

June 1, 2020

Municipality of Port Hope Planning and Development Services 56 Queen Street Port Hope, ON L1A 3Z9

Attention: Ms. Theodhora Merepeza

Planning Manager

RE: Official Plan Amendment (OP01-2019), Zoning By-law Amendment (ZB06-2019)

and Draft Plan of Subdivision (SU01-2019)

Phase 5 - Municipality of Port Hope

Penryn-Mason Homes Inc.

2107401 Ontario Inc.

AON Inc.

Penryn Park Estates Inc.

Dear Ms. Merepeza,

Further to your Letter of Clarification dated May 26, 2020 with respect to our 2nd submission applications, we have updated our materials to address comments pertaining to the Comment Matrix, Update Letter to Planning Justification Report, Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment, and Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan.

For your ease in reference, the Municipality's comments are outlined below and responses are shown in orange. Revised submission materials are provided via Dropbox link to the Municipality.

Comment Matrix, May 12, 2020

• It is noted in the matrix that Geoprocess R.A. *Bat Report* (November 20, 2018), MNR response (January 15, 2019) and Niblett Environmental Associates (NEA) Letter dated January 16, 2020 (on pg. 10) are submitted to the GRCA and will be submitted to the Municipality. Please forward these reports and the correspondence noted to us so we can include in the re-circulation package.

Niblett Environmental Associates has directly submitted the above noted reports to the MNR and GRCA, please find copies of the correspondence and report to those agencies in the Dropbox link provided via email.



- Throughout the report, responses related to comments to the original Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TIPP October 2019) indicate that "appropriate revisions to report will be made". Upon my reading, it appears that the revisions are already made in the TIPP dated May 12, 2020. I would encourage you to revise the comment matrix to reflect current information and help avoid any potential confusion.

 The interpretation that the revisions had been made is correct. The grammar in the response in
 - The interpretation that the revisions had been made is correct. The grammar in the response in the matrix has been revised to reflect that the modifications to the Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (including comment nos. 49, 103-107, 116 and 118) have been made. Please refer to the file in the Dropbox link provided via email for the updated comment matrix.
- Throughout the report, there are several responses re comments to NEA report of September 2019. Would it be prudent to have NEA revise the 2019 EIS report, in a similar fashion to the revised TIPP? I suggest this with the hope it will provide greater clarity for all.
 - Niblett Environmental Associates will be providing a comprehensive updated report upon completion of additional bird survey work after completion of spring and summer data collection.
- Page 16, response to TAC questions 58-60, include a statement from the Municipal Official
 Plan regarding the Boundary Definition: "For the purposes of development of aggregate
 resources, significant woodlands will be defined based on the criteria in the Natural
 Heritage Reference Manual". It is not clear why this definition is being noted on the
 response and would suggest expanding on the whole paragraph.
 - The definition has been removed from the comment matrix (comment no. 58).
- On page 31, it is stated that NEA will explore the possibility this spring for *landbird migratory stopover* on the site. Can you please confirm whether the survey has been completed?
 - The seasonal spring landbird migratory stopover survey is currently being performed by Nibett Environmental Associates. This data and analysis will be provided in the comprehensive updated report noted above.

Update Letter to Planning Justification Report, May 13, 2020

• It is noted that the southern boundary of the Draft Plan is slightly revised. Please clarify what this change is and where it is located, perhaps through a map or diagram. The southern boundary of the Draft Plan of Subdivision has not been modified. The Updated Planning Letter has been revised to remove reference to the revision to the southern boundary. Please refer to the Updated Planning Letter file in the Dropbox link provided via email.



Draft Plan revised May 7, 2020

- On our meeting to review WE comments to first submission, we discussed the rectangular parcel bounded by Strachan Street to the north and Block 304. You noted that is owned by the Municipality likely to accommodate a temporary turning circle, prior to Strachan Street being extended west. We agreed that as part of the second submission you could ask the Municipality to convey it to Mason Homes so to square off the section. Are you planning to request such conveyance now or in the future?

 Further discussion with the Municipality on the details and timing of the redline revision would be helpful. The redline revision takes place after the conveyance, and any time before registration of the Plan.
- Phase 4 was Finally Approved in Dec 2019 and under construction. The label on the plan
 is still "Draft Plan Approved". Please correct it.
 The Phase 4 text on the Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised to remove reference to "Draft
 Plan Approved" (replaced with "Approved December 2019" and "Under Construction"). Please
 refer to the file in the Dropbox link provided via email.

OP Amendment, May 2020; Schedule A/Legend

- Add "Recreational Open Space" under the current designations
- Add "Subject to a Holding provision" for the Hatching area
 The schedule of the draft Official Plan amendment has been revised to include the designation
 "Recreational Open Space" and the text ""Subject to a Holding Provision" to the legend. Please refer to the file in the Dropbox link provided via email.

Tree Inventory & Preservation Plan, May 12, 2020

• We appreciate there are considerable data contained within the Tree Inventory Plan (Sheets TC293-01) and Tree Preservation and Removal Plan (Sheets TC293-02), including aerial photo and identification of significant trees within tree compartments. However, in my opinion the quality of such sheets (printed and attached to the report and as PDFs) does not pay service to the amount of work and efforts that have gone on the current update of the report. We suggest you provide us with three (3) hard full copies of the Sheet TC293-01 (overview), IC293-02 (overview) and TC293-03. Further we would like you to forward us separate PDF files of the report without the sheets and high quality resolution PDFs of each sheet so we can upload them in the Community Consultation Webpage. Both figuratively and literally, we hope this will provide greater clarity for all. Three (3) full size hardcopies of the Sheet TC293-01 (overview), TC293002 (overview) and TC293-03 have been couriered to the Municipality of Port Hope to the attention of Theodhora Merepeza. An electronic PDF copy of the report without the sheets and high quality resolution PDFs of each sheet is provided to the Municipality via Dropbox link.

We note that while reviewing the report electronically, it is possible and helpful to zoom in on any of the drawings. In this way, anyone reading the report online has full ability to see the details.



I trust the enclosed information clarifies the questions from your letter dated May 26^{th} on our 2^{nd} submission applications. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you require anything further or wish to clarify anything contained in this letter.

Yours very truly,

Penryn-Mason Homes Inc.

Karen Liu

Land Development Coordinator