

Project Address:	12489 & 12861 Dixie Rd.		Date
Project Description:			21 April, 2025
File	RZ 2024-0034 and POPA 2024-0011		
Comment Matrix			
Number	Comment	Consultant	Response
Transportation Engineering Public Works & Transportation Department			
	Comments		
1	A letter titled ‘Town of Caledon – Draft Official Plan – Road Network – Dixie Road’ is reference in the responses. Please confirm if this letter was circulated with Town Staff.	BA	A letter titled 'Town of Caledon – Draft Official Plan – Road Network – Dixie Road' was circulated to Town staff.
2	Please note that Town staff are of the opinion that an east-west collector road system, as identified in the Official Plan, is required and that portions of it will be located on these lands.	Armstrong/BA/QuadReal	A letter was sent to the Region of Peel on May 8, 2024, titled “Town of Caledon – Draft Official Plan – Road Network – Dixie Road” which addresses the rationale for excluding the proposed east west collector road. It outlines that the collector roads would negatively impact the functionality of employment lands by reducing developable space, duplicating on-site circulation systems, and creating conflicts between employment and residential land uses. Furthermore, the transportation needs of the area are already met by the regional arterial network and proximity to current and planned provincial highway interchanges. Including the collector road would not enhance connectivity but would likely generate conflicts and diminish the viability of employment lands.
3	The location of included background developments has not been attached under Figure 1 and Figure 2.	BA	Figure illustratting the background developments have been included in the BA Group's updated reports.
4	It is stated that the analysis for Bramalea Road and Old School Road are included in Table 2 within Appendix C. Please note that this should be included within the body of the main report. It is noted that currently the report dated December 2023 is provided as an appendix, the report should be submitted as a main study report with the comment responses either as a part of the study, or an appendix. The main body of the study should be updated to reflect the responses provided as part of the comment responses.	BA	The main body of the reports have been updated to include Bramlea Road and Old School Road. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
5	Similarly, sight line review, which is currently provided as part of the Appendix D, needs to be included within the body of the report.	BA	The sight line review has been included in the main body of the report. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
6	The current report submitted “12489 Dixie Road Town of Caledon Urban Transportation Considerations’ in appendix A is submitted for both 12489 and 12861 Dixie Road. The report title, as well as the references (including figures) within the report, should be updated to reflect the correct site(s).	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
	Rezoning and Site Plan Applications		
1	Figure 3 shows the site location for 12489 Dixie Road, where as all the figures leading up to and following figure 3 are referencing 12861 Dixie Road. Please update to ensure consistency.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.

2	Section 2.5.1 Dixie Road Widening: The recent 100% detailed design drawings circulated by the Region for Hurontario Street include a single dedicated left-turn lane at all approaches of the Dixie Road intersection, rather than dual left-turn lanes. Please ensure this is reflected in the analysis.	BA	Synchro analysis in future conditions have been adjusted to reflect a single dedicated left-turn lane at all approaches of the Dixie Road / Mayfield Road intersection. Refer to BA Group's updated reports. However, under this configuration, it is of note that the eastbound left movement operates at v/c ratio above 1.0 in future conditions. It is recommended that the region continuously monitor the intersection to assess whether a dual-left at the intersection might be required.
3	Note that speed on Old School Road has been recently reduced to 60 km/h. Update Section 2.1 and revise the sight distance evaluations accordingly.	BA	The section has been updated to reflect a 60 km/h road speed.
4	The “Minor Arterial” road classification is not applicable in the Town’s road classification system. Bramalea Road and Old School Road are both classified as ‘Collector’ Roads. Please revise Figure 4 accordingly.	BA	Figure 4 has been revised to reflect the appropriate classification. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
5	Update Figure 4, Figure 5 and Figure 6 with correct site boundary		Figures have been revised with the correct site boundary. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
6	The future active transportation infrastructure on Old School road and Bramalea Road should be identified according to Town’s Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP). No shared On-Road cycling route is recommended on Old School Road as a part of ATMP in the study area. Please revise Figure 6 accordingly.	BA	Figure 6 has been revised. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
7	Parking Review		
a	Please clarify the nature/type of land use considered for parking calculations. Additionally, confirm the anticipated Office Net Floor Area.	BA	The type of land use used for parking calculations was Industrial Use within Section 5.2.3 of Zoning By-Law 2006-50. The anticipated office net floor area have been added within the table notes of Table 1 of each report.
b	Barrier-free parking requirements should be reviewed in accordance with the Town’s new Traffic By-Law 2024-048 Schedule O and AODA.	BA	Parking requirements have been reviewed in accordance with the Town’s new Traffic By-Law 2024-048 Schedule O and AODA.
c	The Town’s Green Development Standard regarding Electric Vehicle parking requirements should be considered and incorporated.	BA	Noted.
d	Ensure bicycle parking is also included in the parking review as a part of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy. Additionally, consider providing bicycle parking closer to building entrances to improve accessibility.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
e	The required number of loading or parking spaces shall be rounded to the next higher whole number. Please update Table 2 accordingly.	BA	Table 2 has been revised. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
8	Intersection Capacity Analysis		
a	The PHF used in the Synchro analysis for existing conditions should reflect the actual intersection PHF. Please ensure the correct value is applied.	BA	Synchro analysis has been revised with surveyed intersection PHFs for existing conditions.
b	The channelization of right-turning lanes at the Hurontario Street/Dixie Road intersection was not considered in the Synchro analysis of the future conditions, as planned/proposed. Including this channelization will improve the reported critical operations of the SBR movement.	BA	The analysis has been updated to include the channelized right-turn lanes at the Mayfield/Dixie intersection. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
c	Provide the available or proposed storage lengths under the existing and future conditions to review the Queuing Analysis.	BA	The storage length have been provided for existing and future conditions. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
d	Please confirm the pedestrian signal timings are included at the proposed new intersections at 12489 DIXIE ROAD SITE ACCESS 2 and 12861 OLD SCHOOL ROAD SITE ACCESS 3.	BA	The pedestrian signal timings at the proposed new intersections are summarized in BA Group's updated reports.
9	Future (2028 and 2033) Lane Configuration and Traffic Control Exhibit is not attached under Figure 15 for review.	BA	Figure 15 has been added. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
10	Explain the reasoning behind the inclusion of the following turning lanes and how the proposed storage lengths of the proposed turning lanes were determined:		

a	NBR at 12489 DIXIE ROAD SITE ACCESS 1	BA	The inclusion of the NB right turn lane at 12489 Dixie Road Site Access 1 is provided to meet regional requirements for a right-in/right-out access. It also ensures that NB right turning vehicles into the site does not impede northbound through traffic along Dixie Road.
b	NBL 12489 DIXIE ROAD SITE ACCESS 2	BA	The inclusion of the NB left turn lane at 12489 Dixie Road Site Access 1 is to ensure access is provided to the existing site on the west side of Dixie Road.
c	NBR 12489 DIXIE ROAD SITE ACCESS 2	BA	The inclusion of the NB right turn lane at 12489 Dixie Road Site Access 2 is provided to meet regional requirements for a signalized intersection. It ensures NB right turning vehicles into the site does not impede northbound through traffic along Dixie Road.
d	SBR 12489 DIXIE ROAD SITE ACCESS 2	BA	The inclusion of the SB right turn lane at 12489 Dixie Road Site Access 2 is provided to meet regional requirements for a signalized intersection. The SB right turn lane accommodates the site traffic to the proposed development at 12668 Dixie Road. It ensures SB right turning vehicles into 12668 Dixie Road does not impede southbound through traffic along Dixie Road.
e	NBR 12861 DIXIE ROAD SITE ACCESS 1	BA	The inclusion of the NB right turn lane at 12861 Dixie Road Site Access 1 is provided to meet regional requirements for a right-in/right-out access. It also ensures NB right turning vehicles into the site does not impede northbound through traffic along Dixie Road.
f	EBR 12861 OLD SCHOOL ROAD SITE ACCESS 3	BA	The inclusion of the EB right turn lane at 12861 Dixie Road Old School Site Access 3 is provided to accommodate right turning vehicles in to the site does not impede northbound through traffic along Old School Road.
11	Section 12.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (for both 12489 Dixie Road and 12861 Dixie Road SPAs)	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
a	Please incorporate the proposed turning lanes on the Old School Road and Dixie Road.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
12	No Signage Plan is included in Architectural Drawings and Signage Plan in Appendix A. Ensure that Fire Route locations are also shown on the architectural drawings in compliance with BL2024-048.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
13	The discussion of corner radii as a part of the Site Review was not completed. Please ensure the analysis is included to confirm compliance with OPSD 350.010 and the TAC Geometric Design Guide.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
14	An AutoTurn analysis is required for all access driveways and onsite for all site plan applications.	BA	Vehicle manoeuvring diagrams for all access driveways have been included in BA Group's updated reports.
15	To enhance the safety of vehicles exiting the parking lot, please include traffic control signs. Please ensure all the traffic signs are shown on the architectural drawings.	BA	Refer to BA Group's reports for the signage plan.
16	Provide the on-site pedestrian connection map and consider incorporating pedestrian connections that could potentially link to the facilities planned on Dixie Road and Old School.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
17	Include the correct functional design plan under Appendix F (12489 Dixie Road SPA).	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
18	Please provide the recommendations for transit route extensions and potential on-site transit stops. The proposed Transit Plan is to be circulated to Brampton Staff for consideration.	BA	Future potential stops are to be considered at the site accesses pending further discussion with Brampton Transit staff.
19	Old School Road is currently designated as a 'No Heavy Vehicles' route, and the submitted documents do not account for this restriction or provide recommendations. Town staff require additional information on the necessary improvements to Old School Road to accommodate heavy vehicles, or confirmation that the access on Dixie Road can accommodate all site-related heavy truck traffic (12861 Dixie Road SPA). The following additional information and analysis are required:	BA	Noted.

