

Town of Caledon, Finance Department, Finance					
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response	
1	a	Rice Group	Finances	If the proposed applications were to proceed as planned (includes the development of an industrial park with nine or more buildings), the taxable assessment value of the property will change, to reflect any developments that would have taken place.	Acknowledged.
	b	Rice Group	Finances	Development Charges will be levied at the Non-Residential (Industrial) rates.	Acknowledged.
	c	Rice Group	Finances	Applicable Development Charges will be determined by the rates in effect on the date when a site plan or zoning amendment application is deemed to be complete (the application completion date). A DART application does not represent a site plan application or a zoning amendment application.	Acknowledged.
	d	Rice Group	Finances	Currently, the Development Charge Non-Residential (Industrial) rates are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town of Caledon: \$90.19 per m² of new or added industrial floor space. • Region of Peel: \$227.53 per m² of new or added industrial floor space. • Education: \$9.69 per m² of new or added industrial floor space. 	Acknowledged.
	e	Rice Group	Finances	Interest on Development Charges will apply for the period running from application completion date through to the date on which those charges are received by the Town.	Acknowledged.
	f	Rice Group	Finances	For the purposes of Development Charges, the term 'industrial floor space' should comply with the definition of an 'industrial building', as outlined in the Town's By-law No. 2019-31 or as amended. If compliance is not met, then the Non-Residential (Other) rates will apply.	Acknowledged.
	g	Rice Group	Finances	Development Charges are indexed twice a year, on February 1st and August 1st.	Acknowledged.
	h	Rice Group	Finances	Additional information on Development Charges may be accessed on the Town's website at https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/development-charges.aspx	Acknowledged.

	i	Rice Group	Finances	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at June 23, 2023 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. For site plan or rezoning applications dated on or after January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated at rates applicable on the date when an application is determined to be complete; and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. Interest charges will apply for affected applications. For site plan or rezoning applications dated prior to January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated and payable at building permit issuance date. 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 changes in actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application.	Acknowledged.
--	---	------------	----------	--	---------------

Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Economic Development

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
2	Rice Group & Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	On pages 1-2 and 1-3 of the Town of Caledon's Employment Strategy Report, it states that looking forward the Town will need to consider land use policy that support a diverse range of sectors and consider policies that direct logistics warehouses (Goods Movement sector) to appropriate locations, as well as policies that encourage higher employment densities (such as integrated office and warehouse developments and multiple storeys) and better utilization of lands for these developments.	Acknowledged.
3	Rice Group & Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	As noted within the Town of Caledon's Economic Development Strategy it encourages new business investments to maximize job density and to diversify the types of industrial sectors. Given the nature of the logistics and warehousing sector (low employment density and high traffic volumes associated with the development), this sector should be effectively managed in Caledon, rather	Acknowledged.

			than actively targeted. Efforts should be focused on expanding the breadth of this sector to include a range of employment opportunities (e.g., office support uses) and ensuring that the sector does not undermine the efforts to attract a broad range of employment opportunities in Caledon. Town of Caledon encourages the Goods Movement sector to provide opportunities for higher order employment activities in Caledon, including corporate offices.	
Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Parks				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
4	Rice Group	Park Block on Site Plan	The park block proposed is not acceptable. The Town will be seeking payment in lieu of conveyance of parkland prior to the registration of the plan pursuant to Section 51.1 of the Planning Act.	Park Block has been removed. Cash In Lieu payment to be provided.
Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Heritage				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
5	GBCA & Weston Consulting	Heritage Plans and Reports & OPA	Significant archaeological resources will be incorporated into the proposed development through either in situ preservation or interpretation where feasible or may be commemorated and interpreted through exhibition development on site including, but not limited to, commemorative plaquing. Please include a policy within the proposed Official Plan Amendment to this effect.	OPA has been updated.
6	GBCA & Weston Consulting	Heritage Plans and Reports & OPA	The significant cultural heritage resources (12245 Torbram Road and 12541 Airport Road) shall be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Heritage staff would like to move forward with designation in the Fall of 2023 for 12245 Torbram Road. Considering the comments contained within this letter, further discussions are required regarding the relocation site for the resources and any required planning approvals. Please include policies within the proposed Official Plan Amendment which speak to the resources, their intended designation, and retention on site.	OPA has been updated.
Town of Caledon, Engineering, Public Works & Transportation Department, Energy and Environment				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
7	Rice Group	GDS	The Town of Caledon is in the process of creating Green Development Standards (GDS) which, once	Acknowledged.

			approved by Council, will apply to residential, commercial and industrial developments across Caledon.	
8	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Although the GDS will not be administered at this stage of the OPA, the applicant is encouraged to review the current draft GDS as well as the climate change section of Caledon's draft Official Plan and include policies in the proposed Official Plan Amendment with respect to green development, sustainability and resiliency.	A review of draft GDS has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.

Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Natural Heritage and Engineering, Public Works and Transportation Department, Development Engineering

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
9	GEI Consultants	CEISMP Study Area	Town staff require the applicant to update and resubmit the Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan & Scoped Subwatershed Study (herein referred to as the CEISMP) and supporting studies to address all provided comments. Staff reserve the opportunity to provide further comments following submission of updated studies.	Acknowledged.
10	GEI Consultants	CEISMP Study Area	<p>The CEISMP Study Area should include at minimum the entire subject lands, as well as all of the associated subcatchment drainage areas flowing to and through the subject lands. The CEISMP study area scope should at minimum include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The subject lands; The extent of Torbram Road and Airport Road that border the subject lands and extending to the limits of the drainage area flowing to and through these road segments; The properties with the addresses 12429 Torbram Road, 12419 Torbram Road, 12409 Torbram Road, 12399 Torbram Road, 12381 Torbram Road and 12361 Torbram Road as these drain to the subject lands; The properties with the addresses 12484 Airport Road, 0 Airport Road (legal description CON 6 EHS PT LOT 20, REG), 12404 Airport Road, 	The Study Area for the CEISMP has been adjusted to include properties in the subwatershed.

			<p>12394 Airport Road, 12374 Airport Road and 12366 Airport Road;</p> <p>e. Have consideration for the scope (extents) of the Mobility Plan area to identify the environmental constraints and stormwater management strategy to support the transportation network; and</p> <p>Please note that subsequent comments may result in further extension of the study area to support discipline specific study requirements.</p>	
11	GEI Consultants	CEISMP Terms of Reference	<p>In comments provided in February of 2023, as per the Region of Peel Official Plan Policy 5.6.20.14.17.f, a Subwatershed Study or an equivalent study Terms of Reference for the CEISMP was requested to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Town, Region and TRCA. In lieu of the applicant providing a Terms of Reference for agency approval, Development Engineering provides the following comments to inform the scope of study required to ensure the supporting CEISMP is sufficiently detailed to comprise an adequate equivalent study. We request a meeting with the applicant to discuss the Terms of Reference. The CEISMP should be completed in a two phased approach: (1) Initial CEISMP and (2) Final CEISMP.</p> <p>a. The Initial CEISMP should be sufficiently detailed to inform and subsequently reflect the Town's preferred Secondary Plan and address all comments provided herein as well as Secondary Plan-level (OPA) comments provided previously. The Initial CEISMP should detail all environmental constraint mapping and management recommendations, including identifying the features, buffers and setback limits, as well as the permitted and non-permitted uses within the subject area, and the conceptual locations of the natural heritage system and stormwater management facility locations. The initial CEISMP should be completed prior to OPA approval.</p>	<p>a. GEI acknowledges the outlined approach and we have drafted the Initial CEISMP to be comprehensive, align with the Town's Secondary Plan, and address feasible comments.</p> <p>b. GEI acknowledges the prerequisites for the Final CEISMP and is committed to incorporating the requisite detail to ensure support for the Draft Plan Approval, while ensuring all comments are addressed to the satisfaction of the Town, Region, and TRCA.</p> <p>Meetings were held on August 17, 2023 and a site visit was subsequently held on September 20, 2023.</p>

