
HALDIMAND COUNTY

Report PED-PD-29-2018 Information Report Beattie Estates Plan of Subdivision



For Consideration by Council in Committee on June 19, 2018

OBJECTIVE:

To respond to Council and public comments raised as part of the initial public meeting for the Beattie Estates subdivision in Caledonia; introduce a revised transportation strategy and associated subdivision plan revisions; and to introduce preliminary draft plan conditions to Council for the residential plan of subdivision.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. THAT Report PED-PD-29-2018 Information Report Beattie Estates Plan of Subdivision be received;
2. AND THAT the south end transportation strategy included in Report PED-PD-29-2018 be approved for implementation;
3. AND THAT the principle of front-ending the development of a south end collector road west of McKenzie Road, including the Environmental Assessment process in 2019, detailed design and construction works in 2021 be supported;
4. AND THAT all aspects of the development of a south-end collector road as described in Recommendation #3, be funded from the \$8.3 million approved as part of the 2018 Capital Budget and Forecast.

Prepared by: Mike Evers, MCIP, RPP, Manager, Planning and Development

Respectfully submitted: Craig Manley, MCIP, RPP, General Manager of Planning and Economic Development

Approved: Donald G. Boyle, Chief Administrative Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This report is a follow-up to staff report PED-PD-06-2018 (February 6, 2018) which advised Council of the details relating to applications for the proposed 700 lot Beattie Estates plan of subdivision in Caledonia. The previous report was presented to assist Council in understanding the potential impacts of the proposal and to provide an opportunity for public involvement and engagement in the planning process. As part of that process, a number of comments were received from Council and members of the public, including concerns relating to: traffic increases, a proposed south-end transportation strategy, emergency vehicle response capabilities, municipal water and sanitary servicing capacities, woodlot protection and style of development.

The subject report provides responses to the primary concerns raised as part of the previous public meeting and outlines the implementation plan associated with the same, where applicable. Further, the report introduces a revised transportation strategy that has been developed in concert with the County's Master Servicing Plan transportation consultant (CIMA). The strategy necessitates a number of design

changes to the subdivision. The changes, which include adjustments to the south end road network and stormwater pond, some lot reconfiguration, and a relocation of one of the subdivision's McKenzie Road accesses, are addressed in detail within the report and have been deemed appropriate by staff. Lastly, the report introduces the draft plan conditions which are to be considered by the General Manager of Planning and Economic Development as part of his delegated approval authority.

BACKGROUND:

Staff report PED-PD-06-2018 was presented to Council in Committee on February 6, 2018 and advised Council of the details relating to the planning applications for the proposed 700 lot Beattie Estates plan of subdivision in Caledonia. To serve as a recap, the details of the project are summarized as follows:

- plan of subdivision consists of approximately 700 residential units, being a mix of single detached dwellings and townhouse dwellings;
- plan of subdivision would include an extensive internal road network, stormwater management facilities and new municipal service infrastructure (water and sewer);
- the project would introduce new public park space and a significant east-west trail segment that would serve to continue to build out the County-wide network of trails;
- the project represents an addition to the built area at the south end of Caledonia and would meet the proscribed Provincial development density targets; and
- the proposal would be subject to draft plan conditions that will address phasing of development to coincide with road network and infrastructure improvements, obligations (of the developer) for municipal service extensions/upgrades and road improvements, and requirements for high quality community development via a set of strict urban design guidelines.

As part of the public process that took place, a number of comments were received from Council and members of the public. While many comments were addressed at the public meeting, some matters required further assessment, including the proposed transportation strategy. To that end, the Council resolution for report PED-PD-06-2018 laid out the following:

“AND THAT, prior to the granting of draft approval for the plan of subdivision by the General Manager of Planning and Economic Development in accordance with By-law 7/01 of the Town of Haldimand, Council be provided with a report outlining the final draft plan design and associated draft approval conditions and a further public meeting be held.”

The subject report intends to serve as response to the aforementioned resolution by:

- introducing a final revised draft plan design;
- introducing the draft plan conditions;
- responding to the main concerns raised at the previous public meeting; and
- outlining a revised transportation strategy (in association with a revised draft plan design).

