

**RESPONSE TO 2<sup>ND</sup> TECHNICAL COMMENTS  
ADOLPHUS REACH RESORT**

June 1, 2026

To: Dale Egan, RPP, MCIP  
Planning Coordinator, Approvals  
The Corporation of the County of Prince Edward

Fotenn Planning + Design is pleased to submit this response table, together with supporting documentation, on behalf of 2522082 Ontario Inc. related to the proposed development of Adolphus Reach Resort at 1315, 1329 and 1357 County Road 7.

Department	Comment	Response	
County - Development Services	Planning Comments	1. The subject lands are designated Shoreland on Schedule A of the Official Plan. Section 4.3.1.2 2) a) of the Plan permits resort commercial uses.	Noted.
		2. Section 4.3.4.2 13) of the Official Plan states that " Permitted resort, tourist and marine commercial uses may only be located on land parcels in the Shore Lands designation which are large enough to accommodate buildings, parking, water and sanitary sewage services, landscaping and recreational facilities." A Water Supply and Sewage Treatment report was prepared by Pinchin dated July 12, 2021, along with additional comments in response to the 1st submission. In regard to the servicing:	Noted.
		i. A peer review of the Water and Sewage Treatment report and responses to the 1st submission comments has been conducted (see attached) and several recommendations were made that require additional information or a response.	Noted. Responses are provided as needed below.
		ii. Comments from the County's Engineering Dept. (see attached) are dated December 5, 2023 and also raise several questions and request additional information. These comments need to be addressed to demonstrate how the property can be properly serviced.	Noted. Responses are provided as needed below.
		iii. Furthermore, an Environmental Impact Study was prepared by Ainley Group dated June 2021. A peer review of the EIS makes several suggestions and recommendation that require additional information or a response. In particular, the peer review indicates that " The EIS should also assess the recommended sewage treatment solution, including the impacts of any piping on the escarpment and shoreline areas."	Noted. The proposed development has been scaled back and pulled away from the escarpment and shoreline. Any additional natural heritage review will be completed during the site plan control process.
		Additional information appears necessary to demonstrate that the proposal meets the intent of the Official Plan policy.	Noted. Additional information has been provided as requested.

	<p>3. Section 4.3.4.2 15) of the Plan identifies a number of criteria that are to be considered to confirm the suitability of a new resort use. A Planning Justification Report prepared by Fotenn, dated November 3, 2021, addresses the criteria in the Official Plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>i. Subsection b) states that "the suitability of the proposed density and scale of the development in relation to the site and surrounding land uses, including access and impact on the existing road infrastructure." The revised concept plan dated February 2023, proposes 13 pod villas, 1 tent villa, 50 tree top houses, 11 winery buildings, a main villa, art gallery, and the existing house on a 10 hectare site. The Planning Justification Report indicates "The lot coverage of the proposed development is approximately 10%, with approximately 80% of the property being provided as landscaped open space." There is no analysis of the density and scale of development in relation to the surrounding land uses. This analysis should be provided and demonstrate the proposal meets the intent of the plan.</p>	<p>The revised development consists of 32 villas/cabins and a main entrance building on an approximately 6.2-hectare portion of the subject site, which represents approximately 5.2 units per hectare. It is noted that the proposed development is a commercial resort, and not a residential development, however, this density calculation is provided in response to the requested analysis.</p> <p>The immediate surrounding area consists primarily of rural residential, rural and agricultural uses. County Road 7, particularly between the property and Chuckery Hill Road to the west, consists of a wider range of land uses, including commercial uses consisting of several restaurants and overnight accommodations.</p> <p>The proposed development represents a small-scale, thoughtfully designed resort integrated with the property, natural landscape and surrounding area. The proposed development will maintain landscape open space and trees throughout the property to ensure the central location of cabins on the property have limited visibility from the roadway and surrounding properties. The proposed development has a</p>