	a	Truck Route Explanation: A detailed explanation of the proposed truck route, with an emphasis on minimizing truck traffic along Old School Road.	BA	As outlined in BA Group's updated traffic report, the heavy vehicle traffic for 12861 Dixie Road will primarily use the easterly signalized access from Old School Road, with some heavy traffic using westerly Old School Road right-in/right-out access. Based on the distribution of heavy traffic for the Site, most of the inbound heavy traffic will be coming NB on Dixie Road, turning right at the intersection of Dixie/Old School and heading eastward to one of the site accesses. Based on the distribution of heavy traffic for the Site, most of the outbound heavy traffic will be heading WB on Old School Road, turning left at the intersection of Dixie/Old School and heading southbound along Dixie Road. A negligible amount of inbound/outbound heavy traffic will be travelling to/from WB along Old School Road.
	b	Interim Mitigation Measures: Proposed measures to ensure safe and efficient vehicle entry and exit without conflicts with oncoming traffic during interim conditions.	BA	To accommodate safe and efficient vehicle entry and exit along Old School Road, the primary access for 12861 Dixie Road is provided from a signalized access from Old School Road. The proposed signal will provide protected turn movements, which minimizes conflict with oncoming traffic. In addition, turn lanes are proposed at all site accesses along Old School Road to ensure the through traffic is not impeded by the turning traffic.
	c	Pavement Assessment: If truck traffic on Old School Road is proposed, as requested by Development Engineering, the applicant's geotechnical consultant must conduct a pavement structure assessment and provide recommendations to confirm the road's suitability for truck traffic.	BA	Assessment of the existing pavement structure of Old School Road is currently being undertaken. The findings and recommendation will be provided as part of a subsequent submission.
Proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning Bylaw Amendment Applications				
		<u>Town of Caledon, Development and Design – April 15, 2025</u>		
	1	Planning Justification Report		
		• The Planning Justification Report (PJR) must be updated to reflect the Future Caledon Official Plan	Armstrong	Previously included; refer to Section 3.4.
		• Reference and mapping should be included to clearly identify the east-west collector road system in accordance with the FCOP Schedules.	Armstrong	Previously included; refer to figures.
		• Employment density calculations must be clarified and consistently presented throughout the report. In accordance with FCOP Policy 4.1.6, a minimum of 26 jobs per hectare is required. Based on 116.7 hectares total and 77 net developable hectares, the site is required to support a minimum of 2,015 jobs. The PJR currently references 2,500 jobs in one section and 2,485 in another; this discrepancy should be corrected for consistency.	Armstrong	Corrected to ensure consistency.
		• Section 1.4 – Growth Management and Phasing Plan (GMPP) should be revised to align with the Council-approved phasing strategy.	Armstrong	Previously included; refer to Section 1.4 where we acknowledge the existing designations and provide justification to move the lands at 12861 Dixie Road into Phase 1.
		• Section 1.4.1 must be updated to provide accurate and current references to all approved and active OPA, ZBA, and SPA applications, specifically those related to 12668 and 12862 Dixie Road.	Armstrong	Corrected. See section 1.4.
		• A map must be included showing all site addresses that are subject to the proposed Official Plan Amendment, clearly delineating all parcels included.	Armstrong	See Schedule A in OPA.
	2	Draft Official Plan Amendment (OPA)		
		• A Word version of the Draft Official Plan Amendment should be provided (Appendix A).	Armstrong	Word doc will be provided.
		• All associated schedules must be updated and included in the resubmission package.	Armstrong	Acknowledged.
		• Comments from adjacent landowners, submitted by GWD and GSAI (attached separately), must be addressed comprehensively within the revised submission.	Armstrong	Items previously addressed in letter dated April 30, 2025 included herewith. Also addressed in the revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study included herewith
	3	Local Subwatershed Study (LSS)		
		• The Terms of Reference for the Local Subwatershed Study must be finalized and submitted, and the study itself must be completed and submitted prior to the advancement of the application.	Armstrong/Stantec/Tribal	Acknowledged. Finalized TOR and responses submitted to the Town on June 20, 2025. Local SWS has been prepared and is included in the submission package. Note, the TOR approval was granted by TRCA on July 18, 2025.
	4	Technical Reviews		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation: The application must address and review truck access limitations at 12861 Dixie Road, as well as confirm alignment with the requirement for an east-west collector road. 	BA	<p>As outlined in BA Group's updated traffic report, the heavy vehicle traffic for 12861 Dixie Road will primarily use the easterly signalized access from Old School Road, with some heavy traffic using westerly Old School Road right-in/right-out access. Based on the distribution of heavy traffic for the Site, most of the inbound heavy traffic will be coming NB on Dixie Road, turning right at the intersection of Dixie/Old School and heading eastward to one of the site accesses. Based on the distribution of heavy traffic for the Site, most of the outbound heavy traffic will be heading WB on Old School Road, turning left at the intersection of Dixie/Old School and heading southbound along Dixie Road. A negligible amount of inbound/outbound heavy traffic will be travelling to/from WB along Old School Road.</p> <p>A letter was sent to the Region of Peel on May 8, 2024, titled “Town of Caledon – Draft Official Plan – Road Network – Dixie Road” which addresses the rationale for excluding the proposed east west collector road. It outlines that the collector roads would negatively impact the functionality of employment lands by reducing developable space, duplicating on-site circulation systems, and creating conflicts between employment and residential land uses. Furthermore, the transportation needs of the area are already met by the regional arterial network and proximity to current and planned provincial highway interchanges. Including the collector road would not enhance connectivity but would likely generate conflicts and diminish the viability of employment lands.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and Financial Impact Study (FIS): The Town has initiated a peer review process for these studies, and additional information will be provided soon. 	Colville/Urbanmetrics	Noted.
	<u>Comments on the Zoning By-law Amendment Application (RZ 2024-0034)</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly define all zone standards as minimum or maximum. 	Armstrong	See attached ZBA herewith.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure future Draft By-law submissions are in editable Word format (tracked changes preferred). 	Armstrong	Word doc will be provided.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Align all zone standards (e.g., setbacks, heights, planting strips) in the Draft By-law with the Zoning Matrix on the Site Plan. 	Armstrong	Corrected to ensure consistency.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove lot line schedules and instead include updated definitions. 	Armstrong	Corrected.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide Finished Grade on elevation drawings for height compliance; confirm lighting fixture heights and revise entrance widths (max 12.5m unless relief is sought). 	Armstrong	Lighting fixture heights will be 12.2m.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify Data Centre areas, garbage enclosures, and confirm the specific use (e.g., warehouse vs industrial) to apply accurate parking ratios. 	Armstrong	It is unknown at this time if/where Data Centre uses will be on site. We added the use to ensure flexibility in the future given the current market dynamics. Requesting a conversation with zoning staff to discuss.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify parking standards for Data Centre use and ensure consistency across documents. 	Armstrong	See above response.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge the existing dwelling at 12489 Dixie Rd will become legal non-conforming under the proposed Open Space zoning. 	Armstrong	Do staff have another recommendation? Requesting a meeting to discuss this item as well.
	<u>Town of Caledon, Transportation Engineering, Public Works & Transportation – April 9, 2025</u>		
1	A letter titled ‘Town of Caledon – Draft Official Plan – Road Network – Dixie Road’ is reference in the responses. Please confirm if this letter was circulated with Town Staff.	BA	A letter titled 'Town of Caledon – Draft Official Plan – Road Network – Dixie Road' was circulated to Town staff.
	<u>Town of Caledon, Transportation Engineering, Public Works & Transportation – May 14, 2025</u>		
	Road Network		

	Collector Road Network		
1	The road system/network as identified in the approved Town of Caledon Multi Modal Transportation Master Plan (MMTMP, June 2024) and Future Caledon OP Schedule C1 and F2a is required as previously advised/commented. The Future Caledon OP identifies:	BA	The site traffic generated by the proposed developments at 12489 and 12861 Dixie Road can be accommodate within the current and future road network with the signalized intersections operating acceptably. As such the potential east-west road network is not required to accommodate the site traffic within the surrounding network and thus not required for the approval of the two sites.
	• Two (2) East-West roads	BA	
	• A North-South road along the eastern limits of the subject property	BA	
2	Town Engineering Services has retained HDR to look at all new development in the Future OP, asses the road network and need for an east-west road (for additional connectivity) and undertake an addendum to the approved Town of Caledon Multi Modal Transportation Master Plan (MMTMP, June 2024).	BA	Acknowledged.
	The MMTMP addendum is intended primarily to assess collector road requirements in the settlement area boundary expansion (SABE) area of Caledon, including an assessment of the need for continuous East-West collector roads. The limits of the assessment for the east-west road is Hurontario Street to the west, Coleraine Drive to the east, Old School Road / Highway 413 to the north, and Mayfield Road to the south. Secondary Planning, Tertiary Planning, Draft Plans and development in the plan area are to have regard for the findings of the MMTMP update. MMTMP update and Secondary Planning are anticipated to proceed concurrently. The addendum may result in a revised road network and the determination of conceptual east-west collector road alignment.	BA/Armstrong	Acknowledged.
i	Determination of conceptual collector roads alignment and assessment of impacts is to be included in the applicable Secondary Plan/OPA documents (Local SWS, FSR/SWM, Servicing Staging & Sequencing Plan, TIS). OPA is to have regard for the findings of this process with regards to collector roads.	BA/Armstrong	An east-west collector road has yet to be agreed upon. If an agreement is reached, the applicable documents will be revised as such.
ii	Any proposed crossings of the NHS/Valley Lands are to be assessed in the Local Subwatershed Study and the FSR/SWM. FSR/SWM is to provide details for crossings including plan profile drawings and preliminary crossing structure design.	Stantec/BA/Armstrong	Acknowledged. Currently no crossings are planned. Should crossings be proposed, they will be addressed in the supporting technical studies, as listed.
3	It is Development Engineering’s understanding that New collector roads requires an EA. The Town does not currently have a timetable for when these EAs are to be undertaken. If the developer is seeking to advance the road ahead of municipal timelines, the developer will need to fulfil the requirements of the EA process. Further discussion with Town Development Engineering and Transportation Staff is required.	Stantec/BA/Armstrong	An east-west collector road has yet to be agreed upon. However, a separate EA can be completed at a later date if a road were to be included on or off the lands.
4	Various Region of Peel Official Plan policies speak to the need for continuous collector roads within the SABE to address traffic, transit, and active transportation objectives. Region water and wastewater DC maps indicate watermain to service the plan area are to be provided between Dixie and Bramalea that are typically within the municipal ROW. The current land use plan and other OPA documents do not provide for an east-west collector road within the plan.	Stantec/BA/Armstrong	A letter was sent to the Region of Peel on May 8, 2024, titled “Town of Caledon – Draft Official Plan – Road Network – Dixie Road” which addresses the rationale for excluding the proposed east west collector road. It outlines that the collector roads would negatively impact the functionality of employment lands by reducing developable space, duplicating on-site circulation systems, and creating conflicts between employment and residential land uses. Furthermore, the transportation needs of the area are already met by the regional arterial network and proximity to current and planned provincial highway interchanges. Including the collector road would not enhance connectivity but would likely generate conflicts and diminish the viability of employment lands. .
	Old School Road Comments:		

5	There is currently no EA or detailed design (DD) being undertaken for Old School Road at this time. The MMTMP (June 2024) and the Towns DC Background Study (Feb. 29, 2024) identifies that timing of the Old School Road urbanization and widening from Winston Churchill Boulevard to Airport Road is 2041. Timeframe for road improvements may need to be accelerated considering the anticipated development in the area. If the developer is seeking to advance the road works ahead of any municipal timelines for the EA, the developer will need to fulfil the requirements of the EA process. Further discussion with Town Development Engineering and Transportation Staff is required.	BA/Armstrong	Acknowledged
6	The MMTMP and the Official Plan (Schedule C) passed by Town council identifies a 36.0m ROW width for Old School Road to support future growth. The applicant shall dedicate to the Town, gratuitously and free and clear of all encumbrances, a road widening of 18 meters from the centerline along the frontage of development lands adjacent to Old School Road. Additional ROW may be required at intersections for auxiliary turn lanes and/or for adjustments to road alignment. Advanced land dedication may be required for any road works anticipated to be completed prior to registration of draft plans.	BA	Acknowledged
7	Old School Road fronting 12861 Dixie Road permits local deliveries but is currently designated as a no-trucking route and is not designated for long term heavy truck traffic. The application currently proposes truck entrances off of Old School Road and as such, the Town will require the applicant's Geotechnical consultant to investigate the pavement structure and conduct a pavement assessment to provide recommendations for Old School Road to accommodate truck traffic to Dixie Road	BA	Acknowledged
i	The TIS included a comment response identifying that "Additional geotechnical investigation will	BA	Noted.
ii	The TIS and Servicing Staging & Sequencing Plan identifies the following:		
	The westerly right-in/right-out access requires the widening of the roadway to accommodate a centre median.	BA	
	• Old School Road/Site Access 3 (easternmost access) is proposed to be signalized as part of the Site Development and Old School Road will be widened to a 3 lane cross section, with dedicated left turn and right turn lanes.	BA	Noted.
	• The intersection of Old School Road and Dixie Road is proposed to be widened to accommodate turn lanes.	BA	Noted
	Further discussion with Development Engineering and Transportation Engineering Staff is required regarding these improvements including but not limited to:	BA	Noted
	• The location of the proposed intersection and that it has regard for its future northern extension and spacing/separation from other roadways.	BA	Noted
	• How the identified road network improvements will be facilitated.	BA	Noted
	<u>Dixie Road Comments:</u>		
8	Dixie Road is currently a Regional Road and thus please confirm details and requirements for this roadway with the Region of Peel. However, please note that it is anticipated that Regional Roads will be downloaded to the Town in the future.	BA	Noted
	<u>General Roadway Comments:</u>		
9	Draft Plan of Subdivisions (DPOS) are typically required to implement proposed public infrastructure (road network and SWM facilities). Development Engineering requires clarification on the mechanism to implement the required road network, various improvements and associated infrastructure.	BA	Noted

10	Geotechnical reports and Hydrogeologic Reports will be required with draft plan submissions or submission associated with facilitating the road network and any associated public infrastructure (i.e. SWM Ponds). Reports are to address construction requirements of the proposed roads and SWM ponds considering soil and groundwater conditions.	BA/Stantec	Geotechnical reports and Hydrogeologic Reports have been prepared for the proposed development concept for the draft plan submissions and address construction requirements considering soil and groundwater conditions.
11	An active transportation network is required based on the required road network. Policies will need to be included in the OPA to address implementation of the AT network	BA	Noted
	Local Subwatershed Study and CEISM		
12	At the PARC stage it was identified that the Town requires a Local Subwatershed Study (LSS) however one does not appear to have been included in the submission and remains outstanding.	Stantec/Armstrong	Acknowledged. Please see attached.
i	The LSS is to provide the environmental base, including the natural and water-based systems, to support planning of roads for the Secondary Plan Area. It is the Town's expectation that the Local Subwatershed Study will include the necessary level of study, evaluate impacts and inform the preferred road alignment for collector roads that fully considers the connections through to the east side of the Secondary Plan and west of Dixie. The LSS should finalize the criteria and a proposed strategy for servicing that can be reflecting in the FSR.	Stantec/Armstrong	Acknowledged. Please see attached.
ii	Development Engineering understands that Town Water Resource Staff have provided comments on the various circulations of the Draft TOR for the LSS. Detailed technical comments on the Local SWS are to be provided by Town Stormwater Engineering Staff, the Town Peer Review Consultants (if required), Town Natural Heritage Planners, and TRCA. Please refer to the following comments previously provided which remain outstanding:	Stantec	Finalized TOR and responses submitted to the Town on June 20, 2025. Local SWS has been prepared and is included in the submission package.
	• Water Resources Comments (Cassie Schrembri), dated February 26, 2024.	Stantec	Acknowledged. See response above
	• Water Resources Comments (Cassie Schrembri), dated March 7, 2025.	Stantec	Acknowledged. See response above
	• Development Engineering and Water Resource Comments (Cassie Schrembri and Drew Haines),	Stantec	Acknowledged. See response above
	• It is the Towns expectation that the proposed Terms of Reference for a Local Subwatershed Study for POPA 2024-0001 will be updated to address these comments.	Stantec	Acknowledged. See response above
iii	The Local Subwatershed Study should provide recommendations to inform the EIR and FSR/SWM Report at the next planning stage. The EIR and FSR/SWM should implement the recommendation of the LSS. Therefore, detailed comments on the CESIMP and stormwater management strategy have not been provided until such time as the LSS is completed and circulated.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
iv	The LSS should include and address the revisions to the collector road network and any additional crossings of the NHS.	Stantec	The results of the ecology studies does not comment impacts to the NHS resulting from crossings as no crossings are proposed.
13	The second last paragraph of Section 1 of the CEISMP identifies that a CEISMP has been requested as part of the application package to support the project. At the PARC stage a LSS was requested. The information collected to support the CESIMP should be incorporated into the LSS.	Stantec	Acknowledged, the information in the CEISMP has been included in the LSS
14	The LSS should clearly identify the water balance criteria that is to be achieved. The CEISMP describes how the water balance is to be achieved but does not identify how the criteria was determined or set the framework for the FSR/SWM.	Stantec	Water balance criteria set in Local SWS and this requirement has been added to FSSMR.
15	The CESIMP references and summarizes the FSSMR for how water balance, water quality and water quality is to be achieved. The LSS is the higher level study and should set the framework and criteria for the FSR/SWM to abide by and implement, not the other way around.	Stantec	Noted

