



April 27, 2020

Casey Blakely,
Town of Caledon
6311 Old Church Road
Caledon, ON L7C 1J6

**Re: Submission of revised application package
Application for Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment
Graham Property (1685078 Ontario Inc.)
0 Highway 9, Part of Lots 28 & 29, Concession 9 (Albion)
Your Files 21T-08001C & RZ 08-05**

We are pleased to provide the accompanying submission package for review by the Town of Caledon, Region of Peel and Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority.

The Plan of Subdivision is generally consistent with the previous submission. However, there are many minor revisions related to grading and stormwater management.

This submission is generally consistent with the last several submissions of the Draft Plan. The most significant changes are that:

1. The dwellings along Highway 9 have reverted to the orientation originally proposed in the first submission, with front entrances facing Street A and outdoor living area between the dwelling and Highway 9.
2. Block 23 has been widened between Lot 21 and Mount Pleasant Road, with a commensurate reduction to the widths of Lots 18 – 21.

The required documents have been revised and provided in accordance with the Town of Caledon's comment letter dated April 23, 2018.

We have addressed the detailed comments as follows:

General Comments

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 1) This property is currently assessed as Farmland (\$811,000 CVA). The Town's share of taxes levied based on current value assessment is approximately \$657. As at April 19, 2018, the property tax account had an overdue balance of \$7.91. If the development were to proceed as proposed the taxable assessment value of the property would change to reflect the development that occurs. | Acknowledged. |
| 2) No further archaeological concerns | Acknowledged. |
| 3) <i>Hydro One</i> has no objections provided the following are met: a) All private electrical infrastructure on the property have owner agreements/easements placed on them when impacted by property severances/easements to ensure all land owners/tenants legal rights are | Acknowledged. |

Robert Russell | MCIP, RPP | PRESIDENT

32 Albert Street | Georgetown ON | L7G 2B3 | C: 647.460.5511 | rob.russell@russellplanning.com

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law

Graham Property

Page 2 of 11



| | |
|--|---|
| <p>maintained;</p> <p>b) All industry standard utility separations and clearance minimums are maintained;</p> <p>c) Underground locates are obtained prior to excavation;</p> <p>d) No open trenching within 1.5m of Hydro poles and/or anchors;</p> <p>e) Minimum of 1m clearance from Hydro One Plant is maintained if trenchless horizontal drilling;</p> <p>f) PUCC owner is responsible to address all conflicts with Hydro One plant and request conflict corrections through appropriate channels; and,</p> <p>g) Any grade changes are brought to the attention of Hydro One and addressed prior to commencing work.</p> | |
| <p>4) Staff confirm receipt of an Environmental and Engineering Summary Report. The document is well organized and effectively compiles and summarizes the technical background work to support the proposal. Please note that as key technical reports are updated to address the comments herein (i.e. servicing, hydrogeology), this document will need to be updated as well. ent charges are payable prior to issuance of a building permit.</p> | Acknowledged. |
| <p>5) Staff note that part of the submission documents were prepared by Rob Russell Planning Consultants. The application forms currently identify Paul King as both Agent and Applicant. If Rob Russell is to be included on correspondence in respect of this application moving forward, please submit revised application forms identifying him as the agent or applicant.</p> | Enclosed with this submission is a letter from the property owner authorizing Robert Russell Planning Consultants Inc. to act as agent and applicant. |

Detailed Comments to be Addressed Prior to Draft Approval

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>6) Comments pertaining to the Draft Plan of Subdivision include the following:</p> <p>a) Several inconsistencies exist between the environmental maps (Maps 11, 12) and the Draft Plan (Map 9) with respect to reforestation limits (i.e. along Highway 9, Lot 9, Block 23 between Lots 14 and 15) and structure envelopes (along Highway 9, front portion of Lots 19 and 20). The reforestation limits and structure envelope for Lot 22 is unclear. Please ensure consistency between the plans noting the following:</p> <p>i) Existing forested areas cannot be included in the reforestation area (Lot 22);</p> <p>ii) The orientation of the lots along Highway 9; and,</p> <p>iii) The Natural Areas (areas outside the structure envelope) in the front yard of Lots 19 and 20 may not be necessary as the Zoning does not permit accessory uses and structures in the front yard; however, please confirm if plantings are proposed for these Natural Areas. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning)</p> <p>b) Please expand the lot size summary chart to include a column with Structure Envelope Area for each lot. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning)</p> <p>c) Please remove the infiltration trenches from the Draft Plan. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning)</p> <p>d) The Planning Justification Report indicates the property could be eligible for up to 3 density bonus lots (this cannot be confirmed until the reforestation plan comments have been satisfactorily addressed); however, the Draft Plan identifies 4 density bonus lots (Lots 11, 12, 13 and 14). (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning)</p> | <p>a) Reforestation limits have been reviewed and all maps should now be consistent.</p> <p>i) Existing forested areas on Lot 22 are not included in the reforestation areas</p> <p>ii) All mapping is derived from the same base plan showing lots fronting onto Street A</p> <p>iii) Natural areas have been removed from Lots 19 and 20</p> <p>b) Lot summary chart on the Draft Plan has been expanded to include Structure Envelope</p> <p>c) Infiltration trenches are no longer shown on the Draft Plan</p> <p>d) The Draft Plan has been updated to show only 3 reforestation lots, consisting of Lots 12, 13, and 14. The total number of lots is in accordance with the calculations provided in the Planning Justification Report.</p> <p>e) The Owner's Certificate has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>f) The Legal Description has been updated accordingly.</p> |
|--|---|

