

**Bolton North Hill
Secondary Plan -
2nd Submission**



TOWN OF CALEDON
PLANNING
RECEIVED
March 3, 2026

Municipal Address: Bolton North Hill
Secondary Plan
Bolton North Hill
Client: *Landowners Group*
Application(s): *POPA 2022-0001*
Timing:
Notes:

Bousfields Job 1619
No:
Date Prepared: *March 3, 2026*

Commenting Agency	Heading	Subheading(s)	Comment	Responsibility	Response
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, June 6 2025					
Nick.cascone@trca.ca					
TRCA	Recommendation	-	As currently submitted, the technical studies received to-date do not fully satisfy TRCA's requirements in support of the Secondary Plan/OPA, as well as the subcomponent documents in support of the planning application including the LSS and associated Functional Servicing Report and Stormwater Management Report. Based on the comments provided in Appendix II and III, final recommendations are premature until TRCA's issues are addressed to the satisfaction of staff	Crozier	Acknowledged.
TRCA	Appendix II	TRCA Comments on LSS ToR	<p>It is noted that on March 16, 2023, TRCA received the first formal circulation of the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan, with the second submission circulated on March 17, 2025. As this application has advanced beyond the ToR phase of the process, it is TRCA's expectation that the comments provided below are addressed through future submissions of the Secondary Plan and accompanying LSS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All TRCA mapped watercourses should be reviewed/tested against the Conservation Authorities Act (found within Ontario Regulation 41/24) definition of a watercourse. This will assist TRCA in determining our interest in certain features. 2. Although development is generally located outside of the Greenbelt, which provides sufficient setback from the existing valley slopes, some aspects, such as SWM ponds, may be located within the Greenbelt and in close proximity to the existing slopes. As such, the need for a geotechnical slope stability assessment to establish the position of the Long-Term Stable Top of Slope (LTSTOS) line corresponding to a factor of safety of 1.50, where applicable, is needed to help establish development limits. This is to ensure that these proposed features will be located sufficiently setback from the slope hazard. 	Crozier and Dillon	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staking has been completed with the TRCA and no watercourses were identified within the Secondary Plan Area during the site visit. 2. A slope stability assessment will be completed as part of the SWS to identify the Long-Term Stable Top of Slope.
Appendix III: TRCA Comments on 2nd submission Materials. See matrix provided in attachment for previous submission comments referenced					
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	1	No Further response required.	-	

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	2	<p>a) Section 16.2.4 of the Future Caledon Official Plan notes that hazardous lands (e.g. erosion and flooding hazards) should be excluded from development and designated Natural Features and Areas. As such, the draft Secondary Plan policies (34.4) should clearly note that hazardous lands form part of the Natural Features and Areas designation on the associated land use schedule.</p> <p>b) The draft Secondary Plan policies should refer to Section 16 of the Future Caledon Official Plan for policies and permitted uses relating to hazardous lands.</p> <p>c) In several locations, the draft Secondary Plan makes reference to certain study requirements being completed in consultation with TRCA. However, any study requirement related to TRCA's core mandate (natural hazard protection, SWM etc.) must be completed to the satisfaction of TRCA. Please revise the draft Secondary Plan accordingly.</p>	Bousfields	BNHSP Policies updated to reflect conformity with Chapter 16 and revised lanuage to indicated studies and reports to the satisfaction of the TRCA.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	3	<p>Given the large scale of the secondary plan area, TRCA staff are unable to confirm if appropriate development setbacks have been applied to applicable hazards/features based on the mapping provided. The applicant is asked to provide several focused constraint maps which assess the subject lands at an appropriate scale to adequately view regulated hazards, features, and applicable buffers.</p> <p>Comment outstanding. Please provide focused constraint maps.</p>	Dillion	Figures have been updated to a smaller scale.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	4	No further response required. Matter deferred to the Town. TRCA will ensure our requirements are addressed through the submitted technical reports.	-	
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	5	No further response required.	-	
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	6	Although the hydrology models are not associated with the HydroG report, they have been submitted for review. See comment 9 for additional comments relating to TRCA's SWM requirements. Comment addressed.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	7	No further response required. Please refer to comment 9.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	8	No further response required. Please refer to comment 9.	Crozier	Acknowledged.

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	9	<p>a) Section 11.0: Conclusions & Recommendations (page 48), point #6 of the FSRSWM Report notes that a total of six (6) stormwater management ponds are proposed within the Main Humber watershed, where quantity control is not required, and an additional three (3) ponds are located within Sub-basin 10 of the Humber River and are designed to provide quantity control. TRCA appreciates the proponent's commitment to providing quantity control beyond the minimum requirements. While not required, the inclusion of post-to-pre-development flow control for the six ponds within the Main Humber watershed—alongside quality and erosion control measures—is commendable. This proactive design approach supports broader watershed management objectives and helps reduce the potential for downstream impacts.</p> <p>b) TRCA's criteria for managing instream erosion associated with new development include two key components: 1) Extended detention of runoff generated from a 25 mm rainfall event over a 48-hour period; and 2) On-site retention of the first 5 mm of runoff from all impervious surfaces using Low Impact Development (LID) measures that promote evapotranspiration and infiltration. These two components are intended to work together to reduce the erosive impacts of stormwater runoff on receiving watercourses by addressing both the timing and volume of flows. Extended detention helps attenuate peak flows by slowing the release of runoff, typically through practices such as detention basins, wet ponds, or LID measures like permeable pavements and green roofs. Volume control focuses on reducing the total runoff volume entering the drainage system by encouraging infiltration and evapotranspiration through measures such as bioretention areas, rain gardens, rainwater harvesting, and vegetative cover. It is noted that the applicant has proposed measures to meet the extended detention requirement; however, on-site volume control measures have not yet been demonstrated. Please outline the proposed strategies or design features that will be implemented to satisfy the volume control component and ensure full compliance with TRCA's instream erosion control criteria</p>	Crozier	<p>a) Acknowledged. It should be noted there are now eight (8) ponds located within Sub-Basin 10 which do not require quantity controls. There are still only three (3) ponds which do not require quantity controls. There are now a total of eleven (11) ponds proposed.</p> <p>b) Verbiage has been included as part of the SWM report outlining the proposed strategies/design features intended to be implemented to satisfy the volume control component and be in compliance with TRCA's erosion criteria.</p>
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	10	<p>Section 8.3: Hydraulic Model Results (page 39) of the FSRSWM Report – notes that, while safe access along Duffy's Lane can be maintained under the proposed conditions, the increased flow at Tributary B may result in higher flood depths and velocities downstream. This could potentially elevate flood risk and impact the developability of downstream properties. Therefore, further assessment is recommended to evaluate any potential adverse impacts.</p>	Crozier	<p>A hydraulic analysis has been completed using HEC-RAS. A model with supporting verbiage and appendices have been included in the SWM report to describe the impact of the proposed flows on Tributary B.</p>

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	11	<p>Given recent legislative amendments, TRCA has an interest in watercourse features (as defined by Ontario Regulation 41/24) and their associated hazards. While detailed field studies have been completed for participating landowners, the removal of potential watercourse features and their associated flooding hazard have been proposed for non-participating landowners as well, where field investigations have not taken place. The applicant is required to conduct assessments of mapped watercourse features if they are proposed for removal. This can include a review of historical imagery along with the inclusion of photographs from areas where access is available (e.g. right of ways, public lands, adjacent participating landowners etc.). If sufficient evidence is provided to confirm these features are not watercourses, additional details are required to confirm how mapped floodplains will be addressed.</p> <p>It is noted that sufficient evidence cannot be provided to justify the removal of a feature on a non-participating landowner, it should be protected in-situ on the land use schedule using mapped constraints (e.g. TRCA's regulation mapping, Official Plan mapping, Scoped SABE Subwatershed mapping). Policy can be included within the Secondary Plan which speaks to future study requirements for particular features/areas.</p>	Dillion	Section 5.1.1 and Figure 6 have been updated to reflect the historical recommendations from the 2014 Dougan & Associates report for features within non-participating properties. These features will require future studies and verification later in the planning process (i.e., during draft plan, etc.).
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	12	No further response required. Please refer to comment 11.	Dillion	Acknowledged
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	13	Comment addressed.	-	Acknowledged
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	14	Comment addressed.	-	Acknowledged
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	15	Comment addressed.	-	Acknowledged
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	16	Comment addressed.	-	Acknowledged
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	17	<p>In error, TRCA's comment referred to the east side of the Secondary Plan area. However, the comment is applicable to the western portion of the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>a) According to wetland mapping provided by the Province, an unevaluated wetland is located at the very south-western part of the Secondary Plan, on a non-participating landowner (see image below). The wetland is not identified in the NHR and a park is proposed in the area. TRCA staff are unsure why this wetland is proposed for removal if it has not been sufficiently studied.</p>	Dillion	The figures have been updated to include this unevaluated wetland. No development is currently proposed in this area. The area has been identified as an "Environmental Policy Area" in Figure 7 of the NHR and not a park. However, future studies later in the planning process (i.e., during draft plan, etc.) will be required to verify the presence/absence of this feature.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	-		Dillion	

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	-	b) Further to the above, the NHR identifies limits for wetlands located on non-participating landowners which differ from wetland mapping provided by the Province (see images below). However, without access to the sites, it is not clear how these limits were established. Additional information is required to determine how a conservative approach was used to establish the proposed wetland limits. It is noted that the wetland identified with the blue star is located on TRCA owned lands. As such, a staking of the feature to confirm its limits can occur with TRCA staff.	Dillion	Wetlands within non-participating lands were conservatively delineated through aerial imagery review. The limits were generally more conservative than existing MNR mapping. Section 4.2.3 has been updated to reflect this. These features will require future studies and verification later in the planning process (i.e., during draft plan, etc.). Although we recognize that some wetlands are within TRCA owned lands, they abut or extend into non-participating properties and as such staking would still require access from these landowners.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	-		Dillion	
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	-		Dillion	
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	18	The revised NHR does not provide additional information on this wetland. Additionally, neither the NHR nor the Wetland Water Balance Risk Assessment includes a review of the wetland identified at the round-about intersection of Emil Kolb Parkway and Highway 50. Please provide additional information on this feature.	Dillion	Table 4 and Section 5.2.3 has been updated to include discussion on this feature.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	19	No further response required. However, related comments are provided in the 'new comment' section below.	Dillion	Acknowledged.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	20	No further response required. However, related comments are provided in the 'new comment' section below.	Dillion	Acknowledged.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	21	The Wetland Water Balance Risk Assessment (WWBRA) notes that wetlands A and D as denoted in Figure 2 appear to be hydrologically connected. As such, the applicant is asked to investigate and provide opportunities to maintain this hydrological connection. The response that has been provided does not clarify how the hydrological connections between these two wetlands are to be maintained. Please provide additional information.	Dillion	Please note that wetlands have been re-named since this comment was originally made. Wetlands B and C appear to be hydrologically connected, however they are at low risk of impact from the development and they will remain in place so the hydrologic connection will be maintained. Wetlands E - J are also hydrologically connected and will remain in place, so this connection will be maintained. Wetlands A, K and D are not hydrologically connected to other wetlands.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	22	Comment addressed.	-	

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	23	<p>If there is no watercourse in this location, please clarify how flows are being maintained to wetland 10 (wetland D per the Wetland Water Balance Risk Assessment). The HDF assessment identifies HDF BN-14 and BBS8 flowing under Emil Kolb Parkway into the parcel, as well as an HDF that has no classification (see Figure 3 of NHR), both of which provide hydrological inputs to wetland 10 (wetland D). Please clarify the following:</p> <p>a) How are flows from BN-14 proposed to be maintained to wetland 10 if the parcel to the south of Emil Kolb Parkway has removed the watercourse feature, and the Detailed Concept Plan has classified these lands as mixed use, and medium and high density.</p> <p>b) Please clarify the classification of the unnamed HDF running west of BN-14 that also provides flows to wetland 10. Currently, only the breeding bird survey location BBS8 is attached to the HDF.</p> <p>It is noted that TRCA's mapping identifies a watercourse with a floodplain in this location. However, as the feature is located on a non-participating landowner parcel, staff are unsure how the report concludes that a watercourse does not exist in this location. As such, this comment should be considered in conjunction with comment 11, as provided above.</p>	Dillion	<p>a) Clean water from building rooftops or landscaped areas will be collected in an LID which will discharge water to the wetland. Water will need to be conveyed through a clean water collection system (either dedicated pipes or a swale). Details of the system will need to be provided at the draft plan stage.</p> <p>b) Section 5.1.1 has been updated to discuss HDFs that were not present during the assessment. The HDF was not present during the first HDF assessment. A tile drain inlet was observed within the hedgerow that appeared to capture surface flows, however no flow was observed during the site visit. Figure 3 has been updated accordingly. Appendix D has been updated to include photos of the tile drain inlet as well as the conditions in the adjacent property.</p>
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	24	<p>Please clarify the hydrological connections between identifies watercourse/HDFs and wetlands, specifically Wetlands B, C and D, as referenced in the Wetland Water Balance Risk Assessment. Accordingly, please explain how hydrological connectivity between these features will be maintained given the proposed development framework.</p>	Dillion	<p>As noted in the response to comment 21 the hydrologic connection between wetlands will be maintained as all wetlands and their connecting features are outside of the development limits. The headwater drainage features which are proposed for removal and require mitigation will be replaced with clean water collector systems which outlet to LIDs and then to the wetlands.</p>
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	25	<p>No further response required. However, related comments are provided in the 'new comment' section below.</p>	Dillion	Acknowledged
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	26	<p>No further response required. However, related comments are provided in the 'new comment' section below.</p>	Dillion	Acknowledged
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	27	<p>New comment: Figure 6 of the NHR identifies SWM pond limits extending into the Greenbelt in several locations. Please ensure that infrastructure situated within these areas -particularly within or near the Castlederg Wetland Complex and its immediate catchment – do not disrupt wetland hydrology. It is our understanding that a full feature-based water balance will be provided in the future, however, sufficient information should be provided at this phase of the planning process to ensure wetland hydrology will not be negatively impacted. TRCA wants to ensure that sufficient information has been provided to support the proposed land use plan.</p>	Dillion	<p>The ponds shown in the Greenbelt are intentionally shown outside of the wetland buffers. These ponds will be included in the feature based water balance for the wetlands to verify that they do not disrupt the wetland hydrology. Discussion will be included in the Local Subwatershed Study on where pond outlets should be located and on volume reduction techniques which may need to be included in the SWM strategy to protect the wetlands.</p>

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	28	New comment: The NHSR, Section 9.1.1 notes that each of the 12 wetlands identified within the Study Area has been identified as high risk, with Appendix F containing the Risk Assessment. However, the separate Wetland Water Balance Risk Assessment report by Crozier, dated March 2025, has identified 11 wetlands (wetlands A-K), with wetlands A, G-K assigned as high risk, and wetlands B-F assigned as low risk. Please clarify these discrepancies and which Wetland Water Balance Risk Assessment is the correct one, including clarification on which wetlands require pre-development monitoring of wetland hydrology. Note that TRCA may have additional comments upon clarification.	Crozier	All wetlands were determined by NHSR to have a high-sensitivity (from ecology stand-point), however the BNH development will only have a significant impact to the hydrology of wetlands A, G-K. Using the TRCA risk characterization table, Wetlands B-F are an overall low-risk, and wetlands A, G-K are assigned an overall high-risk.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	29	New comment: Further to the above comment, the Crozier Wetland Water Balance Risk Assessment assignments for wetlands A-K detailed in Table 4: Wetland Risk Assignment Summary does not correlate with the risk assignment illustrated on Figure 2. Please clarify and ensure that the colour coded risk assignments match on both Table 4 and Figure 2. Note that TRCA may have further comments regarding wetland risk upon clarification.	Crozier	Colour coding of Figure 4 represents the type of wetland (ecological) and does not correlate to the level of risk.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	30	New comment: Appendix E of the Hydrogeology Report identifies a pre-development impervious area condition measuring 4,598 m ² within a woodlot. Please provide clarification on this matter as impervious areas are typically not expected within a woodlot.	Crozier	Understood. The water balance has been revised to account for 0% impervious in the woodlot.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	31	New comment: Page 12 of the Hydrogeology Report states that infiltration may decrease from 199,128 m ³ /year pre-development to 73,526 m ³ /year in post-development. However, Table 3 presents different figures, indicating a reduction from 216,625 m ³ /year to 80,146 m ³ /year, resulting in a deficit of 136,479 m ³ /year. Additionally, the report references a deficit of 125,602 m ³ /year instead of 136,479 m ³ /year. Please clarify these discrepancies.	Crozier	The hydrogeology report has been updated for consistency.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	32	New comment: Table 7 provides anticipated seasonally high groundwater elevations for design purposes, ranging from 257.3 masl to 267.0 masl. Please clarify the methodology used to estimate these elevations. Additionally, include an extra column in Table 7 (and any other relevant sections) showing the depth below the ground surface.	Crozier	Noted. We have included a depth below ground surface column in Table 7. These values represent the top of the confining layer or the highest elevation where groundwater would be expected during excavation.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	33	New comment: Section 8.1 of the report states that high groundwater elevations across the site are estimated to range from 258.6 masl to 269.7 masl. Please clarify the difference between these values and those posted in Table 7.	Crozier	As noted above, the values presented in Table 7 are representative of where groundwater is expected to be during excavation based on the top of the confining layer. The recorded high groundwater within the monitoring wells is interpreted to be representative of a potentiometric surface rather than true groundwater levels. Above the elevations presented in Table 7, no groundwater is expected based on the presence and thickness of the confining layer.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	34	New comment: Provide geological cross-sections (both north-south and east-west) that include MECP boreholes along with all site-specific boreholes and monitoring wells.	Crozier	Acknowledged. Cross sections are provided.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	35	New comment: Please add ground surface elevation data to all hydrographs in Appendix D. Additionally, clarify the observed differences between manual and data logger measurements.	Crozier	Acknowledged. Hydrographs have been updated accordingly.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	36	New comment: Provide full details on the methodology used to construct hydrographs from data logger data, including information on the type of data loggers used, barometric station data, and barometric compensation (if applicable). Ensure that the report explicitly outlines the hydrograph construction methodology.	Crozier	The report has been updated to include this methodology.

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	37	New comment: The Hydrogeology report should assess the potential impacts on TRCA regulated features within the site and adjacent lands if the infiltration deficit of 136,479 m ³ /year cannot be mitigated.	Crozier	A section in the hydrogeological report will be included to discuss the TRCA regulated features and potential impacts if the infiltration can not be mitigated.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	38	New comment: Section 6.2 of the FSR outlines the design criteria for the proposed stormwater management ponds. Please incorporate the requirement for pond lining where groundwater levels are within one metre of the pond invert elevation.	Crozier	Pond lining will be incorporated where groundwater levels are within 1 m of the pond invert elevation.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	39	New comment: The feasibility of the proposed Low Impact Development (LID) facilities has been deferred to future Draft Plan submissions. Given that most of the site is within a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA), it is recommended that the viability of the proposed infiltration facilities should be assessed at the current planning stage, with refinements made in later stages. A conceptual plan for the proposed LIDs to maintain the pre-development water budget should be established.	Crozier	To be included in next submission (high-level) feasibility assessment of LID locations
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	40	New comment: The Summary Section of the FSR states that a feature-based water balance assessment will be included in the Hydrogeology Report. However, the December 2024 Hydrogeology Report by Crozier does not contain this assessment. Please clarify	Crozier	The feature based water balance assessment is included in the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan Subwatershed Study report. The reference has been updated accordingly.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	41	New comment: Several of the proposed SWM facilities appear to be located within the Greenbelt. Although most of the facilities appear to be located away from the existing slopes, SWM Pond 6 block appears to be located in close proximity to the existing slope. A slope stability assessment by a geotechnical engineer will be required to determine the position of the Long-Term Stable Top of Slope (LTSTOS) corresponding to a minimum factor of safety of 1.5, in order to ensure the proposed SWM pond is located beyond the LTSTOS and its corresponding buffer. The general terms of reference for the slope stability study will be as per the TRCA Geotechnical Engineering Design and Submission Requirements (November 2007).	Crozier	Noted. SWM pond 6 is no longer proposed (former pond on James Dick land).
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	42	New comment: The conceptual grading for SWM Pond 8 has been provided in the Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report; however, due to its proximity to the existing slope, the conceptual grading for SWM Pond 6 will need to be provided and demonstrated that it is located beyond the LTSTOS and its corresponding setback.	Crozier	SWM pond 6 is no longer proposed (former pond on James Dick land).
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	43	New comment: At detailed design, depending on the grading, the SWM pond berms and associated earthworks will need to be reviewed by a geotechnical engineer to ensure the berm and associated grading is stable in the long-term.	Crozier	Acknowledged. To be reviewed at detailed design.
TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	44	New comment: At detailed design, the outfalls for the SWM ponds will need to be designed to ensure that the discharge will not result in erosion and instability of the slopes. All necessary measures will need to be developed to ensure the protection of the slopes and surrounding areas from erosion due to discharge, and all details will need to be provided.	Crozier	Acknowledged. To be reviewed at detailed design.

