

## CEAC Report 2007-02

Report to: Mayor and Members of Council

From: Neil Morris, Chair, Caledon Environmental Advisory Committee (CEAC)

By: Mayfield West Community Development Plan sub-group: John Abbott, Graham Bryan, Debbe Crandall, Dorothy Mazeau, Steve McElroy, Kari Morrison, Bill Wilson.

Date: May 31, 2007

Re: **Mayfield West – Achieving the Objectives of the Original Vision**

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Caledon Environmental Advisory Committee (CEAC) recommends to the Corporation of the Town of Caledon:

1. That Council receive CEAC Report 2007-02;
2. That Council revisit the Critical Issues comments contained in CEAC Report 2006-04, *Remaining True to the Mayfield West Development Plan*, dated June 20, 2006, with a view to confirming progress achieved in addressing the concerns raised in that report; and,
3. In addition, that Council give particular attention to the points raised in this report dealing with water quality and stormwater management, building certification and the eco-design of specific components of the new village.

### BACKGROUND

CEAC appreciates the complexities that have been involved to date in the development of the Mayfield West Community Design Plan, a plan which will guide development within the secondary plan area up to the year 2021. Mayfield West is a most significant project and CEAC commends Mr. Tim Manley, Senior Planner responsible for Mayfield West, for his efforts in managing the project.

Members of CEAC were involved with the development of Mayfield West from the outset as participants in the Mayfield West Design Charette process inaugurated in 2003.

CEAC's current role regarding Mayfield West, as approved by Council, includes the direction to "Report to Council at the appropriate time in the Mayfield West development process regarding specific components of the Community Design Plan".

Members of the CEAC Mayfield West Community Development Plan sub-group have been deeply involved, through delegations, submissions and urban design tours, in the

process of finalizing the Community Design Plan since the submission of CEAC Report 2006-04, dated June 20, 2006, and Planning and Development Report 2006-43, which was submitted to Council at the time of the tabling and passing of OPA 208 by Council on July 4, 2006.

CEAC's questions and comments throughout the process have been extensive and are well documented. We believe that responses to these questions and comments are necessary and, we trust, are in the process of being prepared.

## **REPORT OBJECTIVES**

The principal objectives of this report are to;

1. Ensure that key aspects of the Mayfield West Community Design Plan that have the potential to impact the environment are addressed satisfactorily;
2. Draw Council's attention to those recommendations submitted in CEAC Report 2006-04, dated June 20, 2006; and,
3. Highlight and recommend that Council consider specific recommendations dealing with three key overarching areas of concern: water quality and stormwater management, building certification and the potential for eco-design in a designated area of Mayfield West.

## **DISCUSSION**

The goal of realizing the advanced and innovative concepts that were first tabled through the Mayfield West Design Charettes in 2003 will be difficult to achieve due largely to the complexities of the project, the attention to detail required at the community design phase, and the lack of an historical perspective on the part of some of the current decision-makers.

To mitigate these difficulties to some extent, CEAC is recommending a review of CEAC Report 2006-04, with particular emphasis on the Critical Issues comments, as well as a review of the document attached as Appendix 1 to this report, entitled *Synopsis of CEAC Comments Regarding the Mayfield West Community Design Plan Report*, dated February 1, 2007, and which has been submitted to Planning and Development staff.

Furthermore, in an effort to bring to Council's attention a few areas of specific concern in this complex process, CEAC presents a brief discussion below of the issues of water quality and stormwater management, building certification, and the potential for the eco-design of designated components of the new village.

These are 3 key issues to consider in terms of the success of Mayfield West.

## **1. Water Quality and Stormwater Management Are Inextricably Linked**

Water quality in the Etobicoke Creek was rated as “Poor” in the Report Card published by the TRCA in 2006. The Report Card states that “continued development in the watershed will increase pollutant loadings to the Creek”. Without extraordinary efforts, over and above “best management practices”, the planned development of Mayfield West on the headwaters of Etobicoke Creek will seriously further degrade water quality.

Surface water quality will depend on a number of factors including stream setbacks and riparian cover, imperviousness of development lands, lot level or source control of stormwater and other innovative methods of stormwater control such as conveyance system improvements and wetland /pond or other innovative end-of-pipe methods. Water quality is also linked to land use – an increase in strategic placement of natural vegetation and increased forest and urban tree cover will help mitigate the effects of an impervious urban landscape.

CEAC meetings with the Town and the TRCA have focused on the November 2006 Community Design plan. While the basic features of a conventional end -of -pipe stormwater control system are outlined, the projected effectiveness of this system and the matter of innovative conveyance and source control measures are not yet addressed. CEAC understands that the proponent will deliver a Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) with stormwater management details by June 19<sup>th</sup>. Included in this MESP will be a “ water monitoring protocol”. CEAC believes the following issues will need to be addressed in the MESP:

### **Role of Green Spaces as a Component of Stormwater Management**

CEAC believes that the value of larger porous green (and/or wetland) spaces needs to be specifically evaluated within the development area. Modelling the effectiveness of alternative sizes of green areas in the development areas as a stormwater control mechanism should be undertaken.

### **Location and Extent of “Greenways”**

The TRCA has backed off its original requirement to require a 30 metre setback on the east side of Etobicoke Creek in favour of a 20 metre setback. A 30m naturally vegetated riparian zone is recommended by Environment Canada and is becoming entrenched as a standard guideline. Increasing the size of ‘greenways’ throughout the developed portion of Mayfield West will not serve the same aquatic habitat and water quality function as a 30 m vegetated riparian set-back along the creek itself.