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law
Graham Property
Page 3 of 11



| | |
|--|---|
| <p>e) <i>The Owner's Certificate should be revised to Adrian Kleywegt, as opposed to Klegwegt</i></p> <p>f) <i>The legal description should be revised to "Part Lots 28 and 29, Concession 9 (Albion) designated as Part 1 on Plan 43R-36501 and Part Lot 28, Concession 9 (Albion), designated as Part 2 on Plan 43R-21080; Town of Caledon; Regional Municipality of Peel"</i></p> <p>g) <i>The Owner's Certificate and Surveyor's Certificate require signatures on the Draft Plan. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning)</i></p> <p>h) <i>Block 26 and Block 23 are abutting Blocks to be dedicated to the Town. Please combine into one Block (i.e. Block 23). Also, please label the block between Lots 14 and 15 as Block 23.</i></p> <p>i) <i>Comment 13(c) of the Town's Comment Summary Letter dated February 12, 2016 has not been adequately addressed. Please ensure the 0.3m reserve extends along the backs of the daylight triangles of Street A, where abutting Lots 1 and 21. Block 25 (0.3m reserve) is not required as Town Block 24 can be adjacent to Town Blocks 23 and 26. The Draft Plan does not correctly reference the location of Block 30. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering)</i></p> | |
| <p>7) Comments pertaining to the Environmental Mapping that need to be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval include the following:</p> <p>a) Map 8 (Environmental Summary Map): (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Please include all private LIDs (infiltration trenches, etc.) for each lot; ii) Please differentiate between structure envelopes and natural areas; iii) Please explain how the proposed septic bed for Lot 2 meets TCOP policy 7.1.9.11 that limits sewage disposal systems to a suitable well drained area with slopes of 10 percent or less; <p>b) Map 11 (The Environmental Management and Reforestation Plan). Please revise as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Please revise to include the proposed dwellings, driveways, private LIDs, and proposed septic beds for each lot; ii) Please revise either/both Map 11 and Map 12 (Draft Plan, Environmental Summary and Revegetation Plan) to ensure consistency, specifically the layout of the building envelopes (e.g. Lot 9) and reforestation areas. Several reforestation areas are noted on Map 12 but not included on Map 11; iii) Please adjust the reforestation area on Map 11 to remove the reforestation area over the Block 23 access between Lots 14 and Lot 15, matching the reforestation depicted on Map 12; iv) Please adjust the limits of reforestation along the rear of Lot 18 and Lot 19 to align, providing for easier maintenance by residents and reduced risk of future encroachment (If applicable); v) The applicant is to confirm the responsibility of reforestation drawings and implementation with the NVCA, including timing of construction. It is recommended to follow the reforestation area sequencing of the subdivision to the south (Beaverhall 21T-95027C), i.e. meadow, savanna, etc. The applicant can contact the Open Space Design department for further clarification. (TOC, CS, Open Space Design) vi) The eligibility of the plan for density bonus lots cannot be confirmed until the reforestation areas are clarified and consistent between the plans. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning) <p>c) Map 12 (Draft Plan, Environmental Summary and Revegetation Plan): (Town of Caledon, Development</p> | <p>a) Map 8 has been revised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Infiltration trenches locations are now identified ii) Structure envelopes are shown with black lines whereas the natural areas are shown with a variety of colours in accordance with the legend iii) As a result of the reorientation of the dwellings along Highway 9, the septic bed for Lot 2 is no longer coincident with steeper slopes. However, the conceptual septic bed location for Lot 3 coincides with a small anomalous area with slopes greater than 10%. The average slope within the proposed septic bed is less than 10%. <p>b) Map 11 has been revised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) now depicts dwelling locations, driveways, infiltration trenches and septic beds ii) Reforestation areas are now shown consistently on all maps. iii) Reforestation area has been removed from Block 23 between Lots 14 and 15 iv) The Reforestation Area at the rear of Lots 18 – 21 is now shown at a consistent depth across these 4 lots. v) NVCA has indicated the reforestation concepts will be refined at the detailed design state, after Draft Plan approval. vi) Reforestation areas are now shown consistently. <p>c) Map 12 has been revised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Slope categorization has been shown in colour. ii) Structure envelope is now coincident with the Reforestation Limit on on lots and as such only the Reforestation limit is shown. iii) EZ1 and EZ2 are labeled in the legend iv) Infiltration trenches are shown on Lots 13 – 21, which are the only lots that are proposed to contain such features. v) Side yard setbacks for Lot 8 are now shown at 5.8 m and 9.6 m |

