

**Stormwater Servicing Master Plan - Northern Point Clark
Township of Huron-Kinloss**

Public Meeting Consultation Summary

1.1 Second Public Information Meeting

Date: August 24th, 2024

Location: Point Clark Community Centre (344 Lake Range Drive)

Time: 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Number of Attendees: 90 individuals

Table 1.1 summarizes the feedback submitted by residents to BMROSS or directly to the Township in response to information presented at the August 24th Public Meeting.

**Table 1.1
Summary of Public/Adjacent Property Owner Comments**

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
Point Clark (PC) Resident (via comment sheet) August 24 th , 2024	- Suggests that the plate be removed from the 4-foot pipe on the north side of St. Arnaud. After removal, monitor for 5 years.	- Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via comment sheet) August 24 th , 2024	- Suggests that residents of the area should vote on the decision to be made. - States that water quality issues need to be addressed.	- Information noted and filed.
PC resident (via comment sheet) August 24 th , 2024	- Suggests that all meeting be conducted prior to Labour Day weekend.	- Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via comment sheet) August 24 th , 2024	- Does not support tree removal on E.P. grounds between Birch Crescent and Clark Creek. - Does not support future building in the area. - States that there is a sound reason why ground has been designated as E.P. grounds for the last 15-25 years and it is to conserve the nature of the existing	- Information noted and filed.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
	grounds and limit future growth.	
PC resident (via comment sheet) August 24 th , 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggests that for the south problem area, leave as is. It is not a major problem. - States that if something is ponding, it should be directed to the Lake. 	- Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via comment sheet) August 24 th , 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provided recommendations for the north study area. Alternative #1 includes St. Arnaud storm sewer upgrade. Alternative #2 includes control structure and deeper ditches on Alfred Street. Also notes that a modified flow structure (i.e. damper removal) should be included and \$426,000 funded by Capital Improvement. - Recommends inspection and proper maintenance of current drainage system from existing maintenance budget. 	- Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via email) August 25, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resides at 902 Victoria Road, near the north problem area, and have never had drainage issues. Neither have the neighbours. - Permanent resident for past 17 years. Pay a lot of taxes and receives few services from the Township in return. - Concerned that large homes and proposed developments will create problems for existing residents. - Does not agree that a few properties with problems should have a solution paid for by all residents. They should have completed due diligence when purchasing the homes. - Does not want to pay for someone else's drainage problems or an expensive drainage system to support new developments. 	- Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (comment sheet via email) August 26 th , 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about alternative 1A for the south problem area and how it would empty to the Pine River directly in front of the boat club launch. Asks if there would be a dangerous structure out in the river. - Believes that Alternative 1B along Victoria Road with an outlet further upriver away from most marine traffic would be the best option. 	- Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via email) August 27, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thanks the Municipality for hosting an informative meeting. - Supports alternative 1B and alternatively 1A to direct storm sewers to Pine River. 	- Information noted and filed.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
PC Resident (via email) August 29, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not support the do nothing alternative as work must be completed to deal with flooding that has occurred over St. Arnaud and Lake Range Drive to ensure road is accessible for emergency vehicles. - Suggests that maintenance of the ditch along St. Arnaud be completed to maintain growth of vegetation and allow for proper flow of water during high rainfall events. - Suggests that improvements to drainage system be funded by the existing capital improvement budgets. - Agrees with recommendations for north problem area. - Suggests that the drainage ditch along Victoria Road at Clark Creek be extended to the north to improve the condition of the south portion of Victoria Road. This would ensure that the road would always be in good condition for emergency vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (comment sheet via email) September 2 nd , 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not support the do nothing alternative. - Suggests that the Municipality provide inspection and proper maintenance of current drainage system from existing maintenance budgets. - Suggests that reasonable improvements to the current drainage system be made from existing capital improvement budgets. - Suggests that the system be monitored and maintained for the next 3-7 years and an update be presented to the community within a reasonable timeframe. - Requests a response to ensure comments are received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed. - Response provided confirming that comments were received.
PC Resident (comment sheet via email) September 2 nd , 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the do nothing alternative. - Suggests that the Municipality provide inspection and proper maintenance of the current drainage system from existing capital improvement budget. - Suggests that reasonable improvements to the current drainage system be implemented using existing capital improvement budgets. - Suggests that the system be monitored and maintained for the next 3-7 years and an update be presented to the community within a reasonable timeframe. - Requests a response to ensure comments are received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed. - Response provided confirming that comments were received
PC Resident (via email) September 3, 2024	Re: <u>North Problem Area:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 1A recommendation for the north problem area seems to make sense. As I understand it, making modifications to the control structure and improving the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted & filed. - Response sent to

