April 7, 2026

Town of Caledon
Planning & Development Department
6311 Old Church Road
Caledon, ON
L7C 1J6

Attention: Tanjot Bal, MCIP, RPP, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Department

RE: **Draft Plan of Subdivision (21T-24004C) & Zoning By-law Amendment (RZ 2024-0019) Formal Submission #4**
12519 and 12713 Humber Station Rd.
Owner: PROLOGIS CANADA HOLDING 3 GP ULC

Dear Ms. Bal,

Kindly accept this cover letter containing our development team's responses to the C*onsolidated Comment Letter*, dated November 12, 2025, for the third submission of the Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications.

The following deliverables have been prepared to support the fourth formal submission ('Submission 4'):

1. A copy of this Comment Response Letter
2. Arborist Report prepared by MHBC
3. Channel Realignment Civil Engineering Drawing Set prepared by Crozier
4. Channel Realignment Detailed Design Brief prepared by SLR
5. Channel Realignment Hydraulic Analysis Report prepared by Crozier
6. Draft Plan of Subdivision AutoCAD prepared by Mainline Planning Services Inc.
7. Draft Plan of Subdivision prepared by Mainline Planning Services Inc.
8. Draft Zoning By-law Amendment 'Schedule A' AutoCAD prepared by Mainline Planning Services Inc.
9. Draft Zoning By-law Amendment 'Schedule A' prepared by Mainline Planning Services Inc.
10. Draft Zoning By-law Amendment prepared by Mainline Planning Services Inc.
11. Stage 3 MCM Compliance Letter issued by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism
12. Environmental Impact Study prepared by SLR
13. Functional Servicing Report prepared by Crozier
14. HEC-RAS Model prepared by Crozier
15. Hydrogeological Assessment prepared by SLR
16. Landscape Cost Estimate – Building Area prepared by MHBC
17. Landscape Cost Estimate – Creek Realignment area prepared by MHBC
18. Landscape Cost Estimate – Restoration Area prepared by MHBC
19. Landscape Letter of Conformance prepared by MHBC
20. Landscape Plans prepared by MHBC
21. Site Plan prepared by Petroff Architects
22. Stormwater Management Report prepared by Crozier
23. TRCA Letter regarding Temporary Stormwater Outlet prepared by Crozier
24. Tree Inventory Plans prepared by MHBC
25. VO Model prepared by Crozier
26. Woodland Invasive Species Management Plan prepared by SLR

Please note that the site plan included in this resubmission has been redesigned to reflect a market-driven decision. The revised building layout is intended to provide flexibility for either a single tenant or multiple tenants. The building can be demised along an east-west axis to create separate north and south tenant spaces and further subdivided along a north-south axis to accommodate up to four tenant units

(quadrants). Each configuration is designed to maintain functional and independent loading, parking, and office areas for each tenant.

Building 1 has been reduced to 120,332sm (from 144,266sm) and is now located closer to Street A (George Bolton Parkway). A ring road has been added around the perimeter of the building to facilitate a new parking area (north lot) in the rear yard. The limits of natural heritage features (Block 8 within the Draft Plan of Subdivision), including the channel realignment and woodland buffer, remain unchanged. The total parking supply also remains unchanged and is now distributed between the south lot (adjacent to Street A), the north lot (rear yard), and a new east lot located adjacent to the EPA1 Zone. An increase to the driveway entrance width to allow for truck movements is proposed in our Draft Zoning By-law Amendment; otherwise, the minimum performance standards are achieved.

