

Questions

1. Will all ratepayer questions and suggestions to this email address be posted to a public forum? This will allow full transparency, and give all ratepayers an opportunity to become informed, or inspire other questions or suggestions.
A question-and-answer document is being compiled in conjunction with BMROSS, our Planner and Township Staff. This document will be frequently updated and available on the project website <http://www.acwtownship.ca/port-albert-servicing-master-plan/> once prepared.
 2. For question 1, if not, why not?
N/A
 3. As Council members rely heavily on "expert" recommendations during public meeting votes, will ratepayers answers, include the name of the "expert" answering the question along with a link to the source material for the ratepayer to review?
The question and document answer will include the sources of the answer and will reference any applicable project material.
 4. Will the ratepayers be given a specific cutoff date for questions? This will prevent the appearance of "lack of transparency" as experienced from the arbitrary cutoff date of the BM Ross Master plan public forum?
Once a date is set for the Public Meeting, we will issue a Notice of Public Meeting this document will provide a cut-off date for questions.
 5. Council assigned BM Ross the roll of spokesperson for questions to the public forum. "Misunderstandings" of the Master Plan process came from answers (or lack there of) posted to the public forum. How will seeking answers via this email address ensure clarity to ratepayer questions, if BM Ross couldn't provide that clarity originally?
Questions submitted have different elements, some technical, administrative, and political. Having one place to bring these to will allow the Township to collect and get answers more efficiently and provide for better communication of answers.
-
1. If the farmer who farms our family farm declines to farm our property during the proposed road construction, how does the Township plan to reimburse us for loss of revenue that we specifically rely upon to pay the taxes?
There should be limited impact to properties outside of the proposed road allowance that would prevent adjacent lands from being farmed. Response based on experience with previous road construction projects by BMROSS.
 2. A large part of the value of our properties is enjoying the wildlife that frequent and inhabit the trees on Ashfield Street, often travelling between them and the bush on the south side of Market Street; how does re-creating a habitat for this wild-life a distance away preserve the value and enjoyment of these beautiful animals from our properties?

As part of the final engineering design for Ashfield Street, engineering staff will investigate whether the existing trees located on the north side of the road allowance can be retained. The Master Plan report will also recommend that wildlife corridors be created within future development lands, extending from south to north through the study area. Response based on experience with previous road construction projects by BMROSS and knowledge of MP recommendations.

3. In the December 2020 BM Ross presentation to Council, the cost division for the upgrade of unassumed roads, such as Ashfield Street or Huron Street was to be borne 75% by the Township and 25% by Residents (less \$5,000); in the March 2021 BM Ross presentation to Council, the cost division for the upgrade of unassumed roads, such as Ashfield Street or Huron Street was changed to 50 % by the Residents that front onto Ashfield Street, 1/3 by Residents that access Ashfield Street and the remainder to be paid by the Township ~ what is the rationale for this change which increases the financial burden on the residents, many of whom have been forced to be Seasonal because of the Township requirements?

The financing approach presented at the December 2020 Council meeting was very preliminary. It was revised following the meeting after a more detailed assessment of the costs was undertaken and compared to financing associated with previous road reconstruction projects completed by the Township. Project costs were also updated prior to the March 2021 meeting, to reflect current construction estimates. Response by BMROSS based on attendance at meetings.

4. Current drain outlets have design faults, are not maintained, or cleared and have been responsible for beach level erosion and damage. How will the proposed Ashfield Street drain differ?

The Master Plan Report will contain a recommendation that the Township develop an ongoing maintenance program for existing and proposed storm drainage outlets in the Township. Response by BMROSS based on knowledge of proposed Master Plan recommendations.

5. What assurances are there that future issues related to the newly diverted water, and increased volume, will be addressed?

See answer to 4. Above.

6. How will the public beach access be incorporated alongside the Ashfield Street drain with inconsistent flow and lake levels?

The proposed beach access will be designed as part of the outlet reconstruction, so we cannot confirm how this would be addressed at this time. BMROSS has designed a number of shoreline accesses and can incorporate features to address fluctuations in lake levels. Once the outlet upgrades are completed, the Township would maintain the facilities and address any ongoing maintenance issues that might arise. Response by BMROSS based on previous BMROSS experience with lakeshore and beach accesses.