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
	<p>ditch on Alfred St. should improve their capacity and the flow of water to the Pine River.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding the 2C recommendation, again that sounds like a prudent plan however I will say that I am totally unqualified to give an opinion on its effectiveness. - Does anyone know if the 3' diameter steel drain pipe that runs from the intersection of River Rd. and Alice St. northeasterly to Pine River is clear and free of debris and has no collapsed sections? I was advised by one of my neighbours that they heard there is a depression in the Pine River Church Cemetery near Alice Street and they thought it was due to the pipe collapsing. Maybe it would be worth the time and effort to inspect this pipe since it has the capacity to carry a significant amount of storm water during flood events. <p><u>South Problem Area:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommendation 1A to install a storm drain on Birch and then Victoria to outlet at the Pine River at a cost of \$3,100,000 in my opinion is a lot of money to spend for the number of properties that are adversely affected by storm water. - According to the Project Study Area map, the North and South Problem Areas are connected and being fed by the ravine east of St. Arnaud St. I would wait to see if the improvements at the North Problem Area have a positive impact on the South Problem Area before considering the installation of any of the alternatives proposed. - I think property owners in the South Area that are having annual water issues should take remedial actions themselves, i.e. raise their cottages, improve their sump pumps, regrade their lots etc. - It's just too much money for the small number of properties that have the worst storm water problems. - Also, by spending \$3,100,000, can you guarantee that there will be no problems in the future? - Therefore, I would suggest Do Nothing for now. 	<p>question.</p>