			<p>b. The Final CEISMP should build on the Initial CEISMP and must include a sufficient level of detail to support Draft Plan Approval. As such, the Initial CEISMP must be sufficiently advanced and accepted by the Town, Region and Conservation Authority to support the Secondary Plan prior to review of the Final CEISMP that will be required to support Draft Plan Approval and subsequent approvals. As well, the applicant should be aware that the Final CEISMP will need to be updated to support any site plan approval unless it can be demonstrated that the proposed draft site plan conforms to the approved Final CEISMP. The Final CEISMP should address all comments provided to the applicant to the satisfaction of the Town, Region and TRCA prior to Draft Plan Approval.</p> <p>As noted above, we request a meeting with the applicant to discuss the above, scoped of the Initial CEISMP to support the OPA and the Final CEISMP to support draft plan approval.</p>	
12	GEI Consultants	CEISMP Characterization Study Component	<p>To adequately complete the characterization component of the CEISMP, the applicant needs to sufficiently investigate all of the resources associated with the study area including physiography, hydrology, hydraulics, hydrogeology, stream geomorphology, surface water quality, aquatic ecology and terrestrial ecology.</p> <p>Background and supplemental field data are to be assessed by each discipline, and then across disciplines, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establish the form, function and linkages of the environmental resources, - confirm, refine and identify environmental constraints and opportunities related to terrestrial and aquatic habitat, features, and systems, 	The CEISMP has been updated to include background and field data for a thorough analysis.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - establish surface water and groundwater constraints and opportunities associated with flooding, erosion, water quality, water budgets, including recharge and discharge areas through new numerical tools (models) suitably calibrated to local conditions, - Refine and implement criteria and constraints to later inform management opportunities associated with the environmental features and systems. <p>The applicant is expected to update the characterization component of the CEISMP to reflect the above stated objective and at minimum address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enhance the understanding of the study area and integrate that information with that of the Scoped Subwatershed Study and any existing Environmental Impact Studies from surrounding developments to provide context on how the components of this system work with the larger area. b. All background and supplemental field data are to be assessed for each discipline and then across disciplines to understand how the system works. c. Refine the goals, objectives and targets developed as part of the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Scoped Subwatershed Study (Wood et al., December 2021). The goals, objectives and targets should inform the management strategies presented in the Final CEISMP. d. Ensure all disciplines, including physiography, hydrology, hydraulics, hydrogeology, stream geomorphology, surface water quality, aquatic ecology and terrestrial ecology, are adequately addressed for the entirety of the study area. The 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. As is now outlined in Section 3.1.10, GEI reviewed online mapping available from the Town of Caledon and the City of Brampton related to proposed developments in proximity to the Study Area (i.e., the Subject Lands and relevant nearby properties). Based on the details provided in the City and Town's mapping applications, there are no relevant properties with development applications that may be integrated into the CEISMP. Background information has been reviewed from transportation studies related to the Mayfield Road and Airport Road widening and improvement projects. Mapping will be reviewed again during preparation of the Final CEISMP to ensure the report addresses any new proposals. b. All background and field data have been assessed as part of the Impact Assessment. This information will be used to further refine the management and restoration plan in the Final CEISMP.
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>CEISMP is to provide baseline characterization of the study area that is built on a sufficient period of field data collected and monitored, and serves as the basis from which to examine and assess potential impacts due to planned urbanization and inform appropriate mitigation strategy.</p> <p>e. Ensure that the full study area and the surrounding area is adequately characterized. The extent and form of technical investigation can vary based on the discipline and the areas of interest, with more intensive field investigations in the lands slated for development and less intensive desk-top forms of study in the lands beyond the secondary plan to provide an overall context.</p> <p>f. While the applicant has provided, under separate cover, a Fluvial Geomorphic Assessment of Salt Creek, the Town requires a full Fluvial Geomorphic Assessment to be done for the West Tributary and the East Tributary down to the confluence to inform management recommendations.</p> <p>g. The CEISMP has proposed development of a replicated wetland, low flow channel and surrounding upland vegetation communities within the identified EPA lands associated with the East Tributary. To ensure appropriate design and development of an integrated and continuous natural heritage system, additional characterization of the system to the south of Mayfield Road is required. Should the area to the south of Mayfield Road be contemplated for future development, the design of natural heritage system is to ensure harmony with the policy direction and design of that system.</p> <p>h. The CEISMP is intended to provide a wholistic picture of the study area. As such, any and all information in supporting studies that support</p>	<p>c. A new section on goals, objectives and targets of the SWS has been developed. These will be reviewed as part of the final CEISMP to inform the management and restoration plan.</p> <p>d. The CEISMP has comprehensively addressed all required disciplines, providing a thorough baseline characterization based on extensive field data to assess impacts and guide mitigation strategies for the urbanization of the study area.</p> <p>e. While extensive characterization has been completed for the entire study area, some additional investigations are currently underway (i.e. Fluvial Geomorphic Assessment of the West Humber, Geotechnical Assessment of Salt Creek etc.) and will be resolved in preparation for the Final Submission.</p> <p>f. A Fluvial Geomorphic Assessment for the West Humber River (East and West Tributaries) is currently underway and will be addressed in the Final CEISMP.</p> <p>g. The future Natural Heritage System will be designed to complement the existing system, and the refinement of these details will be incorporated into the Final CEISMP.</p> <p>h. All studies have been summarized within the CEISMP and are appended to the resubmitted version.</p> <p>i. Section 5.4 and Figure 11 have been updated.</p> <p>j. All raw data is provided in the appendices of this submission.</p> <p>k. References to the proposed changes to the Conservation Authorities Act have been removed.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>an understanding of the subject lands should be fully summarized within the CEISMP and those studies should form Appendices to the CEISMP. For example, a tree inventory was completed and summarized within the Arborist Report. A summary of the results of that study should be included within the CEISMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Section 5.4 and Figure 11 provide ecological constraints that are based on TRCA policy. The analysis must address how the proposal meets Town Official Plan policy as it relates to natural heritage. j. All raw sampling data should be provided in appendices of the CEISMP. k. Within the section characterizing watercourses and constraint ranking it was stated that there are proposed changes to the Conservation Authority Act's definition of a 'watercourse'. Given that this has not yet been implemented, the statement has no relevance and reference should be removed. The characterization of features should reflect existing policies and definitions. 	
13	GEI Consultants	CEISMP Impact Assessment	<p>The Impact Assessment component of the CEISMP requires an iterative assessment of the potential impacts of future land use changes on the natural environment and water-based system within the study area. Various options and practices for mitigating these impacts should be reviewed and management strategies to create net benefit should be advanced to the Management component of the CEISMP. The CEISMP has specifically noted a number of impacts that have not been adequately assessed. The CEISMP should be updated and resubmitted to investigate all potential impacts and address the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The impact assessment shall consider the effects of climate change to the natural heritage 	<p>The Impact Assessment component has undergone a thorough review during the Initial CEISMP stage. To enhance clarity and accessibility of the information, an Impact Table has been integrated. The assessments for net benefits will be subsequently addressed and included in the Final CEISMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A new section addressing climate change impacts and benefits from the proposed