TRCA	Appendix III - TRCA Comments on 2nd submission materials	45	New comment: Upon review of the FSR/SWM report, it appears that SWM Pond 1 and 2 are proposed to outfall directly towards TRCA property, and SWM Pond 2 is proposed to be partially located directly on TRCA property. Please note that Property requests for all infrastructure to be pushed back, so it is not located on TRCA lands (i.e., SWM Ponds and outfalls). If infrastructure is required to be located on TRCA lands, this will be subject to an easement and all applicable fees.	Crozier	Acknowledged. Crozier to review with Bousfields to determine if SWM infrastructure can be removed from TRCA lands. If minor encroachments of infrastructure are required the LSS and FSR will indicate that this will be subject to TRCA approval and require easements and all applicable fees.
Region of Peel, Development Services, May 26 2025					
Dylan Prowse, dylan.prowse@peelregion.ca					
Development Services	Planning Authority	-	In accordance with Bill 185, beyond July 1, 2024, the Region's mandate will continue to include the provision of hard and soft services to the community, including but not limited to water and wastewater servicing, transportation, waste management, affordable housing, health services, emergency services, etc. To this end, the Region will continue to have an interest in community building to ensure the efficient, financially sustainable, and effective delivery of infrastructure and services.	Information	
Development Services	Development Staging and Sequencing Plan (DSSP)	-	The Region acknowledges the requirement for an approved community wide Development Staging and Sequencing Plan, as referenced in section 7.17.4.2.4 of the Draft Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan document. The community-wide DSSP is to be aligned and coordinated in accordance with a servicing solution satisfactory to the Region. The staging and sequencing plan must ensure orderly, fiscally responsible and efficient progression of development that is coordinated with the Region's Capital Plan, Peel Water and Wastewater Master Plan, and Transportation Master Plans.	Information	
Development Services	Development Staging and Sequencing Plan (DSSP)	-	Should the Town wish to include policies in the Secondary Plan to have lands conveyed for the purposes of Affordable Housing, it is recommended for the location to be determined and identified on the DSSP.	Bousfields	The Final DSSP will be submitted alongside the final Tertiary Plan and supporting studies including a Transportation Impact Study, Functional Servicing Report and Environmental Implementation Report. Additional information on timing and funding of infrastructure is being discussed with the Region of Peel.
Development Services	Affordable Housing	-	Should the Town wish to include affordable housing policies in the Secondary Plan, please advise so the Region's Housing Development Office can be engaged. In order to achieve an appropriate design and service needs mix, please note that the Region would require sites that are generally 2 acres in size, fully serviced with appropriate future access to transit and general amenities (i.e. commercial sites and schools/community centres), and unencumbered lands (i.e. one complete block).	Bousfields	The BNHSP has included policy language to explore opportunities for Affordable Housing contributions through subsequent Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications and is consistent with the policy approach taken with other Secondary Plan approvals.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Sanitary Sewer Facilities	Municipal sanitary sewer facilities consist of a 250mm diameter sewer on Mount Hope Road and a 525mm dia. sanitary sewer on Coleraine Drive.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Sanitary Sewer Facilities	A Functional Servicing Report (FSR) showing proposed sanitary sewer servicing the Bolton North Hill lands and provision for the adjacent lands is required for review and approval by the Region prior to the engineering submission.	Crozier	Noted.

Development Services	Development Engineering	Sanitary Sewer Facilities	<p>Servicing of the Bolton North Hill (Option 1 and 2) lands will require the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -New Sanitary Pumping Station (SPS) and access road north-east of the Humber River adjacent to the Emil Kolb Parkway. -New deep gravity sanitary sewer on Emil Kolb Parkway from Highway 50/Emil Kolb Parkway intersection to the new SPS. -New gravity sanitary sewers on Highway 50, Mount Hope Road and along new infrastructure corridor to connect to the Emil Kolb Parkway sewer. -New sanitary forcemain extending from the new SPS south along Emil Kolb Parkway to King Street. 	Crozier	The Option 1 and 2 Lands will be serviced accordingly with a new SPS, deep gravities, and forcemain along Emil Kolb Parkway.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Sanitary Sewer Facilities	External easements and construction will be required.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Water Facilities	The lands are located within Water Pressure Zone 7 supply system.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Water Facilities	Existing infrastructure consist of 400/300mm (Pressure Zone 6) watermains on Columbia Way and a 300mm dia. watermain (Pressure Zone 6) on Chickadee Lane.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Water Facilities	A Functional Servicing Report (FSR) showing proposed water servicing plans for the Bolton North Hill lands and provision for the adjacent lands is required for review and approval by the Region prior to the engineering submission.	Crozier	An FSR showing the proposed servicing plans and provisions for adjacent lands will be submitted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Water Facilities	Servicing of the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan, Option 1 and 2, will require the creation of a new pressure zone system due to the elevations differences within the areas. To achieve this a new Zone 7 pumping station, elevated floating storage facility and larger 900-400mm diameter pipes are required. The preferred location for a new pumping station is near the intersection of Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road. An extension of the system through a 400mm watermain would provide water to the station, from there, a new 900/600mm feeder-mains from the proposed Zone 7 pumping station along the Emil Kolb Pkwy to a storage facility are also required. From the storage facility another 400mm dia. Watermains are required along Castlederg Side Road towards Queen Street, on Queen Street south to Columbia Way, along Columbia Way towards Mount Hope Road.	Crozier	The servicing design of the Option 1 and Option 2 lands will incorporate the infrastructure outlined in this comment.
Development Services	Development Engineering	Water Facilities	External construction will be required.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	General	All costs associated with servicing proposed development will be at the applicant's expense.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	General	Servicing of this Lands will require construction of oversized watermains and sanitary sewers, which are the financial responsibility of the Region as per Development Charges By-law and 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 will 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, Regional Council approval and according to Policy F40-06. The required oversized watermains and sanitary sewers are listed below as per 2025	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	General		Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Development Engineering	General	The developer will be required to enter into applicable Development Agreement with appropriate agencies.	Crozier	Noted.

Development Services	Development Engineering	General	Restriction on transfer or charge for all lots and blocks within the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan (Option 1 / 2 lands), save and except those to be conveyed to the Town and the Region, shall be registered on title to said lots and blocks prohibiting any transfer or charge of said lots and blocks without the consent of the Region until external sanitary sewers and watermain works to service this Lands have been completed to the Region's satisfaction. The Developer shall be responsible for all costs in respect of said restriction on title. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Crozier	A clause will be included in the Subdivision Agreement regarding developer responsibility in regards to costs.
Development Services	Development Engineering	General	The developer will be required to obtain and dedicate easements as required by the Region for Regional infrastructure.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	Comments on the Stormwater Management approach remain preliminary and will be refined further as additional phases of the SWS are submitted. Through future submissions please consider RPOP policies 2.6.20.15 to 2.6.20.20 for stormwater management on regional roads. Additional comments are as stated below :	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	SWM report – address the relevant sections of the Region's SWM report submission requirements: https://peelregion.ca/sites/default/files/2024-04/stormwater-management-report-requirements-december-2022.pdf , also addressing Region's SWM criteria, as relevant: https://peelregion.ca/sites/default/files/2024-08/stormwater-design-criteria-201906.pdf	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	Grading and servicing plan with location of SWM facilities and their outlet clearly identified, with flow rate.	Crozier	The locations of SWM facilities and their outlet are clearly identified on the Post-Development Drainage Plan.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	ESC plan with location of temporary sediment basins and their outlet clearly identified, with flow rate	Crozier	An ESC Plan with the location of temporary sediment basins will be provided during detailed design.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	Drainage area plan, outlining internal and external catchment area (ha) and runoff coefficient, with flow direction for minor and major flows.	Crozier	The post-development drainage area plan has been updated to contain internal/external catchment areas, impervious percentages (instead of runoff coefficients) and flow directions.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	Hydraulic/floodplain analysis report, if it impacts Regional roads and crossings.	Crozier	A hydraulic analysis has been included as part of the SWM report.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	Flows from external lands (including lands not participating in application) shall not be rerouted to regional roads.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	No grading will be permitted within any Region of Peel ROW to support adjacent	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	For SWM facilities adjacent to a regional road, emergency overland flows shall not cause flooding of regional roads. Regional road drainage should be managed by any SWM facilities, as needed.	Crozier	Emergency overland flows will not be routed into regional roads.
Development Services	Stormwater Management	-	Through future site plan applications a Stormwater Management Report Review Fee of \$1537.50 will be required as per the current Fees By-law.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	There are two Regional Roads within the planning area - Regional Road 50 (Highway 50) and Regional Road 150 (Emil Kolb Parkway)	Crozier	Acknowledged
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	Land dedication requirements along Regional Roads are as below:	Crozier	Acknowledged and flagged to proponents. Dedication of land shall be made as part of individual draft plan applicaitons and not at the Secondary Plan level.

Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Right-of-way (meters)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Highway 50</th> <th>Emil Kolb Parkway</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mid-block</td> <td>36</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>245 meters within a single left-turn lane intersection</td> <td>41.5</td> <td>50.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>245 meters within a dual left-turn lane intersection</td> <td>45</td> <td>54</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Right-of-way (meters)			Highway 50	Emil Kolb Parkway	Mid-block	36	45	245 meters within a single left-turn lane intersection	41.5	50.5	245 meters within a dual left-turn lane intersection	45	54	Crozier	Noted.			
	Right-of-way (meters)																						
	Highway 50	Emil Kolb Parkway																					
Mid-block	36	45																					
245 meters within a single left-turn lane intersection	41.5	50.5																					
245 meters within a dual left-turn lane intersection	45	54																					
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	Minimum Spacing requirement between proposed new intersection/access:	Crozier	Noted.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Minimum Spacing (meters)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Highway 50</th> <th>Emil Kolb Parkway</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Suburban connector</td> <td>Industrial Connector</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full move</td> <td>300</td> <td>450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Left-in, right-in/right-out</td> <td>150</td> <td>225</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Right-in/right-out</td> <td>75</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Minimum Spacing (meters)			Highway 50	Emil Kolb Parkway		Suburban connector	Industrial Connector	Full move	300	450	Left-in, right-in/right-out	150	225	Right-in/right-out	75	100	Crozier	Noted.
	Minimum Spacing (meters)																						
	Highway 50	Emil Kolb Parkway																					
	Suburban connector	Industrial Connector																					
Full move	300	450																					
Left-in, right-in/right-out	150	225																					
Right-in/right-out	75	100																					
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	An updated detailed concept plan which includes proposed spacing measurements of any new roadways connections is to be provided for our review and comment. Although Table 15 on page 31 of the TIS states the spacing of the proposed road network it is requested a concept plan be provided that clearly indicates the proposed spacing;	Crozier and Bousfields	The Tertiary Plan prepared by Bousfields illustrates spacing measurements from the intersection of Highway 50 and Emil Kolb. A detailed view of spacing can be undertaken as part of Draft Plan applications when curb locations are confirmed.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	Please ensure any proposed new road connections on to Regional Roads meet the minimum spacing requirements noted within the Region's Road Characterization Study (as per the above table);	Crozier and Bousfields	Noted. The proposed road connections now meet the Road Characterization requirements, based on the proposed intersection configurations as outlined in Section 5.3 of the February 2026 Transportation Assessment.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	Please note due to the limited frontage available access to the proposed mixed use blocks located at all corners of Highway 50 and Emil Kolb Parkway will only be considered as restricted; full moves access will not be permitted.	Crozier and Bousfields	Noted. Mixed-Use blocks are intended to only have internal accesses.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Regional Road ROW and Access Spacing Requirements	Please note due to the limited frontage available access to the proposed mixed use blocks located at the NE and SE corners of Emil Kolb Parkway and Street F, access will only be considered as restricted; full moves access will not be permitted .	Crozier and Bousfields	Noted. Mixed-Use blocks are intended to only have internal accesses. Street F is proposed as a Right-In/Right-Out local road connection due to the proximity to Street E and Highway 50.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Concept Plan	Concept plan does not have spacing of proposed new roadways along Regional roads. Please provide;	Crozier and Bousfields	The details included on the Tertiary Plan as part of the submission include intersection spacing. Spacing is also illustrated in Figure 12 of the February 2026 Transportation Assessment.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Concept Plan	Concept plan should indicate "future potential traffic control signals" for Highway 50 @ Street A & D;	Crozier and Bousfields	Label has been updated on Tertiary Plan. Please note Street D does not warrant signalization.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Concept Plan	Concept plan should indicate "future potential traffic control signals" for Emil Kolb Parkway @ Street E;	Crozier and Bousfields	Label has been updated on Tertiary Plan. Please note Street D does not warrant signalization.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Concept Plan	Revised concept plan is to be updated to reflect the noted access types addressed within the TIS comments below.	Crozier and Bousfields	Noted.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Traffic Impact Study	Traffic Impact Study dated February 2025 has been reviewed and we wish to offer the below comments to be addressed within a revised report;	Crozier	Acknowledged.																		
Development Services	Transportation Development	Traffic Impact Study	Sightline analysis for the proposed intersection of Emil Kolb Parkway at Street E is to be completed;	Crozier	Noted. Please reference Section 5.4 of the February 2026 Transportation Assessment.																		

Development Services	Transportation Development	Traffic Impact Study	Traffic Signal warrants for future proposed signalized intersections along Highway 50 and Emil Kolb Parkway have been provided within the revised study to the Region's satisfaction. It is to be noted that signals will not be supported from the onset of development. Once full build out is completed and signals become warranted they will be supported for installation;	Crozier	Noted.
Development Services	Transportation Development	Traffic Impact Study	Table 15 on page 31 of the study indicates the spacing requirement along Emil Kolb Parkway as 300 meters between full moves when in fact the Region's Road Characterization Study speaks to 450 metre spacing requirement as this roadway is classified as an Industrial Connector. The current proposed roadways do not meet the above noted spacing requirements for full movement access. As such, Street F will be supported as a right-in/right-out access only. The existing round-a-bout can be utilized for vehicles destined westbound along Emil Kolb Parkway. Please update the study	Crozier	Acknowledged. Street F has been revised to a local road with a Right-In/Right-Out configuration to support the adjacent mixed-use blocks.
Development Services	Transportation Development	Traffic Impact Study	Table 15 on page 31 of the study indicates the spacing requirement along Highway 50 as 300 meters between full moves is classified as a Suburban Connector. The current proposed roadways do not meet the above noted spacing requirements for full movement access. As such, Street C will be supported as a restricted right-in/right-out access only. The existing round-about can be utilized for vehicles destined southbound along Highway 50. Please update the study accordingly.	Crozier	As a Suburban Connector, the available spacing (210 m) meets the requirement for a Left-In/Right-In/Right-Out configuration (>150m). As such this configuration is proposed.
Development Services	Health Planning	-	The revised HDA has scored a gold threshold on the tool, which shows the developments commitment to a healthy built environment design.	Bousfields	Noted.
Development Services	Health Planning	-	We look forward to confirming that sidewalks have been labelled on both sides of the street as mentioned within the Secondary Plan policies.	Bousfields	In addition to the BNHSP policies, the Community Design Guidelines indicate sidewalks are provided on both sides of Local Streets. See cross sections for local roads as per Crozier updated Transportation Impact Study.
Development Services	Health Planning	-	As mentioned within the comment matrix there is the possibility to break up longer block lengths with mid block connections. We encourage this where possible and look forward to reviewing in the detailed design.	Bousfields	Understood, mid-block connections will be explored, where possible, at the detailed design stage (e.g. Draft Plan of Subdivision). Further refinements to medium density blocks have been provided in the Draft tertiary Plan which is generally reflective of individual landowner draft plan applications that have been submitted to the Town of Caledon for Pre-Application Review meetings.
Development Services	Health Planning	-	For the future medium density, mixed use or high-density block submissions, a small scale HDA will be required at the time of the site plan submission. If any of the blocks will include ICI uses, please submit a small-scale ICI HAD instead. The tool can be found under the 'Resources' tab here: Healthy communities - peelregion.ca .	Bousfields	Noted.
Development Services	Real Estate	-	There are several Region of Peel easements within the subject property. No encroachments, including crane swings or tie-backs shall be permitted.	Bousfields	Noted.
Development Services	Waste Management	-	All single and non-stacked townhouse units would be eligible to receive Region of Peel curbside cart-based waste collection of garbage, recycling, and organics provided that the requirements outlined in Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual (WCDSM) are met;	Crozier	Acknowledged - Not in the scope of a Secondary Plan.
Development Services	Waste Management	-	All multi-residential Apartment and stacked townhouse units would be eligible to receive Region of Peel front-end waste collection of garbage and recycling provided that the requirements outlined in Section 2.0 and 4.0 of the waste collection design standards manual are met;	Crozier	Acknowledged - Not in the scope of a Secondary Plan.
Development	Waste Management	-	Retail and Employment units will be required to receive private waste collection	Crozier	Acknowledged - Not in the scope of a Secondary Plan.
Development Services	Waste Management	-	The Waste Collection Design Standards Manual available at: https://peelregion.ca/public-works/design-standards/pdf/waste-collection-designstandards-	Crozier	Acknowledged - Not in the scope of a Secondary Plan.

Development Services	Waste Management	-	Through proceeding development stages, a Waste Management Plan will be required to demonstrate how the requirements of WCDSM will be met.	Crozier	Acknowledged - Not in the scope of a Secondary Plan.				
Peel District School Board, June 18, 2025									
Nick Gooding, nick.gooding@peelsb.com									
PDSB	Information		Peel District School Board (PDSB) has reviewed the 2nd submission (Resubmission 1) of the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan consisting of 1,278 single-detached dwellings, 2,498 townhouses/back-to-backs/medium density townhouses/low-rise apartments, and 669 apartment units. PDSB requires and requests 2 elementary school sites of 8 Acres (3.24 Hectares) to accommodate the proposed number of units proposed for this development and request that these be added to the Facility Fit Plan and included in the next submission. PDSB requires school sites to have 2 frontages along the street to accommodate bus and vehicle access to and from the site.	Arcadis	Please refer to submitted School Site Memorandum. The required school block has been provided with frontage onto two collector streets. A detailed facility fit can be provided in the Draft Plan of Subdivision for the appropriate Landowner based on CAD provided by the school board.				
PDSB			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Kindergarten to Grade 8</td> <td>Grade 9 to 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,654</td> <td>553</td> </tr> </table>	Kindergarten to Grade 8	Grade 9 to 12	1,654	553		
Kindergarten to Grade 8	Grade 9 to 12								
1,654	553								
PDSB									
PDSB	-	-	Once subdivision applications are submitted for the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan area, PDSB will require the inclusion of the following conditions in the Conditions of Draft Plan Approval and Subdivision Agreements:	Information	Acknowledged				
PDSB	Conditions	1	Prior to final approval, the Town of Caledon shall be advised by the School Boards that satisfactory arrangements regarding educational facilities have been made between the developer/applicant and the School Boards for this plan.	Owner	Acknowledged				
PDSB	Conditions	2	Prior to final approval, the Peel District School Board is to be satisfied that the following provisions are contained in the Subdivision Agreement and on all offers of purchase and sale for a period of ten years after registration of the plan:	Owner	Acknowledged				
PDSB	Conditions	2.1	"Whereas, despite the efforts of the Peel District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students in neighbourhood schools, you are hereby notified that some students may be accommodated in temporary facilities or bussed to schools outside of the area, according to the Board's Transportation Policy. You are advised to contact the Planning and Accommodations Department of the Peel District School Board to determine the exact schools."	Owner	Acknowledged				
PDSB	Conditions	2.2	"Whereas, despite the efforts of the Peel District School Board, please be advised that noise, dust and truck traffic are normal circumstances during the construction of a school, and once constructed, the school will have normal operating conditions for a school such as noise, exterior lighting, portable classrooms (including installation and removal), and increased traffic on surrounding streets during peak A.M. and P.M. hours	Owner	Acknowledged				
PDSB	Conditions	2.3	"The purchaser agrees that for the purposes of transportation to school the residents of the development shall agree that the students will meet the school bus on roads presently in existence or at another designated place convenient to the Peel District School Board. Bus stop locations will be assessed and selected by the Student Transportation of Peel Region's Bus Stop Assessment (STOPR012) procedure and	Owner	Acknowledged				

PDSB	Conditions	3	That the Subdivision Agreement shall contain a clause satisfactory to the Peel District School Board that the developer will erect and maintain signs at the entrances to the subdivision which shall advise prospective purchasers that due to present school facilities, some of the children from the subdivision may have to be accommodated in temporary facilities or bussed to schools, according to the Board's Transportation Policies. These signs shall be to the School Board's specifications and at locations determined by the Board.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	4	Prior to final approval, satisfactory arrangements shall have been made with the Peel District School Board, acting reasonably, for the acquisition, or reservation for future acquisition, of two elementary school sites for a period of ten years following registration of a plan of subdivision.	Owner	Please refer to submitted School Site Memorandum.
PDSB	Conditions	5	Any amendment or adjustment to the proposed subdivision that would result in an increase of proposed residential units should address to the satisfaction of the Peel District School Board the adequacy of school capacity to support the increase in proposed residential units beyond two elementary schools.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	6	The developer shall agree to install fencing that is 1.8 meters (6 feet) in height, 6 gauge black vinyl chain link fence running along the property. The fence is to be supported with a rail at the bottom and one at the top of the fence.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	7	The developer shall agree to post and maintain "No Dumping" signs along the perimeter fence of the two school sites as required by the Peel District School Board.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	8	The developer shall agree that there will be no stockpiling of topsoil (or other material) on the school sites. A clause and securities shall be included in the servicing agreement which prohibits the stockpiling of any soils	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	9	The developer shall agree to confirm in writing to the Peel District School Board that capacity for two new schools with regards to natural gas and hydro is adequate.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	10	In order to ensure that sanitary, storm, and utility easements (hydro, gas, water, etc.) do not interfere with approved site plans, it is requested that such easements be approved by the Peel District School Board prior to their establishment on the proposed school	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	11	The developer will ensure that community mailboxes are not located along the frontage of the school sites.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	12	The developer shall agree that during construction of the surrounding development they will provide any traffic control as required by the municipality at no cost to the Peel District School Board.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	13	The developer shall agree that the stormwater management design of the proposed subdivision must incorporate the school sites in the analysis.	Owner	Acknowledged
PDSB	Conditions	14	Please provide PDSB with a copy of the Notice of Decision. Please keep PDSB informed on the status of the secondary plan and provide us with information as it becomes available. Should	Owner	Acknowledged
Town of Caledon, Development Planning July 2, 2025 and October 14, 2025					
Tanjot.bal@caledon.ca					
Development Planning	Draft OPA	1	Development review staff are currently reviewing the proposed secondary plan policies and land use plan. Track changes and comments will be provided directly within the submitted OPA.	Bousfields	The Draft OPA has been revised based on City comments and is included as part of the resubmission materials.