All the reports and drawings submitted to support the application have been coordinated to maintain consistency between all materials submitted with the Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (OPA 287) and associated CESIMP Reports.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING **Tanjot Bal**		
1	Please explain why Block 6 is an irregularly shaped lot. Concerns with how this block can be redeveloped in the future when the interim pond is no longer required.	Block 6 is shaped to accommodate the Interim Stormwater Management Pond. Once the Interim Pond is no longer needed and decommissioned, and Block 6 is returned to Prologis, it will form a cohesive development block with Block 5.
2	Comments from Transportation Engineering indicates a north-south collector road south of the George Bolton Parkway extension must be shown on the draft plan. Please revise the draft plan accordingly.	We have updated the Draft Plan of Subdivision to include Block 14, a north-south collector road.
3	The road block and natural heritage block does not appear to align with the limits shown on the site plan. Please review and confirm.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been coordinated with all of the development team's deliverables.
LANDSCAPE **Tanjot Bal**		
4	The Landscape Architect Letter of Conformance shall be reference to both draft plan of subdivision and Site Plan application number.	The Letter of Conformance submitted references both the Draft Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan applications.
5	The Arborist Report, along with the Tree Inventory, Protection, and Removal Plans, shall be revised to ensure consistency, clearly identifying which trees are to be retained and preserved versus those proposed for removal.	The Arborist Report, Tree Inventory, Protection, and Removal Plans have been coordinated.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
6	Arborist report shall be updated and include the following information a. A title page containing: i. Civic address of the subject property. ii. Development application number. iii. Applicant's name. iv. Author name, title and company name. v. Date the report was prepared. vi. Dates in which site visit(s) were conducted vii. Author's arborist certification number b. Updated Summary of tree inventoried table to include i. A column for the number of required compensation trees. ii. Ownership of the tree - private, neighbour, Town or shared (boundary). c. Aerial photo of site and abutting properties. d. Include General Notes (section 2.6 of Town's Terms of Reference for Arborist Reports)	Arborist Report has been updated accordingly.
7	Tree Inventory, protection and removals (T1-1 - 14) shall be updated and included the following information. a. Updated title block to include: i. Civic address of the subject property. ii. Development application number. b. Identify location of tree protection fence as per Town tree preservation detail 606 c. Proposed grades and the existing grades along the property lines and base of trees (root flare) d. Town standard tree preservation notes 710 & 711.	Tree Inventory has been updated accordingly.
8	To be considered compensation, the proposed new trees must exceed the Town's typical tree planting requirements associated with development approvals, to the satisfaction of the Town. Compensation trees shall be identified on the landscape drawings and shall also be listed on a separate plant list accordingly	Noted.
9	All drawings shall be stamped and signed.	Noted.
10	Any trees located on the property line or on the adjacent property that are proposed to be removed, pruned or injured, will require written consent from the adjacent landowner. All correspondence is to be forwarded to the Town.	Consent will be obtained where required.
11	All landscape works related to subdivision application (21T-24014C) must be submitted under a separate set of landscape drawings, with the cost estimate provided using the Town's standard cost estimate format.	As requested, three separate cost estimates have been provided and are included in the submission.
MUNICIPAL NUMBERS **Tanjot Bal**		
12	The property addresses are confirmed as 12519 Humber Station Road & 12713 Humber Station Road	Thank you for the confirmation.
13	A municipal number will be issued to each block at the earliest of grading approval, servicing approval or Final Site Plan Approval.	This is acknowledged and understood.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
14	Upon issuance of one of the above-noted approvals, the Lead Planner will forward a copy of the approval package to municipal numbering staff to work with the owner to issue the required number and post any required signage of the number in accordance with the Town's Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines.	This is acknowledged and understood.
15	In accordance the Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines, the municipal number must be posted on the exterior of the building that faces the road on which the building is numbered. The elevation drawings shall identify the location of the municipal address on the elevations and those drawings shall form part of the approval package. The number shall be identified in accordance with the By-law and Guidelines. Should the owner require clarification on the requirements of the By-law, please contact municipal numbering staff at municipalnumbers@caledon.ca or 905-584-2272 x. 4119	Once a new municipal address is provided, the necessary elevations and site plan materials will be updated to reflect the new address.
16	There are no concerns with the proposed Zoning by-law Amendment	Thank you for confirming that Municipal Numbering has no concerns.
HERITAGE Tanjot Bal		
17	As part of the second submission of the above noted application, the proponent provided Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) compliance letters for the Stage 1 and Stage 2 archaeological assessments. This requirement has been addressed.	Thank you for the confirmation.
18	The date of the Stage 2 archaeological assessment referenced in the Stage 2 MCM compliance letter does not match the date of the archaeological assessment on file. Heritage staff will contact the archaeologist to receive the finalized version. No action is required by the proponent.	Thank you for the confirmation.
19	Heritage staff acknowledge, per the comment matrix, the update from the proponent re: the ongoing Stage 3 and 4 work and the aim for completion of the archaeological program in 2025. We appreciate the ongoing collaboration and communication with the proponent and their consultant archaeologist.	The Stage 3 MCM Compliance Letter is included with the latest submission.
20	There are no further archaeological concerns for the above noted application. All further archaeological work will be addressed through the related site plan application.	This is acknowledged and understood.
21	Heritage staff acknowledge, per the comment matrix, that the proponent has committed to a commemorative feature in Phase 2 of the development, to be coordinated between the heritage consultant and landscape architect. No further action is required at this time.	At the time of Phase 2 development, we will work with Heritage Staff to design the commemorative feature.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
MINISTRY OF ENERGY		
22	Thank you for including the Ministry of Energy and Mines in the circulation for the application for the Subject Lands at 12519 Humber Station Road (File 21T-24014C & RZ 2024-0032 & SPA 2024-00322).	Noted, thank you.
23	The Subject Lands are partially within the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Study's 2025 Narrowed Area of Interest. An updated version of the Narrowed Area of Interest may be found here: https://data.ontario.ca/dataset/northwest-greater-toronto-areatransmission-corridor-study-area.	Thank you for providing the resource. We have been in close communication with the Ministry on this matter. Additionally, as of March 12, 2026, it appears that the limits of the 'Narrowed Area of Interest (NWGTA Transmission Corridor Study)' have been reduced to the point where the property impacts affect only Block 5 (please see the submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision). Given that Block 5 is retained for future development, we request that the MTO approve the first phase of development which includes Block 1, Block 6, Block 7, Block 8, and Block 15.
24	At this time, the Ministry is unable to allow any development to proceed within the Narrowed Area of Interest that may preclude the future use of the corridor for the purpose for which it was intended. The Provincial Planning Statement (s. 3.3.3) stipulates that planning authorities shall not permit development in planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified.	The Owner has been in contact with the Ministry to discuss the proposed development and subsequent approval from the Ministry of Energy. As noted above, it appears that as of March 12, 2026, the limits of the 'Narrowed Area of Interest (NWGTA Transmission Corridor Study)' have been reduced to the point where the property impacts affect only Block 5 (please see the submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision). Given that Block 5 is retained for future development, we request that the MTO approve the first phase of development which includes Block 1, Block 6, Block 7, Block 8, and Block 15.
25	For context, the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Identification Study is a joint effort by the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) and the Ministry of Energy and Mines. Its goal is to identify and protect land for future electricity transmission lines near the proposed Highway 413. Land protections for the Corridor Study and the Highway are similar but not identical.	This is acknowledged and understood.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
26	The Ministry of Energy and Mines and Independent Electricity System Operator continue to work with the Ministry of Transportation to co-locate the transmission corridor as refinements are being made to the Highway 413 transportation corridor. These studies are coordinating closely but are entirely separate.	This is acknowledged and understood.
MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION		
27	The Major Infrastructure Projects office has reviewed the submission material for 12519 Humber Station Road and the subject lands are partially within the 2025 Focused Analysis Area (FAA) land protection boundary for the Highway 413 project in blocks 4 5, and 6. Block 5 additionally has a small portion with direct impacts to the future MTO right-of-way. The Highway 413 project team is currently unable to endorse the advancement of new developments within the FAA limits at this time. The Highway 413 project is currently in the preliminary design and assessment of environmental impacts phase. Property requirements and release of FAA lands for the project will be determined at the completion of the preliminary design phase which we anticipate being in early 2026. Once Highway 413 is designated as controlled access highway (CAH), all Corridor Management policies and setback requirements would be applicable to all developments.	The Owner and development team have coordinated with the MTO to design an appropriate intersection at Humber Station Rd and Street A (George Bolton Parkway extension). Further discussions were had to clarify design criteria for the remaining development Blocks within the Draft Plan of Subdivision.
28	Considering MTO's acceptance of the George Bolton Parkway extension with a single left turn (from GBP) onto Humber Station Road, the Highway 413 project team does not have any concerns with any of the proposed development outside of the FAA. We would however like to suggest consideration for the site plan to include planning for an access road off of GBP for the adjacent southeast lands given that direct access to these properties from Humber Station Road may be constrained by the proximity of the Highway 413/Humber Station Rd interchange.	A future north-south road (Street A2) has been included in the Draft Plan of Subdivision as Block 14.
PEEL REGION **Dylan Prowse**		
29	Functional Servicing The Region has reviewed the Functional Servicing Report prepared by C.F. Crosier & Associates Inc., dated August 2025 which speaks to phase 1a of the proposed subdivision, with consideration of the future phase 1b. Phase 2 is not considered. As part of a future resubmission, the Region requires a revised Functional Servicing Report for the entire subdivision, including the future George Bolton Parkway Extension as it is tied to the site servicing strategy. We require complete sanitary and watermain servicing and drainage plans, including provisions for external lands adjacent to the proposed development to enable water and wastewater modeling for the entire subdivision.	Crozier: Noted. The FSR has been revised to include the entire subdivision area, including Phase 2, and sanitary and water servicing and drainage plans have been provided for the full subdivision area, appended to the report. The updated report does not include the future Street A (Block 7) George Bolton Extension, as this is covered under a separate report prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
30	Municipal Watermain: • The infrastructure consists of an existing water pressure zone 6, 200mm dia. watermain on Humber Station Road and a future 400mm dia. watermain on Humber Station Road, with the completion date of approx. spring 2026. • There is a provision in the Region's budget for a 400mm watermain on Street A (George Bolton Parkway extension).	Crozier: Noted.
31	Municipal Sanitary Sewer: The infrastructure consists of a 750mm/1200mm diameter sanitary sewer on Humber Station Road with construction completion anticipated in spring 2026	Crozier: Noted.
32	This Functional Servicing Report was prepared for Site Plan Application, and detailed comments will be issued during Site Plan review stage.	Crozier: Noted.
33	The FSR reports "a future 600 mm diameter sanitary sewer on Humber Station Road designed by the Region of Peel". Is unclear what this sewer is, as it does not match the Region's records.	Crozier: Noted. The information on the future infrastructure has been revised per the Region's records. Refer to section 4.1 of the Functional Servicing Report.
34	A corridor for Street A is marked in the plan for the subdivision as "Lands to be dedicated for George Bolton Parkway Extension." The Town of Caledon has planned for this road extension, however there is no current plan for when, and the Region of Peel does not have current plans to construct the water and wastewater servicing in this road corridor. o Going forward the applicant must either: ▪ Advance the construction of the Road A extension, and associated sanitary sewer; or ▪ Propose a plan to service the development that does not utilize Road A. In which case the Peel Region will likely require provision to connect it in the future.	Crozier: Noted. The Owner will advance the construction of Road A extension, and associated sanitary sewer to service Block 1.
35	Note that draft plan conditions maybe be amended and/or added based on the ultimate servicing approach.	Crozier: Noted.
36	More detailed FSR comments are included in the comment memo for SP-24-100C.	Crozier: Noted.
37	Capital Budget Servicing of this Plan will require construction of 400mm watermain which is the financial responsibility of the Region of Peel as per Development Charges By-law Policy F40-06. Should the Developer wish to proceed with the works in order to obtain clearance of the Draft Plan conditions at a time when the Region is not prepared to fund the works, then the Developer shall be required to enter into a Front-Ending Agreement prior to the construction of the works. This agreement will be subject to the Region's determination that it has or will have sufficient funds to justify entering into the Front-Ending Agreement and Regional Council approval. The following oversized watermain is included in the Five-Year Capital Budget and Forecast.	This is acknowledged and understood.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
38	Development Charges The Owner acknowledges that the lands are subject to the Region's Development Charges By-law in effect and amended from time to time. The applicable development charges shall be paid in the manner and at the times provided by this By-law.	It is understood that Regional Development Charges must be paid prior to the release of building permits.
39a	Draft Plan Conditions: 1. Prior to registration of the subdivision, the Owner shall execute a Subdivision Agreement with the local municipality and Region for the construction of municipal sanitary sewer and water associated with the lands. The Owner shall construct and design these services in accordance with the latest Region standards and requirements.	We understand that the Region will be party to the Subdivision Agreement along with the Town. The proposed infrastructure has been designed in accordance with the latest Region standards.
39b	2. The Owner shall gratuitously transfer to the Region, free and clear of all encumbrances and contamination and to the satisfaction of the Region: a) all necessary easements for proposed and existing Regional infrastructures as required by the Region to service the proposed plan and external lands. b) all costs associated with easements transfers shall be the sole responsibility of the Owner. Clauses shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	The necessary land for the Humber Station Rd road widening will be conveyed to the Region free and clear of all encumbrances and contamination.
39c	3. Prior to a satisfactory engineering submission, the Owner shall submit to the Region for review and approval a Functional Servicing Report (FSR) showing proposed watermain and sanitary sewer servicing plan for the subdivision development and provision for the external lands if applicable. A Clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Crozier: Noted.
39d	4. The Owner shall acknowledge and agree that servicing of the subdivision will require construction of a 400mm dia. watermain on Street A which is the financial responsibility of the Region as per Development Charges By-Law and Policy F40-06. The Owner shall make appropriate financial arrangement with the Region prior to construction of such works. The construction will be subject to the Region's determination that it has or will have sufficient funds to finance the works. Clauses shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39e	5. The Owner shall acknowledge and agree that financing and construction of all temporary/permanent infrastructures not covered by the Current Development Charges By-law (watermains, sanitary sewers) shall be the sole financial responsibility of the Owner. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	This is acknowledged and understood.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
39f	6. The Owner shall acknowledge and agree that the Owner is responsible for all costs associated with the relocation of existing services to accommodate the development. The Owner shall made appropriate arrangements with the Region regarding financing and relocation of Regional services prior to execution of this agreement.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39g	7. The Owner shall acknowledge and agree that prior to servicing, their engineering consultant shall submit a satisfactory engineering submission to the Region to review and approval and shall submit all engineering drawings in the digital format in accordance with the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines.	Crozier: Noted.
39h	8. The Owner shall acknowledge and agree that their engineering consultant is required to provide all "as constructed" drawings within (60) days of Preliminary Acceptance of the underground services. The "as constructed" drawings must be submitted in digital format, in accordance with the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines. The Owner's engineering consultant shall also provide ties to all main line valves, ties to individual water service boxes, linear ties to sanitary sewer services and GPS coordinates of all watermain and sanitary sewer appurtenances in accordance with the latest requirements of the Region's design, standards specification and procedures. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Crozier: Noted.
39i	9. The Owner shall agree that the Region shall hold back a portion of the Letter of Credit to cover the costs of services completed on the Owner's behalf by the Region, calculated and charged on a time and material basis pursuant to the current Region's User Fee By-Law. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39j	10. The Owner shall agree that neither Owner nor any Builder will apply for building permits for any lots or blocks within the plan of subdivision until the Region's Public Works Department has issued Preliminary Acceptance and provided notice to the local municipality stating that the sanitary sewers and watermains, including fire protection, have been completed to the Region's satisfaction. The Owner's consulting engineer shall certify in writing that the sanitary sewers and watermains have been constructed, inspected and shall function in accordance with the detailed design as approved by the Region. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	This is acknowledged and understood. Once the sanitary sewers and watermains have been constructed, the necessary certificates will be issued and submitted to the Town and Region.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
39k	11. Provision will be required in the Subdivision Agreement for the following clauses in respect of servicing existing properties within the zone of influence in the event that existing private services (wells) deteriorate due to the servicing of the proposed plan of subdivision; a) Until the issuance of Final Acceptance, a portion of the Letter of Credit shall be held back to serve as protection for the private wells in the zone of influence of the plan of subdivision. This amount shall be based on the anticipated cost of replacing water supplies within the zone of influence as shown in the schedules of the agreement. The minimum amount shall be $20,000.00. If the private well systems in the zone of influence deteriorate due to the servicing of the plan of subdivision the Owner shall provide temporary water supply to the residents upon notice by the Region and the Owner shall continue supplying the water to the effected residents until the issue is resolved to the satisfaction of involved parties. If the quantity of water in the existing wells is not restored to its original condition within a month after first identification of the problem, the Owner shall engage the services of a recognized hydrogeologist to evaluate the wells and recommend solutions including deepening the wells or providing a permanent water service connection from the watermain to the dwelling unit. b) The Owner shall inspect, evaluate and monitor all wells within the zone of influence prior to, during and after the construction has been completed. Progress Reports should be submitted to the Region as follows: i. Base line well condition and monitoring report shall be submitted to the Region prior to the pre-servicing or registration of the plan (whichever occurs first) and shall include as a minimum requirement the following tests: a) Bacteriological Analysis - Total coliform and E-coli counts b) Chemical Analysis - Nitrate Test c) Water level measurement below existing grade ii. In the event that the test results are not within the Ontario Drinking Water Standards, the Owner shall notify in writing the Homeowner, the Region of Peel's Health Department (Manager - Environmental Health) and Public Works Department (Development Supervisor) within 24 Hours of the test results. iii. Well monitoring shall continue during construction and an interim report shall be submitted to the Region for records. Well monitoring shall continue for one year after the completion of construction and a summary report shall be submitted to the Region prior to Final Acceptance.	This is acknowledged and understood.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
39l	12. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner acknowledges the Region's responsibility to provide safe drinking water in Peel and to provide reliable delivery of wastewater services, including protection of the environment. The Owner shall confirm its familiarity with the Region's Drinking Water Quality Management System (QMS) and Wastewater Integrated Management System (IMS), which require that drinking water and municipal wastewater meet all applicable legislative and regulatory requirements and that the QMS/IMS be continually maintained and improved.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39m	13. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge that the Region's drinking water systems are governed by Province of Ontario legislation, and that every person authorized to carry out work on any aspect of the Region's drinking water system, including construction, extension, system modification, and operation, must be familiar with the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002, applicable regulations, and the Drinking Water Works Permit and the Municipal Drinking Water License issued to the Region by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). The design and construction of any aspect of the drinking water system shall be conducted in compliance with the conditions of the Drinking Water Works Permit and the Region's Design, Standards Specification, and Procedures.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39n	14. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge that Region's wastewater systems are governed by Province of Ontario legislation, and every person authorized to carry out work, including construction, extension, system modification, and operation of any aspect of the Region's wastewater system, must be familiar with the Environmental Protection Act, Ontario Water Resources Act and applicable regulations, including the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) issued to the Region by the MECP for wastewater infrastructure within the subdivision, and any required reporting and notification. The design and construction of any aspect of the wastewater system shall be conducted in compliance with the conditions of the ECA and the Region's Design, Standards Specification, and Procedures.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39o	15. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge and agree that the Region may require the Owner to construct one or more water sampling stations at the Owner's sole cost within the plan of subdivision. The location of and the requirement for a water sampling station will be determined at the engineering review stage.	We request that the Region clarify if a water sampling station is required within the plan of subdivision as detailed design has progressed.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
39p	16. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge that prior to the issuance of preliminary acceptance, the Owner shall review the Drinking Water QMS, available on the Region's website at https://www.peelregion.ca/construction/, including sections on compliance with applicable legislation, and confirm its familiarity of the same.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39q	17. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge to maintain adequate chlorine residuals in the watermains within the subdivision from the time the watermains are connected to the municipal system until the Region issues final acceptance. To maintain adequate chlorine residuals, the Owner shall be required to either install automatic flushing devices or to retain Regional staff to carry out manual flushing. Regional staff will conduct the water quality monitoring and testing for chlorine residuals. The costs associated with the monitoring and flushing shall be the responsibility of the Owner pursuant to the Region's Fees By-law, as amended.	This is acknowledged and understood. The required flushing and commissioning will be completed by the relevant project manage/ engineer.
39r	18. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge that if the development of the proposed subdivision is delayed such that the Owner does not proceed with the planned development within ONE calendar year from the Preliminary Acceptance of the watermain(s), the Region may require that any watermain(s) be cut and capped at the sole cost of the Owner. The Owner shall further acknowledge that any re-commissioning of the watermain(s), as required by legislation, will be at the sole cost of the Owner.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39s	19. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge that they will be solely responsible for all utility locates of infrastructure works servicing the subdivision from the time of their installation until final assumption of the subdivision.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39t	20. The Owner shall acknowledge that the Owner has full responsibility to ensure compliance with the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and all other legislative requirements including Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 406/19- Onsite and Excess Soil Management. The Owner shall be familiar with and meet the objectives of O. Reg. 406/19 for all work completed.	This is acknowledged and understood.
39u	21. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Owner shall acknowledge that prior to registration of the Plan of subdivision, the Owner shall submit draft reference plan(s) for the Region's review and approval prior to such plans being deposited. All costs associated with preparation and depositing of the plans and transfer of lands shall be at the sole expense of the Owner.	This is acknowledged and understood. Upon Draft Approval we will submit the Draft Reference Plan to the Town and Region for review and approval.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
39v	22. The Owner shall acknowledge and agree that prior to the Region granting clearance of the draft plan conditions of subdivision approval, the following shall require to be forwarded to the Region's Legal Services Division: a) A signed copy of the final M-Plan; b) A copy of the final draft 43R-Plan(s); and c) Easement and conveyance documents required pursuant to the Subdivision Agreement and the registration of this plan. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	This is acknowledged and understood. The noted deliverables will be prepared by the project OLS and submitted to the Town and Region for approval.
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING **Drew Haines**		
40	*1. The Environmental Assessment (EA) for George Bolton Parkway (GBP) is still underway. The Town is waiting for clarification from the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) that the proposed location where GBP connects to Humber Station Road is acceptable. The Town is also waiting for confirmation through the EA that GBP's proposed 26.0 m right of way at Humber Station is sufficient to accommodate required turning lanes, through lanes, sidewalks, active transportation etc.. Until clearance is provided by the MTO and GBP right of way width determined, the Development Engineering cannot draft approve the plan.* The Draft Plan needs to reflect the latest revision to the Environmental Assessment for Gorge Bolton Parkway. Provide the road right of way that corresponds to the EA recommendations.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been updated and coordinated with the latest EA recommendations, provided by LEA Engineers.
41	*2. GBP and Humber Station will require 15 x 15 m daylight triangles. Future north south street and GBP will require 7.5 m x 7.5 m daylight triangle.* A response is provided that the daylight triangles are shown in Site Plan drawings. The daylight triangle shall be part of the Draft Plan and shall be conveyed to the Town at the time of Street A and Street A2 conveyances.	This is acknowledged and understood.
42	*3. Local road that connects to the southern property, as identified in the EA, needs to be included on the draft plan.* CEISMP and Site Plan submission have shown a N-S local road Street A2 as shown below. Provide a road ROW block in the Draft Plan as a separate block than the interim pond block. The road block shall be conveyed to the Town free of any encumbrances and charges. Provide a 0.3m reserve along western boundary of Street A2 blocks.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been updated and coordinated with the CEISMP to include a right-of-way block for the north-south collector road (Street A2).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
43	*4. Will ownership of the future channel through Block 2 be retained by the developer or transferred into public ownership.* A response is provided that the channel block 2 will be conveyed to the Town as EPA-1. No further comment.	Block 2 is land to be retained by the Owner for future development. Block 8 will be conveyed to the Town as Environmental Protection.
44	*5. Humber Station Road is identified as a 36.0 m ROW in the Town's Multi-Modal Transportation Plan and Future Caledon: Our Official Plan. The applicant is to dedicate land such that the right of way is 18.0 m from the centerline along the frontage of the property. This road widening is to be identified on the draft plan of subdivision.* Road widening allowance is provided, no further comments.	Thank you for clearing this comment.
45	*6. Currently Humber Station is rural road that does not support truck traffic and is subject to half load season. The DC Background Study identifies Humber Station for reconstruction prior to 2031, however a portion between Mayfield Road and Healey Road is subject to Highway 413 construction, which may impact time of its reconstruction.* Response provided that Region will be restoring the road to support truck load. Town can accept this however, no construction will be allowed until Region has completed the work and access from Humber Station Road can be supported. This will be a Draft Plan Condition for the development.	It is acknowledged and understood that this will be a Draft Plan Condition. We understand that the Region will be completing works by approximately mid-April.
46	New Comment *7. Town's Multi-Modal Transportation Master Plan is being updated at this time, and based on the most current version, George Bolton Parkway is proposed to continue west, past Humber Station Road. Please consider updating the GBP intersection design, considering Through Traffic provision and provide ROW to accommodate the future need. See the snip from MMTMP Update.*	The intersection design has been updated following the latest EA process which is managed by LEA Engineers.
47	<u>Storm Water Management/Storm Drainage</u> *1. The Town needs to understand ownership of the interim pond. The Town's CLI ECA requires that stormwater infrastructure approved under the CLI ECA be in public ownership.* Response provided that the Pond block will be conveyed to the Town. Comment addressed.	Crozier: As discussed in the meeting with the Town of Caledon on January 12, 2026, the Town will take ownership and responsibility for the proposed interim pond. Per the updated draft plan prepared by Mainline Planning Services, Block 6 is dedicated for the interim stormwater management pond.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
48	*2. The report should provide stormwater calculations for Street A as well as providing suggested LIDs in the right of way to achieve CLI ECA requirements.* A separate Stormwater Management Report prepared by Schaeffers has been submitted for the Street A SWM and LID design. Comments are provided in New Comments after 2nd Submission section.	Crozier: The detailed design for Street A, including stormwater controls and LIDs, is being completed by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers. Please refer to the associated reports for details.
49	*3. The report should provide information on how the interim pond will be constructed and provide recommendations for decommissioning rehabilitation of stormwater pond and Clarkeway Tributary.* Decommissioning of interim stormwater pond and rehabilitation of the area are discussed in Geotechnical Report prepared by Pinchin. Comment addressed.	Crozier: Decommissioning of the interim stormwater pond and rehabilitation of the area are discussed in Geotechnical Report prepared by Pinchin. A figure showing the Interim SWM Pond Decommissioning Construction Phasing is also include in the SWM Report prepared by Crozier.
50	*4. Demonstrate that the future north south road will be located outside the limits of the interim pond.* Future north-south road is shown in engineering drawings, while missing in the Draft Plan.	Crozier: Refer to the Draft Plan of Subdivision prepared by Mainline Planning Services and the Interim Pond Figure SWM-3 in the SWM report which shows the location of the interim pond outside of Block 14 for the future North-South road.
51	*5. The interim pond has a normal water level of 230.60 m however Palmer's Hydrogeological Assessment dated November 21, 2024, identifies the groundwater level at 231.2 masl for MW169. This appears to be the closes monitoring well near the interim pond. The consultant is to identify if the pond will require special building measures or dewatering in order for the pond to function.* 2nd submission report has a pond bottom at 229.1masl and groundwater table at 231.20masl. The report has outlined dewatering requirement for building foundation and for the interim pond construction. The dewatering rates are calculated and are found to be below 40,000L/day. Comment addressed.	Crozier: The interim pond bottom elevation is 229.1masl. Please refer to the updated Hydrogeological Report for construction dewatering calculations showing rates below 40,000L/day
52	*6. The emergency overland flow route for Street A is not identified on the drawings, however based on the original topography of the site it appears that the overland flow route will be located approximately where the access road to the interim pond is proposed. The location for the future north south local road is located further east next to the Clarkeway Tributary. The consultant is to identify how the overland flow route will reach the ultimate pond location in the future.* Emergency spillways from Street A to the interim pond is provided, comment addressed.	Crozier: The detailed design for Street A is being completed by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers. The preliminary design for the north/south road and the ultimate pond are included in the CEISMP report. Please refer to the associated reports for additional details.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
53	*7. The lands where the interim pond outlet is proposed are not owned by the applicant or the Town. The Applicant is to demonstrate to the Town how the infrastructure will be constructed and access for operation and maintenance will be provided.* An easement needs to be established for the use of the outlet structure within the eastern land. Provide the easement document to the Town.	Crozier: Noted. An easement will be provided within Block 14 in a future submission.
54	8. Maximum allowable slope for a stormwater pond access road is 8%. Access road slope is revised to stay within 8%. Comment addressed.	Crozier: Noted. The access road has been revised to have a slope of 7.6%.
55	New Comment 9. The FSR requires describing how the Water Balance is met at the interim development phase. This can alternatively be covered under the Hydrogeological Report.	Crozier: Preliminary LIDs sizing for the development blocks is provided in the stormwater management report prepared by Crozier for the draft plan of subdivision application. Water balance for Steet A is addressed in the Steet A stormwater management report by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers.
56	New Comment 10. George Bolton Parkway, extending from eastern PL to Humber Station Rd needs to be designed and constructed as part of the Subdivision application.	George Bolton Parkway will be constructed as part of the Subdivision application. A second detailed design submission will be made by the end of April or early May.
57	Environmental Impact Study *1. The report does not speak to the drainage realignment being proposed as part of the interim stormwater management pond or the impacts it may have the Clarkeway Tributary.* The revised EIS report has discussed on restoring vegetation cover after the interim SWM pond is constructed. It is demonstrated that no impact will occur on Clarkeway Tributary water level. No further comments.	Thank you for confirming that there are no further comments in this regard.
58	*2. The report does not mention the interim stormwater management proposal or provide any guidance on how the interim pond should be design, stabilized, decommissioned and the area restored.* Comment addressed through Geotechnical Report prepared by Pinchin and EIS report prepared by SLR.	Thank you for confirming that this comment has been addressed.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
59	*3. The report is to provide recommendations for restoration of the Clarkeway Tributary once the interim stormwater management pond is decommissioned and removed.* Comment addressed through Geotechnical Report prepared by Pinchin and EIS report prepared by SLR.	Thank you for confirming that this comment has been addressed.
60	Preliminary Noise Impact Study *1. The report is to identify any acoustical impacts and required mitigation related to Street A on the exiting residence and potential. Any noise mitigation required for the individual Lots/Blocks within the plan will be dealt with through their respective site plan application.* The report has identified that the sound level along Street A are within NPC300 limits for the existing 3 residential properties and no mitigation measures are required. Future Phases 1B and 1C are much closer to the residential properties and will therefore require a separate Noise Impact Study when they come to application.	This is acknowledged and understood. An addendum to the Noise Report will be prepared for the future phases of development.
61	Geotechnical Investigation *1. The Geotechnical Investigation Report will be required as part of detailed engineering design that provides recommendations for construction of Street A, the temporary storm pond, north south local road, realigned channel, etc. The report should also provide recommendations for removal of the interim stormwater management pond and bring the site back to grade. A draft condition will be included to speak to this.* The Supplementary Geotechnical Recommendations for Interim SWM Pond prepared by Pinchin is submitted, comments are addressed.	Thank you for confirming that this comment has been addressed.
62	New Comment 2. Geotechnical Report Table 10-12 recommended Pavement does not meet Town's minimum standard. Refer to pavement design provided in the Town Standard 209- Local Industrial Road and meet or exceed the recommended pavement design.	The development team requests that this comment be deferred to the detailed design or site plan review stage.
63	Environmental Site Assessment *1. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by Pinchin Ltd., dated April 28, 2022 did not identify current or historical recognized environmental conditions for the site.* Comment addressed.	Thank you for confirming that this comment has been addressed.
64	*2. A Record of Site Condition will be required for all lands transferred to Town ownership.* Acknowledged that a RSC will be submitted in the future which will be a Draft Plan Condition.	Thank you for confirming that this comment has been addressed.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
65	<u>New comments based on 2nd Submission.</u> 1. Channel Realignment Civil Drawings prepared by Crozier do not match with Channel Realignment and Wetland Relocation Design Drawing produced by SLR and Profile submitted by GEI as part of CEISCM Stage 3. Coordination among Crozier, SLR and GEI is required for a consistent design.	Crozier: Noted. The channel re-alignment drawings have been coordinated between SLR, Crozier and MHBC.
66	2. Channel Construction Phasing 1 & 2 has a break in the construction area. Explain the void area below and revise the construction phasing as per need	Crozier: The void between Phase 1 and Phase 2 is intentional, please refer to the phasing notes provided on the Channel Construction Phasing plans C636 and C637. Please also refer to construction Phases 3A, 3B, 4 and 5. The void is required to ensure that once Phase 1 is completed, the drainage can flow into existing channel to allow the construction of Phases 2 and 3.
67	3. Construction Phase 5 is shown within the existing channel alignment. Revise the drawing to reflect the construction to the new alignment.	Crozier: Phase 5 is intentionally shown within the existing channel, please refer to the phasing notes provided on the Channel Construction Phasing plans C636 and C637. Phase 5 will occur after the new channel is completed and active. Since the remaining undisturbed existing channel would no longer be functional. The depression of the existing channel must be filled in and re-graded to avoid ponding water on the property.
68	4. Construction access for the Channel alignment is from Humber Station Road, which aligns with Phase 3 construction. Provide clarification on accessing Phase 1 and Phase 2 area	Crozier: Phase 1 can be accessed from Humber Station along the proposed future maintenance access road shown on drawing C629. Phase 2 can be accessed from the Block 1 construction area. There is currently an existing haul road that connects Humber Station Road to the Block 1 construction area near the future George Bolton Parkway right-of-way. This haul road was constructed and approved part of the Grading Permit.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
69	5. Town standards section 1.12.4 allows maximum swale/channel side slope to be 1:4, however the designs are done for a slope of 1:3. Revise the channel side slopes to the allowable limits in Channel Realignment Civil Drawings.	Section 1.12.4 Swales, of the Town's Development Standards Manual is for proposed swales within residential lots, therefore, this criteria should not apply to proposed channels which is under section 1.4.2.2.6 of the manual. An assessment of shear stress on the channel and overbanks has been included in the updated channel realignment design brief. The maximum overbank boundary shear stress observed within the channel corridor is 26.92 N/m2 during the Regional Event at one of the 90 degree corridor bends. Local boundary shear stress may increase by up to 50% along outer meander bends, resulting in a max shear stress of approx. 40.5 N/m2. The permissible shear stress for established brush layering specified along the 3:1 side slopes is approximately 300 N/m2, therefore this bioengineering treatment is expected to remain stable even under the Regional Event, with a safety factor of approx. 7.5 (Stability Thresholds for Stream Restoration Methods, Fischenich, 2001).
70	6. The realigned channel from STA 0+620 to STA 0+980 has proposed retaining structures along the eastern bank. Since the channel block 8 will be transferred to the Town, Town can not support the use of retaining structures along the channel. Retaining wall exceeding 0.6m requires fall protection. Provide detailed design of the Retaining Wall and the design will be Peer Reviewed, with the fees to be paid by the owner.	Crozier: Noted. Please note that due to the changes proposed on the Phase 1A (Block 1) site plan, a retaining wall is no longer required along the eastern bank of the channel. Additional grading design details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
71	*Hydrogeological Assessment* 7. Section 6 describes that a separate report for Test Pit Investigation will be provided to support feasibility of LID structures, SWM pond and other underground structures, which is outstanding. Schaffer's SWM Report for future Street A has identified that the permeability of the native soil are not favorable for infiltration. See section 4.2 of Schaeffer's SWM report.	The test pit report will be provided in next submission.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
72	8. Describe how does the infiltration tanks in the Site Plan at Phase 1A with invert elevation 236.85, 236.03 and 236.06 will function given the GWT is in the range of 229.1.	Invert elevation of infiltration tank is one m or more above gw level, which meet standards.
73	9. Provide calculations/justification that the infiltration tanks C, E, F and Rainwater harvesting tanks A, B, D are safe against upthrust pressure and buoyancy impacts. Provide invert elevation of the Infiltration tanks to demonstrate that these tanks will perform given the existing soil has low infiltration rate and shallow water table. The location of these infiltration tanks and rainwater harvesting tanks needs to be identified in engineering drawings.	The infiltration tanks have elevations of 235.7 masl. The gw levels shown from test pit investigation is from 226 to 227 masl. The inverts of infiltration tanks are more than one m above the gw levels. The rainwater harvesting tank has invert elevation of 232.8 masl, which is also more than one m above groundwater levels from the test pit report. Therefore, there will be no issues of upthrust and buoyance impacts for both infiltration tanks and the rainwater tank.
74	10. Report Table 18 Site Water Balance shows increased runoff to 118% and reduced infiltration by 28% at an ultimate development stage. Provide calculations and commentary on the Water Balance for the interim condition.	Water balance scope was limited to pre- and post-development scenarios. The water balance for interim scenario should range from the pre-development values to post-development values. The interim scenario is in progressing. We need continuous hydrological model to simulate, which is far beyond our scope.
75	George Bolton Parkway Drawings 11. Define and show the ROW limits of George Bolton Parkway in all drawings. Ensure that the ROW limits are as per the EA recommendation. Additional ROW is required at the intersection with Humber Station Road to accommodate 2nd left turn and Through lane for future.	Comment addressed. The ROW limits of George Bolton Parkway have been shown on all engineering drawings in accordance with the EA recommendations. Additional ROW has been incorporated at the intersection with Humber Station Road to accommodate the second left-turn lane and future through lane. The design has been updated based on the LEA Consultant traffic report.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
76	12. The road grading backslopes extend into private property of the Site Plan. Show the PL and revise grading to stay within GBP right of way. The backslope shall be maximum 4:1. There are 3:1 slopes in parking stalls. The Grading Plan requires coordination with Crozier's Site Plan drawings.	The property line has been shown on the drawings and the 3:1 slopes have been revised to 4:1. The grading design considers the construction sequencing. If the George Bolton Parkway (GBP) construction proceeds in advance of the Site Plan development, temporary slopes will be provided to match the interim grading conditions. The grading plan has been coordinated with Crozier's Site Plan drawings for the ultimate condition so that their grading ties into the proposed road grading. All grading will remain within the ROW limits.
77	13. Drawing D-5: Town acknowledges that Stormcon Tank, a product of Concast is proposed to receive runoff generated from the western portion of Street A 0.82ha area(George Bolton Parkway). The Tank is situated in private land. The Road GBP is a municipal road and municipal property shall discharge into a municipally owned SWM facility. Town prefers the flow to be diverted towards Interim SWM Pond and eliminate the use of the underground Strom Tank.	Due to the higher elevation at the bridge crossing on the east side of the site and the lower existing elevations along Humber Station Road, it is not feasible to divert the entire George Bolton Parkway drainage to the interim SWM pond to the east. Significant efforts have been made to minimize the drainage area directed to the SWM tank, and a separate SWM block will be provided to support the tank.
78	14. The proposed Tank is located within the Focused Analysis Area of Highway 413, which will require an approval from the MTO.	MTO building and land use permit application in process.
79	15. Please provide a few examples from Southern Ontario where Stormcon products have been implemented for Municipal Drainage solution. Staff Plant Tour or Presentation at the Town by the manufacturer may be helpful for knowledge sharing. Multiple departmental staff need to be aware, trained and educated about the product.	Stormcon presentation has been organised on Jan 27, 2026, to provide Town staff with information of underground storage tank.
80	16. Drawing TA-1 and Storm Design Sheet: Town's standard for overland drainage ponding which contributes to the nearest channel shall not exceed a velocity of 0.65m/s. The STM pipes next to three 100-yr ponding areas in GBP exceed the allowable velocity as shown in the Storm Design Sheet. Reduce the ponding depth to maximum 150mm instead of 300mm and provide calculations to support the ponding as an option.	Catchbasin grates and downstream stm pipe at 100yr capture locations has been revised to reduce ponding depth to 150mm.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
81	17. The SWM Report describes that the SWM Tank is positioned within its ultimate planned location within the private site plan block, with long-term municipal access and maintenance secured through easements. Town can not support maintenance responsibility for a SWM Tank in private land. The Tank has to be in a separate block in the Draft Plan and transferred to the Town through Subdivision process. It is preferred to divert flow from the 0.82ha catchment area towards east Interim SWM Pond and avoid the need for the Tank.	Due to the higher elevation at the bridge crossing on the east side of the site and the lower existing elevations along Humber Station Road, it is not feasible to divert the entire George Bolton Parkway drainage to the interim SWM pond to the east. Significant efforts have been made to minimize the drainage area directed to the SWM tank, and a separate SWM block will be provided to support the tank.
82	18. Proposed Stormcon O&M report Section 3.1 speaks to manual entry and walk down for inspection. The units have a clear height of 900mm, which is not realistic for manual entry and inspection.	Maintenance method had been updated in the O& M report and would be provided to town review in detail submission
83	<u>Comments that can be deferred to the Detailed Subdivision Stage</u> 19. Drawing GR-1 and GR-2: show existing and proposed spot elevations along the Road, backslope. Show how they tie to existing/design grades of adjacent lands.	Comment addressed.
84	20. GR-1 and GR-2: Avoid text overlapping and duplication of text in the drawings.	Comment addressed.
85	21. Drawing PP-1, PP-2 and PP-3: Show Crest and Sag Curve parameters for the proposed Road.	Comment addressed, Crest and Sag information had been updated in detail design drawings.
86	22. Drawing RW-2 and RW-3 provide % slope of the ditch graded towards north of the 600mm culvert. Maximum permissible ditch side slope is 4:1.	Comment acknowledged. Please refer to RW-4 for the grading slope. Typically, swale slopes are not shown on the Pavement Marking and Signage Plan (RW-2) or the New Construction Plan(RW-3)
87	23. Drawing RW-4 and all relevant, Town's maximum permissible slope is 4:1. Revise the ditch sideslopes, wherever applicable.	Comment acknowledged. The slope has been revised to 4:1 on the pavement side, while the opposite side is set at 2.5:1 to avoid encroachment into the daylight triangle.
88	24. Drawing D-1: 31.7m ROW for George Bolton Parkway is supposed to have 2 left turn lanes and a through lane.Road cross section elements will be decided as per the EA recommendations and as agreed by the Town's Transportation Department.	comment addressed. Comment addressed. The road widening plan has been updated based on the latest traffic report from the LEA Consultant.
89	25. Drawing D-1, GR-1 and GR-2: road ROW for George Bolton Parkway in the Grading Plans do not add/match to the total shown in the Detail Drawing. Detail drawing is more accurate, except that the standard ROW should be 26.80m.	The George Bolton Parkway ROW limits have been updated based on the latest LEA Consultant plan, and the cross-sections have been updated accordingly.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
90	26. Drawing D-4: include GWT related information in the LID cross-section.	Please refer to the SWM report section 4.1.3
91	27. Provide information related to GWT at the vicinity of the Tank and also provide calculations on how the tank safety against buoyancy and upthrust pressure.	Storm tank design would be reviewed by Hydro-G consultant at detail design stage
92	28. Drawings UT-1 and 2: Provide Photometric Drawing during the Detailed Design submission in support of Streetlight location and type of light fixtures.	Comment acknowledged. The photometric drawing will be added in the next submission.
93	29. The O&M Report Section 4.3 describes that the LID can be flushed through the cleanout wells, show the location of such wells in the Drawing D-4.	comment addressed, showed the cleanout well, please see the updated D-4
TRANSPORTATION Jasleen Kaur		
94	*Draft Plan and Rezoning Comments:* 1. The draft plan must be updated to reflect the latest revisions to the Environmental Assessment (EA) for George Bolton Parkway (GBP). A draft plan condition will require the Environmental Study Report (ESR) to be finalized and approved in accordance with regulatory requirements.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been coordinated with the latest GBP design following the EA process which is managed by LEA Engineers.
95	2. Town staff has requested the following revisions to the GBP and North-South (N-S) Road design: • Provide two through lanes (westbound) at the GBP/Humber Station Road (HSR) intersection; as the current design diverts one lane into a left-turn lane at the intersection. In the interim, while this intersection operates as a T-intersection, one of the westbound through lanes can be hatched but must be protected for. • Increase the width of the inner travel lanes from 3.2 m to 3.3 m. • Additional right-of-way (ROW) along the N-S Road approaching GBP is required to accommodate turning lanes and/or alignment adjustments. The Town requires a leftturn lane at a minimum; however, the potential need for a right-turn lane should also be reviewed and confirmed. These changes will impact the right-of-way and must be incorporated into the draft plan and future site plan submissions.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been coordinated with the latest GBP design following the EA process which is managed by LEA Engineers.
96	3. The draft plan does not reflect the required right-of-way (ROW) along GBP and the N-S Road in accordance with the EA: • The EA identifies midblock ROW of 26.8 m along GBP. • The North-South (N-S) Road connecting to the southern property with midblock ROW width 22.5 m, as identified in the EA, must be included in the draft plan.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been updated to include Block 14 for the future N-S collector road.
97	4. The ROW requirements to support the draft plan approval must reflect full build out of GBP/Humber Station Road intersection.	This is acknowledged and understood. The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been coordinated with the latest GBP design following the EA process which is managed by LEA Engineers.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
98	5. Please clarify when the extension of GBP east of subject-site will be delivered	The extension of GBP east of the subject-site is an ongoing process. It is our understanding that the Town is expropriating land to allow for the alignment of GBP. Additionally, the Detailed Design of GBP and the Bridge is ongoing. The construction of GBP is expected to commence in 2026.
99	6. The ROW for the future N-S road is not shown on the draft plan. The draft plan needs to be updated to show the block for future 22.5m N-S road including additional flaring at the intersection to accommodate turn lanes including a dedicated northbound left turn lane.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision has been updated to include Block 14 for the future N-S collector road and is designed with additional flaring at the intersection to accommodate turning lanes.
100	7. The interim design of George Bolton Parkway (GBP), which terminates in a cul-de-sac at the N–S Road/Site Access 2, requires additional land for the bulb to be dedicated to the Town. However, the bulb area mostly coincides with the future right-of-way (ROW).	Please review the revised Draft Plan of Subdivision. The Plan has been updated and removes the cul-de-sac as the proposal is to construct GBP and the easterly extension.
ZONING David Shortt		
101	*RZ 2024-0032 Zoning Comments:* 1. 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.	Included in the resubmission is a Word format copy of our Draft Zoning By-law.
102	21T-24014C Zoning Comments: 1. Please update the Draft Plan of Subdivision dated April 2024 to reflect the correct proposed Zoning. The submitted version still indicates a proposed “Serviced Industrial” (MS) Zone, whereas a “Prestige Industrial – Exception XXX” (MP-XXX) Zone has been proposed as part of the associated Zoning By-law Amendment file RZ 2024-0032.	The proposed zone is now consistent between the submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision and the Draft Zoning By-law.
103	2. Draft Plan of Subdivision dated April 2024 has been reviewed for compliance with the applicable minimum Lot Area and minimum Lot Frontage requirements. Zoning staff have no concerns at this time.	Thank you for confirming that there are no lot area or lot frontage concerns.
104	3. Final lot frontages and lot areas to be confirmed at a later date when a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage has been prepared and signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor (see Condition #2 below).	This is acknowledged and understood.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
105	4. Zoning standards such as parking space requirements and dimensions, building height, encroachments, building setbacks, landscaping areas, building areas, entrance setbacks, driveway widths etc. have not been reviewed as part of this application. Staff acknowledges that this may be deferred to the technical review stage (reviewed under associated Site Plan Application SPA 2024-0100).	Included with this submission is the proposed Site Plan that includes the relevant performance standards. The Draft By-law requests that the maximum driveway entrance width be increased to 17.0m in order to accommodate truck turning movements. Otherwise, the proposed Site Plan meets all necessary zoning standards.
106	Please note the following conditions for draft approval of the subdivision requested by zoning staff: 1. Prior to registration, a Zoning By-law for the development of these lands is to be passed under Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, and be in full force and effect.	This is acknowledged and understood.
107	2. Prior to registration, the Owner shall provide a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage prepared and signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor, to the satisfaction of the Town of Caledon.	Prior to Registration, the project OLS will prepare the necessary Certificates.
NATURAL HERITAGE Jason Elliott		
108	General: • Most of the review materials were submitted for both the draft plan/rezoning and site plan applications. As such, the two submissions were reviewed together and comments provided under headings indicating before which approval they must be addressed. As comments were recently provided on the Secondary Plan CEISMP that must be addressed, note that all of the draft plan/rezoning and site plan materials must be revised to be consistent with the approved CEISMP, as necessary. Outstanding CEISMP matters relevant to natural heritage that could affect the draft plan/rezoning and site plan materials include but are not necessarily limited to: o Drainage diversions – CEISMP must demonstrate no negative impact; note that the comment response is not accurate and does not address the comment o Compensation wetland hydrology – outstanding comments on CEISMP to be addressed.	Crozier: Noted. A separate ZBA-DPS submission has been prepared and is consistent with the most recent Secondary Plan CEISMP submission materials.
109	FSR: • Clarify why Figures 1 and 2 indicate "proposed channel (by others)" when the channel realignment civil drawing set was prepared by the same consultant as the FSR and must be implemented as part of subdivision detailed design.	Crozier: Noted. The figures in the Functional Servicing Report have been revised to remove the "By Others" note. The creek re-alignment drawing set issued for the Draft Plan of Subdivision prepared by Crozier has been included in this submission package.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
110	• As it does not conform to the draft plan of subdivision or zoning, the portion of the building encroaching into in the PSW buffer shown on Figures 1 and 2 must be removed.	The FSR and all other Civil drawings have been coordinated with the updated Draft Plan of Subdivision included with the resubmission.
111	Hydrogeological Report: • It continues to be indicated that no natural features are supported by groundwater despite the CEISMP indicating seasonal discharge in some features. The response to comments acknowledges that upward gradients were observed in the CEISMP data but that it is thought that the SLR interpretation is more reasonable considering the groundwater has a weak connection. As matching infiltration pre- to post-development is required and demonstrated for Phase 1A, this does not affect the proposal. Nevertheless, a conflict between reports is not supported. Revise the report to acknowledge the CEISMP conclusions, indicate a differing interpretation and outline that the infiltration target will be provided regardless.	To address the comments. a paragraph is added in the chapter 8: "It noted that the CEISMP indicated seasonal discharge in some features. However, SLR monitoring results did not identify any pattern of seasonal discharges, which is more of a random phenomenon. Plus weak connections between groundwater and surface water as manifested by stratigraphy, SLR's interpretation that no natural features are supported by groundwater is more reasonable. In spite of the different interpretation, the infiltration deficit will be fully compensated regardless; "
112	• The response to comment #19.18 regarding the CEISMP infiltration target is inaccurate as it does clearly indicate a target. However, as the target is being provided, nothing further on this item is required.	Noted
113	• Section 4.4 concludes that appropriate separation from groundwater can be maintained based on infiltration tank inverts that are different than proposed on the civil drawings. Confirm that the proposed inverts will have appropriate separation.	As provided above, the infiltration tanks have invert elevation of 235.7 masl, which is more than one m above groundwater level elevations shown in test pit report.
114	• Section 5.4 continues to indicate that runoff to wetlands should be managed through the SWM Plan to prevent increases (previous comment was not addressed). Consistent with the water balance analysis provided in the report indicating increased runoff to the HDF3 and the Clarkway Tributary, this is generally not possible when increasing impervious surfaces through development. While there are no concerns with the increased runoff (because the wetlands are riparian, flow through wetlands), revise the report to delete that statement.	The sentence was deleted to address this comment.
115	EIS: • Despite the report being prepared after approval of the Secondary Plan, Sections 3.3.2 and 6.2.1 discuss the formerly proposed Secondary Plan woodland policy amendment that wasn't necessary or included and also discusses things "upon approval of the Secondary Plan". Revise accordingly.	Text has been updated (removal of most of woodland text and 'approval' text) and replacement with some Octoboer 2025 OP reference

