

# Memo

**To:** Curtis Thompson, Planner

**CC:** Jason Marr, Director of Public Works; Barb Wiens, Director of Planning and Development; Derek Young, Manager of Engineering

**From:** Tolga Aydin, Engineering Technologist

**Date:** 28<sup>th</sup> August 2020

**RE:** Draft Plan Approval – Kunda Park Phase 4 – 1<sup>st</sup> Submission

The Public Works Department has reviewed the submitted documentation regarding the proposed Draft Plan for the subdivision known as Kunda Park Phase 4. Please note the following comments;

The following submitted drawings have been considered for the purpose of this application:

- 26T19-02002 Draft Plan of Subdivision, by Upper Canada Consultants, dated 04/30/2020

The following submitted reports have been considered for the purpose of this application:

- Functional Servicing Report, by Upper Canada Consultants, dated April, 2020
- Stormwater Management Report, by Upper Canada Consultants, dated April, 2020

The following comments shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.  
Note that further comments to be forthcoming on subsequent submissions.

### **Functional Servicing Report**

#### **Storm System**

No Comment

#### **Sanitary System**

No Comment

#### **Water System**

No Comment

### **Stormwater Management Brief**

No Comment

### **Submitted Drawings**

No Comment

**Planning and Development Services**

1815 Sir Isaac Brock Way, Thorold, ON L2V 4T7  
905-980-6000 Toll-free: 1-800-263-7215

---

**Via Email Only**

September 28, 2020

File Nos.: D.11.06.SD-20-0020  
D.18.06.ZA-20-0034

Curtis Thompson  
Development Planner  
Town of Pelham  
20 Pelham Town Square  
Fonthill, ON L0S 1E0

Dear Mr. Thompson:

**Re: Revised Provincial and Regional Comments  
Zoning By-law Amendment Application and Resubmission of Draft Plan of  
Subdivision- Kunda Park Phase 4  
Town File No.: AM-03-2020 and 26T19-02002  
Agent/Applicant: Upper Canada Consultants (Matt Kernahan)  
Owner: Sterling Realty (Niagara) Inc.  
Location: Kunda Park Boulevard/John Street (Part 1, 59R-19105), Pelham**

---

Regional Planning and Development Services staff have reviewed the information circulated with the application for Zoning By-law Amendment and resubmission of a Draft Plan of Subdivision application for lands described as Part 1 on Reference Plan 59R-19105 in the Town of Pelham. The application, resubmission and required fees were received on May 15, 2020.

The revised Draft Plan of Subdivision, prepared by Upper Canada Consultants (dated April 20, 2020) (certified by Kirkup-Mascoe-Ure Surveying Ltd. on February 18, 2020), proposes the creation of 84 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1-84), one block for a pedestrian walkway (Block 86), a block for environmental features (Block 85), and associated roadways on a 11.1 ha property (the subject land).

The Zoning By-law Amendment proposes to rezone the lands to a site-specific R2 zone for the residential lots (Lots 1-84) and Environmental Protection (EP) zone for the environmental block (Block 85).

A preconsultation meeting was held on November 21, 2019, at Town Hall, with Town and Regional staff, and the Agent in attendance. Regional staff provides the following comments to execute Regional Council's Strategic Priority for a Sustainable and Engaging Government. By commenting on conformity with Provincial and Regional policy, the Region fulfills our commitment to high quality, efficient and coordinated service through enhanced communication, partnership and collaboration, and aims to assist the Town in their consideration of the applications from a Provincial and Regional perspective.

## **Applicable Policy**

Regional staff acknowledge that the Kunda Park Subdivision has an extensive history that dates back to the 1950s. Phase 4 is the last planned phase of the development. The Draft Plan of Subdivision for Kunda Park Phase 4 was originally submitted to the Town of Pelham in May 2002. Since then, there have been several revisions to the proposed Draft Plan. As a result of this being a resubmission of an application originally filed in May 2002, not all current policies apply to the review of the Draft Plan of Subdivision. Regional staff concur with the Planning Justification Report (PJR), prepared by Upper Canada Consultants that the 2001 Regional Policy Plan (RPP) applies to the review of the Draft Plan of Subdivision resubmission. However, in accordance with Part II and Policy 4.1 of the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, the 2020 PPS applies to this application.

As outlined in the PJR, the 2019 A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe does not apply pursuant to Ontario Regulation 311/06, because the application was filed prior to the original Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006) coming into effect.

As indicated in previous comment letters, Regional staff are of the understanding that "grandparenting" would not apply to subsequent Planning Act applications, and the Draft Plan of Subdivision would not be "grandparented" from other applicable legislation (e.g.: Fisheries Act, Conservation Authorities Act, Endangered Species Act).

## **2020 Provincial Policy Statement**

The subject land is located within a Settlement Area under the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The PPS directs growth to settlement areas, and encourages the efficient use of land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities that are planned or available. Specifically, Policy 1.1.3.2 of the PPS states that land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses. Although the Draft Plan of Subdivision does not include a mix of land uses, the development is located within close proximity to a variety of commercial and institutional uses. Furthermore, Section 1.4 of the PPS speaks to provision of an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities required to meet the projected requirements of current and future residents, including projected market-based and affordable housing

needs. Regional staff are of the opinion that the proposal is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement.

## **2001 Regional Policy Plan**

The subject lands are within the Fonthill Urban Area Boundary under the 2001 Regional Policy Plan (RPP). The 2001 RPP permits a full range of residential, commercial and industrial uses generally within the Urban Area, subject to the availability of adequate municipal services and infrastructure. Objective 5.11 of the 2001 RPP seeks to contribute to the overall goal of providing a sufficient supply of housing that is affordable, accessible, adequate and suited to the needs of a full range of types of households and income groups in Niagara. The 2001 RPP directs the responsibility for regulating housing types (including affordable housing), locations and densities, within the Urban Area, to the local municipalities. As such, the Town of Pelham should be satisfied with respect to these matters.

Regional staff concur with the justification and conclusions contained in the PJR with regard to conformity and compliance to the 2001 Regional Policy Plan.

