

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

April 18, 2024
File 10208

Attn: Aleah Clarke, MHBC

RE: Resubmission of Draft Plan of Subdivision
0 & 12245 Torbram Road
Municipal File No. 21T-21002C

Weston Consulting is the planning agent for Tullamore Industrial GP Limited, the registered owner of the lands municipally known as 0 & 12245 Torbram Road (the “subject lands”). The subject lands are generally bordered by Airport Road to the east, Torbram Road to the west and Mayfield Road to the south. On April 16, 2024, Caledon Planning and Development Committee adopted a Staff report that recommended approval of an Official Plan Amendment (POPA 2021-0007) to expand the Industrial/Commercial Centre of Tullamore, include the subject lands in the Tullamore Land Use Area with policy amendments to the Secondary Plan and redesignate the subject lands from *Prime Agricultural Area* and *Environmental Policy Area* to *Prestige Industrial Area* and *Environmental Policy Area* to permit the development of an industrial plan of subdivision. We are pleased to provide this Planning Response Letter in support of a Draft Plan of Subdivision resubmission to respond to comments received from Staff between January and February 2024. This Letter is provided as an addendum to the Planning Justification Report (PJR) dated July 2021, the PJR Addendum dated April 2023, PJR Letter dated October 30, 2023 and PJR Letter dated February 23, 2024.

Based on the analysis contained herein, it is our opinion that the proposed development represents good planning and continues to be consistent with Provincial Policy and conform to Provincial, Regional and Municipal Plans. The findings and analysis contained in our July 2021 PJR and April 2023 PJR Addendum remain relevant and accurate and should be read in conjunction with this letter.

Description of the Proposed Development

The proposed development has been modified in response to comments received by Regional and Town Staff and the relevant commenting agencies. The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been revised accordingly:

- Revised the overall property boundary by removing blocks 10, 11 and 32.
- Reconfigured the natural features overlay to remain consistent with Figure 12 of the CEISMP.
- Updated the Key Plan to indicate “Lands of Interest by the Owner”.
- Relabeled Blocks 9, 11, 12 and 15 as EPA.
- Removed the eastern tributaries and wetlands.

The table below provides site statistics for the revised proposed development of the subject lands:

Block	Building	GFA (m ²)	Parking and Loading
Block 1	Building A	± 100,702 m ²	Loading Bays: 157 spaces Car Parking: 540 spaces Trailer Parking: 505 spaces
Block 2	Building I Building J	± 33,516 m ² ± 9,197 m ²	Building I: Loading Bays: 74 spaces Car Parking: 341 spaces Trailer Parking: 50 spaces Building J Loading Bays: 26 spaces Car Parking: 140 spaces Trailer Parking: 17 spaces
Block 3	Building C	± 72,901 m ²	Building C Loading Bays: 81 spaces Car Parking: 320 spaces Trailer Parking: 220 spaces Cab Parking: 25 spaces
Block 4	Building D	± 93,759 m ²	Loading Bays: 183 spaces Car Parking: 506 spaces Trailer Parking: 148 spaces
Block 5	Building H	± 90,662 m ²	Loading Bays: 100 spaces Car Parking: 450 spaces Trailer Parking: 68 spaces
Block 7	Building E	± 90,730 m ²	Loading Bays: 100 spaces Car Parking: 445 spaces Trailer Parking: 277 spaces
Block 8	Building F	± 74,090 m ²	Loading Bays: 170 spaces Car Parking: 425 spaces Trailer Parking: 149 spaces

In our opinion, the revised Draft Plan of Subdivision represents good planning and remains consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2020 and conforms to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Peel Region Official Plan, the Caledon Official Plan, and the draft Caledon Official Plan. The proposed development aligns with the Ministerial Zoning Order (MZO) that was issued for the subject lands on September 9, 2022. A detailed review of these policies is contained within the July 2021 PJR, the April 2023 PJR Addendum, and the October 20, 2023 and February 23, 2024 PJR Letters and remain relevant and accurate. The findings and analysis in the PJR Addendum and Letters should be read in conjunction with this letter.

