitted to take surface water, it is uncertain if the site can supply the amount of water needed.
   A. We agree that water supply is dependent on a surface water source. There is no permitting required for a surface water taking less than 50,000 L/day however the intake structure requires a permit from Quinte Conservation.

Stormwater Management Report

8. The drainage area of the combined pre-development parcels and the drainage area of the combined post-development parcels do not match the total area of the site noted under section 2.0.
   A. Noted and corrected.

Updated and corrected reports are provided with this letter. The Greer Galloway Group trusts this response satisfies the requests of the initial peer review.

Yours truly,

GREER GALLOWAY
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Peter Zandbergen, P.Eng.
Project Manager
pzandbergen@greergalloway.com

G R E E R
GALLOWAY
CONSULTING
ENGINEERS

1620 Wallbridge Loyalist Road
R.R. #5
Belleville, Ontario
K8N 4Z5

Telephone
(613) 966-3068

Facsimile
(613) 966-3087

E-mail
Belleville@greergalloway.com

September 6, 2023

The Corporation of the County of Prince Edward
P.O. Drawer 1550
332 Main Street
Picton, ON
K0K 2T0

Attn: Matt Coffey
Planning Coordinator, Approvals
Development Services Department

RE: File Number Z-38-22
Trae Resort, 2353 County Road 7 – Ward of North Marysburgh
Application for Zoning By-law Amendment
Responses to Peer Review Comments – Quinte Conservation

Stormwater Management

1. Quinte Conservation has no concerns with the proposed stormwater strategy outlined in the report. Discharge from the developed area of the site will be directly towards the Bay of Quinte. Quantity controls are not required for this discharge. The undeveloped area that continues to discharge south to the county road will not see a notable change in flow rates.

2. While no concerns were raised, it is noted that existing conveyance to the north after the flow spreaders will be maintained similar to existing, including heavily vegetated / rock slopes; shallow swales along the edges of the gravel path; steel troughs provided for flows to cross the path; gravel surface will be maintained that balances traction / safety and maintenance demands. These features have been in place for many years and are expected to continue to be adequate with the proposed redevelopment.

3. Conveyances of storm water flows will be by a network of enhanced swales leading to three flow spreader protected discharge points at the top of the slope. Flows during a regulatory event have not been adequately analyzed for conveyance, but are not anticipated to cause significant issues.
   A. Additional and clearer comments have been added regarding major storm event conditions. Note: Channels will convey the major event and flow spreaders at the slope to the north have been enlarged to control the major event as well as the minor event.

4. Final detailed grading is not presented in a drawing and has not been reviewed. Drainage via sheet flow (on a significant slope) towards the conveyance swales may pass near buildings. At construction, a grading strategy that directs surface sheet flows away from building foundations should be checked.
   A. All buildings will be located and constructed in a manner that provides a minimum 2m apron sloped at 2% away from the building. All drainage

will be such that it is conveyed without risk to buildings. A site grading plan was prepared and can be shared if it was not previously as part of the peer review package.

5. Flow spreader and outlet positioning are shown on the plan drawings at the top of the slope. The potential for erosion on the slope and the bottom of the plunge should be checked. Also, stormwater discharges may have to cross a road at the bottom of the slope. How this water crosses the road is not addressed in the submission.
   A. The intent is that, to the extent possible, existing drainage condtiions will be emulated by the provision of multiple flow spreaders and construction encroachment into the sloped area is avoided to maintain the existing heavy vegetation / rock surface. Based on site observations, it is felt highly unlikely that the anticipated flows through the 100mm outlet pipe across the rip rap energy dissipation pad will present an errosion issue, but the owner is aware of this possibility and will put additional measures in place should it be required. Should it be necessary, a rip rap swale at the top of the retaining wall and/or a shallow asphalt swale at the foot of the wall can be constructed - but the desire is to minimize construction encroachment into these areas and mainting a gravel path surface if at all possible.

Servicing

6. The Planning and Design Rationale states that water will be supplied via a shore well. As per O. Reg. 596/22 this office no longer provides comments on water supply and/or hydrogeological reports. Please note that the installation of a shore well requires a permit from this office. Shore wells must be installed above the 100 year floodplain.
   A. Noted, a permit will be requested at the appropriate time.