7. The largest erosion of bank within the project study area is at the Port Albert drain outlet due to lack of municipal maintenance for over 40 years. There is nothing in the proposal to indicate definite allowance for ongoing maintenance and prevention of erosion at the 4 drain outlets. Plans for ongoing maintenance and prevention to ensure protection from erosion at the 4 drain outlets need to be part of the written proposal. Please advise how this will be addressed?

See the response to 4. above.

8. There is nothing mentioned in the latest proposal to address beach erosion from the Ashfield Street drain and the 3 other drains to the lake; all within the proposed project study area. Prevention of beach erosion needs to be part of the written proposal. Please advise how this will be addressed?

See the response to 4. above.

9. The drainage survey results shown in the 2019 BM Ross presentation clearly indicate very few drainage issues and none of significance in the project study area and certainly none to the magnitude that warrant the majority of the drainage aspects of this proposal. Please explain how this aspect of the proposal has proceeded when the survey results clearly do not support it?

The survey results were only one component of the Master Plan investigations. A major driver for the study was the current holding zone policies in the Township Zoning-By-Law, which indicated that the needed services, such as public road or drainage are provided, before the holding zone could be lifted and new home construction could occur. Response by BMROSS based on Township request for Master Plan study.

10. With respect to drainage and erosion, even though a new improved drain is being contemplated, does Council really want to eliminate farmland to ease the creation of housing developments which will only serve to increase hard surface runoff?

Although some of the subject lands are currently being used as farmland, the ACW Official Plan designates the whole of Port Albert as a Village/Hamlet Settlement Area. Policies in the Official Plan direct new development to these designated settlement areas, so that further encroachment does not occur into designated Agricultural areas outside of Port Albert. Response by BMROSS based on planning experience.

11. In the December 2020 BM Ross presentation to Council, the cost division for the new storm drainage outlet at the bottom of Ashfield Street or the pond/stormsceptor was to be borne 66% by the Township and 33% by Residents (less \$5,000); in the March 2021 BM Ross presentation to Council, the cost division for the new storm drainage outlet at the bottom of Ashfield Street or the pond/stormsceptor was changed to 50% by the Township and 50% by Residents (less \$5,000) ~ what is the rationale for this change which increases the financial burden on the residents, many of whom have been forced to be Seasonal because of the Township requirements?

See the response to 3. above.

12. The Township has taken upon themselves to redesignate our 17 acre family farm as "Medium Residential" without our input or prior knowledge, without notice, our input or consideration. This is unacceptable conduct on the part of the Township! If, as individual property owners we were to request a redesignation of this farmland to something else, there is a process which we would be compelled to follow, which process would include completing an application, notice to neighbours to allow for objections, a fee to be paid, and an appeal process. How is it considered reasonable or ethical for the Township to have redesignated this property in this manner?

Our Planner provided the following response to your question. "These properties are presently designated Village/Hamlet. They are zoned 'Village/Hamlet Residential – Low Density - Holding (VR1-H)' and 'Natural Environment (NE1)'. From my records, these properties have been designated Village/Hamlet since prior to 2003 when the original ACW Official Plan was adopted, and the Ashfield Secondary Plan was in place. This designation is consistent with the properties being within the historic settlement area boundaries of Port Albert. I can further confirm that the zoning on the subject properties has remained the same since at least 2012."

13. If an improved access is created to the beach at the foot of Ashfield Street, the idea of "if you build it, they will come" no doubt will prove true and accommodations will need to be made, but we don't see any plans for, increased parking, garbage clean up, safe water testing and washroom facilities, etc. As it is, although most people are respectful, a timely inspection of the bush just around the public beach access will show that lack of washroom facilities is already a problem, and when Goderich beach is closed, and often on long weekends especially, we find many cars parked at the top of the hill, around the dumpster, edging onto our property and in the ditches. Plans to deal with these important issues, need to be included in print prior to approval of the proposal. What are the plans in this regard?