			<p>system and water resources system, and the manner in which the proposed development and management plan may exacerbate or mitigate these impacts.</p> <p>b. The significant woodlot at the north end of the subject lands should be provided a 30 metre buffer unless the woodlot is fully characterized and the impacts of the development on the woodlot are fully assessed and demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Town that a small buffer is appropriate. The proposed Secondary Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision should be updated to reflect a 30m buffer until sufficient study has been completed and accepted by the Town of Caledon.</p> <p>c. The subject lands include lands zoned as Greenbelt NHS and Environmental Policy Area. The Region's Official Plan includes most of the features on the subject lands as part of their Greenland System (Schedule C-1). Infrastructure within the Greenbelt NHS and Environmental Policy Area is not permitted, as per the Town's Official Plan, unless it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Town, the Region and TRCA that: (1) all reasonable alternatives to locate the infrastructure outside of the Greenbelt NHS and natural features and areas have been explored, (2) that the Town's ecosystem principles, goals, objectives, policies, and performance measures have been adhered to, to the greatest extent possible, and (3) a recommend appropriate mitigation, restoration and management measures have been agreed to. Development Engineering requests that the impact of removing any component of the natural areas and features be fully investigated from a flooding, erosion, and ecological perspective. Infrastructure currently proposed within the Greenbelt, EPA and Block 13 should</p>	<p>development has been incorporated into the Initial CEIMSP.</p> <p>b. GEI has revised this buffer to be 30m.</p> <p>c. Infrastructure is not proposed within the Greenbelt, EPA or Block 13.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>be relocated to the tablelands or subsequent submission of the CEISMP should provide justification to support the location of infrastructure in accordance with the Town's Official Plan policies and to the satisfaction of the Town, the Region and TRCA.</p> <p>d. Section 7 does not appear to be consistent with the Existing Conditions and Vegetation Assessment outlined in Section 4. Similarly, the development proposal displayed on Figure 12 does not appear to be consistent with the ecological constraints displayed in Figure 11.</p> <p>e. In line with the comment above, the CEISMP recommends the rehabilitation of Watercourse 2 to restore natural channel functions and fisheries connectivity. This appears to have been missed and does not appear to be reflected in the concept plan or justified in the study.</p> <p>f. Completion of the Feature Based Water Balance component of the CEISMP for all wetlands being retained is missing and required to demonstrate no negative impacts to the wetland features and to inform the management strategy of the development.</p> <p>g. The CEISMP has indicated that the local groundwater flows towards the southeast and influenced by the West and East Tributary. Given that these receiving systems are occupied and supporting habitat for Redside Dace, the Impact Assessment needs to include investigation of the potential impacts of the development on groundwater recharge and the potential impact to the West and East Tributary. The study should discuss the level of investigation undertaken to support the Secondary Plan and identify further investigation required prior to Draft Plan Approval, if required.</p>	<p>d. The CEISMP and associated figures have been updated to ensure consistency.</p> <p>e. This is proposed to be achieved via online pond removal, as described in Section 8.3.3. Reference to this section has been added to the text and justification for online pond removals is presented therein.</p> <p>f. The Feature Based Water Balance will be addressed as part of the Final Submission of the CEISMP.</p> <p>g. The CEISMP has been updated to assess groundwater recharge.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

14	GEI Consultants	CEISMP Management Plan	<p>The Management Plan component of the CEISMP should identify and set the framework for implementation of the preferred management strategy building from the results of the impact assessment. Generally the Management Plan should sets out the requirements for phasing, operation of facilities, and monitoring to ensure the future development(s) are in compliance with the approved CEISMP. The Management strategies should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - prevent environmental degradation - provide adequate flexibility for integration with adjacent development - assist in the establishment of open space linkages - provide a strategy to manage legacy impacts from existing land uses - detail preliminary locations and areas for stormwater management (LID and end-of-pipe facilities) - identify restoration and enhancement opportunities <p>The CEISMP should be updated to present a holistic Management Plan that will guide future study and approvals. At a minimum, the following comments must be addressed in subsequent revisions of the CEISMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The CEISMP has indicated that the development will be phased. The Final CEISMP in support of Draft Plan of Subdivision will need to include a phasing strategy, the resulting interim solutions for managing impacts and the final ultimate solutions. d. The Management Strategy did not fully address the loss of habitat for a number of species that will be impacted by the change in land uses. For example, the farm buildings are identified as providing habitat to Barn Swallows. The applicant needs to consider management strategies for mitigating the impact to Barn 	<p>The preliminary management plan has been finalized as part of the Initial CEISMP. However, the Final CEISMP will encompass more comprehensive details, such as phasing, facility operations, and monitoring strategies, all of which will be based on the finalized site design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Final CEISMP will include a phasing strategy. b. A review of sensitive species on-site has been completed. Consideration of impacts to Barn Swallow nesting habitat will be made and incorporated into the final restoration plan for the north and south EPA blocks, where appropriate. Barn Swallow is no longer considered for habitat protection under the Endangered Species Act. c. The preliminary cash-in-lieu compensation memo was prepared for Block 1 and is now summarized in Section 7.2.1.1. The full version of the cash-in-lieu memo can be found in Appendix D. This memo only addresses removals within Block 1. Further cash-in-lieu calculations will be completed as required and included in the Final CEISMP. d. Replication of form and function of the features proposed for removal needs to be considered in the context of the origin of the features. The berms installed for agricultural irrigation and cattle watering necessarily ponded the drainage occurring on the Tullamore Lands. The system is not natural in origin, and it is appropriate to consider the compensation and replication strategy with a lens to this context. <p>GEI will review the compensation</p>
----	-----------------	------------------------	--	---

			<p>Swallows and other species as identified to be impacted by the development.</p> <p>e. The CEISMP references the development of a preliminary cash-in-lieu compensation plan. Should compensation be part of the Management Plan, all details of the compensation need to be outlined and included within the Final CEISMP.</p> <p>f. Please be aware that for compensation to be supported by the Town, it needs to include replication of the form and function of the features within the subwatershed from which they are removed. Currently proposed compensation does not adequately replace the form and function of the features proposed for removal or meet the NHS targets outlined in Section 8.2.1. Furthermore, the following inconsistencies will need to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Eastern Tributary and Watercourses 1 and 2 are identified as medium constraint features and two headwater drainage features are identified as having a 'conservation' management recommendation which can all be realigned/relocated using appropriate designs. However, the proposal does not include realignment/relocation of these features and the length of channel being proposed is far less than existing. ii. Several headwater drainage features are identified as having a 'mitigation' management recommendation. Section 4.5.1.5 indicates that these can be removed from the landscape with their hydrologic functions replicated by conventional stormwater management or low impact development techniques to maintain flow conveyance to downstream reaches. However, this is 	<p>strategies proposed in the Final CEIMSP to specify how NHS targets will be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Discussions with the MECP and the DFO regarding permits for these watercourses are still in progress. The realignment and/or relocation of these features will be guided by insights gained through this process. ii. Clean rooftop rainwater collection is proposed to replicate the function of the Mitigation HDFs and this contribution will input to the system at the upstream end of the southern EPA block. iii. Replication of XX ha of wetland is proposed in the southern EPA block, and substantial wetland restoration, including buckthorn management, conversion of a manmade pond to turtle habitat, and removal of bridge abutments from Redside Dace habitat in Salt Creek is proposed as part of the northern EPA block. The balance of compensation for the removal of manmade ponds occurring only as a result of berms installed to facilitate agricultural practices occurs through an improvement to the overall system, reduced thermal loading to downstream habitat, and overall improvement in flows, in combination with appropriate compensation mechanisms to be refined through Detail Design.
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>not consistent with the management outlined in the Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment Guidelines which indicate that mitigation of contributing functions is to be provided through lot-level conveyance swales, bioswales, or constructed wetlands. Please note that stormwater discharge from end-of-pipe facilities, as proposed in Blocks 14 and 15, is not consistent with the guidelines.</p> <p>iii. Section 7.3 indicates that the wetlands impacted by the development plan will be replicated. However, while 7.3ha of wetland and their buffers are proposed for removal, only 3.34 ha of restoration area is being proposed. Further, the complement of restoration areas include a buffer to the northern woodland and an area adjacent to the existing Salt Creek corridor. In addition to being in a different subwatershed than the wetlands proposed for removal, it is not clear that these areas can support wetland creation. Therefore, it appears that the form and function of the wetlands proposed for removal would not be appropriately compensated.</p> <p>iv. Section 7.3 indicates that additional headwater drainage feature studies are underway in spring 2023. As the management recommendations for this additional headwater drainage features should be included in the resubmission of the Initial CEISMP.</p> <p>e. The Management Plan should recommend the technical framework for future infrastructure works and support the future development proposals. As such, the full extent of the natural heritage system strategy and the location of public infrastructure, most notably public roads</p>	<p>iv. Headwater drainage feature studies completed in Spring 2023 and were updated in the report.</p> <p>e. This will be addressed in the final CEISMP, once additional information from Crozier, MECP, and DFO is available, ensuring a comprehensive approach to the natural heritage system strategy, public infrastructure placement, and stormwater management practices.</p> <p>f. A new section on additional studies has been added to the report.</p> <p>g. Information on management recommendations for groundwater recharge and water quality have been added into the Initial CEISMP.</p> <p>h. A feature based water balance to support wetland restoration will be completed for the Final CEISMP.</p> <p>i. As stated in Section 8.3.2, reach-scale watercourse management recommendations will be addressed through the Final CEISMP.</p> <p>j. The report has been updated to ensure consistent numbers.</p> <p>k.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