## **Caledon's Adaptive Management Approach**

The ability to address environmental stress requires a clear understanding of environmental base-line conditions and long-term monitoring. It is not clear yet whether the base-line quality of Etobicoke Creek waters, or any other environmental parameters, have been established for the Mayfield West development site. It is not clear if a long-term monitoring system for impact assessment exists, or will be established. Clear plans for establishing base-lines and long-term monitoring in accordance with Caledon's Adaptive Management Approach need to be produced.

## **Innovation**

CEAC will be interested in a comprehensive approach to innovation in stormwater management at the three levels of control, that is 1) within the pond infrastructure (end-of-pipe) e.g. use of wetlands in addition to standing detention and retention ponds, 2) throughout the stormwater conveyance system, e.g. use of grassy swales, and 3) at source or lot level, e.g. porous parking areas and roof-top retention. There are opportunities for innovation in both stormwater control techniques and a water monitoring system through demonstration projects.

## **2. A High Level of Building Quality Certification Was Anticipated and Needs to be Re-affirmed**

*The Town of Caledon Mayfield West Community Development Plan Comprehensive Planning Report in support of The Kennedy Road Village Centre* (February, 2005), notes "Mayfield West is proposed to be 'Certified' under LEED-ND, and that "A comprehensive approach would apply to land development as well as commercial, residential, employment, and institutional buildings"(p.36).

The Green Building Program as stated in the Mayfield West Community Design Plan has been substantially reduced in scope. Only energy efficiency features for single family residential buildings (Energy Star for New Homes) are required and elements of LEED for Homes are optional. Also, there is reliance upon the Commercial Building Incentive Program (CBIP) for Multiple Unit Residential Buildings and Institutional and Commercial Buildings, and the LEED-NC (New Construction) requirements for Institutional and Commercial are only encouraged.

A narrow focus on energy and buildings is compounded by non-committal language - "optional", "may include", "encouraged" - that leaves no requirement for any initiatives beyond energy efficient individual homes. It is also likely that the LEED name cannot be used in literature without proper registration in the program. In addition, the Commercial Building Incentive Program (CBIP) has been cancelled.

Given that the original proposal supported the vision for Mayfield West and was described in a competitive process, CEAC believes that there should be a firm expectation that the spirit and scale of the original promises be carried through to completion. The Town should begin to challenge the development group in this area.

For example, the Builder Option Packages and the development as a whole should be required to seriously address all LEED (or equivalent) categories.

It should be recognized that LEED-ND (New Development) is still in the pilot stage, the launch of LEED for Homes is expected in the summer of 2007, while LEED-NC (New Construction) is more established. The Town is urged to contact the Canada Green Building Council ([www.cagbc.org](http://www.cagbc.org)), providers of LEED certification, to discuss possibilities. For example, it might be possible to apply LEED-NC to Multiple Unit Residential Buildings (MURBS) as well as to Institutional and Commercial Buildings.

According to the developer's *Planning Report (February, 2005)*, "Water conservation and recycling are important elements to build into the community from the start [and] alternative energy use is also a more realistic option when incorporated into the original designs..." p.35-36. This statement suggests that equivalent alternatives can also be negotiated. Leading edge developments should be sought out (e.g. Earth Rangers LEED building and Okotoks, Alberta water and solar energy initiatives) as part of the process to minimize the new town's ecological footprint.

### **3. Opportunities Exist to Lead in the Eco-design of Mayfield West Village Components**

Examples exist outside of Ontario of successful, sustainably designed communities. In particular we draw Council's attention to Eco-village at Ithaca in New York State ([www.ecovillage.ithaca.ny.us](http://www.ecovillage.ithaca.ny.us)), Okotoks, Alberta ([www.okotoks.ca](http://www.okotoks.ca)), and Sunward Cohousing in Ann Arbor, Michigan ([www.sunward.org](http://www.sunward.org)). Mayfield West offers an opportunity to build on the success of these examples and to create a "made in Caledon" solution that can serve as a model for sustainable growth within the Town and for all of Ontario. Such eco-design initiatives could be applied throughout the Village Centre or to one or more of the neighbourhood components of the development.

#### **Density of Housing**

The draft Mayfield West Community Design Plan projects an overall density below that called for in the Places to Grow document. CEAC recommends increasing the percentage of multi-family housing, and townhomes, particularly in the Village Centre, but also within the neighborhoods. Not only will this reduce the footprint of the built community and bring it into line with Places to Grow, but will also result in housing that is more affordable to a wider range of people.

#### **Design for Residents, Not Their Cars**

One concern that often arises with increased density is the specter of traffic congestion. The draft Mayfield West plan continues to be largely automobile-centred. Although the extent to which our society is dependent on the automobile is beyond the control of this study, an effort should be made to keep traffic circulation and parking to the periphery of habitable space. Rear laneways are a step in this direction, but this concept could also be applied to the retail and civics areas, keeping cars out of the center of these areas.

Congregate parking in the residential areas, either surface or shared garages, is an option that could be considered so that residents walk through their neighborhoods to reach their homes. Bike paths and walkways should be given prominence as an attractive alternative to getting into your car.