16	The CEISMP identifies the SWM pond will include a 2m forebay and at least a 3m deep main bay (as the receiving watercourse is Redside Dace habitat), but does not elaborate on any other criteria or requirements. The higher level LSS should identify details regarding mitigation of potential impacts to Redside Dace Habbitat and contributing habitat including the required criteria. The SWM facilities should be designed in accordance with the MECP's Guidance for Development Activities in Redside Dace Protected Habitat (2016). Confirmation from MECP and DFO that they support the proposed design is required as part of this application. Further to this, the design of the facilities should be done in alignment with Thermal Mitigation Checklist for Stormwater Management Ponds Discharging into Redside Dace Habitat – Version 1.1 (MNRF Aurora District, June 18, 2014, and as amended) and the findings of Data Synthesis and Design Considerations for Stormwater Thermal Mitigation Measures (Van Seters, T., Graham, C., Dougherty, J., Jacob-Okor, C., David, Y. 2019) should be considered in the design of the facilities. Any stormwater discharge cannot be thermally impacted by the urban development.	Stantec	Noted
	Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report		
17	The stormwater management strategy should align and be informed by the recommendations of the Local Subwatershed Study which has yet to be provided. Therefore, the stormwater management strategy has not been reviewed in detail or comments provided until the LSS has been completed and circulated.	Stantec	Acknowledged. Local SWS has been prepared and is included in the submission package.
i	Provide SWM Design Criteria as informed by the LSS and in compliance with the Towns CLI ECA criteria.	Stantec	SWM Design criteria is in compliance with Local SWS and Town's CLI ECA criteria.
18	The FSR and SWM Report is to be revised to include the revisions to the required collector road network, including identifying compliance with the Towns CLI ECA Performance Criteria.	Stantec	There is not a collector road proposed within the north or south site. FSR and SWM Report updated with criteria in compliance with Local SWS and Town's CLI ECA criteria.
	https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/standards-policies-and-guidelines.aspx#Consolidated-Linear-Infrastructure-Environmental-Compliance-Approval-CLI-ECA-	Stantec	
19	Include the water balance infiltration target on a Figure, including flow targets/requirements for flows to the remaining portion of the HDF and receiving EPA.	Stantec	Water balance infiltration targets have been added to the Figure D3 in LSS
20	Water Balance Criteria is to be set and informed by the LSS.	Stantec	Water balance criteria is provided in Local SWS (Section 5.3.2) and this requirement has been added to FSSMR.
21	Clearly identify and elaborate on the requirements and criteria associated with Redside Dace. This should be informed from the LSS. Elaborate in the SWM Report on where the criteria/requirements was obtained from and what is being implemented to address the criteria. Please refer to other comments in this memo pertaining to Redside Dace.	Stantec	References to the Guidance for Development Activities in Redside Dace Protected Habitat (OMNRF, 2016) have been added to the Local SWS and the FSSMR in the SWM criteria, and temperature of discharge has been added to the Criteria list in both documents. Bottom draw outfalls at a certain depth are proposed to provide thermal mitigation
22	The SWM Report is to include a section and details pertaining to how external drainage is accommodated. Section 4.6.3 is currently insufficient.	Stantec	Additional text added to this section to describe the proposed servicing solution for the external drainage which allows for conveyance of the existing flows through the site to the receiving watercourses.
i	The EA and drainage strategy for Old School Road needs to be sufficiently advanced to determine the future conditions of how existing drainage north of Old School Road, and Old School Road itself is accommodated. This may require additional land and an appropriate outlet. The widening and urbanization of Old School Road will trigger the Towns CLI ECA through which a detailed strategy for stormwater management will be identified. Currently, Old School Road does not comply with the Towns CLI ECA.	Stantec	Town to advise on timing of EA and potential widening requirements for Old School Road

ii	Section 4.6.3 and the Figures identify a storm sewer at the northeast corner of the site that accommodates drainage from north of Old School Road as well as a storm sewer at the northwest corner of the site that accommodates drainage parallel with Dixie (on private property) and ultimately to the Tributary of West Humber River. However, no details have been included including capacity analysis, emergency overland flow, Old School Road drainage, etc. The Report is lacking substantial detail on external drainage.	Stantec	Proposed pipes are sized to convey the existing 100 year flow. Drainage to be collected on the south side of Old School Road to be able to collect the ditch drainage as well as the lands north of Dixie flowing through the culverts. Conveyance calculations to be provided as part of the site plan submission.
iii	It is not clear how servicing (storm, water, san) for the two fragmented parcels northeast of the subject Development which are part of Secondary Plan Area E3 of the Towns Future Official Plan have been considered and will be developed in the future. These properties are required to be included and considered. Furthermore the report should also address the properties fronting Dixie Road that are part of Secondary Plan Area E3 of the Towns Future Official Plan, but are not part of the subject development.	Stantec	The OPA/ZBA packages are for 12489 and 12861 Dixie Road only and do not provide servicing or grading stragies for properties that are not part of the application.
23	The feature-based water balance is to be reviewed and approved by the TRCA.	Stantec	Acknowledged
24	As the site is proposing to outlet to the TRCA regulated area review and approval of the SWM Report is required by the TRCA.	Stantec	Acknowledged
25	The FSR and SWM Report is to be stamped, signed and dated by a Professional Engineer.	Stantec	Acknowledged
26	Update the Servicing Staging and Sequencing Plan accordingly based on the revisions and comments contained within this memo.	Stantec	Acknowledged
27	At the Site Plan stage, it is recommended that a separate SWM report be provided for each subject property (north site and south site) for clarity, ease of review and referencing.	Stantec	Acknowledged
	<u>Noise and Vibration Assessment (December 14, 2024)</u>		
28	The Noise and Vibration Assessment is to be peer reviewed at the applicant's expense. Development Engineering is of the opinion that the applications submission material is subject to change based on the required road network and comments contained within this memo. Therefore, the Noise and Vibration Assessment will be sent out for peer review when a revised report is received.	SLR	Noted. A revised report will be provided. However, QuadReal has not agreed to a road yet. Therefore, the roadway network in the report will be unchanged.
29	The Assessment appears to only consider existing sensitive receptors and should include consideration for the future residential lands as identified in the Towns Future OP Figure F1 and Area E4 Figure F3, which is currently being advanced through the Mayfield Tullamore Land Owners Group (OPA 24-06). The site design is currently right up to the property line and does not demonstrate or provide a satisfactory design, buffer, or separation distance to address land use compatibility between the new community area sensitive land uses (Future OP Figure F3 – Area E3) and the new employment area (Future OP Figure F3 – Area E3). The report is elaborate and identify how land use compatibility and the requirements of the D-6 guidelines will be met. It appears the north-south road identified in the Towns Future OP along the eastern property line which has been omitted from the site design, may have been intended to act as a buffer between the conflicting land uses.	SLR	The applicable MECP Publication NPC-300 noise guidelines only requires an assesment of lands with existing receptors or where the property is <i>zoned</i> for future sensitive receptors. It does not apply to lands which merely have a Official Plan designation, and certainly does not apply to where an only an OP amendment has been applied for. Regardless, the revised report includes an assessment of potential noise impacts on the Mayfield-Tullamore Secondary Plan. Feasible mitigation measures exist to ensure compoliance swith ther noise guidelines. The need for the extent of noise mitigation measures would be established as part of noise studies conducted when Zoning By-law Amendment for the Mayfield-Tullamore lands are filed, as part of the normal land use planning approval process.
30	The proposed zoning permits cold storage, however only cold storage was assessed for Buildings 1 and 3 at 12489 Dixie Road. The report identifies that "Cold storage activities must be restricted to Buildings 1 and 3 on the 12489 Dixie Road property." Please confirm and clarify how this is intended to be restricted for the other property and buildings as the proposed zoning currently permits cold storage	SLR	The revised report includes further assessment of miitgation for potential Cold Storage operations. With mitigation, Cold Storage is feasible for all buildings on the site.

31	As the zoning permits cold storage the analysis should consider the worst-case scenario of cold storage for all buildings at both properties (12489 Dixie Road and 12861 Dixie Road). The report identifies that “Cold storage cannot be used at either of the two buildings on the 12861 Dixie Road property (no feasible mitigation measures exist).” It is assumed this is the same for Building 2 of 12489 Dixie Road. As there are no feasible mitigation measures, please identify and elaborate on how this is to be addressed.	SLR	The revised report includes further assessment of mitigation for potential Cold Storage operations. With mitigation, Cold Storage is feasible for all buildings on the site.
32	The noise report identifies barriers ranging in height from 3.0 to 4.5m are needed to meet the noise guideline limits. However, as per Town Standards, the maximum height of a noise barrier is 4.8m (2.4m berm + 2.4m noise barrier) through the combination of a berm and noise barrier.	SLR	As noted in the Revised Report, the Town Standards apply to noise walls used to address transportation noise, and not to purpose built noise barriers intended to address stationary/ industrial noise, and which are located on private property.
33	Policies should be included in the OP to address Land Use Compatibility and Noise matters.	SLR	Per the conclusions of the revised report, with the inclusion of noise mitigation, the Project is compatible with surrounding land uses.
34	Review and revise any typos throughout the report:	SLR	Noted.
i	Revise “mat” to “may” in Section 6.3	SLR	Noted.
ii	Revise “art” to “at” in Section 6.4.4	SLR	Noted.
	<u>Urban Transportation Considerations (December 2023)</u>		
35	Development Engineering defers review and approval of the Urban Transportation Considerations Report to the Towns Transportation Department.	BA	Noted.
36	Refer to general comments above for comments on the proposed and existing road network. Comments are to be incorporated into the Study, as applicable. Collector road alignment is to be coordinated with surrounding properties.	BA	Noted.
37	The Study is titled 12489 Dixie Road. The report and figures only include the 12489 Dixie Road property. Study is to be updated to reflect the entire OPA subject area within both the text, figures and appendices.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
38	Report references three buildings while figures only show two and does not include 12861 Dixie Road.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
39	The Study is to include reference to required road improvements for Old School Road to support the development including timing of the improvements and how these works will be facilitated as Old School Road currently does not permit truck traffic. Refer to other comments contained within this memo.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
40	Section 1.2 and 6.0 only references the accesses off of Dixie Road and does not include Old School Road where according to the Site Plans access is also proposed. Ensure all accesses are included.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
41	Figure 15 is missing.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
42	Section 8.4.1.5 and 8.4.1.6 appear to be the exact same and is repeated. Clarify/revise.	BA	Noted. Refer to BA Group's updated reports.
	<u>Town of Caledon, Planning & Development, Zoning – March 11, 2025</u>		
	<u>POPA 2024-0011 Zoning Comments:</u>		
1	Zoning staff have no comments with regards to POPA 2024-0011.		
	<u>RZ 2024-0034 Zoning Comments:</u>		
2	Zoning notes that Lot Line Schedules do not form part of Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2006-50, as amended. Schedule B to Zoning By-law 2006-50 is reserved exclusively for structural envelopes. Zoning staff have reviewed the proposed Schedules and have recommended changes to the Draft By-law to include amended definitions regarding the establishment of lot lines, in lieu of the proposed Schedules.	Armstrong	See revised draft ZBA attached.

