

POPA 2021-0007 : Town of Caledon, Finance Department, Finance

Summary of Comments

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
1	Rice Group	-	The following comments are advisory comments on this application: a) If the proposed development (to include at least nine industrial, warehouse and distribution buildings) were to proceed as planned, the property's taxable assessment value would change to reflect the developments that would have taken place. b) Development Charges will be levied at the rates that will be in effect on the date of building permit issuance. Note that 'frozen' Development Charges rates had initially been in effect, starting on the application completion date, (September 15, 2021). However, the 24 months validity of those rates have expired, and so, current rates will apply. Development Charge rates for industrial buildings are currently: i. Town of Caledon: \$94.06 per m² of new or added industrial floor space. ii. Region of Peel: \$216.28 per m² of new or added industrial floor space. iii. Education: \$9.69 per m² of new or added industrial floor space. c) 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. d) The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at December 7, 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 (the application completion date); and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. That determination of rates is valid for 24 months after application completion date. 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.

POPA 2021-0007 : Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Parks

Summary of Comments

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
2	Rice Group	-	Park block has been removed from the draft plan, Parks has no further comments on this application.	Acknowledged.

POPA 2021-0007 : Hydro One

Summary of Comments

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
3	Rice Group	-	Hydro One doesn't have any conflicts with this project providing that: a) Underground locates are obtained prior to excavation. b) No open trenching within 1.5m of Hydro poles and/or anchors. c) Maintain 1m clearance from Hydro One Plant if trenchless horizontal drilling / directional bore. d) PUCC owner is responsible to address all conflicts with Hydro One plant and request conflict corrections through appropriate channels e) Ensure all industry standard utility separations and clearance minimums are maintained. f) Any grade changes are brought to the attention of Hydro One and addressed prior to commencing work a) g) Any poles affected by grading requiring a pole setting adjustment will be charged at 100% labour and material without advanced notice having been received.	Acknowledged.

POPA 2021-0007 : Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Heritage

Summary of Comments

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
4	Weston Consulting	Draft OPA	The following comments are related to the draft Official Plan Amendment (OPA). a) The Draft OPA did not include the requested archaeology policy. The following policies are proposed: i. Significant archaeological resources shall be preserved in situ, where feasible. ii. If in situ preservation is not feasible, appropriate mitigation will be required for significant archaeological resources, undertaken by a licensed archaeologist in accordance with the advice and requirements of Indigenous communities, the Town, and the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism. iii. Completion of the archaeological assessment process for the subject lands, to the satisfaction of Indigenous communities, the Town, and the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism will be required prior to the approval of development applications for the subject lands.	a) The OPA has been updated to include the policies in I, ii and iii.
	Weston Consulting	Draft OPA	b) The Heritage Conservation Plan won't be approved until the Draft Plan of Subdivision Stage. As such, please reword draft section 15 to read: i. "The cultural heritage resources at 12245 Torbram Road and 12542 Airport Road shall be conserved in accordance with the Cultural Heritage Conservation policies in the Official Plan and as set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment(s) and Heritage Conservation Plan(s), prepared to the satisfaction of the Town of Caledon, for these cultural heritage resources."	b) Section 15 of the OPA has been reworded to reflect the Town's comment.
	Weston Consulting	Draft OPA	c) The following policies are proposed to support the revised section 15 above: i. Heritage Impact Assessments, completed to the satisfaction of the Town, will be required as necessary based on the scope and nature of proposed works for development applications in the subject lands. ii. Where it is determined, through a Heritage Impact Assessment or other means, that there is direct impact to a cultural heritage resource as part of proposed works for a development application, a Heritage Conservation Plan will be required prior to that development application's approval. iii. The cultural heritage resources at 12245 Torbram Road and 12542 Airport Road will be provided with lots sized to support their fulsome adaptive re-use, including space for future additions and landscaping.	c) The aforementioned policies have been added to the OPA

POPA 2021-0007 : Town of Caledon, Parks and Natural Heritage, Planning Department

Jason Elliott, Senior Environmental Planner

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
1	GEI Consultants	Initial CEISMP & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	While the FSR/SWM report acknowledges that Block 12 is proposed to be an EPA block, it mischaracterizes that block as a stormwater facility. While this occurs throughout the report, it is especially evident in Section 5.9 which discusses that area specifically. The EPA block can be designed to be a natural area that provides Regional quantity control storage but cannot be (or be referred to as) a stormwater facility and include associated infrastructure.	All stormwater infrastructure has been removed from Block 12. Stormwater infrastructure is contained within Blocks 13 and 14.