### **Social Cohesion**

Increasing the density of housing together with minimizing the impact of the automobile will go a long way towards increasing the amount of informal interaction among the residents of the community. This can be enhanced by ensuring that public spaces such as parks and small-scale community centres are dispersed throughout the residential neighborhoods. While the schools indicated on the plan could help to serve this purpose, historically school construction lags far behind the building of homes. CEAC recommends that this social need be addressed concurrent with home construction.

### **Resource Conservation**

As described elsewhere in this report, homes and subdivisions should be designed to a high level of energy efficiency and should include or accommodate future solar or wind collection systems, and rainwater collection.

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposal for Mayfield West, as chosen by Council, would confirm the Town's 'green' reputation. Realizing the commitment made in that proposal requires periodic monitoring of planning progress against that original vision. Paying attention to stormwater and water quality issues, building certification and sustainable urban design will do much at this stage to ensure that the third community in the tri-nodal vision for Caledon truly is 'green' and clearly distinguishable from other planned communities.

**Synopsis of CEAC Comments  
Regarding the  
Mayfield West Community Design Plan Report  
(dated Draft November 30, 2006)**

*Note: Synopsis prepared by CEAC February 1, 2007 for discussion with Town staff and for use at the February 2, 2007 Community Design Plan Peer Review Workshop.*

**Executive Summary**

Mayfield West will have an ecological footprint. CEAC's recommendations are meant to help reduce that footprint as well as to ensure that Mayfield West serves as the best possible urban environment template for any further development within Caledon.

- The vision for Mayfield West is to be applauded. However, there should be an acknowledgement that this is still an automobile-centred design, and that without an integrated transit/transportation plan and creative ways to deal with parking and the throughflow of traffic, the traditional village plan for Mayfield West will not be realized. CEAC's comments within the policy context are aimed at creating both a people and ecologically friendly community.
- The Environmental Planning Objectives defined in the Implementation Section of the EIS&MP call for "linkages between existing forests, aquatic features and major valley land systems" that "maintain and enhance the corridor function through the study area to natural areas off site, including the Humber River valley and wetland units south of Mayfield Road." One of CEAC's principal concerns pertains to how this is expected to occur.
- CEAC suggests that the housing mix in the Village Centre should be substantially higher-density and that priority should be given to achieving this goal.
- The transportation network continues to be an area of concern. Only Fig. 24 (page 29) shows a transit hub. All other maps and figures provide detailed conceptual planning but do not include a transit hub. Transit features should be consistently identified and included at the community design stage.
- The natural connectivity between the Humber and Etobicoke valley systems will be difficult to achieve, but is important to realizing the overarching vision for Mayfield West. CEAC has made a number of comments and recommendations within the context of the Parks and Open Space Master Plan with regard to achieving the goal of natural connectivity within the settlement boundaries.
- Enhanced stormwater management (SWM) is specified within the proposal and is critical to environmental sustainability considering the soil types found within the settlement boundaries. Detail regarding the method of enhancement would be informative. In addition, CEAC believes that a means of monitoring and measuring the effectiveness of the SWM system, once in place, should be defined.

- Also, within the context of environmental sustainability, it should be recognized that Energy Star is the equivalent of just one aspect of the LEED home building options. LEED standards can be applied to other environmental goals (e.g. stormwater management). None of these wider applications of LEED, or a suitable equivalent, appear to be recognized. CEAC believes that there is an opportunity for the Town to work with the developers, the TRCA and others to apply further green building standards at the community level.

The Mayfield West development provides an unparalleled opportunity to undertake environmental monitoring as envisioned in section 6.5 of the Official Plan and as implied within the adaptive management concept recently adopted by the Town.

## **1.0 Introduction and Policy Context**

### **1.1 Introduction**

The vision is to be applauded, however there should be an acknowledgement that this is still an automobile-centred design, and that without an integrated transit/transportation plan and creative ways to deal with parking and the throughflow of traffic, the traditional village plan for Mayfield West will not be realized.

A primary goal must be creating social cohesion and community connectiveness – people traveling in cars, parking lots and cars parked on residential streets create barriers to social interaction. This goal, more than having a community centre in the middle of an urban settlement, will create this cohesion and will make Mayfield West unique. And yet this is not addressed in any new and innovative way.

Perhaps the Village Centre should be automobile-free with ‘congregated’ (segregated) parking on the periphery? Perhaps all roads, other than Kennedy and Main Street, should be more fully regarded as ‘public realm’ and designed for maximum pedestrian usage with parking relegated to back alleys. The best traffic calming is in fact that provided by people walking on the streets and kids playing in the streets.

While this may not be feasible for all the residential roads, some choice of neighborhood styles should be provided. This is not a new idea with examples in new subdivisions in Orangeville and old neighbourhoods in Toronto and Vancouver. Another example is Kentlands, Maryland ([www.kentlandsusa.com](http://www.kentlandsusa.com)). Some excerpts from a descriptive web site ([www.beyonddc.com/features/kentlands.html](http://www.beyonddc.com/features/kentlands.html)) accompany a photo tour of the community.

“Technically part of Kentlands but actually contemporary with Lakelands in both time of construction and architectural style, Market Square is the "downtown" for Gaithersburg's West Side. It's focused around a small plaza. Adjacent to the plaza is a small ice skating rink. During warm months it's a mini-golf course.