The beach access will be monitored, maintained, enforced, and repaired in the same manner other beach access and roads are. Unwanted behaviours and concerns will be addressed as they arise.

14. According to the proposal, the costs that have been allocated - \$152, 623 - to our two Seasonal and two farm lots are exponential, unreasonable, and intolerable, and no matter how lengthy the financial payment plan, they are unmanageable. At the 11 December 2020 Council meeting mention was made that properties such as ours that would suffer such extreme financial burdens would be dealt with separately to alleviate such financial burdens; there is nothing in the tables in the presentation made on 24 March 2021 to indicate any financial relief. If this proposal is to go ahead, we need the plan to deal with our properties included in print, prior to approval of the proposal. What are the plans in this regard?

The financing approaches and cost estimates have not been finalized. These finalized approaches and estimates will be presented following the next Public Meeting. Following the Public Meeting report recommendations may be modified based on feedback.

15. Given the fact that we and many other constituents who we are in contact with oppose this proposal, please advise how each of you, as our elected representatives, intend to represent our interests?

The Township cannot speak on behalf of elected representatives.

1. I would like to know the timelines and what allocations are being made for us to access our property during the first few phases involving Ashfield Street?

The proposed construction timelines will be finalized once the Master Plan process is complete, a final design is completed, and approvals are obtained from the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) and possibly from the Maitland Valley Conservation Authority. It is possible that the proposed Phase 1 projects, such as reconstruction of Ashfield Street, could be scheduled for construction in 2022. During the final design phase of the project, notifications would be provided to existing residents explaining how property access would be maintained during construction. Response by BMROSS based on BMROSS experience related to approvals and final design for similar road reconstruction projects, and project timelines suggested in the Master Plan.

2. We also understand that with increased sprawl in the village and along the lake bank, we will be faced with increased foot and car traffic, potential for increased danger of the steep embankment, strangers on our properties, vandalism, etc. but respect and welcome new residents. Community visioning is part of an effective Master Plan, **is it our vision to create unwanted behaviours that comes with sprawl to a water access area?**

Some Master Plan processes do include a visioning component. An example of this would be a new Secondary Plan process through the Planning Act. Master Plans being completed through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process are more technically-based processes that are responding to an infrastructure need within the community and don't require a visioning component. Response by BMROSS based on a review of Master Plan guidelines contained within MCEA document.

That is not the Townships vision, the beach access will be monitored, maintained, enforced, and repaired in the same manner other beach access and roads are. Unwanted behaviors and concerns will be addressed as they arise.

1. At the 11 December 2020 Council meeting mention was made that properties such as ours that would suffer such extreme financial burdens would be dealt with separately to alleviate such financial burdens; there is nothing in the tables in the presentation made on 24 March to indicate any financial relief. We need the plan to deal with our properties put in print. What are the plans in this regard?

The financing approaches and cost estimates have not been finalized. These finalized approaches and estimates will be presented following the next Public Meeting. Following the Public Meeting report recommendations may be modified based on feedback.

2. Also, we understand the basis used for allocating who would be required to contribute to the upgrade of Ashfield Street is that those of us who use it for access to our properties should contribute. What about the many locals who will use it to access the new, improved beach access on the road allowance at the foot of Ashfield Street? To allocate the expenses fairly, it would seem that this should be taken into consideration. Will this be taken into consideration and acted on?

This is not being considered, the initial construction of infrastructure is to be paid by landowners. After construction is complete the road maintenance and repairs of the roads will be a part of the yearly budget and will be paid for by the tax levy of the entire Township.

3. Why is the Community of Port Albert portion of the Township of Ashfield-Colborne-Wawanosh Service Master Plan this select small, outlying portion of the Village of Port Albert when there are many other access roads with adjacent farmland that are not up to municipal standards within the Village? If it is primarily to accommodate possible development, which is what it definitely appears, the costs should not be borne by existing, seasonal residents, who were previously not given any assistance, support or concessions by the Township.

The project study area was selected due to the large central area zoned as VR1 Holding that needed upgrades to drainage and road infrastructure. There were also numerous inquiries from existing property owners requesting that services be provided that would allow for the construction of homes on portions of these lands. Response by BMROSS based on Township request for Master Plan.