	Crozier	Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report (C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc, April 2023)	The proposed berm and outlet at the southern end of the proposed Regional storage area is stormwater infrastructure and is not permitted within EPA. To ensure that the channel and habitat improvements and compensation for watercourse, wetland, and headwater drainage feature removals outlined in the CEISMP & SWS are realized, any necessary infrastructure must be located at the existing culvert under Mayfield Rd.	
2	GEI Consultants	Initial CEISMP & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	The FSR/SWM report and associated drawings indicate that additional erosion protection measures around the perimeter of the Regional storage area within the EPA block will be specified during detailed design. Further, the report discusses cable concrete outfalls and indicates that access to the EPA block for maintenance is a consideration. Ideally, the Regional storage area will be designed with stable slopes that don't require erosion protection or maintenance. If this isn't possible, those areas and any access routes for maintenance are considered infrastructure and the EPA block must be revised to omit them (i.e., EPA is reduced in size and the SWM blocks increased). The infrastructure discussed in the previous comment at Mayfield Rd. should also be included in the SWM block not the EPA block (including proposed OPA Schedule N).	Block 12 (the EPA area) has been designed such that it does not contain access roads or erosion protection materials. OPA Schedule N has been revised to reflect this design.
	Crozier	Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report (C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc, April 2023)		
	Weston Consulting	OPA Schedule N		
3	GEI Consultants	Initial CEISMP & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	The FSR/SWM report indicates that further evaluation of measures to mitigate erosion due to discharge from the site is required during detailed design. Additionally, the report indicates that the results of the on-going water quality monitoring program will help inform stormwater management. Finally, the CEISMP & SWS indicates that discussions with DFO and MECP are on-going. As all of these items could affect the EPA boundaries, they must either be addressed now or an OPA policy must be included that prohibits a reduction in the size of Block 12 if an expansion of Blocks 13 and/or 14 is required and allows refinements to the EPA boundaries if MECP/DFO approvals require additional lands to be protected as EPA. MECP/DFO approvals will be required in relation to SAR bats, bobolink, eastern meadowlark and redbreasted nuthatch. With respect to redbreasted nuthatch, that includes approval in relation to the removal of contributing habitat, the stormwater management facility design, and surface and groundwater water balance. It is noted that the CEISMP & SWS discusses stormwater details that are inconsistent with the FSR/SWM; therefore, the latter should be referenced in MECP/DFO correspondence	Acknowledged.
	Crozier	Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report (C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc, April 2023)		
4	GEI Consultants	Initial CEISMP & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	Section 7.2.3 and 8.5.4 of the CEISMP & SWS indicates that the boundaries of Block 9 will be finalized at the Draft Plan Stage as the Long-term stable top of slope has not yet been determined. Additionally, several figures in the report indicate that the western portion of the dripline of the off-site northern woodland has not been delineated and that the southern portion of the dripline has not been verified by Town staff. As these limits inform the land use designations, this work must be completed prior to OPA approval or an OPA policy must be included that allows refinements to the EPA boundaries based on additional study.	The Long-term stable top of slope has been determined for Salt Creek by GEI through a geotechnical study. The study is summarized in and appended to the Initial CEISMP. The dripline was staked by GEI on the southern limit of the Woodlot. The western limit of the woodlot has been delineated conservatively through ELC. Confirmation of limits can be finalized at site plan application.
	Weston Consulting	OPA Schedules		
5	Crozier	Grading, Servicing and Stormwater Management Plans	Drawing C103B displays the bottom of the Regional storage area in Block 12 as completely flat. As such, it is not clear how a channel can be implemented. As the channel is intended to replicate some of the form and function of the watercourses and headwater drainage features that are being removed, it must be ensured that the design of the Block can accommodate a channel	Block 12 will not be completely flat. Drawing C103 depicts the proposed microtopography within Block 12 that includes low flow channels, pools etc. The CEISMP by GEI further details the microtopography within Block 12.
6	GEI Consultants	Initial CEISMP & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	Figure 12 of the CEISMP & SWS displays a natural heritage constraint in the northern portion of proposed Block 10. That block must be revised in the OPA to exclude the constraint area represented by the greater of the long-term stable top of slope + 10m and the wetland + 30m.	The draft plan has been adjusted to include the greater of the LTSTOS and 30-metre wetland buffer as the boundary for Block 10.
	Weston Consulting	OPA Schedules		

