

**Third Submission Comments**

**Subject Property:** Block 44, West Meadows, 24 Beasley Crescent

**Application Type:** Site Plan Control Application

Section	Comment Number	Comment	Response
Site Plan	1	Please ensure all dimensions are illustrated for setbacks of buildings to lot lines and parking areas.	Please see updated drawings
	2	Please remove the line work from Site Plan 2 (adjacent site) on the drawing.	Please see updated drawings
	3	Indicate where the fire hydrants are located on the site plan.	Please see updated drawings
	4	Please illustrate Water Main Easement on the Site Plan.	Please see updated drawings
Typical Floor Plan and Elevation Drawing			
	5	Please provide updated floor plans and elevations. Floor plans should label areas and units within the building. Please provide all dimensions in metric.	Noted
	6	Common laundry facility. Please identify the common laundry facility that has been referenced in the floor plans. The floor plans by Glenn Dowds do not indicate where laundry facilities within the building will be located. Please provide an updated set of floor plans. The comment response matrix provided in the third submission suggests that laundry is located in the basement, but this is not shown on the floorplans.	Laundry is located on floors 2 and 3
Landscape Plan Drawing			
	7	Some plantings are in proximity to the sanitary lateral and water service into both buildings. We do not recommend plantings near the sewer lateral or water services due to root issues and challenges associated with excavation, if repairs are required.	This has been addressed.
	8	Please amend the location of the White Pine tree planting on the east side of the building between building and easement. Concern of being planted close to building and to watermain easement. Relocating this tree will resolve conflicts with plantings near the easement.	This has been addressed.
	9	The as-built drawings provided by Ainley for Phase 2 of the West Meadows Subdivision illustrates a conflict for tree planting and will require an update to street tree plantings.	This has been addressed.
Functional Servicing Report			
	10	Plan & Profile - WM Connection - DWG NO. C-PP-1 (dated 09/24/25) - shows a 300x300x200 tee fitting on the watermain in the easement closest to Loyalist Parkway with a 200mm watermain stub with a 200mm valve and cap to service the future building or possibly the two buildings on this property. If this future building has road frontage on the Loyalist Parkway, which it appears it does, it should be serviced with water from the Loyalist Parkway and not connected to the watermain in the easement. The other future building, if it has road frontage, should also be serviced for both water and sanitary from Loyalist Parkway as the services will be much shorter than to connect to Beasley Crescent. If the two future buildings are required to be serviced from road frontage and will connect from Loyalist Parkway, we would recommend they bring these services to property line, when they connect the 300mm watermain in the easement to the 250mm watermain on Loyalist Parkway	The proposed stub has been removed.

