

ARCH responses

LANDSCAPE ARCH responses

Engineering responses

Block 55, Fields of Wellington - First Submission Comments

PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY SITE PLAN		
Item no.	Comment	Response
1.	Density is low, potential for higher density should be explored.	This block creates a transition from proposed low-density homes and higher density apartment buildings at Block 15 and 55
2.	Consider reconfiguring the site to accommodate increased height.	The increased height will be accommodated on Blocks 15 and 54.
3.	Pedestrian corridor aligned with the Block 11 Walkway to connect to amenity area. Incorporate central parking area into amenity area.	Walkway has been located on the site plan (A.100) and connected to Block 55. Internal walkways are connected to the amenity area.
4.	Please provide a Lighting Plan.	Lighting plan has been provided. Please refer to Drawing E1 for details.
5.	Pedestrian pathways shall be painted. Dropped curbs are tactile plates at all sidewalk connections.	Dropped curbs and tactile plates are provided. Refer to drawing C1: Grading Plan.
6.	I high quality digital file as well as four paper copies will be required for the Final Site Plan.	Noted, these will be provided with next submission.
7.	Provide a garbage area detail.	Garbage room plan and elevations have been provided (A.401)
8.	Please include a zoning compliance table.	Zoning Compliance Table has been added (A.001)
9.	Consider dropped curb to access garbage area.	Noted. Curb will be dropped on both east and west side of garbage room.

10.	Path to west street on south side of west building	Noted and revised.
11.	Additional landscaping along southern and eastern boundaries	Noted . Additional Landscaping added along S and E boundaries.
12.	Fencing required along southern and eastern boundaries	2.2m Privacy Fence provided. Refer to C1: grading plan and landscape plan. L1.
13.	Confirm EMS turning movements	Fire route has been added to Site Plan (A.100)
14.	See attached mark ups on the site plan and landscape plan.	Noted and Revised

ENGINEERING DRAWING PACKAGE

Item no.	Comment	Response
15.	Please provide a Traffic Impact Study that addresses the impacts to the development.	The Traffic Impact Study address all on Cork and Vine projects has been submitted within Phases 2A-4A submission and is currently under review.
16.	The site has two (2) entrances that look to be approximately 12 m wide at the street and spaced fairly close together. Please reduce the width of the entrances to reduce the width at the street. One new entrance is preferred (as opposed to two. Two entrances can be considered if accesses are one directional.	Revised as requested, refer to the revised drawings.
17.	<p>Drawing C1:</p> <p>a. The slope and slope arrow are missing from the swale along the east side of the property. Cross-section B/C3.</p> <p>b. A section of the swale along the west side of the property and the swale along the south side of the property is less than 2%. For urban areas we do request a minimum slope of 2%, or where 2% cannot be met enhanced swales be used. Please revise.</p> <p>c. Please provide a detail of the intersection point between the swale along the north side and the swale along the east side. How it the runoff then being conveyed to the SWM pond?</p>	<p>a. Refer to revised drawing C1, slopes and slope arrows are shown for the east side swale.</p> <p>b. Refer to revised drawing C1, the swale grade has been adjusted to 2% and where 2% cannot be achieved, the swale has been modified to an enhanced swale.</p> <p>c. Refer to revised drawing C3, detail added showing how the runoff will be conveyed to the SWM pond.</p>