Comm. #	Comment	Response
116	Section 3.4 refers to the approved Secondary Plan but discusses non-existent policies whereas Section 6.2.2 refers to a draft Secondary Plan. Revise accordingly.	Section 3.4 has been completely revised with reference to the adopted natural heritage plan polices
117	Sections 4.1.1 and 6.1.2 includes the same revised HDF management recommendations as the latest CEISMP. Refer to those comments and revise.	Sections 4.1.1 and 6.1.2 of the EIS have been updated to reflect discussions with the Town on March 4, 2026, and revised to include GEI field data from 2017.
118	Sections 4.1.3 and 6.1.3 are out of date relative to the CEISMP and Redside Dace habitat and Section 4.6.2 is out of date relative to the recent changes to the habitat definition of the ESA.	Sections 4.1.3, 6.1.3 and 4.6.2 have been updated to include MECP consultation notes and the latest ESA habitat definition.
119	Section 4.7 - it is indicated that SLR generally does not consider a single territory of Eastern Wood pewee to be SWH. As indicated in a comment on the previous submission, as per the EcoRegion criteria schedule, it does count. While the response to comments inaccurately indicates that that comment was addressed, as the SWH has been appropriately considered in the proposal, nothing further on this item is required.	Acknowledged
120	Sections 4.8.3 and 6.2.2 reference the approved Secondary Plan in relation to buffer widths. However, the Secondary Plan does not prescribe buffer widths, it indicates that they will be determined through the Final CEISMP and EISs. Additionally, the section refers to a Draft Secondary Plan and an incorrect policy. Section 7 also refers to a draft Secondary Plan. Revise accordingly.	The reporting in these sections has been changed to reflect the direction of the CEISMP primarily regarding buffers and that the Secondary Plan is not a Draft.
121	Note that Section 6.1.4 incorrectly conflates water levels and peak flows in the Clarkway Tributary. However, nothing further on this item is required.	Acknowledged
122	Section 6.2.2 inappropriately indicates that there may be an encroachment into the wetland buffer along HDF3. As this does not conform to the proposed draft plan and zoning schedule the statement must be deleted.	Buffer encroachment into the buffer of the (south) Prologis wetland near Humber Stn. Road was discussed with the proponent, consulting team, and the Town staff after these comments were made. An approach going forward was that this encroachment would be shown.
123	As it was submitted, Section 6.2.2 incorrectly indicates that an EMP for the woodland removal and compensation is in draft form.	Text in this section has been edited and updated in including removal of the reference to Draft. The 'EMP' has now been refocussed and is called an Invasive Species Management Plan (ISMP)