3	Please clarify whether the proposed zone standards on the Draft Zoning By-law are minimum or maximum values. Zoning staff note that certain zone standards have a value assigned, but a minimum or maximum has not been identified.	Armstrong	See revised draft ZBA attached.
4	Confirm lighting fixture heights and ensure compliance with the proposed Draft Zoning By-law for both 12489 and 12861 Dixie Road properties.	Armstrong	Lighting fixtures are 12.2m.
5	Zoning staff note that certain zone standards (ie. rear and interior side yard planting strip widths, building height etc.) as proposed in the Draft Zoning By-law are not consistent with those shown in the Zoning Matrix provided on the submitted Site Plan. Please ensure consistency between the zone standards proposed in the Draft By-law and those shown in the Zoning Matrix on the Site Plan.	Armstrong/Ware Malcomb	Corrected to ensure consistency.
6	Zoning notes that Finished Grade, as defined below, has not been provided on the submitted Elevation Plans. Please provide Finished Grade on the Elevation Plans in order to determine building height compliance.	Armstrong/Ware Malcomb	WM: Please refer to updated elevation drawings. The average grade and dimensions for Max. building height from average grade are added.
a	Finished Grade means the average surface elevation at the outside walls of any building or structure, which is determined by taking the arithmetic mean of the levels of the finished ground surface at every location of change of grade at the outside walls of the building or structure.	Armstrong/Ware Malcomb	WM: Please refer to updated elevation drawings. The average grade and dimensions for Max. building height from average grade are added.
7	Section 4.3.5 of Town of Caledon Zoning By-law 2006-50 permits a maximum entrance width of 12.5 metres. The submitted Site Plan shows a maximum entrance width of 17.15 metres for 12489 Dixie Road and 17.00 metres for 12861 Dixie Road. Revision is required, or consider adding relief through the Draft Zoning By-law.	Armstrong/Ware Malcomb	Relief will be added through Draft Zoning By-law.
8	Provide clarification on the location of any proposed garbage enclosure(s) in accordance with Section 4.14 of Town of Caledon Zoning By-law 2006-50, as amended.	Armstrong/Ware Malcomb	WM: Please refer to updated site plan drawings and keynote 46. Staging areas to be used for temporarily placing the bins for garbage collections are now shown at the drive-in ramps.
9	Zoning notes that the submitted Site Plan identified an “Industrial Use” parking ratio of 139 + 1 per each 170m2 of Net Floor Area over 10,000m2. It is noted that under the Building Area calculations, the use has been identified as a Warehouse. More clarification on the specific proposed use may be required in order to apply the correct parking ratios.	Armstrong/Ware Malcomb	WM: The buildings are considered industrial warehouse and the parking rate that is used if for this type of use. Office area is less than 5% of the entire footprint of each building, therefore the warehouse rate has applied for the entire area. (Refer to site statistics on A100).
10	Zoning requests the applicant please identify any areas dedicated to the Data Centre use on the submitted Floor Plans.	Armstrong	It is not known at this time if Data Center uses will be on site. Added as a use for flexibility given the current market. Request a meeting with staff to discuss this issue.
11	Zoning notes that a Data Centre has been included in the Draft By-law; however, no parking ratio has been proposed for such use. Please clarify the intended use and the applicable parking ratio in order to determine parking compliance.	Armstrong	It is not known at this time if Data Center uses will be on site. Added as a use for flexibility given the current market. Request a meeting with staff to discuss this issue.
12	Zoning notes that the existing Dwelling, Detached located on the property 12489 Dixie Road appears to be located within the proposed Open Space (OS) Zone. The Open Space (OS) Zone does not permit a Dwelling, Detached and as such, the use would be considered legal non-conforming once the property has been rezoned to the proposed Zones as stated in Paragraph 2 of the Draft Zoning By-law.	Armstrong	Do staff have other recommendations? Requesting a meeting to discuss.
13	Please see the draft by-law comments provided. Any future copies of the draft by-law must be in Microsoft Word format (no PDF to Word conversions). Tracked changes are recommended but not required.	Armstrong	Comments in ZBA addressed.
	<u>Town of Caledon, Strategic Policy Planning, Planning Department – March 10, 2025</u>		
1	Redesignation of Lands:		

	The Official Plan Amendment (OPA) proposes to redesignate lands from Prime Agricultural Area to General Industrial. Please note that this redesignation will not amend the existing Official Plan but will instead amend the Council-Adopted Future Caledon Official Plan. As such, in future submissions the proposed land uses must conform to the Future Caledon Official Plan. For example, the proposed redesignation of Prime Agricultural designation to General Industrial will need to be revised to a proposed redesignation of the “Employment” designation to “General Employment” to ensure consistency.	Armstrong	The current land use designation as per the current in force OP is Prime Agricultural. The FCOP has yet to receive approval and cannot be amended. This application was deemed complete under the current OP.
2	Alignment with Future Caledon Official Plan		
	Future submissions for the OPA and Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) must fully reflect the policies and designations outlined in the Council-Approved Future Caledon Official Plan.	Armstrong	PJR has previously included a Section on FCOP. See Sec. 3.4.
3	Secondary Plan Process		
	Previous policy planning comments dated May 4, 2024, requested that this application follow the Secondary Plan process as directed by the Future Caledon Official Plan. Subsequent discussions have resolved this matter by revising the process to a Scoped Secondary Plan.	Armstrong	Noted. As per previous correspondence and discussions, this will not be a Secondary Plan in the traditional sense, but rather a scoped OPA or revised title of Secondary Plan.
4	Response to Previous Comments		
	All other responses to policy planning comments dated May 4, 2024, are satisfactory and require		Noted.
	<u>Town of Caledon, Fire and Emergency Services – March 12, 2025</u>		
1	The Community Risk Assessment indicates a significant gap in the delivery of an appropriate level of fire suppression services within this development area.	Stantec	As noted in Section 5.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by Stantec, the Peel Region 2020 Water and Wastewater Plan for the Lake-Based Systems identifies Project 10-1210 C5 with extension of the existing 400mm diameter watermain along Dixie Road up to Old School Road. This work is anticipated to be completed as part of the capital works program. Service connections for the proposed development will be provided up to the property line to service the properties. The proposed fire service connection have been coordinated with the capital works watermain design drawings.
2	The 2022 amended Fire Station Location Study has identified this area as under serviced and an ideal location for a new fire station equipped with apparatus and staffed by a minimum of 4 firefighter 24/7.	Stantec	Noted. The proposed building will be springled, however, the comment will be discussed further with the Town.
3	Fire Services does not recommend increasing this risk until further strides are made in the fire suppression deployment benchmarks including a minimum of 10 firefighters responding within a 10-minute response time (turnout time + travel time) to 80% of the fire related incidents within this response area.	Stantec	Noted. The proposed building will be springled, however, the comment will be discussed further with the Town.
4	Pressurized Fire Hydrants with adequate fire flow must be provided in accordance with Region of Peel Standards.	Stantec	The requested fire hydrant tests will be provided upon completion of the proposed 400mm diameter watermain along Dixie Road.
	<u>Town of Caledon, Finance Department – March 10, 2025</u>		
1	Future Town circulations and other correspondences should carry the property owners’ names and tax roll numbers as are set out in tax invoices.	Quadreal	Noted
2	If the proposed applications were to proceed as planned, the taxable assessment value of the properties may change, to reflect any development that would have taken place.	Quadreal	Noted
3	Under current by-laws of the Town and other charging entities, any new, added, or regularized buildings will attract Development Charges (DC) at the Non-Residential (Industrial) rates that will be in effect on the date when the first zoning amendment application (if required) is deemed complete (the application completion date), and provided that the first zoning amendment took place after January 1, 2020. Otherwise, Development Charges will be determined on the date of building permit issuance.	Quadreal	Noted
4	Current Development Charges for buildings at the Non-Residential (Industrial) rates are:	Quadreal	Noted

a	Town of Caledon: \$114.89 per square metre of industrial floor space.	Quadreal	Noted
b	Region of Peel: \$230.15 per square metre of industrial floor space.	Quadreal	Noted
c	School Boards: \$11.84 per square metre of industrial floor space.	Quadreal	Noted
5	For the purposes of Development Charges listed above, industrial floor space should comply with the definition of an 'industrial building', as outlined in the Town's By-laws 2024-042 and 2024-043, or as amended. Otherwise, the Development Charge rates for Non-Residential (Other) will apply.	Quadreal	Noted
6	Additional information on Development Charges may be accessed on the Town's website at https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/development-charges.aspx	Quadreal	Noted
7	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at March 10, 2025, 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 18 months after application approval date. Interest charges will apply for affected applications. For applications other than site plan or rezoning applications; and 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.	Quadreal	Noted
	<u>Town of Caledon, Urban Design, Planning & Development Department – March 10, 2025</u>		
1	Where parking areas are visible from the street, buffer landscaping and architectural screening features shall be provided, such as tree planting, berming, low walls, decorative fencing and/or hedging	Ware Malcomb/MHBC	MHBC: Landscape has been proposed where applicable.
2	This site is a priority lot and thus shall require superior design qualities such as increased building massing/height and architectural interest for both front and flanking façades facing the streets	Ware Malcomb/MHBC	WM: Please note that this is the same design similar to other QuadReal projects in (12173 Dixie) this area which are laready approved.
3	For all industrial frontages along major roads, the landscape zone shall be 12.0m in width where there is truck parking and loading, otherwise the landscape zone shall be 9.0m in width. (TWDG 10.2.5.4)	Ware Malcomb/MHBC/Armstrong	Landscape buffers along Dixie Road are more than 12m for both lots.
4	Lands adjacent to residential areas shall be developed in a compatible manner, locating parking, loading and storage areas away from residential uses, and utilizing such provisions as landscaping, berming, site design and on-site open space and landscaping features to ensure adequate buffering between the two uses.	Ware Malcomb/SLR	MHBC : Landscape has been proposed moe plantings .
a	The Project North edge of the site is adjacent to future community lands and thus shall include provisions mentioned above	Ware Malcomb/SLR	WM: Curently there is 6m landscape buffer between these projects and the future community developments on project north. MHBC: Landscape has been proposed where applicable.
5	Urban Design Brief:		
a	On page 6, provide details on the intended integration and use of the retained 2-storey heritage building	Ware Malcomb/Armstrong	It is unknown at this time what the use is. Ongoing discussions with heritage staff to determine that.

b	Please note the propose phasing plan for the site	Ware Malcomb	WM: Please be advised that each site will be constructed in a single phase, therefore no phasing drawings is needed.
c	Please include language speaking to the transition features proposed along the project north edge to the adjacent community designated lands	MHBC	MHBC : Landscape has been proposed moe plantings along project north and further details can be sorted during site plan approval.
6	Accessibility is not applicable to POPAs or RZs.	Ware Malcomb	WM: Noted
7	One thing to note- The Healthy Development Assessment form submitted is not the correct form type. The Region of Peel has an ICI HDA large-scale form that is the correct form for this development.	Ware Malcomb/Purpose	ICI HDA large-scale form is included with this submission. (Purpose)
	<u>Town of Caledon, Policy & Heritage, Planning & Development Department – April 11, 2025</u>		
1	Heritage Impact Assessment		
	• In February 2025, Heritage staff provided Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) comments via email.	Stantec	Comments recieved on February 19 and 28, 2025 from Cassandra Jasinski.
	• The HIAs are to be revised and resubmitted as part of the second submission.	Stantec	Acknowledged
	• Heritage staff acknowledge that related Site Plan applications have been submitted for the heritage resources. Heritage Conservation Plans will be required in support of those applications, in line with the recommendations of the HIAs.	Stantec	Heritage Conservation Plans have been prepared for 12489 and 12861 Dixie Road. The plans were submitted as part of the Site Plan Application in February 2025.
2	Draft Official Plan Amendment		
	• See tracked changes excerpt of the Draft OPA text, provided under a separate cover, for Heritage comments	Stantec/Armstrong	Noted. Changes made.
3	Zoning By-law Amendment		
	• See tracked changes excerpt of draft ZBA text, provided under a separate cover, for Heritage comments.	Stantec/Armstrong	Noted. Changes made.
	• Further discussion required with TRCA to ensure that identified uses are supported and that any TRCA restrictions are considered in the ZBA.	Stantec/Armstrong	Further discussions will be had with TRCA to determine uses.
4	Site Plan and Landscape Plan – Comments Deferred		
	• Heritage comments on the site plans and landscape plans for 12489 Dixie Road and 12861 Dixie Road are deferred to the related site plan applications.	MHBC/Ware Malcomb	Noted.
5	Urban Design Brief		
	• For text in the Cultural Heritage section for 12489 Dixie Road, revise following the example set out in the Cultural Heritage section for 12861 Dixie Road, which is far more fulsome and better addresses HIA recommendations.	Ware Malcomb/Stantec	
	• Pg. 6, first paragraph: revise second sentence to “For the purpose of this redevelopment, all existing structures on the property will be demolished, with the exception of the two-storey farmhouse on the south side of the development area, as highlighted below.”	Ware Malcomb/Stantec	WM: Please refer to the updated UDB.
	• Pg. 24, second paragraph, second line: “adjacent cultural heritage resource” rather than “adjacent heritage property”	Ware Malcomb/Stantec	WM: Please refer to the updated UDB.
6	Archaeological Assessment		
	• The proponent provided the following archaeological assessment as part of the application submission:	Irvin	Noted.