This Servicing Master Plan is specific to the Port Albert Settlement area, which has been designated in the Official Plan to serve the surrounding agricultural community and function as a residential area. Settlement areas are identified to protect the agricultural land base and natural environment areas by directing development towards the designated areas. As a Village, Port Albert functions as a centralized location for residential, commercial, and social activities. For more information on the history of Port Albert, please review the 'History of Port Albert' document on our project page <http://www.acwtownship.ca/port-albert-servicing-master-plan/>.

The following are questions I have with respect the Recommendations in the presentation by BMRoss on March 24, 2021.

Sewage and Water Servicing

Select Alternative 3 – Do Nothing for Sewage and Water Servicing

Rationale for Selecting Alternative 3

1. Financial Impact to residents would be significant
 - a. Why would the Financial Impact to existing residents be significant when the developers should be required to provide proper sewage and water systems for the new development(s)?
 - b. New developments should require communal water and sewage for their areas provided by the developers.
 - c. Is new infrastructure for new developments not the responsibility of the developer(s)?
 - d. Are specific upgrades to add new drainage to existing drainage out lets not the responsibility of the developer(s)?
 - e. Current residents are already serviced.

Alternative 1 was to Service the Entire Community of Port Albert with a Municipally-Owned and Operated Water Distribution and Sanitary Collection and Treatment System. This alternative was not chosen due to the economic impact to existing residents who are already serviced with private or shared services. Alternative 2 was to Service only Future Development Lands with a Municipally-Owned and Operated Water Distribution and Sanitary Collection and Treatment System, this alternative was not chosen because the preference is to service a whole community, and the cost associated with servicing only future lands could make new development costs prohibitive. Alternative 3 the one chosen was to 'Do Nothing.' This option proposes that no improvements or changes be made to address the servicing needs. This means landowners remain responsible for the water and sewage service of their own property, water and sewage needs will be addressed during the planning process of any new development.

2. No evidence of significant issues with existing sewage and water systems

a. How was this evidence (lack of evidence) determined?

A high-level review of Sewage and Water Servicing was completed including a survey. Which results did not indicate a significant concern with septic system operations and/or water quality. Hydrogeology report indicates that most wells are drilled to bedrock aquifer and overburden provides sufficient separation between septic systems and well supplies. Lastly, the Aquifer has potential to provide sufficient water quantities for the needed water supply.

3. Hydrogeology of study area supports existing servicing model

a. Does this Hydrogeological Study address intensification in the area?

b. The size of the lots recommended in the study do not appear to support safe septic and drilled wells on the same property as the dwellings:

i. A standard 3 bedroom home only requires 400 m² or 0.0988422 acres

ii. A standard 4 bedroom home only requires 500 m² or 0.123553 acres

iii. A standard 5 bedroom home only requires 625 m² or 0.154441 acres

c. How will the township maintain the current lot sizes when these minimum standards are reported?

d. Were the Hydrogeologic Studies backed up with soil samples and proper on-site investigations?

A Hydrogeological Study is an objective science-based review of the subsurface hydrogeologic and geologic conditions in an area or location to identify development suitability and constraints. The hydrogeological investigation was completed by Ian D. Wilson Associates, they are familiar with the Port Albert Area due to past investigative work completed within the Township. The purpose of the Study was as follows:

- Conduct a desktop review of available geological and hydrogeology information to establish the hydrogeological setting of the study area and surrounding lands
- Conduct desktop analysis of MECP water well records for the study area to confirm aquifer conditions and well yields
- Provide comments on typical septic system design criteria and sewage system impact potential

Results from the Hydrogeological Study

Port Albert Master Servicing Plan- Question and Answer

- Available information indicates that the project study area is within a low-risk geologic setting due to depth of overburden (avg. 26m) consisting of clay or hardpan.
 - Average well is completed to a depth of 38.4m into the bedrock aquifer with an average yield of 64 L/min
 - Due to low permeability of dense silty clays in study area, and probable seasonally perched water table conditions, raised beds would typically be required for septic disposal.
 - Based on the low risk geological setting, the number of lots within the Master Plan area will not be limited by MECP Procedure D-5-4 ("nitrate guideline").
4. Septic inspection program could be developed to address aging septic systems within the community
- a. Why specifically aging septic systems?
 - b. Aging septic systems does not require any responsibility to be part of the new developments to maintain the new systems

At this point we have not received direction from Council to investigate or pursue a septic inspection program. Therefore, we do not have any further details on what the program would look like.