Comm. #	Comment	Response
124	6.3.1 indicates that MECP should be involved when there are clear impacts to bat habitat. Therefore, the discussion regarding the snags in the former farmstead is not appropriate. However, as a condition of draft plan approval will be included requiring clearance from MECP as necessary, nothing further on this item is required.	SLR notes that MECP does not provide clearance letters. The provincial species at risk process is proponent driven, and thus, should the proponent through their consultants determine that bat or other SAR impacts are likely, it is the proponent's responsibility to engage with the MECP. Additionally, it should be noted that in 2026 the Endangered Species Act (which was amended in 2025) is expected to be revoked and replaced with a (equally or more proponent-driven) Species Conservation Act.
125	The CEISMP provided high-level monitoring requirements. The EIS must confirm that these are appropriate for the draft plan area and/or refine as appropriate. Note that implementation of the monitoring plan will be a draft plan condition and a cost estimate to inform securities must be provided.	A section has been added to the EIS report that discusses monitoring and which refers to Table 11 in the CEISMP Phase 3. Acknowledged re securities.
126	Civil Plans: • Drawing C601 displays the proposed infiltration tank overflow manhole design. While the concrete weir is set at the top of the tank levels, it includes four 25mm drainage holes at the manhole inlet elevation which corresponds to the tank bottoms. Therefore, it appears that the infiltration tanks will not fill before overflowing. Outline how the tanks will fill before overflowing or revise the design accordingly.	Crozier: Noted.The design will be updated and details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
127	Channel Realignment Design Brief: • Update Figure 1 to reflect HDF comments on the CEISMP.	Figure 1 has been updated as per comments on the CEISMP
128	Section 4.2 indicates that the design of the relocated wetland will allow flood water from HDF3 to enter and exit over the full range of flows. The hydrology and design of the proposed wetland area is not clear. Refer to CEISMP comments regarding the wetland hydrology and comments on the design drawings below and address accordingly.	Comment addressed through detailed consultation with Town. Additional rationale for wetland function has been included in the updated channel realignment design brief.
129	Table 6 is not consistent with the details on Sheet 09 of the Channel Realignment Design Drawings. The smallest appropriate rock sizing is preferred. Revise to be consistent.	Stone sizing in Table 6 updated to be consistent with design drawings.
130	• Section 5 is not consistent with Dwgs C636 and C637. All reports/plans must be consistent.	Section 5 updated to be consistent with Crozier phasing plans

Comm. #	Comment	Response
131	Channel Realignment Civil Plans: • Dwgs C636 and C637: o A woodland removal area is incorrectly identified, and By-pass Pipe Phase 1 is proposed through the protected woodland. The pipe must not impact the protected woodland. o It is proposed to construct the Phase 1 and 3 low flow channels and activate them while the remainder of the corridor is being constructed. As it is preferable, clarify why the full corridor widths cannot be constructed while the flows are bypassed. o A Phase 3A upstream coffer dam is missing. o Geomorphology implementation (flood plain and high flow channel) for Phase 4 is missing. o Removal of the downstream Phase 2 berm (if necessary) is missing. o Phase 3B includes activating the low flow channel but it would already be activated during Phase 4	Crozier: -The label for woodland removal has been corrected. The alignment of the by-pass pipe for phase 1 has been revised to be on the north limit of the phase 1 contruction area within the woodlot area to be cleared to accommodate the phase 1 area. Please refer to the updated drawing C636. -Significant "in-water works" time savings and unnecessary by-pass pumping cost savings may be achieved by activating the low-flow channel to it's natural flows prior to constructing the full corridor width. However, where the schedule allows, the Contractor may construct the full channel corridor within each phase. This approach will be confirmed closer to construction. -An upstream coffer dam for phase 3A has been added on drawing C637. -A note for geomorphology implementation (flood plain and high flow channel) for phase 4 has been added on drawing C637. -A note has been added on C637 to remove the temporary earth berm downstream of phase 2 (if constructed). -The note in Phase 3B to put low flow channel online has been deleted on drawing C637.