			suitable density and scale to maintain compatibility with the surrounding rural area. The proposed development is appropriate for the property in the Shore Lands designation.
		ii. Subsection d) states that "The suitability of the site for sanitary sewage disposal facilities and water supply, as determined through a servicing options investigation." As noted in section 2 of these comments, additional information appears necessary to demonstrate the proposed development can be serviced.	Noted. Additional information has been provided as requested.
		iii. Subsection e) states that " The impact of the development on surface and subsurface water, as determined through a hydrogeological study and a stormwater management investigation." Comments from Quinte Conservation and the County's Engineering Dept have been provided see attached) that raise concerns and request additional information. In particular, Quinte Conservation raises concerns with stormwater being directed to an adjacent property. Quinte Conservation also comments on the pump house for the water supply and states "This office does not support the rezoning application as presented because it illustrates structures within the flood and erosion hazards of Lake Ontario."	Noted. Responses provided as needed below.
		It does not appear that the proposal meets the intent of these policies at this time.	In our professional opinion, the revised development proposal continues to conform to the official plan and the policies referenced above.
		4. Approval of a Site Plan Control application will be required should the ZBA application be approved.	Noted.
		5. The subject lands may be 3 separate properties that should be merged and the PINS consolidated during the site plan control process.	Confirmation has been received from the applicant's solicitor that the subject lands have merged and are one lot.
		6. An Interim Control By-law approved on May 23, 2023, applies to a portion of the subject lands and temporarily prohibits development. A copy of the ICBL has been previously provided to Fotenn. The area affected includes the Wetland and the Significant Woodlands identified on Schedule B of the Official Plan. The Significant Woodlands are in proximity to a Steep Slope (an escarpment) identified on Schedule C of the Plan. The Planning Justification Report should consider the Interim Control By-law and any restrictions on development, including the main villa and proposed servicing.	It is understood the Interim Control By-law is no longer in effect.

		<p>7. An Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) will need to be issued by the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks for the sewage system. A Holding (-H) symbol appears necessary in order to ensure adequate servicing is provided. Issuance of the ECA should be a condition for removal of the Holding (-H) provision. Additional information should be provided to support the ZBA in regards to the proposed packaged sewage system, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the location of the system on the property;</li> <li>ii. the type and manufacturing specifications of the system that is proposed;</li> <li>iii. the discharge point of the treated sewage;</li> <li>iv. the method of conveyance from the development located on top of the escarpment to the discharge point on Adolphus Reach, including the location of any piping, measures to prevent freezing in the winter, and if the pipe will be buried; and</li> <li>v. details about the volumes necessary to ensure proper operation.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated May 20, 2026 prepared by Forefront Engineering.</p>
		<p>8. The Environmental Impact Study should be updated to consider the servicing infrastructure, including pipes for the proposed water supply and the sewage system and any potential impact on the Significant Woodland and Escarpment.</p>	<p>Much of the development has been scaled back and pulled away from the escarpment, and in our opinion any additional natural heritage survey work can be completed during the site plan control process.</p>
		<p>9. Safe and effective treatment of the water supply will need to be provided in accordance with applicable provincial regulations. Any necessary Permit to Take Water (PTTW) or Environmental Compliance Approval should be required as a condition to remove a Holding (-H) symbol from the zoning.</p>	<p>Refer to the revised zoning by-law amendment text included with this resubmission.</p>
		<p>10. The Geotechnical Report should be updated to consider the feasibility and implications of water and sewage infrastructure on the escarpment.</p>	<p>A geotechnical investigation report was prepared by Englobe in December 2017. Since then, the proposed development has been significantly scaled back, with fewer building proposed and less development proposed in proximity to the escarpment. The study did not find any major or relevant rock and soil instability issues during the site visit. Stability analyses demonstrated that the Factor of Safety level was above the targeted level, which meant that the global stability of the cliff and the local</p>