## **Core Natural Heritage**

The subject lands contain natural heritage features and areas (i.e., significant wetland, significant woodland, fish habitat). These environmental features provide important linkages to other natural heritage features and areas across Niagara Region. Although there are no natural heritage policies included in the 2001 RPP, the 2020 PPS does contain policy pertaining to natural heritage features and areas. Specifically, Policy 2.1.1 of the PPS states “natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term”. The PPS further states that the diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area and their long term ecological function should be maintained, restored, or improved (where possible), recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features.

Policies 2.1.5 (a) and (b) of the PPS state that development and site alteration should not be permitted in significant wetlands and significant woodlands unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions. Policy 2.1.6 of the PPS states that development and site alteration shall not be permitted in fish habitat except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.

The subject property contains portions of the Region’s Core Natural Heritage System (CNHS), consisting of Niagara Street Cataract Road Woodlot Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) Complex and Significant Woodland. Regional CNHS mapping also identifies potential Important (Type 2) Fish Habitat traversing the site. The

Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and both EIS Addendums have concluded that Fish Habitat is not present on the subject property.

In this regard, Regional Environmental Planning staff have reviewed the EIS Addendum, prepared by Beacon Environmental (dated April 2020), submitted with the applications. A previous EIS and EIS Addendum, both prepared by Beacon Environmental, were originally submitted in June 2014 and January 2019, respectfully. The most recent EIS Addendum (dated April 2020) was prepared to address a number of concerns detailed in a letter from the Region to the Town of Pelham on April 24, 2019.

Comprehensive environmental planning comments relative to the submissions are included in Appendix I. In summary, Regional Environmental Planning staff are satisfied that the EIS Addendum demonstrates that the development can be accommodated without negative impact to the natural features, provided that:

- the mitigation measures outlined in Section 4.3 of the EIS Addendum (dated January 2019), together with those further described in Appendix I, are implemented;
- Block 85 is zoned Environmental Protection (EP) or similar zoning, which achieves the same level of protection;
- all required authorizations are received from applicable regulatory agencies.

Recommended conditions of approval are included in Appendix II.

Please note that the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) continues to be responsible for the review and comment on planning applications related to their regulated features. As such, NPCA should continue to be consulted with respect to their comments and permit requirements pursuant to Ontario Regulation 155/06.

## **Archaeological Potential**

The 2020 PPS and 2001 RPP provide direction for the conservation of significant cultural heritage and archaeological resources. Specifically, Section 2.6.2 of the 2020 PPS and Section 7.H.2.11 of the 2001 RPP state that development and site alteration are not permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential, unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.

The subject land was identified as having high archaeological potential as a result of registered sites and a watercourse located on the property. In this regard, a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, prepared by Detritus Consulting (dated September 7, 2016) was completed, but a copy was not submitted with the applications. A copy of the report was subsequently provided by email on September 4, 2020. The study recommended further archaeological work for one archaeological site (AgGt-51). On

the basis that this site and its buffer lands (10m) fall entirely outside of the subdivision lands (approximately 150m to the north), a condition requiring the work as part of this draft plan of subdivision is not included. However, as per the MHSTCI's acknowledgement letter, if in the future it is decided to develop the land adjacent to Glen A. Glynn Public School, site AgGt-51 and its protective buffer will need to be protected through a strategy that includes both temporary protective fencing, scheduled construction monitoring by a licensed archaeologist and no construction impacts will be allowed. Long term-protective provisions were also recommended to be implemented. Because these lands fall outside of the draft plan area, these mitigation measures are not required as a condition of subdivision approval; however, the Region does recommend that the developer follow the recommendations of the licensed archaeologist to ensure there is no unintended contravention of the *Heritage Act*.

The Region commends the developer for following the best practices outlined in the MHSTCI Standards and Guidelines to avoid and protect sites recommended for Stage 4 mitigation, by excluding the archaeological site and buffer area from the proposed development. The Standards and Guidelines also support incorporating the area of the archaeological site into the project, but without alteration, if that's an option the developer would like to pursue.

Recognizing that no archaeological survey, regardless of its intensity, can entirely negate the possibility of deeply buried archaeological materials, Regional staff also recommends the inclusion of a standard warning clause in the subdivision agreement, relating to deeply buried archaeological materials that may be encountered during grading and construction activities. A condition requiring the clause has been included in Appendix II.

## **Servicing**

The functional servicing strategy for the subdivision has proposed that it will be serviced through Saffron Meadows Phase 3 and the Forest Park Subdivision. Based on this strategy, the flows from this site would be received by the Towpath Road Sewage Pumping Station (SPS). Regional staff have reviewed the Master Servicing Plan (MSP) and offers the following comments with regards to the Towpath SPS.

Currently the MSP has identified sufficient dry weather flow at the station based on the allotted growth that was added to the sewershed and all the contributing sewersheds that reach the SPS. This sewershed experiences wet weather flows and the is working to reduce infiltration and inflow to the contributing sewershed through various reduction programs. The final MSP can be found at the following link:

<https://www.niagararegion.ca/2041/master-servicing-plan/default.aspx>

Regional staff notes that this property is located at the boundary of three Regional sewersheds and if this property is not serviced through Saffron Meadows Phase 3 or with the sanitary sewer on Port Robinson, and rather connected into the sanitary sewer on Station Street, further analysis will be required as the Station Street sewer is within

the Hurricane Road Sewage Pumping Station sewershed. If the subdivision is connected into the existing regional sewers on Stella Street, this sewer is within the Welland Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) sewershed and no analysis will be required; however, connection details, connection permit and connection fee will be required.

Any extension of municipal sewers will require an ECA application, which can be obtained through the Region's Transfer of Review (ToR) program, and no construction of infrastructure should commence until ECAs are obtained. Conditions pertaining to servicing requirements are included in Appendix II.