and stormwater management practices, need to be reflected within the CEISMP and justified to the satisfaction of the Town. The stormwater management strategy will need to outline the siting for various components of the overall stormwater management plan, including key locations for facilities and general guidance for selecting green infrastructure and LID practices to manage the impacts to the Natural Heritage System and Water Resources System. The CEISMP is to identify preliminary locations for logical development blocks drainage sheds for consideration as part of future neighbourhood plans.

- f. The scope for additional studies to be completed in support of future Site Plans to meet the objectives and targets of the CEISMP will also need to be identified as part of the Management Plan. The scope for additional studies should include requirements to complete hydrologic and/or hydraulic modelling to verify the stormwater management criteria established as part of the FSR & SWM Plan are met with the development of each site plan.
- g. Management strategies are required that will reflect the local and functional linkages of sensitive groundwater recharge and discharge areas, the potential groundwater quantity impacts on the private wells and groundwater quality degradation. Groundwater management strategies should include technical input (quantitative and qualitative) into the determination or refinement of hydrogeologically sensitive areas relating to both recharge and discharge, as well as planning and policy recommendations for groundwater quantity and quality protection.
- h. The CEISMP indicates that a water balance assessment for the new wetland block will be provided at detailed design. As a minimum the

			<p>applicant will need to demonstrate how the wetland restoration areas will be supported hydrologically as part of the CEISMP.</p> <p>i. The Management Plan should include watercourse management recommendations to be made at the reach scale and based on an integrated characterization of feature constraints.</p> <p>j. Please note the amount of proposed wetland removal and compensation outlined in Section 8.2 (2.2 ha and 2.3 ha, respectively) is not consistent with the remainder of the report.</p>	
15	GEI Consultants	CEISMP Policy Conformance Assessment	<p>The CEISMP must address all applicable environmental planning policies. The CEISMP is intended to clearly reference relevant policy, legislative and technical requirements and describe how the proposed Management Plan meets or exceeds these requirements. A summary of applicable federal, provincial, and municipal environmental planning policies and regulations relevant to the application and an evaluation of how the land use plan complies with the applicable environmental policies and legislation needs to be provided. While it is the applicants responsibility to ensure all environmental planning policies are addressed within the CEISMP, the following provides some of the obvious components that have yet to be sufficiently discussed:</p> <p>a. Both occupied and contributing habitat for provincially listed Species at Risk is present on the subject lands. As such, this habitat is to be protected in accordance with the provisions of the Endangered Species Act and its regulations (Ontario Regulation 242/08). If a proposed activity has the potential to impact the habitats of threatened or endangered species, then the activity must be authorized by Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). Similarly, there are Federally identified Species at Risk on the subject lands and as such any proposed activities should be done so in</p>	<p>a. MECP and DFO will be consulted throughout the process and the appropriate approvals will be obtain to support the proposed works.</p> <p>b. The Request for Review process with the DFO is currently underway to address these concerns.</p> <p>c. The MBCA and considerations around timing windows has been added to the report.</p> <p>d. The policies have been referenced in the Initial CEISMP, and for the development of the final restoration plan as well as on-site compensation, these policies will serve as guiding principles.</p> <p>e. The Initial CEISMP has been updated to include these policies and provide an initial discussion on how these policies will be met. Further revisions to this section will occur for the Final CEISMP.</p>

accordance with the Species at Risk Act (2002). The applicant must demonstrate confirmation that MECP and DFO support the proposal, in accordance with Town policy conformance. Consultation with MECP should also address the Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark observations.

- b. Fish habitat is present on the subject lands. Development activities taking place in or near water may affect fisheries by adversely affecting fish or fish habitat. Under the Fisheries Act, DFO recommends that proponents of these activities should undergo the following: (1) Understand the types of impacts their projects are likely to cause; (2) Take measures to avoid and mitigate impacts to the extent possible; and (3) Request authorization from the Minister and abide by the conditions of any such authorization, when it is not possible to avoid and mitigate impacts of projects that are likely to cause serious harm to fish. The applicant must demonstrate to the Town that the proposed removal of any features has been properly vetted through DFO.
- c. The Management Plan has had no regard for the Migratory Birds Convention Act (1994) and should be updated to do so given the proposed removal of trees.
- d. The Region of Peel's Official Plan identifies the majority of Watercourse 1 and Watercourse 2 of the East Tributary as part of the Region's Greenland System (Schedule C-1). The applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Town and the Region that the proposed plan is done in accordance with the policies of the Region's Official Plan as they relate to the Greenland System, including but not limited to Policy 2.14.7 and 2.14.8.
- e. The Town's Official Plan contains detailed Ecosystem Planning and Management policies and the fundamental objective of these policies

			<p>is to ensure that as land uses change and development occurs, the integrity of Caledon's ecosystem is protected, maintained and, as appropriate, restored and enhanced. To this end, Section 3.1 of the Official Plan establishes detailed Ecosystem Objectives and outlines an overall Ecosystem Planning Strategy, including an Ecosystem Framework and Performance Measures, which must guide planning and development decisions. Section 5.7 of the Town's Official Plan contains further detailed policies regarding the Town's Environmental Policy Area land use designation and the requirement for studies. While the MZO has changed the designation of the Environmental Policy Area within the subject lands, the Ecosystem Planning and Management policies e. Stormwater management design is being led by Crozier. Updates will be made to the CEISMP based on the Crozier's provided design.of the Town's Official Plan still apply. In line with the Town's Official Plan, all effort should be made to protect, maintain and restore ecosystem functions and processes of natural core areas and corridors. The applicant needs to demonstrate how this has been achieved within the CEISMP Management Plan.</p>	
	<p>GEI Consultants & Croziers</p>	<p>CEISMP-Stormwater Management</p>	<p>a. As part of the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Scoped Subwatershed Study (SABE Study) it is recommended that for the West Humber Watershed stormwater management for quantity controls would be required to control post-development flows to pre-development levels for all events including the Regional Storm event, in order to mitigate both local and subwatershed-scale flood risks. Analyses completed by TRCA for the Humber River SWM Quantity Control Criteria Updates (WSP, November 2, 2020) have concluded that over-control of peak flows would be required to</p>	<p>a. GEI has initiated a comprehensive water quality program, currently in progress, with findings and data to be integrated into the Final CEISMP. This aligns with the recommendations from the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion Scoped Subwatershed Study (SABE Study) for the West Humber Watershed. b. GEI has initiated a comprehensive water quality program, currently in progress, with findings and data to be integrated into the Final CEISMP. c. Stormwater Management Blocks have been identified as such, and wetlands proposed for</p>

achieve watershed-scale flood protection, based on the application of synthetic design storms for hydrologic analysis. The requirements for stormwater management are thus to be established as part of future studies (i.e. local SWSs) and are recommended to apply continuous simulation and account for the spatial variability in rainfall across the watershed.