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law
Graham Property
Page 4 of 11



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Section, Planning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The sloping is difficult to decipher – please colour code the map instead of grayscale. ii) It is difficult to decipher the reforestation line and structure envelope boundary. Please revise. iii) As per the previous comment letter, please ensure all EZ1 and EZ2 are labelled on Map 12. iv) Please illustrate all private LID measures. v) As per zoning comments, please ensure Lot 8 has a minimum side yard setback of 5.0 metres. | |
| <p>8) Comment 12 in the previous summary of comments letter identified the need for a Record of Site Condition for all lands within the Plan, as a condition of draft approval. The comment response matrix indicates a Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment will be submitted prior to dedication of the lands. Please be advised that since the Town is acquiring property through this development a Record of Site Condition (not just a Phase 2) will be required. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering & Planning)</p> | <p>A Record of Site Condition will be provided in accordance with the applicable regulations under the Environmental Protection Act.</p> |
| <p>9) The following comments pertaining to the Geotechnical Investigation and Hydrogeological Report must be addressed prior to draft approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Hydrogeological Investigation prepared by V. A. Wood Associates Ltd. has been peer reviewed, the results of which are attached. Notably, the revised investigation did not address the 2011 Burnside peer review comments. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Deeper boreholes need to be drilled in order to measure and monitor groundwater level and direction and calculate existing and potential future nitrate concentrations. ii) The report needs to outline measures for private well protection, including mitigation. iii) The peer reviewer is recommending that, as a condition of draft approval, groundwater conditions be monitored for a minimum of one year in accordance with a Work Plan approved by the Town and an updated Final Report be submitted to the satisfaction of the Town. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning) b) A geotechnical letter/report is required to confirm the feasibility of the conceptual stormwater management design. (NVCA) c) Additional information is required that addresses the following: potential impacts of the development on natural features (proximal water courses, wetland features and functions and springs/seeps), water balance (post development versus pre development), site topography and drainage and aquifer properties, depth to water table and groundwater flow direction. (NVCA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) DS Consultants have been retained to provide the necessary updates to the V.A. Wood Associates Ltd. report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) monitoring wells were advanced to depths between 21 and 28 metres below grade to intercept the groundwater table. ii) Section 5.0 of the DS Consultants report recommends that a monitoring plan be implemented, and Section 6.0 provides a contingency plan which includes options for temporary and permanent solutions should a private well be impacted by the proposed development. iii) Acknowledged. Section 5.0 of the DS Consultants report provides the preliminary framework for the Work Plan. b) The geotechnical letter was provided by Soil Engineers in a letter dated October 27, 2013 and is included as part of Appendix C of the GHD SWM Calculations and Background Information, which in turn is Appendix A of the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report. c) Please refer to the Hydrogeological report prepared by DS Consultants dated January 17, 2020 for updated topography and aquifer properties. Please refer to the Water Balance Investigation by DS Consultants Ltd dated April 17, 2020 containing the water balance calculations and indicating that the project will not impact any adjacent natural features |
| <p>10) The following comments pertaining to the Noise Impact Study must be addressed prior to draft approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Noise Study has been peer reviewed (see attached) and comments need to be addressed, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Sound level reporting is to include nighttime for Living and Dining Area and daytime for Bedrooms; ii) Identification of points of reception and a noise analysis for Lots 9 to 21 is required; and iii) More information is needed regarding the location and analysis of the Outdoor Living Areas, including topography considerations and Zoning By-law conformity. b) The Noise Impact Study is now proposing eliminating the berm and noise wall along Highway 9 and using the proposed dwellings of Lots 1 – 8 to mitigate noise to acceptable levels (below 55dBA) for the OLA which is now proposed at 'the front' of the houses fronting Street A. Further discussion is needed with Town staff regarding the zoning implications of this approach. In conjunction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The comments from the Valcoustics peer review are provided later in this document. b) As per the request made in the Town of Caledon comments issued February 12, 2016, the previous submission proposed to orient the dwellings to face Highway 9 thus locating the OLA between Street A and the dwelling. As is evident by the latest Town comments this was not a viable option. The current submission reverts to the original orientation for the lots adjacent to Highway 9 and proposes to create acoustic barriers around the OLA only, rather than at the property line, in accordance with this comment. c) Acknowledged d) Acknowledged |