## **Stormwater**

Regional staff have reviewed the Preliminary Stormwater Management Plan – Forest Park/Kunda Park, Town of Pelham, prepared by Upper Canada Consultants (UCC) (dated April 2020). The Report indicates that a future stormwater management (SWM) facility in Forest Park subdivision will service Kunda Park Phase 4, north of John Street, to meet the SWM criteria prior to discharge to the realigned Singer's Drain to the box culvert crossing Rice Road (Regional Road 54). An oil-grit separator (OGS) along with an existing Timber Creek Estates SWM facility will service a 1.15 ha development south of John Street. Based on our review, the Region offers the following comments:

1. The Region confirms that we will require that:
  - a. Peak Flow Attenuation: all post development stormwater peak flows be attenuated to pre-development levels for up to and including the 100 year return period design storm event.
  - b. Water Quality Control: all stormwater runoff be treated to a Normal standard as the minimum acceptable standard prior to discharge from the site.
  - c. Erosion Control: runoff from the 25mm design storm event be captured and detained for a period of at least 24 hours in order to mitigate the impacts of erosion on the downstream watercourse.
  - d. Prior to construction, the detailed grading, storm servicing, stormwater management, and construction erosion/sediment control drawings be submitted to this office for review and approval.
2. The Region, in principle, has no objection to the overall SWM plan for Kunda Park Phase 4 development. However, we will require that the following information be provided during the detailed engineering review for the subdivision:
  - a. Existing Drainage (pre-development conditions):
    - Clarify why the west boundary of the drainage catchments covering the existing residential areas west of Forest/Kunda Park subdivision are inconsistent in the SWM Reports for Forest/Kunda Park (Figure 2) and Saffron Meadows (Figure 3). This discrepancy of catchment delineation results in that the total drainage area to the Rice Road culvert is 114.93ha and 126.94ha respectively. The Region requires that the existing drainage parameters (area, impervious, flow) be confirmed, as they are the basis for stormwater analysis.



- The south boundaries of catchments A4 and D1 east of Steve Bauer Trail (refer to Figure 2, Forest/Kunda SWM Report) are not on the contour high points. Revise the catchment delineation or provide information to justify the catchment boundaries are correct.
- b. Future Development and SWM Plan
  - Integrate Low Impact Development measures to the SWM plan for the 1.15 ha parcel south of John Street, in order to mitigate the erosion impacts on the downstream watercourse.
  - Provide the imperviousness assigned for each type of land use to justify that the overall imperviousness of 45% and 30% can appropriately represent the proposed land use schedule for Forest Park and Kunda Park subdivision, respectively.
  - Revise the description (refer to Forest/Kunda SWM Report Page 17) regarding the storage requirement, as the applicant chose to size the proposed SWM facility to meet an Enhanced treatment.
  - The water elevation of the Forest/Kunda SWM facility during a 100-year design storm is higher than the spillway elevation. The freeboard between the pond top 192.9 m and the high water level 192.78 m is only 0.12 m. The MECP SWM Design Manual requires 'A 0.3 m freeboard should be provided above the design high water level'. Therefore, the Region requires the pond configuration be revised to ensure that the active storage for flow attenuation is sufficient to meet a 0.3 m freeboard.
  - The 100-year flow to the Rice Road culvert is 4.38 m<sup>3</sup>/s, which is larger than the flow of 4.2 m<sup>3</sup>/s used for culvert hydraulic analysis (refer to the Saffron Meadow SWM report). The Region requires the culvert headwater analysis be updated.
- 3. With respect to the natural channel design of the realigned Singer's Drain within Forest Park subdivision, the Region has no objection to the design. The Region requires the Report outline the erosion protection measures prior to the channel soil stabilization (vegetation growing).
- 4. With respect to the Kunda Park PSW By-pass, the NPCA should continue to be consulted with the design details and potential work permit requirements, as this proposed system is related to the NPCA regulated features.

Conditions relating to stormwater management requirements are included in Appendix II.

## **Waste Collection**

Niagara Region provides curbside waste and recycling collection for developments that meet the requirements of Niagara Region's Waste Collection Policy. The subject land is eligible to receive Regional curbside waste and recycling collection provided that the owner brings the waste and recycling to the curbside on the designated pick up day, and that the following limits are not exceeded:

- No limit blue/grey containers;

- No limit green containers; and,
- 1 garbage container per unit.

In order for the above noted services to be provided, the developer shall comply with Niagara Region's Corporate Policy and Procedure for Requirements for Waste Collection and complete the application for commencement of collection. The forms and policy can be found at the following link: [www.niagararegion.ca/waste](http://www.niagararegion.ca/waste)

Based on the draft plan provided, Regional staff have assumed that the construction of Station Street will be a condition of draft plan approval from the Town. Depending on the timing of the construction for Station Street, temporary turn arounds may be required at the east end of the proposed roads (Streets A and D).

The draft plan of subdivision was reviewed for the potential for waste management services to collect recycling and waste through the subdivision; however, further review will be required once the servicing plans have been completed, since the plans do not show detailed road design. If the subdivision is going to be phased, a phasing plan should be submitted to ensure that no temporary turn arounds are required for the waste management services vehicles. Conditions pertaining to waste collection are included in Appendix II.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, Regional staff have no objection to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision from a Provincial and Regional perspective, subject to the conditions outlined in Appendix II and provided Block 85 is zoned Environmental Protection (EP). Subject to the conditions and the EP zoning for Block 85, the proposal is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the intent of the 2001 Regional Policy Plan.

Please send a copy of the staff report and notice of the Town's decision on these applications.

Should you have any questions related to the above comments, please feel free to contact me at 905-980-600 ext. 3432 or by email at [Britney.fricke@niagararegion.ca](mailto:Britney.fricke@niagararegion.ca).

Kind regards,



Britney Fricke, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Development Planner

cc: Adam Boudens, Senior Environmental Planner/Ecologist, Niagara Region  
Matteo Ramundo, Development Approvals Technician, Niagara Region

## **Appendix I**

### **Core Natural Heritage Comments**

The subject land contains portions of the Region's Core Natural Heritage System (CNHS), consisting of Niagara Street Cataract Road Woodlot Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) Complex and Significant Woodland. Regional CNHS mapping also identifies potential Important (Type 2) Fish Habitat traversing the site. The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and both EIS Addendums have concluded that Fish Habitat is not present on the subject property.

Regional Environmental Planning staff have reviewed the EIS Addendum, prepared by Beacon Environmental (dated April 2020), that was submitted with the proposed residential development application located at Part Lot 173, in the Town of Pelham. A previous EIS and EIS Addendum, both prepared by Beacon Environmental, were originally submitted in June 2014 and January 2019, respectfully. The most recent EIS Addendum (dated April 2020) was prepared to address a number of concerns detailed in a letter from the Region to the Town of Pelham on April 24, 2019.