		stability of the rock wall are ensured. The proposed development was found not to have any impact on the global stability of the escarpment. No geotechnical issues were identified with the proposed development. Any further required review will occur through the site plan control process.
	11. The Stormwater Management Report needs to be updated to address comments from Quinte Conservation and the County's Engineer.	Noted. An updated Stormwater Management Report included with this resubmission.
	12. A Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) calculation should be provided for a barn that appears to be located at 1280 County Road 7. It should be demonstrated that the proposed development complies with the MDS requirements.	Refer to the additional Minimum Distance Separation Study calculation included with this resubmission, along with a map illustrating the MDS setbacks associated with 1338 County Road 7 and 1280/1296 County Road 7. All development will be located outside of the Type B MDS setback for both properties, as demonstrated by the concept plan.
	13. A Commercial Entrance Permit will be required from the municipality to access the new development on the property. The County's policy is to permit one entrance per site.	Noted. The Concept Plan has been revised to provide one commercial entrance. A Commercial Entrance Permit will be submitted and reviewed, as necessary.
	14. The private internal road network should accommodate emergency vehicles. More specifically, the internal road to the main villa will need to include a turn around and the dead end near the winery buildings should be eliminated.	Noted. The Concept Plan has been revised to incorporate a 30 metre radius turnaround to accommodate emergency vehicles.
	15. Garbage enclosures should be illustrated on the final site plan.	The site is sufficiently sized to accommodate garbage enclosures. The location of garbage enclosures will be identified through the future site plan control application.

		<p>16. Comments have been provided from various departments and agencies that need to be addressed, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Engineering Department of Prince Edward County;</li> <li>ii. The Operations Department of Prince Edward County;</li> <li>iii. Quinte Conservation;</li> <li>iv. Peer review comments of the Water Supply and Sewage Treatment Report;</li> <li>v. Peer review comments of the Environmental Impact Study;</li> <li>vi. The Agricultural Advisory Committee;</li> <li>vii. First Nations comments</li> </ul>	Noted. Responses provided as needed below.
<b>County - Engineering Comments</b>	<b>Water Supply and Sewage Treatment Letter</b>	1. That the comments provided by the Peer Review be addressed.	Noted. Responses provided as needed below.
		2. It is understood a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) will be required from the MECP. In addition to the PTTW, will an ECA for water also be required?	Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated May 20, 2026 prepared by Forefront Engineering.
		3. Please provide more information regarding the Package Treatment Plant (PTP) including but not limited to:	
		a. the types of Package Treatment Plants (PTP) systems are being considered? An example of one of the systems mentioned in the report was the Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) system, is this the only PTP being considered? Please provide a description of how the systems being considered work.	
		b. How much space is required for a PTP?	
		c. Where will the discharge from the system be directed to and how?	
		d. It was noted that a PTP might be the more appropriate option over a leaching bed system due to the significant daily flow and the depth of bedrock. Is there a minimum/maximum amount of flow required for a PTP system?	
		e. It is understood the intention is to operate the resort all year round (4-seasons). Since the system will be designed for the maximum sewage flow, how will the effectiveness of the system be impacted during the periods where all units are not occupied? What percentage of the maximum flow is required for the system to be effective?	
f. If the intention is not to operate the resort all year round, how will that impact the PTP system if it is not used for a portion of the year?			
g. In addition to a PTP system, will additional treatment/disinfection equipment be required for the effluent discharging from the PTP system? Such as tertiary filtration, UV systems, etc.			