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law

Graham Property

Page 5 of 11



Robert Russell Planning Consultants Inc.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>with the attached peer review, the Town would like the applicant to investigate the option of acoustical patio fences around OLA's, i.e. a 'living wall', provided it meets the required MOECC and Town criteria. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering & Planning)</p> <p>c) Please note the Developer is ultimately responsible for noise mitigation for this development therefore the Town will require the landowner's consultants to coordinate the design, construction and certification of noise mitigation for Lots 1 – 8 inclusive, as a result these lots need to be subject to a Scoped ORM review and approval. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering)</p> <p>d) The Noise Impact Study must be reviewed and approved by the Ministry of Transportation. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering)</p> | |
| <p>11) The following comments relate to the Function Servicing & Stormwater Management Report must be addressed prior to draft approval</p> <p>a) The Functional Servicing Report (FSR) must be revised to eliminate the 50mm dia. watermain at the end of Street A and include a temporary flushing hydrant off 200mm main instead. (Region of Peel)</p> <p>b) NVCA requires additional information with respect to the post-development CN values, runoff coefficients, and emergency overflow. Also, please provide NVCA with the digital model of all stormwater calculations. See attached comments for further detail. (NVCA)</p> | <p>a) The FSR has been revised accordingly. Figure 4 shows the flushing hydrant in the Street A ROW adjacent to Lot 12.</p> <p>b) Please refer to the detailed response to the NVCA comments later in this response matrix.</p> |
| <p>12) The following comments related to grading and drainage must be addressed prior to draft approval:</p> <p>a) Proposed lot grading does not comply with the Town's Development Standards, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Some areas on Map 13 show swale grades at 0.7 %, 1.5%, etc. and Drawing CF -3 shows a grade at 1.25%. ii) The invert of Block 26 has been lowered by 1.50m and this steepens the side slopes to 2:1, whereas 4:1 is required. Please provide two cross sections through Block 26 to include existing edge of asphalt grade and proposed Lot 21 grades. iii) Sections of Block 23 are still at 3:1, whereas 4:1 slopes are the minimum the Town will accept. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering) <p>b) Map 13 will need to demonstrate where the OLA will be and further confirm that a minimum 7.5m of the rear lot area is sufficiently level (2.0% - 5.0% slope) for all lots; therefore additional grades will be required throughout the lots i.e. corner grades, septic etc. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering)</p> <p>c) Permission to grade adjacent to Highway 9 right of way will be required from the MTO. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering)</p> | <p>a) The proposed grading shown on Map 13 has been revised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) all swales appear to be designed with a minimum 2% grade, with the exception of the overland flow route within SWM Block 23 in the area between Lots 14 and 15 ii) Former Block 26 has been included within Block 23 now. This portion of Block 23 has been widened with a commensurate reduction in the width of Lots 18 – 21 to accommodate the maximum 4:1 slopes within Block 23 iii) Block 23 has been revised with maximum 4:1 slopes. <p>b) Additional grades are provided at the corners of the proposed OLA, and for the proposed septic beds.</p> <p>c) Acknowledged</p> |
| <p>13) The following comments pertaining to the Planning Justification Report must be addressed prior to draft approval:</p> <p>a) No further comments at this time.</p> | <p>a) Acknowledged. Please note that an amendment to the PJR has been provided to address the changes to the Draft Plan and other documents as necessary.</p> |