	Draft OPA	2	As discussed at the October 2, 2025 meeting with Planning and Transportation staff, please revise the vision, objectives and policies in the draft OPA, to specifically speak to the type of development that fronts onto the roundabout at Emil Kolb and Highway 50, and north of the roundabout along Highway 50 (Truck by-pass). The Community Design Guidelines should be revised to add direction on how these areas should develop (i.e. pedestrian activity away from the roundabout, treatment to buildings that frame the major	Bousfields	The Community Design Guidelines have been updated to include direction on development surrounding the intersection of Highway 50 and Emil Kolb Parkway, and have been included as part of the resubmission materials.
Development Planning	Development Staging and Sequencing Plan	3	The submitted DSSP provides a high-level overview, however it does not provide the details required to ensure development in this new community is completed in a logical order, based on extension of infrastructure (i.e. water, wastewater, transit, roads) and availability of other services (i.e. schools, parks, commercial uses).	Bousfields	As discussed with City Planning staff on January 29, 2026, the final DSSP will be updated based on the final Tertiary Plan where more information regarding sequencing can be provided as necessary. An updated DSSP based on current information in the Tertiary Plan has been provided.
Development Planning	Development Staging and Sequencing Plan	4	Please revise the DSSP to include phasing details, based on availability of infrastructure (number of units and commercial GFA to be broken down by year, aligning with Regional capital projects). The DSSP should also confirm the timing for delivering community elements such as, but not limited to stormwater infrastructure, parks and schools	Bousfields	As mentioned above, the DSSP will be revised to include phasing details and the timing for delivery of community elements, at a later stage in the design process.
Development Planning	Affordable Housing	5	As the Town plans for new communities, we require secondary plans to provide for a range and mix of housing options and densities, including affordable housing, to help meet the Peel-wide housing targets (see Table 4 in Peel Official Plan).	Bousfields	The revised Secondary Plan includes policies related to Affordable Housing and is consistent with approved policy language for other Secondary Plans in the immediate vicinity (e.g. Mount Hope West). The in-force Zoning by-law currently permit a wide range of housing typologies and the BNHSP policies continue to support these objectives/permissions.
Development Planning	Affordable Housing	6	A meeting was held between Town and Regional staff to discuss how this secondary plan can assist in achieving these targets, beyond the current proposal to provide a mix of housing typologies and densities. The applicant requested staff to explore locating affordable housing within the Greenbelt Lands. Staff have reviewed the policies within the Greenbelt Plan and Town's Official Plan. Locating affordable housing in the Greenbelt is not permitted and therefore will need to be located on developable lands in the Secondary Plan area. Please revise the concept plan to identify an affordable housing	Owner/Bousfields	Acknowledged. No housing is proposed in the Greenbelt Lands and the BNHLG has entered into conveyance agreements for Greenbelt Lands east of the Secondary Plan Area. Affordable Housing can be explored through subsequent Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications. No land dedication is being explored at this time.
Development Planning	Fiscal Impact Study	-	A request for peer review fees was submitted via email on May 5, 2025. No fees have been received to date. Once fees are received, the peer review will be initiated.	Arcadis	Peer review fee has been paid.
	Fiscal Impact Study	-	The peer review of the FIS is on-going. Additional information was requested on September 19, 2025. No response has been received as of the date of this comment	Arcadis	Peer review of the FIS has been received and updates have been incorporated into the resubmitted FIS.
Development Planning	Other	7	The comment matrix indicates that a facility fit plan was prepared for the catholic elementary school, however it is not within the submission material. Please provide the plan for DPCDSBs review. The catholic school board has also advised that the school site is shown as 2.75 ha, which can be reduced to 2.41 ha (6 acres).	Bousfields/Crozier	The school site for the DPCDSB has been provided at a size of 2.42 ha, as shown on the draft Tertiary Plan. A draft facility fit plan has been provided based on CAD provided by the DPCDSB. The landowner will be submitting a Draft Plan of Subdivision Application in which a more detailed Facility Fit Plan could be provided if deemed necessary.
Development Planning	Other	8	Please include responses to all public comments received to date, including comments and questions raised at the Public Meeting on September 16th, 2025.	Bousfields	A summary of comments from members of the public and local Councilors has been provided in the Planning Addendum Letter prepared by Bousfields Inc. and responses to how the Secondary Plan has been modified have also been included.

Urban Design	Community Design Guidelines	-	Please find Urban Design comments within the Community Design Guidelines	Bousfields	Acknowledged. Comments have been addressed on the revised material included as part of the resubmission. Please refer to Planning Addendum which speaks to the modifications.
Urban Design	Concept Plan	-	Please find Urban Design mark ups on the Concept Plan.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. Comments have been addressed on the revised material included as part of the resubmission. Please refer to Planning Addendum which speaks to the modifications.
Urban Design	draft secondary plan	-	Please find Urban Design comments within the draft secondary plan	Bousfields	Acknowledged. Comments have been addressed on the revised material included as part of the resubmission. Please refer to Planning Addendum which speaks to the modifications.
Town of Caledon, Finance, July 2, 2025 and October 14, 2025					
Tanjot.bal@caledon.ca					
Finance	Comments	11	Based on the proposed development (establishment of a new Secondary Plan Area to permit a range of residential, commercial and institutional), Development Charges will be levied as follows:	Owner	Acknowledged.
Finance	Comments	a	Proposed new residential dwellings will attract Development Charges at the Residential rates. Proposed new commercial buildings will attract Development Charges at the Non-Residential (Other) rates. Those charges will be 'frozen' at the rates that will be in effect on the date when the first Site Plan or Zoning Amendment application is deemed complete (the application completion date), provided that the first Site Plan or Zoning Amendment took place after January 1, 2020. Otherwise, Development Charges will be determined on the date of building permit issuance.	Owner	Acknowledged.
Finance	Comments	b	If frozen rates apply, interest on Development Charges will accrue for the period starting one day after the application completion date, through to the date on which the charges are received by the Town.	Owner	Acknowledged.
Finance	Comments	c	Currently, Development Charges at the Residential and Non-Residential (Other) rates are: a. Town of Caledon: (a) \$60,235.59 per single or semi-detached unit; (b) \$41,413.92 per apartment > 70 sq. metres; (c) \$24,305.21 per apartment <= 70 sq. metres; (d) \$54,608.35 per townhouse dwelling; and (e) \$114.89 per sq. metre of commercial floor space. Stacked townhouses will attract Development Charges at the large apartment rates. All other townhouses will attract Development Charges at the Residential (Other) rates. b. Region of Peel: (a) \$75,101.98 per single or semi-detached unit; (b) \$54,476.68 per apartment > 70 sq. metres; (c) \$28,811.18 per apartment <= 70 sq. metres; (d) \$59,481.10 per townhouse dwelling; and (e) \$301.08 per sq. metre of commercial floor space. c. School Boards: (a) \$5,076 per any residential unit; and (b) \$11.84 per sq. metre of commercial floor space.	Owner	Acknowledged.
Finance	Comments	12	Effective February 1, 2016, the Region of Peel began collecting directly for hard service development charges (i.e., water, wastewater and roads) for residential developments, except apartments, at the time of subdivision agreement execution.	Owner	Acknowledged.
Finance	Comments	13	Additional information on Development Charges may be accessed on the Town's website at https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/development-charges.aspx	Owner	Acknowledged.

Finance	Comments	14	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at April 10, 2025, and are based upon information provided to the Town by the applicant, current By-laws in effect and current rates, which are indexed twice a year. For site plan or rezoning applications dated on or after January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated at rates applicable on the date when an application is determined to be complete (the application completion date); and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. That determination of rates is valid for 18 months after application approval date. Interest charges will apply for affected applications. For applications other than site plan or rezoning applications; and site plan or rezoning applications dated prior to January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated and payable at building permit issuance date. Development Charge by-laws and rates are subject to change. Further, proposed developments may change from the current proposal to the building permit stage. Any estimates provided will be updated based on changes in actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application.	Owner	Acknowledged.
Town of Caledon, Parks, July 2, 2025 and October 14, 2025					
Tanjot.bal@caledon.ca					
Parks	Comments	15	The park system for new communities should be designed as part of a comprehensive planning process with all landowners at the table so that parks can sized and located with consideration of the other future developable lands and to support the assembly of larger park blocks that support larger recreational amenities.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. The Applicant has consulted with Parks and Planning Staff outlining the proposed distribution and sizing of parks. As a result, a larger 3.5 hectare park block is proposed on the east side of Highway 50 to accommodate recreational facilities in addition to existing amenities at Albion District Park and the new baseball facility on Emil Kolb Parkway. Revised Facility Fits have also been included.
Parks	Comments	16	Parks should be located centrally to the population they serve to maximize population catchment and minimize trip distances. They should be positioned so that residents can easily reach them without needing to cross major roads.	Bousfields	Parks have been located centrally to the population they serve and are positioned to limit the need to cross major roads.
Parks	Comments	17	Parks should be placed in prominent locations to ensure high visibility from an adjacent streets. Parks should have frontage on a minimum of two streets. This positioning will facilitate ease of access and increase the likelihood of frequent use.	Bousfields	Parks policies are included in the draft OPA, included as part of the resubmission materials.
Parks	Comments	18	Park blocks should be generally be regular rectangular/square in shape, as opposed to elongated, truncated, or complex parcel shape, to maximize park design flexibility and programmability.	Bousfields	Park blocks have been designed to generally be rectangular/square in shape to maximize park design flexibility and programmability. Facility Fits have also been provided.
Parks	Comments	19	The Town is not supportive of locating parks within designated Natural Heritage areas and Greenbelt lands due to policies limiting the use of the lands for recreational uses.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. The Land Use Plan has been designed to limit locating parks within designated Natural Heritage areas and
Parks	Comments	20	Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPs) will be required as part of the approval process for high-density and mixed-use developments. The specific location and total land area of these spaces will be determined during the Site Plan process. POPs will not be considered part of the parkland dedication under the Parkland (Secondary Plan)	Bousfields	Understood, POPs will be determined through the Site Plan process.
Parks	Comments	21	Walkway blocks are not credited towards parkland dedication.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Parks	Comments	22	Provide trail connections to public parks to ensure accessibility and connectivity throughout the secondary plan area.	Bousfields	Trail connections to public parks will be provided, where feasible, throughout the plan area to ensure accessibility and connectivity. These connections can be further refined/determined at the detailed design stage (e.g. Draft Plan or Site Plan).
Parks	Comments	23	Trails must be located on Town property. Proposals should show how trail locations will be conveyed to the Town and confirm that trails will not be located on properties of non-participating landowners.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. This will be determined through the detailed design stage (e.g. Draft Plan of Subdivision)

Parks	Comments	24	Comments will be provided for the park facility fit and trail layout after Town staff is satisfied with Park block locations and sizes.	Crozier and Bousfields	Acknowledged. Facility Fits have been provided.
Parks	Comments	-	Please see Parks comments/markups within concept plan	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Parks	Neighbourhood Park Blocks	25	Neighbourhood Parks are to be sized between 1 ha and 2 ha	Bousfields	The Neighbourhood Parks have been generally be sized between 1ha and 2ha where possible.
Parks	Neighbourhood Park	26	Parks should be located centrally to the population (4,000 – 5,000 people) they serve	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Parks	Neighbourhood Park	27	Parks should be strategically separated from school blocks to prevent the overlap of	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Parks	Neighbourhood Park Blocks	28	Potential Facilities can include: a. Playground b. Seating Area with shade structure c. Courts (basketball, pickleball courts) d. Amenities (bike racks, benches, trees, signage, garbage receptacles) e. Outdoor fitness stations f. Free play areas	Bousfields	Park facility fits have been revised following Town Staff being satisfied with the general park block locations and sizes.
Parks	Community Park Block	29	Community Park should be a minimum of 6 ha in size to meet parkland dedication requirement	Bousfields	In consultation with Parks and the Planning Department, as well as a review of existing facilities, the proposed Community Park is 3.52 ha in size. Providing a CP of 6 hectares would result in more than 60% of the required parkland dedication for the entire BNHSP in one location. As such, a variety of park sizes have been distributed to ensure equitable distribution of these amenities. To meet the parkland dedication requirements for the entirety of the Plan area, which is calculated to be a total of 8.92 ha the BNHLG will enter into a Master Parkland Agreement with the Town of Caledon.
Parks	Community Park Block	30	Parks should be located centrally to the population they serve (15,000 – 20,000 people)	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Parks	Community Park Block	31	Community Parks may be located adjacent to Secondary School Blocks	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Parks	Community Park Block	32	Potential Facilities can include: a. Splash Pad/Misting Station b. Courts (basketball, pickleball, multi-use courts) c. Sport Fields (minimum two fields) d. Skatepark and BMX pump track e. Large playground f. Washroom Building g. Shade structure and seating area h. Amenities (parking lot, bike racks, water fountain, benches, trees, signage, interpretive signs, garbage receptacles) i. Community Gardens j. Off-Leash Dog Park k. Outdoor fitness stations l. Skateboard Park/Pump Track m. Ice rinks or skating loop n. Free play areas o. Picnic Areas	Bousfields	Park facility fits to be revised after the Town staff is satisfied with Park block locations and sizes.

Parks	Parkland Dedication	33	A Financial Parkland Agreement will be prepared between the Landowner Group and the Town. The calculation and dedication of the parkland contribution requirements will be calculated on behalf of the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan Landowners on a collective basis as a whole and not on the individual Owners' Lands. Further discussion will be required between the Landowners Group and the Town. a. Owner will be required to provide a Certificate Letter from the Trustee to confirm that the owner of the subject lands has contributed to the Trustee its share of the parkland dedication and parkland cash-in-lieu payment to be made by the Landowners Group.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Parks	Parkland Dedication	34	Parkland dedication will be calculated from the total land area at 5% of the total area of the land (or 1 hectare per 600 residential units), whichever is higher: a. At 5% of the land area, the draft plan will generate approximately 8.92 ha (178.57 ha x 5%) of parkland. b. At 1ha/600 units, the draft plan will generate approximately 7.41 ha (based on proposed 4,446 units) of parkland.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. 8.92 hectares of parkland will be accommodated across the Secondary Plan Area.
Town of Caledon, Landscape, July 2, 2025 and October 14, 2025					
Tanjot.bal@caledon.ca					
Landscape	Comments	36	Landscape comments will be provided for the park facility fit and trail layout after the Town staff is satisfied with Park block locations and sizes.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. Park layouts were confirmed and Facility Fits have been provided.
Landscape	Comments	-	OPA, 7.17.9.3.1 shall be relocated under 7.17.9.3 Right-of-way and revise to the following: "Street trees will be encouraged along all public right of ways where feasible. Where street trees are not able to be established due to soil depth constraints or lack of space, native pollinators will be encouraged." "Development applications will demonstrate that sufficient lands are being provided to accommodate streetscape elements (e.g. street trees, street lighting, seating, signage), bike lanes, low impact development, medians and on-street parking. The Town may require additional lands at intersections to provide for exclusive turning lanes and daylight triangles. Such additional rights-of-way requirements may be determined during	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Town of Caledon, Energy and Environment, October 14, 2025					
Tanjot.bal@caledon.ca					
Energy and Environment	Comments	37	Comments on the Community Energy and Emissions Reduction Plan attached.	Pratus	Please refer to Pratus CEERP Addendum Letter
Energy and Environment	Comments	38	Request a meeting with the consultants to go over the results of the plan and discuss how we can collaboratively support implementation.	Pratus	Please refer to Pratus CEERP Addendum Letter
Town of Caledon, Heritage, October 14, 2025					
Tanjot.bal@caledon.ca					
Heritage	OPA	39	Comments on the OPA are attached.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. Comments addressed to be consistent with Cultural Heritage policies in other approved Secondary Plans.
Heritage	Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (CHAR)	40	A revised "Cultural Heritage Assessment Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario" report, prepared by TMHC Inc., dated February 28, 2025 has been received.	TMHC	Acknowledged.
Heritage	Cultural Heritage Assessment Report	41	Most of Heritage staff's comments on the previous version of the report have been addressed.	TMHC	Acknowledged.
Heritage	Cultural Heritage Assessment Report	42	Heritage staff comments on the revised CHAR are attached.	TMHC	Acknowledged. Please refer to Cultural Heritage Addendum Letter.
Heritage	Cultural Heritage Assessment Report	43	Heritage staff are open to meeting with the heritage consultant to discuss the requested revisions.	TMHC	Acknowledged.
Heritage	Community Design Guidelines	44	Revise the Community Design Guidelines to illustrate and briefly summarize, as part of section 6.3, the cultural heritage resources within the secondary plan area.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. Please refer to revised Community Design Guidelines.

Heritage	Community Design Guidelines	45	Specific comments on the existing section 6.3 are attached.	Bousfields	Community Design Guidelines have been revised accordingly.
Heritage	Secondary Plan Schedule A – Land Use Plan Revision	46	Please identify all of the listed, non-designated cultural heritage resources on the Land Use Plan with an H symbol for 'potential cultural heritage resource' (see Alloo Secondary Plan for example of these are incorporated) to facilitate current and future review of the Land Use Plan.	Bousfields	Land Use Schedule has been updated to identify Cultural Heritage resources within the Secondary Plan Area. Through future draft plan of subdivision applications, where necessary, cultural heritage resources will be subject to further review and determination of an appropriate conservation strategy.
Heritage	Secondary Plan Schedule A – Land Use Plan Revision	47	The proponent has not adjusted the alignment of the collector road east of Highway 50, as shown on Schedule A – Land Use Plan to avoid the cultural heritage resource at 14685 Highway 50, per Heritage staff's first submission comments.	Bousfields	The collector road is conceptual and precise alignments will be determined through subsequent Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications which may require coordination between landowners. At which time an appropriate and further evaluation of a potential heritage resource would be conducted through this process.
Heritage	Secondary Plan Schedule A – Land Use Plan Revision	48	The high and medium density blocks along Highway 50 will make conservation in situ challenging for the resources determined to meet the criteria for designation. Further discussion is required to determine how/if this disconnect can be addressed through policies.	Bousfields	The high and medium density blocks have been further refined in the Draft Tertiary Plan. The exact layout of remaining high density and medium blocks will be developed through the Draft Plan of Subdivision Applications.
Heritage	Archaeological Assessment	49	The Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) compliance letter for the Stage 1 archaeological assessment of the subject lands has been submitted.	TMHC	Acknowledged.
Heritage	Archaeological Assessment	50	In the MCM compliance letter, the referenced Stage 1 archaeological assessment is dated March 4, 2022.	TMHC	Acknowledged.
Heritage	Archaeological Assessment	51	The Stage 1 archaeological assessment previously received by the Town is dated January 13, 2022.	TMHC	March 22, 2022 version provided.
Heritage	Archaeological	52	Submit the March 4, 2022, version of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment.	TMHC	This has been submitted with the resubmission materials.
Heritage	Archaeological Assessment	53	Given that the March 4, 2022, version of the report was accepted by the Ministry, it is anticipated that Heritage staff's requested revisions were not addressed. Regardless, the archaeological consultant is advised take Heritage staff's comments into consideration during the preparation of future archaeological assessment reports in	TMHC	Acknowledged.
Town of Caledon, October 14, 2025					
Tanjot.bal@caledon.ca					
-	Comments	-	Comments from the following departments/agencies are attached for your review: •Town of Caledon, Transportation Engineering, dated October 6, 2025•Town of Caledon, Natural Heritage, dated October 6, 2025•Town of Caledon, Development Engineering, dated August 25, 2025•Town of Caledon, Heritage, dated July 31, 2025 and August 8, 2025•Town of Caledon, Water Resources, dated July 28, 2025•Town of Caledon, Energy and Environment, dated July 24, 2025•Peel District School Board, dated June 18, 2025•Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board (Same comments as 1st submission)•Town of Caledon, Urban Design, dated June 17, 2025•Region of Peel, dated May 26, 2025•Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, dated June 6,	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	The following departments have no concerns: •Rogers•Town of Caledon, Municipal Numbers•Town of Caledon, Fire•Town of Caledon, Zoning•Ministry of Transportation•Enbridge•Hydro One	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	The following comments were received from members of the public:	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	•Flagship Development Group, dated September 15, 2025	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	•MHBC on behalf of James Dick, dated September 15, 2025	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	•GSAI on behalf of Sundial Homes, dated May 12, 2025	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	•Adam Debowski, dated May 10, 2025"I would welcome some corner stores in this area, as we're not too close to any, but I'd like to voice my concerns of warehouses leading to higher trucking traffic as I believe we already have way too much of it in	Bousfields	Noted.