ANALYSIS:

The previous staff report PED-PD-06-2018 provided the full analysis of Provincial and County (Official Plan) policy and thus is not required for this report. The previous report also provided a full analysis of the proposed zoning and customized zone provisions for the development and thus same, is not required as part of this report. Lastly, the previous report provided a detailed assessment of the key

technical matters of sanitary servicing, water servicing and stormwater management and these are not addressed within this report. Rather, the subject analysis focuses on the following:

1. Response to key comments/concerns.
2. Revised transportation strategy.
3. Revised draft plan design.
4. Introduction of preliminary draft plan conditions.

Each of the above listed items are examined in more detail in the sections that follow and which contain the same numerical identifier.

1. Responses to Key Comments/Concerns.

A number of public and Council comments were raised at the public meeting and via correspondence (letters, emails) received by staff. The table below summarizes the key comments received and staff responses thereto. It is noted that the concerns relating to the transportation strategy are not included in this table as they have been addressed in the section above.

Issue/Concern Raised	Staff Comments
A third bridge (at McClung) is required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on County commissioned (e.g. Master Servicing Plan (MSP)) and developer commissioned traffic analyses, there is no requirement for an additional Grand River bridge crossing within a twenty year time horizon. Given the fact that there are no development drivers for the additional bridge, the \$17.5M (2013 estimate) cost of the bridge and ring road cannot be funded from development charges. It is important to note that the data used in the MSP traffic analysis show Caledonia more than doubling in population. • A bridge at McClung Road does not create direct/convenient access to Caithness that is envisioned by various members of the public—the bridge is part of a limited access ring road corridor providing access to the south end of Caledonia which due to topography would start at the high point on McClung Road and pass over Caithness Street and after spanning the Grand River meet River Road at grade. The ring road would then curve westerly to the south end of Argyle Street. Desired solution of traffic distribution can be accomplished through alternative of collector road design (to Hwy 6 by-pass) as set out subsequently in this report.
Timing of development - should any of the required infrastructure upgrades be in place first?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure (roads, sanitary conveyance, water supply) can accommodate an initial phase of the subdivision of 50 lots. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Note: previous staff report PED-PD-06-2018 estimated that 177 lots was the threshold for upstream traffic impacts. However, through the public and Council review process it is clear that needs to be adjusted to 50: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ address existing community concerns;

Issue/Concern Raised	Staff Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ address the County's desire to ensure the proper transportation outlet is in place so new residents use it when they move in; and ▪ address a desire to minimize, as much as possible, infiltration into the existing neighbourhood to the north. <p>The above will also require that phasing will proceed west to east.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New/upgraded conveyance infrastructure (e.g. pumping station) and new road network (collector) are required as construction moves beyond the first phase. Draft plan conditions will ensure that construction of these works proceeds in step with the development. • The County's wastewater treatment plant can accommodate all of Beattie Estates once process improvements are completed at the plant in Fall 2018.
Will replacement of Argyle Street bridge be problematic?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will be key to have the collector road in place prior to the new bridge construction being initiated to limit impacts, allow for new travel habits to be formed, etc. This will be required/outlined in draft plan conditions, in particular as it relates to the phasing of the project. Staff's recommendations are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To front end the construction of the collector west of McKenzie Road so it is in place in 2021 with the cost to be recovered through Development Charges—note, Council has already committed \$8.5 million in its capital forecast for this work; ○ In the interim, permit 50 lots to be serviced, registered and constructed immediately as a Phase 1—such Phase to be located adjacent to McKenzie Road to minimize infiltration onto local streets in the existing subdivision to the north; ○ Permit additional 125 lots (as a Phase 2) to be serviced immediately, but not registered and constructed until the Environmental Assessment (EA) and design process of the new collector road is completed and construction start-up of same is imminent; ○ Permit balance of the project (i.e. remaining 550 lots as multiple phases) to be serviced, registered and constructed only when the collector road is constructed and fully operational; and ○ This phasing will be ensured through conditions of subdivision approval (see conditions 2 to 7 of Attachment 6).
Emergency service provisions—will there be implications for response (e.g. with Argyle Street bridge closure/replacement) and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was discussed in detail with the Fire Chief. Currently, we provide ambulance service from the south side of the river 24/7. In the event of a bridge closure that would affect response times, we up staff by adding a unit and place it on the north side of the river to facilitate responses. As part of our regular deployment plan, if units