| <p>14) The following urban design considerations must be addressed:</p> <p>a) With this circulation there is a first submission document named 'Architectural Guidelines' prepared by Mary Lawson, V.P. General Manager, Dalerose Homes. It seems that this document is intended to address the requirements for an Urban Design Brief and Architectural Design Guidelines for the Subdivision. From a preliminary review of the document, clarity is required as to the design framework proposed for the subdivision. The document needs restructuring, additional information to be added, some design information to be removed and</p> | <p>a) Please note that the previously submitted document is no longer applicable. RPD Studio has been retained to provide an Urban Design Brief that meets Town Official Plan policies. As such, the individual comments from the Urban Design Reviewer are not directly applicable to the new UDB and a specific response to each is not provided in this document.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>the addition of maps, figures, illustrations and photos, which are to be reference in the descriptive text. The document shall consider attributes on the site, existing design policy and describe and illustrate the proposed design vision, objectives and character for the subdivision. Architectural design guidelines intended to implement the overall vision shall be provided. The subdivision Architect and Landscape Architect shall contribute to the preparation of this document. Detailed Urban design comments are as follows:</p> | |
| <p>16) Detailed Comments to be Addressed Prior to Approval of a Zoning By-law Amendment:</p> <p>a) A draft Zoning By-law Amendment was submitted with this submission. Please find below comments to be addressed (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Planning)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The legal description should read Part Lots 28 and 29, Concession 9 (Albion) designated as Part 1 on Plan 43R-36501 and Part Lot 28, Concession 9 (Albion), designated as Part 2 on Plan 43R- 21080; Town of Caledon; Regional Municipality of Peel The RE Exception Numbers in the By-law (RE(A)/(B) and Schedule (RE(1)/(2)) are inconsistent; however, it would appear that one zone can be proposed by including a front yard setback standard of 15.0m. Please confirm that frontages have been measured from the (proposed) front yard setback (i.e. 15m). The minimum side yard setback is generally not less than 5.5m; however Lot 8 is proposed at 4.9m. Staff could support a 5.0m minimum side yard setback. Please revise the plans and by-law accordingly. The minimum setback from the side façade of a dwelling to side limit of a structure envelope shall be 5.5m. Clause 2 needs to include EPA1-576 in the list of zone changes. A separate Structure Envelope Map is required. Please ensure all natural area zones are dimensioned. Schedule A needs to be revised to zone Block 23 as EPA1-405 and the EZ-1 lands on Lot 22 as EPA1-ORM. Please revise the By-law as per the comments herein as well as submit a revised Draft By-law in both PDF and Word formats (to allow for any additional revisions to occur in track-edit format) and submit the schedules in both PDF and CAD formats as per the attached Digital Submission Standards. The revised By-law and Schedules will need to be reviewed at a future By-law Review Committee Meeting. <p>b) The Urban Design Brief and Architectural Design Guidelines will be used in the review of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment. (TOC, CS, Urban Design)</p> | <p>a) The Draft Zoning By-law has been revised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The legal description has been updated The Draft Zoning By-law text and schedule are now consistent. Only a single RE zone is now proposed accommodating all proposed lots. Frontages as shown on the Draft Plan are measured at the 15 m front yard setback. The layout of Lot 8 has been revised to provide a 5.8 m minimum setback. All conceptual dwelling locations meet the minimum 5.5 m sideyard within the structure envelope, however, a 5.0 metre side yard is proposed in the by-law to allow for architectural siting flexibility. EPA1-576 is now noted in Clause 2. A structure envelope map is now provided. Schedule A has been revised accordingly. PDF, CAD and Word formatted documents are provided with this submission as appropriate. <p>b) Acknowledged</p> |