-	Comments	-	•Robin Wenzel, dated April 23, 2025“Further development in the area is concerning to me as we see with the growth and expansion in the southern parts of town increased traffic and damage to road ways increased air pollution. Neighboring towns that were once small opened there zoning and we see increased crime, auto theft, gun violence and with that we'll see residents impacted with increased insurance costs for both home and automotive. Many chose the area to raise families given the confidence that the area was safe, provided scenic environment and would be with minimal growth to ensure these foundational pieces thrived. Don't open pandora's box, let's keep it green and	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	•MHBC on behalf of James Dick, dated December 7, 2023“While we appreciate the general intent of the proposed land uses, we have attached a proposed land use plan that is more reflective of the underlying base conditions and represents our client's vision for the development of the lands. We would request that this alternative be considered in the preferred land use plan for the Secondary Plan.”	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	•Tav Schembri, dated December 12, 2023“Upon examining the development mapping for Bolton North Hill on your website, I observed that a park has been designated on our property, covering approximately 40-45% of it. We are not supportive of this park placement, as we did not initiate this request. I am interested in understanding how this park designation will impact us financially and in terms of usability.”	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	Next Steps: At your request, Town staff will coordinate a Comment Review Meeting to discuss the comments enclosed within this letter to assist in the processing of your application. Please review all comments contained within this letter and provide your teams availability for a meeting. Please note that an agenda is required at least 3 days prior to the meeting.	Bousfields	Noted.
-	Comments	-	Once you are ready to resubmit using the Town's FTP site, please contact the lead	Bousfields	
	Comments	-	Please submit the following items in a revised digital submission: 1.Cover Letter 2.Comment Matrix 3.Revised OPA (including Schedule(s)) 4.Revised Concept Plan 5.Revised Hydrogeology Report 6.Revised Natural Heritage Study 7.Revised Functional Servicing Report 8.Revised Transportation Study 9.Revised Local Subwatershed Study (Stage 1) and Appendices 10.Revised Staging and Sequencing Plan 11.Noise Report 12.Revised Cultural Heritage Assessment Report 13.Revised Community Design Guidelines 14.Final Archeological Assessments 15.Revised Community Energy and Emissions Reduction Plan 16.Other material to address comments.	Bousfields	1.Cover Letter - Provided with Planning Addendum/Coverletter 2.Comment Matrix - Provided 3.Revised OPA (including Schedule(s)) - Provided 4.Revised Concept Plan - Draft Tertiary Plan Provided 5.Revised Hydrogeology Report - Comments continue to be resolved through the LSS. 6.Revised Natural Heritage Study - Provided 7.Revised Functional Servicing Report - Provided 8.Revised Transportation Study - Provided 9.Revised Local Subwatershed Study (Stage 1) and Appendices 10.Revised Staging and Sequencing Plan - Update provided. Final version to be provided in Final Tertiary Plan Submission and Studies 11.Noise Report - Policies added to LOPA. 12.Revised Cultural Heritage Assessment Report - Provided 13.Revised Community Design Guidelines - Provided 14.Final Archeological Assessments - Provided 15.Revised Community Energy and Emissions Reduction Plan - Provided 16.Other material to address comments."
Town of Caledon, Parks and Natural Heritage, October 6, 2025					
Parks and Natural Heritage	Hydrogeology Report	1.a.	it is indicated in the FSR that the feature-based water balance assessment would be included in this report, but it does not appear to be present. This assessment is	Crozier	A FBWB is will be submitted as part of the SWS.
Parks and Natural	Hydrogeology Report	1.b.	A monitoring plan is required as part of the FBWB.	Crozier	A monitoring plan is discussed within SWS.

Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.a	Field notes and all field sheets or data cards are required. Please append to the NH study.	Dillon	The relevant field notes have been appended in Appendix E
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.b	Management and mitigation approaches to the NHS are to follow the direction given in the SABE Scoped Subwatershed Study Implementation guidelines (Part C). Please demonstrate conformity with that guideline.	Dillon	Section 5.1.1, 8.0 and 9.0 have been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c	c.Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 Survey Locations and Natural Heritage Features: i.some of the features on this figure are unlabeled or unreadable. The labels that appear to be italicized and shadowed are very difficult to read. Please clarify and resubmit. ii.Some features are inconsistent and/or missing between these figures and compared to the report text. Please ensure these maps are complete and consistent.	Dillon	Figures 3 to 6 have been updated to be more legible.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c	3.2 Aquatic Environment: indicates that habitat for the Endangered Redside Dace is present within the Humber River 450m downstream. MECP must be consulted regarding the potential for the headwater drainage features in the study area being considered contributing habitat for the species. Please provide any correspondence with the ministry and their requirements in this regard.	Dillon	Based on the proposed changes to the Endangered Species Act and Species at Risk in Ontario List (i.e., removal of provincial protections for aquatic species), MECP will be consulted as required later in the planning process (i.e., during draft plan, etc.).
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c	4.0 Fieldwork Methodology: a.All natural heritage features (including potential open country breeding bird habitat, for example) that can't be studied must be identified and conservatively accommodated by the secondary plan and/or associated policies.b.Woodland limits must be confirmed in the field by Town staff prior to finalizing the secondary plan. Woodland features that have been delineated via aerial interpretation on non-participating lands must be staked in the field in conjunction with Town staff (potentially in conjunction with future stages/applications) or be mapped, treated as significant and protected conservatively until such time.	Dillon	a) Natural heritage features outside of the participating parcels have been identified and conservatively accommodated in the NHR and Secondary Plan. Based on the example, active agricultural fields planted with row crops were not included as they are not identified as suitable breeding habitat for birds given the active management during the breeding season. This aligns with SWHECS for 6e which excludes actively farmed fields where agricultural fields apply (i.e., Open Country Bird Breeding Habitat and Shrub/Early Successional Bird Breeding Habitat). b) Confirmation of woodland limits within non-participating lands is not feasible without access from landowners prior to finalizing the Secondary Plan. As noted in the same comment, confirmation of woodland limits will be required as part of future applications (i.e., draft plan/site plan, etc.). Woodlands that have met the criteria for significance based on roadside assessments, background and aerial imagery review have been identified and conservatively protected in the Secondary Plan.

Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c	5.1.1 Headwater Drainage Features Assessment (HDFA): c.It doesn't appear that the Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment was completed in compliance with the guideline methodology. The first visit should have been conducted during spring freshet or within 24 hours after a rainfall event. The required precipitation events were not met and the spring freshet was not captured. Notably, the site was not revisited after a heavy rain event that occurred just a few days later, when 80% of the entire month's precipitation fell in one day. There were approximately three weeks of warm temperatures and little precipitation prior to March 23, including several days with temperatures above 10 deg C. Similarly, the May 20th visit occurred two weeks after receiving any rainfall. Considering conditions were extremely dry at the times of observation and the spring freshet was missed, the HDFs under normal spring freshet and/or precipitation event conditions must be assumed to convey significantly more water than observations and the report's assessment suggest. Accordingly, the results must be interpreted conservatively to reflect the fact that the sampling times/conditions were not representative of a typical spring freshet event, and at least of modest amount of flow must be assumed to be present after spring freshet and/or precipitation events.	Dillon	The timing windows (Table 4) within the HDFA guidelines were followed (i.e., late March to mid - April; late April to May; July to August, if required). As noted in our previous response, the GTA rarely has a true freshet and there was little snow cover during the freshet and dry conditions in March 2021 based on ECCC weather data. Surveys are scheduled in advance based on weather forecasts and in order to capture data under suitable conditions. While surveys may be flexible to a certain extent, if the forecast is wrong, there are constraints to when they can be completed such as project initiation, work days, scheduling conflicts, staff availability, etc., particularly for those that are dependent on weather events. For the first site visit, our intent was to complete the survey within the applicable window as per the HDFA guidelines even if the weather was uncooperative. The HDF guideline does not specify that the second site visit has to be completed following rain events. It is intended to determine baseflows and completion following rain events would bias that determination. Nonetheless, it is our opinion that a conservative approach has been applied to the HDF assessment.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	a.Figure 3 displays several HDFs which are not consistently mapped/labelled on Figure 4.	Dillon	Figures 3 and 4 have been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	b.Information from correspondence with the MECP is required, pertaining to Redside Dace or other aquatic SAR, as this will inform the HDFA and may affect the results of this assessment.	Dillon	Please see our response regarding MECP correspondence above.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	c. The report states that the first site visit was timed so as to "be completed before it was too late in the season, regardless of the precipitation.", acknowledging that the results are based on non-representative data, since the conditions were outside guideline-specified conditions. It also omits some of the options that were available: i.the site visit could have been conducted earlier in the month (i.e., sooner after late Feb/Early March spring thaw conditions, and prior to a protracted warm dry spell), and ii.over 80% of March's entire precipitation fell on March 25, just after the first site visit was done, and the site should have been re-visited after that event in order to obtain reliable, representative data. iii.the data obtained (which was acknowledged to be outside guideline conditions, and therefore unrepresentative) could have been interpreted in conjunction with historic aerial imagery, as recommended in the HDFA guidelines. iv.The site could have been revisited any of the subsequent years since to obtain more representative observations.	Dillon	Please see our response above. Section 5.1.1 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	d.The second site visit was May 20th, 2021, at which time there had been no precipitation for over two weeks, and only 10mm of rain prior to that, in the first few days of the month. This, following a dry April, makes it clear that conditions overall were very dry that season, and the results need to be understood and assessed in light of this, since it will not otherwise give a realistic assessment of HDF function.	Dillon	Please see our response above. Section 5.1.1 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	e.Note that the sampling time ranges given in the guidelines are general and actual site visits have to be timed according to the seasonal conditions in a given year, especially in light of global warming and shifting seasonal weather patterns.	Dillon	Please see our response above. Section 5.1.1 has been updated.

Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	f.The report states, "...the actual amount of flow within these features will not change the ultimate management recommendation." This is incorrect, as the variation in Flow Condition and Feature Type can make the difference between Limited, Recharge and Valued Hydrology classification, which in turn can determine the difference between "Mo Management", "Maintain Recharge" and "Mitigation" management outcomes. There are a number of HDFs in the study area where this distinction is important.	Dillon	Section 5.1.1 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	g. Management classifications for HDFs (Headwater Drainage Features) are provided. It must be demonstrated that the recommended management outlined (i.e., 'mitigation' in most instances) can be accommodated in the proposed secondary plan layout. Per guideline requirements, the functions of features recommended for mitigation must be replicated through enhanced lot-level conveyance measures or constructed wetland features. The report must demonstrate how and where the management	Dillon	The secondary plan identifies features that need to be mitigated and examples of mitigation measures but the exact location and methods are usually determined later in the planning process. In our experience, specific mitigation measures are determined through SWM planning at the tertiary plan/ draft plan stage when the site planning is completed at a lot-level.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.c.c.	h. Mitigation does not include relegating features to SWM ponds. The functions must be replicated thorough an open BMP such as constructed wetlands, enhanced lot-level conveyances such as well-vegetated swales or LIDs. SWMPs are not considered an open BMP. Recharge Function Protection is to be included, as per the guidelines.	Dillon	Section 5.1.1 has been updated to remove reference to SWM ponds.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.d	Some HDF features were not mapped/labelled or were mapped inconsistently between the various figures in the report.	Dillon	The HDF figures (Figure 3 and Figure 4) have been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.e	Some features were described as a Rill, "Not an HDF". Respectfully, some of these are not accepted where the feature shows (or is described as having) downstream connection/confluence with further HDFs, as this is contrary to the definition of a rill in the HDFFA guidelines. These features are considered HDFs and should be included in this assessment.	Dillon	Section 5.1.1 has been updated to remove references to rills.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.f	Given the stated concerns about the field methodology and resultant data, and in light of the above comments, staff respectfully disagree with parts of the HDFFA analysis and findings, and offer the re-assessment below, incorporating consideration of historic aerial imagery, as per the HDFFA guidelines. These are based on the information in the report, an assessment of their consistent, defined form over time and assuming spring freshet flow condition of 3 or higher. If the applicant disagrees with these results, they have the option to conduct new site visits to obtain new, more representative data and resubmit a new assessment for review, based on new data.1.The following HDFs are assessed as Mitigation management: BN-1, BN-2, BN-5, BN-6, BN-7, BN-8, BN-14, BN-22, BN-26, BN-28 and BN-29.2.The following HDF is assessed as Conservation management: BN-15.3.The following HDFs are assessed as Protection management: BN-19, BN-23, and BN-24.	Dillon	Section 5.1.1 and Figure 4 have been updated to provide further discussion on each HDF. BN-1, BN-2, BN-5, BN-6, BN-7 and BN-8 were small, ephemeral and undefined features that represent points where surface flows entered a defined channel or valley. They were dry during the first assessment and did not extend beyond a few meters. As a result, we have maintained the no management recommendation. Further, they are mostly outside of the Secondary Plan Area. BN-14, BN-22, BN-26, BN-28 and BN-29 have been conservatively re-assessed as mitigation based on the dry year and background review. BN-15 was maintained as mitigation however the proposed removal of the associated wetland community has been addressed further in Section 9. BN-19, BN-23 and BN-24 were maintained as conservation due the intermittent flows and lack of riparian habitat. These features are also outside of the Secondary Plan Area and not anticipated to be impacted but a conservation recommendation would allow for future enhancements (i.e., natural channel design) should it be discussed in future plans.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.g	Breeding Bird Surveys: At station BBS1 and BBS4, Eastern Wood-Pewee was observed but the adjacent woodland was not designated as habitat on Fig. 4. Please update the mapping accordingly.	Dillon	Confirmed SWH for Special Concern and Rare Wildlife Species (Eastern Wood-pewee) was mapped within woodland communities where territory was confirmed (i.e., where the species was heard during both site visits). Figure 6 and Section 5.2.6 have been

Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.h	The TOR specifies that breeding bird surveys “must follow generally accepted scientific protocols, not necessarily atlasing methods.”. This is understood to entail thorough surveying of all applicable habitats in the study area. Agricultural fields removed from the periphery must be adequately surveyed or the results would necessarily be deemed inconclusive, since the bird surveys conducted were restricted to the periphery.	Dillon	The field program focussed on existing natural features that would provide suitable habitat for breeding birds within accessible properties. Active agricultural fields planted with row crops were not included as they are not identified as suitable breeding habitat for birds given the active management during the breeding season. This aligns with SWHECS for 6e which excludes actively farmed fields where agricultural fields apply (i.e., Open Country Bird Breeding Habitat and Shrub/Early Successional Bird Breeding Habitat).
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.i	5.2.6 Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH):iii.SC species Habitat: Barn Swallow: Although site access may be limited, not all details or investigation should be deferred to the Detailed Design stage. A combined field (to the extent feasible) and desk-top assessment should determine areas within territorial range of Barn Swallow nesting sites (barns, etc.) that will constitute necessary habitat types other than nesting, including foraging habitat, and streambanks or similar sources for nest mud. All suitable habitat types must be included in the vicinity, not limiting the assessment to fields/meadows, as woodland edges or clearings, wetlands, open water, shorelines parkland and other communities also offer foraging habitat for this species. Similarly, nesting sites other than barns must likewise be considered, including natural sites like hollow branches/trees, and other structures, such as bridges, eaves, sheds, garages, culverts, etc.	Dillon	Barn Swallow were observed foraging throughout the Study Area however mapping habitat as suggested is not a productive method of discussing habitat as it would essentially cover the entire area. Figure 6 depicts the locations where there is potential for breeding/nesting activity (i.e. manmade structures) that may be impacted within the Study Area. In our experience, this is a widely accepted approach within the GTA. Further, the existing natural heritage features within the Study Area are proposed to be protected. Note, man-made structures are consistently excluded as a criteria for SWH in the SWHECS for 6e so these structures have been identified for mitigation purposes (i.e., nest sweeps prior to their removal).
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.i	iv.Amphibian surveys:1.The TOR required Amphibian breeding surveys without specifying methodology or protocol. It specified that surveys cover “the full amphibian breeding season to ensure that the peak periods of activity for early and late breeding species are accounted for”. However, the NHE study does not cover the full breeding season, considering weather conditions of the 2021 breeding season. (see comment below)a.Please provide all field data sheets/cards.b.Given the wetland-woodland associations present in the study area, the presence of Salamanders is possible and dedicated salamander breeding surveys could have been conducted as the TOR stated, “For non-calling amphibians, appropriate methodology will be used.”. Incidental observations alone are not sufficient for salamanders, as they are highly unlikely to be detected through incidental observations alone. Suitable salamander habitat (woodland-wetland associations) should be treated as candidate SWH.c.While they broadly meet the general MMP survey protocol requirements (noting that the MMP protocol offers time frames that are “generally” the peak calling periods, while seasonally variable conditions must also be accounted for in any given year.), and the minimum required number of surveys required by the TOR, the Amphibian survey dates did not cover the full range of the 2021 breeding season, considering the seasonal weather conditions that year: Spring 2021 was warm and dry, with several weeks of temperatures > 5 deg C, prior to the first Amphibian breeding survey date, and multiple rain days in late March-early April, over two weeks prior to the first amphibian survey. It is therefore not unlikely that early-breeding species such as Wood Frog or Chorus Frog may have been missed, resulting in a false negative result for those species. The results must therefore be understood in light of this and a precautionary approach applied. d. In light of the above, AMPH3 should be treated as candidate SWH, and the appropriate habitat and Amphibian Movement corridor mapped per the SWHECS region 6E habitat guidelines. Please show this on an updated wildlife habitat map.	Dillon	<p>While the TOR did not specify a specific survey protocol, it is our experience that the standard MMP protocol has been the accepted default protocol used across southern Ontario when assessing amphibian habitat for land development applications. In addition, if a specific protocol was required by the Town, it should have been noted through the TOR process and in the first set of comments. The amphibian surveys were completed within the correct windows, under suitable weather conditions as established by an accepted protocol.</p> <p>We standby the results of our amphibian survey which identified confirmed SWH for Amphibian Breeding Habitat (woodland) north of AMPH2. Since the surveys did not meet the SWH criteria at AMPH3, it was not confirmed at SWH.</p> <p>Regarding Amphibian Movement Corridors, the criteria for confirmed were not met based on the existing conditions since the HDFs did not have 15 m of vegetation on both banks and the gaps between woodland habitat were greater than 20 m. However, the area to the east has been mapped as Candidate SWH for Amphibian Movement Corridor since it will likely be naturalized in the future. Figure 6 and Section 5.2.6 have been updated to include this discussion. Note, development has not been proposed within this area and existing natural heritage features will be protected by appropriate buffers.</p>

Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.j	8.0 Impact Assessment: Needs to include discussion of the specific proposed impacts, including but not limited to: proposed encroachments and buffer modifications, impacts of changes/diversions assessed in the WWB Risk Assessment and in the Feature-based Water Balance Assessment, impacts of proposed HDF alterations, removals or mitigations, and proposed subwatershed flow diversions shown in the FSR.	Dillon	Section 8.0 and Section 9.0 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.k	8.1.1 Diversion of Surface Water Flows: As stated in the HDFA guidelines, Management of "Mitigation" type HDFs requires functions be replicated in an open BMP, such as constructed wetlands, enhanced lot-level conveyances, etc., not diverted to SWM ponds. HDF length is part of its form and function to be replicated.	Dillon	Section 8.1.1. has been updated to include mitigation measures. The SABE study and the HDFA guidelines only require replication of function for HDFs. They did not have a requirement to replicate form or length.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.l	8.1.3 Tree and Vegetation Removal: The report states, "as well as the proposed Secondary Plan are detailed on Figure 7. As shown, the proposed Secondary Plan results in the encroachment of some Town required buffer areas. These include:•0.66 ha of wetland buffer encroachment•0.48 ha of Significant Woodland buffer encroachment Refer to Section 9 for mitigation and enhancement opportunities. " Avoidance of encroachment is the first requirement, if possible. this is not possible, demonstrate why not. Add policy analysis and corresponding	Dillon	Section 8.1.3. has been updated to include further discussion on removals and encroachments. Section 9 has been updated to discuss encroachments and compensation.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.m	8.1.4 Loss of and/or Disturbance to Wildlife: For species such as bats and Barn Swallow, other habitats (e.g., foraging, roosting, etc.) must also be included in addition to nesting habitat. Include MIST recommendations as appropriate for mitigation of potential impacts to SWH.	Dillon	Mitigation for wildlife impacts are discussed in Section 9.3.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.n	8.2.2 Colonization of Non-native and/or Invasive Species and 9.2.1 Landscaping and Planting Plan: Include direction that any root, stem, seed or other parts of invasive species that are disturbed, removed or otherwise managed must be collected and properly disposed of in landfill offsite. Such material may not be mulched, composted, slash-piled or in any other way reused or dispersed onsite or in nearby areas, especially natural areas, as many such species may be propagated this way.	Dillon	Section 9.2.1 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.o	9.3 Wildlife Impact Mitigation Plan: The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (FWCA) requires that various species of wildlife be protected, including bird species not covered by the Migratory Bird Convention Act (MBCA). Include direction to observe such protections as required, and to conduct nest searches outside the nominal migratory bird breeding season where applicable for such species (e.g., raptors, owls, etc.).	Dillon	Section 9.3 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.p	9.4 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan: add direction to avoid non-woven plastic mesh products, to eliminate the entanglement risk these incur to wildlife.	Dillon	Section 9.4 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Natural Heritage Study Report	2.q	Appendix C – Headwater Drainage Assessment Tables – A map should be included for reference.	Dillon	Refer to Figure 4.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Secondary Plan	3.a	NH Policies which address protection or avoidance of impacts to Natural Heritage features, functions and areas must be included in the Secondary Plan and Official Plan Amendment.	Bousfields	BNHSP policies have been further refined and are consistent with the approach taken other Secondary plan Approvals.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Secondary Plan	3.b	Please clarify why some policies refer to development in the Green Belt Plan and Oak Ridges Moraine Plan areas. If development is proposed for those areas, they must be included in the primary study area and the analyses completed now.	Bousfields	No development is proposed in these areas. However, infrastructure such as SWM Ponds are permitted to encroach into these areas which is reflected in the BNHSP Policies.