11	<p>Plan &amp; Profile - WM Connection - DWG NO. C-PP-1 (dated 09/24/25) - shows a 10m watermain easement from Loyalist Parkway to Beasley Crescent and it appears as though it is on the edge of the property at 13260 Loyalist Parkway. The watermain between the two buildings is not in the best interest of our users and should not be placed in this location. The watermain in this location exposes the County to additional risks, increased costs due to challenging repairs, and liability when failures occur. Should consideration be given to moving this easement further to the east, past the fourth building (Phase 2)? This location could have a properly accessible and constructed access road that could be designed in a way that reduces the chance of difficult repairs and the risk of liability. Also, we received feedback from PEC Engineering that "we will also add language into all subsequent phases that when the connection is made through Beasley to GWB to the east, the main/easement will be abandoned if adequate fire flow can be achieved without out." PEC Engineering has indicated that this watermain could potentially be decommissioned in the future, if fire flows can be achieved without it. We want to ensure that the language is clear that this will be developers' responsibility to decommission this watermain, if necessary, in the easement and not the County's. We want to ensure that this watermain in the easement will be accessible and that structures, trees/plantings will not be placed over this easement. It appears in the drawing set that a portion of the parking lot for future Stage 2 will be located over this watermain easement. It would be ideal if the parking lot were not located over the watermain easement, as it makes repairs, if required in the future, more costly. If a decision is made, through our PEC Engineering department, to keep this as a permanent watermain easement, language should be inserted/included in the subdivision agreement that speaks to the developer being responsible for the costs of all refurbishment/repair of damaged surface works/structures (e.g. asphalt, curbing, etc. that needs to be reinstated after repair of watermain in an easement).</p>	<p>The watermain loop will remain as discussed with the County.</p>
12	<p>page 5 - States, "based on the modeling results, the existing downstream system is adequately sized to accommodate the proposed development, concluding there is no known impact due to the proposed development and no need for expansions or upgrades. Appendix B includes the graphed maximum HGL under the ultimate condition along Loyalist Parkway, from the site connection to the intersection with Lake Street. From this figure, it can be shown that no pipes are surcharged." The modelling ends at the intersection of Loyalist Parkway and Lake Street. Modelling needs to continue to Lalor SPS. Manhole 522-521 on Lake Street is already near capacity as outlined in the Picton MSP. This comment was included in the previous submission comments and the response from Insite Project Consulting Inc. was, "the proposed flows from this current Stage 1 (Buildings 1 and 2) and proposed future flows from Stage 2 (200 units) result in 2.98l/s additional flows from the approved West Meadow Subdivision Ph.2, If additional HGL is required, we would need the updated municipal model." The Water and Wastewater Department is working with PEC Engineering to ensure the County wastewater model is updated on Picton Main Street, in the area of Cold Storage Road and Lake Street to accurately reflect the sanitary sewer conditions in this area, and then likely an updated municipal model can be provided.</p>	<p>Refer to the updated modeling results included in the FSR.</p>
13	<p>Functional Servicing Report - West Meadow Phase 2 Block 44 Apartments - Appendix B - page 19 - This drawing shows that Stage 1 (Buildings 1 and 2). 54L/s but they have been revised to 7.07L/s due to a much greater number of units. This is a significant change, and additional modelling work will be required prior to Stage 2 being submitted. This comment was included in the previous submission comments and the response from Insite Project Consulting Inc. was, "noted." We will need to ensure that when Stage 2 is submitted, the modelling accurately reflects the anticipated flows based on the number of units/persons. The Functional Servicing Report that was updated in September of 2025 shows Stage 1 (Buildings 1 and 2) current design flow of 2.10L/s and the future Stage 2 (Buildings 3 and 4) conceptual design flows as 6.48L/s. These values have changed slightly from what is shown above due to using 320 average daily per capita flow versus 350 average daily per capita flow.</p>	<p>The anticipated density of future Stage 2 development is provided for the purposes of the downstream HGL analysis requested. Please clarify what is required for Site Plan approval of Stage 1.</p>
14	<p>NOTE: The Water &amp; Wastewater Department require a water tie-in and commissioning plan and the opportunity to review, prior to any work being undertaken on county water and sewer mains. A meeting with the water and wastewater department and the contractor might also be a good idea to better understand the scope of work and tie-in and commissioning plans.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	15	NOTE: PEC Water and Wastewater operations staff must be onsite for all tie-ins and connections to the water and wastewater systems.	Noted
	16	NOTE: The PEC Engineering department will need to confirm that all requirements of the new CLI-ECA will be met for the proposed sanitary work. Engineering sign-off may be required on particular form(s) (SS2) as per CLI-ECA requirements for these connections.	Noted
	17	NOTE: PEC Engineering will need to weigh in on capacity allocation for the Picton Water Distribution System and Picton Wastewater Collection System with regards to this development. We realize that the increase in usage may not be very significant for this development but want to ensure this has been included in the overall capacity values/calculation for Picton.	Noted
Building Comments			
	18	Indicate the location of fire hydrants and confirm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>distance to standpipe connections</li> <li>location of the principal entrance including distance to the hydrants, and street(s). This comment is still outstanding.</li> </ul>	Please see updated drawings
	19	Indicate barrier free access to the building(s). Under the 2024 OBC 3.8.1.2 (1) all pedestrian entrances to be barrier free.	Please see updated drawings
	20	Fire access route to conform to OBC 3.2.5.5 and 3.2.5.6.	Noted
	21	Confirm laundry facilities provided. Outstanding - Stated that there is laundry, however not shown on floor plans.	Laundry is located on floors 2 and 3
	22	Ensure barrier-free access to parking as per OBC 3.8.2.2, including an access aisle min, 2.44m x 7.4m and curb ramps and exterior walls.	noted
Accessibility Advisory Committee Comments			
The comments from the Accessibility Advisory Committee have been included for your reference.			
Within the revised site plan submission, please ensure that all of the drawings are consistent with the building design for accessibility.			
	23	As there is no specific mention of affordable units, can it be assumed that the size of the units is to be considered affordable? No improvements or modifications have been made to address the accessibility concerns with units. David had indicated that these will be CMHC Affordable rental units. Please confirm as the response contradicts David's comment.	The units will not be CMHC affordable housing units, they will be market rentals.
	24	The larger spot closest to Building 1 is not near any of the building entrances. These spots still require crossing the driveway to get to the door.	This parking spot is the closest parking spot to the end of the ramp leading into building 1; any other spots result in the travel distance increasing.
	25	The first building looks like a car could block the driveway to stop at the ramp leading into the building. A better design would be a proper drop-off area.	Please see updated drawings
	26	Specific barriers related to Building 1 (on page 6 of Civil-Drawing-Binder): a) Building 1 west (rear) entrance ramp leading to 10 steps to entrance. b) Building 1 north (side) entrance ramp leading to 4 steps to entrance. c) Main entrance has a ramp to enter in addition to 4 steps. d) South (side) appears to have ramp to door.	Please see updated drawings
	20	Specific barriers related to Building 2 access (on page 6 of Civil-Drawing- Binder:	Noted
		a) Building 2 west (main) entrance ramp in addition to 7 steps	
		b) Building 2 north (side) entrance ramps leading to 5 or 4 steps to entrance.	
		c) Main entrance has ramp to enter in addition to 4 steps.	
		d) South (side) appears to have a ramp to enter the building however where the ramp begins at the parking lot the plan shows a solid curb with no cutout. This makes a barrier to the building.	
		e) No pathway from Beasley Road to north (side) Building 2 that is barrier free. Must go back to main entrance and through the parking lot to gain barrier free access to the building	
		f) Appears to be a 1:10 barrier free ramp to the entrance of building 2, however at the top of the ramp, there are steps leading to the building entrance ("Elevations Building - 2- Architectural - Floor - Plans.pdf" Page 5)	