	d. Has the runoff from the parking lot, that will be directed to Street 'R', been accounted for in the road design and in the CB's to the east of each entrance?	d. Yes, drainage from the entrances are directed to the Right of Way and are accounted for in the Fields of Wellington Subdivision design.
SITE SERVICING & STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT		
Item no.	Comment	Response
18.	Section 2 notes the minimum recommended fire flow is 218.1 L/s, but then notes that the Maximum Daily flow plus the Fire Flow is a minimum of 218.1 L/s.	Refer to the revised report, the minimum recommended fire flow is 217 L/s.
19.	Appendix B - The Fire Flow calculation only looks at the Fire Flow for the East Building (28 units). What is the Fire Flow required for the West Building (32 units)?	Refer to revised appendices, required Fire Flow for the West building are included added.
20.	Section 3 and Appendix B notes a Infiltration Allowance of 0.14 L/s/ha was used for the sanitary calculations. This should be 0.28 L/s/ha?	Refer to revised Sanitary Sewer design sheet, sanitary calculations are updated with PEC preference for Infiltration allowance of 0.28 L/s/ha.
21.	Section 3 notes the peak sanitary sewage flow will be 1.6 L/s, however Appendix B identifies the peak design flow as 1.73 L/s.	Refer to the revised servicing report, the peak flow is 2.01 L/s accounting for the 0.28 l/s/ha infiltration and PEC previously requested 350 L/cap/day.
22.	There are some inconsistencies between the areas outlined in FIG 3 and the areas used in the Composite Runoff Coefficient calculations.	Refer to the revised calculations, all inconsistencies have been corrected.
23.	Please clarify what event was used for the minor storm event. Why does the minor event rainfall intensity change at each CB in the storm sewer design sheet?	Refer to the revised report, the minor event is defined as the 5 year event. Note that the rational method is being used for design of the storm sewer system and the rainfall intensity is a function of the time of concentration. The initial time of concentration of the storm sewer system is taken to be 15 minutes at the upstream inlet. Added to this value is the travel time in the conduit (pipe or swale) to the next inlet. The resulting time of concentration is than used for calculating the intensity at the next point. At the

		intersection of two or more conduits, the longest time of concentration is selected and the procedure is continued downstream. As the time of concentration through the system increases the intensity decreases.
24.	What major event was used? Please provide calculations. What storm event are the swales designed for?	Refer to the revised Report the major event is defined as the 100 year event. Additional discussion is included in the report to clarify the major event is the 100 year event. The swales are designed for up to the major event. Refer to the revised Storm Sewer and Swale design sheet in the report for additional calculations.

WATER/WASTE WATER

Item no.	Comment	Response
25.	How will the utilities/maintenance rooms in both of these buildings be outfitted with water meters and backflow prevention devices? Will the water & wastewater department have the opportunity to provide comments on the plumbing layout in the utility/maintenance rooms, with regard to water meters and BFPs, at a later date?	Noted, this will be addressed at the building permit stage and opportunity to review the maintenance rooms will be provided at that time.
26.	Fields of Wellington Block 55 - Drawing No. C2 - Servicing Plan - Has the 200mm sanitary sewer main through this property been adequately sized to handle to sewer flows from the two multi-unit buildings (60 units total)?	Yes, this is confirmed in the Servicing Report.
27.	Fields of Wellington Block 55 - Drawing No. C2 - Servicing Plan - Has the 150mm and 100mm watermain through this property been adequately sized to service the two two-storey multi-unit buildings (60 units total)?	L-2023-07-26- Response to Agency Technical Comments Page 4 of 4 Yes, this is confirmed in the Servicing Report.
28.	Fields of Wellington Block 55 - Drawing No. C2 - Servicing Plan - Why does the proposed 150mm watermain extend so far south into this property when it appears as though it could be situated much closer to Street R and extend into both the buildings?	The maintenance rooms are central to the building as is the primary entrance to locate the hydrant and metering as required the service extends midway into the property.

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Item no.	Comment	Response
----------	---------	----------

29.	that the tree policy is adhered to and that deciduous trees be used on the south portion of the site	Noted, Deciduous trees are now proposed on south portion as well. Response to be provided under separate cover.
30.	that native species, as well as pollinator plants, be used as much as possible as apposed to hybrids	Noted. Pollinator and Revised Native species used. Native species are denoted with an * symbol in the Plant List. Response to be provided under separate cover.
31.	to encourage the developer to consider heat pump technology for heating/cooling system as well as district energy system.	Noted. This can be considered at the building permit stage.