	Preliminary Stormwater Management Report	<p>4. Based on the preliminary SWM report (dated June 2021) and the comments provided, it is understood the preliminary report increased the 5-year runoff coefficient by 25% for the 100-year storm to account for majority of the rainfall now becoming runoff. It is also understood from the comments that only the 100-year storm used a different runoff coefficient, and that all the other storms (such as the 25mm 4-hour quality event, 2 year, and 5 year) used the runoff coefficient identified for the 5 year. It is understood this method was as per the MTO Drainage Management Manual Part 4 Design Chart 1.07.</p> <p>However, the comments note that for the revised preliminary SWM report (dated February 2023) only a single higher range runoff coefficient was selected to be used for all storm events. Based on the calculation table in Appendix B, the pre-development conditions use the runoff values originally calculated for the 5-year storm (from the previous report). The post-development flows use a mixture of the runoff values originally calculated for the 5 year and runoff values between the 5-year and 100-year storm (from the previous report). Please clarify what is meant by using a higher range runoff coefficient?</p>	Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated September 19, 2025 prepared by Forefront Engineering.
		<p>5. It is understood Outlet 1 and Outlet 2 direct runoff from the site onto the neighbouring property. Drainage from the site cannot be directed to the neighbouring property without an easement agreement. Is there a drainage easement in place for this? Additionally, it appears as though Outlet 1 directs runoff towards the existing building on the neighbouring lot, which is concerning.</p>	Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated September 19, 2025 prepared by Forefront Engineering.
<b>County Operation Services</b>		Regarding this file, I'm assuming a site plan will be in place? My only comments are to the number of entrances and if they are commercial, the aprons should be paved.	One commercial entrance is proposed. Further details of the entrance will be provided through the future site plan control application.
<b>CCR Environmental</b>	Peer Review Comments	We acknowledge that the consultant has provided only a preliminary rough estimate of water demand for assessing options and that a more detailed calculation would later be provided. We recommend that any future assessment include the fire flows.	Noted.
		We agree with the consultant that a surface water intake is likely to be the most feasible option for water supply in this setting. We agree that the surface water intake will require a PTTW as well additional permitting from the Conservation Authority, and potentially others.	Noted.

		We recommend that the consultant provide some information/feasibility assessment regarding available lake depth and routing of the water from lake level up significant height to the resort from below the escarpment during winter months – to prevent freezing.	Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated May 20, 2026 prepared by Forefront Engineering.
		We are not convinced that the water supply treatment system can be operated under O.Reg.319/08 unless the resort is closed for 6-months of the year or there are less than five or fewer T-offs from the treated water main. We recommend further discussion, additional support and options regarding this matter.	Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated May 20, 2026 prepared by Forefront Engineering.
		We agree that the sewage disposal system will require an MECP ECA, whether for a large subsurface sewage disposal system (LSDS) or a Package Sewage Treatment system.	Noted
<b>Quinte Conservation Authority</b>	<b>Stormwater Management</b>	As presented, Quinte Conservation can only give preliminary conditional support to the stormwater strategy outlined in the revised stormwater report. The approach presented, will provide a measure of stormwater control and conveyance. The suitability of the proposed system relies on factors related to the adjacent stormwater receiving property. If these concerns are satisfied, then the approach may be sufficient and suitable.	Noted. Refer to additional information provided through this resubmission.
		Outlet 1 continues to be a concern. This discharge point is onto an adjacent property whose ownership is not specified. As water is being collected and discharged at elevated levels to predevelopment, and being discharged uncontrolled, the full impacts on the external property must be clearly analyzed. Also, Outlet 2, which is primarily sheet flow, sees a significant rise in flows onto the same property. The owner of the external property is not legally required to receive increased surface flows or flows from a charged flow regime. A drainage easement and agreement would be required.	Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated September 19, 2025 prepared by Forefront Engineering.
		The impact of the increased flows needs to be assessed. There is a building immediately proximal to the drainage path. Impacts to this structure, as well as conveyances and erosion should also be analyzed. With Adolphus Reach immediately available as a receiving water body, it is very likely these impacts would be minimal, or easily obviated. Regardless, participation and permission of this property owner would be required in pursuing a strategy of uncontrolled stormwater discharges across said property. The requirement for quantity control (post development runoff peak flows and flow regimes to match predevelopment) is normally required to alleviate impacts to stormwater receiving offsite properties.	Refer to the Response to Technical Comments letter dated September 19, 2025 prepared by Forefront Engineering.
		Stormwater that is released directly to Adolphus Reach at Outlet 3, can be discharged uncontrolled. Only erosion and quality concerns would be applicable.	Erosion and quality concerns are addressed in the stormwater management report.