- b. Furthermore, as per the SABE Study water quality criteria for this receiver is 80% TSS removal (and less than 25 mg/L above background conditions), thermal (below 24 degree Celsius), dissolved oxygen of at least 7 mg/L. As indicated previously, water quality monitoring to understand baseline conditions is required to properly inform the stormwater strategy. The CEISMP must have regard for the recommendations of the SABE Study, monitoring requirements and establish targets for development, accordingly
- c. The Town views stormwater management facilities as strictly infrastructure that requires ongoing operation and maintenance. As such, the Town does not support the use of constructed wetlands as compensation for removal of any natural features.
- d. The Town does not support deferring the water balance assessment to detailed design, as currently proposed. In accordance with Town's Terms of Reference for a Water Balance Assessment and TRCA requirements, this work needs to be completed as part of the Final CEISMP, prior to Draft Plan Approval. Subsequently, development of each block will be required to ensure that the water balance requirements are met prior to Site Plan approval.

replication as part of the compensation plan will be within EPA blocks.

- d. The site water balance has been completed by Crozier. Feature-based water balance will be completed as part of the Final CEISMP.
- e. Stormwater management design is being led by Crozier. Updates will be made to the CEISMP based on the Crozier's provided design.

			<p>e. The location and the design of all stormwater management facilities need to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Town's Official Plan policies prohibit development within woodlot core areas and wetland core areas. For these features within the study area, the corresponding drainage area, feature based water balance and hydroperiod must be maintained post-development. The quality of water directed to significant environmental features must be considered clean and free of high concentrations of contaminants of concern, be of enhanced quality, and have no thermal impacts on the receiving system. ii. The design of the stormwater management facilities must consider and mitigate any impacts to the receiving system, including and not limited to design considerations for receiving system classified as Redside Dace occupied. iii. As indicated through previously provided comments, all public roads must drain to and be managed by stormwater management facilities that will be owned and operated by the Town. iv. The applicant will need to update the CEISMP to address location, design consideration for stormwater infrastructure, and discuss and justify ecological siting of infrastructure to support the natural heritage system to the satisfaction of the Town and TRCA. 	
17	GEI Consultants	CEISMP	Please note that the following CEISMP referenced material not provided. To support a fulsome review	a. Figure 8 and 9 are attached as part of Appendix A. Figure 13 was erroneously

			of the CEISMP please ensure all referenced material is included and specifically: a. Figure 8, Figure 9 and Figure 13 of Appendix A b. Preliminary cash-in-lieu calculation Appendix C	included in the text of the last CEISMP submission. b. The preliminary cash-in-lieu compensation memo has been included in Appendix D.
Town of Caledon, Engineering, Public Works and Transportation Department, Development Engineering				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
18	Crozier	Traffic Impact Study	Road Network: The Town has reviewed the proposed road network. The Town requested a continuous east/west road network through the site while the current proposal has a fragmented road network. This requirement was noted through various discussions and design charettes with the applicant. Knowing there are significant environmental features that make a continuous east/west road north of the proposed development more challenging, the Town would like the applicant to explore another location for a continuous Street C from Torbram Road to Airport Road. Alternatively, the applicant can keep Street C in its current location and explore including another collector road from Street B to Airport Road roughly 400m north of Street A. This will include assessing the feasibility of connecting Potential Collector 3 (Figure 19 of Crozier's Transportation Impact Study) to the future street. The CEISMP is to be updated to reflect any proposed changes that arise from this investigation and final road pattern. This comment must be addressed in support of the proposed Secondary Plan and prior to approval of the OPA.	There are additional environmental constraints that would make providing a continuous east-west Street C infeasible. Block 9 which fronts airport road serves as an EPA block and would therefore prohibit an east west connection through this area should Street C be extended eastwards to Airport Road. In addition, the Norris Bridge currently exists along Airport Road where a Street C extension would intersect with Airport Road, adding additional constraints for infrastructure associated with a new connection such as southbound right turn lanes. The feasibility of providing an additional east-west collector between Blocks 3 and 4 connecting Street B to Airport Road has been reviewed and a new reserve block (Block 6 - Future Potential Street D) has been added in the updated Draft Plans. Section 8 has been revised to further describe the local constraints associated with establishing a local collector network. The plan has been revised to reflect the inclusion of an additional east west collector between Street B and Airport Road approximately 400m north of Street B. Figure 19 has also been updated accordingly.
19	Crozier	Functional Servicing Report (FSR)	The Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report will be peer reviewed at the applicant's expense to confirm that the stormwater management strategy proposed is consistent with the overarching studies and reports. In addition, the following are to be addressed: a. The development to the south of the proposed subdivision was designed to accepted 9.20 Ha of drainage at a runoff coefficient of 0.25. The FSR indicates that 4.9 Ha of land drains to a Town	Noted. a. The pre-development flow towards the neighbouring property was reviewed (due to new information regarding the existing swale along the property line) and it was determined that the total area directed to the neighboring property under existing conditions is 7.7 ha (Catchment 109). The post-development grading design for

owned stormwater management pond near Mayfield Road, however under the post development conditions this drainage area is diverted to the proposed wetlands. The Town requires that these existing flows be maintained to the existing stormwater management pond at predevelopment levels to ensure the pond continues to function as design and does not become starved for water.

- b. There is a portion of the Torbram Road right of way that is shown as Ext4 on the Post Drainage Plan. Torbram Road will be widened to a 35 m right of way in the future so the FSR should speak to how this additional flow could be accommodated in the proposed stormwater network.
- c. The CEISMP identifies that thermal mitigation is required as the receiving stream is Redside Dace habitat. The FSR indicates that mitigation will be provided through bottom draw outlet as well as ample vegetation providing shade over the facilities. Currently the plans show the wetland as being only 0.3 m in depth with no bottom draw so it is unclear how thermal mitigation will be achieved through this method. Additionally, it will take some time before the vegetation around the pond will be sufficient in size to provide enough shade for thermal mitigation. The CEISMP and FSR should speak to interim thermal mitigation measures as well as sizing of the deep pool if this SWM strategy is going to be utilized.

Block 5 was also reviewed for opportunity to redirect some drainage to maintain existing conditions. It was determined that parts of the proposed landscape area within the east and south boundaries of Block 5 can be routed to direct flow south towards the neighbour. The neighbouring pond was modeled under pre-development and post-development conditions to ensure the pond continues to function as designed. Refer to Section 5.4 of the updated report for more details.

- b. drainage patterns should be maintained, therefore, existing external drainage from Torbram into the site will be accommodated for in the stormwater management design. Note, the majority of the Torbram ROW drains to the Greenbelt under existing conditions. Catchment EXT3B, which includes the Torbram ROW, will be conveyed through Block 8 and similarly through the proposed SWM facilities. Drainage will be captured by Block 8's storm sewer system and conveyed to the proposed SWM facilities through a flow splitter. Refer to Section 5.8.2 and Figure X for more details.
- c. Deep pools are not proposed since the SWM facilities are wetlands, any references to deep have been removed from the CEISMP. Providing vegetation shading is sufficient to provide the required thermal mitigation within wetlands. Further coordination will be completed at detailed design to ensure fast growing and dense vegetation is planted within the wetlands. Wording indicating this has been added to Section 5.8.4 of the updated SWM Report.