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
PC Resident (comment sheet via email) September 4, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggests that the Municipality provide inspection and proper maintenance of the current drainage system from existing capital improvement budget. - Suggests that reasonable improvements to the current drainage system be implemented using existing capital improvement budgets. - Suggests that the system be monitored and maintained for the next 3-7 years and an update be presented to the community within a reasonable timeframe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (comment sheet via email) September 13, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the do nothing alternative. - Suggests that the Municipality provide inspection and proper maintenance of the current drainage system from existing capital improvement budget. - Suggests that reasonable improvements to the current drainage system be implemented using existing capital improvement budgets. - Suggests that the system be monitored and maintained for the next 3-7 years and an update be presented to the community within a reasonable timeframe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (comment sheet via email) September 18, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the do nothing alternative. - Suggests that the Municipality provide inspection and proper maintenance of the current drainage system from existing capital improvement budget. - Suggests that reasonable improvements to the current drainage system be implemented using existing capital improvement budgets. - Suggests that the system be monitored and maintained for the next 3-7 years and an update be presented to the community within a reasonable timeframe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via email) September 19, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have been on Birch Crescent since 2007. Not once in our 17 years of residing here have we ever had flood damage to our property. - Why has the town not kept the drainage along the roads clean and cleared of debris? Why have the sewers not been cleaned/cleared? - If people knowingly purchase land that is in a flood plain/Conservation Area and the Town allows for a residence to be built on this land, why does the Town, IE. taxpayers being forced to pay for the damage occurred to their residence due to flooding? (with this plan to upgrade the system to prevent flooding to existing homes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed. - Township staff replied to questions.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
PC Resident (hand delivered to Huron-Kinloss) September 20, 2024	North Proposal Recommendation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alternative#1 – St. Arnaud storm sewer upgrade. 1A – Control structure and deeper ditch on Alfred. - Note 1) – to include modified flow control structure (aka. Damper removal) - Note 2) - \$426,000 funded by capital improvement. - Also to provide inspection and proper maintenance of current drainage system from the existing maintenance budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via email) September 29, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resides in Point Clark. - Appreciates the level of public consultation being completed for this project. - Concerned about the cost and disruption associated with all options being considered. - Opposed to installing a storm water outlet directly to the lake. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
PC Resident (via email) September 20, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attended the meeting and had some questions. - Questioned contradictory message whether the proposal was to support development. - Concerned with plan to send untreated stormwater to the Pine River and the impact on sensitive fish and flora/fauna. - Wondered what concerns SVCA would have. - Questioned why Low Impact Development (LID) measures were not being considered. - Suggested that municipality improve maintenance of ditches along Lake Range Drive. - Only one flooding event since they moved to Point Clark which was the result of frozen ground not being able to absorb runoff. - Concerned that new homes constructed in the last 20 years in Point Clark were not properly reviewed to ensure they would not be impacted by flooding. - The costs of the proposed drain project should not be borne by the municipal tax payers due to bad building practice. The estimated costs of 4 million dollars are excessive for 20+ properties that will experience 1:25 year flooding. The residents in one area have rejected paying for the upgraded ditches and culverts recommended after a municipal review to help their water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted & filed. - Response sent to questions.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
	<p>issues. This should be their responsibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For these very obvious reasons, we do not support the proposed storm sewer drain pipes into Lake Huron or into the Pine River as proposed. We feel that there are better long term solutions that could enhance the community, build resilience for the future and not damage the delicate ecosystem of the area and Lake. 	
<p>PC Residents (86 comment sheets hand delivered to Huron-Kinloss) September 20, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the do nothing alternative. - Suggests that the Municipality provide inspection and proper maintenance of the current drainage system from existing capital improvement budget. - Suggests that reasonable improvements to the current drainage system be implemented using existing capital improvement budgets. - Suggests that the system be monitored and maintained for the next 3-7 years and an update be presented to the community within a reasonable timeframe. - Received 86 comment sheets with the same response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
<p>PC Residents (2 comment sheets via email) October 5, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports the do nothing alternative. - Suggests that the Municipality provide inspection and proper maintenance of the current drainage system from existing capital improvement budget. - Suggests that reasonable improvements to the current drainage system be implemented using existing capital improvement budgets. - Suggests that the system be monitored and maintained for the next 3-7 years and an update be presented to the community within a reasonable timeframe. - Suggests to clean and maintain existing ditches. - Received 2 comment sheets with this same response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.
<p>PC Residents (comments via email) September 20, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attended public meeting on August 24, 2024. - Inquired if the stormwater drainage capacity will include existing developments or existing and future developments in the area. - Noted that in the presentation, it was stated that residents along the route could connect to the system. Stated that downspout disconnection is encouraging by most municipalities in Ontario through additional ‘storm water’ or ‘roof’ taxes to avoid untreated overflow into the lakes. - Believes that sending collected untreated storm water that contains surface nutrients, pathogens, metals and road oil, pesticides and herbicides from a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information noted and filed.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
	<p>severe storm through storm sewers into the Pine River and Lake Huron is unacceptable. Water quality, wildlife, fauna, fish and flora in the ecosystem would be impacted. Inquired if any environmental studies have been completed. Inquired if sensitive or at-risk flora and fauna have been identified in the project limits. Inquired if Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority has commented on the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired about alternative options being considered. Have low impact development designs been considered including grassed swales, wet ponds, ditches and culverts, vegetated bioswales, retention ponds, soak aways and permeable landscaping? - Believes that maintenance of existing ditches on the east side of Lake Range Drive and existing culverts and drains should be prioritized. - Stated that in their 16 years of residence in Point Clark, there has only been one serious flooding event that occurred in the spring when the ground was still frozen. Since the ground was frozen, water could not absorb into the ground. Newly constructed houses on St. Arnaud and Lake Range Drive were constructed with elevations below the road level and there are no ditches or culverts to capture stormwater flows. Believes that they were constructed without proper drainage engineering. At the public meeting, it was noted that the water table is 1 metre below soils levels. House construction should have been adapted accordingly and the cost of the proposed drain project should not have to be paid by all municipal tax paters due to bad building practices. The estimated costs of 4 million dollars are excessive for 20+ properties that will experience 1:25 year flooding. The residents in one area have rejected paying for the upgraded ditches and culverts recommended after a municipal review to help their water issues and this should be their responsibility. - Resident does not support the proposed storm sewer drain into Lake Huron or Pine River. Believes that there are other long term solutions that could enhance the community, build resilience for the future and not damage the delicate environment of the area and the lake. 	