Parks and Natural Heritage	Secondary Plan - 7.17.4 Growth Management Strategy	3.c	7.17.4.7.1 – For clarity and to minimize ambiguity, please refer to site specific Natural Heritage studies using the term EISMP (Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan), or EIS for short. This is consistent with the subsequent direction within the draft Secondary Plan text (7.17.4.7.2), and will serve to distinguish it from the higher level (secondary plan) NHSR.	Bousfields	BNHSP Policies revised to reflect appropriate naming conventions.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Secondary Plan - 7.17.7 Parks and Open Spaces	3.d	7.17.7.1.2 – As it pertains to the Natural Environment System and EPA (Environmental Policy Areas), the plan shall conform with section 13. Natural Environment System.	Bousfields	BNHSP policies have been updated to ensure conformity with Future Caledon OP.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Secondary Plan - 7.17.7 Parks and Open Spaces	3.e	7.17.7.1.7 – Recreational uses are not consistent with NH buffer functions. Therefore, trails can only be included within EPA areas if additional space (corresponding to the planned trail corridor width) is added to the EPA to accommodate the trail. Furthermore, the trail must be located in the outermost portion of the VPZ buffer width (i.e., the several meter wide band furthest from the NH feature).	Bousfields	BNHSP policies have been updated to address potential opportunities for trail opportunities.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Secondary Plan - 7.17.7 Parks and Open Spaces	3.f	7.17.7.1.8 – Lighting in EPA spaces: Lighting in EPA shall be avoided where possible. Where it cannot be avoided, lighting shall be minimized and Dark Sky standards/BMPs shall be implemented to minimize potential impacts on wildlife and NH features and areas.	Bousfields	BNHSP policies have been revised with the proposed language.
Parks and Natural Heritage	FSR	4.a	11.0 Conclusions & Recommendations: it is noted that a future version of the Hydrogeological Report will include a water balance assessment to demonstrate LID	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix - NHSR	35	a. through e.: Comments are addressed.	Dillon	Acknowledged
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix - NHSR	36	a. Redside Dace: Given the proximity of the study area to downstream Dace habitat, the determination of the MECP is required to demonstrate whether they agree with the stated habitat assessment. Even without protected habitat present, this information is needed to inform the HDFA, as well as confirm specific protection/mitigation measures, if any. Please provide any correspondence with the Ministry as an appendix to the NHSR.	Dillon	Please see our response regarding MECP correspondence above.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix - NHSR	36	b. Noted.	Dillon	n/a
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix - NHSR	36	c. Noted: pending updated mapping showing staked woodlands and other feature delineations.	Dillon	Figures have been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix - NHSR	36	d. Addressed through section 10 of the NHSR. Note however, that minimum buffer policies must be met, and compensation/offsetting will be the first order requirement, unless shown to be impossible. Space for such compensation should be demonstrated on Secondary Plan maps.	Dillon	Section 9 and Figure 8 have been updated to address proposed buffer encroachments

Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix - NHSR	36	e. Mitigation management of HDFs: Comment is partially addressed: “Essentially, their function on the landscape requires replication, which is movement of surface flow downstream.” This is an oversimplification of the management requirements. As articulated in the HDFA guidelines as well as the SABE Part C guidelines, Mitigation requires replication or enhancement of functions “... through enhanced lot level conveyance measures, such as well-vegetated swales (herbaceous, shrub and tree material) to mimic online wet vegetation pockets, or replicate through constructed wetland features connected to downstream; Replicate on-site flow and outlet flows at the top end of system to maintain feature functions with vegetated swales, bioswales, etc. If catchment drainage has been previously removed due to diversion of stormwater flows, restore lost functions through enhanced lot level controls (i.e. restore original catchment using clean roof drainage); Replicate functions by lot level conveyance measures (e.g. vegetated swales) connected to the natural heritage system, as feasible and/or Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater options ” (HDFA Guidelines, TRCA 2014) Note that length of the feature is part of its form and function which must be replicated.	Dillon	Please see our response above. Section 5.1.1 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix - NHSR	36	f. HDFs and woodlands on non-participating properties: partially addressed. Some features are not identified. The Secondary Plan must identify all such features and provide recommendations to evaluate such lands in the future.	Dillon	Figures have been updated to be clearer.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix -HDFA	37	See HDFA section, above. Under the conditions that prevailed, a more conservative analysis was warranted. A re-do of the survey is advisable but not required. However, the reassessment of the features provided above will be applied unless new data is provided for review, which conforms to the guideline conditions.	Dillon	Please see our response above. Section 5.1.1 has been updated.
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix -WWBRA	38	Noted.	Dillon	n/a
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix -WWBRA	42.g	Addressed.	Dillon	n/a
Parks and Natural Heritage	Comment Response Matrix -WWBRA	42.h	Tributary realignment using natural channel design: Mitigation management status of HDFs should involve open, well-vegetated lot-level conveyances, constructed wetlands, and/or LIDs, not piping of flows, as per HDFA and SABE guidelines. It is generally preferable that all ‘clean’ external drainage be conveyed directly to the existing outlets to avoid mixing with storm drainage from the development. Further, it is preferred that this conveyance be via open channels. Opportunities to utilize open channels as per the recommendations of the headwater drainage feature assessment guidelines should be explored. Refer to relevant comments regarding headwater drainage features above.	Dillon	Section 9.1 has been updated to include discussion on suitable LIDS and BMPs to replicate HDF function.
Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, April 6 2023					
Krystina Koops, krystina.koops@dp.cdsb.org					
DPCDSB	Comment	-	The applicant proposes the development of 1554 detached, 2165 townhouse and 417 high density units which are anticipated to yield: •455 Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8 Students; and •326 Grade 9 to Grade 12 Students	-	

DPCDSB	Comment	-		-	
DPCDSB	Comment	-	Based on the projected yields, an elementary school will be required to service plan. The proposed school block of 2.4 ha is adequate in size for our accommodation needs, however we will require a facility fit plan to ensure that the block will be functional for the construction of an elementary school.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. 2.4 hectares is provided.
DPCDSB	Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan	-	Section 4.3 – The Board is satisfied with the policies and requirements for the preparation of a Community-Wide Development Staging and Sequencing Plan. (DSSP)	Bousfields	Acknowledged. Updated DSSP has been provided which provides that the school site is within the first phase lands. The final DSSP would be provided with a future Tertiary Plan Submission.
DPCDSB	Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan	-	Section 7.1.1 – While the Board does not object to co-location of facilities, such as the playfields, there is a concern with the northerly school site. The shared field is located on non-participating landowners. This northerly site also appears to have a narrow lot frontage that will be difficult to assess without a proper facility fit. The plan also does not distinguish between which sites are for the Peel District School and Dufferin-Peel	Bousfields	School Site is entirely located on a participating landowner parcel.
DPCDSB	Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan	-	Section 7.1.2 – The requirement for a facility fit will also be required if a facility fit is not completed for the secondary plan.	Bousfields	A Draft Facility Fit Plan has been provided based on CAD received from the School Board. Should a more comprehensive facility fit be required, the landowner may provide additional details within their Draft Plan of Subdivision application.
DPCDSB	Requests prior to approval	-	The Board requests the following prior to approval: 1. That the applicant shall submit a satisfactory facility fit for the elementary school block.	Bousfields	See above.
Town of Caledon, Engineering, July 28, 2025					
Cassie Schembri and Hadiseh Bolkhari					
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	-	Based on the provided approach, the Stage 2 report will serve as a draft of the full Local Subwatershed Study, combining Phases 1 through 3 into a single document, and will include integrated studies for the BNH lands. Hydrologic and hydraulic modeling requiring calibration will be completed using only one full year of monitoring data (June 2024 – June 2025). The Stage 3 report will respond to comments from Stage 2 and incorporate updated model calibration using three years of monitoring data, along with any necessary adjustments to the stormwater management plan. However, this approach may complicate and lengthen the review process, particularly since the Town is considering peer review; relying on an initial report based on limited data may not be the	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	1	The Stage 2 report will be based on a single year of monitoring data (June 2024–June 2025), which may not capture the full range of weather variability (e.g., wet, and dry years) needed for robust hydrologic model calibration. This limitation could lead to underestimation or overestimation of peak flows, baseflows, and erosion risks. Stage 2 of the Subwatershed Study must be based on a minimum of two (2) full years of continuous groundwater and surface water monitoring data. The current TOR indicates Stage 2 will rely on one (1) year of data, which is not acceptable. The Town cannot support a secondary plan, or any confirmation of development limits based on only one	Crozier	Acknowledged

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	2	Stage 2 may be accepted to support the secondary plan approval only. However, policies must be embedded in the secondary plan clarifying that no development limits or SWM strategies are finalized until Stage 3 is completed and approved.	Crozier	Please see our response regarding MECP correspondence above.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	3	Stage 3 of the Subwatershed Study must be completed and approved prior to draft plan of subdivision approval. The TOR suggests draft plan approval may proceed prior to Stage 3. The Town will not support this approach. Applicants may proceed with secondary plan approvals and subsequent draft plans at their own risk, recognizing that final development limits, stormwater strategies, and mitigation measures will not be confirmed until Stage 3 is complete and approved. Stage 3 must deliver final SWM strategies, development limits, and mitigation measures that can be carried forward into	Crozier	Noted
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	4	Event Based Model: Although a model for the Humber River watershed was completed and approved by TRCA (Civica, 2018), it does not include the level of detail required for this study area. Furthermore, the model was not calibrated locally—there is no calibration point downstream of the study area, and the available streamflow data was not used to validate conditions in the headwaters. As such, the model is insufficient for detailed hydrologic assessment and requires refinement and localized calibration.	Crozier	Figures have been updated.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	5	The Bolton McFall Dam, located north of King Street East and west of Highway 50, on the main branch of the Humber River, is representative of flows generated from half of the study area, in addition to a significant external drainage area. While it provides valuable data for regional calibration, its location on the main branch limits its usefulness for validating flows specifically within the study area subcatchments being studied. Please provide clarification if flow gauges have been installed at MM-9-2 – Tributary C+D to improve the accuracy of model calibration and validation, it is recommended that. This location is more directly representative of upstream, localized hydrologic responses within the study area and would provide critical data for refining model performance in smaller, more sensitive drainage areas. Additionally, please provide the rain gauge location I the vicinity of the study area to support a more precise understanding of rainfall-runoff relationships and further refining model calibration.	Crozier	Section 9 and Figure 8 have been updated to address proposed buffer encroachments
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	6	We acknowledge and support the need to update the model to incorporate more detailed soils and topographic data specific to the study area, ensuring improved accuracy and representation of existing conditions. As part of this refinement, we recommend increasing the number of existing conditions subcatchments to better represent variations in land use, soil types, and vegetation coverage.	Crozier	Please see our response above. Section 5.1.1 has been updated.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	7	The ToR should acknowledge that an erosion assessment needs to be conducted in accordance with the TRCA erosion assessment protocol. The erosion assessment will determine the erosion control criteria that will be used to size the stormwater management facility, with the aim of mitigating the impact of erosion resulting from the proposed development.	Crozier	Figures have been updated to be clearer.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study Draft Terms of Reference	8	It is recommended that the 2023 LiDAR dataset be used as the base for floodplain mapping, as it aligns with current standards and provides the most up-to-date topographic information. If the 2014 LiDAR is to be used instead, then comprehensive, field-based map checking must be completed to confirm its accuracy and overall suitability for hydraulic modeling. Please note that the 2014/2015 LiDAR is referenced to the CGVD28 vertical datum, while the 2023 LiDAR uses the CGVD2013 vertical datum, which is the current national standard.	Crozier	Please see our response above. Section 5.1.1 has been updated.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	9	The Subwatershed Study is being delivered through a staged process: The Stage 1 provides preliminary Phases 1 and 2, using baseline characterization data (hydrogeology, surface water, geomorphology, and ecological surveys) collected since 2021–2022. However, much of the hydrologic analysis remains preliminary because continuous hydrologic modeling and full calibration require longer-term datasets. The Stage 2 report is intended to function as a draft of the full Local Subwatershed Study, combining Phases 1 through 3 into a single document and integrating all studies for the Bolton North Hill lands. Hydrologic and hydraulic modeling requiring calibration will rely on only one full year of monitoring data (June 2024 – June 2025). The Stage 3 report will address comments from Stage 2 and update model calibration with three years of monitoring data, making any required adjustments to the stormwater management plan. This staged approach presents several challenges:	Crozier	
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	9a	Relying on a draft report based on limited monitoring data will require revisions to hydrologic results, stormwater designs, and land use constraints once the additional monitoring and calibration are complete.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	9b	Multiple submission rounds will lengthen the review process, especially if peer review is undertaken by the Town as peer review and agency comments will need to be addressed more than once. Each round of review and peer validation will add significant consultant and review costs, as updated models and revised stormwater management plans will need to be resubmitted and reassessed. The iterative revisions could increase	Crozier	Section 9.1 has been updated to include discussion on suitable LIDS and BMPs to replicate HDF function.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	9c	Using preliminary data for Secondary Plan decisions could create uncertainty for downstream studies and approvals, potentially requiring redesigns of the stormwater facility sizing, drainage plans, and development limits established in early drafts may not align with final calibrated results.	Crozier	Crozier informed the Town that the collected monitoring data downstream of the development was insufficient to calibrate the hydrologic model because of dry readings. Crozier is working with the Town to provide a sensitivity analysis instead to fill the gaps in the data.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	9	This process moves forward at the proponent's own risk, as any refinements driven by peer review, additional monitoring, or updated modeling could significantly increase costs, trigger redesigns, and delay approvals.	Crozier	Acknowledged.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	10	Section 2, Study Area of the report does not delineate primary and secondary study areas or clarify jurisdictional boundaries. The Primary Study Area (PSA) refers to the lands proposed for development through the Secondary Plan, where work is detailed and supported by field investigations. The Secondary Study Area (SSA) includes the broader lands beyond the PSA but within the subwatershed limits, where the study is less detailed and based on desktop data and confirmatory field work. The Secondary Study Area is bounded by the extent of topographically derived subcatchments within jurisdictions of the TRCA which flow into or out of the Primary Study Area.	Crozier	Figure 1 Study Area has been updated to delineate the primary plan and secondary study areas.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	11	Figure 3 (Main Humber Subwatershed Plan) must clearly outline and label the Bolton North Hill study area boundary, so its location within the larger watershed is identified.	Crozier	The Bolton North Hill study area is outlined on Figure 3.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	12	The CTC Source Protection Plan (Clean Water Act) material is discussed later in the report (Section 21.1 – Groundwater) but is not summarized in Section 7. This makes the section incomplete given that the lands include Highly Vulnerable Aquifers (HVA) and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRA).	Crozier	Discussion will be added to Section 7 as part of the next submission.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	13	While the report includes a Gap Analysis section, it does not clearly identify specific deficiencies in datasets, field programs, or technical analyses. The section does not provide what critical studies or data are incomplete, how these gaps affect current findings, or how they will be resolved. For example, the report does not highlight. The lack of detail makes it unclear how Stage 2 and 3 will build on Stage 1 findings or how uncertainties will be addressed before finalizing hydrologic calibration and stormwater strategies. The report should explicitly flag these gaps and provides a roadmap for completion.	Crozier	The SWS will be updated to identify specific deficiencies in datasets, such as the lack of obtainable flow data, and will provide a roadmap for completion.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	14	The objectives listed in Section 5 of the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan Subwatershed Study are solid and well-aligned with typical watershed planning goals. However, when compared to the Town of Caledon's Local Subwatershed Study Terms of Reference, a few key elements are missing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Climate Change Impact Assessment: evaluating climate change scenarios and integrating those impacts into hydrologic, hydraulic, and ecological assessments. •Adaptive Management Framework: While monitoring is mentioned, the ToR requires post-development monitoring informing future planning and potential strategy revisions. •Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Engagement to guide the study through all phases. •Public and Indigenous Engagement •Model calibration and validation as a core deliverable. •Coordination with servicing, transportation, and land use planning to avoid iterative redesigns. •Assessment of cumulative and downstream impacts beyond the study area 	Crozier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A climate change impact assessment will be included as part of the SWS. 2. Verbiage has been added stating post-development monitoring will be provided. 3. A TAC has been established between Crozier, the Town, TRCA, and Region. Verbiage has been included citing that the TAC is being engaged to guide the study through each phase. 4. Verbiage has been added regarding engagement. A PIC was held on September 16, 2025. 5. Verbiage has been added regarding calibrating and validating a model. 6. Verbiage has been added regarding coordination between different disciplines to avoid iterative redesigns. 7. Verbiage has been added regarding a downstream analysis.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	15	Section 21.4, Table 28: LID Alternatives credits downspout disconnections to lawns and topsoil amendments toward recharge restoration. Per the Town's Development Standards Manual (2019, Section 3.4.2) and CLI-ECA requirements, these measures cannot be credited unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •They are part of a legally enforceable, maintained LID system (e.g., rain gardens, soakaway pits). •They are supported by field-verified infiltration rates and operation/maintenance plans. The report must remove these unsupported credits and rely on engineered LID facilities with documented performance to meet recharge targets.	Crozier	Downspout disconnections to lawns and topsoil amendments will not be considered because they are not part of a legally enforceable, maintained system, and they are not supported by field-verified infiltration rates and operation/maintenance plans. These credits have been removed from the report.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	16	The FSR and SWS Report defer the feasibility of proposed LID facilities to future Draft Plan submissions, despite the site being within a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) and the Hydrogeology Report identifying a substantial post-development infiltration deficit. A concept-level LID plan is required to demonstrate how pre-development recharge rates will be maintained or offset. The conceptual plan must include preliminary sizing and performance estimates, such as drawdown times, infiltration rates, and estimated storage volumes to confirm feasibility and ensure the proposed stormwater strategy can maintain the site's recharge and hydrologic functions before advancing to Draft Plan.	Crozier	The requested level of detail appears to exceed standard practice at this stage. A lumped area per mini-watershed can be identified for LID implementation, along with specific recommendations for potential sources of clean water.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	17	Section 8 mentions fourteen (14) piezometers and seven (7) flow monitors were placed to track streams, wetlands, and downstream locations. The report notes installations were restricted to accessible lands, but does not clarify how coverage gaps (e.g., non-participating properties, critical headwater areas) will be addressed. The section lacks details on sampling frequency (monthly, seasonal, event-based).	Crozier	Additional detail will be added to this section of the SIS.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	18	Section 23 of the report primarily restates the Town of Caledon Terms of Reference climate change requirements rather than providing a project-specific climate change assessment. The report does not include any analysis of projected climate impacts or	Crozier	Climate change assessment to be provided in the LSWS.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	19	The stormwater strategy must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Demonstrate compliance with TRCA Appendix E2 (thermal mitigation) by incorporating off-line infiltration and filtration prior to ponds. •Avoid reliance on ponds alone for thermal control. •Include redundant erosion/sediment controls per TRCA guidelines. The current SWS design does not show how these criteria will be met.	Crozier	As outlined in Appendix E-2, thermal mitigation applies to pond outfalls and is only required for discharges to cold water tributaries.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	20	The SWM of the report should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Pre and post development drainage area plans showing external drainage, overland flow routes, flood lines, and ponding depths, •Clear mapping of minor (storm sewer) and major (overland flow) systems, or •Confirmation that there is no grading within Regional ROWs as required under the Region of Peel Stormwater Management Report Requirements (Dec 2022) and the Stormwater Design Criteria Manual (2019). •Retention of the first 5 mm and capture/treatment of the 90th percentile rainfall event (27–28 mm) using the Control Hierarchy (LID prioritization) •24–48-hour detention of 25 mm events for erosion control •A site-specific water balance matching pre-development infiltration and hydroperiods for SGRAs, wetlands, or sensitive receivers. 	Crozier	Confirmation of floodlines on the DAP is not typically requested. Ponding depths are not available at the SWS level. Capture of the 90th percentile rainfall event is only required if a site specific water balance is not provided. The LSWS includes a water balance for the study area.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	20	As per Section 8.2.4 of the Town of Caledon Development Standards (2019), proponents must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. 	Crozier	To be addressed at Draft Plan stage.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	20	Pond locations must avoid regulated features, shallow water tables, or artesian conditions. Section 8.1 shows seasonal groundwater fluctuations of up to 4 m, yet no preliminary dewatering or mounding assessment is provided. Per Conservation Halton/TRCA dewatering guidelines and MECP ECA criteria, a radius-of-influence estimate and	Crozier	Preliminary dewatering calculations will be provided. Mounding calculations can be completed during detailed design stage.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	21	Section 10 Hydrogeology describes the regional aquifer system and reviews well records within 500 m of the study area but does not include the door-to-door private well survey within 500 m, dewatering calculations, or a contingency plan for well complaints, and provides no mapping of recharge or discharge zones in relation to the proposed SWMP blocks or sensitive NHS features. In addition, required digital deliverables, including GIS layers for private wells, aquifer extents, and recharge areas, are not provided.	Crozier	A door-to-door survey will be completed for the site and a contingency plan will be included within the subwatershed study. Mapping of the recharge and discharge zones with relation to the proposed SWMP blocks or sensitive NHS features will be included. Digital deliverables can also be provided. It is not anticipated that permanent dewatering will be required for the site. Construction dewatering will be addressed on a site-by-site basis at the Site Plan approval stage. Preliminary dewatering estimates will be included.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	22	To ensure accuracy, the hydrology model needs to be revised using the proposed land use condition and drainage patterns. We must establish regulatory peak flows based on proposed conditions, which will be determined by the greater of uncontrolled 100-year peak flow or Hurricane Hazel flow.	Crozier	The hydrologic model has been updated to reflect proposed land use conditions and drainage patterns.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	23	The establishment of the final regulatory flood lines needs to be based on the peak flows that result from proposed land use conditions, which should be greater than the uncontrolled 100-year flow or Hurricane Hazel flow. To achieve this, the existing hydrology model must be updated using the proposed land use conditions and drainage patterns. After that, the regulatory peak flows, i.e., the greater of uncontrolled 100-year peak flow or Hurricane Hazel flow, can be established based on the proposed	Crozier	Information on floodlines updated with proposed flows will be incorporated into Phase 2.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	24	The hydrologic modeling (Visual OTTHYMO) for the Bolton North Hill Lands is based on a TRCA-provided Humber River/Cold Creek watershed model but has been refined by Crozier through subdivision of subcatchments (17 internal drainage areas for Option 1, 8 external catchments, and additional east/west/downstream catchments) using Land Information Ontario topography and local drainage features (culverts, ditches, bridges). However, the report does not clearly document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •How the Crozier refinements differ from TRCA's original subcatchment boundaries (e.g., changes in areas, land use distribution, or outlet locations). •Updated LiDAR data (2023) must be used for catchment delineation and refinement of subcatchment divides as the TRCA model is based on 2014-2015 LiDAR. •Updated subcatchment imperviousness and hydrologic parameters calculations •The impact of these refinements on peak flow estimates at Cold Creek and Humber River nodes. 	Crozier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refinements to the VO model will be discussed within the SWS. 2. The LiDAR data has been updated to 2023 and stated in the SWS. 3. Subcatchment imperviousness and hydrologic parameter calculations have been updated in the SWS. 4. The impact of these refinements on Cold Creek and the Humber River nodes are described in the SWS.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	24	Per the Town of Caledon SWS TOR (Section 5.3) and TRCA modeling standards, the report must provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •A table comparing Crozier's updated subcatchments against the original TRCA model (areas, imperviousness, outlet locations). •A Visual OTTHYMO schematic showing the updated model layout, connectivity, and nodes. •Peak flow comparison tables (for key nodes and design storms) demonstrating that the updated model remains consistent with TRCA's calibration. 	Crozier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A table comparing updated subcatchments against the TRCA model has been added to the SWS. 2. A schematic showing the updated VO model has been included. 3. Peak flow comparison tables demonstrating consistency with the TRCA model has been included.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	25	Figure 7 Existing Condition Catchment Drainage Plan should include an overlay comparing the TRCA-provided subcatchment boundaries with Crozier's refined subcatchments. This visual comparison is needed to clearly identify which areas were subdivided, how outlet locations or drainage divides were shifted, and how the updated drainage network is different with TRCA's watershed model. The figure should also include labels for all internal and external catchments, outlet nodes, and receiving tributaries to ensure traceability in the hydrologic model.	Crozier	Figure 7 has been updated to include an overlay comparing the TRCA-provided boundaries with Crozier's refined subcatchments.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	26	Table 4: Existing Condition Peak Flow Summary, a map illustrating the tributaries should be included directly in this section to support clarity and spatial understanding, rather than referring exclusively to Appendix C. A detailed catchment map should be provided, explicitly identifying the location and layout of all tributaries within each catchment for understanding the flow paths and how different sub-areas contribute to the overall peak flow. Each significant point in the VO mode schematic (e.g., confluence points, or locations where peak flows are summarized) must be assigned a unique Node ID. These Node IDs should directly correspond to the identifiers used in the "Existing Condition Peak Flow Summary" table to ensure traceability between the spatial model and the tabular results. This will help to easily cross-reference the calculated peak flows with their respective locations within the drainage system.	Crozier	A map will be included in Section 11.2 to illustrate the location of the tributaries.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	27	The Time to Peak Calculations assign a uniform runoff coefficient ($C = 0.25$) to all catchments (Appendix C 1 of the FSR), regardless of soil type, land cover, or hydrologic conditions. Per TRCA and Conservation Authority Technical Guidelines (2017, Section 3.9 and Table 3.2.11), C-values must reflect actual catchment characteristics. Agricultural lands on King and Monaghan Clay Loams (Group C/D) typically warrant C-values closer to 0.30–0.35, while woodlots or sandy loam areas (Pontypool) may justify lower values (0.20). A single constant value risks misrepresenting time-to-peak estimates and subsequent flow calculations. Please consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oRecalculate C-values per catchment, based on land cover and soil mapping. oConfirm that the Airport Method remains valid ($C < 0.4$) for each catchment. oResubmit the Time to Peak table and tc inputs, along with a spreadsheet and GIS shapefiles showing the parameters used. 	Crozier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Runoff coefficients will be reviewed as part of the model validation 2. The airport method remains valid for each catchment. 3. Time to Peak and Tc inputs are included as part of the appendices.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	28	The updated hydrology model must be supported by calibration or validation data (stream gauges, precipitation events) before being used for design flows.	Crozier	Noted. The updated hydrology model will be validated as part of the local subwatershed study.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	29	<p>The report notes: "As part of the Stage 2 submission, this model will be incorporated into the larger Humber model to establish a baseline for an evaluation of downstream impacts." While Stage 1 included Phase 1 characterization and preliminary Phase 2 work, the following Phase 2 hydrology tasks remain outstanding and must be completed in the next submission to satisfy the Town's Local Subwatershed Study TOR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oIntegrate and calibrate the Bolton North Hill hydrologic model into TRCA's Humber watershed model, using updated catchment boundaries (2023 LiDAR), soils, and land use data. oEstablish a calibrated existing conditions baseline for 2-, 5-, 10-, 25-, 50-, 100-year, and regional storm events, quantifying peak flows, runoff volumes, baseflow, and infiltration. Flow gauges must be installed and operated for a minimum of two years to provide sufficient data for model calibration and validation. The report does not clearly state how many gauges, their exact locations, or how much data has been collected to date. oModel future land use scenarios and quantify changes in peak flows, runoff volumes, erosion potential, and downstream flooding risks. oApply climate change factors (per Town and Region IDF guidance) to evaluate flow and flood impacts under future conditions. oAssess downstream impacts at key Humber control points, in coordination with TRCA's hydraulic model, confirming pre-development flow targets can be met. oEvaluate and test SWM and LID options (on-site and/or regional) to mitigate flow. <p>The consultant must provide complete model files, hydrographs, and comparison tables/figures for existing and future conditions to validate stormwater management (SWM) strategies. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oFull documentation of calibration/validation results, with direct comparisons to observed flow and water level data. oVerification of consistency with TRSPA water balance tool outputs (where applicable). <p>Deliverables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oModel files (e.g., Visual OTTHYMO, PCSWMM) with all inputs and outputs. oHydrographs and time-series data for key nodes. oComparison tables/figures showing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oPre- vs. post-development peak flows, runoff volumes, and infiltration rates. oAlignment with TRCA/Town targets (e.g., erosion thresholds, climate change adjustments). <p>Calibration reports detailing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oMethodology (e.g., statistical metrics like Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency). oObserved vs. modeled discrepancies and resolutions. 	Crozier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The BNH hydrologic model has been incorporated into the TRCA's model using updated catchment boundaries, soils, and land-use data. The model has been updated to use 2023 LiDAR. 2. Crozier informed the Town that the collected monitoring data downstream of the development was insufficient to calibrate the hydrologic model because of dry readings. Crozier is working with the Town to provide a sensitivity analysis instead to fill the gaps in the data. 3. Future land-use scenarios have been incorporated into the model. Peak flows, runoff volumes, erosion potential, and downstream flooding risks are shown and explained in the SWS. 4. Climate change factors have been applied to evaluate future flood and flow impacts. 5. Downstream impacts have been assessed in coordination with TRCA's hydraulic model. 6. SWM and LID options have been assessed as part of the SWS.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	29	<p>Section 11.5 states that the integrated surface-groundwater hydrologic model (PCSWMM) will be developed once one year of surface water monitoring data has been collected, and that this model will be built to run as a continuous model for water balance, wetland risk assessment, and erosion assessment. While this reflects a preliminary Phase 2 commitment, it does not yet meet the Town's LSS TOR requirements for Phase 2.</p>	Crozier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Calibration/validation results will be provided as part of the SWS when flows in the tributaries are obtained. 2. Verification for consistency with TRSPA water balance tools will be provided if relevant. <p>Deliverables to be provided in local subwatershed study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Model files for VO and HEC-RAS will be included. 2. Hydrographs and time series data for key nodes will be included. 3. Comparison tables showing pre- vs. post-development results will be included in the SWS. 4. Alignment with TRCA/Town Targets will be provided in the SWS. 5. The methodology will be explained in the SWS. 6. Discrepancies and resolutions will be outlined as part of the SWS.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	30	<p>Section 11.5 states that the integrated surface-groundwater hydrologic model (PCSWMM) will be developed once one year of surface water monitoring data has been collected, and that this model will be built to run as a continuous model for water balance, wetland risk assessment, and erosion assessment. While this reflects a preliminary Phase 2 commitment, it does not yet meet the Town's LSS TOR requirements for Phase 2.</p>	Crozier	<p>A VO Model will be submitted in lieu of a PCSWMM model and meet the Town's LSS TOR. The data required to calibrate this model is still being collected. Crozier will provide a sensitivity analysis in place of calibration which will be used until sufficient data is collected to calibrate the model. Updates have been made to the monitoring plan to improve data collection.</p>

