

OneProperties - 8281 & 0 Healey Road - File RZ 20-07

Comments Response Table

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
Caledon - Planning, Development Review Services (Nov 18, 2020)	1. The Town offers the following comments on the Planning Justification Report: a) Please update the portion of the Report speaking to the PPS, 2020 to include a review and comment on Section 1.6. b) Please update the portion of the Report speaking to the Growth Plan, 2019 to include a review and comment on Section 3 (servicing) and Section 4 (natural heritage). c) The Report speaks to Section 5.7.3.1.4 of the Official Plan regarding minor modifications of EPA lands. Please expand on how the Environmental Impact Study shows that these modifications are deemed minor. d) In Section 4.2, the applicant indicates that the properties are located along Coleraine Drive. This is incorrect and should reflect Healey Road. e) In Section 4.5, please add justification on how the application will meet Section 7.15.7.1 and 7.15.7.1.1 of the Official Plan which states that development shall only be permitted on full municipal services. Furthermore, please add justification on how the applicant intends to ensure that the development will be serviced and will meet Section 7.5.11.1.	Please see Addendum Planning Justification Report dated March 5, 2021
	2. The Town offers the following comments on the draft Zoning By-law Amendment and Schedule, which have been reflected in the track-changed word version of the Zoning By-law Amendment attached: a) Please amend the legal description to reflect the legal description of the property. b) Please update Town Clerk's name to Laura Hall. c) Please remove the zone labels from properties not subject to this application. d) Please ensure zone lines go to the centerline of the road.	The Draft Zoning By-law Amendment and Schedule have been updated to a) amend the legal description; b) update the Town Clerk's name; c) removal of the zone labels not subject to this application; and d) zone lines are extended to the centreline of the roadway
	3. Please confirm the size of land (in metric) that is being re-zoned from Industrial zones (MS-579 and MP-590) to Environmental Policy Area 1 Zone (EPA1) and vice versa. Staff would like to confirm if there is a net gain of EPA1 zoned lands	The rezoning results in an increase of approximately 3,147.77 sq.m of EPA1 zoned lands as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MS 579 and MP 580 to EPA1: approx. 8,921.21 sq. m • EPA1 to MS XXX and MP XXX: approx. 5,773.44 sq. m
	4. A Public Meeting in accordance with the Planning Act was held on October 6, 2020. Minutes and audio recording of the public meeting are available for download from the Town's website at: https://calendar.caledon.ca/Meetings/Detail/2020-10-06-1900-Planning-and-Development-Committee . With your next submission, please include a summary of responses to the comments raised at the Public Meeting.	Please see comment response matrix.
	5. Please include with your next submission a cover letter that explains how all comments provided within and attached to this letter have been addressed.	Please see cover letter, as well as this comment response matrix.
Caledon - Planning , Heritage (Nov 18, 2020)	6. A Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of the subject lands are required.	Please see letter from Ministry in response to Stage 1 & 2 archaeological Assessment. Stage 3/4 Archaeological Assessment underway.