1.2 Township Website – Comments received through the ‘Have Your Say H-K’ website.

Table 1.2 summarizes feedback submitted by residents through the ‘Have Your Say H-K’ website.

**Table 1.2
Summary of Residents Comments from ‘Have Your Say H-K’ website**

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
Point Clark (PC) Resident May 4, 2023	- Inquired about BMROSS’s contact information to submit a plan.	- BMROSS’s contact information provided.
PC Resident May 6, 2023	- Inquired if the project will be funded by Point Clark residents. - Inquired if the project is to support new development in the area and if so, asked why taxpayers are paying the bill when the developer will profit. - Stated that residents should not have to pay for drainage since the Township is profitable.	- A response was provided stating that the study is included in the 2023 Capital Budget which is funded by all ratepayers of Huron-Kinloss. - The study was not initiated as a results of potential development projects. - The intent is for any future storm sewer projects to be funded by future capital budgets.
PC Resident May 15, 2023	- Inquired if the Township is planning to pave Victoria Road as part of the drainage plan. - Explained multiple benefits to maintaining a gravel surface including absorption of rainwater, maintaining a safe traffic speed and maintaining the natural appearance of the area.	- A response was provided stating that paving the road is not included in the scope of the study.
PC Resident May 24, 2023	- Inquired about the protection of wetlands and the watershed of Clark Creek. - Inquired if modelling will consider the 100 year storm projections or more intense precipitation events that are predicted with climate change.	- A response was provided stating that once potential projects have been identified for implementation, an evaluation process will be completed to consider potential impacts to the natural, social, cultural, economic and technical environments. This would include impacts to wetlands. If potential impacts are identified, mitigation measures would be identified to minimize potential impacts. Projects with significant impacts identified that cannot be minimized through