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	30	Phase 2 must deliver the fully calibrated and validated continuous model for both existing and future conditions, along with all supporting datasets, to fulfill the LSS TOR.	Crozier	Crozier informed the Town that the collected monitoring data downstream of the development was insufficient to calibrate the hydrologic model because of dry readings. Crozier is working with the Town to provide a sensitivity analysis instead to fill the gaps in the data.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	31	Section 11.4 Existing Hydraulic Model of the report states that, per TRCA pre-consultation, the existing Main Humber River hydraulic model does not require re-modelling as the floodplain is well outside the site” However, the TRCA correspondence only shows a request for model data and does not confirm that no updates or verification are required. For Phase 2, the consultant must review the existing the Main Humber model and perform the required updates to model downstream boundary conditions under future land use and climate change scenarios and upgrade the tributary models (currently estimate”) to fully engineered models with culverts, bridges, updated LiDAR, and land use data to meet Town and TRCA standards.	Crozier	The hydraulic model for the Main Humber is an engineered model and does not require any updates to the model geometry. The hydraulic models for the site have been combined and the flow files for the main humber were updated based on the updated hydrologic modeling. Plans have been included in the model for both existing and proposed conditions.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	32	Appendix C, VO Modelling Results, shows WARNING: STORAGE COEFF. IS SMALLER THAN TIME STEP! Please consider the following to eliminate the warning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Extend the Storage-Discharge Table - Add more rows to your rating curve with higher storage values and corresponding outflows. - Make sure the last row in the table has a storage value greater than the maximum used in the simulation •Enable Overflow - If the reservoir is allowed to overflow, activate the overflow option in the ROUTE RESERVOIR command. This lets the model manage excess water beyond the defined rating curve. •Reduce the Time Step (DT), a smaller DT (e.g., 1.0 min instead of 5.0 min) can improve accuracy and reduce the chance of exceeding the table. •Check Initial Conditions, ensure the initial storage or elevation is within the defined range of your table. Starting too close to the upper limit can cause early exceedance. •Review Inflow Volume to ensure the inflow is not too high for the reservoir’s capacity, 	Crozier	This warning is unrelated to reservoirs. While DT can be reduced, we believe the difference is not considered significant.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	33	The report directs the reader to “Appendix C of the FSR/SWM Report for additional details regarding downstream boundary conditions,” but the relevant information is contained in Table 27 of Section 8.0 (Floodplain Analysis) of the FSR. This reference must be corrected, and the downstream boundary conditions (flows, water levels, return periods, and derivation) should be clearly summarized within the main LSS report. Additionally, all hydrology, hydraulic modeling, and floodplain analysis must be fully documented within the LSS report itself rather than only in a separate FSR appendix, to ensure completeness and transparency for review.	Crozier	This reference has been corrected and all modelling/floodplain analysis is documented within the LSS report.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	34	The report notes that four tributaries from TRCA’s estimated model were updated and three new tributaries were added, with a revised naming convention summarized in Table 5. However, no figure or map is provided to illustrate the locations and extents of these tributaries relative to the Site. To support review and ensure clarity, a map showing each tributary’s alignment, ID (original and updated), and connection to the Humber system must be included in the LSS report. This figure should also indicate where each tributary ties into the floodplain mapping and where modeling refinements have been made.	Crozier	A figure showing the locations and extents of Tributaries A-E and Cold Creek has been included as part of the SWS.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	35	<p>Section 11.5 notes that four watercourse crossings were added to the hydraulic model based on Region of Peel as-built drawings and field measurements, with summary data provided in Table 6. However, to meet Town and TRCA standards and the MNR 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. 	Crozier	Crozier informed the Town that the collected monitoring data downstream of the development was insufficient to calibrate the hydrologic model because of dry readings. Crozier is working with the Town to provide a sensitivity analysis instead to fill the gaps in the data.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	35	<p>These detailed inventories and cross-sections are necessary for accurate model calibration, flood hazard delineation, and to support Phase 2 assessments of existing and future (including climate change) conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Table 29 in the FSR presents regional flow changes at various HEC RAS stations, noting that results “have been prorated based on an area-weighted calculation of each drainage area.” However, the underlying calculation methodology, inputs, and prorating steps are not provided. Please provide the full area-weighted calculation details (drainage areas, weighting factors, and how prorated flows were derived), 	Crozier	Acknowledged, supporting calculations are provided in the Appendix.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	36	<p>Figure 9A shows the existing floodplain mapping for the Bolton North Hill Subwatershed Study but does not identify individual tributary alignments (by name/ID), modeled hydraulic structures (culverts, bridges), or VO flow node/HEC RAS station locations used in the hydrology and floodplain analysis. For clarity and to support technical review, the figure must be updated (or a companion figure added) to clearly show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Each tributary labeled by ID (matching the updated naming in Table 5), •All modeled structures with reference numbers tied to the hydraulic inventory, and •The flow node and cross-section locations corresponding to Table 29 and other flow change tables. 	Crozier	Figure 9A will be updated to clearly show each tributary, structure, flow nodes, and cross section locations.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	37	<p>Section 11. Table 7 summarizes existing riparian storage volumes for each tributary under multiple storm events, but the supporting calculation details and HEC RAS extraction data are not provided. Please include the extraction outputs from the HEC RAS model (storage versus stage/discharge curves), the calculation methodology used to derive the reported volumes for each storm event, a clear explanation of whether these volumes represent incremental used storage or total corridor storage capacity, and representative cross-sections highlighting storage areas within each tributary.</p>	Crozier	The requested information will be provided in the SIS
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	38	<p>Section 12.6.8 Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model, does not explain how the conceptual hydrogeologic understanding (stratigraphy, groundwater flow, and wetland interactions) will be integrated into the calibration of the surface-groundwater continuous model referenced in Section 11.3. The continuous model must be explicitly informed by this conceptual model to evaluate water balance, groundwater recharge, and wetland protection under existing and future conditions, as required by the Town’s LSS TOR. The report must clarify how these elements will be linked and calibrated.</p>	Crozier	A continuous, feature-based water balance model will be developed in Visual OTTHYMO using available local monitoring data. The model will simulate both existing and proposed land use conditions and will be calibrated against observed hydrologic records to confirm reliability. Model inputs will incorporate site-specific soils, climate, and land cover data. Groundwater components will also be represented to assess overall water balance, groundwater recharge, and potential impacts to adjacent wetlands and groundwater-dependent features.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	39	Section 12.6.8 Hydrogeologic Conceptual Model qualitatively identifies groundwater-fed versus surface-fed wetlands, it does not provide the feature-specific hydrogeologic characterization required by the Town's LSS TOR. Wetlands flagged by TRCA's Wetland Risk Assessment must be supported by flux quantification, sensitivity analysis, and water balance evaluation to guide impact assessment and mitigation planning. This analysis must be incorporated into the Stage 2 work to meet LSS requirements.	Crozier	The continuous model will incorporate feature-specific hydrogeologic characterization, including stratigraphy, hydraulic conductivity, groundwater levels, and monitoring data, to represent surface-groundwater interactions. Fluxes (e.g., recharge, runoff, evapotranspiration, and groundwater contributions) will be quantified and evaluated through a detailed water balance comparison of existing and proposed conditions. Sensitivity analyses on key parameters will be completed to confirm model robustness and to inform impact assessment and mitigation planning.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	40	Section 13.1 Reach Delineation, reaches are defined based on channel planform, gradient, land cover, surficial geology, and tributary inputs, following TRCA and Montgomery & Buffington methodology. However, there is no linkage to hydrologic or hydraulic modeling (e.g., peak flow or continuous simulation outputs) to assess reach sensitivity under current and future conditions.	Crozier	Phase 2 of the LSS will document detailed geomorphological assessments on the most erosion sensitive reaches proposed to receive stormwater discharge. Surface water quantity monitoring was undertaken in 2024 and 2025 and will be expanded upon in 2026. This data will be used to calibrate the continuous hydrology model. In advance of the calibrated modeling being available, the project team will undertake an interim sensitivity analysis with the currently available model. This approach was accepted by the Town of Caledon and TRCA for a separate Local Subwatershed Study. An updated erosion exceedance analysis will be completed using the calibrated continuous hydrology provided by Crozier, when available. The erosion mitigation analyses will be completed following TRCA (2012) guidelines.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	41	Section 13.2 General Reach Observations, Fieldwork (April and November 2024) documented bankfull dimensions, substrate, erosion, and scour, supported by photos and a summary table. While observations are detailed, there is no integration with flow exceedance frequencies or erosion threshold analyses, which are required inputs for phase 2 per the Town LSS TOR	Crozier	Refer to the response to Comment 40.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	42	Section 13.3 Rapid Assessments of the report applies the MOE (2003) Rapid Geomorphic Assessment (RGA), Galli's RSAT, and a modified Downs (1995) Channel Evolution Model to classify reach stability. Scores (Table 12) identify transitional, and in-regime reaches, but the section defers the development of erosion thresholds and exceedance analyses to later SWS stages. The TOR expects preliminary thresholds and their application to inform stormwater and erosion mitigation design early in the process.	Crozier	Acknowledged. Refer to the response to Comment 40.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	43	Section 8 of the FSR, the floodplain analysis relies on TRCA's estimated HEC RAS models for four tributaries (Middle Main and Cold Creek), which do not include culverts, bridges, or detailed roughness coefficients. These screening-level models are not sufficient for a Local Subwatershed Study adjacent to development lands. The tributary models must be upgraded to fully engineered HEC RAS models with surveyed structures and refined roughness parameters to produce accurate flood hazard delineation and satisfy the Town's LSS TOR and TRCA standards.	Crozier	The floodplain analysis is now based on the model received from the TRCA on February 4, 2026. This model includes the structures and their parameters.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	44	<p>The FSR proposed stormwater strategy includes nine separate wet ponds, but the report does not demonstrate whether this number is necessary or optimized. Having so many ponds introduce several concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increased capital and lifecycle costs for construction, inspection, dredging, and long-term maintenance, which create a greater burden for the Town as these facilities will need to be inspected and maintained. •Multiple discharge points to small tributaries, increasing the risk of erosion, thermal loading, and cumulative habitat impacts. •Limited integration with LI) and reliance on end-of-pipe solutions, which may be inconsistent with the Town's stormwater management goals for infiltration and recharge within Significant/High Groundwater Recharge Areas. <p>The consultant must justify the need for nine ponds and assess whether consolidation or optimization could reduce the number and footprint of pond blocks, lessen the long-term burden on the Town, and improve system efficiency while still meeting all TRCA and Town stormwater management criteria.</p>	Crozier	There are currently eleven (11) separate wet ponds proposed, each of which is necessary for the development. Justification has been provided within the report.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	45	<p>The stormwater flow and pond sizing calculations presented in the FSR/SWM Report lack sufficient transparency and completeness to satisfy the Town's LSS TOR and TRCA requirements. Specific concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Regional Flow Prorating (Table 29): Regional flows were derived using area-weighted prorations for HEC-RAS flow change locations, but the supporting methodology, drainage areas, and weighting factors are not documented. These calculations must be provided in an appendix so the flows can be independently verified. •Unit Flow and Post-to-Pre, Flow Targets (Tables 14, 15–24): Target flows for Sub-basin 10 and Main Humber ponds are presented without showing full derivations or confirmation that the values align with VO model outputs. •Pond Storage and Recharge (Tables 11, 15–24): Permanent pool volumes are interpolated from MECP tables without adjustments for site-specific soils, infiltration, or wetland recharge needs. There is no confirmation that active storage volumes maintain pre-development recharge rates, despite the site being within a Significant/High Recharge Area. •Climate Change Sensitivity: None of the hydrologic or hydraulic calculations (flows, storage, WSE, floodplain analysis) include climate-adjusted flows as required by the Town's LSS TOR. •Continuous Model Integration: All sizing and flow checks rely solely on event-based storms (Chicago and AES), with no validation against the calibrated continuous surface-groundwater model (Section 11.3 of the SWS Report) to confirm long-term hydrology, recharge, and erosion performance. 	Crozier	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ARF calculations have been provided in an Appendix 2. Details on the Unit flow calculations are provided in an Appendix, the model results are provided in the tables for ponds 6, 9 and 11. 3. Water quality volumes for ponds are not impacted by site specific soils and infiltration from stormwater ponds is not recommended. LIDs are proposed to provide recharge through infiltration and to buffer clean water directed to wetlands. The Subwatershed Study will include recommendations for LIDs and targets infiltration/surface water contribution targets as part of the wetland water balance. Targets for infiltration for the site wide water balance will also be provided. 4. Climate change scenarios will be included in the next LSWS submission. 4. A continuous model has been completed as part of the LSWS.