	▪ “Revised Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Part of Lots 20 & 21 Concession 4 East of Centre Road, Geographic Township of Chinguacousy, County of Peel, now 12489 Dixie Road in the Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario”, prepared by Wood, dated November 23, 2022.	Irvin	Please note this report was authored by Wood, not IHI.
	▪ Accompanied by Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) compliance letter.	Irvin	See Comment above.
	o “Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment 12861 Dixie Road Parts of Lots 21 and 22, Concession 4 East of Centre Road Town of Caledon Regional Municipality of Peel Historic Township of Chinguacousy North Historic County of Peel”, prepared by Irvin Heritage Inc., dated April 24, 2022.	Irvin	Noted.
	▪ Accompanied by MCM compliance letter		Noted.
	o “Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment 12489 Dixie Road Parts of Lot 20 and 21, Concession 4 East of Centre Road Town of Caledon Regional Municipality of Peel Historic Township of Chinguacousy North Historic County of Peel”, prepared by Irvin Heritage Inc., dated May 4, 2022.	Irvin	Noted.
	▪ Accompanied by Supplemental Documentation		Noted.
	o “Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report 12861 Dixie Road Parts of Lots 21 and 22, Concession 4 East of Centre Road Town of Caledon Regional Municipality of Peel Historic Township of Chinguacousy North Historic County of Peel”, prepared by Irvin Heritage Inc., dated August 4, 2024.	Irvin	Noted.
	▪ Accompanied by Supplemental Documentation		Noted.
	o “Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment Spiers Site AkGw-551 12489 Dixie Road Parts of Lot 20, Concession 4 East of Centre Road Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel Historic Township of Chinguacousy North Historic County of Peel”, prepared by Irvin Heritage Inc., dated September 8, 2023.	Irvin	Noted.
	• A portion of the subject lands for 12489 Dixie Road still requires Stage 2 assessment. While Heritage staff acknowledge that is to be identified as EPA lands, MCM requires full assessment of subject lands as part of the development application process.	Irvin	Per the Minsiter's letter from last month, forthcoming permitting partial assessments will be introduced in Jan-2026. As such we are working with the Ministry to create acceptable wording for this area. Further, while the standards require an entire property be surveyed, this is fomrally at the discretion of the approval authority. A letter from Town of Caledon stating these lands are to be EPA and archaeological survey for this application be not required would likely be acceptable.
	• Stage 2 archaeological assessment resulted in the identification of three archaeological sites determined to have further cultural heritage value or interest:	Irvin	Noted.
	o Spiers Site (AkGw-551)	Irvin	Noted.
	o Hillside Site (AkGw-559)	Irvin	Noted.
	o Swords Site (AkGw-571)	Irvin	Noted.
	• Subsequent Stage 3 archaeological assessment for the Spiers Site (AkGw-551) resulted in the recommendation that the site had no further cultural heritage value or interest and further assessment was recommended.	Irvin	Noted.
	• Stage 3 archaeological assessment is still required for the Hillside Site (AkGw-551) and Swords Site (AkGw-571).	Irvin	Correct.
	• Related Site Plan applications have been submitted for the subject lands (SPA 2025-0016 and 0017) Prior to Site Plan approval, the applicant must:	Irvin	Noted.
	• Retain a licensed archaeologist to carry out Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the previously unassessed lands with archaeological potential, as identified in Map 6 of the Stage 1 & 2 assessment of 12489 Dixie Road.	Irvin	Noted.

• Submit Indigenous Engagement Log for assessments.	Irvin	As these assessment noted above were completed prior to the 2024 TOR for Archaeological Studies, not such logs exist as such engagemd is not required per the provincial archaeological standards.
• Submit outstanding Stage 3, and where warranted, Stage 4 Archaeological Assessments for the Hillside Site (AkGw-559) and Swords Site (AkGw-571).	Irvin	Noted.
• Submit outstanding MCM compliance letters for all Stage 2-4 assessments.	Irvin	The reports are pending review with the Ministry and will be entered into register shortly.
• No demolition, construction, grading or other soil disturbances shall take place prior to the Town of Caledon Heritage staff receiving, to their satisfaction, all completed archaeological assessment(s) and the MCM compliance letter(s) indicating that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied and the report(s) has been entered into the Public Registry.	Irvin	Noted.
<u>Region of Peel – March 21, 2025</u>		
<u>Transportation Development Comments</u>		
<u>Access/Study Requirements</u>		
• A Traffic Impact Study Memorandum (TIS), dated March 2025, was received. Please find our comments below:	BA	Noted.
o The Region will only accept signalization of the proposed full moves access, once traffic control signal is warranted.	BA	Noted.
o The Region is in support of the proposed accesses and the auxiliary lanes provided for the approved accesses on the East side of the Dixie Road.	BA	Noted.
o 1.8m sidewalk is required along the East edge of Dixie Road.	BA	Noted.
<u>Development Engineering Comments</u>		
<u>Water Servicing</u>		
• There is an existing 150mm watermain on Dixie Road	Stantec	Noted. The existing 150mm diameter watermain on dixie Road was picked up on the topographic survey drawings prepared for the proposed development.
• A future 400mm will be installed on Dixie Road	Stantec	Noted. The proposed development will be serviced via the future 400 mm diamter watermain on Dixie Road - refer to the site servicing drawings and the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management report included with the OPA/ZBA appliction.
• This proposal requires connection to a minimum municipal watermain size of 300mm (Design Criteria 2.1)	Stantec	Noted. Refer to the response above.
• Due to the size and function of the 150 mm diameter watermain on Dixie Road, connection will not be permitted (Watermain Design Criteria 6.1)	Stantec	Noted. Refer to the response above.
• It is required that a subject site connects to the municipal watermain(s) within the pressure that it is located in (WPZ 7)	Stantec	Noted. Refer to the response above. It is anticiapted that the future 400mm diamter watermain on Dixie Road will meet the necessary pressure requirements.
• Servicing of this site may require municipal and/or private easements and the construction, extension, twinning and/or upgrading of municipal services. All works associated with the servicing of this site will be at the applicant's expense. The applicant will also be responsible for the payment of applicable fees, DC charges, legal costs and all other costs associated with the development of this site.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
• All unutilized water and sanitary services shall be disconnected and/or abandoned in accordance with Region of Peel standards and specifications.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
• Please review the Region's Water Design Criteria found on-line.	Stantec	Noted. The proposed watermain design have been completed based on the Region's Water Design Criteria. The servicing design will be further detailed as part of the Site Plan Application process.
<u>Sanitary Sewer Servicing</u>		

• This site does not have frontage on existing municipal sanitary sewer	Stantec	As noted in Section 6.1 of the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by Stantec, the Peel Region 2020 Water and Wastewater Plan for the Lake-Based Systems identifies Project 10-1210 C5 with extension of the existing 600mm diameter sanitary sewer along Dixie Road up to Old School Road. This work is anticipated to be completed as part of the capital works program. Service connections for the proposed development will be provided up to the property line to service the properties. The proposed sanitary service connection have been coordinated with the capital works sanitary design drawings.
• There is a 600mm sewer planned for Dixie Road. Future connection will require investigating	Stantec	Noted. Refer to the response above.
• Servicing of this site may require municipal and/or private easements and the construction, extension, twinning and/or upgrading of municipal services. All works associated with the servicing of this site will be at the applicant's expense. The applicant will also be responsible for the payment of applicable fees, DC charges, legal costs and all other costs associated with the development of this site.	Stantec	Noted. Refer to the response above.
• Industrial/commercial properties subject to a conversion from rental units to condominium units, will require additional sampling maintenance holes to be installed on private property, the number and proximity to each separate condominium unit shall be in accordance with Region or Peel Design, Standard Specifications and Procedures. Any offences committed under the wastewater by-law, shall be the responsibility of the Person who is responsible for the sampling maintenance hole. Should the additional sampling maintenance holes associated with the separate condominium units not be installed, the condominium corporation shall be deemed to be responsible. (condo conversions standard 1-8-9)	Stantec	Noted. The proposed servicing design is prepared in accordance to the Peel Region Design Standards.
• A full Engineering submission may be required for the construction of the infrastructure. The infrastructure must be operational/commissioned by the Region prior to Region of Peel site servicing connection approval. Please review the Region's engineering submission requirements within the on-line Subdivision Procedure document. The engineering submission shall be submitted prior to Site Plan Approval	Stantec	Noted. Refer to the response above.
• Please review the Peel Linear Wastewater Standards found on-line	Stantec	Noted. The proposed site servicing design is prepared in accordance with the Peel Linear Wastewater Standards. The servicing design will be further detailed as part of the Site Plan Application Approval process.
Regional Roads and Storm Water Requirements		
• Servicing Connections will require confirmation that Region of Peel Transportation is satisfied with the stormwater management report and associated grading and drainage plans prior to Regional site servicing connection approval.	Stantec	Acknowledged
• A copy of the draft reference plan satisfactory to Traffic and Legal will be required prior to site plan approval.	Stantec	Acknowledged
Functional Servicing Review Requirements		
• We have received the FSR dated 2024-12-06 and prepared by Stantec. The Report has been sent for modelling and comments will be forwarded when available.	Stantec	Acknowledged
• A satisfactory functional servicing report is required prior to OZ/RZ approval.	Stantec	Acknowledged
• Please refer to the Region's Functional Servicing Report requirements found on-line.	Stantec	Acknowledged.
• Consultant is required to complete and submit the demand table for the Region to fulfil our modelling requirements and determine the proposal's impact to the existing system. This table will be required prior to OZ/RZ approval.	Stantec	Refer to the demand table included with the OPA/ZBA application resubmission package.
• Please find the latest demand table form on-line at https://peelregion.ca/public-works/design-standards/pdf/water-wastewater-modelling-demand-table.pdf	Stantec	Acknowledged.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The non-refundable Functional Servicing Report/Demand Table Review Fee of \$1025.00 is required as per the current Fees By-law prior to OZ/RZ approval. 	Stantec	Acknowledged
Payment Process		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please be advised that the approved updated 2025 Fees by-law includes increases in some Engineering Fees. All fees are subject to change on annual basis pending Council approval. 	Quadreal	Noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Securities will be 100% of the cost estimate which will provided by the applicant once the servicing design is satisfactory. Servicing connections will provide instructions regarding what should be included in the cost estimate. It will include work subject to Region of Peel approval within the road allowance and at the property line (water valve and chamber and sanitary/storm sewer maintenance hole). 	Stantec/Quadreal	Acknowledged
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Servicing Connections is accepting payments by Electronic Fund Transfers (EFT) and will accept a Letter of Credit as an alternative for collecting securities. 	Quadreal	noted.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further instructions are provided in the RoP comments (attached with this report). 	Stantec	Acknowledged
<u>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, March 20, 2025:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRCA staff have reviewed the application in accordance with the Conservation Authorities Act (CA Act) and its associated regulations, which require TRCA to provide programs and services related to the risk of natural hazards within its jurisdiction. Whether acting on behalf of the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) or as a public body under the Planning Act, Conservation Authorities (CAs) must help ensure that decisions under the Planning Act are consistent with the natural hazards policies of the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) and conform to any natural hazard policies in a provincial plan. 	Stantec	Acknowledged
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, TRCA staff have also reviewed this application in accordance with TRCA’s permitting responsibilities under Section 28.1 of the CA Act. Where development activities are proposed within a TRCA Regulated Area (i.e., river or valley, wetlands, hazardous lands, etc.), a permit is required from TRCA. 	Stantec	Acknowledged. Further, an additional statement to this effect has been added to Section 3.1.2.4 of the CEISMP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose of the Application: It is our understanding that the purpose of the above noted applications is to facilitate development of site for five (5) industrial buildings, which will include warehouse, distribution and industrial uses. The proposed development also includes a road network, stormwater management facilities and environmentally protected features. 	Stantec	Acknowledged
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Conservation Authorities Act and Ontario Regulation 41/24: A significant portion of the subject lands are within TRCA’s Regulated Area as they are traversed by several valley corridors and watercourse features associated with the Humber River Watershed. Further, the subject lands contain multiple wetland features. A permit pursuant to Section 28.1 of the CA Act and Ontario Regulation 41/24 is required from this authority prior to any development activity taking place within a regulated area. 	Stantec	Acknowledged. Further, an additional statement to this effect has been added to Section 3.1.2.4 of the CEISMP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on our review, the proposed works will require several permits from TRCA. Further details regarding TRCA’s permitting requirements (including fee) will be provided to the applicant at an appropriate stage in the planning process. 	Stantec	Acknowledged

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Background: Please note that TRCA has had previous involvement with the subject lands and the proposed development. Prior to formal submission of this Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment, TRCA staff staked the limit of regulated features/hazards in August 2023. In addition, TRCA has been working with the Town and applicant on a Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Local Subwatershed Study (LSS) which is required to support the applications. At this time of this correspondence, a final ToR endorsed by all relevant parties has not yet been prepared.	Stantec	Acknowledged
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Application Specific Comments: TRCA staff have completed a review of the submitted materials and offer detailed comments, which can be found in Appendix II of this correspondence.	Stantec	Acknowledged
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recommendation: As currently submitted, the technical studies received to-date do not fully satisfy TRCA’s requirements in support of the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment. Based on the comments provided in Appendix II, final recommendations are premature until they are addressed to the satisfaction of TRCA staff.	Stantec	Acknowledged
	<u>The following agencies and departments comments are attached:</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Town of Caledon, Public Works & Transportation Department, Transportation Engineering – April 8, 2024.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Town of Caledon, Energy and Environment Engineering, Public Works and Transportation – March 20, 2024		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Region of Peel, March 21, 2025		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Heritage Planning Comments, April 11, 2025		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TRCA Comments, March 20, 2025		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">GSAI Comments, April 11, 2025		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">GWD Comments, March 3, 2025		
	<u>The following agencies and departments have no comments:</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Town of Caledon, Business Attraction and Investment, Economic Development		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Town of Caledon, Legal and Court Services Corporate Services		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Peel District School Board		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Ministry of Transportation (MTO)		
GWD			
	<u>Growth Management and Phasing Plan Official Plan Amendment – General Comments and Observations</u>		
1	In the draft Growth Management and Phasing Plan Staff Report 2025-0109, the subject site is located within the Phase 1 (2026-2036) New Employment Area as identified in Figure 1 of Staff Report 2025-0109. We are supportive of the inclusion of the subject site within Phase 1 New Employment Area.	Armstrong	Noted.