		Until all potential issues with storm water discharge points (Outlet 1 in particular) leaving the property are resolved, no further review is possible.	Noted. Refer to the additional information provided through this resubmission.
Zoning By-law Amendment		One of the provisions proposed within the TC-XX Zone includes a proposed minimum setback of 5 metres from the 1:100-year flood plain of Lake Ontario. Although, the proposed TC-XX Zone as illustrated in Appendix A (page 43) of Fotenn Planning + Design's Justification Report, dated November 3, 2021, would not include lands below the 1:100-year flood elevation and flood hazard area (inclusive of wave up-rush). It should be noted that the setback from the 1:100-year flood plain elevation (76.03 metres) is 15 metres (as per Quinte Conservation Regulation and Policy). Further, and more importantly, staff cannot issue permits for any new development within the Erosion Hazard Limit as stated below.	Noted. The development has been revised to relocate all accommodation units outside of the erosion hazard limit area.
		Another provision proposed within the TC-XX Zone includes a proposed minimum setback of 5 metres from the escarpment. The top of the escarpment is not labelled on the drawings. It is staff's opinion that the top of the escarpment is near the Erosion Hazard limit. Quinte Conservation's setback from the Erosion Hazard Limit is 6 meters.	Noted. The escarpment setback has been added to the concept plan. All cabins have been relocated outside the escarpment and associated setback. Private utilities continue to be proposed within the escarpment setback and relief continues to be requested. The existing cottage is located within the escarpment area, no changes are proposed to the structure as a result of this application.
		The Environmental Protection site specific zone (EP-XX) proposes to add the following non-residential uses: a club house, accommodation units up to a maximum number of 20 units, and private utilities. Quinte Conservation would not permit the club house (main villa), nor would accommodation units be permitted within the Erosion Hazard of Lake Ontario.	Noted. The development has been revised to relocate all accommodation units outside of the erosion hazard and environmental protection area. An existing legal non-complying cabin is proposed to remain in this area, and no changes are proposed. The proposed EP-XX zone has been revised and seeks to permit private utilities and a cottage and accessory building as they currently exist.
		This office does not support the rezoning application as presented because it illustrates structures within the flood and erosion hazards of Lake Ontario.	Noted. Refer to the revised concept plan and revised zoning by-law amendment text.

Concept Plan	<p>The area within 15 meters of the wetland and 15 meters of the Erosion Hazard Limit is regulated by virtue of Ontario Regulation #319/09 - Regulation of Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses. A permit from this office for all construction and site grading within this area is required.</p>	Noted.
	<p>Staff acknowledge the 100 year erosion hazard limit now included on the plan. As per the plan all the cabins are now located outside of this limit. As stated in our original letter, the foundations of the structures must be located a minimum of 6 meters from the erosion hazard limit. Portions of the proposed decks can be constructed within the setback.</p>	All development will be located a minimum of 6 metres from the erosion hazard limit.
	<p>The plan includes changing the existing cottage near the bay to a Villa. As shown on the update plan, the proposed Villa is located within the Erosion Hazard Limit. Staff can only issue a permit to reconstruct the building on the existing foundation and the same square footage or smaller. Staff cannot issue a permit to enlarge the structure. However, in saying that, staff are not satisfied that the existing driveway to the proposed Villa provides safe access. Staff have inspected the site and observed very steep slopes both up and down gradient of the driveway.</p>	No change to the existing cottage footprint is proposed. Potential required modifications to the existing gravel service road will be reviewed through the future site plan control process.
	<p>Further, there is evidence of erosion on the upgradient site. The existing width of the driveway and lack of turning circle at the bottom may be an issue for emergency vehicles.</p>	Potential required modifications to the existing gravel service road will be reviewed through the future site plan control process.
	<p>Further, the proposed pumphouse is located within the Erosion Hazard Limit. Staff cannot issue permits for new structures within a hazard.</p>	Given the intended water service via lake intake, a pumphouse is proposed and is intended to be located within the escarpment.
	<p>The proponent may want to reconsider the re-use of the cottage as a villa. Both the structure and the access are located within the Erosion Hazard Limit. The slopes are very steep in this area. Perhaps the existing cottage could be demolished and used for a more passive purpose.</p>	Noted.