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
		<p>appropriate mitigation measures would not be recommended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modelling completed in conjunction with the Master Plan will utilize a range of storm events in designing proposed drainage infrastructure improvements.
<p>PC Resident May 30, 2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired if areas zoned as environmentally protected (EP) and open space (OS) will be protected from possible construction as they are essential to holding, draining and preventing flooding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stating that negative impacts to natural features that are zoned EP or OS are not anticipated since most of the upgrades will occur within existing municipal road allowances. However, drainage features that are located within EP land may need to be upgraded as part of the project. - Once potential projects have been identified for implementation, an evaluation process will be completed to consider potential impacts to the natural, social, cultural, economic and technical environments. This would include impacts to wetlands. - If potential impacts are identified, mitigation measures would be identified to minimize potential impacts. - Projects with significant impacts identified that cannot be minimized through appropriate mitigation measures would not be recommended.
<p>PC Resident June 7, 2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stated that a lack of storm drainage at Lake Range Drive and St. Arnaud Street caused massive flooding on their property, washing out their driveway and flooding a crawlspace. - Inquired if the Township was going to address drainage on the east side of Lake Range Drive in the St. Arnaud Street area. Previous owners stated that flooding had occurred in 2019. There is no culvert or ditch on the north side of St. Arnaud Street from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stated that the Township is aware of the drainage issues in the St. Arnaud Street and Lake Range Drive area. The Township will be looking into solutions to prevent these flooding incidents in the future. - Drains in the area have been currently functioning as intended but no longer accommodate flows produced by severe storms such as the events in May 2019 and April 2023.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
	<p>Lake Range Drive, although there is one further west down the road. Even if they were to install a culvert on the St. Arnaud side of the property, it has nowhere to be directed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired the purpose of the current culvert further west of St. Arnaud Street. Other residents have noted that the current drains are blocked causing drainage issues. 	
<p>PC resident August 11, 2023</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired if the Master Plan is being completed to allow more residential development in the mapped area lakeside of Lake Range Drive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stating that the purpose of this project is to provide adequate drainage for existing Township roadways and any future development will be required to submit a stormwater management plan which may or may not use the Township drainage system.
<p>PC Resident October 26, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired about the quality of water going into the lake and if this will cause disruptions to fish populations. Stated that rivers and creeks provide a filtering system to keep sediments out of the lake water. - Inquired about the exact location of the storm drainage outlet on Victoria Road. - Inquired about tax implications for property owners. - Stated that paving and adding curbs on Victoria Road is proposed. Speeding is an issue and by paving it, this will make the issue worse. Paving will also cause more runoff into the lake. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided. Water discharged from the outlet to the lake and outlet to the river would have a small difference in quality. The outlet to the river would be located close to the mouth of the river. - Approvals would be required for either outlet location from Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority, Department of Fisheries and Oceans and Ministry of Natural Resources. Potential water quality and fish population impacts would be addressed during the approval process. - Alternatives being presented are conceptual and no specific outlet locations have been identified. More information will be provided at the next public meeting. - Property tax rates are determined by Council and Council will ultimately decide whether future drainage projects will be included in future budgets and how the projects will impact the tax rate.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The standard road crossing will not work for Victoria Road since the road allowance is not wide enough. Based on information available, the Township has no reason to pave the road.
<p>PC Residents October 30, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired about the contractors for this study and a description of their roles and responsibilities. - Inquired if holding ponds will be constructed to allow runoff to dissipate into the ground instead of discharging directly into the lake. Runoff containing agricultural fertilizer could result in algal blooms. - Stated that previously, several small creeks were closed and redirected. Flooding occurred in the neighbourhood and this resulted in re-opening of the creeks. What did the Township learn from this experience? - Inquired how this project will be funded. Will it be funded through the capital budget or will taxpayers pay through municipal bonds? - Inquired about the quality of the stormwater. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stating that a contractor is not involved with the project but an engineering consulting firm, B.M. Ross and Associates Limited, has been retained to assist the Township with public and agency consultation and the design and evaluation of drainage options. - Options to incorporate stormwater management facilities that will help to reduce the impact of peak flows during storm events and provide enhanced quality control are being considered. - The Township evaluates the effectiveness of previous projects and uses all available information to make the best possible decision. - This study is a capital project that is funded by all ratepayers in Huron-Kinloss. Council determines how drainage construction projects are funded although the intent is to fund these projects as storm sewer projects which will be funded by all ratepayers of the Township. - Drainage construction projects require permits from approval agencies (SVCA and DFO) which will require quality control measures to be included.
<p>PC Resident January 8, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resident has owned a property adjacent to Clark Creek since 1945. Over the years, they have observed significant increases in water flow through Clark Creek as a result of storm water discharge to the river. This has resulted in bank erosion and they have had to spend thousands of dollar on bank 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stating that the purpose of this study is to investigate road drainage solutions between Clark Creek and the Pine River in Point Clark. Shoreline restoration along Clark Creek is not within the scope of this project. - Township assistance can be requested by contacting

