

GWCA meeting notes-regarding 102 Confederation development (Glen Williams Estates) Plans meeting with Town - May 25, 2022

- Attendees from Town: Greg MacDonald – planning lead on this file; Jeff Markowiac (head of Planning); Jeff Jelsma (Engineering dept); Steve Burt (Development Engineering Coordinator)
- Page number references are to the page numbers shown on printout of file sent to town and GWE

| Issue # | Page | Town Comment/Position |
|---------|------|---|
| | | <p>General notes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To date, Glen Williams Estate (GWE) GWE has given no indication to the Town of a planned date for submitting an updated filing i.e., to respond to Town, Region, Credit Valley Conservation Authority (CVCA) and Glen Williams Community Association (GWCA) comments. |
| 1 | 2 | <p>Need for a path on Confederation St</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GWCA emphasized its concerns for the safety issues created even currently by lack of a formal path. The Town noted that GWE is still indicating a willingness to work with the Town on this issue. The Engineering department has a conceptual design study for Confederation Street planned for 2022 and one for Main Street. The study for Confederation will cover from Wildwood Road to Bishops Court. The tentative date for actual construction of Confederation is 2025. There are capital projects currently being planned for several Glen roads i.e. Confederation; Prince St; Main St. The Town noted that careful planning of timing will be required to ensure that there are not excessive overlaps of timing causing significant disruptions to traffic flow. GWCA requested that the Town hold a public consultation so that GWCA and citizens be given an opportunity to comment on the timing of the Confederation project and the relative priority/timing of the various projects. The Town agreed. GWCA suggested that the Town hold off issuing an approval for the GWE project and/or the building permits until a path is established. |
| 2 | 3 | <p>Establishment of Trails in the land deeded to the Town</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Town noted they are onside with creation of trails, noted they have met with GWE in order to indicate it's ideas/preferences for the trails design. GWCA noted that it hoped the CVCA would not push for a plan which provides open spaces but does not provide for accessible trails for the public. GWCA action: follow up with Parks & Rec |
| 3 | 4 | <p>Allowable Density of housing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The GWCA stated its rejection of the logic submitted by GWE to defend a density of 6.9 homes per hectare instead of the 5.0 permitted by the Glen Williams Secondary Plan (GWSP). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>2. Town noted it does not support the proposed density of 6.9 units per hectare. They are waiting to see what the developer comes back with.</p> <p>a. Town indicated they could accept “something more than 5.0” if the development met all other criteria. they must take into consideration the amount of land being deeded to the Town which will permit open spaces and trails. the province is pushing to get more houses built.</p> <p>3. GWCA noted that the density could be reduced by eliminating some of the homes (say # 4 to #9). This would reduce the density to about 5.6 units per hectare.</p> <p>4. GWCA also noted Town could also permit saving much of the ridge at the north side and reduce the problem of establishing road grades of less than 6%. Noting that a considerable number of the existing roads in the Glen have grades in excess of 6.0%</p> |
| 4 | 5 | <p>Number of Wells potentially impacted</p> <p>1. Town has already flagged to GWE the need for a more thorough survey of potentially impacted wells.</p> <p>a. GWCA indicated that surveys shouldn’t just be done during work hours; many people can be absent.</p> <p>2. GWCA identified at least 4 homes still dependent on wells for drinking water (i.e., are not connected to Town system) and are possibly impacted.</p> <p>3. Action for GWCA: Have each of these property owners formally contact the Town and Developer to ensure inclusion of their wells in the survey.</p> |
| 6 | 7 | <p>Establishment of a Buffer</p> <p>1. GWCA noted that the amended GWSP only requires a buffer of 0 to 10 metres; this is in contrast to the 10 metre buffer agreed to by the GWCA in negotiations for the updated GWSP. GWE is already taking advantage of this loophole to propose no buffer.</p> <p>2. Town noted they have asked GWE to provide at least a “planting” buffer. This will not necessarily be 10 meters in width but should be sufficient to provide a visual screening.</p> <p>3. GWCA noted that a visual screening is not good enough and does not equal a buffer and that GWCA will push for a buffer closer in size to 10 meters.</p> |
| 7 | 8 | <p>Need for LID (Low Impact Development) measures</p> <p>1. GWCA expressed concerns re possible need for a SWM (Storm Water Management) Pond to deal with the increasing impacts of climate change, particularly as CVC had noted a drop in infiltration as a result of the construction.</p> <p>2. Town noted the CVC did indicate it was satisfied with the plan for use of LID (Low Impact Development) measures.</p> <p>3. The Town also noted:</p> <p>a. Based on industry experience, there is an increasing trend towards use of LID measures instead of SWM Ponds; the LIDs help to get water into the ground. SWM Ponds have been found to create other problems e.g., release of heated water with attendant impacts on ecology.</p> <p>b. They are not yet satisfied with the GWE’s analysis re planned absorption by the LIDs.</p> <p>c. That swimming pools help control impacts of major storms as they hold the rainfall until released when convenient.</p> <p>Note: DJR agrees with SB’s logic; they are like small SWM Ponds.</p> |

