

ATTACHMENT A

Technical Comments

Engineering Department

Engineering has reviewed the application and has the following preliminary comments considering that the public commenting period remains open:

1. Given the dense form of development, the Fire Flow target for this development increases from 85L/s (single residential) to 150L/s (multi-residential). The submitted Functional Servicing report correctly identifies the 150L/s requirement for Fire Flow, however the applicant has yet to complete the required examination of the municipal system with the right of way to confirm it is capable of supplying the required Fire Flow. This element is addressed by a service modelling examination completed by the County's consultant at the expense of the Applicant. Alternatively a Fire Flow test from a hydrant within the required servicing distance may be completed to confirm availability. Should the modelling determine that the system is not capable of meeting the target, then the applicant may be required to enter into a Development Agreement with the County to complete the necessary infrastructure upgrades to address this requirement. Should the modelling determine that sufficient Fire Flow can be provided by the system, then this condition can be cleared.
2. The engineering plans indicate the use of an infiltration gallery on the land as a means of managing runoff from the land. The application, however, is not supported by a Hydrogeological or Geotechnical Report to confirm the land's ability to support infiltration as a means of controlling runoff from the land. This aspect of the proposal needs to be confirmed through a Hydrogeological and/or Geotechnical Study.
3. A Geotechnical Study is required to confirm the seasonally high groundwater elevation within the land. The seasonally high groundwater elevation plays a key role in determining the infiltration gallery design (if used) and the design of the structures footing and weeper system. It is ideal that the building basement slab elevation and weeper system is designed a minimum of 0.3m above the defined seasonally high groundwater elevation and that the bottom of any proposed infiltration gallery be set a minimum of 1.0m above the seasonally high groundwater elevation.
4. A conceptual and appropriate grading plan needs to be provided to support the application. The supplied site plan provides elevation details that suggest the following:
 - a. The south side of the development sheet drains onto the abutting land which can have a negative impact as there appears no drainage relief for these lands.
 - b. The north side the development partially drains onto the abutting land without clarity on how these lands are relieved of drainage.
 - c. The west side the development includes an infiltration gallery and partial berm which appears to create drainage issues for the abutting lands if constructed
 - d. The abutting lands to the south currently drain through the development parcel. The plan needs to either accommodate this drainage or provide a resolve to this arrangement so as to not create a negative impact on the abutting lands.
5. **To address matters 1, 2, 3 and 4 above, Engineering would require a Hold (H) be placed on the zoning until the following matters are sufficiently addressed:**

- a. Completion of the necessary **Water Modelling or Fire Hydrant testing to confirm that Fire Flows** can be provided to the development or that the applicant commits to the necessary upgrades to resolve same,
 - b. Submission of an acceptable **Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Report** to confirm:
 - i. The suitability of the lands to support the proposed infiltration gallery
 - ii. The confirmation of the seasonally high groundwater table
 - iii. The construction restrictions/parameters for building in light of ii. Above.
 - c. Submission of a **suitable grading plan** for the site addressing the matters of self-containment and accommodation of abutting land drainage. If necessary, the applicant may find it necessary to extend the existing storm sewer (just north of the existing site) to the south limit of the site for use in drainage relief. The site should meet post=pre runoff requirements.
 - d. As a condition of Zoning approval, the Owner **enter into a Development Agreement** for the site to ensure the following matters are appropriately addressed:
 - i. The Owner shall be responsible to design and construct of any necessary off-site works (servicing extensions, roadway upgrades) as may be required to support the development at his/her cost.
 - ii. That any approved on-site storm water management features are built and maintained in perpetuity and only modified with County approval
 - iii. That any approved site perimeter fencing be constructed and maintained in perpetuity and only modified with County approval.
6. Engineering has reviewed the Traffic Impact Statement. While the report asserts that there is sufficient capacity within the roadway to accommodate the additional travel trips from this site, the report does not address how the shortage of on-site parking is to be addressed or the expected ramifications of same. Additionally, visitor parking has not been assessed. Relaxation of parking requirements tends to result in parking on the abutting roadway. Scott Ave has a rural cross-section with a 7.0m wide pavement width, no shoulders and roadside ditches/swales. The road is currently not conducive to on-street parking. As set out in the 2024 Comprehensive Parking Study, a roadways pavement should be 8.5m wide to accommodate on-street parking on one side. The area currently has single family homes with generous on-lot driveways capable of accommodating casual visitors. On-street parking, as a continuous use, is not readily accommodated on Scott Ave as it exists. If on-street parking is sought to support this application, a plan to improve the roadway width will be required and may also require the urbanization of the roadway to appropriately control address drainage. Engineering does not support the reduction of on-site parking as this will likely result in on-street parking that is not readily accommodated without roadway upgrades. The concept as presented in support of the rezoning will also increase on-street parking demands as the site itself offers no additional on-site parking accommodation for visitors.
7. The proposal appears to suggest that the development will be in the form of a condominium or apartment complex as the collective units appear to share access onto Scott Ave. Should this be the case, common element matters such as the driveways,

drive isles, stormwater infiltration galleries, perimeter fencing, snow storage/placement and servicing shall be addressed through the appropriate and subsequent Condominium Agreement or Development Agreement. It does not appear that the proposal supports the use of Part Lot control to further subdivide the land into individual saleable parcels.