Regional Environmental Planning staff have reviewed the EIS Addendum to verify that the findings, proposed mitigation measures and recommendations are sufficient to satisfy Provincial and Regional environmental policy.

In summary, Regional Environmental Planning staff are satisfied that the results, proposed mitigation measures, and recommendations identified in the EIS and EIS Addendums sufficiently address Provincial and Regional environmental policies. Therefore, staff do not object to the development proposal, provided the mitigation measures identified in the EIS and EIS Addendums, and those further described below are implemented.

#### Wetland Buffer

In response to Regional comments, the EIS Addendum provides the rationale used to justify the proposed 15 m buffer from the adjacent PSW. Beacon Environmental acknowledges that based on the existing scientific literature a minimum buffer width of 30 m is typically considered appropriate to protect the functions and features of wetlands. However, for this application, based on the field data collected on the subject property, a 15 m buffer has been deemed to be sufficient as the PSW was found to provide low-quality wildlife habitat for common species of flora and fauna and no sensitive natural heritage features or function have been identified. To ensure that the PSW is sufficiently protected from adjacent land uses, the EIS Addendum recommends that a 1.5 m high chain link fence be installed along the rear of lots that are located along the wetland boundary. In addition, a Planting Plan is recommended to enhance the buffer lands along the western boundary of the wetland and the buffer lands to the north and south of the wetland finger that extends eastward to the Steve Bauer Trail, as these areas are not well vegetated.

Regional Environmental Planning staff support the conclusions of the EIS Addendum; however, staff request that a more robust Edge Management Plan / Planting Plan be required to ensure that the full extent of the buffer lands is sufficiently vegetated with native species to increase the protective and ecological function of the buffer.

#### Water Balance

In response to Regional comments requesting that a water balance be completed to inform the PSW buffer width and address potential impacts, the EIS Addendum indicates that based on existing conditions and the location of proposed development, no alteration to the existing surface water inputs to the wetland will occur. Provided no grading works occur within the 15 m buffer to the PSW and a Grading Plan is prepared for Regional staff review and approval, Environmental Planning staff are satisfied that a water balance is not required.

#### Significant Woodland

In response to Regional comments, the draft plan has been updated to show the limit of the woodland edge based on a survey of the woodland dripline and clearly identifies the locations where woodland is proposed for removal. Small encroachment into the woodland edge is proposed at the rear of Lot 27, representing a total area of 0.03 ha. The woodland buffer width for the remainder of the property is proposed to fluctuate between 0 m in some locations to 10 m or more in other locations. The EIS addendum indicates that there are no sensitive or significant wildlife features associated with the edge of the woodland and therefore the proposed buffer widths are justified. Proposed mitigation measures are the same as those proposed for the wetland buffer and consist of a Planting Plan and 1.5 m high fencing.

Regional Environmental Planning staff do not object to the additional rationale provided in the EIS Addendum in support of narrow buffers and minimal encroachment into the feature. However, to ensure that the remaining Significant Woodland is sufficiently protected, staff request that a robust Edge Management Plan / Planting Plan be prepared for Regional review and approval. The Edge Management Plan / Planting Plan should include an invasive species management and monitoring component. Further details are provided below.

#### Fish Habitat

In response to Regional comments, the EIS Addendum includes a comprehensive evaluation of Fish Habitat on the subject lands, including the results of a Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) assessment following the Evaluation, Classification and Management of headwater Drainage Features Guidelines (TRCA and CVC, 2014). There are three watercourses that traverse the subject lands, identified as the northern, central and southern watercourses. In summary, the EIS Addendum concludes that all

three watercourses support only ephemeral flows, have limited hydrological function (much of which is supported by stormwater flows), support very limited terrestrial functions and are not identified as providing Fish Habitat. The EIS Addendum proposes the removal of the northern and central watercourses to facilitate the proposed development. The results of the HDF assessment identify the need to mitigate for the removal of the two watercourses. The EIS Addendum includes recommendations to mitigate for the loss of riparian habitat associated with the watercourses and to ensure that downstream flows from the watercourses are maintained.

Environmental Planning staff support the conclusions of the EIS Addendum, provided the corridor along the east side of the Steve Bauer Trail and the PSW wetland finger associated with the southern watercourse are sufficiently vegetated through the preparation and implantation of a Planting Plan/Restoration Plan, as proposed.

#### Significant Wildlife Habitat

In response to Regional comments, the EIS Addendum confirms that targeted surveys for rare plant species listed on the Schedules of the *Endangered Species Act* and Checklist on Vascular Plants for the Regional Municipality of Niagara (Oldham, 2010) have been sufficiently completed. With respect to corridor function, the EIS Addendum concludes that the subject lands support little to no landscape corridor function but that the local linkage between the PSW on the subject lands and the PSW and woodlands located directly east of the subject lands (east of the Steve Bauer Trail) will be maintained through the PSW wetland finger. Staff offer no objections to the rationale provided related to Significant Wildlife Habitat.

#### Mitigation Measures and Restoration

In response to Regional comments, the EIS Addendum includes a section on mitigation measures and restoration. Regional Environmental Planning staff requested that additional justification be provided to explain why the previous EIS Addendum (January 2019) omitted a previous recommendation (included in a 2007 EIS prepared by Savanta) to enhance and restore the PSW and Significant Woodland.

With respect to the removal of debris within the PSW and Significant Woodland, the EIS Addendum indicates that this should not be identified as the responsibility of the property owner. Staff find the rationale included in the EIS Addendum to be inadequate and continue to recommend the removal of debris as a condition of draft plan approval.

With respect to the removal of non-native species from the PSW and Significant Woodland and/or their buffers, the EIS Addendum concludes that this restoration measure is not reasonable as there are numerous non-native species (e.g., Common and Glossy Buckthorn, Multiflora Rose, Garlic Mustard, etc.) found within the features and that removal will require the implementation of an intensive program that must be undertaken over a number of years. Staff do not find this rationale to be sufficient. Consistent with Regional Official Plan policy 7.A.3, new development, including

infrastructure, should be designed to maintain or enhance the natural features and functions of a site. Considering the reduced setbacks proposed in the EIS Addendum, staff do not feel that an invasive species management plan is an unreasonable request. As such, staff continue to request that an Invasive Species Management component, including a monitoring plan, be included in the Edge Management Plan / Planting Plan.