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	46	Section 8.3 Hydraulic Model Result of the FSR report states that 25-year WSE values at SWM pond outfalls were interpolated rather than obtained from modeled cross-sections at the actual outfall locations. Adding cross-sections at each outfall in HEC-RAS and is required to accurately capture localized backwater and channel geometry. Please provide justification for not including dedicated cross-sections in the current model. Unless there is a valid reason, the model must be updated to include cross-sections at all SWM pond outfalls and rerun for 2-, 25-, 100-year, and Regional (including climate-adjusted) storms to confirm freeboard and compliance with TRCA's Stormwater Management Criteria.	Crozier	These cross sections will be added at the draft plan stage.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	47	Section 8.3 Hydraulic Model Result of the FSR report notes a 0.29 m increase in WSE downstream of Duffy's Lane due to runoff redistribution from Tributary A to Tributary B and the undersized culvert at this crossing. While the text concludes that the increase is acceptable because it is confined within a valley corridor, affects only a short channel length, and does not pose risks to developable land, several issues remain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Undersized Culvert Not Addressed – The analysis acknowledges that the culvert is a constraining factor but does not evaluate whether its capacity should be increased to mitigate the WSE rise. The LSS TOR requires assessment of infrastructure performance under proposed and climate change flows, including recommendations for upgrades where thresholds are exceeded. •Safe Access Criteria Insufficient – While the Technical Guide thresholds (0.3 m depth, 1.7 m/s velocity, 0.4 m²/s depth-velocity) are met, this only addresses roadway safety. The analysis does not consider erosion potential, long-term channel stability, or the cumulative impact of flow increases downstream, which must be reviewed per the TOR. •No Climate Change or Future Flow Sensitivity – The analysis appears to be based on current proposed-condition flows only. The Town LSS TOR requires climate change-adjusted flows to be assessed for culvert performance and WSE impacts. 	Crozier	The sizing of this culvert will be reviewed in the LSWS and recommendations will be made for improvements if required.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	48	While the FSR tables in Section 8.3 Hydraulic Model Result show minor changes in WSE and velocities for the study tributaries under proposed conditions, the analysis does not compare velocity and shear stress results against erosion thresholds or exceedance frequencies for any of the reaches. The Town's LSS TOR requires these thresholds to be assessed using the calibrated continuous hydrologic model to determine if channel stability or additional mitigation measures are needed, even when velocity changes appear small.	Crozier	A detailed erosion assessment will be included in the LSWS
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	49	The report states that because Tributary D will be converted to a piped system along this reach, "flood risk does not exist." However, the Town's LSS TOR requires that all proposed piped conveyance systems be hydraulically sized, modeled, and evaluated for surcharging or failure conditions under Regional and climate-adjusted storms before any conclusion regarding flood risk can be made. The current analysis does not provide this verification and must be expanded accordingly.	Crozier	To be addressed at Draft Plan stage.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	50	The proposed development requires a review of the existing hydraulic conditions regarding any land use changes, runoff increases, or channel modifications.	Crozier	Clarification required

Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	51	The study will evaluate the impact of the proposed development on watercourse water levels, flow velocities, and water surface profiles for all storm events on those watercourses that may receive additional flow or require no controls. Any flood risk concerns related to the proposed development shall be identified and current flood line information shall be updated for post-development scenarios where the flow would	Crozier	Noted, to be addressed in the LSWS
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	52	The updated future land use flood lines, where changes are considered, will be displayed on the maps. The flood elevations will be identified, along with the locations and cross sections of the Regulatory Event flood line. The overtopping depths caused by the Regulatory Event shall be assessed and documented on all existing roads at all crossing structures. The flood plain maps should confirm that the post-development flood levels are consistent with the current condition. Any changes in the flood inundation magnitude must be listed in the inventory, along with explanations for such changes.	Crozier	Noted, to be addressed in the LSWS
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	53	Appendix D, Hydrogeological Appendices, the hydrographs presented do not show precipitation correlations or event-based responses, and not all wells and gauges have time series plots. Per the Town's SWS TOR (Section 5.4), full datasets (hydrographs with precipitation overlays, seasonal summaries, and event logs) must be included so reviewers can validate model calibration and seasonal high-water estimates.	Crozier	Hydrographs for wells with automatic level logger data have been developed and plotted with precipitation. Full datasets of available hydrographs can be provided. Muted response is expected from precipitation due to the semi-confined to confined nature of the water bearing unit.
Engineering - Stormwater	Local Subwatershed Study	54	Appendix E, Geomorphic Assessment, provides only desktop review and rapid field reconnaissance, with no bank erosion hazard analysis, shear stress modeling, or long-profile surveys. Per TRCA guidelines, a Phase 2 channel stability and erosion risk study (with surveyed cross-sections) is required.	Crozier	The subject lands contain headwater drainage features, which do not have an erosion hazard. Overall channel stability was assessed as part of the Phase 1 LSS through the completion of Rapid Geomorphic Assessments (RGAs) along watercourses that are proposed to receive discharge downstream of the subject lands. Phase 2 of the LSS will document detailed geomorphological assessments on the most erosion sensitive reaches proposed to receive stormwater discharge. Surface water quantity monitoring was undertaken in 2024 and 2025 and will be expanded upon in 2026. This data will be used to calibrate the continuous hydrology model. In advance of the calibrated modeling being available, the project team will undertake an interim sensitivity analysis with the currently available model. This approach was accepted by the Town of Caledon and TRCA for a separate Local Subwatershed Study. An updated erosion exceedance analysis will be completed using the calibrated continuous hydrology provided by Crozier, when available. The erosion mitigation analyses will be completed following TRCA (2012) guidelines.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	1	Figures in the Hydrogeology Report (Figures 1–9) do not clearly show the study area boundary. This makes it difficult to interpret the spatial relationship between monitoring wells, contours, and natural features. All figures should be updated to include a clearly labeled study area boundary and legend for clarity.	Crozier	Figures have been updated to provide more clarity.

Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	2	Section 3, The Geology section provides regional and local stratigraphic context but lacks supporting figures to illustrate subsurface conditions. No geological cross-sections or stratigraphic profiles are provided, which limits understanding of how the borehole logs correlate across the site. The inclusion of subsurface cross-sections or conceptual models are required to visualize soil layers and groundwater units spatially considering the complex Quaternary stratigraphy (Halton Till over interbedded sands/silts). This makes it difficult to verify the continuity of the confining layer or the extent of permeable layers across the site. Moreover, while thin saturated silt/sand seams were encountered in many boreholes, it does not explicitly discuss the hydrogeological significance of these permeable interlayers in this section. These seams suggest localized perched groundwater zones, which should have been reviewed in the geology or stratigraphy discussion. The geology section needs to be updated to address describing all soil	Crozier	Will include a N-S and W-E cross section and a discussion of the stratigraphy of the site to assist with the understanding of the soil layers and their hydrogeological functions.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	3	Section 4.1 MECF Wells inventories 206 water well records within 500 m. However, there is no interpreting or mapping of these wells' elevations and uses. It is required to illustrate nearby well locations relative to the site and discuss if any is hydraulically connected or at risk from development changes (e.g., shallow dug wells vs. deep wells). The report notes twenty-two wells on the subject lands and predominantly domestic use but does not explicitly analyze their status or vulnerability. It does not say if the on-site wells will be decommissioned or if adjacent landowners rely on wells that could be impacted by lowered recharge.	Crozier	No permanent dewatering is anticipated for the site, therefore it is not anticipated that there will be long-term effects on the surrounding domestic wells. A well contingency plan has been outlined in the hydrogeological assessment report. An updated MECF well location plan will be provided to properly outline the surrounding wells.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	4	Section 4.2 Groundwater Properties provides a general regional groundwater flow direction (NW to SE) and references regional baseline groundwater quality data from TRCA (2008). No site-specific groundwater quality sampling was conducted. Assessment of groundwater quality in the area prior to development including testing for key parameters (e.g., nitrate, chloride, metals) especially on agricultural lands or in Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRAs) is required. The report mentions that the site lies in a SGRA and Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) where careful consideration of water quality in recharge management is required. Relying on 15-year-old regional data (e.g., noting high iron/manganese typical of the area) is not sufficient to establish existing characterization. Potential contamination risks like existing nitrate levels from past agriculture or road salt impacts needs to be assessed. Additionally, groundwater-surface water interaction (e.g., vertical gradients near wetlands/streams) are not addressed in Section 4.2. The report identifies several intermittent creeks and wetlands on site, but it is not discussed whether these features are supported by shallow groundwater. Given the presence of eight wetlands (some within the development area), this is a significant gap. There is no analysis of whether the wetlands are perched or connected to the water table, and how development might alter their water inputs. Hydrologic functions of natural features need to be protected; therefore, a feature-based water balance and discussion of groundwater interactions is required. At minimum, field observations of wetland hydrology or any evidence of groundwater discharge (e.g., seepage zones, springtime baseflow in creeks) should be provided.	Crozier	Site-specific groundwater samples can be collected on-site to provide more clarity into the water quality on-site. Wetland and stream monitoring are being completed on-site and an analysis of the groundwater and surface water interaction and if the wetlands are groundwater fed will be discussed. A wetland feature based water balance is being conducted by Crozier to be submitted under a separate cover.

Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	5	Section 4.3 Aquifer Properties presents a regional hydrostratigraphic summary (Table 2) for the Humber River watershed but does not provide site-specific aquifer parameter measurements. No hydraulic conductivity tests (slug tests or pumping tests) performed in any of the twenty monitoring wells, and no grain size or permeability analyses of soil samples are mentioned. The report confirms saturated seams at multiple depths, yet no K testing was conducted to quantify transmissivity. Lab tests (grain size, Atterberg, moisture) are absent, preventing valid permeability estimates. On-site hydraulic testing is required to characterize aquifer properties (transmissivity, K values). Permeability tests should be conducted to support water balance and impact assessments to justify assumed infiltration rates. The Hydrogeology report instead relies on literature and the TRCA watershed report for qualitative statements where the actual in-situ permeability of the Halton Till or the sand seams on site remains unverified.	Crozier	In-situ hydraulic conductivity testing can be completed in select wells across the site to provide insight into in-situ permeability.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	6	6. Section 5, Field Work, documents the installation of twenty monitoring wells in November 2021 and the subsequent monitoring program. The drilling and well construction details are sound, with all wells installed to approximately 6 m depth and screened at about 3 m below grade. However, it is noted that all wells were installed only to shallow depths (2–3 m), and deeper geological units were not investigated. Limiting wells to 6 m depth restricts the assessment to the shallow aquifer and does not provide information on deeper groundwater conditions, such as those within the bedrock aquifer. Additionally, several field programs are missing, including:	Crozier	Noted. Excavations beyond 6 m are not anticipated, therefore it is not anticipated that deep monitoring wells would be helpful with analysis.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	6a,b,c	a. No in-situ infiltration tests (such as double-ring infiltrometer tests, Guelph permeameter, or percolation tests) were conducted to directly measure the soil's infiltration capacity. The report applied a generic "infiltration factor" (50%) from literature without field calibration. Field verification of soil infiltration rates, especially if LID measures are anticipated is required. Water balance relies on assumed values that might not reflect actual site conditions (for instance, Halton Till often has much lower infiltration capacity than assumed, literature suggests <50 mm/year in some till areas, whereas the report's calculation equates to ~130 mm/year infiltration). Achieving the stated infiltration targets on site is uncertain. b. Baseflow or Surface Water Monitoring: The site contains intermittent watercourses (as noted in Section 3.1) and several ephemeral ponds/wetlands. No baseflow measurements or surface water level observations were undertaken as part of the field program. Measurement of flow or water level in spring and summer to quantify groundwater contributions is required. No measuring baseflow or installing shallow piezometers near wetlands, does not characterize how development might affect the	Crozier	a) Site specific infiltration testing with guelph permeameters can be conducted once the LID locations have been finalized in a future site plan approval stage. b) Wetland and surface water monitoring has been conducted in spring and summer months through piezometers and flow monitors. Discussion on ground water to surface water interaction will be included.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	7	7. Table 7 provides anticipated seasonally high groundwater elevations at monitoring wells and links them to proposed stormwater management ponds; however, the report does not include a supporting map showing the locations of these ponds and monitoring wells. A site plan or figure is needed to confirm the spatial relationship between wells and the associated ponds, and to validate that the groundwater estimates used are appropriate for each pond location.	Crozier	A figure update will be provided to provide contextual location of ponds relative to groundwater monitoring locations.

Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	8	8. Section 6.1 Groundwater Levels, concludes that any excavation above 2 m depth should not encounter groundwater. While this may be true for the 2– 3 m deep sand lenses that were monitored, the study did not verify if a perched water table develops seasonally at shallower depths, especially in the wetlands or topographic lows. All monitoring wells were screened at ~3 m depth, so they would not record water that perches in the topsoil or clay above the sand seam. During spring snowmelt or heavy rain, a temporary perched water table could form in the overlying silty clay till, even if it later drains into the sand seams. The report's blanket statement that groundwater will not be encountered above 2 m is therefore not fully substantiated without shallow piezometers or soil moisture observations. It is required to identify the seasonal high groundwater level for design purposes to inform foundation elevations and stormwater facility design. Capturing true seasonal high groundwater conditions may not be fully met if only the confined aquifer was monitored. We recommend that this be addressed by either installing a few shallow drive-point piezometers in wetland areas.	Crozier	For Spring 2026, shallow wetland piezometers will be deployed in select location of concern. These proposed locations will be conferred with reviewing agencies (Town and CA) prior to deployment.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	9	9. Figure 9 shows seasonally high groundwater contours and interpreted flow direction (NW to SE) representing the spring high water of 2022–2024). The potentiometric contours shown cannot be independently verified because the underlying borehole logs lack proper coordinates, elevations, and consistent water level records. Without integrating date-stamped groundwater data from each monitoring well, the contour maps risk misrepresenting gradients, especially in areas with semi-confined or perched systems. To strengthen the analysis, it would be helpful to also illustrate the low-water scenario or any observed temporal shifts in the flow pattern. The contour map should be reviewed to ensure it uses sufficient data points and reflects the semi-confined nature. If the equipotential lines were drawn assuming water table conditions, there is a possibility of misinterpretation since these are potentiometric contours.	Crozier	A seasonal low groundwater figure will be produced in order to determine if there are any shifts in gradient through the variable conditions.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10	10. Section 7 Site Water Balance Assessment, presents a pre-development infiltration volume of 216,625 m ³ /year and a post-development infiltration of 80,146 m ³ /year, resulting in a stated deficit of approximately 136,479 m ³ /year. While the calculation methodology follows the Thornthwaite & Mather approach, following technical concerns needs to be reviewed:	Crozier	See responses below.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10a	a) Appendix E of the Hydrogeology Report indicates that precipitation and temperature data were sourced from the ALBION FIELD CENTRE (Environment Canada Station No. 6150103). However, the timeline or period of record used for the reflects historical normal (1981–2010). Current practice suggests including climate data from the most recent 30-year period (e.g., 1991–2020) or providing sensitivity analysis based on alternate climate scenarios.	Crozier	Weather data utilized will be updated to follow 1991-2020 as requested.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10b	b) The infiltration deficit is calculated based on a generic 50% infiltration factor applied to all pervious areas, with 0% assigned to impervious areas. No justification is provided for this assumption, and no in-situ infiltration testing or site-specific K-values are reported to support it. The infiltration assumptions should be supported by site-specific testing or conservative published values tailored to the site's confirmed soil conditions.	Crozier	Site specific infiltration testing will be completed as part of the Spring 2026 field program. Updates to the approach will be provided accordingly.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10c	c) Precipitation data (971 mm/year) are applied uniformly, but the water balance lacks subcatchment breakdowns or land cover-specific infiltration behavior.	Crozier	Further hydrogeological details will be refined through the completion of Phase 2 and 3 of the Subwatershed Study.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10d	d) Appendix E provides monthly water balance tables but does not include subcatchment-level results, soil group assignments, or runoff curve numbers (CN).	Crozier	Further hydrogeological details will be refined through the completion of Phase 2 and 3 of the Subwatershed Study.

Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10e	e)No mounding analysis is presented to determine if proposed infiltration volumes would cause unacceptable rise in groundwater levels.	Crozier	Mounding analysis will be performed at site plan level stage when detailed design of infiltration features is completed.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10f	f)There is no attempt to validate model results against observed monitoring well data or local recharge estimates.	Crozier	Noted.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	10g	g)There is no discussion or evaluation of how recharge deficit of approximately 136,500 m ³ /year volume might feasibly be restored. While detailed mitigation design may be presented in a future FSR, the hydrogeological assessment should at least explore the feasibility of mitigation. This includes evaluating whether site conditions (e.g., soil permeability, available land area, water table depth) are favorable to achieving the required infiltration. Without a feasibility analysis, it remains unclear whether the magnitude of the recharge deficit can realistically be offset using on-site LID measures. As a result, the report leaves a critical gap in understanding whether groundwater recharge targets can be met particularly important in a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area and Highly Vulnerable Aquifer setting. At a minimum, the hydrogeological report should provide: i.A conceptual discussion of suitable LID strategies (e.g., bioswales, infiltration galleries) ii.Estimated infiltration recovery volumes iii.General feasibility based on land area and soil type	Crozier	A feasibility analysis will be included in subsequent submission. Analysis will include SGRA/HVA/ESGRA mapping and LID locations, as well as feasibility for LIDs based on land use and soil type. Additional details to be provided in FSR/SWM report.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	11	There is a numerical inconsistency between the infiltration values reported in Section 7 (216,625 m ³ /year pre-development; 80,146 m ³ /year post-development; deficit of 136,479 m ³ /year) and those reported in Section 8.1 (199,128 m ³ /year pre; 73,526 m ³ /year post; deficit of 125,602 m ³ /year). These discrepancies of infiltration must be revised. It is also noted the SWS - Bolton North Hill Master Report (Stage 1) presents conflicting infiltration volume estimates in different sections of the report. Section 21.1.4.3 states the post-development infiltration is 63,320.3 m ³ /year (with a deficit of 153,304.6 m ³ /year from pre-development conditions), while Section 22.3 claims infiltration will decrease from 199,128 m ³ /year to 73,526 m ³ /year, resulting in a deficit of 125,602 m ³ /year. Clarification and correction of these values is necessary to ensure that mitigation measures are appropriately sized and based on reliable inputs.	Crozier	Further hydrogeological details will be refined through the completion of Phase 2 and 3 of the Subwatershed Study.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	12	Section 8.2, Long & Short-Term Dewatering and Appendix D of the report acknowledges that dewatering may be required during construction and provides a detailed inventory of nearby domestic and monitoring wells; however, it does not include any screening or evaluation of potential risks to these receptors under construction or post-development conditions. Specifically, the report does not assess potential drawdown impacts, wellhead protection zone compliance, or the risk of water quality degradation due to infiltration practices or dewatering activities. Hydrogeological studies must assess dewatering needs when excavations may intersect the seasonally high groundwater table. TRCA's Table 8-1 (2013) and Conservation Halton's Hydrogeological Assessment Guidelines (2014, Sections 3.3.2 and 3.4.1) require:	Crozier	Noted. Expanded analysis on dewatering impacts will be provided in the subsequent submission.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	12a-d	a)Preliminary estimates of dewatering volume and drawdown radius b)Screening of potential impacts on nearby receptors (wetlands, private wells) c)Evaluation of short- and long-term dewatering impacts d)Recommendations on seasonal construction timing (e.g., summer excavation to minimize groundwater intrusion)	Crozier	Noted. Preliminary dewatering calculations and associated commentary will be completed to meet the hydrogeological assessment guidelines.

Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	12	These requirements are critical for ensuring that dewatering effects are managed proactively and do not cause environmental impacts. While the SWS - Bolton North Hill Master Report (Stage 1) includes a brief discussion of dewatering requirements and references regulatory thresholds, it does not present quantitative dewatering volume estimates or drawdown modelling. No radius-of-influence calculation or seasonal construction strategy is included. The discussion does not meet the level of screening expected under current hydrogeological assessment guidelines, and further analysis is	Crozier	Noted. Preliminary dewatering calculations and associated commentary will be completed to meet the hydrogeological assessment guidelines.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	13	Section 7, Site Water Balance Assessment references the implementation of Low Impact Development (LID) features such as infiltration galleries and bioswales to mitigate the post-development infiltration deficit. However, it does not include any quantitative assessment or scenario-based modeling to demonstrate the effectiveness of these measures in offsetting the calculated recharge loss. It is required to provide a preliminary recharge offset analysis that evaluates the capacity of proposed LID features to restore pre-development infiltration volumes. Without this analysis, the feasibility of achieving recharge equivalency remains uncertain, and the proposed mitigation strategy lacks technical substantiation. Furthermore, the report does not identify specific locations on-site where LID practices could be feasibly implemented based on subsurface conditions including suitable soil permeability, adequate separation from the seasonally high-water table. Without grain-size analysis, in-situ infiltration testing, or mapping of groundwater depths, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed LID measures are technically viable or appropriately located. As such, the feasibility of achieving recharge equivalency is not clear.	Crozier	It is impractical to model specific LIDs as part of a Subwatershed study.. The continuous model will include lumped LIDs to assess the proposed target infiltration volumes and LID storage targets. This modeling will use the infiltration testing results from the Spring 2026 field program. Site specific locations of proposed LIDs will be tested during Draft Plan Approval stage to ensure the proposed features are technically feasible. On site infiltration testing to conceptually confirm the strategy in various soil groups will be completed as part of the Spring 2026 field program.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	14	Section 9 concludes that excavation will not intercept groundwater above 2.0–3.5 mbgs based solely on interpreted potentiometric surfaces from shallow wells. However, the report should include evidence of vertical gradients or artesian conditions to confirm that excavation will remain above the saturated zone under seasonal high conditions.	Crozier	Deployment of piezometers to select wetland locations of concern will occur during the Spring 2026 program to develop defined gradients in the upper soils.
Engineering - Stormwater	Hydrogeological Investigation	15	Appendix A Monitoring Well Logs, several borehole logs (e.g., MW9, MW15) document the presence of sand and gravel seams, which may function as preferential flow pathways or localized high-permeability zones. However, these heterogeneities are not incorporated into the water balance assessment. Such features should be evaluated for their influence on infiltration dynamics, groundwater flow, and potential contaminant migration and to avoid underestimation of recharge variability or localized mounding	Crozier	Commentary on the potential for preferential pathways to increase infiltration dynamics will be included within the subsequent submission.
Engineering - Stormwater	Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	1	It is recommended to add an executive summary that integrates key findings, conclusions, and erosion sensitivity highlights. Additionally, please consider including a glossary of technical terms and acronyms (e.g., HDFs, RGA, RSAT) to enhance clarity.	Crozier	Noted. An Executive Summary, list of acronyms and glossary of technical terms will be provided in the next LSS submission.