Canada Post

Please be advised that this development of 10 units will be serviced by a nearby Community mailbox for mail delivery. The customers will need to register for mail delivery at the Port Dover Post office when units are built.

Zoning

The application proposes to change the zoning of the property from R1-A to R4 to permit 10 unit stacked townhouses

Zoning Deficiencies:

14 parking spaces proposed (20 required, 2 per dwelling, ZBL reference 4.9 a)

6m parking aisle proposed (7.3m required for 2 way traffic, ZBL reference 4.1.4 b)

Lot area proposed is 184.3m² per dwelling unit (215 m² required per dwelling unit with no attached garages, ZBL reference 5.4.2 a)

Proposed number of townhouse units is 10 (8 maximum permitted, ZBL reference 5.4.4)

Front yard landscaped area is deficient and the site plan drawings needs to be updated to show the area they are proposing. The minimum required is 50% of the front yard (ZBL reference 4.2.5 a)

Approximate Total front yard area = +/- 795.65m² (applicant to verify)

Approximate Total landscaped area = +/- 229m² or 29% (applicant to verify)

The following on the site plan is considered landscaping:

Green hatched areas

Armour stone

Sidewalk (including the curb shown)

Any areas used as a driveway, parking space and landings/stairs to the units are not considered landscaping and is not to be included in the calculation.

Planning staff comment: The applicant has revised the application and is only requesting relief for parking and drive aisle width.

Long Point Region Conservation Authority (LPRCA)

No portion of the subject property currently falls within LPRCA's regulation limit and our staff have no comments in regards to the application.

GIS

Please contact NorfolkGIS for new civic addresses when building.

You can apply for a new civic address [here](#). If a green sign is required in order to issue you an address (generally anywhere outside of an urban area) you will have to call Norfolk County Customer Service after applying to make payment before the address is issued (519-426-5870 or 226-NORFOLK). If you would like to apply for a new Civic Address because you are planning to build on a vacant parcel of land, this is dealt with as part of the building permit process. The building inspector can provide you with a copy of a Civic Address Request Form or it can be downloaded [here](#). On the form there are several areas that need to be filled out with information, and a sketch showing the lot layout of the property for which the Civic Address is being requested. A sample sketch will be included with the form.

By-law

Scott Drive is only about 6m wide in the area where the rezoning on Scott Drive is being requested. The applicant is seeking to increase the number of dwelling units by 20% while reducing the available parking by 30% to accommodate the increased density they desire. More people with vehicles, less places to park those vehicles.

Under the Parking bylaw the boulevard is not a permitted place to park a motor vehicle, therefore residents would have to utilize the 6m wide roadway for additional family or visitor vehicles. A 3m wide vehicle parked on a 6m wide roadway will reduce the available passing area to about 3m. Bylaw deals with a number of these types of boulevard or narrow roadway parking issues each year (Waterford is a good example) and we would submit this same scenario should not be encouraged on Scott Drive which would only add to enforcement difficulties, area resident complaints, and create a more dangerous environment for passing vehicles and opening of parked vehicle doors into traffic.

Reducing the parking aisle width by about 20% would be problematic. Many residents in this area drive larger pick-up trucks and we've already seen issues in recent condo developments where the back or front end of these vehicles ends up in the aisle as the driveways are so short.

Norfolk Fire

Norfolk Fire has the following comments for this proposal:

- Same comments as provided for the Pre-Consultation meeting on May 28
- Parking aisle/drive lane reduction in width is not to impact the turning radius for fire department apparatus if the Building Department deems this to be a fire access route

Ministry of Transportation

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has reviewed the proposed subject development for the proposed residential townhouse development located at 9 Scott Drive, Port Dover. The proposal has been considered in accordance with the requirements of the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act, MTO's Highway Access Management Guidelines and all related policies. The following outlines our comments.

The subject property is located in proximity to Highway 6, within MTO's Permit Control Area (PCA), and as such, MTO permits are required before any demolition, grading, construction, or alteration to the site commences.

In accordance with the Ontario Building Code, municipal permits may not be issued until such time as all other applicable requirements (i.e.: MTO permits/approvals) are satisfied. As a condition of MTO permit(s) MTO will require the following for review approval:

Overall MTO has no objection to the zoning changes however, the applicant should be made aware of the following:

General Comments:

MTO requires the entrance to the site to be limited to the north entrance only.

MTO Permits:

MTO Permits required for this site:

- 1 – MTO Building and Land Use Permit will be required prior to the construction of any structures that fall within MTO's Permit Control Area.