132	Detailed Channel Realignment and Wetland Relocation Design Drawings: • The controlling elevation on Dwg 629A appears to be 238.51. If so, that water level in the wetland would have to be always maintained by precipitation to allow the free exchange of flood water into and out of the wetland as is indicated. Due to ET, that is unlikely. Therefore, the wetland would have to fill to that level during flood flows before being able to spill back toward the channel which would not occur across the range of flows. Additionally, it is not clear what event spills out of the existing HDF3 channel into the existing wetland (and therefore the proposed wetland). As the downstream end of the existing wetland is proposed to tie into the realigned channel at 238.23 it appears that flows through the existing wetland will preferentially be conveyed to HDF3 and not the proposed wetland. Conversely, if water levels were always maintained in the proposed wetland at 238.51, the proposed meadow marsh would not be realized as it would always be under a minimum of 3cm of water. Similarly, the shallow marsh would always be under a minimum of 33 cm of water. Additionally, the proposed plantings in these areas do not appear consistent with the target wetland communities. Additionally, as outlined in the CEISMP comments, it is not clear how the design provides the required terrestrial crayfish habitat. Finally, an open water wetland that could have thermal impacts on the channel would not be supported. The proposed design and hydrology are not understood. It is recommended that discussion with staff occurs before a revised submission.	Comment addressed through design revisions and detailed consultation with Town. Additional rationale for wetland function has been included in the updated channel realignment design brief, and is sumarized below. The low water level condition represents observed low flows in the HDF-3 channel when there was approx 5cm of water depth in the main channel, during a flow of 0.01m3/s. This condition is expected to inundate the proposed shallow marsh area continuously from spring through fall except during the summer dry season when the HDF feature is fully dry. During low water levels, the maximum modelled depth in the shallow marsh is approximately 33 cm. It is expected that the shallow marsh area will be rapidly colonized by cattail, which will limit direct sun exposure and mitigate thermal impacts to the watercourse. It is noted that modelled water levels are approximate, and that an adaptive management approach will be followed to ensure water levels and temperatures in the wetland and watercourse are conducive to resident species. Dataloggers will be installed in the constructed wetland and channel to monitor water levels and thermal impacts. The proposed wetland relocation design has been updated to reduce the perimeter slopes to 6H:1V (approx 10 degrees) along the edge of the shallow marsh community to increase suitable burrowing habitat for terrestrial crayfish. This relatively gentle slope is expected to mimic conditions in the existing wetland where crayfish burrows were observed. Further, the substrate, relocated from existing crayfish habitat is

Comm. #	Comment	Response
		expected to retain the required moisture levels and be conducive to burrowing.
133	In addition to the preceding comment, the existing waterway centreline through the existing/protected wetland does not lead to the realigned HDF3. Clarify how flows through the existing and proposed wetland are intended to function.	The 'existing centreline of waterway' through the existing wetland is approximate, and represents only one of multiple channel threads through the wetland. The label has been updated to 'approx channel centreline - multi thread channel through existing wetland'. By incorporating a berm to the south and providing a low point (283.23m) at the upstream channel tie-in, water will naturally be conveyed from the existing wetland to the new channel.
134	Woodland Environmental Management Plan: • The EMP was part of the site plan submission. Note that, as draft plan approval is required before site plan approval, as per Secondary Plan policy, it must be completed to the Town's satisfaction before approval of the draft plan of subdivision.	Noted.
135	Refer to comments on the CEISMP which highlight that the required contents of the EMP have not been finalized. It is inaccurately indicated in Section 1 that the CEISMP recommended an EMP that was location-specific to the proposed woodland removal on the subject property. Revise as necessary to be consistent with the approved CEISMP, once finalized. As the EMP must cover all necessary items for the entire Secondary Plan area, it may be more appropriately completed by the Secondary Plan LOG.	The wording in both the CEISMP and the SLR document will be changed to clarify what tasks will be done at what stage. Note SLR document Woodland EMP will change name to *Invasive Species Management Plan for Prologis Woodland,* and is no longer an EMP.
136	The Secondary Plan policy referred to in Section 1 was not necessary and is to be removed from the CEISMP. Refer to comments on the CEISMP on this item.	Reference to Secondary Plan is removed.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
137	It is indicated that no management of the invasive buckthorn in the protected woodland is proposed as the results of the risk assessment outlined in the CEISMP indicated that it did not meet the high priority criteria. Further, the CEISMP indicates that multiple variables should be assessed including proximity to dispersal routes and practicality of control efforts. These items were not appropriately considered given the realigned channel immediately beside the buckthorn area was not considered and wil be very susceptible to buckthorn invasion and buckthorn management BMPs exist in Ontario. Additionally, the CEISMP indicated that whether the feature should be removed and replaced (replanted) should be assessed. As the woodland will be conveyed to the Town, the lack of buckthorn management is not supported. Consistent with Future Caledon Policy 13.13.4 d), which is in effect, the EMP must outline short-term actions that are the responsibility of the proponent to implement and medium and long-term actions that are recommended for the Town to implement. For instance, nine years of post-implementation monitoring of buckthorn invasion is proposed. It is recommended that discussion with staff occur on this item before a revised submission.	Management of buckthorn in this location was discussed between SLR and Town Natural Heritage staff (Jan 28, 2026). An acceptable approach to both was reached and the document will be revised.
138	It must be quantitatively demonstrated that the proposed control actions are being implemented. It does not appear that dense planting are being proposed in the channel and nothing has been provided demonstrating that the woodland compensation area is proposed to be planted denser than typical as stated. Further, the proposed monitoring and adaptive management only proposes an 80% survivorship threshold.	After conversation between the Town and SLR regarding invasive species management in the north Prologis woodland a new approach is being taken and this comment is no longer relevant.
139	Draft Plan of Subdivision, Zoning By-law: • Confirm that the 10 m buffer to the woodland compensation area is included in Block 8 of the proposed draft plan or revise accordingly.	That is correct, the 10m Woodland compensation area is included within Block 8.
140	The EPA1 zone displayed on Schedule A of the proposed zoning by-law does not align with the proposed draft plan of subdivision. Revise to be consistent and ensure that the 10m buffer to the woodland compensation area is included in the EPA1 zone.	The Draft Plan of Subdivision and Draft Schedule A have been revised and are coordinated to reflect the correct EPA1 zone limits.
141	<u>Comments on Landscape Plans to be addressed prior to subdivision detailed design approval (restoration areas) or site plan approval (development area):</u> • There is a considerable amount of trees and shrubs proposed in the proposed wetland area. While woody vegetation is generally supported, it is not consistent with the target wetland communities (meadow marsh and shallow marsh). Discussion with the ecological consultant and revisions as necessary are required.	This area has been updated per EIS recommendations to largely remove proposed woody material. This will now be re-instated with sod mats per notes on L1 and L2

Comm. #	Comment	Response
142	Nothing is proposed for the online wetland area at the upstream tie-in.	This is located off of the subject property and is not proposed for planting.
143	The native columns in the Plant Schedules are not accurate.	Columns have been updated reflecting the non classification of native cultivars
144	Betula nigra and Sagittaria brevirostra are not native to Ontario and must be replaced in the restoration areas.	River Birch has been removed
145	Due to confusion with the non-native invasive variety, it is preferred that Symphoricarpos albus is replaced.	Species has been replaced
146	Viburnum edule is only native to northern Ontario. Replace with a common native species from the area.	Species has been replaced
147	Many of the proposed live stakes are atypical. Confirm that they are available from suppliers. Similarly, confirm that the rare Saururus cernuus is available.	Livestakes have been updated based on availability. Others have been switched to potted stock.
148	The existing cultural meadow/succession area to be retained was farmed as recently as 2024 and is still bare on 2024 aerial imagery. To ensure stabilization and reduce the amount of undesirable species moving in, a seed mix should be applied to these areas.	Area noted for cultural meadow and succession area has been added to the Upland Trail Seed Mix application area.
149	Need to include rehabilitation of temporary SWM outlet in accordance with EIS recommendations.	This area is outside the property of the proposed development application.
WATER RESOURCES Hadiseh Bolkhari		
150	The Phase 1A site area is reported inconsistently across the submission materials. The Architectural Plan identify a Phase 1A area of approximately 34.11 ha, while the FSR and SWM reports a slightly different value of 33.99 ha. Please clarify/revise the documents so that a consistent Phase 1A site area is used throughout all reports.	Crozier: Noted. Please refer to the revised FSR and SWM Reports for details As well as the updated draft plan prepared by Mainline Planning Services.
151	The Phase 1B drainage areas used across the submission are inconsistent and require clarification. The SWM Report identifies an existing contributing area of 19.72 ha to the Goreway Tributary (Tables 6 and 7), while the post-development hydrologic model (Table 16) uses a larger total of 22.82 ha for catchments 209B, 210, and 211. The FSR and site plan, however, define the Phase 1B development block as approximately 29.16 ha. Please provide a clear reconciliation of these discrepancies, including: a. An explanation of why the existing, post-development, and planning areas differ. b. Confirmation that the VO model and proposed storage volumes fully account for the entire Phase 1B development area as defined in the FSR and site plan; and c. Clarification on the drainage plans of Phase 1B lands excluded from the modelling (e.g., NHS blocks, future phases, or areas draining to a different outlet).	Crozier: Noted. Please refer to the revised SWM Report included in this submission package for details.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
152	The report describes the soil as "silt to clay till and silt of the Halton Till formation" which corresponds to a low Hydrologic Group (C or D). However, it utilizes infiltration rates ranging from 42 mm/hr to 56 mm/hr. Silt/Clay Till typically has much lower infiltration rates (often <15 mm/hr). A rate of 50+ mm/hr is characteristic of sand or sandy loam (Group B). While the report cites "Guelph Permeameter tests," relying on high infiltration rates in clay till for the design of underground infiltration tanks (Tanks 1, 2, 3) creates a high risk of system failure or standing water. Please clarify and verify the test pits and the infiltration design rates. The Water Balance section of the SWM Report must also be updated to explicitly quantify the pre-development annual infiltration target volume that the post-development scheme must match	Crozier: Noted. Guelph Permeameter Infiltration tests (GP tests) were conducted on June 2, 2025, at six locations within the Site. The results provided in the report show infiltration rates range from 42 mm/hr to 56 mm/hr. Please refer to the updated hydrogeology report for test results.
153	The HDF section and Table 1 are not reviewable as currently presented. The SWM Report describes seven HDF features (HDF-1, HDF-2, HDF-3, HDF-6, HDF-7, HDF-8, HDF-14), but no figure is provided showing the HDF networks overlaid with existing drainage patterns, proposed grading, or stormwater catchments. Table 1 assigns drainage areas to each HDF, but these areas do not correlate with the CEISMP HDF mapping (Figure 4b). Some catchments in Table 1 (“Part of Phase 2 lands”) lack IDs, making them impossible to verify. Please provide: a. An HDF overlay figure showing each HDF segment with its contributing drainage area. b. Pre- and post-development HDF drainage maps. c. Identification of all impacts (maintain/realign/remove); d. Confirmation that hydrologic function will be maintained for HDF-1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 14.	Crozier: Please refer to Figure SWM-1 for all labelled HDF and the updated SWM Report for details . Only HDF-3 was found to have valued/contributing hydrologic function. This function will be maintained through site level design and localized restoration. No interruptions to upstream contributions are anticipated and hydrologic function will be maintained through the proposed natural channel design. All other HDF segments within the site lack any hydrologic function. Please refer to SLR's Investigation from 2023, GEI's Report and email correspondence included in Appendix A of the SWM report for reference.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
154	In Section 2.1 of the SWM Report ("Existing Conditions"), the report states that "under the post-development conditions, the existing drainage features HDF-6 and HDF-8 will be removed for the proposed Phase 1A industrial development," and further claims that "mitigation will be provided at the property further south of the site by others, according to Figure 4a." However, this statement is not supported by Figure 4a: Observed Natural Heritage Features – Terrestrial (GEI Consultants, July 2025, CEISMP Phase 1 Report). Figure 4a identifies HDF-6 and HDF-8 as headwater drainage features where hydrologic function must be maintained or mitigated on-site. The CEISMP does not classify HDF-6 or HDF-8 as features to be removed, nor does it identify any off-site mitigation area south of the subject lands.	Crozier: Through email correspondence with SLR dated January 6, 2026, it was confirmed that only HDF-3 was found to have valued/contributing hydrologic function. This function will be maintained through site level design and localized restoration. No interruptions to upstream contributions are anticipated and hydrologic function will be maintained through the proposed natural channel design. All other HDF segments within the site lack any hydrologic function. Please refer to SLR's Investigation from 2023, GEI's Report and email correspondence included in Appendix A of the SWM report for reference.
155	Table 2 in Section "Phase 1A Outlet to Clarkway Drive Tributary" reports a decrease of –2.23 ha (–50%) in uncontrolled drainage area; however, the correct difference between 4.63 ha (existing) and 2.31 ha (proposed) is –2.32 ha. Please revise the Total Area difference accordingly and confirm that the hydrologic model (VO) uses the correct pre- and post-development areas.	Crozier: Noted. The area has been updated.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
156	The MECP 2003 Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual requires: a. Water Quality Control: The MECP's Enhanced Level guideline requires the capture and treatment of the first 5 mm of runoff from the contributing impervious area, or 80% total suspended solids (TSS) removal. For the project's approximate 27.94 ha impervious area, this required 5 mm runoff volume is approx. 1,397 m^3. b. Erosion Control (Quantity Control): The MECP's guideline requires Extended Detention (ED) of the flow generated by the 25 mm storm event (or a similar specified design storm) to ensure a controlled release over a minimum 48-hour drawdown period to prevent erosion. For the same impervious area, the 25 mm runoff volume is approx. 6,432 m^3. The SWM Report's Table 23 states the " MECP Recommendations" for the (ED) Volume (which governs Erosion Control) is 1,096 m^3. This is inconsistent with the required volume for the 25 mm Erosion Control event. Then Appendix C provides Extended Detention (6,432 m^3) volumes. Please clarify/revise as required.	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. a. As discussed in our meeting and outlined in Section 4.3.1 of the SWM Report, under ultimate design conditions SWM Pond 3 will be providing quality control for the site, including 80% TSS removal. Under the interim design condition the interim pond will provide water quality. The permanent pool was sized per Table 3.2 of the 2003 MOE design guidelines. The extended detention is sized to provide 48hr drawdown for the volume of runoff generated by a 25mm storm event. b. Under existing conditions, most of the site does not outlet to the Clarkway Tributary. In order to outlet to the Clarkway Tributary under interim conditions, the TRCA requires additional erosion control. Refer to Sections 4.1 and 5.2.4 in the SWM Report for details. The following erosion control criteria is used for both interim and ultimate conditions: • Retain the first 5mm of rainfall across Phase 1A's impervious areas • Provide a minimum of 48 hours of drawdown time for the 25 mm event (provided in the interim pond for interim conditions and in pond 3 for ultimate conditions) • Retain an additional 5mm of rainfall across the rooftop (additional per the TRCA for interim conditions only)