Main Street runs perpendicular to Market Street and is a part of Lakelands. The units are mixed-use with retail on the bottom floor and residential or office above. Also

note the "pocket park". Since grassy lawns are few and far between, a number of very small parks can be found throughout the neighborhood.

Mixed-use units (usually called "Live / Works" in Gaithersburg) surround Market Square.

Hundreds of double-stacked residential row houses are found throughout the neighborhood, but they are especially concentrated in the blocks near Market Square.

Rowhouses are the dominant form of housing. Kentlands is famous for having many single family homes fronting on pedestrian paths rather than streets.

Though there were relatively few to start off with, an increasing number of the houses are adding granny flats.”

The purpose of these descriptors are to show that there are alternative models for parts, if not all, of Mayfield West based on core principles of cohousing:

- Designed by the community members (financial drivers)
- Designed to encourage interaction of people (e.g. frequently pedestrian oriented -- cars kept to periphery)
- Include extensive shared facilities (e.g. small scale community centers)
- Managed by residents (condo board or homeowners association)

Examples of cohousing include:

- Prairie Sky Cohousing, Calgary, Alta.; [www.prairiesky.ab.ca](http://www.prairiesky.ab.ca)
- Sunward Cohousing, Ann Arbor, Mich.; [www.sunward.org](http://www.sunward.org)
- Great Oak Cohousing, Ann Arbor, Mich.; [www.gocoho.org](http://www.gocoho.org)
- Ecovillage at Ithaca, Ithaca, N.Y. ; [www.ecovillage.ithaca.ny.us](http://www.ecovillage.ithaca.ny.us)

Overall, the current Mayfield West community design/concept plan does not represent a fundamental shift away from business-as-usual because of:

- Automobile dependency
- Extensive percentage of ground units
- Traditional zoning

### 1.2.2 Community Design Plan Purpose

- c) Encourage design creativity and harmony

Build a social community as you build the physical community – the purpose is to build cohesiveness and opportunities for building community connections. This is done through an articulated vision implemented through a community design.

This would be realized through providing, at this community design level, opportunities for casual interaction – mothers and kids having places to get acquainted, laundromat, post office, shopping, kids play, village green/common, non-institutional community services similar to that provided by churches, etc. In addition, a broad range of recreational facilities are essential to building community cohesiveness.

The success of dynamic neighbourhoods is the ability for change and adaptation to accommodate new opportunities. The question becomes, how within the rigidity of Ontario’s model of planning, can the Village Centre and the surrounding neighbourhoods respond to new opportunities. While the current zoning system emerged out of a perceived need, this same system is driving a certain type and pattern of community structure and reinforces the dependency on the automobile and the sterility of the typical suburban subdivision.

The Town should explore open zoning – something to allow for flexibility and change over time.

### 1.2.3 Implementation

Omitted in the “Policy Context” are the Town’s Official Plan provisions for environmental monitoring. Town Planning Report 2006-49 dated August 1, 2006 re: population forecasts refers to these provisions on p.9 as follows:

“An environmental monitoring program is envisioned in Section 6.5 of the Official Plan (OP). This section directs that development be monitored on a regular basis to ensure that the Town’s principles, Strategic Direction, Goals, Objectives and Policies are being achieved with respect to a number of factors including the ecosystem and ecosystem integrity and water resources. The town has an opportunity to undertake environmental monitoring in the policy development and implementation of the Mayfield West Community Development Plan”. (CEAC emphasis)

Monitoring could lead to OP revisions. OP Section 6.2.1 states that OP reviews and possible resulting revisions occur according to the Planning Act “within every five years” which can be interpreted to allow for more frequent reviews than every five years if , for example, monitoring showed up deteriorating conditions in less than five years.

The Town’s OP has further more detailed monitoring provisions in Sections 3.1.4.15 c, g and 3.1.5.10 with respect to fisheries performance standards e.g. “no net loss”.

The same Report 2006-49 makes reference to Official Plan Amendment 203 which added provision 6.2.1.7.1 to the OP as follows: “d) ensure the continued health and integrity of the ecosystem features and functions”. In addition, Report 2006-49 included the recommendations 7 and 8 , which were adopted, as follows:

“7. Direct that the Town adopt an adaptive management approach to ensure that the growth forecasts for 2031 meet the environmental, social and fiscal objectives of the Town.” ,and

“8. Direct that the Town implement the adaptive management approach by initiating a monitoring program in accordance with Section 6.5 of the Official plan and that the growth forecasts be reviewed at the time of the 5 year review on the basis of the results of the monitoring.”

## 2.0 Vision and Community Structure

### 2.3.2 The Parks and Open Space System

The extent to which the Community Design Plan “incorporates the recommendations of the EIS&MP with respect to the protection and enhancement of natural heritage features” is limited. The Environmental Planning Objectives defined in the Implementation Section of the EIS&MP call for “linkages between existing forests, aquatic features and major valley land systems” that “maintain and enhance the corridor function through the study area to natural areas off site, including the Humber River valley and wetland units south of Mayfield Road.” There is little evidence that this can be expected to occur.

The meaning of “greenway system” and “connectivity” continues to be corrupted.

Evidence of commitment to key restoration opportunities identified in the EIS&MP (such as linking the Etobicoke and Humber valleys) is lacking. Green corridors through the village centre continue to shrink to a fraction of what was implied by the Council Endorsed Plan of June, 2005 and the Refined Concept (October, 2005).