20	Croziers	SWM & Functional Servicing Report	<p>Following the meeting held on August 17, 2023, Development Engineering provides the additional comments on the site water balance:</p> <p>a) In line with the Town's Terms of Reference for a site water balance, the Town requires the use of a 30-year temperature and precipitation climate normal data set from the closest Environment Canada climate station to the subject lands that meets the WMO Standard. The Woodbridge Climate Station climate normal are based on a minimum of 15 years of data but less than 20 years. We recommend the use of the Richmond Hill Climate Station.</p> <p>b) Please provide justification for the Infiltration Factors presented in the Water Budget Assessment for pre-development and post-development conditions for both the pervious and impervious areas. It is unclear whether these are the appropriate Factors. Further explanation will clarify their appropriateness.</p> <p>c) The Town requests a figure that clearly depicts the pre- and post- development pervious and impervious areas be provided to support confirming the area values presented in the calculations within Appendix D.</p> <p>d) It is unclear how the applicant is meeting the pre-development total infiltration target post-development. The table on page 263 calculates a total infiltration target of 189047 m³/year. In a post-development scenario the table on page 264 indicates that there will remain a pervious area that will achieve an infiltration target of 20730 m³/year. The remaining portion of the total infiltration target must be met through mitigation measures however looking at the Design Storm Determination tables it does not appear that the full infiltration target is met. Please clearly indicate the total infiltration target to be met on each site in a post-development scenario that equates to the total infiltration deficit.</p>	<p>a. The Site water balance has been updated to use the Richmond Hill Climate Station accordingly.</p> <p>b. Notes have been added to the calculations in Appendix D to provide clarification on the factors used.</p> <p>c. Refer to Figure X for the pre-development land cover. The post-development land cover is unknown at this time however, assumptions have been made based on minimum landscape requirements for the blocks and ROW, these assumptions are stated in Section 5.11 of the report and within Figure XX (LID figure).</p> <p>d. The report sets the targets for the blocks to achieve the water balance. A figure showing potential LID areas and sizes required to meet the water balance/erosion control target is provided with this resubmission. Refer to Figure XX for more details.</p> <p>e. Noted and updated in the SWM report accordingly. Refer to Section 5.11 for more details.</p>
----	----------	-----------------------------------	--	---

			e) The minimum acceptable infiltration target to meet water balance is 5 mm. Should the infiltration target be determined to be less than 5 mm through the site water balance assessment, the applicant should default to a minimum of 5 mm.	
Town of Caledon, Engineering, Public Works and Transportation Department, Transportation Engineering				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
21	Crozier	Traffic Impact Study	Section 2.3; ONGOING COMMENT - More details such as frequency and route map should be provided for the transit services in the study area. Thank you for appending a map & stating number of busses per direction per day. Please discuss transit service periods and typical frequency.	Section 2.3 has been updated to include a table with service periods and typical frequency.
22	Crozier	Traffic Impact Study	Section 4.3; It is noted that truck drivers have been routed to the intersection of Airport Road and Mayfield Road despite failing operations and excessive delays. What measures will the applicants and future occupants take to prevent truck drivers from accessing Town Roads not designed for heavy truck traffic?	<p>Pursuant to the Towns by law, heavy trucks are not currently permitted Torbram Road. Tenants will be required to inform expected deliveries about permitted routes which is typical in the operations of warehouse land use facilities. Future Tenants who may also require LCV routes will require approval from MTO which will also take into account truck route prohibitions by the Town.</p> <p>We further note that particularly with the early phases of the development, no truck access to Torbram Road is accounted for within the Block designs. It should be noted that the delays at the Airport Road at Mayfield intersection are primarily due to key turning movements and through movements are operating below capacity. Truck drivers traveling from the west or east on Mayfield Road can navigate this intersection via the lower delay through movements and enter the industrial park via the Street B signalized intersection. Similarly, trucks already travelling along Airport Road can enter via the Street A signalized intersection, also utilizing the lower delay through movements at the Airport Road at Mayfield intersection. Given Street C's location within the industrial park, it would be a circuitous route for</p>

				truck drivers to access the facility via Street C to access the majority of the truck areas.
23	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 9; If Transportation Demand Management is to be used to support a parking reduction this section should be updated to include specific measures and their anticipated impact on the parking requirements of the site. This reduction in parking demand should be supported by data.	The TDM measures are proposed to support reduced SOV trips as well as the Town's sustainable travel objectives. Each block provides the required parking per the Town's zoning by law, the TDM measures are not proposed as a justification for reduced parking. Should individual sites wish to justify a reduced parking rate in the future, TDM impacts and other justification means would be required during Site Plan Applications.
24	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	<p>Section 9.2; ONGOING COMMENT- In addition to the transit recommendations provided in the 1st TIS submission, please include recommendations on appropriate bus stop locations along the new public roads to provide adequate transit coverage for the development.</p> <p>a) The proposed bus stop locations and shelters should be included as part of the detailed design of Streets A and B. Please note that where busses are to make a left turn Brampton transit often prefers far side bus stops. Subject to confirmation by Brampton Transit the internal bus stops at the intersection of Street A and B should be consolidated to a single transit stop after exiting the intersection in the southbound direction.</p> <p>b) Street C is not proposed to be served by transit, please comment on the anticipated walking distance from the proposed internal bus stops and if That distance is considered an acceptable level of service.</p>	<p>Section 9.2 has been revised accordingly. Figure 21 has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>During the detailed design of the internal collector network, bus stop locations and turning movements will be included for review. This is noted in the TIS report section 9.2 for reference.</p> <p>Conceptual bus stops have also been identified on the Concept Plan, and will be confirmed following continued discussions with the Town and Brampton Transit. Regardless, the proposed bus stops will be accommodated within the collector road ROW.</p>
25	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 2.2; please note that Mayfield Road has a posted speed limit of 80km/h approximately 460 m west of Airport Road.	Noted. Section 2.2 has been updated accordingly.
26	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 2.4; Please ensure that the latest turning movement counts, dated 2022, are included in the Appendices. Currently, the data in Table 2 and Figure 4 does not align with the information provided in the appendix. It is important to include the updated data in the appendices of the revised Transportation	Appendix E has been updated with the most recent and utilized Turning Movement Counts.

			Impact Study (TIS), especially considering the concerns raised by residents during the public information session on June 13th, 2023, held during the planning and development committee public meeting of the council.	
27	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Figure 3; For the intersection of 12333 Airport Road driveway at Airport Road, please include a westbound left turn lane and correct the address. The address currently states '1233 Airport Road' as opposed to '12333 Airport Road'.	Figure 3 has been revised accordingly.
28	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 2.6; Please note some existing Sim Traffic Reports report 95th percentile queues exceeding the available storage length while this is not reflected in the Existing Levels of Service Reported in Table 3. Please ensure conclusions and recommendations are updated as required.	Section 2.6 – Table 3 has been revised accordingly.
29	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 3.2; OUTSTANDING COMMENT - As per the requested TOR comments, the background development situated at 0 Airport Road and 6034 Mayfield Road (OPA 2021-0008 – 0 Airport Road) should be incorporated into the report. a) OPA 2021-0008 – 0 Airport Road (TIS can be found here: https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/0-airport-road-and-6034-mayfield-road.aspx) b) b) Please either include this study or provide justification for not including this study	The background trip assignments associated with the 6034 Mayfield Road TIS were included in the analysis and Future Background volumes per Figure 6 of the previous TIS submission. However the list of the developments was not updated to reflect this inclusion. Table 4 of the TIS Addendum (October 2023) has been updated to reflect this. Note, the future background volumes would be unchanged as these volumes were already included in the previous submission.
30	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 3.2.2; the report states that Figure 5-3 from the Cole report was used. Figure 5-3 provided in Appendix I shows the lane configurations and not site volumes. Please correct the text within the report to refer to the appropriate figure number. Additionally, it is requested that individual background developments figures for each horizon year, as applied to the study intersections, be appended.	Appendix I has been revised to include the site volumes from the Cole report. Sub-figures have been included as Figures 6A, 6B, and 6C to reflect the individual background developments figures for each horizon year
31	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 3.4; ONGOING COMMENT: Please provide lane configuration figures for the future road network differentiating between planned improvements by the Region/Town and recommendations from the Background	Figure 5 has been revised to reflect Town vs Background development recommendations. Figure 8 has also been revised to reflect background vs Future Total development recommendations.