Comm. #	Comment	Response
157	Appendix B provides SSD curves only for Tank 4 and Tank 5, but the report states that Tanks A, B, C, 1, 2, and 3 also exist on-site. Table 14 identifies a constant "Provided Storage" of 37,320 m³ for the combined Tank C, Tank 4, and Tank 5 system. Using the Appendix B stage–storage curves, Tanks 4 and 5 provide a total of 714 m³. This implies that Tank C alone would provide approximately 36,606 m³ of storage, which exceeds the total underground tank storage of 35,535 m³ reported in Table 11. These values are not consistent and need clarification. Without SSD curves or volume summaries for these tanks, it is not clear: a. which tanks are included in the 35,535 m³ subtotal. b. the individual volume allocated to each tank. c. whether the open-bottom infiltration tanks (Tanks 1–3) have been incorrectly included in the total. d. whether the closed-bottom quantity-control tanks (A, B, C, 4, 5) provide the full 35,535 m³ used in the VO model. e. whether the VO model volumes match the actual physical storage available. This requires further verification of the underground storage used for quantity control to meet the documentation expectations of MECP 2003 SWMP Manual (Section 4.9.3) or TRCA SWM Submission Requirements.	Crozier: Tanks 4 and 5 have been removed from the design. This comment will be fully addressed in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
158	Please note that Policies 35.8.4, 35.8.5, and 35.8.6 of the Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan require that: • Interim stormwater managements must be designed to provide adequate quantity and quality control and must not preclude or hinder implementation of the ultimate stormwater management system (Policy 35.8.4). • All benefitting lands must contribute equitably to the cost of the ultimate stormwater system (Policy 35.8.5). • Landowners utilizing interim stormwater facilities are responsible for decommissioning and restoring the lands once the ultimate stormwater system is in place (Policy 35.8.6)	Crozier: Noted.
159	Please clarify whether Tanks A, B, C, 4, and 5 are intended as interim controls only or permanent controls under the Ultimate Condition. The SWM Report does not clearly state the long-term role of these tanks. Section 4.2 (Quantity Control – Phase 1A) describes the use of roof storage and underground storage Tanks A, B, and C to meet Sub-basin 36 unitary release rates under existing (Phase 1A) conditions, but it does not specify whether these tanks remain operational once Pond 3 is built under the Ultimate Condition.	Crozier: The tanks proposed for Phase 1A (Block 1) are permanent and will remain in ultimate conditions. Please refer to the revised SWM Report for additional details.
160	Tables 12 and 13 present the "Provided Storage" as the total tank capacity for every return period. For clarity, please update these tables to show the utilized storage volume for each storm event to demonstrate that the tanks do not overtop during minor events.	Crozier: Noted. This comment will be addressed in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
161	The Phase 1B table clearly states Existing Contributing Area 19.72 ha, but footnote 5 in Appendix B says: “controlled release rates are calculated with 19.36 ha contributing area from existing conditions”. Please correct the inconsistency between 19.72 ha (table heading) and 19.36 ha (note) in the Phase 1B target-flow table, and confirm which area was used to compute the L/s/ha values and to set VO target flows	Crozier: The inconsistency has been corrected. Please refer to the revised SWM Report included in this submission package for details.
162	Table 24 reports an Average Forebay Velocity of 0.01 m/s. While this meets the maximum criteria, such an extremely low velocity suggests the forebay is extremely large relative to the flow rate, which may lead to water quality issues. Please verify the sizing calculations to ensure the forebay will function effectively.	Crozier: Noted. This comment will be addressed in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
163	In Table 26 (Interim SWM Pond Operation Level), the "Required Storage" columns for the 2-year through 100-year storms are not populated. Even if the site meets targets via on-site controls, the interim pond provide storage during these events. Please populate these values from the VO model to demonstrate the active storage utilization of the pond during these events.	Crozier: Noted. This comment will be addressed in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
164	The Interim SWM Pond design presented in Section 5.1 and Table 26 appears significantly oversized for a temporary facility. The report states that the pond is "only required to provide quantity control for the regional storm," yet the "Provided Storage" is listed as 45,208 m^3, while the regional requirement is 17,382 m^3. Please justify the capital cost and earthworks associated with this over-design for a temporary facility. Additionally, the modelling results in Table 26 indicate that the pond creates a significant hydraulic bottleneck for frequent events. The 2-year post-development flow is 0.061 m^3/s against a target of 0.300 m^3/s (an 80% over-reduction).	Crozier: Noted. This comment will be addressed in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
165	The Stage-Storage-Discharge table in Appendix C lists the Regional Water Level at 231.56 m and the Emergency Spillway Invert at 232.50 m. This results in nearly 1.0 m of freeboard between the maximum design water level and the spillway. Standard engineering practice typically requires 0.3 m of freeboard	Crozier: Noted. This comment will be addressed in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
166	Table 27 specifies a D50 = 150 mm (6-inch) riprap stone for the Pond Inlet, Forebay, and Emergency Spillway. A D50 of 150 mm is generally insufficient for resisting displacement in high-velocity or turbulent zones such as spillways and inlets. Please review the sizing against MTO/TRCA standards; typically, a minimum D50 of 300 mm (R-50) is required for these applications to ensure long-term stability.	Crozier: Noted. This comment will be addressed in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

167	The post-development Curve Number (CN) selection and hydrologic parameters have been taken from the TRCA Humber River Hydrology Report (2018), which is a watershed-scale model and not appropriate for site-specific stormwater design. The Humber River model CN values represent generalized land cover and soil conditions at a regional scale and cannot be applied directly to a fully urbanized industrial site without site-specific justification. The TRCA Humber River watershed model is not an accepted source for detailed site-level SWM parameters. For site plan applications, CN values, imperviousness, and initial abstraction should be based on actual post-development land cover, drainage characteristics, and soil conditions of the subject property in accordance with TRCA's current Technical-Guidelines-For-Flood-Hazard-Mapping." The land use in Phase 1A is nearly 100% impervious (roofs, pavement), but Table 9 applies a fixed CN = 81 for all catchments, even where Total IMP ranges from 89% to 100%.	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. The CN values, imperviousness, and initial abstraction used in the design are based on actual post-development land cover, drainage characteristics, and soil conditions. The Post-Development Drainage Plan (SWM-2) included in the SWM Report, shows the % impervious for each sub catchment that was calculated based on actual pervious and impervious land cover measurements. Supporting documents from the MTO Drainage Management Manual are provided in the stormwater management report. The CN value for the NasHyd catchments which are within the developed area in post-development conditions was determined using a table included in the Humber River Hydrology Report that provides CN values based on cover type and hydrologic soil group. As stated in the Hydrogeological Assessment and Section 2.2 of the SWM Report, the site is underlain by silt to clay till and silt of the Halton Til formation, therefore hydrologic soil group C was used. These pervious areas will all be landscaped or re-seeded so "lawn" was used to describe the cover for the pervious catchments. For catchments with over 20% impervious cover the StandHyd command is used. For StandHYDs the VO model only uses the CN value to calculate runoff for the pervious areas in a catchment. Since all the pervious areas will be landscaped or seeded with grass the same CN value is used for the StandHYDs as

Comm. #	Comment	Response
		was used for the NasHyd commands. The impervious cover is accounted for in the VO modeling through the TIMP and XIMP parameters. It should be noted that the CN value used was discussed and agreed upon with the TRCA.
168	Although Section 4.2.4 (VO Model Methodology) of the SWM Report describes post-development catchments, routing to the underground tanks, and conveyance to the interim and ultimate outlets, the report does not include the required mapping to support this description. Specifically, there is no Post-Development Catchment Plan for each phase (Phase 1A, Phase 1B North, Phase 1B South, and future Phase 2), no plan illustrating which catchments drain to the interim underground tanks (Tanks C, 4, 5 and infiltration tanks), and no figure showing how these catchments ultimately connect to SWM Pond 3 under the ultimate condition. Because these figures are missing, the catchment areas in Table 9 and the storage routing used in the VO model cannot be verified. Please include phase-specific Post-Development Catchment Plans and a full VO schematic within the SWM Report, clearly showing all catchment boundaries, outlet directions, tank connections, and interim vs ultimate drainage pathways, ensuring consistency with the hydrologic tables. As per Section 8.2.4 of the Town of Caledon Development Standards (2019), proponents must provide: • Georeferenced shapefiles of all SWM facilities, including pond block footprints, contours, and outlet locations. • Calculation spreadsheets showing stage-storage tables (elevation, area, cumulative volume) for each pond. • Digital files for integration into the Town's GIS and hydrologic modeling system. Pond locations must avoid regulated features, shallow water tables, or artesian conditions.	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. During interim conditions the site will convey stormwater to the "interim" SWM pond and outlet to the Clarkway Tributary. Under ultimate conditions, the stormwater will outlet to the future storm sewer in Street A (George Bolton Parkway). All SWM tanks (infiltration and storage) will remain in ultimate conditions. A Post-Development Drainage Plan (Figure SWM-2) is included in the SWM Report. VO model schematics are also included in the SWM Report. For information regarding SWM Pond 3, the design prepared by others for the CEISMP should be reviewed.
169	Humber River Unitary Flow Rates Summary – Phase 1A – Ultimate Conditions in Appendix B, Regional Release Rates in Lower Table Do Not Match the Rates in the Upper Table The lower table applies the following rates: 43.10 → 139.4 L/s/ha 43.03 → 83.8 L/s/ha 43.06 → 75.9 L/s/ha These values do not match the Regional Flow Criteria in the upper table on the same page, which lists: 43.10 → 136.0 L/s/ha 43.03 → 71.0 L/s/ha 43.06 → 102.5 L/s/ha Please revise the table or provide justification for the release rates.	Crozier: These values have been updated in the revised SWM Report.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
170	Appendix D – Visual OTTHYMO Model Output, the hydrologic parameter sheets and VO input summaries provided in Appendix D are presented only as PDF tables. As a result, the underlying calculations for (CN), runoff coefficients, initial abstraction, and Time-to-Peak (Tp) cannot be verified, and the catchment delineations used in the model cannot be confirmed. Please provide CN, IA, runoff coefficient, Tc/Tp and calculations along with route channel parameters and cross sections in a fully formulated Excel file. Please also provide the shapefiles used to delineate pre- and post-development catchments.	Crozier: Spreadsheets with sample calculations and CAD files with drainage areas will be sent directly to the Town's Water Resources staff.
171	In the Tank 4 Stage–Storage–Discharge table (Tank Dimension: Area 375 m², Depth 1.50 m), the calculated tank floor elevation from the table is 234.14 m (top 235.64 m minus depth 1.50 m), while the ED orifice invert is listed as 234.07 m. This places the orifice 0.07 m below the tank floor, which is not physically possible. Please clarify the Tank 4 floor elevation and/or the ED orifice invert elevation so that the outlet structure is located within the tank volume.	Crozier: Tank 4 has been removed from the design, details of the Phase 1A SWM layout will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
172	The Tank 5 SSD table (Area 126 m², Depth 1.20 m, ED orifice invert 234.30 m) indicates zero orifice flow for depths up to 0.50 m. Given the orifice invert elevation and the use of a 75 mm orifice, some discharge would be expected at these stages based on the standard orifice equation in the MECP 2003 SWM Planning and Design Manual. Please confirm how head on the orifice is defined for Tank 5 (reference level, centerline vs invert, etc.).	Crozier: Tank 4 has been removed from the design, details of the Phase 1A SWM layout will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
173	The Tank 4 and Tank 5 SSD tables list an “Emergency Spill Elev.” of 260 m, which is not compatible with the site grading (all site elevations are approximately 233–238 m). This value does not match the actual surface ponding/spill elevation described in the SWM Report (e.g., surface ponding to 237.45 m). Please update the Emergency Spill Elevation for each tank to match the proposed surface/ponding elevation and reflect this in the VO model. If emergency spill is not modeled explicitly, the SWM report should clearly state that	Crozier: Tank 4 has been removed from the design, details of the Phase 1A SWM layout will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
174	Please provide engineering design drawings for tanks, including: a. Plan view with tank boundaries, dimensions, and coordinates b. Section & profile showing: c. Top of tank elevation d. Floor elevation e. Orifice structure f. Invert elevations for inlet/outlet pipes g. Emergency overflow elevation h. Maintenance access i. Control manhole details with orifice plate/weir, label, and invert j. Connection to storm sewer network k. Confirmation the drawing elevations match the SWM Report and VO model Orifice Plate Details Missing or Incomplete (Drawings C605 & C606)	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
175	The outlet control details shown on Drawing C606 (Control Manhole MH7T) and Drawing C605 (Interim Pond Control Manhole MP2B) include an “orifice plate” symbol, but critical hydraulic information is missing, including: • Orifice invert elevation • Headwater elevation reference • Plate thickness • Bolt pattern • Clogging allowance (MECP requires +25% blockage) • Identification of the outlet control device (is it an orifice plate? V-notch? custom plate?) Additionally: • The 75 mm orifice shown on both drawings cannot physically produce the SSD flows in Appendix B (e.g., 0.003 m^3/s), which is not consistent with the VO model, SSD tables, and the physical drawings. MECP 2003 Section 4.2.3 requires outlet structures to be documented with invert elevations, device geometry, and hydraulic coefficients.	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. As discussed in the meeting, the clogging allowance is not required. Tank detail will be provided as part of the site plan application. The interim pond control details can be found on Drawing C609 in the Civil Engineering drawings which will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
176	The detail for Tank Control Structure STM MH77 shows inlet and outlet pipes and basic structure geometry, but not the orifice diameter, which governs flow to the Tank A/B/C system. Appendix B states the required orifice size is 290 mm, but this dimension is not shown on STM MH77. Please add the 290 mm orifice diameter or the revised modelled dimension directly to STM MH77 in Drawing C606.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
177	Drawings C605 (SWM Interim Condition) and C606 (SWM Details) show: • “Tank 4” • “Tank 5” But the SWM Report and Appendix B refer to: • Tank 4 → Catchment 208A → SSD: 375 m² × 1.5 m (562.5 m³) • Tank 5 → Catchment 208B → SSD: 126 m² × 1.2 m (151.2 m³) There is no legend, no table, and no annotation linking tank labels to hydrologic catchments or to the SSD tables. The MECP 2003 Section 4.9.3 – Design Documentation requires: • All stormwater management facility drawings must correspond directly to the modelling assumptions and design calculations. Please provide a Tank / Catchment Reference Table on C605 and C606.	Crozier: Tanks 4 and 5 have been removed from the design, details of the Phase 1A SWM layout will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
178	Drawings C605, C606, and C607, the StormTrap tanks show footprints only without top of tank elevation (TOE), bottom of tank elevation (BOE), inlet invert, outlet invert, overflow elevation, pavement subgrade elevation, connection to SSD stage–storage curves. These are required to verify the constructed storage matches the SSD, the VO model uses correct storage depths, the hydraulic grade line (HGL) feasibility. MECP 2003 4.9.3 requires all SWM facility elevations to be shown on drawings.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
179	MECP requires all SWM facilities (tanks, ponds, control structures) to include a clearly shown emergency overflow route. On drawings C605, C606, and C607, no overflow is shown for: • Tank 4 • Tank 5 • Tank A/B/C • Interim Pond outlet system	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. Overflow from the tanks would spill at catchbasins and flow overland to the south of site towards the George Bolton Parkway right-of-way. The pond has an emergency overflow weir that is shown on C607 and C608 in the Civil Engineering drawings which will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
180	Drawing C605 – SWM Interim Condition shows an "interim pond" area but does not include: • Permanent pool (PP) elevation • Extended detention (ED) elevation • 100-yr WSE • Side slopes • Storage contours • Emergency spillway • Forebay • Bench grading • Access route • Stage–storage table • Sections A-A, B-B, C-C on the sheet show only earth sections, not SWM facility geometry.	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. It should be noted that drawing C605 is for tank B. Drawing C605 and other drawings related to the tanks will be proved as part of the site plan application for each block. The listed SWM Pond parameters can be seen on SWM Pond Drawings C607, C608, and C609 in the Civil Engineering drawings which will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1). The required sections were discussed in the meeting.
181	Drawing C606 includes emergency weirs, but none of the following are provided: • Weir crest elevation • Crest width • Length of crest • Tailwater condition • Weir coefficient Appendix B includes SSD discharge curves, but no weir data supports these curves.	Crozier: Noted. Further tank details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
182	Table 9 of the SWM Report lists Phase 1A post-development catchments (C201–C209A); however, these catchments do not appear anywhere on the SWM drawings, and the tanks and maintenance holes are not labeled with their associated catchment areas. In addition, the flow routing between catchments and the corresponding storage controls is not shown, and the drawings do not indicate which storage tank is intended to serve each catchment. A complete and clearly referenced drainage mapping is required.	Crozier: Please refer to the Interim and Ultimate Post-development Drainage Figures (SWM-2 & SWM-3) included in the updated SWM Report for details. Detailed drainage area plans for each block will be provided as part of the site plan application for the Block.
183	StormTrap tank drawings (Drawings C605–C607) include generic catalogue pages rather than project-specific engineered designs. While catalogue material may be acceptable at the Site Plan Application stage when only conceptual information is provided. please consider providing the full project-specific StormTrap engineering drawings will be provided at the detailed design / engineering submission stage.	Crozier: Noted. Further tank details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
184	The drawings do not indicate: • How the interim works connect to ultimate Pond 3 • Which structures are temporary vs permanent • How flows transition between stages This is required by MECP under staging/implementation requirements.	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. As discussed in the meeting, the interim SWM Pond outlets to the Clarkway Tributary and does not connect into SWM Pond 3.
185	Hydrogeological Assessment – 12519 & 12713 Humber Station Road, Bolton, ON, Palmer / SLR Consulting, Date: July 31, 2025 Table 13 – Hydraulic Conductivity Estimates Based on Slug Tests show K-values as low as: • 7.0×10^{-10} m/s • 1.7×10^{-9} m/s • 1.0×10^{-8} m/s These correspond to clayey silt to till, normally yielding 1–5 mm/hr infiltration, not the 23–56 mm/hr claimed. Tables 11 and 12 report infiltration rates ranging from 7 to 56 mm/hr, but these values contradict the very low hydraulic conductivity values in Table 13 (10^{-8} to 10^{-10} m/s), which are typical of Halton Till, where realistic infiltration rates are generally 1–5 mm/hr. The empirical OBC 1997 K–I conversion used in Section 2.6 to generate the Table 11 infiltration values is not valid for till soils and inflates infiltration rates exponentially. TRCA LID Manual and MECP hydrogeology guidance both require using field-tested infiltration measurements and conservative rates, not empirical conversions. Revise infiltration inputs by: • Removing the OBC empirical conversion in Section 2.6. • Re-evaluating Guelph Permeameter results in Table 12 for reasonableness given the Table 13 K-values; and • Applying conservative design infiltration rates consistent with TRCA LID Manual (typically ≤5 mm/hr for Halton Till).	Table 12 Infiltration Rate from GP (Guelph Permeameter) Test is acceptable by TRCA. The results from GP tests should predominate.
186	Table 14 shows negative water level elevations (water above ground surface). However, gradients are described as “downward” without explaining how negative readings were handled. Please clarify negative values implying ponded or artesian conditions.	Equation was added in Tabel 14 to explain [Gradient = (Out – In) / Embedded Depth of MP].