7	Weston Consulting	Planning Justification Addendum	The response to OPA Comment 41i in the Planning Justification Report Addendum is not appropriate as it relies on OP Policy 5.7.3.2.3 which contemplates expansions of existing uses. As the stormwater infrastructure being proposed in EPA is a new use, it is not permitted. Refer to comments above for more details.	Block 12 of the Draft Plan of Subdivision has been reconfigured in order to ensure that no infrastructure will occur within the EPA lands.
8	Weston Consulting	OPA Schedules	Proposed OPA policies #7, #10, #11, #12, and #13 have the effect of allowing the listed development within EPA which is not supported. These policies should only refer to the portion of the subject lands designated MP on proposed Schedule N.	The draft OPA has been updated to specify that policies 7, 12 and 13 refer to the MP designated lands on proposed Schedule N. Policies 10 and 11 of the OPA have not been updated, as they refer to the location of the Subject Lands and not the permitted uses of the lands.
9	Weston Consulting	Official Plan Amendment	An OPA policy requiring the completion of the final CEISMP & SWS prior to draft plan approval must be included.	Policy 17 of the OPA has been added to reflect the completion of the final CEISMP and SWS prior to draft plan approval.
10	Weston Consulting	OPA Schedules	It is not clear why proposed OPA Schedules A, A1, F, J, K, L, S and Figure 1 and Appendices I, II and III display the existing EPA and/or ponds associated with the East Tributary of the West Humber River that are, or are proposed to be, removed through this application. It is noted that they are not included on proposed Schedule O.	The aforementioned Schedules, Figures and Appendices have been updated in order to more accurately delineate the proposed tributaries, in line with the revised Draft Plan of Subdivision.

POPA 2021-0007 : Town of Caledon, Development Engineering

Cassie Schembri, Program Manager, Stormwater; Drew Haines, Manager, Development Engineering

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
1		GEI Consultants Initial CEISMP & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	As agreed, upon and acknowledged in the Comment Matrix that accompanied the third OPA submission, the applicant and the Town have agreed to a two-stage approach to the CEISMP. Specifically, the Town supports the submission of an Initial CEISMP that is sufficiently detailed to inform and subsequently reflect the Town's preferred Secondary Plan for the OPA application; and a Final CEISMP that support's Draft Plan Approval that: (1) builds on the Initial CEISMP; (2) addresses all of the remaining outstanding work; and (3) is sufficiently detailed to support that level of planning. At this time, the Engineering Services requires the following comments be addressed within the Initial CEISMP prior to approval of the OPA:	Acknowledged.
	a		Section 8.5.4 broadly indicates outstanding work that needs to be completed in support of future site plans. Based on the two-stage CEISMP approach agreed upon by the applicant and the Town, and that the Initial CEISMP references components of work that will be addressed as part of the Final CEISMP, we require this section be updated to detail all of the work that will be addressed as part of the Final CEISMP. This list needs to be specific and include all of the work outlined in the Initial CEISMP that is still ongoing and all of the work that is being deferred to the Final CEISMP.	Section 8.5.5 Future Studies has been revised to commit to outstanding studies required as part of the Final CEISMP.
	b		The Initial CEISMP should include a section titled 'Management Plan'. From our review, Section 8 'Restoration and Enhancement' appears to include most of what should be included as part of a high-level Management Plan. Included as part of the Management Plan should be the Stormwater Management Plan that outlines the stormwater criteria that should inform the FSR. For the most part, the Stormwater Management Plan appears to be included in Section 6 'Development Proposal'. Engineering Services requests the inclusion of a high-level Management Plan as part of the Initial CEISMP that will be finalized as part of the Final CEISMP. However, if it is the intent of the applicant to defer the develop a Management Plan section to the Final CEISMP, this needs to be specified in Section 8.5.4. Please note comments provided by Engineering Services as part of the 2nd Submission outlines the requirements of the Management Plan section.	Section 8 title revised to "Management Plan: Management, Restoration and Enhancement Opportunities".

