

**Date:** September 19, 2024  
**From:** Vaibhav Desai – Team Leader – Development Engineering & Approvals  
**To:** Community Planning Division  
**Re:** SA-01-2020 – MGV Development – Draft Plan - 1<sup>st</sup> Submission  
Municipality of Lakeshore

---

We received the following documents and drawings on April 11, 2024, and have outlined our comments below. Previous comments and reviews were completed on Stormwater Management and Functional Servicing Report. Traffic reviews were also completed on this file.

This package is considered as a 1st Submission Review (Draft Plan review only) as per our User Fee Bylaw under Subdivision Engineering Review Fee:

<https://www.lakeshore.ca/en/municipal-services/user-fees.aspx>

The following documents were provided for review:

- Cover Letter, dated March 2024
- Draft Plan of Subdivision Drawing, dated December 2023
- Conceptual Development Plan, dated December 2023
- Planning Justification Report, dated March 2024
- Stormwater Management Report, dated February 2024
- Functional Servicing Report, dated December 2023
- Transportation Impact Study, dated May 2023
- Safe Access Memo, dated March 2023
- Transportation Noise Memorandum, dated February 2024
- Site Map

Engineering & Infrastructure Division has reviewed these items in accordance with Lakeshore's Development Manual and the Windsor/Essex Region Stormwater Management Standards Manual (WERSMSM) and provide the following comments:

### **General**

1. A comment matrix is required to be provided to ease in the review process when the next submission is provided with notes addressing the below noted comments.

2. ERCA approval is required. A copy must be forwarded to the Municipality when received.
3. County approval shall be forwarded to the Municipality once it is received.
4. This development is subject to Lakeshore CLI approval process. The CLI Pre-Screening application should be submitted upon receipt of these comments. The CLI application shall be submitted during detailed design review when recommended by Lakeshore. Applications can be found at [Lakeshore.ca/CLI](http://Lakeshore.ca/CLI).
5. Detailed site servicing and grading plans shall be submitted for review. These were not provided as part of 1st Submission.
6. A letter from the County is required to be obtained to confirm the access from County Road 22 is acceptable.
7. For future submissions, please remove AutoCAD text comments from the PDF files, if possible since the files are difficult to load and frequently freeze.

### **Draft Plan of Subdivision**

1. The revised configuration of Street A is approx. 200 m long with only one access. Lakeshore's Development Manual cul-de-sac is permitted when it is 150 m or less. The Municipality has agreed to a variation of the Development Manual, specifically for this site.
2. An easement is identified south of Unit 41. Based on the package submitted for 1<sup>st</sup> Submission, it is not clear what the easement is for.
3. The daylight corners at Girard Drive are to be a minimum of 6.0 meters.
4. The proposed property north of Units 21 and 22 are to be conveyed back to the relative lots as part of the adjacent lands through the site plan approval process (to be conveyed at a later date).
5. The Commercial and Apartment complex shown on the drawings is not being reviewed at this time for Draft Plan of Subdivision and will be under a separate site plan application process. Applicant to remove these items from the drawings.

### **Concept Plan**

1. No grading or servicing plans were included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Submission. These drawings are required to be submitted for 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission.
2. See item 1, 2 and 3 above for Draft Plan of Subdivision comments.