Comm. #	Comment	Response
187	The report states groundwater is perched within Halton Till, please provide clarification on gradient interpretation and append/include the full test pit report.	Test pit investigation report is attached as Appendix J. Basically Halton Till acts as a aquitard, in which groundwater occurs in lens or pockets of coarse soils or joints which do not form a continuous conduits or layers (aquifers). It is in this way, we say groundwater is perched, local features.
188	Section 3 concludes dewatering is required for trench excavations and the interim pond. Please provide the following: • Sensitivity analysis for higher K values (e.g., 90th percentile). • Influence zone mapping required. • Drawdown impact analysis on nearby wetlands or watercourses. • Erosion/sediment control description Please provide a full dewatering analysis including maximum drawdown extents, pump rates, wet-season conditions, and required MECP EASR/PTTW triggers.	The dewatering rate and influence zone is very limited (8m), and are for purpose of permit requirement assessment only. The maximum drawdown extents (H), pump rates (Q), wet-season conditions (Qstorm=25mm) , and required MECP EASR/PTTW triggers (section 3.3) were all in report. Section was updated to reflect amended regulation. 95th k-value was used, which is a industrial standard. Q and K have complicated relations, generally Q increases drastically with k.
189	The report indicates groundwater as shallow as 0.2 m bgs. The SWM Report proposes infiltration tanks and storage chambers. MECP, TRCA, and CVC guidelines require 1.0–1.5 m separation from seasonal high groundwater. Please provide a groundwater separation assessment for Tanks A, B, C, 4, and 5.	0.2 m represents perched groundwater occurrence. Actual groundwater levels are much deeper, which was proved in the test pit investigation report. Details can be found in section 4.1.
190	The report references pre-development and post-development “hydrologic catchments” (e.g., in the water balance tables and methodology), but no figures in the report show catchment boundaries. Figures 10 and 11 illustrate only surface water features and wetland locations, not drainage catchments. Thus the catchment areas used in the water balance (Tables 16–23) cannot be verified. Please provide dedicated pre-development and post-development catchment maps, overlaid on site grading, showing: a. Drainage divides b. Catchment areas (ha) c. Flow directions d. Receiving features (East Wetland, West Wetland, tributaries) e. Links to SWM catchments C201–C209A Please note that catchment areas must match those used in the water balance tables and the SWM hydrology model.	The catchment was delineated based on topography contours (shown on Figure 10). Catchment boundary was reflected with different color of the catchments. The area of water balance units were measured from GIS. Catchment boundaries and receiving features were marked on figures. Overland flow directions will be marked in the updated figures. The catchments will refined to be in line with SWM catchment. Stormwater management plan is stacked in Figure 11 to show how catchment is delineated. Water balance calculation is updated.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
191	Feature-Based Water Balance Assessment The pre- and post-development infiltration calculations rely on a single infiltration factor of 0.4 for all pervious areas (landscape, meadow, wetland buffer) and 0.1 for impervious areas. This is a major oversimplification for a feature-based assessment. Native Halton Till soils across the site exhibit measured field infiltration rates of only 7-23 mm/hr (grain-size derived) to 42-56 mm/hr (Guelph Permeameter) in isolated pockets. Using a factor of 0.4 for meadow and wetland buffer areas significantly overestimates pre-development infiltration. A spatially variable infiltration rate map or at least separate factors for wetland buffers (typically 0.25-0.30 in clay till settings) should have been applied.	More division of infiltration factors will be used in the updated report. A few parameters were also refined to make them more reasonable, such as pond and wetland infiltration factor.
192	Table 22 (Existing Conditions) assigns large contributing drainage areas to some features that do not reflect actual topography or overland flow paths visible on the grading plans and LiDAR contours. For example, the East Wetland is assigned a total drainage area of 16.38 ha, of which 13.94 ha is listed as “pervious meadow”. Site grading plans and the FSR show that a substantial portion of this area will be regraded and drained away from the wetland toward the interim SWM pond or on-site tanks. The post-development contributing area to the East Wetland is reduced to only 1.97 ha (Table 24), yet the report still claims an annual runoff increase of 81,353 m^3/yr to the feature. Please clarify/revise accordingly.	The catchment areas are be refined and revised in the updated report. Figure 10 and 11 are also updated.
193	The assessment provides annual water budget numbers and does not evaluate monthly or seasonal changes. TRCA-regulated wetlands in the headwater tributaries of the Humber River are highly sensitive to spring recharge and summer drawdown. The proposed infiltration tanks are located far from the East and Central Wetlands and will discharge infiltrated water to the shallow till layer, where lateral movement is extremely slow ($K \approx 10^{-7}$ m/s). There is no evidence that this infiltrated water will recharge the wetlands. A monthly water balance (at minimum April–August) with modelled travel times through the till is required to demonstrate that hydroperiods will be maintained.	The proposed development will reduce infiltration by 1546 m3/year for east wetland and by 8472 m3/year for west wetland. There are 1.5 infiltration tanks located in the catchment area of east wetland post-development, and they can infiltrate (78215/3)x1.5=39107 m4/year, which is far greater than 1546 m3/year; There is one infiltration tank located in the catchment area of wetland post-development, and it can infiltrate 78215/3=26072 m3/year, which is far above 8472 m3/year. Consequently, the infiltration deficit will not affect wetland.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
194	The three infiltration tanks (total mitigated volume ≈ 40,550 m³/yr site-wide) are sized to offset the overall site infiltration deficit but are not strategically located to restore recharge to the specific wetlands that lose contributing area. The East wetland experiences an annual infiltration loss of approximately 678 m³/yr and a net runoff increase of 81,353 m³/yr (Table 26). None of the infiltration tanks are placed within or immediately upgradient of the East Wetland's reduced contributing area. The report provides no seepage analysis or modelling to confirm that infiltrated water will move toward the affected features rather than toward the Clarkway Drive Tributary or the interim pond.	As said above, the location of the infiltration tanks are ok.
195	Table 26 concludes that changes ranging from -1,747 m³/yr (infiltration loss) to +81,353 m³/yr (runoff gain) are "insignificant" with no reference to thresholds for acceptable change in wetland water budget (typically ≤5-10 % of annual recharge or ≤10 cm change in average growing-season water level). This is not valid for features that support potential Species at Risk.	The report said that "If the stormwater is managed as recommended, the impact to the wetland and creeks will be insignificant". The reduced infiltration is small and the infiltration tanks will fully compensate the infiltration deficit. So it is up to the stormwater management to deal with the increased runoff.
196	No sensitivity analysis was performed on the most uncertain parameters: infiltration rates in native till, routing of infiltrated water from the tanks, or future maintenance/clogging of the infiltration systems. A ±50 % range on these parameters could change the conclusion of "no negative impact.	Sensitivity analysis is usually for continuous hydrological modelling. It is not part of conventional hydrog investigation.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
197	Channel Realignment Detailed Design Brief (SLR Consulting, August 12, 2025) The Channel Realignment Detailed Design Brief provide details regarding the proposed channel geometry that require justification. Specifically, the conceptual cross-section details indicate riffle slopes of up to 20% in the proposed realigned channel. This gradient is exceptionally steep for a stable, naturalized riffle structure, which typically ranges from 1 to 5% in standard natural channel design. This slope requires explicit justification and confirmation of the stability analysis (e.g., rock sizing, toe protection, and bed stability analysis) against the high forces generated during design flows to prevent catastrophic failure. The Brief specifies the use of soft live stakes/brush layers for bank stabilization on side slopes (e.g., 6:1 slopes). While bioengineering is preferred, its effectiveness is uncertain immediately downstream or adjacent to the high-energy 20% cascade/riffle. Please include an assessment of the shear stress on these banks and confirm that the unrooted shear strength of the specified bioengineering techniques is sufficient to resist the calculated tractive forces. In high-stress zones, harder solutions (e.g., structural riprap, vegetated crib walls, or heavier armouring) must be confirmed.	Addressed through discussion with Town Water Resources on Jan 12, 2026. The proposed riffle construction detail shows a downstream riffle slope of 4%, and an upstream riffle face of 20%. We believe the design is consistent with the reviewer's recommendation of a 1-5% riffle slope.
198	Tables 5–6 propose 100–200 mm riverstone, but no permissible shear stress is calculated for the site-specific cohesive till substrate and no safety factor is justified. The proposed armour is significantly undersized for the computed boundary shear stresses.	Addressed through discussion with Town Water Resources on Jan 12, 2026. Refer to comment 48 above regarding proposed riffle slope. During channel defining flow events greater than bank full stage, effects of pool and riffle features are 'drowned' and do not dictate flow velocity. The instream velocities/shear stresses and stone size in the proposed riffle-pool channel were calculated using the energy gradient slope, which is approximately equivalent to the overall bank full gradient of 0.4%. This approach is consistent with standard natural channel design principles. We believe the specified stone size is conservative for the modelled velocities/shear stress (Factor of Safety for D50=2 to 3). Additional discussion of shear stresses within the channel has been provided in the updated design brief.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
199	Section 3.2 requires more analysis including substrate particle-size distribution, rapid geomorphic assessment scores, historical air-photo analysis, or upstream/downstream continuity discussion. The EIS (Section 4.1 and Appendix B – Headwater Drainage Feature Assessments) provides some of this information, but historical channel change and sediment regime continuity is required.	RGA/RSAT and particle size distribution are typically not part of HDF characterization, per the TRCA/CVC Evaluation Guidelines. Can the Town please clarify what guidance requires rapid geomorphic assessments and detailed particle size distributions for HDF features? Additional discussion regarding historical channel change and overall sediment regime continuity has been included in the updated design brief.
200	Appendix A shows only conceptual planting zones. The EIS (Section 6.2.2) provides general riparian seeding and shrub planting zones. SLR Drawing Sheet 09 provides typical restoration details (live stakes, brush layering, wetland seeding zones, organic soil placement), but a tabular planting schedule listing scientific name, stock sizes, spacing/densities, and total quantities for trees, shrubs, live stakes, and seed mixes has not been submitted. This schedule is required to confirm that the proposed riparian and wetland compensation planting meets or exceeds TRCA's density and diversity requirement.	Detailed planting plan for channel corridor is provided in the MHBC landscape restoration plan.
201	Section 6 propose two years of monitoring using qualitative photo documentation. Current TRCA practice for natural channel designs requires a minimum five-year post-construction monitoring program that includes quantitative geomorphic monitoring (permanent cross-sections and longitudinal profile surveys in Years 1, 2, 3, and 5) and vegetation performance monitoring (survival and cover targets, typically ≥ 80 % native woody survival by Year 3). An updated monitoring plan with clear performance criteria and contingency measures should be provided.	Updated to five-year monitoring period with performance criteria.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
202	If the stream design includes any sediment deposition features, the MECP 2003 SWM Manual requires that the sediment storage zone be sized for a 10- to 20-year accumulation period. The Brief should confirm that the sediment capacity of any such feature, or the downstream pond, is aligned with this guideline.	The natural channel design does not include sediment deposition features as defined in the MECP 2003 SWM Manual. Sediment mobilization and deposition is a natural process, and the proposed channel is designed to allow some transport and deposition through the system during flows greater than the bank full flow. However, sediment mobilization is anticipated to DERCEASE under proposed conditions compared to existing due to lengthening of the channel, incorporation of stone channel lining, bank stabilization and riparian plantings. It is noted that the five-year post construction monitoring plan includes geomorphic monitoring which will document any erosion and sediment accumulation within the channel and associated wetland features. If excessive sediment deposition is observed through monitoring, sediment removal will be initiated.
203	The existing 750 mm diameter culvert at Humber Station Road was also added to the model by SCE based on detailed survey. The inventory sheet for the crossing at Humber Station Road by SCE is included in Appendix A for reference and the culvert details are outlined in Table 1. However, to meet Town and the MNRF Technical Bulletin on Flood Hazard Data Surveying and Mapping Guidance (2023), the report must include detailed hydraulic structure inventory sheets and associated cross-sections for each crossing. These must document: • Exact structural dimensions (span, rise, length), • Inlet and outlet elevations, • Material specifications (e.g., concrete, corrugated steel), • Condition assessments (structural integrity, blockages, sedimentation), • Relevant hydraulic controls (headwalls, aprons, energy dissipation), and • Surveyed cross-sections upstream and downstream of each crossing to capture channel geometry and flood conveyance capacity. Typical structure survey and cross section points are provided at the end of this memo.	Crozier: The inventory sheet for this culvert is included in Appendix D of the Phase 2 Floodplain Analysis Report dated March 2026 prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers. The information is based on the survey completed for the Prologis parcel by David B. Searles Surveying Limited, dated December 8, 2023. Where detailed topographical information was not available, Lidar data was used for modelling and cross-sections. The Town of Caledon advised that this was acceptable at this stage as outlined in the email from Town of Caledon Manager of Water Resources, Cassie Schembri, dated March 5, 2026,