Slope Stability

7. Staff do not concur with the following:
   - The erosion rate stated in the report is 2.9 cm per year. The erosion rate stated in the Quinte Conservation Shoreline Management Plan (approved June 2022) is 10 cm per year.
   - A minimum setback of 20 meters from the crest of slope along the lake is recommended. The hazard limit extends approximately 20 meters inland from the crest of the slope. Quinte Conservation's setback for structures that require a municipal building permit is 6 meters from the hazard limit.
   - A minimum setback of 20 m is recommended from the slope at the bay unless stabilization measures are implemented. QC's policy does not allow for reduced setbacks where shoreline stabilization measures are in place or proposed. It should be noted that with the exception of the comments regarding the retaining wall, there is no discussion on the stability of the driveway down the slope and safeguards to prevent erosion of the surface of the road.

   A. The slope stability report was prepared coincident with the Quinte Conservation Shoreline Management Plan. It was prepared using then-existing MNR guidance. It is noteworthy that the modular dock described in the Planning Rationale is the primary feature at the shoreline and is not a permanent structure. The proposed By-Law moves development

outside a 30 m setback from the flood line or high water mark with the exception of removeable or floating structures. The proposed By-Law amendment provides a setback of 26 m from the crest of the steep slope bordering the bay.

Updated and corrected reports are provided with this letter. The Greer Galloway Group trusts this response satisfies the requests of the initial peer review.

Yours truly,

GREER GALLOWAY
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Peter Zandbergen, P.Eng.
Project Manager
pzandbergen@greergalloway.com

G R E E R
GALLOWAY
CONSULTING
ENGINEERS

1620 Wallbridge Loyalist Road
R.R. #5
Belleville, Ontario
K8N 4Z5

Telephone
(613) 966-3068

Facsimile
(613) 966-3087

E-mail
Belleville@greergalloway.com

September 6, 2023

The Corporation of the County of Prince Edward
P.O. Drawer 1550
332 Main Street
Picton, ON
K0K 2T0

Attn: Matt Coffey
Planning Coordinator, Approvals
Development Services Department

RE: File Number Z-38-22
Trae Resort, 2353 County Road 7 – Ward of North Marysburgh
Application for Zoning By-law Amendment
Responses to Peer Review Comments – CCR Environmental

1. The consultant has identified that a surface water intake is the only feasible solution to meeting development water requirements. We recommend that the consultant evaluate/comment on the feasibility of multiple wells to service the proposed development. We note that a MECP ECA would be required as the flows exceed 50,000 L/day. Should a surface water intake be the only solution, we note that a MECP ECA for a large drinking water supply will be required.
   A. The provision of multiple wells was considered during development and the records of surrounding wells were reviewed. Well records indicate the presence of water between 40 to 50 feet but are more often dry. To preserve the site and prevent unnecessary drilling of dry wells a surface water intake was the arrived conclusion. An ECA and permit will be requested at the appropriate stage in development.
2. The consultant has identified that an LSSDS is feasible and that a MECP ECA will be required. We agree that a MECP ECA will be required for the proposal LSSDS. We recommend that the consultant evaluate/comment on the use of multiple smaller sewage disposal systems.
   A. The use of multiple smaller sewage disposal systems was considered. Owing to the project directive to maintain a high percentage of natural space and the presence of limiting features (e.g. ephemeral swamp), the construction of a single LSSDS was preferable to manage the construction area and limit natural feature disruption.
3. The consultant will have to confirm/demonstrate that the swimming pool will have water during the winter months.
   A. The swimming pool's dual use as water reservoir is confirmed in the Planning and Design Rationale document included with the submission package.

Updated and corrected reports are provided with this letter. The Greer Galloway Group trusts this response satisfies the requests of the initial peer review.