2	<p>Further to the identification of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 New Employment Areas (as noted in comment #1 above), it is not clear in the Staff Report or the proposed Official Plan Amendment when the Town of Caledon intends to start the Secondary Plan Review process for the new Employment Area lands centred on Dixie Road from Mayfield Road in the south to Old School Road in the north, inclusive of the 2476998 Ontario Inc. lands.</p> <p>We request Town Staff to advise if the Secondary Plan process will be commenced by the end of Q2 (2025). If it is expected to take longer, please take this correspondence under advisement that we will be preparing and pursuing our own Amendment to the Region of Peel and Town of Caledon Official Plans, given the number of existing and built, and/or approved (including through MZO) and in-process applications on lands surrounding the 2476998 Ontario Inc. property (see Attachment #2) within the New Employment Area centred on Dixie Road. These applications have clearly established the pattern and types of employment uses along this corridor.</p>	Armstrong	Town staff to advise.
3	<p>Regarding Policy 4.4.5 c), it is not clear what ‘minor adjustments’ includes. The term as currently used is subjective and there are no clearly defined limits as to what constitutes ‘minor’. The policy itself provides an ample framework for the Town to exercise discretion in managing the growth phasing of the new urban area lands. As such, we recommend deleting the word ‘Minor’ from Policy 4.4.5 c). The test as to unacceptable or adverse impacts to the Town or Region, including the Phase 1 lands, is sound from a planning perspective.</p>	Armstrong	Town to advise.
4	<p>We recommend the deletion of sub-section d) of Policy 4.4.5 in connection with a concurrent transfer of lands from Phase 1 to Phase 2, where there are lands transferred from Phase 2 to Phase 1, as outlined in the prior sub-sections of Policy 4.4.5. If the technical evidence is provided justifying the transfer of lands from Phase 2 to Phase 1, without negatively impacting the delivery of the Phase 1 lands, a transfer of lands from Phase 1 to Phase 2 in an equal exchange is not necessary. In addition, it is not clear from the policy how the Town intends to enforce the reciprocal transfer, as it is not reasonable to assume that there will be a willingness of any landowner in Phase 1 to extend into Phase 2. It will result in a situation that is unworkable from a policy or practical perspective.</p>	Armstrong	Town to advise.
DART Application for a Future Official Plan Amendment			
	Comments Related to the Future Site Plan Approval Application:		
	The following comments were provided based on review of the submitted materials, but pertain to the future application for Site Plan Approval, and do not impact clearance of the OPA and ZBA applications:		
	<u>Transportation Development</u>		
	<u>Property Requirements</u>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Region requests the gratuitous dedication of lands to meet the Region of Peel's Official Plan requirement for Regional Road 4 (Dixie Road) which has a right of way of 41.5 metres; 20.75 metres from the centreline of road allowance, within 245 metres of an intersection to protect for the provision of but not limited to: utilities, sidewalks, multiuse pathways and transit bay/shelters;• The Region will require the gratuitous dedication of a 15 x 15 metre daylight triangle at the intersection of Dixie Road and Old School Road;• The Region will require the gratuitous dedication of a 15 x 15 metre permanent easement at the Dixie Road and the proposed full moves access.• The Region will require the gratuitous dedication of a 0.3 metre reserve along the frontage Regional Road 4 (Dixie Road) behind the property line and daylight triangle, except at any approved access points;• The Region requires all other existing accesses to be closed along the proposed development.• The applicant is required to gratuitously dedicate these lands to the Region, free and clear of all encumbrances. All costs associated with the transfer are the responsibility of the applicant. The applicant must provide the Region with the necessary title documents and reference plan(s) to confirm the Regions right-ofway;• A draft reference plan will be required for our review and approval prior to the plans being deposited. All costs associated with preparation of plans and the transfer of the lands will be solely at the expense of the applicant.	BA/Quadreal	Noted.
	<u>Landscaping/Encroachments</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Landscaping, signs, fences, cranes, gateway features or any other encroachments are not permitted within the Region’s easements and/or Right of Way limits.• Cranes will not be permitted to swing over a Regional Road unless a crane swing licence has been granted.	MHBC/Quadreal	MHBC: Landscape drawings have been coordinated with the latest site plan and update accordingly.
	<u>Concept Plan</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All comments provided should be reflected on the site plan, Including:• Centerline of roadways with property dimensions reflected;• Daylight triangle with proper dimensions should be reflected on the site plan.	Ware Malcomb/BA	WM: Please refer to updated site plan drawings for required dimensions.
	<u>Engineering Requirements</u>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A detailed engineering submission of road and access works will be required for our review and comment, designed, stamped and signed by a Licensed Ontario Professional Engineer. The engineering submission MUST include the removals, new construction and grading, typical sections and pavement markings and signing drawings. All works within Region of Peel’s right of way must be designed in accordance to the Public Works, “Design Criteria and Development Procedures Manual” and “Material Specifications and Standard Drawings Manual”;• The Owner shall submit to the Region a detailed cost estimate, stamped and signed by a Licensed Ontario Professional Engineer, of the proposed road and access works within the Regional right of way;• Securities shall be submitted in the form of either a letter of credit or certified cheque, in the amount of 100% of the approved estimated cost of road and access works along Regional Road 4 (Dixie Road);• A 10.8% engineering and inspection fee shall be paid to the Region based on the approved estimated cost of road and access works (minimum \$1,724.40);• The Owner will be required to submit the following prior to commencement of works within the Region’s right-of-way:	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted
	o Completed Road Occupancy Permit and a permit fee as per the Region’s		
	user fees and charges By-law;	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted
	o Completed Notice to Commence Work ;	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted
	o Provide proof of insurance with the Region of Peel added to		
	the certificate as an additional insured with \$5 million minimum from the		
	Contractor;	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted
	o Please note that any proposed construction within the Region of Peel’s right		
	of way is pending PUCC approval (minimum six week process). Please note		
	that PUCC circulation requirements have recently changed. We require PDF		
	version of the full drawing set it is to be sent via email, and cannot		
	exceed 10MB per email.	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All costs associated with the design and construction of road and access works will be 100% paid by the Owner;	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted
	<u>Site Servicing Requirements</u>		
	A satisfactory site servicing submission and the 1st submission fee of \$430.76, as per the latest Fees By-law are required prior to site plan approval		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The 1st submission fee of \$430.76, as per the latest Fees By-law is required prior to site plan approval• Included with the servicing submission, please submit a SUE (Subsurface Utility Engineering) investigation so that conflicts within the municipal ROW can be identified as early as possible. A Level D SUE will not be accepted.• confirm tenure prior to Site Plan Approval• Municipal addresses, confirmed by the local municipality, are required prior to issuance of the Region of Peel’s site servicing connection approval. The approved addresses are entered into the Region’s system and required for the receipt once the final payment has been made.• All Servicing and grading drawings shall reflect the Region’s and local municipality’s road widening requirements• Please indicate if the Developer will be pursuing LEED certification• the Region will not accept property line chambers and maintenance holes within foundation walls and in the road allowance. These appurtenances shall be to Region standards, accessible, separated from the foundation and accommodated with a notch out in the foundation wall• Site plan approval is required prior to Region of Peel site servicing connection approval.• The applicant is required to investigate separate servicing for each owner/property. However, if required, confirmation that the Town of Caledon will permit shared servicing is required prior to OZ/RZ approval• Fire protection approval from the Town of Caledon is required prior to Region of Peel site servicing connection approval. It is the applicant’s responsibility to provide the Region with the Building Division’s final approved drawing.• Region of Peel site servicing connection approvals will not be issued until substantial completion is granted by the Region of Peel for Capital projects 19-1189, 19-1190 and 24-2183.	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Infrastructure information<ul style="list-style-type: none">o The applicant shall verify the location of the existing service connections to the subject site and the contractor shall locate all existing utilities in the field. Requests for underground locates can be made at https://www.ontarioonecall.ca/portal/o The Region of Peel has recently released a web application used for locating water, wastewater, transportation and other regional assets across Mississauga, Brampton, and Caledon as well as viewing as-built drawings. It is called EPAL - External Peel Asset Locator and is now available for external contractors and consultants. If you do not have an existing account, please contact aimsgroup@peelregion.ca to request access. Once access has been requested, instructions will be provided in the welcome email.o If you require assistance in addition to the information found in EPAL, please contact Records at PWServiceRequests@peelregion.ca	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted.
	<u>Regional Easement/Infrastructure Review Requirements</u>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are Regional easements on the subject property. Please be advised that unauthorized encroachments on Regional easements will not be permitted.• Certain restrictions apply with respect to regional easements as per the documents registered on title.• Existing easements dedicated to the Region of Peel for the purpose of sanitary sewer and/or watermain, must be maintained or the existing infrastructure relocated to the satisfaction to the Region of Peel, at the owner’s cost• To determine if there are encroachments on the Region’s easement, prior to site plan approval the Region will require drawings for review, which include but are not limited to, site plan, landscaping, site grading and foundation drawings, each of which shall show: all existing easements and their limits; the purpose of each of the easements (e.g. water / sanitary sewer), the easement instrument number, parts and reference plan number and the benefitting party (e.g. the Region / City)• The applicant shall notify the Region of any proposed encroachments on the easement, including structures, signs, landscaping, walkways, parking and servicing• Foundations of proposed structures must not encroach on the zone of influence of existing infrastructure.• Failure to submit the required information or failure to identify existing and proposed encroachments will result in delays in processing this application and delays in Regional clearance.• For inquiries regarding Regional easement encroachment circulation or release of a Regional easement, please contact Real Estate at realpropertyrequests@peelregion.ca• Through the servicing review, we will require cross sections to be provided to verify whether there is a conflict with the tie backs and servicing connections. The Region shall be satisfied with the cross sections prior to site servicing connection approval• To identify conflicts with Region of Peel Infrastructure and the municipal	Stantec/Quadreal	Noted.
	<u>Stormwater Management</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• South Side SWM Pond – Please show location and elevation of emergency spillway. Assuming that spillway is on the South side and ultimately flows to Kilamanagh Creek, how is the flow being directed over the private drive to the right of the pond, as well as routed overland to the Creek since there is a considerable distance (~135 m)? The Region will not accept emergency overflow onto the ROW of Dixie Road.	Stantec	Emergency overflow is directed over private driveway and will sheet flow towards Kilamanagh Creek. Spillway is adequately sized to ensure drainage is not directed to Dixie Road.
	<u>Legal Requirements</u>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private servicing easements may be required prior to Region of Peel site servicing connection approval. This will be determined once the legal review has been completed and the site servicing proposal is reviewed• The applicant is required to provide to the Region with copies of the most current PINS prior to Site Plan Approval PINS submitted to Peel shall be dated/prepared within 3 months of submission to Peel. Further comments/requirements will be provided once the PINS are reviewed by a regional Law Clerk• The Region requires review of the Declaration and Description prior to registration of the condominium to confirm registration of required private easements• Condominium Water Servicing Agreement may be required prior to Condominium Registration• The applicant is required to provide to the Region copies of all registered easements affecting the subject lands prior to Site Plan Approval• All drawings shall be revised to show all existing easements and their limits; the purpose of each of the easements, the easement instrument numbers, parts and reference plan numbers and indicate whether they are private or municipal• The applicant is required to submit copies of PINS following the completion of transfers and/or subdivision registration prior to Site Plan Approval	Stantec/Quadreal	Acknowledged.
	Phase 1 ESA Comments		
	<u>2489 Dixie Road</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Areas of environmental concern pertaining to farming equipment maintenance, above ground storage tanks, fuel oil storage, orchard location were identified in the Phase One ESA.• These areas of environmental concern were addressed in the Phase Two ESA with multiple boreholes/ monitoring wells to address the potential contamination of soil and groundwater media.• Some minor mercury exceedances were identified in soil when compared to the most stringent Table 1- Background site condition standards (SCS) and were below the Table 6 – Shallow Soils SCS<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Mercury impact was limited to the topsoil or 0.8 metre of soil and may be related to formed coal use.• No groundwater exceedances were identified compared to Table 1 and Table 6 SCS.	MTE	Noted.
	Overall, given the minor impacts to soil, in regard to any potential land dedication to the Region along Dixie Road, there is unlikely to be environmental impact attributed to activities originating from the Site.	MTE	Noted.
	<u>12861 Dixie Road</u>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Similarly, to 12489 Dixie Road, areas of environmental concern identified in the Phase One ESA were addressed through localized and targeted sampling of soil and groundwater in the Phase Two ESA.• Metals found in exceedance in groundwater required comparison to the most stringent Table 1 Background conditions due to 30 m proximity to water. Additional sampling was performed and has identified that the contaminants present are no longer in exceedance in some wells.<ul style="list-style-type: none">o * Additional sampling will be performed with the intention of all wells meeting the Table 1 SCS.• PHC and metal exceedances identified in soil were localized further to the east of the property and can be attributed to onsite activities corresponding to farming equipment maintenance and AST’s present.	MTE	Noted.
	<u>General Comments</u>		
	Overall, it is unlikely that that given the distance from Dixie Road that contaminant exceedances in soil will pose any concern to future Region of Peel. Upon completion, the Region request copies of the Underground Sampling Report with these details for our records.	MTE	Noted.
	<u>Public Health</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In collaboration with the Town of Caledon, Peel Public Health has implemented policies requiring the submission of a health assessment with each development application. The wrong version of the HDA was submitted with this application. Any future resubmission should include the correct ICI HDA. The tool can be found under the ‘Resources’ tab here: Healthy communities - peelregion.ca• Based on some review of the concept plan against our ICI HDA, we offer the following comments for the site plan:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Consider including common outdoor amenity, with an appropriate amount of covered all-weather seating, mixed-used space and street furniture, weather protection and shade along pedestrian pathways and waste baskets. Exposure to natural environments can have a positive impact on the overall mental health and wellbeing of residents. Please include green infrastructure in non-traditional spaces.▪ Ensure the entrances to the building and walkways around the building are well lit.▪ Confirm that parking numbers adhere to the parking requirements within the local zoning bylaw, or consider a reduction in parking.• Peel Public Health continues to work closely with the Town of Caledon in the assessment of the development proposal as our participation enables us to deliver on our mandate and achieve the goals set out by Ontario’s Public Health Standards and our Peel Public Health 2020-2029 Strategic Priorities of Enabling Active Living and Healthy Eating and Reducing Health-Related Impacts of Climate Change. We are committed to participating in the review of community development in Peel to ensure we promote healthy built environments.	Ware Malcomb/Quadreal/MHBC/Purpose	ICI HDA large-scale form is included with this submission. (Purpose) MHBC: Landscape drawings have been coordinated with the latest site plan and update accordingly.
GSAI			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Site Plan drawings for 12861 Dixie Road, prepared by Ware Walcomb (dated December 4, 2024), illustrate a laneway and vehicular parking associated with two industrial buildings; ‘Industrial Building 1’ and ‘Industrial Building 2’. With regards to buffering between the QuadReal lands and Anatolia, the Site Plan provides a 6.0 m landscape setback and a 7.5 metre setback to the trailer parking. <p>It is our understanding, the Environmental Noise and Vibration Study, prepared by SLR (dated December 14, 2024), with regards to 12489 Dixie Road, only assessed existing sensitive receptors (i.e., existing single detached dwellings) along Bramalea Road, Dixie Road and Old School Road. As a result, the Environmental Noise and Vibration Study is not recommending any noise mitigation measures along the shared property line between QuadReal and Anatolia.</p>	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In support of the Applications, Armstrong Planning & Project Management prepared a Planning Justification Report (‘PJR’), dated December 2024. GSAI has reviewed the PJR and can offer the following comments:	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.
	<p>o Page 6 of the PJR, states that, “[t]he proposed buildings [at 12282 and 12442 Bramalea Road] have been strategically located and massed to protect natural heritage feature and provide efficient floor plates for end-users, while also being sensitive to adjacent land uses, included agricultural and recreational operations on adjacent lands”. GSAI agrees that the proposal generally addresses the existing surrounding context; however, consideration should be given to the planned context of the broader community and recognize that the lands to the east are planned for future residential uses.</p> <p>o Page 10 of the PJR, states that “[t]he employment uses do not jeopardize or impact with the planned residential community to the east, nor do they jeopardize the development potential of these lands. Finally, matters relating to urban design, zoning, trail systems and landscaping treatments will all be addressed through the detailed design stage at Site Plan Approval.” GSAI agrees that there are design and landscaping details that can be addressed at the Site Plan Approval stage; however, in our opinion, the submission materials have not appropriately assessed any impact on the future residential lands, which are being advanced through the Mayfield Tullamore LOG’s OPA.</p>	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.