Opportunities to provide limited connectivity in the ecosystem sense through the village and real connectivity on the outskirts will be lost unless substantial changes are made. More detailed concerns regarding these issues are found in Section 6.0 Parks and Open Space Master Plan.

### 2.3.4 The Village Centre

Missing are opportunities for commercial attractors - urban open space must have some commercial/retail to make it palatable and used – mixed use should be the predominant style with more 3-4 story structures in the Village Centre (VC):

- along Kennedy Road as you enter the VC,
- around the Village Blue – need to allow for commercial/retail closer to this major park – perhaps mixed use on the north side of Main Street rather than only residential
- Special purpose park in the VC – this should be made less sterile and should not take up almost the entire eastern part of the downtown.

In addition, CEAC suggests that Village Centre Residential allow commercial uses on the first floor especially in those blocks closest to the “Village Blue’ portrayed in Sec 3.1.2. This could provide more flexibility for commercial location in an area of high pedestrian movement and congregation, as well as providing needed services for medium density Village Centre residents and other residents and tourists.

### 2.3.5 Community Facility and Land Needs (should be renamed Public Realm)

CEAC notes that there is:

- No provision for a central farmers market/village green/village common, and that
- Other public realm components (i.e., lands and facilities owned by the municipality) have not been addressed – village common, Village Blue, farmers market, stacked municipal car parking.

### 2.3.7 The Industrial District

Given the professed “environment first” philosophy of the development and the fact that this area contains some of the most important land from an ecological standpoint, it is disconcerting that scant attention is paid to this fact in this and other sections related to industrial lands.

The area contains major woodlots, has the only area with both Key Bird Wildlife Habitat and Key Amphibian Habitat according to Dillon Consulting mapping, and sits on the watershed boundary of the Etobicoke Creek and Humber River valley systems. The area also includes a corridor that could achieve the important objective of connecting the two valley systems if the recommended restoration opportunities in the EIS&MP are implemented. More details regarding opportunities in this area are addressed in subsequent sections related to industrial lands.

## **3.0 Community Design Guidelines**

### 3.1 Village Centre

Figure 18 (page 20), The Village Centre Demonstration Plan – Detail.

Why not orient the Village Centre commercial more towards the “Village Blue”? Would this not provide better ambience for establishments such as restaurants as well as taking advantage of view lines to this proposed “Water Feature” and a “major naturalized amenity”?

A key assumption here is that this “Village Blue” storm water management pond can be maintained in a relatively stable and clean looking condition throughout the year, and that it would be a safe amenity to walk beside and in which to possibly view aquatic features i.e. “an integral part of the open space system” as claimed on page 65. What annual management functions would have to be carried out, and at whose cost, to maintain this sort of water amenity?

CEAC suggests that the housing mix in the Village Centre (VC) should be substantially higher-density and that there should be priority phasing given to building this up.

### 3.2 Community Neighborhoods

- Transportation/roads: impact of wide ROW on cohesiveness – the wider the ROW the further people are from each other and the less interaction – people walking on the road are traffic calmers. Is there an optimum ROW that works?
- The housing mix has still too much emphasis on single-family and ground-based housing. Kentlands as an example shows that there is a market for more row/town houses and more higher-density units. However this begs the question of adequate open space for people if you reduce the backyards – there must be an optimum open-space density ratio.

- Location of seniors building – currently seems removed from the VC and the Community Centre (CC) – it should be located right beside the downtown area.
- Smaller clubhouses/civic centres in the neighbourhood parks must not be watered down.

### 3.3 Industrial Districts

One “asset strength” that goes unrecognized is the opportunity to provide a land use that is less of a disturbance to adjacent natural areas than residential areas would be. As stated before, this is a prime area from an ecological standpoint. Maximizing the compatibility of the industrial area with these natural areas should be an objective.

Considering the habitat importance of the area, the watershed boundary location (everything is downstream), and the increased contaminated runoff potential of the clay base, the types of industry that are permitted in the area should be more specifically controlled. This could mean certain uses may not be permitted next to natural areas or may be banned from the area completely. This ranking could be determined according to the potential risk for runoff contamination (including accidental spills) and negative impacts on wildlife.

An opportunity to encourage green landscaping, LEED building standards, pedestrian/bicycle connections to the village centre, lot level stormwater controls, and green planning concepts in general could be realized by stating these goals as objectives.

### 3.4 Transportation Network

Only Fig. 24 (page 29) shows a transit hub. All other maps and figures provide detailed conceptual planning but do not include a transit hub. However, they include other features consistently. A hub – bus terminal, transfer point, passenger drop-off – should be shown in detail in Fig. 24 and repeated consistently in all other detailed figures/plans/maps, especially Appendices B,C and D. **Transit features should be identified and included at the community design stage.**

## 4.0 Site Planning, Architecture and Landscape Architecture

### 4.3 Industrial Districts

As stated previously, guidelines for any type of green planning or building practices are essentially absent in this section. The level of attention devoted to visual appearance in contrast with the lack of environmental considerations is disturbing, particularly in light of the environmental significance of the area.

The “environment first” philosophy is not translated into the actual guidelines, as illustrated in the Open Storage section where one of the only references to environmental considerations can be compared with the bullet that precedes it. The text states:

- If permitted in an interior yard, the open storage area shall be set back a sufficient distance from the road allowance, approximately 40 metres, to ensure there is no visual impact;
- Open storage should not be located within 10 metres of any lands designated as Environmental Protection (excluding any lands forming a buffer area)

While ten metres is better than zero, it is unclear why our visual sensibilities should be accorded four times the protection of an environmentally sensitive area.