			developments. This can be achieved by color coding the existing Figure 8.	
32	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 3.6; report states that for the intersection of Mayfield Road at Torbram Road is projected to have a maximum v/c ratio of 1.05 for the westbound left turn movement, it also states that there is reserve capacity to accommodate future growth. If there are movements operating above the capacity (v/c > 1.0), the intersection does not have reserve capacity. Please correct the verbiage to describe the intersection operations.	The Section 3.6 verbiage has been updated.
33	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 4.3; There is a discrepancy in the use of different TTS Data for the AM and PM periods in the appendix, while only AM data is summarized in Table 17. It is important to ensure that the table references both peak periods within the report. In future applications with the Town, it is recommended to summarize all TTS data in the main body of the report for clarity and consistency.	Table 17 has been revised to reflect the PM distribution and summary. Note, this will not impact the analysis as the revisions provide clarification. The PM distribution was used in the analysis.
34	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 8; The applicant states that Street C has the opportunity to the west (though environmental protection) but not to the east due to environmental protections. Transportation Engineering defers to staff more experienced with Environmental restrictions in reviewing the validity of this argument.	Noted. Section 8.0 provides additional detail on constraints associated with extending Street C east.
35	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 8; It is noted that slight curves have been included in the design for Street A and Street C. Please provide justification for the proposed roadway orientation.	The slight curves noted comply with the min radii per the Town's engineering design criteria. The curves are also required to ensure the intersection angles satisfy the Town's requirement of 85-95 degrees for the collector-collector intersections, considering the requirements to connect with existing intersections.
36	Croziers	Traffic Impact Study	Section 8; Transportation Staff is requesting a feasibility study to assess the viability of a potential new east-west collector roadway that would connect Street B to the 'Potential Collector 3' roadways. The proposed location for this potential roadway is approximately 400m north of the planned intersection of Street A and Airport Road.	Noted. Section 8.0 discusses the viability of providing an additional east-west collector between Street A and Street C.

37	Crozier	Traffic Impact Study	Please explore the possibility of extending the existing sidewalk at Airport and Mayfield, westward to connect into the proposed SWM trail. Please also provide a direct connection from the SWP trail to the intersection of Street B and Mayfield	There are a number of constraints associated with extended the existing sidewalk at Airport Road and Mayfield Road, given the culvert crossing, OGS structure and grading constraints. Similar constraints also prohibit pedestrian facilities west of Street B as previously discussed with the Region. However, sidewalk connections along the north side of Mayfield Road have been proposed between Street B and the SWM pond limits, and illustrated in the Functional Design. Further discussion with the Region is expected during detail design of Street B and Mayfield intersection.	
38	Crozier	Traffic Impact Study	Please note that Transportation Engineering reserves the right for additional comments based on a revised submission. Transportation Engineering requests that the Traffic Consultant provide a response with the re-submission package clearly reiterating the Town's comments in order and including details for how each comment has been addressed	Noted.	
Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Development Planning					
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response	
39	Rice Group & Weston Consulting	Public Comments Memo	A response to the public comments received during the first circulation was not submitted as part of this resubmission. Additional comments have been received (including those comments from the second Public Meeting) and further comments may be received before the third submission. A public comment response document is required with your resubmission that addresses these comments. This is required prior to any report being brought forward to Council on this matter.	A Public Comments Response Matrix has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.	
40	Rice Group & Earthworks Archaeology	Indigenous Letter	Written confirmation is required to confirm that meaningful consultation with indigenous communities has occurred.	Written Confirmation has been provided as part of our resubmission package.	
41	a	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Page 13 of the PJR discusses the GTA West Corridor, but the references to the Focused Analysis Area figures don't match the figures provided. Please ensure that future submissions include all referenced figures.	GTA West Corridor figures have been updated and included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.

41	b	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Further information is needed about how transit users will be able to access the subject lands. It is not appropriate for transit users to be walking along roadways without sidewalks. Please clarify if Brampton Transit has been consulted to determine if existing bus routes can be extended through the proposed development.	Brampton Transit and the Town have been consulted. It is our understanding that the Town currently pays Brampton Transit until such time as the Town can provide service in the future. Details pertaining to potential bus routes and bus stops have been highlighted in the revised Traffic Impact Study.
41	c	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Page 23 of the PJR notes that the heritage house is being moved to the Greenbelt portion of the property, but based on the submitted draft plan, it appears that the relocation lot is outside of the Greenbelt Plan area. Page 23 also notes that the new farmhouse location is reflected in the zoning by-law amendment schedule, but no revised zoning by-law amendment was submitted. The lands receiving the house will need to be designated and zoned appropriately to accommodate the farmhouse. The lands are designated Urban System/Designated Greenfield Area in the Region's Official Plan. As per the Heritage comments, further discussions on the location of the relocated heritage resources is required.	The farmhouse is proposed to be relocated to Block 10 of the Draft Plan of Subdivision. The Official Plan Amendment has been revised to redesignate this portion of the subject lands "Urban System/Designated Greenfield" in accordance with the Regional Official Plan.
41	d	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	The sound mitigation plan in the Noise Study recommends sound barriers ranging from 2.4m to 10m to meet the guideline limits. The maximum barrier wall height in the Town is 2.4m, and the rest of the required height must be accommodated through the use of a berm. The PJR references the wrong barrier heights on page 26, and these barriers are not clearly identified on the Concept Site Plan, or the landscape plan. These plans must be revised to identify sound barrier locations and design. i) The urban design brief must also assess the design and impacts of the proposed sound barriers.	Planning Response Letter has been updated.
41	e	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Page 33 should have included analysis of section 2.12.12.2.7 of the ROP related to land use compatibility and mitigation between agricultural and non-agricultural uses.	An analysis of Section 2.12.12.2.7 of the ROP has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.

41	f	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Page 43 of the PJR notes that the development preserves and protects the existing natural environmental features, but this has not yet been demonstrated in the CEISMP to the satisfaction of Town staff.	Revised CEISMP and Planning Justification Report provided to reflect comments received by Town Staff.
41	g	Urbanmetrics	Fiscal Impact Assessment Report	Page 48 makes reference to a Fiscal Impact Assessment from Urban Metrics relating to employment generation for the development. Please submit the Urban Metrics Fiscal Impact Assessment as it is a supporting document.	Urbanmetrics report provided as part of latest submission.
41	h	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	The PJR defers the analysis of section 5.5.7 of the Official Plan, but there is a concurrent DART and subdivision application proceeding, therefore an assessment of section 5.5.7 should be provided in the next submission by way of a memo or addendum to the PJR.	An analysis of Section 5.5.7 has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.
41	i	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	If future iterations of the development propose infrastructure in lands designated EPA, analysis of section 7.3 of the Town's OP will be required. New infrastructure is only permitted in EPA lands in cases where an EIS or MP demonstrates that there are no reasonable alternative locations for the infrastructure.	An analysis of Section 5.7.3 has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.
41	j	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	The PJR notes that details related to section 3.1 of the Town's Official Plan will be provided in future submission. This information must be included in all future submissions.	An analysis of Section 3.1 has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.
41	k	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	In accordance with section 4.1.8 of the Official Plan, more detail is required related to how the development will constitute a complete community and provide transportation choice.	Please see Planning Response Letter for an analysis of how the proposed development constitutes a complete community in accordance with Section 4.1.8.
41	l	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Section 5.6 should include analysis of the following sections of the Official Plan: i. Policies of section 5.7 of the Official Plan will continue to apply to the Greenbelt Plan lands which should remain in the EPA designation. No development should be proposed in this area. ii. Page 54 notes that the TIS recommends further discussions with transit providers to identify and protect future routes. Further	i. Acknowledged. ii. Proposed Bus Stop locations have been highlighted in the revised TIS. iii. Section 5.9.5.9 has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting. Future Site Plan applications will address bicycle parking requirements. iv. Section 5.10.7 (including 5.10.7.2.6 and 5.10.7.2.7) and 7.8 (including 7.8.1.3.3,