Thank you for your responses. Please clarify some of the unclear responses for me.

Please clarify:

3. No evidence of significant issues with existing sewage and water systems
- a. How was this evidence (lack of evidence) determined?

A high-level review of Sewage and Water Servicing was completed including a survey. Where can we locate this "high-level review of Sewage and Water Servicing"? (what is the location we can reference this report at?) What was the one survey? Who was included in answering this survey? Were the questions opinion based or factual based? Which results did not indicate a significant concern with septic system operations and/or water quality. Please provide the questions and the summary of statistical analyses of this survey; confidence intervals for the accuracy of the factual results will help rate payers understand the definition of "significant". Hydrogeology report indicates that most wells are drilled to bedrock aquifer and overburden What is meant by overburden? provides sufficient separation between septic systems and well supplies. Lastly, the Aquifer has potential to provide sufficient water quantities for the needed water supply.

Also, clarify:

A Hydrogeological Study is an objective science-based review of the subsurface hydrogeologic and geologic conditions in an area or location to identify development suitability and constraints. The hydrogeological investigation was completed by Ian D. Wilson Associates, they are familiar with the Port Albert Area due to past investigative work completed within the Township. The purpose of the Study was as follows:

- Conduct a desktop review of available geological and hydrogeology information to establish the hydrogeological setting of the study area and surrounding lands
- Conduct desktop analysis of MECP water well records for the study area to confirm aquifer conditions and well yields. Did this desktop analysis of MECP get accurate information for the multiple files lost in the fire, flood, and/or move when the Huron County Health Unit experienced these different incidents before the merger with Perth, January 1, 2020? The missing information on the map suggests there is quite a number of residents located in the Master plan footprint data, with respect to both wells and septic systems, unaccounted for. What percentage of the data is not represented?
- Provide comments on typical septic system design criteria and sewage system impact potential

Results from the Hydrogeological Study

- Available information indicates that the project study area is within a low-risk geologic setting due to depth of overburden (avg. 26m) consisting of clay or hardpan.
- Average well is completed to a depth of 38.4m into the bedrock aquifer with an average yield of 64 L/min
- Due to low permeability of dense silty clays in study area, and probable seasonally perched water table conditions, raised beds would typically be required for septic disposal.
- Based on the low risk geological setting, the number of lots within the Master Plan area will not be limited by MECP Procedure D-5-4 ("nitrate guideline").

Thank you for clarifying these outstanding questions?

I look forward to your responses.

All information and reports for the Port Alert Servicing Master Plan we have received are linked on the project website

<http://www.acwtownship.ca/port-albert-servicing-master-plan/>. The Survey Results as presented by BM Ross are included in the Presentation to Council December 2020, view it here <http://www.acwtownship.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/16135-December-11-Council->

[Presentation.pdf](http://www.acwtownship.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Hydrogeological-Background-Study.pdf). Additionally the Desktop Hydrogeological Background Study completed by Ian D. Wilson Associates, view it here <http://www.acwtownship.ca/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Hydrogeological-Background-Study.pdf>.

Increased beach access via the Ashfield St drain is an additional goal of the Servicing Master Plan. Adequate washrooms and garbage collection etc has been mentioned in numerous meetings but details have yet to be released to the public. How will these be addressed so as to not damage the environment? This is particularly concerning because the nearby beach at the mouth of Nine Mile River is not a positive example of these issues being well handled. And although not an environmental issue, increased access equates to increased vehicles. Where do increased numbers of people safely park their vehicles?

The beach access will be monitored, maintained, enforced, and repaired in the same manner other beach access and roads are. Unwanted behaviours and concerns such as parking will be addressed as problems arise.