To be Addressed as a Condition of Draft Plan Approval

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>17) The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report, dated September 20, 2016 was carried out and confirmed that the potential for adverse environmental impact to the site exists and therefore is recommending that a Phase II is carried out. As a condition of draft approval and prior to grading/site alteration, a copy of the Record of Site Condition acknowledged by a Provincial Officer of the Ministry of The Environment will be required for the entire property. (Town of Caledon, Development Section, Engineering)</p> | <p>A Record of Site Condition will be provided in accordance with the applicable regulations under the Environmental Protection Act.</p> |
| <p>18) At detailed design, please note the following: (TOC, CS, Open Space</p> | <p>a) Acknowledged</p> |

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law
Graham Property
Page 7 of 11



| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| Design) a) Wooden bollards are to be installed along the perimeter of all reforestation areas to delineate to private property owners the extent of the reforestation areas. b) Please inventory and assess the condition of all fences on site. Please identify the type and location of all existing and proposed fencing on site. c) All street tree plantings are to be located entirely upon private property. | b) Acknowledged c) Acknowledged |
| 19) The Town of Caledon shall collect from the developer twice the costs of the construction value of the proposed entry feature to be located within Block 33, for future maintenance purposes. (TOC, CS, Open Space Design) | Acknowledged |
| 20) Minimal maintenance clauses for storm pond blocks shall be included in the purchase and sales agreements | Acknowledged |
| 21) Any permitted tree removals shall only occur outside nesting timelines. (TOC, CS, Open Space Design) | Acknowledged |
| 22) Staff previously indicated that the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision requires one approved street name and that Town protocol requires the use of a minimum of one historically significant street name. The single proposed street is an extension of a previously named street developed through the adjacent subdivision to the south which has already been assigned the name "Walter Brown Drive". As this is a historically significant name, the Town's street naming requirements for 21T-08001C have been satisfied. (Town of Caledon, Policy and Sustainability Section, Heritage) | Acknowledged |
| 23) The Town will require as a condition of draft approval, that prior to offering units for sale and in a place readily available to the public, the owner will display information regarding universal design options that may be available for purchase within the development prior to offering units for sale. (TOC, CORP, Accessibility) | Acknowledged |
| 24) During detailed design, please ensure if a community mail box is installed, the area shall be well lit via a light standard and a curb depression provided from the sidewalk and/or roadway to the mail box landing area. | Acknowledged |

Golder Associates Peer Review – February 14, 2018

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) The investigation does not meet the requirements of the OP for installing wells to monitor the groundwater levels in aquifers. | Additional boreholes have been advanced to intercept the aquifer and the monitoring data is presented in the updated Hydrogeological Report from DS Consultants. |
| 2) a) Prior to Draft Plan Approval, an updated nitrate loading assessment should be provided which incorporates an additional hydrogeological investigation to obtain groundwater samples from onsite wells to be analyzed by an accredited laboratory. A groundwater contour plan should be prepared showing the flow directions on the site to be used to indicate which wells are downgradient and potentially at risk from nitrates originating from the septic tiles at the site. The nitrate assessment should include, as necessary, any treatment requirements and benefits from these, should the applicable guidelines be exceeded. b) Prior to Draft Plan Approval, an updated assessment of the nitrate impacts at the proposed development is required with an updated calculation incorporating actual nitrate concentrations in groundwater based on analysis of groundwater samples collected at the site. c) Prior to Draft Plan Approval, the proponent is required to demonstrate | a) An updated nitrate loading assessment is provided in Section 4.0 of the DS Consultants report. The groundwater contour plan is provided as Figure 4 of the DS Consultants report. The nitrate assessment determined that the background nitrate levels are currently near the Ontario Drinking Water Standard limit, with some boreholes providing samples that exceed it. To supplement this data, samples were obtained from both an upgradient domestic well and a downgradient domestic well. It was determined that upgradient of the subject property the nitrate levels were less than 0.02 mg/L (less than 0.2% of the ODWS limit), whereas the nitrate concentrations at the downgradient well were 4.6 mg/L (about half the ODWS limit) suggesting that the background nitrate levels are a result on the current agricultural operation on the subject property and will decrease when the agricultural operations cease and the property is developed. As such the nitrate loading assessment is |

Robert Russell | MCIP, RPP | PRESIDENT

32 Albert Street | Georgetown ON | L7G 2B3 | C: 647.460.5511 | rob.russell@russellplanning.com

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law
Graham Property
Page 8 of 11



| | |
|--|---|
| that septic services can be located on the proposed lots. In order to demonstrate this conceptual designs for the sewage disposal systems are required that indicate the size of the beds(s) and that there is sufficient area on the lots for structures and beds. | <p>based on the assumption that the background levels will be less than 4.6 mg/L. Using this figure as the background level, the proposed 21 new septic beds would meet the ODWS. Please note that the calculations are based on 22 new septic systems, however, Lot 22 is an existing dwelling with an existing septic and as such the nitrate loading for the proposed 21 new lots would be slightly less than shown.</p> <p>b) The updated assessment is provided as Appendix E to the DS Consultants Report.</p> <p>c) The structures and beds shown on the various mapping included with this submission are based upon the sizes required as the Town of Caledon (see comment # 11(g)(ii) from the February 12, 2016 comment letter. It should be noted that as per the OBC, the septic bed size will be determined through consideration of the number of bedrooms and fixtures in the dwelling and the percolation time of the soil at the location of the septic bed. These factors are unknown at this time, as such, a conceptual design of the septic system is not feasible.</p> |
| 3) It is recommended that the applicant follow the Region of Peel protocol for protection and mitigation of private wells, which is considered to include adverse effects related to nitrate loading and construction dewatering. | Acknowledged. |
| <p>Hydrogeological Condition</p> <p>1) Prior to grading, the Owner shall submit a revised Hydrogeological Report to the Town for review and approval that addresses the following:</p> <p>a) The revised report shall be prepared after the groundwater monitoring has taken place for a minimum of one year with any update of discussions and interpretations necessary and shall include a discussion of hydrogeological conditions at the site which are not included in the current report including cross sections. A pre and post development water budget should also be provided. Recommendations should be provided for any long-term monitoring and impact mitigation as well as a contingency plan should the updated nitrate impact assessment indicate the potential for adverse effects. The Owner shall reimburse the Town for the cost of any necessary peer review of the above noted report.</p> <p>b) A clause shall be included in the subdivision agreement stating that the Owner shall carry out, or cause to be carried out, the recommendations set out in the aforementioned report(s) to the satisfaction of the Town.</p> | <p>a) Acknowledged</p> <p>b) Acknowledged</p> |