ACCESSIBILITY CHECKLIST

1. Designated Accessible Parking

Item no.	Comment	Response
1.1	<p>Is the parking layout logical for accessibility based on the use of the plan?</p> <p>The committee would like to establish whether a 1.5 metre by 6 metre unimpeded passenger loading zone aisle is required by legislation. Could the planners please confirm legislated requirements for this type of building for members.</p> <p>To consider including conveniently located dedicated family/expectant parent parking space.</p> <p>To consider whether 4 accessible parking spaces out of 91 is sufficient for the size of the building,</p>	<p>Yes, the plan provides accessible parking close to entrances where there are depressed curbs and parking aisle.</p> <p>Noted, parking is provided in according with the approved zoning by-law.</p> <p>Noted, parking is provided in according with the approved zoning by-law.</p>
1.2	<p>Is the location of parking space(s) within reasonable proximity of the building's accessible entrance(s)? Yes [changed to No]</p>	<p>Yes, accessible parking spaces are in close proximity to building entrances.</p>

	2 parking spaces are oriented where the passenger side are next to a regular width parking spot. See note below regarding width and orientation.	
1.3	Parking space(s) allow immediate access to accessible walkway? Yes Sufficient walkways, unsure if there is immediate access.	Yes, please refer to site plan.
1.4	Are appropriate and sufficient curb cuts identified? (ie sidewalks and lifted areas) Yes	Yes, please refer to grading plan. C1
1.5	Opportunity for primary location with drop-off or with no vehicle lane crossing? No Strongly encourage the developer to consider establishing a 1.5 metre by 6 metre unimpeded passenger loading zone such an inclusion either in the parking area or front of each building and would encourage the planning department to seek a reduction in the required amount of parking spaces to accommodate.	Noted, parking is provided in according with the approved zoning by-law.
1.6	Are snow storage or loading and delivery locations adjacent to designated accessible parking areas(s)? N/A Unclear of where this information is on the drawing. Please ensure there is sufficient space for snow clearance so that accessible parking spaces and adjacent walkways will be unencumbered.	Snow storage areas are not adjacent to accessible parking spaces. These areas are labeled on the site plan.
2. Barrier-Free Entrance Requirements		
Item no.	Comment	Response
2.1	Is the Main Entrance clearly identified? Yes Encourage additional building entrances that are oriented toward the road to create better interaction with and shorter active connections to Street R,	Yes, please refer to site plan.
2.2	Are the Main Entrance doors automatic? N/A The committee was unable to assess details relating to lighting, automation and identification of Entrance ways but encourage the developer to prioritise accessibility when designing these features	This will be determined at building permit stage.
2.3	Is the Main Entrance clear of all barriers and obstacles, such as garbage receptacles, planters, etc.? N/A	Noted. Garbage room has been designed to be fully accessible (dropped curb, flush transition at entrance, 38" door)

	Ensure the garbage room is fully accessible with any required features such as automatic door, curb cuts, and sufficient door width to ensure wheelchair users can be self-sufficient.	
2.4	Are light fixtures identified and placed in appropriate places for both entrance and parking lot? N/A The committee was unable to assess details relating to lighting, automation and identification of Entrance ways but encourage the developer to prioritise accessibility when designing these features.	Yes, please refer to Photometric Plan E1.
3. Other Comments/Feedback		
Item no.	Comment	Response
2.1	Due to the inherent social barriers posed by regional housing precarity and Prince Edward's current restrictive housing mix, and in keeping with the goals for housing mix and affordability stated in our Wellington Secondary plan, we congratulate any development that prioritises multi-unit blocks over single family dwellings in its implementation timeline. We encourage Cork and Vine to continue these and any efforts to aid in diversifying Prince Edward's housing landscape and in creating dense, barrier-free, and vibrant neighbourhoods.	Noted.
2.1	Committee encourages the developer to include accessible features in a small percentage of units.	A Passive, central seating area with concrete pad and benches allows accessibility for residents.
2.2	Please note the following attached diagram and comments relating to width and orientation of accessible parking spaces.	Noted and revised accordingly.