**Stormwater Management Report**

1. The proposed site is shown in Figures 1 and 2 however the existing drainage area that outlets to the pond should also be included in the Figures. The size of the existing and proposed sites draining to the pond should be clearly identified and discussed.
2. Section 2.1 of the report explains three existing sub catchments and where they drain. Please confirm where the rest of the site drains that is not included in these boundaries (see Figure 1). The subcatchment drainage areas should be clearly identified. It appears as if the remaining areas drain easterly overland. Please clarify further on the drawing.
3. Many design/model parameters were not clearly identified in the report. Please clarify in the report. Some clarification was provided.
4. In section 3.2.1, design release rates were calculated based on available downstream capacity using the rational method. Does this mean that the remaining capacity of the Rourke Line Storm Sewer and Brown's Creek Drain will be used up with this proposed development? How was this calculated? Release rates are very high for the size of the drainage areas in Table 2. Drainage Areas are different between Table 2 and 3, so it is assumed that the catchments have increased to the drain and storm sewer. With added areas and increased imperviousness, this will increase runoff volume and duration. Was the added stormwater volume and duration considered in the receiving drainage areas for the major storm events? Please provide more detail and calculations for the release rates. In the report it appears as if a portion of the properties fronting Rourke Line are currently designed to drain to the municipal drains at a rate higher than agricultural. Additional lands will be added to the original areas with higher impervious levels, so the previous comment "Was the added stormwater volume and duration considered in the receiving drainage areas for the major storm events?" still applies since it doesn't seem to be addressed.
5. Please provide details for underground and surface storage for each block. (Report states this will be completed under detailed design). **Identify each parcel volume required to be stored.**
6. During the UST storm, the Girard Pond overflows significantly. Table 7 shows and increased overflow volume for the UST storm for the developed condition. Can the Brown's Creek Drain accommodate these flows, or does it increase the potential for flooding? Additional runoff from the proposed development in this storm event should not increase ponding/flows to the drain. The updated report still has an UST storm overtopping the pond by an additional 231 cubic m post development vs existing. Our previous comments still apply. Although this is only a 1.5% increase as noted in the report, it is a large volume that should be reviewed.

7. Further an increase in lot coverage to 52% is being requested. Based on the above and/or the additional imperviousness, it is likely additional on-site storage will be required if the existing pond cannot accommodate this. Please review and clarify.
8. The conclusion of the report states that the site will be assessed in accordance with the Drainage Act during detailed design. Please clarify.
9. Water Quality treatment to be sized during detailed design.

### **Functional Servicing Report**

1. In section 1.0, the total area of the site is stated as 6.27 ha, but the individual areas listed in the following sentence do not add up to that area. Please revise in updated submission.
2. In section 2.2, it states that access to the multi-unit development site will include access from County Rd 22. A letter from the County is required to be obtained to confirm the access from County Road 22 is acceptable. Further, it should be clarified that the internal road network (not “roads”) noted in this section is only applicable for Street A.
3. Review of sanitary and water servicing will be required during detailed design and as part of the CLI review and approval process.
4. In section 5.3, it states that the new storm sewer will outlet into the existing storm sewer along Girard Drive. The storm sewer design sheet does not include the existing storm sewer on Girard Drive. Confirm the existing sewers to the SWM pond have sufficient capacity to accommodate this added flow. The storm sewer design sheet was not included in Appendix B of the most recent submission. Section 5.3 discusses attenuating flows from Street A. The sizing will need to be confirmed during detailed design.

### **Transportation Impact Study**

1. The study states that the intersection of County Road 22 and Rourke Line Road must be signalized to achieve an acceptable level of service by 2025. The signalization must be operational before the site is built out and occupancy is required. The schedule shall be reviewed and coordinated with the County to the satisfaction of the Municipality. If the County Road 22 widening does not proceed in advance of the apartment building complex completion, temporary traffic signals will be required by the Developer.

2. Confirmation if the driveway access onto County Road 22 is acceptable is required to be obtained from the County. A memo was forwarded to the County, but no response was included.

**Planning Justification Report**

1. Maximum lot coverage is proposed to be increased, minimum front yard reduced, maximum height increased, parking ratio reduced. Zoning bylaw amendment application underway, pending approval. Approval is required prior to 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission.

We recommend that the proponent address the above comments and resubmit revised drawings/documents for further review. Note that additional review comments may become apparent with further review.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the undersigned.

*Vaibhav Desai*

---

Team Leader – Development Engineering & Approvals

Approved by: Krystal Kalbol, P.Eng.