OneProperties - 8281 & 0 Healey Road - File RZ 20-07
Comments Response Table

TOWN OF CALEDON
 PLANNING
 RECEIVED
 3/5/2021
 March 10, 2021

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
Caledon - Development Engineering (Nov 18, 2020)	7. Development Engineering understands that the closest sanitary servicing connection is at Coleraine Drive and that the proposed sanitary servicing is to be a Force Main adequately sized at the detailed design stage to convey flows to the proposed 250mm gravity sewer extension from Coleraine Drive on Healey Road. The private sanitary service is proposed within the Towns right-of-way under Healey Road and will require review and approval from the Towns FIS Engineering Department and the Region of Peel. It is understood from previous discussions that the costs for extending these services would be at the Applicants expense.	Staff and Applicant looking to secure an agreement for the temporary servicing of the site as proposed, with the ultimate connection once planned expanded municipal infrastructure in place. Detailed servicing information to be advanced through the detailed design stage.
	8. Healey Road is not designed for and does not permit truck traffic. Development Engineering respectfully defers the review and approval of any required upgrades, road and infrastructure improvements and/or ongoing maintenance requirements of Healey Road to the Towns FIS Engineering and Traffic Department.	Noted. No action required at this time.
	9. Development Engineering understands that the SWM proposal is to utilize available capacity from an existing downstream SWM pond on the property to the south (ONTARI Holdings Ltd. – Amazon) at 12724 Coleraine Drive (south of the subject site). Thus, a storm connection is proposed beneath the wetland feature and is to be reviewed and approved by the TRCA. Additionally, from a high level the following would be required at detailed design in relation to stormwater management: a) Confirm that there is sufficient capacity in the SWM facility and that quantity and quality criteria will meet TRCA and Town of Caledon standards. Including any proposed adjustments, upgrades or retrofits required to the existing SWM Facility on private property. b) Drainage easements will be required for the conveyance of stormwater to the existing SWM pond and outlet located on the site to the south. c) Permission from the adjacent property owner will be required for any proposed works on the adjacent property. d) Demonstrate the ability to contain the larger of the 100yr storm and Regional Storm events on the subject lands with a suitable emergency overland spillway to the creek to be reviewed and approved by the TRCA. e) Please note that as per Town Standards, the minimum slope for a storm sewer pipe is 0.4%; however, if a slope of less than 0.40% is required, then self-cleaning velocities must be maintained. Please confirm that self-cleaning velocities are maintained, and this should be included on the plan. f) Maximum spacing of MHs shall be 150m for sewers 675mm or greater in diameter as per Town Standards Section 1.4.2.2.3.	Noted, please see revised Functional Servicing Report.
	10. Please have the full extent of the property line clearly identified on Fig. SG. Please confirm and clearly indicate that existing property line grades are to be matched.	Please see revised Site Grading plan.

OneProperties - 8281 & 0 Healey Road - File RZ 20-07
Comments Response Table

TOWN OF CALEDON
 3/5/2021
 PLANNING
 RECEIVED
 March 10, 2021

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
	11. Section 4.3 bullet 3 of the FSR and SWM Brief identifies that the post-development flood line external of the site to the east, is plotted as extending in some cases farther east into the neighbour's property than the pre-development flood line, whereas the flood elevation is actually lower than pre-development. Please clarify if the "site" is in reference to the proposed developable area and the "neighbours property" is the flood plain compensation (cut) area. Please clarify. a) Section 5 bullet 2 identifies that the proposed development can be graded such that the flood line falls generally outside the subject property, or so as to provide a 10m setback from the flood line. Please confirm that "subject property" is in reference to the proposed developable area and not the actual subject property. Please clarify.	100 year and Regional Storms are being conveyed to downstream pond, this is the intent of completing this connection. 100 year and Regional storms will not be controlled on site. Please see Functional Servicing Report.
	12. Please update the FSR and SWM Brief to reference the Towns latest design guidelines (Version 5, 2019)	Noted.
	13. The FSR and SWM Brief and all engineering drawings are to be signed, stamped and dated by a Professional Engineer	Noted.
	14. Development Engineering defers the review and approval of the floodplain analysis and the refinement of the EPA lands including the ditch realignment and cut/fill in the regulated area to the TRCA.	Noted.
	15. As the site ultimately drains to a Toronto Reginal Conservation Authority (TRCA) regulated area, approval of the FSR and SWM Brief is required from the TRCA.	Noted.
	16. A Road widening of 13m from the CL is required as the Official Plan lists Healey ROW as 26m.	Noted, plans indicate required road widening of 13m from Centreline of Road.
	17. Development Engineering requests that the Engineer provide a response letter with the re-submission package including reiterating the Towns comments and details for how each of the above comment is addressed.	Noted. Please see Engineering Response Letter from Odan Detech.
Caledon - Finance (Nov 18, 2020)	18. The Property at 8281 Healey Road has its owner listed as 8281 HEALEY ROAD GP LIMITED. For property tax purposes it is currently assessed as Farmland (\$353,000 CVA). The Town's share of property taxes levied, based on current value assessment is approximately \$500. As at September 21, 2020, the property tax account is determined to current.	Noted.
	19. Property at 0 Healey Road has its owner listed as 8281 HEALEY ROAD GP LIMITED. For property tax purposes it is currently assessed as Farmland (\$316,000 CVA). The Town's share of property taxes levied, based on current value assessment is approximately \$300. As at September 21, 2020, the property tax account is determined to current.	Noted.
	20. If the proposed developments were to proceed as planned, (rezoning applications) the property's taxable assessment value would change to reflect any developments that would have taken place.	Noted.