	c			Please note, the Stormwater Management Criteria outlined as part of the Management Plan section needs to address the CLI-ECA.	Section 8 has been updated to include SWM Criteria and commentary based on Crozier's 2024 SWM report.
	d			Engineering Services requires confirmation that no additional permitting is required for the area providing Regional Flood control and that no undue operation and maintenance will be required on behalf of the Town as part of this facility.	GEI is not aware of any additional permitting required for Regional Flood control.
	e			All OPA level comments from all agencies have been addressed.	Acknowledged.
2		GEI Consultants	Initial Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	As identified in the Initial CEISMP, there continues to be work that needs to be done that has the potential of impact the Secondary Plan. For these outstanding issues, Engineering Services will allow them to be deferred to the Final CEISMP as long as there is agreement that the supporting Secondary Plan policies will allow for amendment of the Secondary Plan. Where there lacks detail on environmental constraint and management recommendations, including identifying the features and setback limits, as well as the permitted and nonpermitted uses within the subject area, and the agreed upon sizing of stormwater management facility (e.g. erosion criteria to still be determined), the Town will require supporting secondary plan policies to allow for establishment of these prior or concurrent to draft plan approval. As part of this, Engineering Services will not support infrastructure within the EPA lands or encroachment into the EPA lands.	Acknowledged.
3		GEI Consultants	Initial Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan & Scoped Subwatershed Study (GEI Consultants Ltd., October 2023)	Section 6.4.2 and 7.5.1 of the CEISMP identify that bottom draw outlets will be utilized to capture cool water found below the surface. This is contrary to the design proposed by Crozier which proposes thermal mitigation through fast growing and dense vegetation within wetlands. Stormwater management strategy for the site should adhere to the recommendations made in the CEISMP or the CEISMP needs to identify and provide recommendations for the proposed thermal mitigation for the wetland facilities. Should bottom draw be required for thermal mitigation, then Crozier is to identify that it can be accommodated within the current stormwater management footprint being provided and there will be no encroachment into the EPA lands.	The FSR/SWM Report and CEISMP have been updated accordingly to address the changes to Crozier's design. GEI is conducting baseline water temperature monitoring to establish existing conditions. This data has been shared with Crozier to inform their design. The stormwater wetland designs propose thermal mitigation through fast growing and dense vegetation within wetlands.
		Crozier's	Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management Report (C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc, April 2023)		

POPA 2021-0007 : Town of Caledon, Planning & Development Department, Development

Summary of Comments

#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
10	TFAI & Weston Consulting	Draft Plan of Subdivision and Conceptual Site Plan	The following comments are advisory and are not required to be addressed prior to approval of the Official Plan Amendment. The following comments be required to be addressed through future development applications. a) The Staging and Sequencing Plan needs to identify when the SWMP blocks will be developed, and that the relocation of the Heritage House will be included in Phase 1. The plan must be updated as part of the draft plan of subdivision resubmission. b) The Conceptual Site Plan does not identify the proposed maximum building heights and the sun shadow study appears to apply a standard height across all buildings on the site. Detailed building height information will be required through the future development applications and an updated sun shadow study will be required if taller buildings are proposed.	Acknowledged.
11	Weston Consulting	Draft OPA	The following comments must be addressed in advance of staff recommending approval of the Official Plan Amendment: a) A response to the public comments was received but it did not address all comments received. A fulsome public comment response document is required prior to the Official Plan Amendment being brought forward to Council on this matter. Please update the response to public comment document and submit at your earliest convenience.	a) Acknowledged. Please see enclosed. b) i. Acknowledged. ii. Acknowledged. iii. Acknowledged.