<p><b>Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc</b></p>	<p>Environmental Impact Study Peer Review</p>	<p>Section 6.0 indicates: <i>The identified marsh feature is associated with tile drainage from the former agricultural fields, and is not considered to be provincially significant.</i> This conclusion is certainly reasonable but should be supported with brief information such as the size of the marsh, extent of standing water and associated wildlife potential, vegetation diversity, and isolation from other wetlands.</p>	
		<p>Section 6.0 indicates no watercourses were observed on the site however Section 6.1 refers to an agricultural drain. Additional information is required on why the drain is not considered a watercourse. The drain does not appear to be discussed in Section 6.4. Section 6.3.8 describes the ground flora but should also describe the tree cover and any other woody vegetation in addition to regenerating red cedar.</p>	
		<p>Sections 6.4 and 7.0 – the amount of development along the shoreline should be clarified. Based on Figure 4, there appears to be no alterations planned along the immediate shoreline. The development description in Section 7.0 should confirm that no docks will be installed, describe any in-water work such as piping required for the pumphouse and sewage treatment discharge if applicable. Details of the fire pit should be briefly described. When discussing northern map turtle in Section 6.6.1. the wording <i>Limited development is proposed along the shoreline</i> is used. What is this referring to? Section 7.0 should clearly indicate that all work associated with converting the existing cottage to the main villa will occur south of the 15 metre shoreline setback and address impacts on the escarpment.</p>	
		<p>Sections 6.5.1 and 6.6.1 and Table 1 – since the EIS was written the status of barn swallow has changed. A discussion of black ash should be added. Also, in Section 6.6.1 it is suggested that the seasonal timing for butternut health assessments be identified as this could represent a constraint on project scheduling. The information in Section 8.1.5 that based on the existing concept design a 25 metre setback may not be possible for the butternut located nearest to Adolphus Reach should be repeated in this Section as it does appear a BHA of at least this one butternut will be required;</p>	
		<p>Section 7.0: Refer to the updated concept plan as required. For clarity should indicate that the main villa/clubhouse will be constructed using the footprint of the existing cottage and that the existing residence fronting onto County Road 7 will be retained/expanded within a new severance. Typical footprints of the smaller villas should be provided. I didn't see the overall size of the site in the EIS. This could be added to the introduction or here.</p>	
		<p>The EIS should also assess how the development is consistent with a minimum setback of 5 metres from an escarpment established by the special planning provisions.</p>	