### Conclusion

Regional Environmental Planning staff are satisfied that the EIS Addendum demonstrates that the development can be accommodated without negative impact to the natural features, provided that the mitigation measures outlined in Section 4.3 of the EIS Addendum (dated January 2019) are implemented and provided that all required authorizations are received from applicable regulatory agencies. Recommended conditions of approval are included in Appendix II (#3-11).

Please note that the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) continues to be responsible for the review and comment on planning applications related to their regulated features. As such, NPCA should continue to be consulted with respect to their comments and permit requirements pursuant to Ontario Regulation 155/06.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss these comments, please feel free to contact Adam Boudens, Senior Environmental Planner at 905-980-6000 ext. 3770 or [adam.boudens@niagararegion.ca](mailto:adam.boudens@niagararegion.ca), or Cara Lampman, Manager, Environmental Planning at 905-980-6000 ext. 3430 or [cara.lampman@niagararegion.ca](mailto:cara.lampman@niagararegion.ca).

## Appendix II

### Regional Conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval

#### Kunda Park- Phase 4, Pelham

1. That the following clause be included in the subdivision agreement:

*“Should deeply buried archaeological remains/resources be found on the property during construction activities, all activities impacting archaeological resources must cease immediately, notify the Archaeology Programs Unit of the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (416-212-8886) and a licensed archaeologist is required to carry out an archaeological assessment in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act and the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.*

*In the event that human remains are encountered during construction, all activities must cease immediately and the local police as well as the Cemeteries Regulation Unit of the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services (416-326-8800) must be contacted. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, MHSTCI should also be notified to ensure that the site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the Ontario Heritage Act.”*

2. That the subdivision agreement contain wording wherein the owner agrees to implement the mitigation measures and recommendations found in Section 4.3 of the EIS Addendum, prepared by Beacon Environmental (dated January 2019), including but not limited to:
  - a) Along the perimeter of the retained Provincially Significant Wetland/Significant Woodland (Block 85 – EP1, Lots 5, 11, 12-27) and along the watercourse channel/corridor adjacent to the Steve Bauer Trail (Lots 12, 47, 70-84), a 1.5 m High Chain Link Fence will be constructed. The location of the fence should be detailed in final plans to the satisfaction of Niagara Region. In addition, a “no gate” bylaw should be implemented to reduce human encroachment and limit the movement of pets into the adjacent natural areas.
  - b) To the extent possible, all proposed outdoor lighting be downward facing and shielded to prevent light spillage into the surrounding natural area.
  - c) That the Environmental Protection Block (Block 85) boundary be identified in the field with visible construction fencing prior to the commencement of any site alteration and that no machinery, equipment, or materials be stored or allowed to enter this area, to the satisfaction of Niagara Region.
  - d) That detailed sedimentation and erosion control plans be prepared for review and approval by the Region. All sediment and erosion control measures shall be maintained in good condition for the duration of

construction until all disturbed surfaces have been stabilized. Muddy water shall not be allowed to leave the site.

- e) No construction materials or equipment is to be located, even on a temporary basis, within the buffers of the PSW and Significant Woodland.
  - f) That the storage and handling of materials associated with material and chemical and refueling of heavy machinery follow OPSS 180. Additionally, specific refueling areas should be identified that are no closer than 30 m from any watercourse.
  - g) Any required vegetation removals should be conducted in a manner to avoid impacts to nesting birds that may be utilizing habitats on the property. The breeding bird period for this area is generally March 15 to August 31. Additionally, site clearing should not be undertaken one week before June 1<sup>st</sup> through to 1 week after June 30<sup>th</sup> to avoid impacts to bats potentially breeding in the woodland.
- 3. That an Edge Management Plan be provided to the satisfaction of Niagara Region, to identify and illustrate the location of additional native trees, shrubs and/or groundcover to be planted within the Provincially Significant Wetland, Significant Woodland and/or their buffers, as appropriate. The Edge Management Plan should include an invasive species management component as well as a detailed monitoring plan.
  - 4. That a Restoration Planting Plan be provided to the satisfaction of Niagara Region, to identify and illustrate the location of additional native trees, shrubs and/or groundcover to be planted along the Steve Bauer Trail, as appropriate.
  - 5. That a Tree Saving Plan (TSP) be submitted to the Niagara Region for review and approval. The TSP shall generally be prepared in accordance with Section 1.36 of the Region of Niagara Tree and Forest Conservation By-law (By-law 30-2008).
  - 6. That a Grading Plan be provided to the satisfaction of Niagara Region, that demonstrates that existing overland flow patterns are maintained and that no grading within the PSW, Significant Woodland and/or their buffers will occur.
  - 7. That the subdivision agreement contain wording wherein the owner agrees to implement the approved Edge Management Plan, Restoration Planting Plan, Tree Saving Plan and Grading Plan.
  - 8. That the owner submit a written undertaking to the Niagara Region that draft approval of this subdivision does not include a commitment of servicing allocation by the Regional Municipality of Niagara as this servicing allocation will be assigned at the time of registration and any pre-servicing will be at the sole risk and responsibility of the owner.



9. That the owner submit a written undertaking to the Niagara Region that all offers and agreements of Purchase and Sale, which may be negotiated prior to registration of this subdivision, shall contain a clause indicating that a servicing allocation for this subdivision will not be assigned until the plan is registered, and a similar clause be inserted in the subdivision agreement between the owner and the Town.
10. That prior to final approval for registration of this plan of subdivision, the owner shall submit the design drawings [with calculations] for the sanitary and storm drainage systems required to service this development and obtain Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, Compliance Approval under the Transfer of Review Program
11. That prior to approval of the final plan or any on-site grading, the owner shall submit a detailed stormwater management plan for the subdivision and the following plans designed and sealed by a qualified professional engineer in accordance with the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change documents entitled Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual, March 2003 and Stormwater Quality Guidelines for New Development, May 1991, or their successors to the Niagara Region for review and approval:
  - a. Detailed lot grading, servicing and drainage plans, noting both existing and proposed grades and the means whereby overland flows will be accommodated across the site;
  - b. Detailed erosion and sedimentation control plans;
  - c. Detailed phasing of construction of the stormwater management facility to coincide with phasing of development of residential lands (internal and external to the subdivision) planned to be serviced by the stormwater management facility; and,
  - d. That prior to final approval for registration of this plan of subdivision, the owner shall submit the design drawings [with calculations] for the stormwater management facility required to service this development and obtain the necessary Ministry of the Environment Compliance Approval.These plans shall address the detailed comments provided in the Region's June 23, 2020 comment letter.
12. That the subdivision agreement between the owner and the Town contain provisions whereby the owner agrees to implement the approved plan(s) required in accordance with the condition above.
13. That the owner ensure that all streets and development blocks can provide an access in accordance with the Niagara Region's policy and by-laws relating to the curb side collection of waste and recycling throughout all phases of development. If developed in phases, where a through street is not maintained, the owner shall provide a revised draft plan to reflect a proposed temporary turnaround/cul-de-sac with a minimum curb radius of 12.8 metres.