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
	<p>protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired if erosion of creek banks is being considered as part of the project. 	<p>the Township Office at (519) 395-3735 or sending an email to info@huronkinloss.com.</p>
<p>PC Resident June 30, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired why the drainage solution does not include the proposed subdivision developer that will benefit without any financial responsibility. - In other municipalities, one option is for the developer to provide land for a holding pond to reduce direct run off affecting the quality of the receiving bodies of water. - Inquired why the taxpayer and environment are expected to assume the full burden of long term proposed solution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stating that the focus of the Master Plan is on finding solutions to existing stormwater problem areas impacting existing developed properties in Northern Point Clark. The preferred solutions presented at the meeting have not been sized to accommodate stormwater from future development lands. They have only been sized to accommodate runoff from the existing problem areas identified at the meeting. If a new development is proposed on the lands south of the Birch Crescent area, they would be responsible for dealing with stormwater runoff from their own lands, including finding a suitable outlet for the stormwater and ensuring that the proposed development does not aggravate stormwater conditions for existing developed areas. One of these options could be to incorporate into a Township storm sewer project in the future, however, these costs would be recovered from the developer through development charges or a cost sharing agreement.

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
Bruce Beach (BB) Residents September 8, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understands that the project will potentially be funded by taxpayers in Township. - Inquired why this project would be treated differently than the municipal drain project affecting residents such as the Bruce Beach municipal drain. - Believes that the source of water is the same and is coming from farmland, tiling of fields, township aggregating and concentrating water via roadside infrastructure/culverts and poor planning. - States that the Township needs to be consistent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stating that the purpose of the Municipal Drain process is to construct a drainage system to solve a specific problem, which was the case with Bruce Beach Road. In this case, the issue is a general lack of road drainage in the entire study area, so a Master Plan will provide us with the information we need to upgrade drainage infrastructure in the future as our budget allows. This provides the Township with more flexibility than is permitted through the Municipal Drain process. The Municipal Drain process could be used for upgrades to the drainage system in a specific area if it is deemed to be the best method of doing so. This will be evaluated as we proceed with specific drainage improvement projects.
PC Resident September 8, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired why taxpayers should pay to have a developer develop land that they will sell and make a profit on. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided stating that development pays for development. This means that if the Township decided to account for the drainage requirements of a development in a capital project, then the Township can either recover these costs through development charges or a cost sharing agreement with a developer. - At this time, the Township has no plans to provide drainage for private development. The purpose of either approaches is to ensure that existing taxpayers don't have to pay for the cost of growth.
BB Resident September 9, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired why residents of Bruce Beach have to pay separately to fix drainage issues when Point Clark residents' drainage projects will be paid through taxes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided. - Bruce Beach Road and the Northern Point Clark projects are different projects that require different solutions. While there are specific areas of concern for Point Clark, the intent is to look at the entire watershed and develop a plan that will enable the

Member of Public	Comments	Action Taken
		<p>Township to upgrade our infrastructure as the budget allows. Once the plan has been adopted, then the Township will look at specific projects to determine the best method of funding them. One option is to use Municipal Drain process, but generally speaking, this is not the preferred approach in an urban area where the drainage infrastructure can be installed on Township property. This was not the case on Bruce Beach Road, which led to the Municipal Drain process.</p>
<p>BB Resident September 10, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understands that the Point Clark drainage issues will be funded by all ratepayers in the Township. - Inquired why Bruce Beach cottagers are treated differently. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response has been provided. - See previous response to question asked on September 9, 2024.
<p>PC Resident September 20, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired why existing homeowners and cottage owners of Point Clark have to pay to fix a parcel of land that will be developed. Believes that the developer should have to pay for drainage solutions and suggests the area remain a greenspace. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided. - This project is focused on providing drainage for existing roadways, not providing drainage for development. Any drainage that will allow for development will be funded by developers or through development charges and not existing tax payers.
<p>PC Resident September 27, 2024</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inquired about the delay in response to questions asked on the website. - Suggests that the Township complete a Drainage Master Plan for the entire Township and analyse data from the past 10 years, adjust localized municipal drain activity and provide credit back to the landowners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A response was provided to the comment stating that there has been a delay in response due to technical difficulties with the website. - There are areas of the Township that have adequate drainage so the entire Township does not need to be studied.