			b) Planning Justification Report (“PJR”) Comments: i. Advisory Comment: According to the Highway 413 interactive mapping a portion of the subject lands are within the Route Planning Study Area, but none of the lands are within the Focused Analysis Area (FAA). As such the Town has no concerns with the location of the subject lands in relation to the Highway 413 FAA. ii. Advisory Comment: Further information about the design of the required sound barriers will be required through the draft plan of subdivision application and future site plan applications. iii. 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. iv. 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. c) Official Plan Amendment (“OPA”) Comments: i. i. The general legal description in the draft Official Plan Amendment appears accurate. ii. Please refer to the attached draft Official Plan Amendment. The Draft OPA has been revised by Staff to align with the approved MZO and the Town’s Official Plan. iii. iii. The limits of the southern EPA Area identified on Schedule N of the Draft Official Plan Amendment must be revised to align with the limits of the natural heritage. features in this area. Please align the limits of the EPA designation with the limits of the LTSTOS 10m setback identified on Figure 12 of the CEISMP. iv. A site specific policy is required in the Official Plan Amendment in order to permit the creation of an undersized agricultural parcel for the purpose of protecting the heritage house. 1. Although the Official Plan permits a single detached dwelling on an existing lot of record, the proposed draft plan of subdivision would be creating a undersized lot based on the Prime Agricultural Area land use policies. As such, a site specific policy is required.	iv. No infrastructure is proposed within lands designated EPA. c) i. Acknowledged. ii. Acknowledged. Draft OPA has been revised. iii. Schedule N of the Draft OPA has been revised. iv. Draft OPA has been revised to include site-specific policy. See policy 12 of revised OPA.
POPA 2021-0007 : Peel Region (File Number: OZ-21-007C) Patrick Amaral, Principal Planner Development Services, Region of Peel				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
1	GEI Consultants	Natural Environment	Regional Official Plan (ROP) Policy 5.6.20.14.17 f) specifically sets out requirement for a detailed subwatershed study or equivalent study to be conducted prior to designating land uses and adopting secondary plans. The policy provides direction that a detailed subwatershed or equivalent study be based on terms of reference acceptable to the Region and Town. Recommended terms of reference for detailed local subwatershed studies	Acknowledged.