Valcoustics Canada Ltd - December 14, 2017

Please refer to the response letter from YCA Engineering Limited enclosed with this submission for a response to the individual Valcoustics comments. However, it should be clarified that some of the comments from Valcoustics are no longer applicable to the proposed development due to the changed dwelling orientation for the lots adjacent to Highway 9.

NVCA – April 17, 2018

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. The NVCA recommends the use of the MTO's online tool available at www.mto.gov.on.ca/IDF_Curves/terms.shtml for the creation of IDF storm data. | Previously addressed by GHD through direct correspondence with NVCA. Refer to letter attached. |
| 2. A geotechnical investigation has been completed in support of the infiltration system. The NVCA accepts this analysis. | Acknowledged |

Robert Russell | MCIP, RPP | PRESIDENT

32 Albert Street | Georgetown ON | L7G 2B3 | C: 647.460.5511 | rob.russell@russellplanning.com

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law
Graham Property
Page 9 of 11



| | |
|--|--|
| 3. The curve numbers used are in the range of 62 to 68 for the pre-development scenario. In the post-development scenario the CN values should be higher. Please show calculations for the lower numbers. | Previously addressed by GHD through direct correspondence with NVCA. Refer to letter attached. |
| 4. Please show how the runoff coefficients were calculated along with the time of concentration and time to peak | Previously addressed by GHD through direct correspondence with NVCA. Refer to letter attached. |
| 5. Please supply digital model of all stormwater calculations. | Previously addressed by GHD through direct correspondence with NVCA. Refer to letter attached. |
| 6. In the event of frozen or clogged soil there must be an emergency overflow path for the stormwater runoff. The calculations confirming the capacity of the emergency runoff flow path are required. | Previously addressed by GHD through direct correspondence with NVCA. Refer to letter attached. |
| 7. The storm sewer has been sized for the 100 year storm. In the event that the sewer is clogged please confirm that conveyance of the runoff will continue to the proposed pond. The drainage easement seems small to convey flow overland, and the grades may not work. Please confirm that the drainage will not flow on to the adjacent property to the south. | The SWM design has been revised to convey the 100 year storm event overland between Lots 14 and 15. |
| 8. Please ensure that any riprap has been sized using the appropriate design flow rate. These calculations will need to be provided with the detailed design submission. | Acknowledged |
| 9. Easements for access to and from the infiltration pond are required. We defer to the municipality as to whether the maintenance accesses are sized in accordance with municipal standards. | Acknowledged |
| 10. Approval from the municipality is required for the acceptance of drainage from the property onto the adjacent right-of-way. A maintenance access way is shown from Mount Pleasant Road to the infiltration pond. Approval from the Municipality is required for an access from this roadway. | Acknowledged |
| 11. Detailed sediment and erosion control is to be provided with the detailed design submission. | Acknowledged |
| 12. Please provide landscape plans for the proposed stormwater management pond with the detailed design submission. Plantings should be native to the Caledon area. | Acknowledged |
| 13. Section 2.3 of the NVCA Stormwater Technical Guide requires a geotechnical engineer's letter/report confirming the feasibility of the conceptual stormwater management design from a geotechnical perspective | Please refer to the geotechnical letter provided by Soil Engineers dated October 27, 2013 included as part of Appendix C of the GHD SWM Calculations and Background Information, which in turn is Appendix A of the Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report. |
| 14. Please provide information on the potential impacts that the development may have to: proximal water courses, wetland features and functions, and springs/seeps. | As per the water balance report prepared by DS Consultants there is expected to be a reduction in evapotranspiration and infiltration, and an increase in runoff. However, through LID measures and infiltration roof water, the infiltration deficit can be eliminated. |
| 15. Please provide water balance calculations to evaluate post development recharge rates against pre development infiltration rates. | Please refer to the water balance report prepared by DS Consultants |
| 16. In the site description, please provide information on the site topography and drainage along with a description of the natural heritage features. | Information is provided in Section 2.0 of the Hydrogeological and Nitrate Loading Assessment prepared by DS Consultants and dated January 17, 2020. |
| 17. Regarding Section 2.0- geological information- please provide information on aquifer properties, depth to water table, and groundwater flow direction. | This information is provided in the Hydrogeological and Nitrate Loading Assessment prepared by DS Consultants and dated January 17, 2020. |
| 18. It is understood that the development will be serviced by individual septic systems. We note that review and approval of the individual septic systems (<10,000 l/day) is within the purview of the municipality. | Acknowledged |