Issue/Concern Raised	Staff Comments
how are the south and north sides to be serviced?	<p>are called to service, we bring in standby units from other areas to cover off.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For fire, it is the opposite of above—service is from the north side 24/7 and any up staff needed (e.g. bridge closure) sees use/deployment to the south side (of the river). The Highway 6 by-pass is currently included in the Emergency Services (EMS) response planning and utilized (beneficially) as required. The addition of an east west collector as proposed, will support the provision of EMS and allow faster by-pass access.
MTO road system capacities/upgrades—does MTO monitor County development/plan for growth for Highway 6 and key intersections (i.e. Greens/66 and #6)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MTO regularly monitors all traffic activity and increases on its road network. The County provides MTO with its traffic data and also circulates them on all major development projects such as Beattie Estates. This, as well as field work that is completed, allows for MTO to actively monitor and plan for any future system upgrades.
School Board reviews—do the schools plan for this new development and is there capacity at existing schools to accommodate this project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School boards are part of the circulation process for projects such as Beattie Estates and they have opportunity for inputs during the review process. None of the school boards indicated any issues or concerns with the project as part of their formal comments to the County. It is staff's understanding from direct discussions with the Public School Board that new residents to Caledonia in the new developments are attending the high school in Cayuga. As an underutilized school, the Grand Erie Board is assigning new residents to this school and providing transportation (busing) for same. Residents attending the Separate School Board will attend Notre Dame elementary and thus, there will be some traffic from the new subdivision to this school. Sidewalks are required on local streets to ensure safe and convenient pedestrian access routes to schools. County Planning staff, at least once per year, provide the school boards with development activity updates including permit data and a summary of key residential projects proposed, approved or under construction. This information is analysed regularly by the boards and used for their future planning.
Stormwater/flooding impacts could arise from this form of development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary stormwater and grading/drainage plans were provided as part of the application package. These have been reviewed by technical staff at the County and the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA). No issues were identified with the preliminary plans. These plans ensure that no increased run-off due to more hard surfaces enters watercourses during rain events, that adjacent

Issue/Concern Raised	Staff Comments
	<p>properties are protected from flooding and that stormwater quality matters are addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to registration and any construction taking place, detailed design plans and reports must be submitted for review and approval. This is set out in Condition 24 to 28 in Attachment 6. This process ensures that plans approved for construction will not have a negative impact on surrounding, upstream or downstream lands.
<p>The woodlot at the east end of the subdivision needs to be protected for public good.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) has been completed which identifies significant species and habitats in the woodlot and staff is recommending a draft plan condition that would require the transfer of the woodlot to the County. This will ensure its long term protection. See Condition 30 in Attachment 6. • Restrictive zoning will be put in place to limit the uses of the woodlot to open space. • The current intent is to retain the woodlot as a natural feature. Should any public trail in the future be contemplated in or adjacent to the woodlot the EIS will be used to keep users away from sensitive environmental features.
<p>The development could negatively impact the watercourse that runs north-south at the west end of the site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subdivision design is predicated on preservation/protection of the watercourse, including maintaining it as open channel to preserve existing flows. • GRCA is supportive of the revised plan as presented and satisfied with protection measures and development setbacks proposed from the watercourse.
<p>There is parkland identified but is it sufficient?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities and Parks Operations (FaPO) reviewed the plan and is satisfied with the ¾ acre community park. The developer has also located the park in the preferred location of FaPO. This size of park will allow for proper amenities such as play equipment, free play area and seating. To be situated for the benefit of residents, a detailed park and road design in this location will ensure safe access to it. • Development is in proximity to McKinnon Park (~750 m to the north) which provides a wide variety of recreational opportunity. Improvements to McKenzie road required as part of the first phase of development will include sidewalks to ensure safe pedestrian access. • Trail provision also addresses recreational needs and would be approximately 1.5 km in total length within the hydro corridor that runs along the north end of the site and will connect with wider County trail/cycling routes.