Notes:

- Prior to granting final plan approval, the Town must be in receipt of written confirmation that the requirements of each condition have been met and all fees have been paid to the satisfaction of the Niagara Region.
- Prior to final approval for registration, a copy of the draft subdivision agreement for the proposed development should be submitted to the Niagara Region for verification that the appropriate clause pertaining to these conditions have been included. A copy of the executed agreement shall also be provided prior to registration.
- In order to request clearance of the above noted Regional conditions, a letter outlining how the conditions have been satisfied, together with all studies and reports (one hard copy and a PDF digital copy), the applicable review fee, and the draft subdivision agreement shall be submitted to the Niagara Region by the applicant as one complete package, or circulated to the Niagara Region by the Town of Pelham.

July 31, 2020

Via Email Only

Mr. Curtis Thompson, B.URPI  
Planner  
Town of Pelham  
20 Pelham Town Square  
PO Box 400  
Fonthill, ON, L0S 1E0

Our File: PLSUB201900156

Dear Mr. Thompson

**Re: Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) Comments (Resubmission)  
Applications for Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision  
Kunda Park Phase 4  
Town of Pelham  
Applicant: Upper Canada Consulting  
File Nos.: AM-03-2020, 26T19-020-02**

---

The NPCA has received a revised application for Draft Plan of Subdivision for Phase 4 of the Kunda Park Subdivision as well as an application for Zoning By-law amendment (ZBA). In support of the applications, the NPCA also received an environmental impact study (EIS) addendum, prepared by Beacon Environmental, dated April 2020 and a preliminary stormwater plan, prepared by Upper Canada Consulting, dated April 2020. The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to feature 84 lots for single detached dwellings and a block for a Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW). The NPCA previously commented on the Subdivision application on April 12, 2019. At that time, we indicated concerns with the proposed removal of the northern and central watercourses. We have reviewed the revised applications and supporting information and offer the following comments, which should be read in conjunction with our April 12, 2019 comments.

## **NPCA Policies**

The NPCA regulates watercourses, flood plains (up to the 100 year flood level), Great Lakes shorelines, hazardous land, valleylands, and wetlands under *Ontario Regulation 155/06* of the *Conservation Authorities Act*. The NPCA's *Policies, Procedures and Guidelines for the Administration of Ontario Regulation 155/06 and Land Use Planning Policy Document* (NPCA

policies) provides direction for managing NPCA regulated features. The subject lands contain three watercourses and the Niagara Street Cataract Road Woodlot Wetland Complex, which is a PSW.

The Draft Plan proposes a 15 metre buffer to the PSW and places the wetland and buffer within Block 85. The original EIS indicated that given the wetland form and lower function, a 15-metre buffer is suitable and will maintain most of the existing edge vegetation currently buffering the wetland. The EIS addendum has indicated that grading along the 15 metre buffer will be minimal and recommended a grading plan be reviewed/approved by the NPCA as a mitigation measures. NPCA staff have no objection to this rationale and have incorporated the grading plan requirement into the recommended Conditions of Draft Plan Approval.

The EIS addendum also identified portions of the western wetland boundary in which the buffer conditions are poor (not well vegetated). A buffer planting plan is recommended as a mitigation measure. NPCA staff agree with this recommendation and have included a Condition of Draft Plan Approval to this effect. Note that implementation of the buffer planting plan will require an NPCA Work Permit.

The PSW and buffer (Block 85) is proposed to be rezoned to EP1. NPCA staff have no objection to this as it provides the appropriate level of protection for the wetland and its buffer.

NPCA staff previously indicated that there was insufficient information to support removing the northern and central watercourses. The EIS addendum provided a more detailed analysis of the proposed watercourse removal, including an assessment under the 2014 Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and Credit Valley Conservation Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guideline. The assessment supports removal of the watercourses, subject to mitigation. The Applicant is proposing to incorporate the drainage into the stormwater system to a newly created, naturalized watercourse along the east side of the Steve Bauer Trail. Water flows would be picked up in the realigned watercourse of the adjacent development (Forest Park Subdivision). The newly created watercourse will provide improved ecological function of the watercourses and maintain the required hydrologic flows. NPCA staff have no objection to this. An NPCA Work Permit will be required for removal of the existing watercourses and establishing the new watercourse.

Given the above, NPCA staff consider the applications to conform to the NPCA's Policies.

### **Conditions of Draft Plan Approval**

The NPCA requests that the following conditions be incorporated into the Conditions of Draft Plan Approval:

1. That Block 85 be rezoned to EP1, or equivalent, to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.
2. That the Developer submit to the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority for review and approval, detailed grading and construction sediment and erosion control plans.

3. That limit of work fencing be shown on the grading plan along all portions of the 15 metre buffer and that no grading occur beyond this point, to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority. Limit of work fencing must be maintained during the development process and all silt fencing shall be removed once work is completed and all exposed soils are re-vegetated or otherwise stabilized.
4. That the Developer provide 1.5 metre high chain link fencing along the boundary of Block 85 and Lots 5, 12 to 20, and 23 to 27 (inclusive), to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.
5. That the Developer obtain a Work Permit from the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority for the proposed wetland buffer enhancement work. In support of the Work Permit application, the following information will be required:
  - a. A planting plan providing details about species, planting densities and locations.
  - b. Any other information as may be determined at the time a Work Permit application is submitted to the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.
6. That the Developer obtain a Work Permit from the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority for the proposed watercourse removal and new natural watercourse construction. In support of the Work Permit application, the following information will be required:
  - a. Design drawings for the new watercourse.
  - b. Planting plan for the riparian corridor.
  - c. Any other information as may be determined at the time a Work Permit application is submitted to the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.
7. That the Developer obtain a Work Permit from the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority for the proposed trail within Block 86. In support of the Work Permit application, the following information will be required:
  - a. Detailed design drawing of the proposed trail.
  - b. Any other information as may be determined at the time a Work Permit application is submitted to the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.
8. That Conditions 1 to 7 above be incorporated into the Development Agreement between the Developer and the Town of Pelham, to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority. The Town of Pelham shall circulate the draft Development Agreement to the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority for its review and approval.

