Table of Contents

1.0 Quinte Conservation – November 26, 2025

	Comment	Responder	Response
1	As per QC's last response, staff are generally supportive of the onsite stormwater strategy outlined in the stormwater report. Both adequate stormwater quantity and quality control are obtainable by the approach proposed. The very low impervious cover and development density, makes the use of BMPs, lot level controls and treatment train approaches suitable design approaches. Staff have no outstanding concerns with the operational stormwater design.	**ENGAGE**	It is noted that QC staff have no outstanding concerns with the stormwater management design, and as such, no revisions have been made to the report or design. As previously noted, the permeable pavement locations are located very far away from the proposed well and are not expected to impact the water quality in the well. There are no opportunities for pretreatment or hydrocarbon retention in a permeable pavement parking lot. Regardless, the STEP LID Wiki authored by the LID SWM Planning and Design Guide notes the following "Like other stormwater practices, the water quality performance of permeable pavements is closely tied to the reduction of runoff volumes through infiltration. However, permeable pavements are also very effective stormwater runoff filters. Most sediments and associated contaminants are trapped within the surface pores or gravel filled joints between the pavers. A five year study of three permeable pavement surfaces in Vaughan showed total suspended solids (TSS) concentration reductions between 88 and 89%". Overall, the permeable pavers are expected to provide an enhancement in runoff quantity and quality compared to a typical gravel or paved parking area.
2	Please note that previous concerns, although acknowledged, have not been addressed in the Response Matrix. Specifically, the two parking lots (daytime and overnight guest parking) are proposed to be porous pavement with underlying infiltration gallery. The proposed configuration of pavement to infiltration gallery LID, does not provide any opportunity for pretreatment or hydrocarbon interception. This configuration provides a direct connection between possibly contaminated surface water with the water table.		

2.0 Development Services – February 11, 2026

	Comment	Responder	Response
General			
1	Please label Nordic Spa as **'Future Phase' or 'Phase Two'** on all drawings as it is not proposed at this time. Please be advised that primary access to the buildings, as shown, does	**ERA**	The Nordic Spa has been labelled as 'Future Phase' on drawings SPCA-3.1 and 3.2. The Nordic Spa plan and elevation drawings have also been removed from the building

	not appear to be within 3-15 metres of a fire route as required under the Ontario Building Code (OBC). **The fire route will need to be extended to comply with OBC regulations**. Further spa buildings do not face a street which is required under OBC 3.2.2.10 & 9.10.20.3. **This will need to be revised when the spa (Phase 2) is conducted.**		plans and elevation drawing set (sheets SPCA-9.6, 9.7, and 9.8).
Signage Plan			
2	The Traffic Impact Study does not appear to recommend the establishment of directional signage in the road allowance. Generally, only regulatory and/or warning signage is permitted in the road allowance. If the signage is to be for regulatory or warning purposes, please reference specific signage to be used as per the Ontario Traffic Manual; otherwise, please remove the signs.	**ERA**	The directional signs have been removed from the signage plan.
3	Please ensure that ground sign is outside of the sight triangle prescribed under the Zoning By-law.	**TM** **ERA**	The ground sign is located outside the sight triangle as shown in **Attachment 1** ***[refer to response letter]***. The proposed ground sign is confirmed to be outside of the sight triangle. The sight triangle as described in the Traffic Impact Study has been added to the Signage Plan drawing (SPCA- 8).
Site Plan			
4	Please indicate dimensions of required turnaround facilities as per O.B.C 3.2.5.6	**ERA**	All fire access route information has been consolidated and moved to 1:1000 plans (refer to drawings SPCA-3.3, 3.4 and 3.5). For clarity, the fire access route and turnaround facilities are highlighted in light red.
5	Please remove vegetation from any required turnarounds to ensure that there is a stable surface for emergency vehicles	**ERA**	The area identified in Comment 5 (dated February 27, 2026) is not a turnaround facility, therefore the vegetation has been retained. The turnaround facilities have been highlighted in light red in drawings SPCA-3.3 and 3.4.