			are provided in Appendix F of the Region of Peel's Scoped Subwatershed Study Part B Report. The Region's Scoped Subwatershed Study, Part C Report, pages 65 to 73 provide guidance on the completion of detailed studies and a list of key findings and recommendations addressing water management and natural heritage system planning.	
2	GEI Consultants	Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP)	Updating of Section 2.2 summarizing the Region of Peel Official Plan policies to reflect ROP policies 5.6.20.14.16 d) to e) addressing subwatershed study requirements and natural heritage system protection, restoration and enhancement in the 2051 New Urban Area;	Section 2.2 has been updated in Version 4 of the CEISMP.
3	GEI Consultants	Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP)	Updating of Sections 4 and 5 characterization of the study area resources, constraints and opportunities to the satisfaction of the Town including: • characterization of the physiography of the subject lands and surrounding area; • characterization and assessment of the existing and future climatic conditions affecting natural systems; • characterization of the subwatershed and site catchment hydrology and hydraulic conditions; • characterization of groundwater conditions including site and feature based water balance evaluations of all watercourses, wetlands and woodlands recommended for protection based on TRCA guidelines; • completion of the hydrogeological impact assessment based on comprehensive ground water monitoring and modelling information; • characterization of surface and ground water quality; • characterization of stream geomorphology including a fluvial geomorphological assessment of the West and East Tributaries; and • completion of the assessment of significance of the Salt Creek Valley Corridor and confirmation of the westerly limits of the corridor to be protected;	Section 4 and 5 have been updated in Version 4 of the CEISMP with new information from recent field investigations.
4	GEI Consultants	Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP)	Updating of Section 8 Restoration and Enhancement to the satisfaction of the Town to outline the management strategies, implementation, and monitoring to be carried out including: • a new section addressing how the Region's Scoped Subwatershed Study recommendations and targets to increase natural cover will be achieved with mapping delineating restoration and enhancement areas and the implementation steps that will be taken to implement natural heritage system improvements. • a review of the assessment of significance of the Watercourse 2 valley/stream corridor and whether a management recommendation to retain all or a portion of the watercourse/stream corridor as part of the recommended natural heritage system should be supported; and • a new section addressing guidelines for additional site-specific environmental studies and approvals that would be needed to support subsequent site plan applications.	Section 8 has been updated. Further updates are expected to be characterized in the Final CEISMP regarding natural cover.
5	GEI Consultants	Additional Detailed Comments: CEISMP	That appropriate policy wording be included in the OPA to the satisfaction of the Region and Town to provide for the finalization and implementation of the CEISMP recommendations prior to the subsequent draft plan of subdivision and site plan approvals including addressing whether further environmental implementation reports may be needed;	Acknowledged.
6	GEI Consultants	Additional Detailed Comments: CEISMP	That the CEISMP and associated studies including the FSR and SWMR have been updated based on the recommended terms of reference in the Region's Scoped Subwatershed Study to the satisfaction of the Town and Region in consultation with the TRCA with appropriate scoping to reflect the status of the MZO;	Acknowledged.
7	GEI Consultants	Additional Detailed Comments: CEISMP	That the CEISMP has been updated to the satisfaction of the Town to clearly delineate and quantify the current and proposed extent of natural cover on the subject lands and that proposed natural cover enhancements contribute	Section 4.3.1 provides existing natural cover on the Subject Lands. Section 8.3.2 details the retained natural cover outside of the development. Proposed natural cover

			to meeting or exceeding the recommended target to increase natural cover by 30%; The CEISMP should delineate and provide total area calculations for all existing natural cover on the subject lands (including in the adjacent owned Greenbelt lands and Salt Creek valley); the total area of existing natural cover to be retained; and all areas proposed to be restored and enhanced to natural cover to be implemented in the restoration and enhancement plan and related planning approvals. The overall system target for the proposed development should be clearer and identify distributed enhancement opportunities across the NHS to support the development of a robust and sustainable system and contribute toward achieving or exceeding the 30% target established in the Scoped Subwatershed Study.	enhancements including mapping will be updated and included as part of the Final CEISMP submission.
8	GEI Consultants	Additional Comments	The Region acknowledges that the limit of the proposed EPA Block 9 in the proposed draft plan of subdivision and OPA has been revised and increased to protect the Salt Creek Core Valley and Stream Corridor. The applicant has advised that further analysis will be completed as part of the Final CEISMP to determine appropriate development limits in accordance with the Region of Peel Official Plan to the satisfaction of the Region, Town and TRCA; and	The Salt Creek Long Term Stable Top of Slope Study has been appended to the CEISMP (Appendix K).
9	Rice Group	Additional Comments	The Region acknowledges that the previous parkland dedication Block 34 within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System has been removed. There are no further concerns with respect to policy 2.12.13.1.5 of the ROP.	Acknowledged.
POPA 2021-0007 : TRCA Eliza Oprescu, Senior Landscape Architect, MHBC Planning				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
1	GEI Consultants	Landscape Plans	No further comments. It is expected that a more in-depth review and discussion will continue at the Site Plan Application stage, and the applicant is encouraged to review the General comments noted on page 3 when developing these plans.	Acknowledged.
POPA 2021-0007 : TRCA Jason Wagler, Senior Manager, Development Planning and Permits Development and Engineering Services				
#	Assigned to	Referenced Documents	Comment	Response
1	GEI Consultants	Relocated Heritage Home	The submitted conceptual site plan, prepared by Turner Fleischer Architects Ltd., shows the relocated heritage house and portions of Block 10 within the valley erosion hazard, an unevaluated wetland, and the required adjacent buffers (see Figure 12 of the CEISMP). To be consistent with PPS and TRCA policies, please relocate the heritage house and any associated required infrastructure and amenity space outside of the erosion hazard, wetland and associated buffer. In addition, please reconfigure Block 10 such that it is outside of the hazards and adjacent buffers and the hazards and buffers are designated EPA.	Acknowledged.
2	GEI Consultants	Hydraulics	Please note that an existing flow of 20.85 cms needs to be applied upstream of the Mayfield Road crossing at the flow change location of HEC-RAS cross section ID 790.	The HEC RAS model has been updated. Please refer to the Hydraulic Analysis Report.
3	GEI Consultants	Hydraulics	Please assess whether the proposed flows will be conveyed without overtopping the Mayfield Road crossing. It is necessary to apply the proposed condition flows upstream of the crossing. If the proposed flows do overtop, TRCA requires that either the crossing be upsized, or relief culverts provided.	The Hydraulic Analysis Report has been updated to include a potential mitigation measure to ensure the proposed Regulatory flows do not overtop Mayfield Road.
4	GEI Consultants	Ecological Compensation Area Calculations	CEISMP Section 7.2.1.1 - Details of the overall compensation approach have been deferred to a later draft of the CEISMP. TRCA looks forward to those discussions to ensure the approach satisfies all stakeholders and their requirements. The most crucial element of the strategy is mapping, defining	Compensation approach is included in Version 4 of the Initial CEISMP. An additional figure has been created to justify compensation totals.