## Conclusion

At this time, NPCA staff have no objection to the applications subject to the above Conditions. I hope this information is helpful. Please send a copy of any staff reports to Committee/Council once they are available. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "David Deluce". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "David" and last name "Deluce" clearly distinguishable.

David Deluce, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Manager, Planning & Regulations (ext. 224)

cc: Mr. Matt Kernahan, MCIP, RPP, CNU-A, Upper Canada Consultants (email only)  
Ms. Elissa Quintanilla, Region of Niagara (email only)  
Mr. Adam Aldworth, NPCA (email only)

## **Curtis Thompson**

---

**From:** circulations@wsp.com  
**Sent:** March 13, 2019 4:10 PM  
**To:** Curtis Thompson  
**Subject:** Draft Plan of Subdivision (26T-1902002); Part of Lot 173; Kunda Park Extension No. 4

**2019-03-13**

**Curtis Thompson**

**Pelham**

, ,

Attention: Curtis Thompson

Re: Draft Plan of Subdivision (26T-1902002); Part of Lot 173; Kunda Park Extension No. 4; Your File No. 26T-1902002

Our File No. 84253

Dear Sir/Madam,

We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application.

The following paragraph is to be included as a condition of approval:

“The Owner shall indicate in the Agreement, in words satisfactory to Bell Canada, that it will grant to Bell Canada any easements that may be required, which may include a blanket easement, for communication/telecommunication infrastructure. In the event of any conflict with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities or easements”.

We hereby advise the Developer to contact Bell Canada during detailed design to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.

As you may be aware, Bell Canada is Ontario’s principal telecommunications infrastructure provider, developing and maintaining an essential public service. It is incumbent upon the Municipality and the Developer to ensure that the development is serviced with communication/telecommunication infrastructure. In fact, the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires the development of coordinated, efficient and cost-effective infrastructure, including telecommunications systems (Section 1.6.1).

The Developer is hereby advised that prior to commencing any work, the Developer must confirm that sufficient wire-line communication/telecommunication infrastructure is available. In the event that such infrastructure is unavailable, the Developer shall be required to pay for the connection to and/or extension of the existing communication/telecommunication infrastructure.

If the Developer elects not to pay for the above noted connection, then the Developer will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Municipality that sufficient alternative communication/telecommunication

will be provided to enable, at a minimum, the effective delivery of communication/telecommunication services for emergency management services (i.e., 911 Emergency Services).

MMM (a WSP company) operates Bell Canada's development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. Please note, however, that **all responses to circulations and other requests, such as requests for clearance, come directly from Bell Canada, and not from MMM**. MMM is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses.

Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Meaghan Palynchuk  
Manager, Municipal Relations  
Access Network Provisioning, Ontario  
Phone: 905-540-7254  
Mobile: 289-527-3953  
Email: Meaghan.Palynchuk@bell.ca

---

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain information which is privileged, confidential, proprietary or otherwise subject to restricted disclosure under applicable law. This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on, this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized or intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies. You are receiving this communication because you are listed as a current WSP contact. Should you have any questions regarding WSP's electronic communications policy, please consult our Anti-Spam Commitment at [www.wsp.com/casl](http://www.wsp.com/casl). For any concern or if you believe you should not be receiving this message, please forward this message to [caslcompliance@wsp.com](mailto:caslcompliance@wsp.com) so that we can promptly address your request. Note that not all messages sent by WSP qualify as commercial electronic messages.

AVIS : Ce message, incluant tout fichier l'accompagnant (« le message »), peut contenir des renseignements ou de l'information privilégiés, confidentiels, propriétaires ou à divulgation restreinte en vertu de la loi. Ce message est destiné à l'usage exclusif du/des destinataire(s) voulu(s). Toute utilisation non permise, divulgation, lecture, reproduction, modification, diffusion ou distribution est interdite. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, ou que vous n'êtes pas un destinataire autorisé ou voulu, veuillez en aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement et détruire le message et toute copie électronique ou imprimée. Vous recevez cette communication car vous faites partie des contacts de WSP. Si vous avez des questions concernant la politique de communications électroniques de WSP, veuillez consulter notre Engagement anti-pourriel au [www.wsp.com/lcap](http://www.wsp.com/lcap). Pour toute question ou si vous croyez que vous ne devriez pas recevoir ce message, prière de le transférer au [conformitelcap@wsp.com](mailto:conformitelcap@wsp.com) afin que nous puissions rapidement traiter votre demande. Notez que ce ne sont pas tous les messages transmis par WSP qui constituent des messages électroniques commerciaux.

-LAEmI-hhHzdJzBITWfa4Hgs7pbKI





CANADA POST  
955 Highbury Ave N  
London ON N5Y 1A3  
[CanadaPost.ca](http://CanadaPost.ca)

POSTES CANADA  
955 Highbury Ave N  
London ON N5Y 1A3  
[PostesCanada.ca](http://PostesCanada.ca)

June 3, 2020

CURTIS THOMPSON  
TOWN OF PELHAM  
20 PELHAM TOWN SQUARE  
FONTHILL, ONTARIO, L0S 1E0

Re: **FILE # 26T19-020-02**  
**Kunda Park Phase 4**

Dear Curtis,

This development will receive mail service to centralized mail facilities provided through our Community Mailbox program.

I will specify the conditions which I request to be added for Canada Post Corporation's purposes.