6	Please provide dimension for walkway to the ramp and ensure that a minimum width of 1.5 metres is provided.	**ERA**	The area for the requested dimension is not a path but a landscaped area below the proposed patio deck. The winery building has two levels with separate functions; the lower level is the hotel lobby while the upper level is the winery/restaurant. Visitors will access each level independently by separate paths. There is no exterior path connecting the two entrances. Drawing SPCA-6.1 has been revised to clarify which areas are located on the upper and lower levels. Please refer to drawing SPCA- 9.1, 9.2, 9.4, and 9.5 for more detailed information on the proposed building and circulation.
7	Please consider swapping location of access aisle/barrier-free space near to restaurant to accommodate a Type B space to the south.	**ERA**	The recommendation has been implemented. Please refer to drawing SPCA-6.1 for the revised parking layout.
8	How will parking spaces be delineated? How will barrier-free spaces be identified?	**ERA**	Parking spaces will be delineated with a concrete parking curb stop. Barrier-free spaces will be identified with a parking sign on a post. Please refer to labels 8.2 and 8.3 on drawings SPCA-6.1 and 6.2 for the locations of the curb stops and barrier-free parking signs on a post.
9	Barrier-free access shall be provided to all pedestrian entrances including those for cabins.	**ERA**	Ramps are provided to all pedestrian entrances including the barrier-free cabins and the winery building. The pool house will be accessible from grade (refer to drawings SPCA-9.22 and 9.23)
10	Please provide a guard rail on the ramp and provide a detail.	**ERA**	As per OBC 3.3.1.17, guards are only required where the difference in level is more than 600mm between the walking surface and the adjacent surface. The proposed ramps are within that threshold, therefore a guard is not required. A handrail and pickets have been added to drawings SPCA-9.9, 9.10, and 9.11. Refer to drawing SPCA-9.10 for a typical section detail of the proposed handrail.
11	Please include dimension for access ramp on the site plan drawing in addition to the elevation drawing.	**ERA**	Dimensions for all ramps have been added to drawings SPCA-9.2, 9.4, 9.9, and 9.10.

12	The underground storage tanks appear to encroach into the required fire route which is indicated as having a 6.0 m dimension on the landscape plan. **Please realign the fire route to provide a minimum width of 6.0 m exclusive of the storage tanks or verify that tank performance will not be impacted by traffic above.**	**ENGAGE**	The location of the underground storage tanks have been revised to avoid the encroachment with the fire route.
13	Please include loading space dimensions.	**ERA**	Loading space dimensions have been added to drawing SPCA-6.1.
Traffic Impact Study & Cross Section			
14	A Peer Review of the Traffic Impact Study and Cross Section was completed by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Ltd (Attachment 1). Please provide an Addendum Letter to address the comments from Paradigm.		Refer to responses below.
15	Please provide additional rationale to justify use of 'resort hotel' factor to calculate trip generation which results in fewer vehicle trips than a non-resort hotel. Notably, the majority of the units are classified as non-resort in the servicing study calculations.	**TM**	The site trip generation approach used in the December 2024 Report is conservative as noted in the Peer Review **Comment #5**. Refer to Peer Review **Comment #5** response for additional details on the site trip generation approach used in the December 2024 Report.
	Additional clarification from County Staff (Feb 6, 2026): The resort factor has been applied in the TIS which would reduce the number of vehicle trips to the property whereas the bedroom hotel rate has been applied in the Hydrogeological Study which would result in a reduced water demand. I am thinking that these should be consistent but perhaps we can discuss further next week.		
16	Please verify whether the grade of Loyalist Parkway will impact sightlines and require changes to the cross section. If the entrance location/common element location changes as a result, this should be reflected on the Draft Plan of Condo.	**TM**	The grade of Loyalist Parkway will not impact sightlines and changes to the cross section are not required. Refer to Peer Review **Comment #7** response for additional details on sightlines.
17	Please indicate width of entrance on the cross section and verify that the entrance/internal road network can accommodate emergency services per within the Traffic	**ENGAGE**	The width and radius of the entrance has been noted on the civil drawings. The width of the entrance at the property line

	Impact Study Addendum Letter. For reference, emergency service standards are outlined in By-law 3121-2012.	**TM**	and through the site is 6m, which is in line with the TIS and By-Law. The entrance width is 6 m and can accommodate a pumper fire truck. Additional pumper fire truck swept paths are provided in **Attachment 2** ***[refer to response letter]*** which demonstrated that a fire truck can enter and exit the site at Loyalist Parkway.