			the features and areas to be compensated for, and the total areas of land-base and each ecosystem structure type.	
5	GEI Consultants	Ecological Compensation Area Calculations	CEISMP Section 7.2.1.1 – This section refers to compensation for 9.037ha of wetland and associated buffers. Under the Conservation Authorities Act (s.28.0.1(25)), TRCA requires compensation for watercourses, valley and stream corridors, wetlands and contiguous vegetation to those features that are within the defined regulated areas. Total compensation area required by TRCA is calculated based on the total area of the greater of the following layers from Figure 11 in the CEISMP: • TRCA Staked Natural Features (Top of Slope/Dripline) • Long Term Stable Top of Slope • Wetland • Regional Floodline This applies to features and hazards associated with Watercourses 1 and 2, as shown in blue on Figure 8. For clarity, the floodline limit, for the purposes of determining the limit of the natural system, can be cut off at the northern limit of watercourse 2 (Figure 8).	Compensation has been assessed through ecosystem structure compensation based on TRCA's (2023) Guideline for Determining Ecosystem Compensation as well as the TRCA Staked Natural features, LTSTOS, Wetland limits, and Regional floodline. Please see Figure 13 of the CEISMP.
6	GEI Consultants	Ecological Compensation Area Calculations	CEISMP Section 7.2.1.1 indicates that buffer areas were included in the wetland area of 9.037ha. TRCA does not require buffers to be included and compensated for. Future calculations should be provided without buffers.	Calculations have been revised to omit buffers. Updated totals can be found within version 4 of the CEISMP and the Block 12 Design Brief.
7	GEI Consultants	Ecological Compensation Area Calculations	CEISMP Section 7.2.1.1 – This section indicates that TRCA has approved the Ecological Compensation Memorandum, Block 1 in Appendix D. TRCA has not provided review and sign off on this document. The preliminary cash-in-lieu calculation for land-base provided therein has not been reviewed by TRCA. While the valuation may be acceptable, TRCA needs to review it as part of the comprehensive compensation strategy for the block, as intended through the permit approval and conditions for Block 1.	Acknowledged and updated in text.
8	GEI Consultants	Ecological Compensation Area Calculations	As a reminder, TRCA compensation guideline (2023) lists cash-in-lieu as one of several options for providing land base compensation. The comprehensive compensation strategy for the block should explore all options and determine which is most feasible.	Acknowledged.