<p><b>Muncaster Environmental Planning Inc</b></p>	<p>Environmental Impact Study Peer Review</p>	<p>Section 8.1.3 - <i>If works are required within this timing window, then the area should be cleared of nests by a qualified biologist within five calendar days of the activity being undertaken.</i></p>	<p>The proposed development has been scaled back and pulled away from the escarpment. In our opinion, any additional natural heritage survey work should be completed during the site plan control process.</p>
		<p>For clarity, the setback descriptions in the legend for Figure 4 should be repeated for Figure 2. The legend should also identify what the purple polygons west and east of the meadow marsh in the south portion of the site are referring to.</p>	
		<p>On Figure 2 the legend should also include the yellow cross-hatching representing the wetland boundary. If the blue is the extent of a dug pond, the text should elaborate why all of the pond area is not included in the wetland boundary. Section 6.4 indicates that the dug pond is dominated by marsh vegetation.</p>	
		<p>Section 9.0, fourth bullet: recommend adding that properly keyed in silt fencing will also isolate the work areas from turtle, snakes, and other sensitive wildlife. The work areas should be searched each morning prior to the commencement of work and any sensitive wildlife relocated as required outside of the work areas.</p>	
		<p>Mitigation measures to control the spread of non-native vegetation, including dog-strangling vine, is recommended for Section 9.0. These measures should include proper preparation of construction machinery before transporting off site.</p>	
		<p>Updated field surveys and other additional information should be added to a revised EIS, though no changes in the current assessment conclusions of the EIS are anticipated, pending the new observations collected during the 2024 field season.</p>	
		<p>I agree with the assessment, recommended mitigation measures, and conclusions of the Environmental Impact Study as described in Sections 8 and 9. Given the historically disturbed nature of much of the site and retention of the more significant areas of the site from a natural heritage perspective, the proposed development would appear to be suitable from a natural environment perspective, provided the important mitigation measures to protect Adolphus Reach, the escarpment, and other adjacent and onsite features and functions are properly implemented.</p>	

<b>Agricultural Advisory Committee</b>	1, The last time I checked, you needed 5 ac in vines to get a winery Licence. Looking at their latest map it looks less than that.	The vineyard and winery buildings have been removed from the revised Concept Plan.
	2, They have 11 winery building plus a tent villa and parking space listed that looks like a larger footprint than the vineyard itself leading to the question, are they there to support the vineyard, or is the vineyard there to support an events venue.	The vineyard and winery buildings have been removed from the revised Concept Plan.
	3, Grapes need intensive spraying programs so closeness is not compatible with an art gallery, a pond ,or higher human activity.	The vineyard and winery buildings have been removed from the revised Concept Plan.
	4. We would have liked to see the MDS setbacks for the barns at 1280-1296 CR7 in this package but even without them we feel the gallery and the events venue should be a type B setback. Reference Pub 707: "Type B uses are typically characterized by uses that have a higher density of human occupation, habitation or activity."	Refer to the additional Minimum Distance Separation calculation included with this resubmission, along with a map illustrating the MDS setbacks associated with 1338 County Road 7 and 1280/1296 County Road 7. All development will be located outside of the Type B MDS setback for both properties. The previously proposed winery, gallery and events venue have been removed from the proposed development.
	5, The land is rocky and shallow and with this high density of occupation we have concerns about water and wastewater impacts to the Bay. With the Bay of Quinte remedial action plan still asking for more support from agriculture and the municipality more large private systems maybe problematic.	The vineyard and winery buildings have been removed from the revised Concept Plan.
<b>Alderville First Nation</b>	Submit Notice of Request to Consult along with \$300 cheque	A Request to Consult has been submitted to Alderville First Nation.
<b>Hiawatha First Nation</b>	No comments or concerns (at this time)	Noted

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"><b>Nation Huronne-Wendat</b></p>	<p>The Huron-Wendat Nation wishes to be consulted for this project. We are also interested in participating in all archaeological fieldwork for this project, as well as receiving copies of the draft reports for review and comments. Funding must be made available to insure our participation.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. A Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment was completed by Abacus Archaeological Services which confirmed no significant archaeological resources were found, and no further work is required within the study area. The Archaeological Assessment was entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports on October 23, 2017. Both the Archaeological Assessment and Ministry Clearance Letter were included with the original application submission.</p>
---	---	--

We trust that this addresses the comments and the development can move forward to a Statutory Public Meeting. Please feel free to contact the undersigned with any additional comments or questions at 613.542.5454.

Respectfully submitted,



Mike Keene, MCIP RPP  
Principal  
Fotenn Planning + Design



Kelsey Jones, MCIP RPP  
Senior Planner  
Fotenn Planning + Design