Comm. #	Comment	Response
204	Functional Servicing Report (FSR) submitted in support of Site Plan Application (SPA) for a phased industrial development at 12519-12713 Humber Station Road The FSR references the future 400 mm watermain and 250 mm sanitary sewer within Street 'A', and the 600/1200 mm sanitary sewers on Humber Station Road, all "designed by others," but does not demonstrate that these systems have capacity for the Phase 1A/1B demands. Please Include explicit confirmation from the CEISMP / Regional design that the proposed flows (10.52 L/s domestic + 316.67 L/s fire; 36.12 L/s sanitary) are accounted for in the trunk sizing.	Crozier: Noted. Specific references to the CEISMP report have been added to the FSR sections 3.3, 3.4, and 4.3 to confirm capacity for the separate blocks in the proposed external infrastructure on Street A (George Bolton Parkway Extension) and Humber Station Road.
205	Section 3.2 and the text in the calculation sheet incorrectly state the construction type is "non-combustible construction" (or Type II), which has a Flow Cap of 25,000 L/min and a coefficient C=0.8. The engineer's calculation sheet (Appendix A) uses a coefficient of C=1. This coefficient is specific to "Type III Ordinary Construction" (Jointed Masonry), which has a higher Flow Cap of 30,000 L/min and was provided by the architect in the referenced email. The report must be revised to consistently state the construction type is "Type III Ordinary Construction" (as dictated by the architect's input and confirmed using C=1) in Section 3.2 and the notes in the Appendix A calculation sheet. The calculation itself is mathematically correct for Type III construction, but the description is wrong.	Crozier: Noted. This has been revised and matches confirmation from the Architect regarding the building construction type, which is appended to the report.
206	Stormwater Servicing – Missing Major Overland Flow System (FSR Section 5.2 and 5.3) The FSR describes the storm sewer system and notes that some surface ponding will occur (Section 5.2: Storm Drainage and Section 5.3: Stormwater Management), but nowhere in the report is the major overland flow system identified, described, or analyzed. There is no mapping, no narrative, and no hydraulic assessment of exceedance flows for the 100-year or Regional storm events. Town of Caledon Development Standards Manual (2019) – Section 5.4.3 Requires identification and design of major overland flow routes.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the FSR in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
207	Region of Peel Storm Drainage Design Criteria (June 2019) – Section 4.3.2 states that the minor system (storm sewers) is designed for the 5-year event, and the major system must safely convey the 100-year event overland. It is not clear why FSR mentions that the storm sewers will convey the 100-year event and relates it to stormwater underground tanks.	Crozier: The Region of Peel Storm Drainage Design Criteria (June 2019) is for municipal infrastructure as determined by the following statement in their standards "Designs of municipal services in the Regional Municipality of Peel (Region of Peel) are to be based upon the most current Public Works Stormwater Design Criteria and Procedural Manual." For Block 1, the storm system including the catchbasins and storm sewers have been designed to capture and convey the Regional storm event to the tanks, rather than having to provide Regional storm event capture points at the downstream end of the site in order to convey runoff to the storm tanks. Additional details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1), and in the SPA submissions for the other future blocks.
208	TRCA Stormwater Management Criteria (2020) – Section 4.4 requires demonstration that Regional storm runoff can be safely conveyed to receiving systems without risking adjacent properties or infrastructure.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the FSR in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
209	The FSR must be revised to include a new subsection that clearly describes: • All 100-year and Regional overland flow routes • Confirmed spill direction from the interim SWM Pond • Confirmed spill direction from future SWM Pond 3 • Overland relief from Phase 1A and 1B to Street 'A' • Confirmation that exceedance flow paths remain on-site or within ROW • Maximum surface ponding depths and limits • Depth × velocity safety compliance (≤0.45 m²/s) Drawings C120, C121, and C300 must be updated to show: • Major overland flow arrows • 100-year / Regional high-water-level (HGL) contours • Critical spot elevations • Emergency spillway locations Given the size and complexity of the site and the reliance on Pond 3 and Street 'A', a complete dual-drainage (major + minor system) hydraulic model is required (PCSWMM, InfoWorks ICM, or MIKE). Model must include: • All storm sewers (minor system) • All road surface and site grading (major system) • 100-year and Regional HGLs • Pond 3 interaction • Exceedance routes and depths • Depth × velocity safety verification • Confirmation of no cross-boundary spill to adjacent private lands	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the SWM Report in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1). Refer to Engineering reports and drawings prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers for details on Street A, Street A2 and Pond 3.
210	The "Proposed Sanitary Design Flow – Phase 1" table (Appendix B of the FSR) the Total Block Area is not correct. The correct total should be 56.29 ha. However, the table reports the total as 33.99 ha (the same value as Building 1). The FSR uses the GFA figures (e.g., 4.92 ha for Building 4) but does not include the source documentation (an Area Calculation Table) from the architectural set (Petroff Partnership Architects). Please provide the Architect's official Area Calculation Sheet clearly itemizing the total GFA. Additionally, the sheet states the target is the "Harmon Peaking Factor" (which would be 4.1 for this population), but the final value used is a fixed 4. This suggests a minimum peaking factor of 4 used but did not properly justify why the Harmon result was overridden.	Crozier: Noted. The design calculations have been updated to include the block area for each block per the Draft Plan, rather than the GFA. This matches the allocations for capacity in the CEISMP. In the previous submission, the Harmon result was overridden as the maximum Harmon Peaking Factor in the Region of Peel is 4.0. With the revised calculations, none of the blocks have a Harmon Peaking Factor above 4.0.
211	Section 6.0 states that grading will match existing and future elevations at development limits and be governed by drainage but does not mention key features such as the Clarkway and Goreway tributary valley systems, HDF-3 realignment, or fill limits near wetlands. Please add explicit reference to grading constraints from the CEISMP and Channel Realignment studies (e.g., minimum setbacks, maximum fill against valley slopes).	Crozier: Noted. This has been added to Section 6.0 of the revised Functional Servicing report.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
212	Section 7.0 properly references Grading Permit drawings C801–C802 and notes the temporary pond on Phase 2 lands discharging to HDF-8. Please add a short note confirming that ESC measures will follow TRCA's Erosion & Sediment Control Guidelines and that the temporary pond has been sized in accordance with MECP/MECP-TRCA construction pond criteria.	Crozier: Noted. This has been added to the report in Section 7.0 of the revised Functional Servicing Report.
213	Operations & Maintenance Manuals (Interim Stormwater Facility and On-Site Stormwater Tanks) The two submitted O&M Manuals prepared by C.F. Crozier & Associates Inc. (August 2025) provide a solid foundation and are generally consistent with the requirements of Chapter 6 of the MECP SWMP Design Manual (2003). The documents clearly describe the interim pond and the underground storage/infiltration tank systems, include appropriate inspection frequencies, maintenance tasks, and supporting drawings, and identify Prologis as the party responsible for ongoing operation and maintenance. However, to fully satisfy current MECP and TRCA expectations for large private industrial facilities and to reduce future liability for the owner, the following enhancements are recommended prior to final acceptance:	Crozier: This comment has been resolved in the meeting with the Town on January 12, 2026. See details below. It was confirmed in the meeting that the Town the Town will take ownership and responsibility for the proposed "interim" pond.
214	Cleanout Frequency Note: Maintenance Interval Inconsistency The Section 4.1.5 of the Interim Stormwater Facility Operation & Maintenance Manual calculates the minimum cleanout frequency for the Interim Storm Pond based on sediment accumulation rates to be 31 years. This calculation is based on the criterion of the sediment accumulating to 50% of the forebay capacity. The specific sediment accumulation calculations are detailed in Appendix B of the Manual, using an Annual Sediment Loading Rate of 128.7m ^3/ year. The MECP 2003 SWMP Design Manual (Chapter 4 and Chapter 7) recommends that SWM facilities, specifically wet ponds, be designed to provide 10 to 20 years of sediment storage capacity before the permanent pool volume is significantly compromised. An estimated cleanout interval exceeding 30 years is a very long interval for an urban wet pond. While the calculation gives 31 years, the Manual itself acknowledges this by stating that pond cleanout should occur every 10-15 years at a minimum.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
215	The manuals should include inspection log templates (or a commitment to maintain standardized logs) together with a clause requiring completed records to be retained for a minimum of five years and submitted to the TRCA and/or MECP upon request or annually if stipulated under future permits or agreements. This addition aligns with Section 6.3 of the MECP Manual and is routinely required by the TRCA for facilities discharging to regulated tributaries.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).

Comm. #	Comment	Response
216	A dedicated emergency response section should be added to both manuals, outlining procedures for spills (including immediate notification of the MECP Spills Action Centre and the TRCA duty officer), structural failure, or extreme storm events that could cause over-topping or flooding. Given the industrial nature of the site and the significant volume of impervious area draining to the facilities, clear spill containment and emergency contact protocols are considered essential under section 6.3 and are increasingly flagged by reviewing agencies.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
217	Explicit pollution-prevention measures during maintenance activities (e.g., mandatory silt fence or turbidity curtains before any dewatering, pumping of sediment-laden water to an upland filter area or tanker, and immediate stabilization of disturbed areas) should be added, particularly for forebay and sediment drying area cleanouts at the interim pond. These measures ensure that maintenance itself does not cause erosion or downstream sedimentation, consistent with Sections 5.2 and 6.2 of the Manual.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
218	Finally, a brief statement should be inserted requiring each manual to be reviewed and updated at least every five years or within six months of a change in ownership, major facility modification, or significant regulatory amendment. This aligns with Section 6.1 and ensures the documents remain current throughout the life of the development.	Crozier: Noted. Further details will be provided in the next detailed design SPA submission for Building 1 (Block 1).
219	Channel Realignment Hydraulic Analysis Report, prepared by Crozier and dated August 2025 <u>Channel Realignment 90-Degree Bend (Hydraulic Feasibility Concern):</u> The proposed channel realignment introduces an abrupt 90-degree bend, which is not supported by fluvial geomorphology best practices and is expected to create significant hydraulic inefficiencies, including increased local velocities, energy losses, sediment deposition, scour, and potential instability at the bend. The design does not demonstrate that the proposed geometry can safely convey regulatory flows or maintain long-term stability. A revised realignment that uses gradual bend, appropriate bend radius, and naturalized alignment principles is required to ensure hydraulic performance and geomorphic resilience.	Crozier: As outlined in Section 4.1.3 of the Hydraulic Analysis Report, the manning's n coefficient for the cross-sections near bends are applied a meandering correction factor of 1.3, per the USGS Guide on Coefficients for Natural Channels and Flood Plains and as recommended by TRCA, to properly reflect the function of the 90-degree bends. The hydraulic model results show that the proposed geometry can safely convey regulatory flows. A revised realignment is not deemed required. Refer to the Channel Realignment Detailed Design Brief by SLR for more details related to the geomorphic resilience of the proposed channel.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
220	HECRAS Model Review GeoHECRAS is reporting that several cross-sections in the imported HEC-RAS model have Manning's roughness breakpoints whose horizontal stationing does not align with the surveyed ground stationing, which HEC-RAS does not allow. To resolve this, GeoHECRAS automatically "snapped" each n-value breakpoint to the nearest ground point and listed all affected cross-sections. These locations should be reviewed to ensure that the adjusted roughness segments still align with the intended channel and overbank boundaries.	Crozier: The Rivers identified in the error message in this comment are not reviewed as part of this analysis. The analysis is focused on HDF-3 only. The model has been trimmed accordingly. Refer to Section 4.1.3 of the updated report for more details.
221	Ineffective Flow Areas Multiple ineffective areas are positioned away from controlling elevations, sometimes extending too deep or too shallow relative to soffit/road crest. Flow can remain ineffective too long or be activated prematurely, leading to unstable conveyance transitions and distorted water surface profiles. Please consider placing ineffective flow triggers at hydraulic control points (low chord, road crest, or top of bank) to prevent unrealistic conveyance	Crozier: The ineffective flow areas within HDF-3, which is the focus of this analysis, have been reviewed to ensure they are placed at hydraulic control points.
222	*Cross Section Placement & Order* Several cross sections appear to be out of numerical order, placed too close together, or overlapping at junctions. This irregular spacing can create hydraulic instability, disrupt energy grade transitions, and reduce reliability of junction flow routing. Cross sections should be ordered sequentially along the channel thalweg, spaced hydraulically (typically ≤ 1–2 channel widths in detailed areas), and represent gradual geometric transitions to ensure smooth conveyance.	Crozier: The cross-sections within HDF-3 have been reviewed accordingly. No changes were deemed necessary. No changes were made to existing cross-sections in the remainder of the model as they are outside the scope of this analysis and do not impact the results of HDF-3.
223	Boundary Conditions The report and Appendix D do not provide sufficient information on the boundary conditions applied in the HEC-RAS hydraulic model. The standard modeling practice requires that boundary conditions be explicitly described, justified, and supported by figures or model schematics to ensure transparency, reproducibility, and hydraulic stability. • Verify and document flow inputs from the VO hydrologic model for each design storm (2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, 50-, 100-, and Regional), ensuring that HEC-RAS peak discharges match the VO model outputs at corresponding nodes. • Describe and illustrate downstream boundary conditions (e.g., normal depth slope, fixed stage, or tie-in to TRCA's parent model), supported by a boundary location figure or schematic.	Crozier: Flow inputs are documented in Section 4.2 of the report and extracts from the VO model by Schaeffers are included in Appendix A. Boundary conditions are described in Section 4.1.3 of the updated report. The model schematic in Appendix B has been updated to include the boundary conditions as well.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
224	*Hydraulic Roughness (Manning's n)* The current HEC-RAS model applies a uniform Manning's n = 0.08 across entire cross-sections, including main channels. In some reaches, channel n-values are equal to or greater than floodplain n-values, which is unrealistic and not supported by field evidence. No justification, field photos, or survey notes are provided for these elevated roughness values. Uniform or excessive n-values distort hydraulic performance by reducing conveyance within the main channel, causing premature overbank flow, flattened water-surface profiles, and underestimated velocities—undermining erosion, scour, and sediment transport analysis. To ensure defensible and stable hydraulic results, please revise the model to address the following: • Apply Manning's n values consistently between main channel and overbank zones. • Ensure values match TRCA, MNRF, and Town of Caledon guidance (typically 0.030–0.040 for natural channels, 0.06–0.12 for vegetated overbanks). • Avoid abrupt or sudden transitions in n between adjacent cross-sections that cause numerical instability. • Provide documented justification (e.g., field photos, vegetation surveys, reference tables) for all assigned values; and • Verify bank stationing so channel and overbank divisions are appropriately defined in HEC-RAS geometry.	Crozier: The manning's n values for the cross-section within HDF-3 have been appropriately assigned. No changes were made to existing cross-sections in the remainder of the model as they are outside the scope of this analysis and do not impact the results of HDF-3.
225	*Rating Curve Instability* There are instabilities in the cross-section rating curves. Please review and identify all locations with unstable rating curves and implement corrections/adjustments and re-run model to confirm stability.	Crozier: No instabilities in the cross-section rating curves are identified within HDF-3. No corrections/adjustments are required to support this analysis.

Comm. #	Comment	Response
226	A review of the Clarkway Tributary – Mayfield Road culvert (Reach: Clarkway Trib A, River ID: 43.03) identified differences in the modelled geometry (5.1 × 2.0 m vs 5.5 × 2.2 m) and a negative slope between the upstream and downstream inverts, which appears inconsistent with expected flow direction. To verify the inputs, please update the corresponding survey sheet for this structure and the bounding cross-sections collected immediately upstream and downstream, in accordance with the survey requirements outlined in the standard figure show below. The submission should include: o CAD drawings and shapefiles showing culvert centerlines, barrel dimensions, and invert elevation points. o Plan and profile drawings or survey cross-sections for each structure. o Benchmark and vertical datum information, indicating whether elevations were tied to the 2014 TRCA LiDAR datum or local benchmarks (CGVD28 or CGVD2013); and o A note confirming any datum transformation or vertical adjustment applied during model setup	Crozier: This cross-section is outside of the analysis boundary and was removed as part of the trimmed version of the model.

We trust that our application has been well received and will be circulated to all the necessary departments and agencies. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

mainline planning services inc.

Joseph P. Plutino, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.

James Davidson, Planner