3.0 Technical Review – January 14, 2026

	Comment	Responder	Response
1	The type of planning application that the study is in support of is not entirely clear since there is only a reference to a site plan control process.	**TM**	The December 2024 Report was prepared to support the site plan control process only. Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) related to the proposed uses and development standards were approved through a prior application process.
2	While the TIS does follow a standard approach for this type of study, there is no reference to any pre-consultation discussions with County staff regarding the scope.	**TM**	Response It is acknowledged that the typical practice is to submit a Terms of Reference (TOR) for a TIS to the municipality for review and approval. However, for this project it was TraffMobility's understanding that the TIS scope to support the site plan control process required the previously approved traffic study conducted by Greer Galloway dated October 8, 2021 (October 2021 Study) to be updated using recent traffic counts and to provide design input for the left turn lane and right turn taper design at the Loyalist Parkway and Site Access. As noted in the comment, the standard TIS approach was followed in the December 2024 Report.
3	There is no discussion of parking requirements in the TIS whereas the architect's site plan does include parking required and parking provided statistics on the site plan.	**TM**	According to the County's Zoning By-Law No. 140-2025, the proposed developments can be categorized as "Winery", "Restaurant", "Hotel", and "Personal Service Establishment".

			Based on the By-law requirement, the parking supply for the proposed development is summarized in **Table 1** ***[refer to letter]***. The total parking supply proposed for the development has a surplus of 111 spaces. The barrier-free parking space requirement as per the County's Zoning By-law is summarized in **Table 2** ***[refer to letter]***. The proposed barrier-free parking supply has a surplus of 29 spaces.
4	The TIS included a robust summer 2024 traffic data collection exercise, which included 24-hour traffic, vehicle classification, and speed data. It did not include field observations, which can be helpful in verifying road and traffic conditions as well as other local characteristics. It is clear from the data collected that the subject section of Loyalist Parkway operates well within capacity during peak summer conditions. It is also evident that the observed travel speeds showed very low compliance with the posted 80 km/h maximum speed limit (less than 20% of observed traffic at or below 80 km/h).	**TM**	Noted. Field observations were not conducted since the approved October 2021 Study documented site conditions and the roadway alignment does not present any apparent sightline issues. However, in addition to conducting traffic counts TraffMobility also conducted the speed study to obtain an understanding of operating speeds along Loyalist Parkway.
5	The methodology used in forecasting 2034 horizon year traffic volumes was thorough and satisfactory. It should be noted that the methodology used to estimate the site traffic component results in a conservative estimate of the forecasts (errs on the higher side) since the potential synergy of the complementary on-site uses was not estimated. As well, the use of hotel/villa *"rooms"* as the independent variable for the consultant's estimate of trip generation and hotel/villa *"bedrooms"* as the independent variable for the site architect's calculation of parking requirements should be clarified.	**TM**	The proposed hotel/villa development consists of 134 units containing a total of 148 bedrooms. Trip generation presented in the December 2024 Report was calculated based on the number of bedrooms rather than the number of units. When compared to a unit-based calculation as summarized in **Table 3** ***[refer to letter]***, the bedroom-based approach results in approximately six (6) additional vehicle trips during the Friday and Saturday peak hours. The ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th Edition for Resort Hotel (LU Code 310) indicates that the published trip rates and equations are derived from survey data reflecting an average occupancy rate of approximately 88%, rather than full