Robert Russell | MCIP, RPP | PRESIDENT

32 Albert Street | Georgetown ON | L7G 2B3 | C: 647.460.5511 | rob.russell@russellplanning.com

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law

Graham Property

Page 10 of 11



Robert Russell Planning Consultants Inc.

| | |
|---|---|
| 19. The Golder Associates peer review comments which recommend the installation of monitoring wells to meet the Official Plan requirements, the completion of a water balance, and nitrate loading calculations are acceptable to NVCA staff. | Acknowledged. |
| 20. We concur that the EZ1 feature currently mapped on the west portion of the property is indistinct on the landscape, part of active agricultural fields and does not need either EZ1 or EZ2 status based on the definition in the Town's Official Plan. However, we believe that the EZ2 mapping on Figure 3 is incomplete – it should include the two south arms of the feature roughly as depicted in the attachment. We note that the south arm(s) lie outside of the proposed development envelopes in an area of proposed reforestation so this may not be significant issue. NVCA staff believes reforestation in these areas is appropriate. | The EZ2 delineated on Figure 3 has been updated as per the direction from NVCA. The portion of these areas within the subdivision boundary is proposed for reforestation. |
| 21. Eight Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) rare species were observed on the property. Most were observed along the south fencerow and the vegetation communities around the existing residential property well east of the proposed development. Four species lie within the proposed development area (along the south fencerow). The EIS correctly notes that none of these species are rare according to Riley (1989) which is our standard reference for rare species in our watershed (with some interpretation). We do not have a concern from our watershed perspective regarding these species and it is likely that they will persist provided the fencerows are left intact. | Acknowledged |
| 22. Significant woodlands (the forests associated with the existing residence and extending off property) may meet the size criterion for significant woodlands in Settlement Areas; however, these forests are far removed from proposed development. We are satisfied with the EZ1 mapping in this area. | Acknowledged |
| 23. Twelve hectares of reforestation is proposed in support of the proposed development. Concepts are proposed to be refined at detailed design stage of the planning process. As per other proposed developments in this area, we recommend that bollards/signage (or equivalent) be placed at the edge of these reforestation areas where they are part of proposed lots to educate landowners and discourage encroachment. | Acknowledged |
| 24. With respect to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment, staff are in agreement with the Town's approach that a restrictive zoning of EPA1-ORM be applied to the EZ1 feature on proposed Lot 22. | The draft Zoning schedule has been updated to show the affected area in Lot 22 zoned as EPA1-ORM. |

The remaining comments provided as attachments to the April 23, 2018 letter are mostly comprised of Conditions of Draft Approval. The following agencies provided only Conditions of Approval:

- Canada Post
- Enbridge
- Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board
- Peel District School Board
- Bell Canada

The Region of Peel provided one comment, with the remainder of their letter devoted to Conditions of Approval. The Region's comment was related to the elimination of the 50 mm watermain and replacement with a 200 mm watermain and temporary flushing hydrant. This comment was included above in the discussion regarding comment #11 related to the FSR.

Robert Russell | MCIP, RPP | PRESIDENT

32 Albert Street | Georgetown ON | L7G 2B3 | C: 647.460.5511 | rob.russell@russellplanning.com

May 04, 2020

April 27, 2020

Re-submission of Draft Plan and Zoning By-law
Graham Property
Page 11 of 11



We have reviewed and acknowledge all above referenced conditions.

We trust that the above response and documents provided is sufficient to allow the Town of Caledon to review the Plan of Subdivision and recommend that it be approved with conditions. If you should have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Regards,

ROBERT RUSSELL PLANNING CONSULTANTS INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Rob Russell', is positioned above the printed name.

Rob Russell, MCIP, RPP
President