				<p>information related to these discussions is required and the bus stops should be provided for on the concept plan.</p> <p>iii. Section 5.9.5.9 is not discussed in the PJR, Active transportation needs to be assessed on the subject lands. At the site plan stage, bicycle parking should be provided in accordance with the recommendations of Section 10 of the Transportation Impact Study. The recommended bicycle parking rates are in accordance with the Peel Region Healthy Study framework, being 0.06 units per 100 sq.m. for occupants and 0.1 for 100 sq.m. for visitors.</p> <p>iv. 5.10.7 (including 5.10.7.2.6 and 5.10.7.2.7) and 7.8 (including 7.8.1.3.3, 7.8.2, 7.8.4.2, 7.8.5.4, 7.8.5.5, 7.8.7. 7.8.8, 7.8.9) should be assessed as the subject lands are being added to the Tullamore Industrial/Commercial Centre.</p> <p>v. The PJR notes that EPA is proposed for the Greenbelt Plan area, but the proposed Official Plan amendment identifies the lands as Rural, please correct the Official Plan amendment text and schedule. If the designation of the Greenbelt lands is proposed to be amended, this analysis needs to be provided in the PJR or an addendum. This analysis should include but is not limited to section 7.13 and section 5.7 of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>7.8.2, 7.8.4.2, 7.8.5.4, 7.8.5.5, 7.8.7. 7.8.8, 7.8.9) have been included.</p> <p>v. The OPA has been revised.</p>
41	m	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	The Town does not support the proposed park location.	The park has been removed from the Draft Plan in accordance with comments from Staff.
41	n	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Report	Section 5 of the Town's Draft Official Plan relates to climate change. This section of the Draft Official Plan should be considered and incorporated into the updates to the site's design. The PJR notes that further details of the sustainable development principles for the proposed development will be provided in future submissions, but some of these details may need to be incorporated into the Official	A discussion of Section 5 of the Town's Draft OP has been included in the Planning Response Letter prepared by Weston Consulting.

				Plan Amendment, and/or Draft Plan of Subdivision. Deferring these issues to future submissions could slow down the approvals for the development. The applicant is encouraged to provide these details in their resubmission.	
42	a	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	The legal description in the draft Official Plan Amendment and draft Zoning By-law Amendment should read as follows: i. Part of Lot 17 to 20, Concession 6 EHS (Chinguacousy); Road Allowance between Lots 17 and 18, Concession 6 EHS (Chinguacousy).	OPA has been revised.
42	b	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	The Official Plan Amendment should be amending Section 7.8 Tullamore Secondary Plan and the relevant Schedules and Figures of the Official Plan, to expand the Secondary Plan to include these lands. Please revise the proposed Official Plan Amendment accordingly.	Section 7.8 has been included.
42	c	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	In the text of the Official Plan Amendment (OPA), one section should be added to the Official Plan to capture all proposed special provisions and referencing the issued MZO instead of amending various sections of the Official Plan separately. For example the following special provisions should be noted: i. Notwithstanding Section 5.5.3.10, for the lands identified as Prestige Industrial on Schedule 'A' attached hereto, commercial use shall be permitted adjacent to a provincial or arterial road. ii. Notwithstanding Section 5.5.4, for the lands identified as Prestige Industrial on Schedule 'A' attached hereto, open storage areas are permitted on the subject lands. iii. Notwithstanding Section 5.5.4.1, for the lands identified as Prestige Industrial on Schedule 'A' attached hereto, the following uses shall be permitted: 1. Cold Storage Warehouses; 2. Accessory open storage areas;	The OPA has been revised accordingly.

				<p>3. Accessory outside display or sales areas; and</p> <p>4. Retail stores in accordance with section 5.5.3.9</p>	
42	d	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	<p>The Official Plan amendment should be consistent with the approved MZO. The industrial land use designation should be Prestige Industrial and the Greenbelt lands should be designated as Environmental Policy Area. The Peel Region Official Plan continues to identify the Greenbelt Lands as Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>i. The MP zoned area of the subject lands should be designated Prestige Industrial with site-specific provisions as outlined above.</p> <p>ii. The Greenbelt Plan and Region of Peel Official Plan identify a portion of the subject lands as Protected Countryside, Natural Heritage System – these lands are not appropriate to be redesignated as Rural and no justification for this change was provided in the PJR. The lands are to be designated Environmental Policy Area.</p> <p>iii. The corner of Torbram Road and Mayfield Road should be redesignated in conformance with the Region of Peel Official Plan which designates the lands as part of the Urban System, Designated Greenfield Area, but not employment. A designation does not appear to be proposed at this time. Should the above noted lands be proposed as the new location for the Heritage Farmhouse, and as such, the Draft Plan of Subdivision will not be approved until the lands proposed to accommodate the relocated Heritage Farmhouse are designated appropriately. If the lands are proposed to be redesignated, justification for the new land use designation should be provided in the PJR.</p>	<p>The Official Plan has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>i. The subject lands have been redesignated Prestige Industrial.</p> <p>ii. This portion of the subject lands has been designated EPA.</p> <p>The corner of Torbram Road and Mayfield has been redesignated Urban System in accordance with the Regional Official Plan</p>

				iv. The park designation should be removed, cash in lieu is requested instead.	
42	e	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	The Official Plan Amendment will need to amend Schedules A, F, J, K, L, N, O, S and Figure 1 and Appendices I, II and III. All schedules which identify the current Tullamore Industrial/Commercial Centre need to be amended to reflect the new settlement area boundaries.	These schedules have been amended. Please refer to revised Official Plan Amendment.
42	f	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	The Settlement area boundary needs to be amended and identified on the proposed Official Plan Amendment Schedules to align with the approved MZO and Region of Peel Official Plan (ROP).	These schedules have been amended. Please refer to revised Official Plan Amendment.
42	g	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	<p>Please refer to the Town's Terms of Reference documents for Official Plan Amendments, specifically the Draft Official Plan Amendment Guide and the Draft Official Plan Amendment Template, for guidance on the preparation of the Official Plan Amendment document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Official Plan Amendment Template is attached and should be used for future resubmissions. ii. The Official Plan Amendment must include wording to identify that this amendment is for a site-specific policy. iii. Various revisions to the Official Plan Amendment are required to reflect the terms of reference documents and to reflect comments provided in this letter. iv. Please see attached the Official Plan Amendment Template and Official Plan Amendment Guide. 	The OPA has been revised.
42	h	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	The 30m buffer from the woodlot to the north is to be designated as EPA.	The OPA has been revised.
42	i	Weston Consulting	OPA Document	Please revise the proposed Official Plan Amendment to incorporate and address comments from other agencies and departments as contained within this letter.	Noted.