Issue/Concern Raised	Staff Comments
Trails are proposed but how will they be constructed, maintained?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard County construction of 3 to 3.5 m width, hard packed granular will be employed. The trail is required to be constructed by the developer. • No illumination of trail is proposed at this time. • Edge of trail (2 to 3 feet either side) will be maintained (cut/trimmed) but balance of the corridor wherein it is situated will be left in natural state. • The maintenance program applied to all other County owned trails will be applied here. • The trails plan, which is still to be developed, will require the trail to be oriented to the south side of the corridor in proximity to the new development. This will ensure that a significant setback buffer of 20 to 25 metres from existing residential to the north can be achieved. Condition 32 to 34 in Attachment 6 addresses this requirement.
There are gas mains and hydro infrastructure in the north corridor—these will be threatened with this development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the hydro and gas infrastructure rests within the corridor that runs along the north boundary—this is a protected corridor by easement and no development is to take place in this area other than trail construction and road/infrastructure crossings. • The type of development proposed in the corridor (noted above) is supported by the various agencies (Hydro One, Trans-Northern) provided they are involved in the process, receive the detailed plans for review and ultimately approve the construction details. This is addressed as draft plan conditions 37 to 43 in Attachment 6.
How are community bonds formed with a project like this?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trails, centralized community park and sidewalks on one side of every street provide opportunities for outdoor activity and community building. The layout including pedestrian walkways provide opportunity for walking loops to encourage active pedestrian use. • Layout of subdivision, including pushing houses to street with front porches is standard and creates foundation for interaction and getting to know members of the community. • Street design is intentional and allows for small areas of the subdivision to generate community feel and activity.

2. Revised Transportation Strategy.

As part of the previous report, staff introduced a conceptual south end transportation strategy. The main focus of the strategy was to make provision for traffic infrastructure to direct south end residents to the Highway 6 By-pass (thus avoiding travel north on Argyle to the downtown/Argyle Street bridge). Staff recommended this strategy based on the following principles:

- To give people multiple ways in and out of the subdivision and connections to major roads to disperse traffic;

- To limit impacts to existing residential areas—i.e. discourage infiltration of traffic into them; and
- To create the opportunity to develop a new road network that will be intuitive, fast, direct so residents will choose convenience/efficiency over frustration and use the by-pass.

What this strategy ‘looked like’ is shown on Attachment 1 and it is summarized as follows:

- Route A would be extended as a collector (similar to Highland Drive to the north) to a signalized intersection at Argyle Street South. This would be completed as development occurs to provide one choice of route for residents; and
- Route B would be a limited access collector at the south end of the community, with direct access restrictions being focused west of McKenzie Road. While Street A would be extended as development occurs, the new collector road would be installed early in the development process to provide a convenient direct access from the outset. In order to ensure this occurred, it was recommended and Council approved that the County would front-end the construction of this infrastructure with the cost recovered through Development Charges. The Capital Budget was amended to include \$8.3 million for this road, with \$2.4 million being identified in 2019 for EA, engineering/design, archaeology, land acquisition, contingency, and \$5.9 million in 2021 being for the construction.

As part of the public meeting and presentation of the strategy, a number of concerns were raised by Council and members of the public. The main concerns focused on the conceptual Route B were as follows:

- The alignment of the road route would require the acquisition of several fully developed private properties and the impacts of this to the affected homeowners; and
- Concern was raised with the fact that the route was proposed outside the urban boundary and would impact adjacent agricultural operations by removing land from that farm. These owners felt strongly that the limited access road should be brought within/be incorporated into the residential lands that necessitate its development.

In response to the input received, staff worked with the County’s Caledonia Master Servicing Plan transportation consultant (CIMA) to assess various alternative alignment options for a new limited access south end connector road and determine a preferred route. That work is outlined in Attachment 2 and has culminated in a revised Route B which is shown on Attachment 3 (note: new route is identified as Alternative Route A2 on Attachment 3). The revised route at Attachment 3 is shown within the context of the westerly travel route (i.e. subdivision to Highway 6 by-pass) and future potential easterly connection. The revised route sees the road allowance brought fully within the urban boundary and it would avoid the need to acquire other private properties that are already developed. The CIMA analysis has concluded that this route option is optimal and would provide for the desired function of moving motorists from the subdivision to the west as opposed to north. The key benefits of the route include:

- Shortest travel time between a central intersection in the Beattie Estates subdivision and Argyle Street of all the options evaluated within the urban boundary;
- Provides a peak travel time (AM and PM) of approximately 10 minutes (both northbound and southbound) from the central area in Beattie Estates to the north end of Caledonia (intersection of Argyle Street and Greens Road) at full build-out of the Beattie Estates and McKenzie Meadows subdivisions versus over 11 minutes using McKenzie Road, across Argyle Street Bridge, along Argyle Street. This time differential will increase as the remaining lands in the south end develop representing approximately 1,000 units;