The owner shall complete to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering of the town of Pelham and Canada Post:

- a) Include on all offers of purchase and sale, a statement that advises the prospective purchaser:
  - i) that the home/business mail delivery will be from a designated Centralized Mail Box.
  - ii) that the developers/owners be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Centralized Mail Box locations prior to the closing of any home sales.
- b) The owner further agrees to:
  - i) work with Canada Post to determine and provide temporary suitable Centralized Mail Box locations which may be utilized by Canada Post until the curbs, boulevards and sidewalks are in place in the remainder of the development.

- ii) install a concrete pad in accordance with the requirements of and in locations to be approved by Canada Post to facilitate the placement of Community Mail Boxes
  - iii) identify the pads above on the engineering servicing drawings. Said pads are to be poured at the time of the sidewalk and/or curb installation within each phase of the plan of subdivision.
  - iv) determine the location of all centralized mail receiving facilities in co-operation with Canada Post and to indicate the location of the centralized mail facilities on appropriate maps, information boards and plans. Maps are also to be prominently displayed in the sales office(s) showing specific Centralized Mail Facility locations.
- c) Canada Post's multi-unit policy, which requires that the owner/developer provide the centralized mail facility (front loading lockbox assembly or rear-loading mailroom [mandatory for 100 units or more]), at their own expense, will be in effect for buildings and complexes with a common lobby, common indoor or sheltered space.

Should the description of the project change, I would appreciate an update in order to assess the impact of the change on mail service.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding these conditions, please contact me.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project.

Regards,

*A. Carrigan*

Officer, Delivery Planning

(226) 268-5914

[Andrew.Carrigan@Canadapost.ca](mailto:Andrew.Carrigan@Canadapost.ca)



Enbridge Gas Inc.  
500 Consumers Road  
North York, Ontario M2J 1P8  
Canada

June 25, 2020

Curtis Thompson  
Senior Planner  
Town of Pelham  
20 Pelham Town Square  
PO Box 400  
Fonthill, ON L0S 1E0

Dear Curtis,

Re: Draft Plan of Subdivision – Resubmission, Zoning By-law Amendment  
Kunda Park Phase 4  
Sterling Realty  
Part of Lot 173, Geographic Township of Thorold  
Town of Pelham  
File No.: 26T-19-020-02

Enbridge Gas Inc. has no changes to the previously identified conditions for this revised application(s).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Alice Coleman'.

**Alice Coleman**  
Municipal Planning Analyst  
Long Range Distribution Planning

**ENBRIDGE GAS INC.**  
TEL: 416-495-5386  
[MunicipalPlanning@enbridge.com](mailto:MunicipalPlanning@enbridge.com)  
500 Consumers Rd, North York, ON, M2J 1P8

[enbridgegas.com](http://enbridgegas.com)  
**Safety. Integrity. Respect.**

## Curtis Thompson

---

**From:** Mabee, Sue <Sue.Mabee@dsbn.org>  
**Sent:** July 16, 2020 8:49 AM  
**To:** Curtis Thompson  
**Subject:** RE: Request for Comments - Draft Plan of Subdivision Resubmission (Kunda Park Ph.4) (26T19-020-02; AM-03-2020)

Hi Curtis,

I need to apologize as this one seems to have gotten lost in the shuffle. We do not have any objections to the developments but we will be requesting a fence along the properties that back onto Glynn A Green. I have someone from Facilities heading out there today/tomorrow to take a look at what exists, and as soon as I hear back I will send you a formal letter detailing our request.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Thanks!  
Sue

---

**From:** Curtis Thompson <CThompson@pelham.ca>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 14, 2020 3:45 PM  
**To:** Jason Marr <JMarr@pelham.ca>; Derek Young <DYoung@pelham.ca>; Bob Lymburner <BLymburner@pelham.ca>; Mike Zimmer <MZimmer@pelham.ca>; David Christensen <DChristensen@pelham.ca>; Jason Longhurst <JLonghurst@pelham.ca>; Fricke, Britney <Britney.Fricke@niagararegion.ca>; Dev Planning Applications - Region (devtplanningapplications@niagararegion.ca) <devtplanningapplications@niagararegion.ca>; David Deluce (ddeluce@npca.ca) <ddeluce@npca.ca>; Vickie vanRavenswaay <VvanRavenswaay@pelham.ca>; scott.whitwell@ncdsb.com; Mabee, Sue <Sue.Mabee@dsbn.org>; landuseplanning@hydroone.com; Canada Post-Niagara <andrew.carrigan@canadapost.ca>; Jim Sorley (jim.sorley@npei.ca) <jim.sorley@npei.ca>; Bell Canada <circulations@mmm.ca>; Enbridge- Municipal Planning (MunicipalPlanning@enbridge.com) <MunicipalPlanning@enbridge.com>  
**Cc:** Barbara Wiens <BWiens@pelham.ca>; Shannon Larocque <SLarocque@pelham.ca>  
**Subject:** Request for Comments - Draft Plan of Subdivision Resubmission (Kunda Park Ph.4) (26T19-020-02; AM-03-2020)

**External:** This email is from an external source. Please exercise caution with attachments, links, or requests for information.

Hello,

We are in receipt of a resubmission for Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval (26T19-020-02) for the lands referred to as **Kunda Park Phase 4** in Fonthill. This resubmission is also accompanied by a Zoning By-law Amendment application (AM-03-2020) to rezone from R1 to site-specific R2 and Environmental Protection zones.

The submitted material attached includes:

- Resubmission Cover Letter (2020)
- Draft Subdivision Plan (2020.04.30)
- EIS Addendum (2020.04)
- SWM Report (2020.04)
- FSR (2020.04)

- PJR (2020.05.01)
- Zoning By-law Amendment application

Comments would be appreciated by **Thursday, June 11<sup>th</sup>, 2020**. If you have any questions, or require additional material, please let myself know. Plans and reports will only be provided electronically.

Thank you,



**Curtis Thompson, B.URP**

Planner

Town of Pelham

T: 905-892-2607 x324 | E: [cthompson@pelham.ca](mailto:cthompson@pelham.ca)

20 Pelham Town Square | PO Box 400 | Fonthill, ON | L0S 1E0

---

**Town of Pelham Confidentiality Notice:**

The information contained in this communication, including any attachments, may be confidential and is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, disclosure, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please re-send it to the sender and permanently delete the original and any copy of it from your computer system. Thank you.