Response to Comments

The February 2024 PJR Letter provided a comprehensive response to comments received on the Official Plan Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision application, as well as comments received from the public. Since then, Caledon's Planning and Development Committee adopted a recommendation from Staff to approve the Official Plan Amendment (POPA 2021-0007). As such, the following section provides a response to comments received by Staff on the Draft Plan of Subdivision application received between January and February 2024. This includes additional policy analysis, updated figures, and details descriptions where appropriate.

DRAFT PLAN OF SUBDIVISION COMMENTS

DPS Comment 34

The following comments are related to the Planning Justification Report:

The section on the Farmhouse in the Planning Justification Report should be updated as required following clarification of the suitability of its proposed relocation site from all commenting agencies. This section should include a description of the process required for relocation and adaptive re-use of the Farmhouse

Response to DPS Comment 34

According to comments provided by the Town of Caledon, the proposed location of the farmhouse is appropriate in principle, subject to certain requirements related to zoning and environmental constraints. These matters and other details related to the relocation of the existing farmhouse are being finalized between the Applicant and Town staff.

DPS Comment 47

Draft Plan of Subdivision

- a) Through the Draft Plan process, the Town will be requesting the gratuitous conveyance of all EPA (Blocks 9, 11, 12, and 15). It is noted that only Blocks 9 and 12 are currently labelled EPA. Revise to label all four blocks EPA.
- b) Revise as appropriate when addressing the comments on the CEISMP & SWS in relation to Blocks 10 and 11.
- c) It is not clear why the Eastern Tributary and associated wetlands and ponds are displayed as these are proposed for removal. The plan should be revised as per the final EPA limits.

Response to DPS Comment 47

- a) Blocks 9, 11, 12 and 15 have been relabeled as EPA
- b) Acknowledged
- c) The Eastern Tributaries and wetlands have been removed on the Draft Plan

DPS Comment 61

The following comments related to the Draft Plan of Subdivision:

- a) Block 10, 11 and 32 will not form part of the plan of subdivision. The Town's Official Plan does not permit new subdivisions on rural lands and Block 10, 11, and 32 have not yet been brought into the settlement area.
 - a) Block 11, and 32 should be conveyed to the appropriate public agencies on a reference plan.
 - b) Block 10 will be created as a remnant parcel.
- b) Sidewalks should be proposed along all public road frontages internal to the site.
- c) The TIS and PJR Addendum identify that Bus stops are proposed through the subject lands on the proposed collector roads. Where bus stops and shelters are identified, they will be required to be installed as a condition of Draft Plan Approval.

Response to DPS Comment 61

- a) The Draft Plan boundary has been revised to remove Blocks 10, 11 and 32.
- b) Acknowledged.
- c) Acknowledged.

DPS Comment 67

Additional detail needs to be added to the Draft Plan of Subdivision to meet the requirements of section 51(17) of the Planning Act:

- a) The Draft Plan requires updates to accurately reflect the limit of natural features on the subject lands. The Natural features on the Draft Plan do not align with the features identified on Figure 12 of the CEISMP. This is a requirement of Section 51(17)(g) of the Planning Act.
- b) Additional contours and elevations may need to be added to the Draft Plan in accordance with Section 51(17)(j) of the Planning Act.
- c) If the owner owns or has interest in any of the adjacent lands they must be identified on the Key Plan, as per Section 51(17)(c) of the Planning Act.

Response to Comment 67

- a) The Draft Plan accurately reflects the limit of natural features, in accordance with Figure 12 of the CEISMP.
- b) Acknowledged
- c) Additional lands owned by the owner have been added to the Key Plan. The lands are situated west of the Subject Lands.

In our opinion, the revised proposed development continues to represent good planning and is in the public interest. We trust that the responses and analysis contained herein are sufficient. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at extension 329 or James Todd at extension 345.

Yours truly,

Weston Consulting

Per:



Darrin Cohen, RPP, MCIP
Senior Planner

Cc : Tullamore Industrial GP Limited