Yours truly,

GREER GALLOWAY
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Peter Zandbergen, P.Eng.
Project Manager
pzandbergen@greergalloway.com

G R E E R
GALLOWAY
CONSULTING
ENGINEERS

1620 Wallbridge Loyalist Road
R.R. #5
Belleville, Ontario
K8N 4Z5

Telephone
(613) 966-3068

Facsimile
(613) 966-3087

E-mail
Belleville@greergalloway.com

September 6, 2023

The Corporation of the County of Prince Edward
P.O. Drawer 1550
332 Main Street
Picton, ON
K0K 2T0

Attn: Matt Coffey
Planning Coordinator, Approvals
Development Services Department

RE: File Number Z-38-22
Trae Resort, 2353 County Road 7 – Ward of North Marysburgh
Application for Zoning By-law Amendment
Responses to Peer Review Comments – Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc.

General Commentary

1. More analysis on the extent of significance associated with the cultural alvar habitat would be helpful. For example, page 5 of Appendix D with respect to reptile hibernaculum indicates that alvar habitat is not present. Most of this community will not be disturbed but the septic system is proposed for the west portion of the community.
   A. Reptile hibernaculum assessment included in appendix D has been reviewed and information regarding the significance of alvar habitat has been included in Section 7.1 Significant Woodland of the updated EIS.

2. It would be helpful to locate the butternuts on one of the Figures. Photo 26 shows potential habitat for reptiles. Will this habitat be retained and protected?
   A. Location of the buternuts have been included in Figure 4. Vegetation communities. A copy of the Butternut assessment report has been included in the updated EIS report. It would be recommended to create reptile habitat close to this area as the pile of material will be removed.

3. The EIS should clarify in Section 8.2 which site alterations are proposed in the regulated area adjacent to Lake Ontario, including the upgrading of the existing deck/boat dock, and how these alterations are consistent with activities within the regulated area, including setbacks.
   A. Additional information has been included in the updated EIS.

Suggestions

4. page 1, Section 2: The closest wetland is approximately 630 m east of the property boundary. This wetland is mapped as unevaluated wetland. May be helpful to indicate here that as assessed in this EIS, small previously unmapped wetlands are on the site.
   A. The information has been included in the updated report.

5. page 3, Section 3: For the Environmental Protection Area description it may be helpful here to reference Figure 3 to indicate to the reader the portion of the site covered by the Environmental Protection Zone though page 1 does indicate it is the escarpment that is zoned Environmental Protection.
A. The information has been included in the updated report.

6. page 4, Section 5.2.4: it would be helpful to identify the date that the MNRF database was accessed.
A. The information has been included in the updated report.

7. page 6, Section 6: there is a general reference to photos at the end but it would be helpful to identify a specific photo number after a feature, for example the retaining wall along the waterfront driveway, to assist the reader.
A. Photos has been referenced in the updated report.

8. page 11, Section 6.6.1: in text could indicate that the eastern meadowlark observation was off-site, though this is identified in Table 3.
A. The information has been included in the updated report.

9. page 11, Section 6.6.4: could indicate that the habitat associated with the observation of amphibians will be retained and protected as described later in the EIS.
A. The information has been included in the updated report.

10. Table 3 – should add black ash which is now listed in Ontario though there is an exception currently in place.
A. The information has been included in the updated report.

11. page 16, Section 6.7 (and also on page 18): Retainable butternuts would be either Category 2 or 3. Table 3 should identify that at this time it is not anticipated that the healthy butternuts will be impacted. Referring to page 18, the removal or harm of this small number of healthy butternuts would not require a permit from MECP, but would be addressed through the on-line registration process
A. The information has been included in the updated report.

12. page 20, Section 8.2: The landowner is proposing a cottage resort adjacent to an Environmental Protection (EP) Zone, which includes the significant woodland and the escarpment…. Impacts to the EP Zone are not expected as development is not proposed within this area. Could repeat more detail here including the distance of the closest portion of the development to the EP zone and a reference to where in the Tables other mitigation measures to avoid impacts are provided.
A. The requested information has been included in the updated EIS report.

13. page 21, Table 4. As Section 4 indicates that the existing buildings will be removed, would a summer evening survey for potential bat activity in these building be helpful?
A. All the buildings do not have open spaces for bats to get in and use them as roosting or hibernation habitat.

Updated and corrected reports are provided with this letter. The Greer Galloway Group trusts this response satisfies the requests of the initial peer review.

Yours truly,

GREER GALLOWAY
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Peter Zandbergen, P.Eng.
Project Manager
pzandbergen@greergalloway.com