OneProperties - 8281 & 0 Healey Road - File RZ 20-07
Comments Response Table

TOWN OF CALEDON
 3/5/2021
 PLANNING
 RECEIVED
 March 10, 2021

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
	21. The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at September 21, 2020 and are based upon information provided to the Town by the applicant, current By-laws in effect and current rates, which are indexed twice a year. Development Charges are calculated and payable at the time of building permit issuance. Development Charge By-laws and rates are subject to change. Further, proposed developments may change from the current proposal to the building permit stage. Any estimates provided will be updated based on the Development Charges By-law and rates in effect at the time of building permit, and actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application.	Noted.
Caledon - Building (Nov 18, 2020)	22. Any proposed future development will be reviewed under the Ontario Building Code through the review of the Building Permit application.	Noted.
Caledon - Engineering Services, Transportation (Nov 18, 2020)	23. The Transportation Impact Study can be deferred until the Site Plan Application for the proposed development.	Noted.
MPAC (Nov 18, 2020)	Outstanding	N/A
Canada Post (Nov 18, 2020)	24. Since there is no indication in the documentation that the below amendment is directly tied to a development project, Canada Post has no comments. Should a development project be defined for these lands, we would appreciate the opportunity to assess the project and provide our comments accordingly.	Noted.
Enbridge (Nov 18, 2020)	25. Enbridge Gas Inc. does not object to the proposed application however, they reserve the right to amend their development conditions.	Noted.
Hydro One (Nov 18, 2020)	26. Hydro One has no objections at this point as our plant is overhead and on the opposite side of Healey Rd to the proposed construction site.	Noted.
Town of Caledon, Planning, Zoning (Nov 18, 2020)	No Concerns	N/A
Caledon - Planning - Landscape (Nov 18, 2020)	No Concerns	N/A
Caledon - Fire and Emergency (Nov 18, 2020)	No Concerns	N/A
Region of Peel (Sept 1, 2020)	Please be advised that the subject land contains a watercourse and is located within Generic Regulation Limit of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). We rely on the environmental expertise of the TRCA for the review of development applications located within or adjacent to this regulation area in Peel and their potential impacts on the natural environment. We therefore request that town staff consider comments from the TRCA and incorporate their conditions of approval appropriately. Final approval of this application requires all environmental concerns to be addressed to the satisfaction of the TRCA.	Noted.
	Servicing to this site will require an extension of services and private easement at the applicant's own cost. Any work completed in advance of an approved Functional Servicing Report and the servicing scheme for the proposal shall be at the applicant's own risk.	Staff and Applicant looking to secure an agreement for the temporary servicing of the site as proposed, with the ultimate connection once planned expanded municipal infrastructure in place. Detailed servicing information to be advanced through the detailed design stage.
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (Oct 30, 2020)	Based on our review of the materials submitted and comments attached to this letter, we find the application premature until the following threshold issues have been addressed to our satisfaction:	Noted, see below responses:

OneProperties - 8281 & 0 Healey Road - File RZ 20-07
Comments Response Table

TOWN OF CALEDON
3/5/2021
PLANNING
RECEIVED
March 10, 2021

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
	- Floodplain modelling for the cut and fill analysis (TRCA comments 18-20)	See Functional Servicing Report.
	Stormwater management and Water Balance	See Functional Servicing Report.
	Servicing connection under watercourse – 1m cover from bed of watercourse to the storm pipe is proposed whereas 2m is typically needed. Supporting analysis is needed to confirm the 1m cover will not be an issue	See Functional Servicing Report.
TRCA Development Planning and Permitting	1. The watercourse realignment and cut and fill work proposed are acceptable in principle to TRCA staff. Revisions to the floodplain modelling are required as detailed in comments 18-20 before the pre-post floodplain limits can be accepted by staff. Given that previous erosion/large storm events have caused the channel to migrate away from the original creek bed and riparian wetlands, we agree that the proposal would in theory have a net ecological benefit to the Clarkway tributary. The grading work would remove portions of the site from the floodplain through filling and create floodplain storage in other areas on site. The proposed cut and fill work must be completed to TRCA's satisfaction before any development could be approved in areas currently in the floodplain. Two separate TRCA permits would be required for the future industrial development of this property: one to rehabilitate/relocate the water course and create the wetland enhancement area; and two, to facilitate the construction of the future industrial use and servicing connections. The rehabilitation work again would need to be completed and certified by qualified professionals prior to the issuance of the second permit.	Noted, permits and certification will be obtained and provided at the appropriate time.
	2. The Natural Heritage System (NHS) boundary is established from a number of components, including the regulatory floodplain, wetland limits and their associated buffers in this particular instance. Under TRCA's Living City Policies, Wetlands that have been evaluated as Provincially Significant by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), require a setback of at least 30 metres. Wetlands that are not Provincially Significant are afforded a minimum 10 metre setback. A scoped letter Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and setback review analysis have been submitted in support of the proposed ZBA. TRCA staff have reviewed the submitted July 30, 2020 Letter Environmental Impact Study, prepared by MTE and through pre-consultation previously reviewed the letter titled, "Healey Road Property and Wetland Setback Review", prepared by MTE, dated October 30, 2019. The materials submitted indicate that the riparian wetlands on the subject lands have not been evaluated as Provincially Significant. We are of the opinion that the proposed 10-30 metre setback from the wetlands and ultimate floodplain is acceptable and meets applicable policies. Provided the engineering comments under 18-20 concerning floodplain modelling can be adequately addressed, we accept the limit of development as shown.	Noted.
	3. Schedule A in the submitted Planning Justification Report prepared by Zelinka Priamo Limited illustrates the areas on the property that will be removed and added to the Environmental Protection Area (EPA 1) zoning for long-term protection. In comparison with Figures 7 and 8 in the submitted EIS, it appears that the 10m post-development floodplain setback/10-30m wetland buffer would be appropriately zoned EPA1.	Noted.