- Does not preclude future creation of a ring road corridor and McClung Bridge should it ever be required;
- Minimal private driveways (approximately 50) and road intersections along the southerly collector within Beattie Estates allows for desired function;
- County has (future) control over direct connections to the road with regard to the development lands to the west. This is through the subdivision design and approval process and will follow (in future) and allows for protection of the route for its intended function;
- Does not require modification to the McKenzie Meadows subdivision and does not compromise the proper design or functionality of the remaining undeveloped lands in the south end of the community;
- Impacts to natural environment are minimal;
- 0.8 km of the road (approximately 1/3 of its length) will be constructed as part of the Beattie Estates subdivision-the remaining 2/3's will be 'front-ended' by the County so it is in place by 2021;
- New road is within the Urban Boundary limits and the revised subdivision design will represent the southerly limit of the community; and
- May eliminate through design the need to acquire existing properties/houses.
- The alignment and intersection controls at McKenzie and at Argyle will ensure minimal stop conditions using the collector system thus making it a more convenient and less frustrating driving choice than travelling through town.

It remains that the implementation program for the collector road construction would be incorporated as a condition of subdivision approval in all south end developments, including the Beattie Estates project. Until this work is completed and timing and methods of implementation are clearly defined, staff is recommending a strict phasing plan that will serve to minimize impacts to the upstream (northerly) transportation network and ensure that the new transportation network is completed in the early stages of the project to assist in developing travel route habits as intended through the transportation strategy. In this regard, staff are recommending the following:

- An initial phase of 50 lots can be serviced, registered and constructed immediately with no limitations related to the new collector road system (McKenzie to Argyle) (note: other upgrades identified for McKenzie Road would still be required and will be completed in concert with the McKenzie Meadows development to the west). This is predicated on the analyses completed to date that indicate upstream traffic impacts would be negligible;
- A second phase of 125 lots can be serviced immediately (as part of the phase 1 identified above) but cannot be final registered and constructed (with dwellings) until the technical work relating to the new collector road (from McKenzie to Argyle) is completed and initiation of construction is imminent. This would include the completion of the Environmental Assessment (EA), detailed design, land securement and archaeological assessment. This work is proposed to be initiated by the County in 2019 (additional discussion on this included below);
- The balance of the development (approximately 550 lots, likely spread over a number of phases) could not be serviced, registered and constructed until the new collector road (McKenzie to Argyle) is in place and operational.

It should be noted that the previous staff report PED-PD-06-2018 estimated that 177 lots was the Phase 1 threshold for upstream traffic impacts (i.e. versus the 50 lot threshold identified in the first

bullet above). However, through the public and Council review process that took place in February of this year, it is clear that needs to be adjusted to address:

- existing community concerns;
- the County's desire to ensure the proper transportation outlet is in place so new residents use it when they move in; and
- a desire to minimize, as much as possible, infiltration into the existing neighbourhood to the north. In this regard, additional steps will be considered to minimize infiltration into the existing neighbourhoods to the north, including: adding stop signs to slow north south traffic, limiting direct connections (i.e. only connection north would be Balvenie Boulevard extension) and internal traffic calming (stop signs, etc.).

The above will also require that phasing will proceed west to east. Clearly defined draft plan conditions including funding measures and holding provisions in implementing zoning by-laws will be the legal mechanisms to ensure the above approach is adhered to.

Lastly, it should be noted that the resolution passed by Council at the February 12, 2018 meeting set out the following as it relates to the collector road study and construction:

“AND THAT the by-pass arterial road at the south end of Caledonia be reflected in the 2018 Capital Budget and Forecast to 2027, with all project costs associated with engineering, environmental work, archaeology, land acquisition and construction anticipated to be recovered from Development Charges.”

To that end, the approved 2018 Capital Budget and Forecast includes \$8.3 million which reflects the estimated amount to complete the noted tasks. Given that the new transportation system plan would place approximately 1/3 of the road construction requirement within Beattie Estates (i.e. previous plan had that 1/3 resting outside the urban boundary), it will reduce the total required budget for the above-described work. Staff will review and make any necessary adjustments through the appropriate process. It is also recommended that the County front-end the collector road construction process, which would include initiation of the EA and design process in 2019 and the construction process in 2021 (once all the design/technical work is completed and approved). It is anticipated that this entire process would take approximately 4 years with collector road construction occurring in 2021 with completion being in 2022.