	<p>o Page 19 of the PJR speaks to Section 3.5 of the 2024 Provincial Policy Statement ('PPS 2024'), which outlines provincial policies concerning land use compatibility. More specifically, the PJR acknowledges Section 3.5, which reads, "Major facilities and sensitive land uses shall be planned and developed to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate any potential adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term operational and economic viability of major facilities in accordance with provincial guidelines, standards and procedures." The PJR continues by responding to the policy framework by stating that "as currently proposed, the development is separate and would avoid future residential uses to the east." In our opinion, while Mayfield Tullamore LOG's OPA is currently being processed, the Region and the Town undertook an extensive planning and growth management exercise, which identified the Mayfield Tullamore Area as an integral part of the Region's Urban Structure to address population growth and increase the overall housing supply in the Region of Peel and Town of Caledon, as such, a balance through the review of the QuadReal Application needs to be considered to achieve an appropriate transition and land use compatibility with future sensitive land uses.</p>	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.
	<p>o Section 5.5.7 of the Town's Official Plan (March 2024, Office Consolidation) provides general design policies for employment uses. More specifically, Policy 5.5.7.2 directs that "lands with a prominent visual exposure or lands adjacent to residential uses shall be developed in a compatible manner utilizing such provisions as landscaping, berming and site design, on-site open space and landscape features". Additionally, 5.5.7.4 continues by stating "lands adjacent to any non-industrial uses shall be developed in a compatible manner utilizing such provisions as landscaping, berming and site design." We note that Section 5.5.7 of the Town's Official Plan has not been assessed in the Applicant's PJR or Urban Design Brief.</p>	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.
	<p>o Similar to the above, the Town's new Official Plan, 'Future Caledon' provides general policy direction for Employment Areas. More specifically, Section 23.1.4 reads, "[b]uffering, landscaping and landscaping and strategic site design will be required to ensure visual and physical separation between employment uses and adjacent non-employment areas to maintain land use compatibility". We acknowledge the PJR responded to the above policy framework; however, the Applicant's response is in the context of connectivity, whereas no access points are being proposed between the employment lands and the future residential lands to the east.</p>	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is understood through QuadReal's OPA and ZBA, permissions for "Cold Storage" have been proposed. More specifically, the OPA and ZBA propose a maximum permitted height of 45 metres for a Cold Storage Building. It is important to note that, Cold Storage is not a listed permitted use in the parent "Prestige Industrial" (MP) zone. The infrastructure and mechanical equipment on the rooftop to support a Cold Storage typically emits loud and continuous noises, which can result in challenging mitigation measures if not appropriately addressed at the source. 	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure an appropriate transition between the employment lands and the future residential lands, it is our opinion that the Zoning By-law and site design should restrict loading areas and trailer storage from the eastern property line. 	Armstrong/SLR	See attached letter dated April 30, 2025 and revised Environmental Noise and Vibration Study.

Toronto and Region Conservation			
	<u>Appendix II: TRCA's Application Specific Comments</u>		
1	<p>The submitted Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report (FSSWMR) and associated drawings have omitted several floodplains located on the north site (12861 Dixie Road). Further, TRCA's floodplain modelling identifies a flood spill in the area of Old School Road which may impact the site. The applicant is asked to review TRCA's current floodplain modelling and conduct an assessment of flood limits in accordance with TRCA's standards to ensure they are accurately depicted on the development plan.</p> <p>It is noted that drainage features with a catchment area of 50 hectares or greater are generally considered significant for flood hazard assessment. Smaller areas may still require evaluation, especially in urbanized settings, steep terrain, or locations with historical flooding issues. As such, any drainage feature receiving runoff from a drainage area of 50 hectares or more should be assessed for potential hazards, and its floodplain must be delineated.</p>	Stantec	<p>As part of the Local SWS (Section 4.4.3), TRCA's current floodplain modelling and mapping was obtained and reviewed. A floodplain constraint review was undertaken to confirm if these drainage feature met the definition of a watercourse and had a drainage area greater than 50ha. This report and summary should be reviewed.</p>
2	<p>As illustrated in the figure below, under existing conditions, the north site is divided into multiple sub-catchments, each draining to different receiving features. However, under proposed conditions, all runoff will be directed to the proposed Stormwater Management (SWM) pond, which will discharge to the tributary located at the southwest portion of the property. Given this reconfiguration, the allowable release rate must be calculated solely on the existing drainage area contributing to the tributary where the pond will discharge. When determining the allowable release rates using unit flow rates, it is essential to base calculations only on the existing drainage area to each outlet – not the total contributing area under the proposed conditions. However, the SWM pond must be sized to accommodate the entire proposed contributing area to ensure proper water management, maintaining downstream hydrological balance and preventing unintended impacts on receiving water bodies. The applicant is asked to revise the calculations accordingly and adjust the sizing of the proposed SWM pond to reflect this requirement.</p>	Stantec	<p>Humber River which traverses through the North and South sites within the PSA. Catchments 103 to 106 drain to the Main Tributary of the West Humber River and catchments 101 and 102 drain to a branch of the Tributary of the West Humber River which combines with the Main Tributary of the West Humber River just northeast of the site. Refer to the Ontario Watershed Figure in Appendix B of FSSMR.</p> <p>The North site is controlled to targets calculated using the unit release for the Humber River watershed sub-basin 36 for the 2-100 year storms, which provides significant overcontrol of flows when compared with existing conditions modeled flows for the same area, as shown in the summary tables of existing and target flows in Appendix B. The total proposed site flows for 2-100 year event are less than the existing conditions flows draining to the main Tributary of the West Humber (developable portion of catchments 103 to 106), therefore post to pre peak flow control is provided for drainage directed to the main Tributary. The total proposed site flows are less than the total allowable site flow from the developable area, ensuring no negative impacts to downstream lands. Both of these assessments indicate sufficient quantity control is provided. It is noted that the total proposed site flows directed to the main Tributary are slightly higher than allowable site flows (for developable portion of catchments 103 to 106 that drain to the main Tributary) for the 25-100 year, however the allowable flows are calculated using unit target rates and since post to pre control is provided this minor exceedance is acceptable. The existing modelled flows, calculated target flows, and modeled outflows are included in Appendix B of the FSSMR.</p> <p>For the Regional storm event all drainage is directed to the SWM pond and underground tanks for attenuation, with the total controlled flow of 4.706 m3/s discharged from Outlets 1 & 2 to the main Tributary of the West Humber River which is less than the existing Regional flow of 4.77 m3/s from the developable area of the North site. Therefore, post to pre control is provided from the north site. The total proposed Regional flow of 4.706 m3/s is greater than allowable site flow of 3.72 m3/s (from the developable portion of existing catchments 103-106 that drain directly to the main Tributary). The proposed minor increase in Regional peak flow of 1.01m/3s would occur within the main Tributary of the West Humber and is approximately</p>

<div data-bbox="758 147 864 167" data-label="Caption"><p>North Site</p></div> <div data-bbox="292 175 1305 707" data-label="Figure"></div>	Stantec	
<div data-bbox="254 739 1401 1209" data-label="Text"><p>3 As illustrated in the figure below, under existing conditions, the south site (12489 Dixie Road) is divided into multiple sub-catchments, each draining to different receiving features. However, under proposed conditions, all runoff will be directed to the proposed SWM pond, which will discharge to the tributary located at the southwest portion of the property. Given this reconfiguration, the allowable release rate must be calculated solely on the existing drainage area contributing to the tributary where the pond will discharge. When determining the allowable release rates using unit flow rates, it is essential to base calculations only on the existing drainage area to each outlet – not the total contributing area under the proposed conditions. However, the SWM pond must be sized to accommodate the entire proposed contributing area to ensure proper water management, maintaining downstream hydrological balance and preventing unintended impacts on receiving water bodies. The applicant is asked to revise the calculations accordingly and adjust the sizing of the proposed SWM pond to reflect this requirement.</p></div>	Stantec	<div data-bbox="1768 889 2974 1024" data-label="Text"><p>Existing and targets flows have been calculated for the existing catchments draining to main Tributary of the West Humber River and Kilamanagh Creek. A portion of each catchment has a portion that is developable and a portion that is undevelopable, therefore allowable flows are calculated based on the developable portion of the existing catchment.</p></div> <div data-bbox="1768 1064 2974 1266" data-label="Text"><p>Under proposed conditions, some roof areas are directed to underground tanks will discharge through outlet 1 which is controlled to the allowable flow rates for the Main Tributary of the West Humber. Some roof areas as well as parking lots and drive isles are directed to the SWM pond which dishcages through outlet 2 which is controlled to the allowable flow rates to Kilamanagh Creek. Proposed flows are less than allowable for both outlets as shown in Tables 4.14 and 4.15 and in Appendix B calculations.</p></div>
<div data-bbox="745 1276 864 1296" data-label="Caption"><p>South Site</p></div> <div data-bbox="304 1300 1292 1814" data-label="Figure"></div>		