In addition to the objectives suggested previously (Section 3.3), it is important to provide environmental guidelines that exceed or match the level of detail accorded to aesthetics. Suggestions include, but are not limited to, controlling what is contained in open storage next to environmentally sensitive areas, guidelines on appropriate lighting and other features that can negatively impact wildlife, and incentives for land stewardship practices that increase the ecological viability and forest cover of the area.

The current ecological importance and potential of the industrial area dictates that related guidelines should be developed in consultation with the TRCA and other experts. Public lands adequate for species movement need to be set aside in areas designed as natural corridors.

## **5.0 Streetscape Design**

### 5.1 General Guidelines for All Streets

CEAC believes that transit stops should be included in the design of all primary roads and collectors.

CEAC suggests moving ‘Street Trees’ from ‘5.0 Streetscape’ to it’s own section in “7.0 Environmental Sustainability”: have section 7.0 move beyond ‘Streetscape’ by grouping street, residential lot and industrial trees under Urban Forest. Also, make explicit reference and commitment within this section to ensuring that vegetation easements are in place as per 6.4.6 and that plantings occur at the time of development.

### 5.5 Traffic Calming

Of interest in this section is the rejection of some traditional traffic calming devices while relying on urban design including reduced building setbacks and street trees overhanging roadways to encourage traffic calming (refer Page 54).

### 5.6 Parking

Of concern to CEAC is the area of impermeable surface set aside for parking, as well as the impact on traffic flow caused by on-street parking.

The second paragraph of section 5.6.1, Parking in Village Centre, is encouraging in that it deals with shared use in order to mitigate against providing large expansive parking areas. However, the issue is addressed from an engineering point of view only, with no

recognition of the need to reduce the environmental impact by reducing the area of impermeable surface throughout the Town.

The designs presented on pages 34 – 36 would seem to indicate that 1/3 to 1/2 of residential frontage will be paved – is it not possible to put parking in the back; perhaps shared driveways leading to backyard garages? From a pleasing design perspective, the fronts of houses could then be porches instead of garages. This would reduce impervious surfaces in favour of private greenspace, be safer, and might deter people from filling their drives with as many vehicles as possible.

## 5.8 Streetscape Elements

### 5.8.1 Street Lighting

Light pollution – it would be very easy to make lighting dark-sky friendly. This is a new and strong movement in North America. Most night-sky friendly lighting meets security and safety concerns while also being more energy efficient. CEAC suggests that all public lighting be dark-sky friendly and that dark-sky friendly lighting be incorporated into all residential, commercial and industrial designs.

## 6.0 Parks and Open Space Master Plan

### 6.1 Conceptual Framework

One way to evaluate the Conceptual Framework is to consider it in the context of the guiding principles and objectives found in Section 6.0. The most relevant examples include:

- Protect existing natural heritage features and habitat;
- Provide continuous vegetative corridors connecting natural features;
- Provide a comprehensive trail system

Another method is to consider it in the context of larger watershed and environmental goals and guidelines including the TRCA's Terrestrial Natural Heritage Strategy, and Environment Canada's *How Much Habitat is Enough?: A Framework for Guiding Habitat Rehabilitation in Great Lakes Areas of Concern* (2004).

While credit must be given for substantial improvements over past practices, there is considerable need for additional improvement:

Statements promising protection of existing features are made many times and appear likely to be achieved if adequate buffers are provided. It should be remembered that the agricultural land now existing does provide some connectivity between existing features, so protecting individual features may not maintain their ecological function if these connections are absent.

The identification of opportunities to connect natural features through vegetative corridors is minimal. The only Area listing "Green Linkage" as a function is the lower

Etobicoke Creek, with the location defined as “Existing Valley Lands along the Etobicoke Creek”.

Woodlot 2 offers a possibility for new linkages, listing “potential” natural links between woodlots. These areas represent the best opportunity for real connectivity. According to *How Much Habitat is Enough?*, “corridors designed to facilitate species movement should be a minimum of 50 metres to 100 metres in width”.

Greenway Corridors offer “Continuous naturalized pedestrian links”. The effectiveness of these as vegetative corridors will depend on their size, the interpretation of the term “naturalized”, and actual linkage to other natural areas. Judging by the narrow widths of 15 to 20 metres defined in 6.4.4, and the number of dead ends and barriers (road crossings), these areas will provide some pedestrian connectivity but little else. The form and function of the Green Walkway shown in 6.0 Figure 54 is also unclear.

Attention should be given to what really constitutes a Greenway Corridor. Caledon Public Works and Engineering’s Memorandum (July, 2006) expressed concerns regarding the term linear parks used earlier. It stated that “these features should be considered natural linkages or green corridors and as such will not be considered as parkland. Accordingly, to avoid misconception in terms, we ask that these types of green corridors should be referred to as ‘natural linkages’ or ‘green way’ in the various supporting documents.” It now appears that the preferred language is being used without delivering on its intent.

No provision is made for connecting the Humber and Etobicoke valley systems.

