



Ecological Services
R.R. 1, 3803 Sydenham Road
Elginburg, Ontario K0H 1M0
Phone: (613) 376-6916
E-mail: mail@ecologicalservices.ca

Oct 31, 2024

Sean McGregor
Campfire Circle
464 Bathurst St.
Toronto, ON
M5T 2S6

VIA EMAIL: Sean@copegroup.ca

RE: Campfire Circle EIS Review Addendum

The following addendum is provided in reference to some requests made by B. Muncaster, the EIS peer reviewer. This addendum is separate from the Comments Response Matrix that is being provided by the applicant in response to inquiries/comments (including others by the peer reviewer) that cover a variety of topics, including those associated with the EIS.

Peer Reviewer: The results of pre-consultations with the County and Quinte Conservation should be added to the EIS, perhaps in an appendix and referenced in the text.

ES Response: Aside from the attached, there have also been consultations with PEC and QC between the applicants' consultants acting on our behalf throughout the EIS production effort. This information was relayed to us via conference calls.

Peer Reviewer: The EIS needs to be a standalone document and once the development plan and stormwater management approach are finalized, the EIS is to be updated with the recommendations of the stormwater management, erosion and sediment control, and landscape planting plans, and finalization of the wetland and shoreline setback areas.

ES Response: It is our understanding that erosion, sediment, and planting plans have not been required for the rezoning application. When the time comes for the required submission of these documents, we can cite them. However, our expertise is in natural heritage assessment, and we are not qualified to determine the efficacy of engineering plans or landscape planting plans per se, and will defer to the various commenting agencies (e.g., MECP) and/or peer reviewers in that regard. As the authors of the Natural Heritage part of the EIS, it is our opinion that this part of the EIS process is stand alone, and it will be up to the applicants planning consultants to package all the appropriate documents for review purposes at the site plan control stage.

Peer Reviewer: The EIS contains many map excerpts which are valuable when referring to specific features and functions in each sub-section of the EIS. However, the EIS needs more comprehensive mapping so the reader can understand the overall context of the proposed development with respect to wetland boundaries and fish habitat and other features and functions and associated setbacks. This information should be overlaid on the aerial photography. Much of this information is on Figure 1 but is difficult to read.

An overall figure should include an airphoto base, the site boundary, the wetland/ANSI boundaries and names, and associated 15 and 30 metre setback lines clearly identified, and components of the proposed development.

ES Response: The resolution quality for EIS report purposes is limited by the large size of the development property and the 8.5 x 11” format of the digital reporting. On page 3 of the EIS, it was noted that a higher resolution image could be obtained by the applicant, and this is being provided as an attached image in the applicants planning package with the intention of showing the requested features by the peer reviewer.

Respectfully submitted,



Rob Snetsinger
Ecological Services