2.1	It is unclear from the drawings if all 4 spots are the same width as the document later notes state 4.0M and 2.8M.	All accessible parking spots are 4 m wide and are adjacent to walkways.
2.2	The current placement of spots 2 and 4 could present a barrier to persons with physical disabilities who use a wheelchair or other aide and a side-loading vehicle ramp as they could have difficulty using a loading ramp especially if spots 2 and 4 the narrower spots and should a vehicle be parked in the immediate adjacent spots. Spots 1 and 3 don't have this issue as their passenger sides open to a walkway.	Noted and revised accordingly.

HYDRO ONE COMMENTS		
Item no.	Comment	Response
1.	Prior to HONI providing its final approval, the developer must make arrangements satisfactory to HONI for lot grading and drainage. Digital	Noted. Forefront Engineering will coordinate with Hydro One.

	PDF copies of the lot grading and drainage plans (true scale), showing existing and proposed final grades, must be submitted to HONI for review and approval. The drawings must identify the <i>abutting transmission station</i> on the <i>site plan</i> . Drainage must be controlled and directed away from the <i>abutting transmission station</i> .	
2.	Any development in conjunction with the site plan must not block vehicular access to any HONI facilities located on the <i>abutting transmission station</i> . During construction, there must be no storage of materials or mounding of earth, snow or other debris on / <i>along</i> the <i>abutting transmission station</i> .	Noted.
3.	At the developer's expense, temporary fencing must be placed along the <i>abutting transmission station</i> prior to construction, and permanent fencing must be erected along the common property line after construction is completed.	Noted, a silt fence is proposed along the southern boundary of the subject lands OPSD 219.130
4.	The costs of any relocations or revisions to HONI facilities which are necessary to accommodate this site plan will be borne by the developer. The developer will be responsible for restoration of any damage to the <i>abutting transmission station</i> or HONI facilities thereon resulting from construction of the <i>site plan</i> .	Noted, the developer is currently in discussions with HONI regarding these issues.
5.	In addition, HONI requires the following be conveyed to the developer as a precaution: The <i>abutting transmission station</i> operate at either 500,000, 230,000 or 115,000 volts. Section 188 of Regulation 213/91 pursuant to the <i>Occupational Health and Safety Act</i> , require that no object be brought closer than 6 metres (20 feet) to an energized 500 kV conductor. The distance for 230 kV conductors is 4.5 metres (15 feet), and for 115 kV conductors it is 3 metres (10 feet). It is the developer's responsibility to be aware, and to make all personnel on site aware, that all equipment and personnel must come no closer than the distance specified in the Act. They should also be aware that the conductors can raise and lower without warning, depending on the electrical demand placed on the line.	Noted

QUITE CONSERVATION COMMENTS

Item No.	Comment	Response
----------	---------	----------

1.	<p><i>Staff have reviewed the Site Servicing & Stormwater Management Report by Forefront Engineering dated September 2022 including drawings C1 & C2 dated September 2022. Staff have the following comments: As per O. Reg. 596/22 this office no longer provides comments on water quality as part of our stormwater management review. Municipalities must continue to follow the Ministry of the Environment Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual March 2003 for stormwater quality requirements. Staff will continue to provide comments on stormwater quantity.</i></p> <p><i>This 1.3 ha apartment block is part of Phase 1B of the Fields of Wellington Subdivision. Post development imperviousness will be approximately 70%. Storm water will be directed to the Fields of Wellington stormwater management facility which has been previously reviewed. Quinte Conservation is supportive of the stormwater strategy and does not foresee any engineering constraints or potential issues in the final design and construction stage. Staff agree with the conclusions outlined in the stormwater report and have found no notable issues with the approach and calculations. Quantity controls are not required for this site given the use of the central facility. Conveyances of the minor and major flows appear adequate and suitably placed.</i></p> <p><i>The Landscape Plan indicates tree planting that may interfere with the swale placement. Trees or shrubbery should not be placed in or directly adjacent to the drainage swales. This should be checked by the consultant.</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, landscape plan has been coordinated with engineering drawings.</p>
----	---	--