3. Revised Draft Plan Design.

The revised transportation strategy outlined above necessitates a number of changes to the subdivision design. The changes are distributed throughout the subdivision with the most significant changes being along the southerly edge and centre of the subdivision. A copy of the revised plan is included as Attachment 4. The changes are summarized as follows:

- Creation of contiguous east–west road (identified as #1 on Attachment 5);
- Creation of a new McKenzie Road access at the south end (identified as #2 on Attachment 5);
- Elimination of the main centralized McKenzie Road access (identified as #3 on Attachment 5);
- Revisions to the stormwater management pond facility to facilitate culverts/road crossing (identified as #4 on Attachment 5);
- Realignment of various streets and intersections (identified as #5 on Attachment 5);
- Creation of future east end connection/road extension option near the woodlot (identified as #6 on Attachment 5); and

- New mid-block pedestrian connections added to create more active transportation opportunities (identified as #7 on Attachment 5).

Staff and the Grand River Conservation Authority have reviewed the plan changes and deemed them acceptable. The changes do not impact on the functionality of the subdivision relating to (internal) traffic flows, water servicing, sanitary servicing or stormwater management. Further, the changes have resulted in a net increase of 18 lots when compared to the previous version of the plan as well as improvements to pedestrian connectivity throughout the subdivision.

4. Preliminary Draft Plan Conditions.

A preliminary set of conditions has been drafted and is included in entirety as Attachment 6. While conditions are typically not included in staff reports or presented to Council, staff is of the view it is important to present the conditions in this case due to the complex nature of the project. This approach ensures that Council is aware of the requirements moving forward and it also serves to demonstrate to the public how its concerns will be addressed through the imposition of specific conditions that must be fulfilled prior to/as part of development proceeding. There are a total of 60 conditions proposed within the areas of development phasing, servicing (water and sanitary), stormwater management, roads, parkland/trail development, external agency requirements and urban design. The following key matters are addressed in the draft plan conditions:

- The conditions lay out strict phases of development as described earlier in this report;
- Detailed evaluations and completion of infrastructure requirements, including water, storm and sanitary systems are to be completed in connection with the new Caledonia Master Servicing Plan and as required for each stage (phase) of development;
- Detailed stormwater management plans are to be provided, approved and implemented as part of each stage (phase) of development;
- Implementing zoning is set out as a requirement and the necessary amendment must be obtained;
- Detailed urban design guidelines are to be developed and implemented to ensure high quality development results (e.g. on street parking plan, driveway location plan, landscaping/street tree planting plan, housing style guidelines, etc.);
- Trails and park development, including site plans for each that detail setbacks, are set out as requirements and to be completed in early stages of the project with these lands being conveyed to the County. The mature woodlot at the east end of the project would also be conveyed to the County as part of the first phase of development;
- Final approval requirements are set out from external agencies including Grand River Conservation Authority, Hydro One, Trans-Northern Pipelines; Canada Post; telecommunications providers, etc. and required to be completed;
- Final acceptance and approvals of technical studies including Archeological Assessments and Traffic Impact Study are required; and
- Confirmation of servicing allocation is required.

The draft plan conditions will be finalized subsequent to the public meeting and revised, if required, to accommodate any additional matters. Once completed, the conditions will be presented to the General Manager of Planning and Economic Development for approval per the delegated authority that exists for such process. The necessary public notices of decision would then be issued in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act*.

FINANCIAL/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

The 2018 Capital Budget and Forecasts includes \$8.3 million for the south end collector road as described in this report. The funding covers all aspects of the project including the EA process, detailed design, archaeological assessment, land purchase and construction. The funding is broken out as \$2.4 million in 2019 (for EA, design, land purchase, archaeological) and \$5.9 million in 2021 (for construction). The funding is 100% recoverable from Development Charges.

STAKEHOLDER IMPACTS:

All stakeholder impacts were addressed as part of Report PED-PD-06-2018.

REPORT IMPACTS:

Agreement: Yes

By-law: Yes

Budget Amendment: No

Policy: No

ATTACHMENTS:

1. PED-PD-29-2018 Attach1 Alternative Travel Route.
2. PED-PD-29-2018 Attach2 Transportation Analysis.
3. PED-PD-29-2018 Attach3 Travel System.
4. PED-PD-29-2018 Attach4 Revised Draft Plan.
5. PED-PD-29-2018 Attach5 Plan Revisions.
6. PED-PD-29-2018 Attach6 Draft Plan Conditions.