OneProperties - 8281 & 0 Healey Road - File RZ 20-07
 Comments Response Table

TOWN OF CALEDON
 PLANNING
 RECEIVED
 3/5/2021
 March 10, 2021

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
	<p>4. Policies 5.7.3.18 and 5.7.3.1.9 in the Town's Official Plan support placing EPA lands into public ownership through the planning process. TRCA supports the conveyance (gratuitous dedication) of natural heritage systems into public ownership. TRCA staff have discussed the gratuitous dedication with the proponent and staff have agreed that the land transfer would occur as a condition of Site Plan approval once the rehabilitation works have been completed and monitored appropriately.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>5. A natural channel design brief or environmental implementation report with detailed restoration plans will be required at the site plan application stage to detail the proposed realignment, wetland enhancement and species, timing and buffer treatments. We expect that the buffer would be restored in its entirety as part of the future application. The report would also include a proposed monitoring plan for the wetland enhancement and creek work as well as a projected cost estimate for the monitoring program</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>6. The cut and fill work and watercourse realignment appear to require alterations on the adjacent lands. Has permission from the adjacent landowner been obtained to complete the work?</p>	<p>This is not the intent. All works are to be completed within the Development lands. If any works are required outside these limits permission will be obtained from the adjacent landowners. As shown on the revised sections the grading will be within the development limits.</p>
	<p>7. The CEISMP originally envisioned a stand-alone SWM facility (i.e., SWM 2) on the subject lands. However, as it is our preference to reduce the number of SWM ponds and outlets draining to the Clarkway Tributary, we're supportive of the conceptual connection to the Ontari site SWM pond downstream. We understand from discussions with the proponent's consultant that future maintenance to the servicing connection through EPA1 lands would be designed to be minimized and no negative impacts would result through construction of the servicing connection once mitigation measures are in place.</p>	<p>This is the intent. As per the Storm Sewer Figure within the report there would be upstream and downstream Maintenance Structures to service the storm sewer system. Two (2) storm sewers will be placed to provide for conveyance of the allowable flow from the proposed development. This would allow for maintenance each sewer separately should the need arise. In addition upstream sediment would be contained via catch basin sumps and goss traps to prevent larger debris from entering the downstream storm sewer system</p>
<p>Water Resources Engineering</p>	<p>8. It is noted that the adjustments to the downstream pond release rates considered the entire area from the subject site (i.e. 21.87 ha). It is our understanding that the entire area of subject site will not discharge to the existing pond; therefore, please revise the adjustments to the downstream pond release rates by considering only the area draining to the pond.</p>	<p>The report has been revised to consider only the proposed developable area to be conveyed to the pond. The exact final development area will be finalized based on TRCA approvals under this application. Currently the developable area has been established at 9.21 ha.</p>
	<p>9. It is noted that the proposed development will be serviced by the downstream pond. Please submit the revised digital hydrologic model that was used to size the existing south pond.</p>	<p>The revised Hydrologic Model has been updated and completed by AM Candaras and has been included with the Odan/Detech report to support this application. As discussed with the TRCA a Technical Memo and supporting calculations for the Hydrological Model is all that is required at the FSR stage. Detailed design and modifications to the Pond will be completed at the SPA stage and provided at that time</p>
	<p>10. It is noted that for resizing the existing pond for quality treatment, 10ha of the subject property was considered. Please clarify if it is only 10ha of the subject area that will be discharged to the pond.</p>	<p>Similar to the above AM Candaras has provided a memo in support of the downstream pond being capable of providing the necessary water quality requirement for the proposed development. Only the proposed developable area was considered for water quality at this time up to a maximum of 10 ha., knowing that the developable area will be less than this.</p>

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
	<p>11. It is noted that 1974m3 of permanent storage is provided for quality treatment and it is not clear how this number was derived. Please submit the supporting calculations.</p>	<p>The required volume for permanent storage is based on MOE Calculation for 250 cu.m./ha. based on a private pond for this development with a contributing area of approximately 10 ha. or less based on the developable area. An area of 10 ha. has been provided for the downstream pond designer AM Candaras to aid in confirming their calculations for the Zoning and FSR stage. This will be adjusted and updated at the detailed design stage. As discussed with AM Candaras the downstream pond was designed to accommodate additional capacity of approximately 21.87 ha. As noted above in point 10. AM Candaras has provided a memo in support of the downstream pond providing water quantity and quality for the proposed development area of less than 10 ha.</p>
	<p>12. The submitted FSR mentioned that "should the treatment of water quality become a concern at the downstream pond the use of Oil/Grit separators on site at 8281 Healey Road will be reviewed". Please note that standalone Oil/Grit separators will not achieve enhanced level treatment, as such if this option is the way to go, then additional measures need to be considered.</p>	<p>Downstream pond will address water quality. This statement was provided for alternative means if deemed necessary in advance of the downstream pond which would be determined further at the time of detailed design. It is not expected that Oil/Grit Separators will be required. The statement has been removed.</p>
	<p>13. Please note Oil/Grit separators units are effective for the area not greater than 5ha. As such, if this option is the way to go, then multiple OGS units need to be considered, so that each serves an area less than 5ha.</p>	<p>Noted. As indicated above we do not believe Oil/Grit separators will be utilized with the connection to the downstream pond.</p>
	<p>14. TRCA staff acknowledges that roof runoff is considered clean water from stormwater management perspective.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>15. The submitted FSR mentions that there will be minimum of 1m separation from the bottom of the watercourse and the proposed pipe that conveys flows from that subject site to the existing SWM Facility located on the AIMCo. Property (Amazon Site). Please note that typically TRCA requires minimum of 2m separation from the bottom of the watercourse and the proposed pipe. As only 1m is proposed, please provide additional analysis to ensure that the pipe will not be exposed through bed scour.</p>	<p>In support of the 1m separation from the bottom of the watercourse to the top of the pipe support calculations have been provided from Geoprocess and have been included within the revised FSR. This memo has identified that 1m of cover will be adequate. Any required details will be provided at the detailed design stage during SPA.</p>
	<p>16. The stated criteria are acceptable and please revise the hydrology model for the exist pond by adding the subject property and determine the additional extended detention volume to address erosion control.</p>	<p>AM Candaras has revised the hydrology model for the existing pond by adding the subject property to a maximum development area of 10 ha., know that the development area will be less than based on the floodplain mapping. The revised model and support technical memo and calculations can be found in the revised FSR.</p>
	<p>17. TRCA's site water balance requirement is on-site retention of 5mm runoff from total impervious area and this retained runoff can be infiltrated and or evapotranspiration using low impact development measures. Please submit supporting calculations that demonstrate the achievements of this criteria.</p>	<p>The 5mm requirement has been added to the report as discussed with the TRCA. This provides the required volume. The location of LID's will be reviewed at the Detailed Design Stage with the Geotechnical Engineer to determine infiltration rates of the soils at specific locations.</p>
	<p>18. TRCA staff compared the existing and proposed cross sections extracted from the respective models and the comparison (see below) shows that according to the proposed cross sections in the proposed condition HEC-RAS model, although the submitted Figures show proposed grading is within the property limit, the grading exercise appears to extend beyond the property line. Please confirm that the grading shown within the HEC-RAS model are consistent with the Figures.</p>	<p>The HEC-RAS Sections have been reviewed and revised based on the above comment. The grading is within the proposed property limit and the HEC-RAS Sections have been updated to match with the HEC-RAS Model Stations and UTM locations between the survey and HEC-RAS Model and Plans.</p>