4	The applicant is asked to assess the potential impacts of the proposed drainage diversions for both the north and south sites on the tributaries receiving additional flow under proposed conditions. Please confirm the tributaries can handle the additional flows without exceeding their capacity.	Stantec	This analysis is being undertaken as part of the Local SWS Erosion Analysis which will be submitted as part of an Addendum Submission.
5	The applicant is also asked to assess the drainage diversions to confirm the additional flows do not increase flooding to downstream properties. Please note that the floodplain impact must be assessed using the uncontrolled regulatory peak flow (i.e. the greater of the uncontrolled 100 year or regional peak flows).	Stantec	This analysis is being undertaken as part of the Local SWS Erosion Analysis which will be submitted as part of an Addendum Submission.
6	As a component of the above noted comment, the applicant must also assess the impacts of the drainage diversion to ensure the additional flows do not overwhelm culverts, bridges and other hydraulic structures.	Stantec	This analysis is being undertaken as part of the Local SWS Erosion Analysis which will be submitted as part of an Addendum Submission.
7	The applicant proposed erosion control through the extended detention of runoff from a 25 mm rainfall event over 48 hours. However, TRCA's criteria also requires the onsite retention of 5 mm of runoff from the total impervious area via infiltration and/or evapotranspiration. As such, additional Low Impact Development (LID) measures should be incorporated into the design to meet the required volume control target and mitigate instream erosion impacts. The applicant has proposed an infiltration chamber, however, TRCA requires supporting calculations to confirm this measure provides 5 mm onsite retention from the entire impervious area. Please confirm whether the proposed infiltration chamber contributes to achieving TRCA's erosion control volume target.	Stantec	<p>For the South site, 16.8 mm of runoff from the contributing roof areas will be directed to tanks for infiltration and the volumes provided meet the 5mm retention requirement for all impervious areas.</p> <p>For the North site, 6mm of runoff from the roof areas will be directed to tanks (sized for infiltration and quantity control) which then discharge directly to the HDF. Note the 6mm retention from the roof areas provides 50% of the 5mm retention requirement for all impervious areas on the site. The reduced retention volume is recommended based on the continuous feature based modeling completed in Section 4.3.1 & 4.8.1 in the FSSMR and the need to maintain the surface runoff to the HDF as this feature is a surface water fed feature.</p> <p>FSSMR text has been updated to indicate that the proposed infiltration tanks contribute to the erosion control volume target.</p>
8	As part of any future submission, the applicant is asked to submit both the hydrology and hydraulic models for review.	Stantec	Hydrology modeling has been provided with the Submission.
9	While a Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) assessment was completed for the study area, it did not include a review of the features in accordance with the definition of a watercourse per Ontario Regulation 41/24. For example, it is unclear if reach WHR-H3E/WHR-H3F is considered to be an HDF or a continuous watercourse with defined bed and banks. The applicant is asked to revise the assessment accordingly and include photographic evidence.	Stantec	Acknowledged, the CEISMP has been updated accordingly. The Photographic Log located in Appendix G of the CEISMP has also been updated to provide clarity of feature locations and associated codes.
10	It is noted that Section 6.6 of the Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP) references TRCA's old regulation. This section should be updated to reflect TRCA's current regulation provide an accurate depiction of the features/hazards that are regulated by the Authority.	Stantec	Acknowledged, the CEISMP has been updated accordingly
11	The CEISMP does not include a Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation. The CEISMP (Section 4.1 and 5.0) must be updated to include this study, in accordance with TRCA's Wetland Water Balance Risk Evaluation Guideline, 2017.	Stantec	The evaluation was not included. A continuous feature based assessment pre and post development was prepared for WHR-HDF-3C as the change in drainage exceeded 10% change.
12	Section 7 of the CEISMP must be updated to include wetland monitoring in accordance with TRCA's Wetland Water Balance Monitoring Protocol, 2016.	Stantec	Monitoring of wetlands within the valleylands has not been undertaken.

13	Throughout most of the subject lands, the Greenbelt Plan limit provides an appropriate setback from steep valley slopes. However, at the southwest portion of the north site (see illustration below), there is an area which requires further assessment. At this location, a slope stability study by a geotechnical engineer will be required to delineate the position of the Long-Term Stable Top of Slope (LTSTOS), corresponding to a factor of safety of 1.50. The applicant must ensure that development in this area (i.e. parking areas, Industrial Building 2, the SWM pond) has been appropriately setback from the LTSTOS.	Stantec	A LTSTOS may not be needed. The proposed grading within the buffer is 3H:1V which is considered a stable slope. This grading is occurring in the location of a historic farm driveway through the valley wall with existing valley slopes that are flatter than 3:1.
14	According to the Conceptual Grading Plans provided within the FSSWMR, grading has been proposed within setbacks from the top of slope. Further, in one location, grading is proposed up to the top of slope limit. The applicant is asked to pull back grading from these areas to the greatest extent feasible. If it is determined that there are areas where grading into the typical setback is required, they will need to be reviewed by a geotechnical engineer to ensure that the proposed treatment is stable over the long-term.	Stantec	Refer to response 13 above. The area will be graded with a 3H:1V slope which is considered stable, and will be stabilized once grading is completed. The 3:1 slope is proposed instead of a retaining wall and is pulled bak to the greatest extent possible
15	An emergency overland spillway associated with SWM pond on the north site is shown to be outletting/discharging onto or part way down the valley slope. This also appears to be the case for the headwall (101) on the south site. The applicant must demonstrate how the existing slopes in these areas will be protected against erosion due to the discharge. All necessary measures to mitigate the risk of erosion and slope instability must be provided and clearly presented on the drawings.	Stantec	As noted in the FSSMR, erosion protection details will be provieed at detailed design.
16	The applicant is asked to revise the landscape plan to include the limit of all TRCA regulated features and setbacks. The applicant must ensure that where feasible, trails should be appropriately setback from natural hazard limits. Consideration should also be given to ensuring appropriate space is provided for plantings required to stabilize areas adjacent to slopes.	MHBC	The landscape plan has been revised to show the limits of all TRCA-regulated features and setbacks. Trail alignments maintain appropriate setbacks from natural hazard limits, and sufficient space has been provided for stabilization plantings adjacent to slopes. The landscape drawings have also been coordinated with the architectural and civil drawings.
17	The applicant is asked to provide the SWM pond planting calculation table on the landscape plans, in accordance with Stormwater Management Pond Design Guidance (Appendix E) of TRCA's SWM criteria document (2012). Further, the applicant must ensure all SWM outfalls are designed in accordance with TRCA's criteria as well.	Stantec	Acknowledged, SWM outfalls will be designed in accordance with TRCA's criteria
18	It is TRCA's understanding that tile drain removal will be required. However, the location and extent of the tile drains are not known. As removal of the tile drains may impact the local water table, the applicant is asked to provide a discussion on how this may impact nearby wetlands and watercourses.	Stantec	Tile drain plans are appended to the FSSMR. Removal of the tile drainage system will also remove any direct piped connections potentially conveying seasonally high groundwater to the valley corridors and may allow for slower moving baseflow to the nearby wetlands and watercourses.
19	Soil infiltration capacity has been assessed from the hydraulic conductivity values obtained from slug tests carried our on select monitoring wells. However, TRCA's SWM criteria document requires soil infiltration capacity to be determined through different methods, including the Guelph Permameter. The applicant is asked to conduct infiltration tests through the methods recommended in TRCA's SWM criteria document.	Stantec	Additional in-situ infiltration testing will be completed and provided in future reports
20	The applicant is asked to amend Section 4.2.2 of the report as it gives the impression that the soil infiltration capacity is 22 mm per hour. Table 3 of the report provides the Geomean value of infiltration as 10 mm per hour for the two sites. It is the option of TRCA staff that infiltration facilities can be installed at locations where the infiltration rate is about 15 mm per hour and above.	Stantec	Text revised. Additional in-situ infiltration testing will be completed and provided in future reports
21	It is noted that based on some of the above noted comments (e.g. comment 1, 9, 13 etc.), both the draft Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment schedules may need to be revised to accurately reflect TRCA's limits of development.	Armstrong	The schedules include the EPA lands and limits of development. Can staff be more specific? Requesting a meeting if necessary.

22	According to the submitted draft Official Plan Amendment, there are several sites both west and south of 12489 and 12861 Dixie Road that are proposed to be re-designated as part of this process. However, these sites have not been included in any of the studies submitted, nor are they included within draft Zoning By-law Amendment. If these sites are to be re-designated and re-zoned, they need to be studied. If the parcels are participating landowners, detailed assessments (including the staking of TRCA regulated features and hazards) need to be completed. If the parcels are non-participating, a desktop review needs to be completed to conceptually define limits of development. Further, policies must be included within the draft Official Plan Amendment which speak to future study requirements.	Armstrong/Stantec	Acknowledged; Natural heritage features and hazardlands located on Adjacent Lands (including those described in this comment) will be delineated based on desktop review for non-participating landowners. See updated Local SWS TOR circulated for details (dated June 20, 2025).
23	Any TRCA regulated feature, hazard and setback should be placed within an EPA (Environmental Protection Area) designation and EPA-1 zone (not EPA-2) on the draft Official Plan and Zoning By-law schedules.	Armstrong	This was previously included on the schedules.
24	The draft Official Plan Amendment schedule identifies a light blue area, which generally corresponds with the location of watercourses. However, this area has not been included on the legend. As such, TRCA staff are unsure as to what it represents. Please clarify.	Armstrong	Please note that the Town’s schedules does not depict the watercourse in their legend, it appears to be included as part of the Environmental Policy Area, as per the other land use plans. We have excluded it to ensure consistency. Please advise if TRCA and Town staff would like to have it added in.
12489 & 12861 Dixie Road Energy and Emissions Reduction Study and Climate Adaptation Study			
	<u>Applicant-Proposed Energy Conservation and Efficiency Initiatives</u>		
	Please also note the GDS requirement for projects with greater than 50,000 square feet of roof space must conduct a feasibility assessment for solar installation (GDS Guidebook page 71). Installation is not a requirement at this time, but we do require the assessment demonstrating due consideration for solar, including engagement with the local hydro utility on capacity. This should be reflected in the proposed activities.	WSP	This GSD is noted in the existing report, however, requirements to complete the feasibility assessment will be more clearly noted in the revised report.
	<u>Active Transportation – Recommendations</u>		
	Just a flag that we’ve had a few meetings with Hop in Tech, a company that provides shuttle services to employers underserved by transit around the GTA, including Caledon. For your consideration when exploring micro-transit/shuttle services.	WSP	Noted. This will be considered in the revised report.
	<u>General</u>		
	The Terms of Reference for the Community Energy and Emissions Reduction Plan included analysis of estimated energy and emissions on site under baseline and proposed scenarios. Is there a reason this analysis was not included in the submission? The Town recognizes it is early in the development process and that analysis would provide only estimates at this stage, however it is helpful to understand anticipated energy usage and GHG emissions from the development, and to what extent various strategies can help reduce them. The TOR also asks for a stakeholder engagement plan focused on implementation of the proposed strategies. Are there plans to engage with alternative energy and sustainable technology providers, as well as different utilities?	WSP	An analysis of estimated energy and emissions on site under baseline and proposed scenarios was not completed due to the site being in early stages of the development process. Please confirm if the completion of this analysis and the Stakeholder Engagement Plan are mandatory submission requirements. We would like to discuss further with Staff.
	<u>Climate Adaptation Study</u>		
	<u>Stormwater Management - Recommendations</u>		
	If feasible and appropriate, consider installing naturalized stormwater ponds (constructed wetland) that enhance habitat benefits, in addition to flood control and water quality.	WSP	Noted. This will be considered in the revised report.
Transportation Engineering			
	<u>The following comments are applicable to the Rezoning and Site Plan Applications:</u>		
7	Parking Review		

	a. Please clarify the nature/type of land use considered for parking calculations. Additionally, confirm the anticipated Office Net Floor Area.	BA	WM: The buildings are considered industrial warehouse and the parking rate that is used if for this type of use. Office area is less than 5% of the entire footprint of each building, therefore the warehouse rate has applied for the entire area. (Refer to site statistics on A100).
	b. Barrier-free parking requirements should be reviewed in accordance with the Town’s new Traffic By-Law 2024-048 Schedule O and AODA.	BA	WM: Barrier-free parking rates are used for industrial warehouse use. (Please Refer to site statistics on A100).
	c. The Town’s Green Development Standard regarding Electric Vehicle parking requirements should be considered and incorporated.	BA	WM: Please refer to updated site plan drawings for provided EV spaces.
	d. Ensure bicycle parking is also included in the parking review as a part of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategy. Additionally, consider providing bicycle parking closer to building entrances to improve accessibility.	BA	WM: Please refer to updated site plan drawings for location of bicycle parking spots, which are close to the office pods.
	e. The required number of loading or parking spaces shall be rounded to the next higher whole number. Please update Table 2 accordingly.	BA	WM: Please refer to site statistics on A100 for required and provided loading spaces.