			occupancy. Accordingly, the additional six (6) trips resulting from the bedroom-based methodology represents a conservative approach and does not change the overall conclusions of the December 2024 Report. The County's Zoning By-law requires the minimum parking supply to be calculated based on the number of guest rooms and gross floor area devoted to public use (excluding the lobby), as discussed in the response to **Comment #3**. Accordingly, the number of bedrooms was used to calculate the minimum parking supply requirement.
6	The operational analysis for the 2034 horizon year background and total traffic forecasts showed that the Loyalist Parkway/Site Access intersection would have more than sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development. From a safety and efficiency perspective, it was determined that intersection improvements would be required due to the proposed development, and these include a southbound left turn lane and a northbound right turn taper on Loyalist Parkway at the Site Access. The same improvements would be required for either the Phase 1 hotel/villa development (half of the proposed rooms) or at full buildout (all proposed hotel/villa rooms).	**TM**	Noted. The recommended southbound left-turn lane and northbound right-turn taper on Loyalist Parkway at the Site Access will be provided during Phase 1.
7	While acknowledged in the 2021 Traffic Brief for the initial development proposal for the subject site, the potential effect of the relatively steep Loyalist Parkway downhill grade to the north of the subject site was not accounted for in the current TIS.	**TM**	The design requirement for intersection sight distance for passenger cars from the TAC manual and the available sight distance from the site plan are summarized in **Table 4** ***[refer to letter]*** with adjustment of 5% increase to account for the approach downslope grade between 3% and 4% for the stopping sight distance and left turn sight distance. The results show that the proposed site access has adequate sight distances for a design speed of 100 km/h when

			accounting for grade. The access sightline analysis is provided in **Attachment 1** ***[refer to letter]***.
8	In review of the Loyalist Parkway/Site Access intersection improvement drawings prepared by Engage Engineering, it was found that the design dimensions for the recommended southbound left turn lane and northbound taper matched the recommendations contained in the TIS. It was also noted that the southbound left turn lane would be located adjacent to and immediately west of the existing centreline, which is the preferred type of design for this improvement since there is no effect on the alignment of the northbound through lane on Loyalist Parkway.	**TM**	Noted. No response required.
9	The Site Access and the internal site road network was shown to adequately provide for vehicle maneuvering for access to and circulation within the site for a front-loading waste collection truck and a pumper fire truck.	**TM**	Noted. No response required.
10	It was noted that the 2021 Traffic Brief did include a report section regarding emergency access and circulation requirements, but this was not included in the current TIS.	**TM**	The October 2021 Study included a list of Ontario Building Code (OBC) requirements for fire route access design through the site. The December 2024 Report demonstrated that the site plan can accommodate a pumper fire truck throughout the site in Section 6.2 and Appendix I. Additional pumper fire truck swept paths are provided in **Attachment 2** ***[refer to letter]*** which demonstrated that a fire truck can enter and exit the site at Loyalist Parkway.
Recommendations			
1	The consultant should prepare a response to the various areas of the TIS that require clarification.	**TM**	This memo provides responses and clarifications to the identified areas of the Traffic Impact Study.
2	The intersection sight distance analysis and the design details (parallel lane and taper lengths) for the recommended southbound left turn lane at the Loyalist Parkway/Site Access intersection should be reviewed by the consultant to determine	**TM**	As noted in the December 2024 Report, the proposed site access is located approximately 200 m south of the intersection of Partridge Hollow Road and Loyalist Parkway, and a left turn lane design extending beyond the existing

	if the downhill grade on Loyalist Parkway to the north of the Site Access would have any effect on the feasibility of the design.		intersection is not considered safe. The recommended left turn lane dimensions in the December 2024 Report are provided in **Table 5** ***[refer to letter]*** which give an overall length of 190 m and the resulting left turn lane does not extend into the intersection of Partridge Hollow Road and Loyalist Parkway. As discussed in **Comment #7** response, sufficient sight distances are available for the north approach when accounting for the effect of the downgrade; therefore, the recommended left turn lane design in the December 2024 Report is consider adequate for the location as sufficient length is provided and the left turn lane does not encroach into the intersection of Partridge Hollow Road and Loyalist Parkway.
3	County staff should consider if there are any measures that may be feasible to encourage lower travel speeds and higher compliance with the posted maximum speed limit on the subject section of Loyalist Parkway.	**TM**	This recommendation is directed to County staff for consideration.
4	County staff should confirm the sufficiency of the proposed parking supply relative to the Zoning By-law and the adequacy of the proposed site plan as related to emergency access and circulation.	**TM**	This recommendation is directed to County staff for consideration. Additional pumper fire truck swept paths are provided in **Attachment 2** ***[refer to letter]*** which demonstrated that a fire truck can enter and exit the site at Loyalist Parkway.