Instead of adherence to current minimum standards, the Conceptual Framework should contribute to big picture goals, including connections between watersheds and increases in regional forest cover. The Etobicoke Creek watershed in particular receives poor ratings from the TRCA largely due to urbanization and lack of forest cover. How headwater areas like those in the Mayfield West area are treated will largely determine whether this watershed will improve or continue to decline.

Also, it should be noted that better connectivity of existing and proposed green space will likely assist to mitigate storm water effects.

## 6.2 Natural System Context - Etobicoke and Humber River Valleys

The statements in the text represent a clear picture of what needs to be done to adhere to an “environment first” philosophy. Unfortunately these admirable statements often ring hollow when the details are examined:

The statement that “green corridors in the form of neighbourhood parks connect the existing natural features to one another and thereby protect, enhance and restore the ecosystem form, function and integrity” cannot be accepted. As discussed before, in their present form these corridors will have minimal ecological function. While the commitment to naturalization along these routes is admirable, the reality is we are

replacing agricultural fields that have some connectivity function with intensive development.

Furthermore, the statement that the “‘green’ connections provide for ...environmental linkages between the major valley systems which exist on the outer limits of the community plan” is not clearly borne out. The only evidence for this appears to be the small line of green space pointing north shown on maps in 2.2, 3.3, 4.0 and 4.3 (but not on maps in 2.1, 6.0 or 6.2). This could correspond with Restoration Site 7 in the EIS&MP. If made wide enough, this would connect the valley systems.

This valley connection appears achievable largely due to the provision of connecting lands between features in the industrial area. If adequate size for these connectors is provided, along with appropriate industrial uses and a way to cross the highway on the south end, this corridor between valleys would represent a significant achievement. The steps necessary to make this occur should be clearly defined.

The guidelines demonstrate a commitment to providing appropriate buffers as required by the environmental agencies. Much remains to be determined, but results appear promising. Stream rehabilitation in particular could greatly improve what exists now.

The statement “as required by the environmental agencies” should be clarified. Does it mean work with these agencies to provide enhanced protection, or adherence to minimum guidelines demanded in existing regulations?

The hoped for 30 metre setback for the Etobicoke Creek has not occurred, but the potential for negotiating variations in buffer width with the TRCA to achieve overall improvements is recognized. Goals beyond the minimum should be sought to help achieve watershed level goals (e.g. percentage forest cover) and reduce runoff impacts in this largely impermeable area of clay soils. The Environment Canada guidelines specify that the 30m should be on EACH side of the stream, starting from the bank – is this what has been calculated? It should be noted that 30m is a minimum setback; are there opportunities to increase the setback?

An increased commitment to natural connectivity is warranted. This means going beyond recognizing that “general areas of restoration were identified as part of the supporting documents”. A commitment to carry out these recommendations needs to be made.

In addition to the above, the Town should consider connecting the valley-lands and provide missing upland habitat through creating a wide forest/woodland connection to the north of the planned settlement area – the upland link should be preferably wider than current valley widths; narrow greenways will not do. Furthermore, CEAC suggests a ‘net increase’ in tableland forest (larger than 5 ha patches) in areas outside of the built settlement.

### 6.3 Stormwater Management Facilities

What stormwater control techniques will be implemented at the lot level, in addition to the large stormwater collection areas shown on the graphic plan?

What arrangements are being made between the Town and the TRCA for innovative stormwater control techniques over and above best management practices, e.g. are there any pilot projects being considered in the design to further the present effectiveness of stormwater quality control?

### 6.4 Parks and Community Facilities

The first sub-section that is of significant interest to CEAC is that dealing with the Greenway Corridors (sub-section 6.4.4, page 70). The introductory paragraph specifies that the corridors are to “provide a natural corridor for flora and fauna to integrate into the community fabric.” Does one row of new trees along the streets and sidewalks address this indistinct function? Specific measurement designations for width should be included for each Greenway Corridor. More than 6ha total greenway corridor would distinguish Mayfield West as a unique community when compared to suburban developments south of the study area. The design and location of such corridors needs to be challenged and clarified. A hierarchy of parks, greenway corridors, trails and facilities are supposed to, “connect with the natural system heritage of the site to create a strong, cohesive framework of open space that weaves its way through the community.”(p.66 CDP) The greenway corridor along Hwy. 10 appears to serve as a buffer for noise reduction from highway traffic rather than connecting to open space. The greenway corridor in the Eastern community lacks cohesion as disjointed, random greenway “corridor” dots are inserted between residential developments and again lack any connection to open space, parks, natural environment or trails? (p.66, fig 57)

Park trail systems “as required” (p.70 6.4.4 CDP) needs to be clarified and outlined in more detail. More trails and cycling paths could improve the connection to the neighbouring community of Valleywood. Is there an opportunity to increase the number of cycling and walking trails adjacent to storm water management facilities? What is the rationale for a walking trail that leads to the 410 highway? Why is there a green walkway around the perimeter of the subdivision? Trails and walkways would be more accessible if they were to be placed throughout the community with a greater focus on connections to the natural environment. The identification of, “the open space links between existing natural open spaces and community parks” requires further clarification as the connections are vague at best. Identified bike paths (potentially on main roads as well as separate paths that are safer for children to get to school) would discourage car use within the community and are strongly recommended.