Development of the lands south of Ashfield St means more runoff of household, including chemical waste. The track record of drain outlets in the area is not positive (most notably Port Albert drain). Design for the upstream system has been generally communicated. But how will the outlet be designed and entire system maintained to operate differently, positively to benefit the environment?

The concern for maintenance of drains has been heard and taken into consideration, one of the additional recommendations presented by BM Ross on March 24, 2021 is to develop a policy for the maintenance of storm outlets. More information on this policy will be available before the Servicing Master Plan is finalized.

We front on the lake and back on to Victoria Beach Road. So why should we be allocated costs for Ashfield St or Huron St reconstruction?

The current recommendation is for those properties that use Ashfield Street as an access road to pay 1/3 of road construction costs.

Does road reconstruction automatically reclassify our properties as 4 season and therefore trigger tax increase, even though this is a summer use only property?

Tax Collector was consulted. There is currently no seasonal tax class, and therefore your cottage will remain in the residential tax class it is currently in. It is her understanding that the reconstruction would not directly impact your property taxes. According to MPAC there are five key factors that affect your property's assessment value: age of the buildings on the property, total square footage of living area, location of your property, size of your lot and the quality of construction. For more information on how MPAC assesses your property visit

<https://www.mpac.ca/en/PropertyTypes/ResidentialPropertyAssessment>

Port Albert Master Servicing Plan- Question and Answer

In our opinion, it is evident that the Servicing Master Plan is changing to accommodate new development. Why, then, is our seasonal residence being forced to contribute such a large amount for the benefit of the developers?

Along with being a guide to growth and development, the Servicing Master Plan also improves the existing infrastructure and drainage in the area. The infrastructure and drainage improvements will provide benefit to all landowners and therefore there is a cost sharing allocation.

The Port Albert Drain is a very good example of how a drain can deteriorate under the flow of increase drainage area. What contingencies are in place to upkeep and repair the new Ashfield Drain when it sees similar issues. Nothing has been done for the Port Albert drain. Can we expect the same for the Ashfield drain?

The concern for maintenance of drains has been heard and taken into consideration, one of the additional recommendations presented by BM Ross on March 24, 2021 is to develop a policy for the maintenance of storm outlets. More information on this policy will be available before the Servicing Master Plan is finalized.

Currently, our three-season cottage of 900 square feet has a higher tax bill then our four-season home. Are these high tax rates going to increase even more after the road upgrades? Will we be taxed as a four-season property even though we will still not have four-season access to our cottage?

Tax Collector was consulted. It is her understanding that the reconstruction would not directly impact your property taxes. There is currently no seasonal tax class, and therefore your cottage will remain in the residential tax class it is currently in. According to MPAC there are five key factors that affect your property's assessment value: age of the buildings on the property, total square footage of living area, location of your property, size of your lot and the quality of construction. For more information on how MPAC assesses your property visit

<https://www.mpac.ca/en/PropertyTypes/ResidentialPropertyAssessment>

I am writing to inquire about the Port Albert drain. As the landowners of PROPERTY which includes the creek that is the outlet into the lake we are concerned by the amount of water that flows through there and the impact it can have on our property. Will the work in the recommendations increase the water flow? We are particularly concerned about the peak times such as during a significant rain storm. Over the years erosion and slope failures have occurred but the stream is pretty much down to lake level, so it cannot go lower. The failures seem to occur as the stream starts to widen out or meander at the bottom to disturb the toes of the slope on each side. We would like to request some erosion control along the creek bank. Perhaps rip rap as we have seen along the creek in other areas along the creek in Port Albert.

From the BMROSS Q & A document available on our website. The current preliminary design for the regional stormwater management facility is based upon diverting as much drainage as is feasible to the proposed outlet at the west end of Ashfield Street. Although limited by elevation, the stormwater management facility will divert some water that currently discharges to the Port Albert Drain to the new outlet.

As for your request on erosion control along the creek bank, I will ensure BMROSS is informed and receives your request for erosion control, including the suggestion of rip rap along the creek.