| | | |
|---|-------|--|
| 7 | 10 | <p>Need for an outside firm to check the Water Balance assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Town rebutted GWCA’s concern re levelling the Archdekin land would add to potential flooding onto the GWE land stating that reducing the slope on the Archdekin land will slow the rate of flow during storms. 2. Town reinforced above points re potential advantages of LID measures instead of a SWM Pond. However did note that the Town is not yet committed to just use of LID measures. 3. The Town has now hired an engineer that can do the necessary review of the water balance calculations. |
| 9 | 13 | <p>Impact of Cut & Fill activities on the Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GWCA emphasized: a) The scope of the materials to be removed from the site; b) Concerns re the potential for flooding issues as per The Chase; and c) The impact of trucking needed on traffic on Confederation St. 2. The Town indicated there are rules governing removal of excess soil and its disposal and that they are pushing to have developers leave a larger amount of topsoil (e.g. 12”) instead of the typical 6”. In addition to being better for the environment, it also reduces the amount of trucking required. |
| 9 | 14 | <p>Removal of Hill on north side of property</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GWCA noted the impacts of removing the hill/ridge e.g., excess dirt to be trucked; potential impact on climate change; possible increase of flow onto property from Archdekin property. 2. GWCA asked whether the Town is in favor of removing the ridge? NO SPECIFIC RESPONSE 3. The Town did however indicate they can’t forbid removal of the ridge (it is within the “developable area”) as long as GWE meets all formal planning requirements. The Town can’t actually say No to the developer’s plan if they respect the development rules/limits and taking into account what GWE proposes to deed to the Town. GWCA questioned whether the planned road slope is less than the 8% limit; the answer is Yes, it is 6%. 4. Town noted that levelling the Archdekin field (i.e., with soil from the ridge) will slow the speed of the water flow from the Archdekin property. Town noted any changes to the Archdekin property will need approval from the town’s Site Alteration Committee. 5. Town did note they preferred the removal of the ridge to use of high retaining walls; they have challenges. 6. GWCA reinforced most of the issues can be avoided by eliminating some of the proposed homes (e.g., #4 to #9) on the northern side. |
| 9 | 15-17 | <p>Removal of Hill/Ridge on north side of property</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GWCA again noted that hill/ridge could possibly be saved if developer eliminated some of the homes (say # 4 to #9). This would: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduce the density to about 5.6 units per hectare. b. Reduce the environmental impact. c. Reduce amount of soil to be removed. 2. P 16-17 GWCA noted its opinion that the submitted plan conflicts with the Town’s stated commitment to the “environment”. There was no real response by the Town reps. |
| 9 | 18-19 | <p>Removal of Hill/Ridge on north side of property</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Time did not allow for a detailed discussion of the environmental impact of these changes. 2. Actions planned by GWCA: |

| | | |
|--------|-------|--|
| | | <p>a. Action 1 (GWCA) Ask CVCA directly for their position on such a change.</p> <p>b. Action 2 (GWCA) Ask Parks dept for their reaction to the loss of trees when meeting with them.</p> |
| 10 New | 20-21 | <p>Adequacy of Traffic Impact Study (TIS)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GWCA noted that the traffic estimate does not appear to include any provision for the truck traffic during construction and questioned the validity of the estimates themselves. 2. The Town clarified that the volume estimates applied to a 1-hour peak measurement for AM and another for PM. The estimates are based on established/formal formulas over which the Town has no control. 3. Action (Town): Town committed to confirm whether traffic estimates took Bishop’s Court Phase 3 into account. However, it was noted that they can’t officially include estimates for developments that aren’t yet approved. |