The encouragement of extensive environmental design and building practices should be applied to the Multiuse Gathering Facility, Community Centre and Schools as these buildings will form the basis for community integration. For example, the application of LEED-H standards (this was a key selling point for this developer during the initial application stage), south facing windows and the potential for green roofs are but a few

ecological opportunities to improve energy consumption. What are the dimensions and potential functions of The Multiuse Gathering Centre? Perhaps smaller structures that could serve as local meeting places within the village centre would better capture the “small town vision”. Mayfield West could then fit into Caledon’s community of villages whereby residents can join local clubs and organizations that will eventually foster a community identity and minimize the necessity to commute elsewhere.

Schoolyard naturalization should be a priority as trees and shrubs allow for shade and encourage outdoor activity. The use of native trees “wherever necessary/ possible” should also be stressed. Back lot Vegetation Easements, as described in sub-section 6.4.6, page 72, is an interesting concept to protect naturalized, back lot planning areas and might have the potential for expansion in terms of a broader application throughout the Town. Back lot Vegetation Easements require a width of 3m and 1.5m on each side of the rear lot; therefore, it is worth clarifying how often this opportunity will be implemented? Will the number of such easements be limited due to the rarity of park/ open space and vegetated rear linkages on private residential lots? Native species would be preferred for medium and large trees for the Back lot Vegetation Easements.

Further to the above, consideration should be given to the expansion of the use of vegetation easements to industrial areas. Note that land under easement is actually accessible to the Town for the purposes of inspection and enforcement.

## **7.0 Environmental Sustainability**

### 7.2 Environment and Energy Conservation Practices

Regarding the water and terrestrial impact of the MW development, the TRCA submitted, as part of a November 2005 document entitled “Etobicoke Creek Headwaters Subwatershed Synthesis Report”, an Appendix A: “Recommended Study Requirements in Support of the Mayfield West Community Plan”. The question is whether or not the draft CDP has substantially addressed the three page list of requirements tabled by the TRCA?

### 7.3 Sustainability Elements

The proponent claims “Enhanced stormwater management”. Please explain how it is enhanced?

Does any back up exist for the proposed large system of stormwater management (SWM) ponds.

Even if solid SWM innovation is claimed and it is somehow implemented, there does not seem to be any real basis to measure its effectiveness. Monitoring to establish base line information can be the best basis for assessing effectiveness. Only with two or three year’s data can any meaningful baseline and trend be implied by the data compiled. In this respect, TRCA recommended on page 119 of their November 2005 report referenced above, the following for monitoring:

*- measurements of baseflow at indicator site should continue on a monthly basis throughout the spring and summer months of each year.*

*-long-term monitoring in this subwatershed should include tracking vegetation communities and flora and fauna species of concern in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the natural heritage system design and existing management programs.*

*-monthly monitoring of surface and groundwater levels should be undertaken as soon as possible in hydrologically sensitive features that may be affected by anticipated changes to land use.*

Only by getting a solid base line of local conditions for two or three years can we actually begin to measure if , in fact, our stormwater management system is effective. The Town and the TRCA should collaborate to convince the proponent to fund this monitoring system at least until 2021. Only with such a system in place can we begin to see if stormwater management can sustain a watershed in MW.

#### 7.4 Green Building Program

The extent of green building guidelines for residential buildings deserves praise for going far beyond traditional practices and the current practices of some developers (7.4.1).

The environmental scope of the green building program for residential buildings will be largely determined by the effectiveness of the Builder Option Packages related to LEED-H (7.4.3). While it is clear that the developers will be required to offer packages, it appears that no package may be an option for the buyer.

It is also unclear how many of the “may include” options in 7.4.3 are required (if any), if other options are possible, and how much influence the Town will have in determining the mix of options that will be offered. The Town should be able to approve the content of builder option packages to ensure that they correspond with the environmental goals of the Town.

The statement that all “Multiple Unit Residential Buildings in Mayfield Units may be constructed to Canada’s CBIP Program” is problematic (7.4.2). Is this simply permission to do this? Is it possible that no MURBs will be built in this way?

The statement LEED-NC will “be encouraged” for Institutional and Commercial Buildings could mean that nothing will happen.

As it stands, “the detail elements” will be determined by the developer in consultation with the Town (7.4.5). It appears risky to “adopt the Green Building Program as a policy applicable to Mayfield West and to development within areas of future expansion of the Community.” Given the current level of developer control described, it would be inadvisable to tie the Town’s hands in this fashion.

Just as Energy Star is the equivalent of just one aspect of the LEED home building options, it should be recognized that other LEED standards can be applied to other

environmental goals (e.g. stormwater management). None of these wider applications of LEED, or a suitable equivalent, are recognized. The Town should work with the developers, the TRCA and others to apply further green building standards at the community level.

It should also be recognized that this program appears to be a departure from the original promise to use LEED certification. While considerations such as difficulties in adopting new standards and high financial costs can be appreciated, the Town should reserve the right to ensure that the original spirit of the promise is followed. The Town should work with the developers to ensure that meaningful advances in green building that go beyond energy efficiency are achieved.

### **Conclusion**

As much mitigation should occur within the secondary plan area as possible (provision of natural habitat, energy efficiency, etc.), but this footprint will also need to be balanced beyond the secondary plan area. In order to repay the ‘ecological debt’ of the settled area of Mayfield West (MW) and to meet the vision of distinct contained settlement areas, further secondary planning, outside of the current MW CDP exercise, must occur adjacent to the current MW secondary plan to secure ‘countryside’ – agricultural and natural land use – as the predominant land use.