OneProperties - 8281 & 0 Healey Road - File RZ 20-07
 Comments Response Table

TOWN OF CALEDON
 PLANNING
 RECEIVED
 3/5/2021
 March 10, 2021

Department/Agency/Municipality	Comment	Response
	19. It is noted that the cut and fill balance analysis includes only the Regional storm. Please demonstrate that the cut and fill balance analysis does not create any negative impact for the water surface elevations of the 2-100 year design storms.	The FSR has been revised to provide for the 2-100 year cut-fill balance and the report has been updated accordingly.
	20. It is noted that the manning roughness coefficient of 0.035 for about 20m of the valley section at HEC-RAS cross section ID 1561.551, however under existing condition the manning roughness coefficient of 0.035 applied at the same HEC-RAS cross section is about 4m. Please apply the manning roughness coefficient of 0.035 within bankfull width that may not be greater than 4m in such small watercourses.	A discussed with the TRCA on Jan. 8 2021, via webex meeting it was agreed that a roughness coefficient of 0.050 could be applied outside the low flow channel or bank full for the valley section of the HEC-RAS model within the areas that are being regraded/reworked. The FSR and HEC-RAS models have been revised to these parameters.
Natural Heritage	21. TRCA ecology staff would like all future reference to the watercourse to include the terminology of 'creek' rather than 'ditch'. Please ensure the watercourse is appropriately identified on all the plans as a creek.	Drawings have been updated to indicate creek rather than ditch.
	22. We also would like that consideration be given to using the future roof water/clean stormwater as a resource, rather than sending it to the SWM pond to the south. This clean water should be used as a resource to feed the wetland enhancement area or the proposed cut areas of the floodplain; both of these areas could be constructed as additional wetland habitats and fed with clean roof water. Consideration may also be given to relocating the watercourse closer to the south property limit, to allow for direct discharge of roof water to a newly constructed wetland. Since creek and floodplain alterations are being proposed, they should be maximized to facilitate a more robust wetland/creeky enhancement area.	Noted. Can this be addressed during the detailed design stage as part of the water balance and enhancement features with the Ecologist.
MPAC	Outstanding	N/A
Bell Canada	Outstanding	N/A
Ministry of Transportation (GTA West)	Outstanding	N/A
Rogers Commuin	Outstanding	N/A