Engineering - Stormwater	Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	2	<p>The report provides minimal explanation regarding the modeling assumptions, input parameters, and data sources used to support the RGA, RSAT, and anticipated erosion threshold analyses. To ensure transparency, please clarify the basis of hydrologic characterization, specifically, whether local hydrology was measured or assumed, and if assumed, which datasets informed the assessments.</p>	Crozier	<p>The RGA (MOE, 2003) and RSAT (Galli, 1996) are standard, industry-accepted tools for assessing channel stability and overall stream health. Data used in these assessments are collected in the field. Velocity and flow permanence was estimated on the day of assessment using tools such as a wiffle ball.</p> <p>Surface water quantity monitoring was undertaken in 2024 and 2025 and will be expanded upon in 2026. This data will be used to calibrate the continuous hydrology model. In advance of the calibrated modeling being available, the project team will undertake an interim sensitivity analysis with the currently available model. This approach was accepted by the Town of Caledon and TRCA for a separate Local Subwatershed Study.</p> <p>An updated erosion exceedance analysis will be completed using the calibrated continuous hydrology provided by Crozier, when available.</p> <p>The erosion mitigation analyses will be completed following TRCA (2012) guidelines.</p>
Engineering - Stormwater	Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	3	<p>Please confirm the rationale for using 2014 LiDAR (MNR, 2014) for reach gradient and topographic analysis instead of more recent LiDAR datasets (e.g., 2023). This could improve the accuracy of gradient calculations and support a more current reflection of topographic conditions relevant to erosion sensitivity analysis.</p>	Crozier	<p>Reach gradients were first calculated using 2014 LiDAR prior to 2023 LiDAR being available. The reach gradient analysis will be updated using 2023 LiDAR data in the next submission of the LSS.</p>
Engineering - Stormwater	Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	4	<p>Section 5 (Reach Delineation) and Section 6 (Recommendations) fail to delineate erosion hazards (e.g., meander belts, stable top-of-slope setbacks) despite this being a Phase 1 requirement per the Town's LSS TOR. While reach boundaries and general observations are provided, no spatial mapping or quantitative hazard limits are included. This is critical because Phase 1 requires preliminary hazard mapping to inform land use constraints. The report must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Apply RGA/RSAT uniformly or justify exclusions. •Delineate hazards (e.g., meander belts for unconfined systems, slope setbacks for confined valleys) using field data and LiDAR. 	Crozier	<p>Erosion hazard delineation was not completed within the study area as it contains only headwater drainage features, which do not have an erosion hazard. All headwater drainage features were evaluated by Dillon Consulting following TRCA and CVC (2014) guidelines. RGA and RSAT tools are generally not applied to headwater drainage features.</p> <p>RGA and RSAT tools were applied by GEO Morphix to all watercourse reaches downstream of the Secondary Plan Area. In areas where slopes are present adjacent to proposed infrastructure, a geotechnical slope stability assessment can be undertaken. GEO Morphix will provide input to the geotechnical slope stability assessment, where required/appropriate. Toe erosion allowance recommendations will be documented in the next LSS submission, as required. Meander belt width delineation is not required as there are no unconfined watercourses within the Secondary Plan Area or adjacent to proposed infrastructure.</p>

Engineering - Stormwater	Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	5	Section 6.0 Recommendations, explicitly defers the calculation of erosion thresholds (e.g., critical discharge, shear stress) to a future phase, stating that thresholds will be determined once SWM outlet locations and flow regimes are finalized. However, as outlined in Section 2.2.3 of the Town LSS TOR, erosion threshold analysis (including parameters such as critical discharge, velocity, and shear stress) is a required deliverable during Phase 1. This analysis is essential to assess erosion sensitivity of receiving reaches, without thresholds, the proposed SWM strategy (e.g., 5 mm retention) cannot be validated.	Crozier	Surface water quantity monitoring was undertaken in 2024 and 2025 and will be expanded upon in 2026. This data will be used to calibrate the continuous hydrology model. In advance of the calibrated modeling being available, the project team will undertake an interim sensitivity analysis with the currently available model. This approach was accepted by the Town of Caledon and TRCA for a separate Local Subwatershed Study. An updated erosion exceedance analysis will be completed using the calibrated continuous hydrology provided by Crozier, when available. The erosion mitigation analyses will be completed following TRCA (2012) guidelines.
Engineering - Stormwater	Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	6	Section 5 Reach Delineation & Section 6 Recommendations identifies the presence HDFs within the study area but does not apply the TRCA/CVC (2014) Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features protocol, nor does it provide a formal classification of HDF segments based on hydrology, riparian condition, fish habitat, or terrestrial connectivity. Additionally, Section 6 does not include preliminary management recommendations (e.g., protection, conservation, mitigation, or no management) for individual HDFs, nor does it identify which features may be retained, realigned, or removed. This is inconsistent with Section 2.2.3 of the Town LSS TOR, which requires that HDFs be evaluated and classified during Phase 1 to inform land use planning, SWM outlet siting, and natural heritage system refinement.	Crozier	Section 1 of the Fluvial Geomorphology Assessment notes that headwater drainage features were assessed by Dillon Consulting. Refer to the LSS for the methodology used to evaluate HDFs, as well as management classifications.
Engineering - Stormwater	Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	7	Section 5 Reach Delineation and Section 6 Recommendations, presents geomorphic observations and channel condition assessments but does not incorporate findings from other technical disciplines, such as hydrogeology or aquatic ecology. Specifically, there is no reference to groundwater discharge indicators (e.g., seepage zones, iron staining), baseflow contributions, or fish habitat features that may influence channel stability or sensitivity. The Town LSS TOR requires that Phase 1 characterization provide data across disciplines to identify groundwater-surface water interactions and ecological constraints. Integration of hydrogeologic and aquatic data is essential to delineate functionally significant reaches, inform erosion sensitivity, and support defensible management strategies. The report identifies knickpoints in THRC-2 (Table 3) and shows visible iron staining in Photo 42, yet it does not analyze how groundwater seepage (implied by iron oxidation) could accelerate knickpoint migration or bank erosion.	Crozier	Assessments completed by all disciplines are documented in the overall LSS. The direct incorporation of all disciplines into the fluvial geomorphology assessment is not required. Channel stability and erosion sensitivity are evaluated by reviewing topographic data, surficial geology data, historical aerial imagery, and field observations. Specifically, the RGA is a standard tool used to identify dominant modes of channel adjustment and degree of erosion sensitivity. General visual evidence of groundwater discharge is collected during rapid geomorphological assessments; however, the hydrogeological assessment conducted by Crozier provides a technical assessment of hydrogeological conditions within the study area. Impacts of potential groundwater seepage at knickpoints will be investigated as part of the next LSS submission. In addition, monumented cross-sections were installed in late 2024 for repeat monitoring to assess the extent of knickpoint migration. This will also be documented in the next LSS submission.
Town of Caledon, Development					
Monika Dhungana and Drew Haines					
Development Engineering	Road Network	2.9	The Town has reviewed the proposed road network and provide the following comments:	Bousfields/Crozier	Acknowledged

Development Engineering	Road Network	a	Road right of way widths determined prior to draft plan approval will be based on the functions of the right of way and may include stormwater management measures in the form of low impact development. 26m ROW possibly extending to the east is proposed; comment addressed.	Bousfields/Crozier	Please reference Section 5.1 within the February 2026 Transportation Assessment for review of ROWs
Development Engineering	Road Network	b	The Town will require that Emil Kolb Parkway extend to the eastern limit of the plan so that it can be connected to the Option 2 lands when they develop. The Subwatershed Study is to evaluate this extension, recommend a suitable cross-section through the Greenbelt and recommend mitigation measures that may be required to offset the impacts of achieving the connection in the future. Emil Kolb Parkway extension to east is very conceptual and lacks recommended cross section of the road. It is recommended that a full environmental assessment to be done for such road extension and recommend any mitigation measures for the road extension. Comments remains outstanding.	Bousfields/Crozier	Street B/Emil Kolb Extension is proposed to extend to the limit of the plan.
Development Engineering	Road Network	c	The Town requires that Kingsview Drive extend into the Bolton North Hill Secondary plan at its current right of way width of 26 meters. This right of way (ROW) is to extend through the development. N-S road connecting to Kingsview Drive is proposed as 20m ROW, comment remains outstanding.	Bousfields/Crozier	Please reference Section 5.1 within the February 2026 Transportation Assessment for review of ROWs
Development Engineering	Road Network	d	A road connection is to be provide to the north on the west side of Highway 50. The ROW width is to be determined through the Transportation Impact study. A 20m ROW is provided. Comment addressed.	Bousfields/Crozier	On the north side of Highway 50, outside the limits of the plan is Greenbelt lands. These lands are not developable and therefore extension of the roadway is not required as there is no internal access to support.
Development Engineering	Road Network	e	Duffy's Lane is to be an urbanized collector with a 26 m ROW from the north end of the development to Emil Kolb Parkway. Duffy's Lane appears to be 23m ROW, comment remains outstanding.	Bousfields/Crozier	Duffy's lane has been illustrated with a 26 m ROW on the included Tertiary Plan.
Development Engineering	Road Network	f	The current ROW width of Emil Kolb Parkway near Highway 50 currently exceeds the proposed ROW width of 35 m shown on the secondary plan. Further conversations with the Region and Town are required to determine the appropriate ROW width of Emil Kolb Parkway. Emil Kolb Parkway ROW of will need to be determined and reflected on the concept plan and in the applicable studies. Comment remains outstanding.	Bousfields/Crozier	The ROW width of Emil Kolb at Highway 50 has been revised within the included Tertiary Plan.
Development Engineering	Hydrogeological Report	2.10	The report prepared by Crozier Consulting Engineers, dated April 4, 2022 is to be updated to include the Spring 2022 groundwater data to determine the seasonally high groundwater level. It is indicated that a feature-based water balance was to be provided in the hydrogeological report. However, this was not included in that report. This assessment is required. Hydrogeology Report Appendix is provided with February 2022 data, which does not represent the seasonally high groundwater level. The Spring 2022 data is missing in the appendix. Comment remains outstanding.	Crozier	A wetland feature based water balance will be provided by Crozier as a stand-alone report. Updated groundwater monitoring data from Spring 2022 will be provided within the appendix.

Development Engineering	Environmental Noise Investigation	2.11	A report is to be submitted for review to determine if the land uses proposed are satisfactory or if alternate built form or concept is required to reduce substantial noise mitigation measure. A Noise Report is outstanding.	Owner	The proposed land uses in the BNHSP are consistent with Future Caledon's vision for a Neighbourhood Centre which is intended to include a mix of residential uses and mixed use blocks. In addition, the BNHSP is identified as "New Community Area" per Schedule B4. All lands within the BNHSP have been zoned under BL 2024-052 which permits a range of residential and non-residential uses. To address potential concerns related to noise, a detailed Noise Study could be required by the Town through a subsequent Draft Plans of Subdivision Application to evaluate noise levels, specifically as it relates to lands that interface with Highway 50 and Emil Kolb Parkway. Should any area of concerns require mitigation measures, these would be required to the satisfaction of Development
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	2.12	The report prepared by Crozier Consulting Engineers, dated April 4, 2022 was reviewed and recognizes the work that has been completed to date. However, Town requires a Subwatershed Study (SWS) to better inform development in this area. The FSR should be revised to reflect the development criteria, constraints, and recommendations of the SWS. The Town reserves the right to require all reports/plans and studies be updated pending the recommendations of the SWS. Alternatively, if the work remains valid, the applicant may submit a justification memo requesting that the materials dated December 2021 be reviewed in light of the SWS recommendations.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	a.	The stormwater management strategy shown the Secondary Plan are to be based off the findings of the requested Subwatershed Study. The SWS is still under review and the SWM strategy may be impacted due to any changes in the SWS study findings.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	b.	Prior to Draft Plan Approval, the FSR must include preliminary design of LID measures required either by the SWS recommendations and/or in accordance with the Town's CLI ECA. Section 7 of the FSR has references to Hydrogeological Report for the water balance implementation, however the Hydrogeological Report does not cover how the required water balance is achieved. Town does not credit use of Green Roof, Roof downspout disconnection, rainwater harvesting, permeable pavers, vegetated filter strips, bioretention within private property as components of LID for CLI- ECA. The water balance measures are to be implemented in publicly owned property and the feasibility of such infrastructure needs to be established at this stage. Comment remains outstanding. (response provided to defer to future subdivision stage)	Crozier	Noted, the water balance section has been updated to reflect the Towns requirement that LIDs to meet CLI-ECA requirements be placed on publicly owned property. Further information on LID sizing will be provided in the next submission.
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	c.	Prior to Draft Plan Approval the preliminary grading and servicing plans are to be provided for review to determine how the site functions overall and demonstrate implementation feasibility of the Stormwater Management Plan. A high level grading and servicing drawings are provided. Some of the slopes of road grading do not meet Town Standards of 0.75% to 6%. Provide a detailed grading design drawing at the Subdivision stage. Servicing Plan is subject to approval from the Region. Comment partially addressed.	Crozier	Ensure road slopes are within an acceptable range, or provide rationale to why they are not.

Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	d.	A portion Duffy's Lane is located outside of the proposed secondary plan. This section of road will require reconstruction to facilitate an urban cross section; therefore, Prior to Draft Plan Approval, the FSR is to identify stormwater quality and quantity control measures and their locations, in accordance with the SWS recommendations. Pre and post development drainage plans has reference to catchment ID EXT70 and EXT 62 within Duffy's Lane, however urbanization is not considered. Comment remain outstanding (A response is provided to defers to future subdivision stage)	Crozier	Comment to be addresses in the next LSWS submission
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	e.	Drainage from external lands is to be conveyed through underground pipes sized to the 100 year storm, unless deemed to be maintained as open systems/channels. Preliminary cross sections will be required to demonstrate that conveyance of external drainage can be accommodated within the proposed ROW without constraining/conflicting with any other functions below or above ground, including consideration for local traffic during maintenance of the proposed infrastructure. Catchment areas EXT 3, EXT 4 and EXT 5 are proposed to be captured with storm pipes that outlet into Tributary C. All other external runoff are proposed to discharge into swale and surface runoff towards natural drainage direction. Comment addressed.	Crozier	Comment Addressed.
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	f.	In the absence of any Secondary Planning work completed for the Option 2 lands, the Town cannot comment on the location, form and function of the SWM pond shown in this area. Future work completed through the Subwatershed Study and secondary planning for the Option 2 lands will better define the ideal location of that stormwater management pond and we ask that the FSR be revised accordingly, if needed. Comment remains outstanding.	Crozier	Noted.
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	g.	It is indicated that some minor drainage diversions are proposed. Provide a map for clarity on where these are located and their size/impact. Post-development storm Drainage Plan C713 includes external lands and the flows are incorporated in stormwater management strategy. Comment addressed.	Crozier	Comment Addressed
Development Engineering	Functional Servicing Report	h.	It is indicated that some tributaries will need to be realigned to convey external flows through the development area and includes the possibility of using natural channel design. However, it does not appear that any channels or channel corridors are proposed on the concept plan. Section 11.0 Conclusion & Recommendation has statement of realignment, provide more information on any channel that requires realignment. Comment remains	Crozier	Realignment of channels not proposed

Development Engineering	Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approval	2.13	The Town of Caledon has been granted a Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approval (CLI-ECA). The CLI-ECA allows the Town to approve stormwater infrastructure projects that: (1) are wholly located on Town owned lands; and (2) are designed to treat total suspended solids, grease and oils. In order to be approved under the Town's CLI-ECA the applicant will need to ensure that the maximum drainage area to each stormwater management facility does not exceed 65 ha and that the criteria depicted in Table 1 is adhered to. The Town will not allow any stormwater infrastructure that is achieving the CLI-ECA criteria to be placed on private property. The outlet of any stormwater management facility must be entirely within the public domain and the locations of all stormwater management facilities need to be reasonable and justified. A list of potential LIDs have been provided in Table 25, however a general plan of such infrastructure location needs to be provided. Further investigation on the suitability of the listed infrastructure can be provided at Draft Plan stage. Comment remains outstanding.		Catchment areas to all ponds are less than 65ha (mega pond receives 32ha of drainage)
Development Engineering	New Comment	2.14	Drainage from proposed Phase 1 development east of Duffy's Lane is proposed to be captured by SWMP 1, which falls on the west side and within non-participating land. Similarly, drainage from properties marked 2 and 3 will be managed at SWMP 3, that partially falls within non-participating land. Provide information on the timing of development of the Phase 1 lands and other non-participating lands. If Phase 1 land needs to develop prior to the non-participating lands, it needs to have its own SWM solution. Provide a sensitivity analysis for the worst case scenario and reduce		Drainage plans and pond locations have been revised to provide stormwater management for participating lands (i.e.. Not reliant on SWM ponds proposed within downstream non-participating lands)
Development Engineering	New Comment	2.15	FSR Table 12 describes Permanent Pool Elevation and the approximate outfall invert discharging into the natural water course via storm pipe. Some of the elevation differences between the permanent pool and discharge elevation are significantly large and may create erosion and slope stability issue. For example the SWM Pond 9 outfall at 244.23m which is 12.37m below the Permanent Pool elevation of 256.60. Provide information on the flow velocity and demonstrate that slope stability can be achieved at Cold Creek due to the flow. A Plunge pool or energy dissipating structures may be		These concerns will be addressed in future iterations of the stormwater management reporting that will support the Tertiary Plan and/or Draft Plan applications. For the purposes of Secondary Plan Approval, we are confident that the SWM locations can be supported based on available outlets.
Development Engineering	New Comment	2.16	Table 15 and Table 17 SWM Pond 5 and 9, information/calculation related to storage provided are missing.		Tables have been updated.
Development Engineering	New Comment	2.17	Align Street H with proposed Street B on the development on west of Mount Hope Road. Coordinate with SGL Planning & Design Inc for this coordination.		Future roads that would be proposed to cross Greenbelt lands and connect to Mount Hope Road would be determined through the Draft Plan of Subdivision process. Currently, the proposed conceptual collector road network has been illustrated on the LOPA Land Use Schedule, with a potential future connection from Emil Kolb Parkway east to Mount Hope Road which would link these two Secondary Plan areas.
Town of Caledon, Transportation Engineering, Jaspreet Kaur					
Transportation Engineering	Proposed Road Network Review	1.a	The Future Caledon Official Plan (Schedule C1) designates the extensions of Emil Kolb Parkway and Kingsview Drive as collector roads. However, in the proposed concept plan, both roads end as local roads. Please clarify and incorporate the following:	Bousfields	Both roads are intended to be Collector Roadways as reviewed in Section 5.2 of the February 2026 Transportation Assessment. Kingsview Drive ends at a east-west collector as north of the development lands is designated Greenbelt Lands.
Transportation Engineering	Proposed Road Network Review	1.b	The extension of Emil Kolb parkway beyond the Bolton North Hill study area should be illustrated as a conceptual collector road with yellow dotted line, consistent with Schedule C1 of the Future Caledon Official Plan, extending up to Mount Hope West Road.	Bousfields	Extension of the roadway has been indicated by an arrow on the Tertiary Plan.

Transportation Engineering	Truck Bypass Review	2	Given the potential conflicts between pedestrians and trucks, propose mitigation measures to enhance safety, including the feasibility of grade-separated solutions — including for pedestrians and full traffic separation — and reducing access points from Emil Kolb Parkway and Highway 50 along the existing truck route.	Bousfields	Additional policies and guidelines have been included in the BNHSP and Community Design Guidelines to ensure appropriate interfaces with these roundabout conditions. Only two new accesses locations are proposed to Emil Kolb, Street E and full-moves signalized intersection and Street F a Right-In/Right-Out configured intersection. The spacing adheres to the Region's requirements and
Transportation Engineering	Truck Bypass Review	3	Remove the proposed north-south access onto Emil Kolb Parkway immediately west of Hwy 50 to reduce the number of conflict points and crossings with the existing truck route.	Bousfields	Two new access locations are proposed. Street F, which is immediately west of Highway 50 is proposed to be a Right-In/Right-Out access limiting vehicle conflict points. Crossing of Emil Kolb will not be permitted at this location.
Transportation Engineering	Truck Bypass Review	4	Please incorporate the following policy into the secondary plan "All intersections of collector to collector roads and collector to arterial roads shall be designed to include auxiliary turn lanes. The configuration, geometry, and associated intersection flaring shall be established through a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) to the satisfaction of the Town, in order to ensure safe and efficient operations and preserve the long-term	Bousfields / Crozier	Acknowledged. Policy has been added to Section 3.9.2 of the BNHSP.
Transportation Engineering	Truck Bypass Review	5	Please ensure the secondary plan includes a policy to assess the feasibility of a signalized intersection versus a roundabout as the development progresses.		Acknowledged. Policy has been added to Section 3.9.2 of the BNHSP. Roundabouts have not been pursued due to space requirement. Consideration for a roundabout could be reassessed as independent landowners move forward.
Transportation Engineering	Section 3.2 Boundary Road Network	6.a	The Multi-Use Path (MUP) on Columbia Way exists between Kingsview Drive and Westchester Boulevard, but not between Highway 50 and Kingsview Drive. Please revise Figure 2 and Table 4 accordingly.	Crozier	Noted. Table 4 and Figure 2 have been updated accordingly.
Transportation Engineering	Section 3.2 Boundary Road Network	6.b	The existing shared cycling route on Columbia Way extends between Westchester Boulevard and Mount Hope Road. Please correct Table 4 accordingly.	Crozier	Noted. Table 4 has been updated accordingly.
Transportation Engineering	Section 3.2 Boundary Road Network	6.c	Please update the legend label from "On-Street Cycling" to "On-Road Signed Cycling Route".	Crozier	Noted. Figure 2 has been updated accordingly.
Transportation Engineering	Section 3.3 Transit Operations	7.a	Figure 2 doesn't illustrate the transit stop locations. Please provide a map showing existing transit routes and transit locations. Also, note that there is a bus stop at the Columbia Way and Kingsview Drive intersection.	Crozier	Noted. Figure 2 has been updated accordingly.
Transportation Engineering	Section 3.3 Transit Operations	7.b	Route 41 service improvements have been approved recently. Please incorporate this into the report.	Crozier	Noted. Section 3.4 (updated section number) has been updated to reflect the current transit service timing and headways.
Transportation Engineering	Section 4.2 Horizon Years	8.a	The future conditions are assessed for the horizons 2031 and 2041. The 2051 horizon should also be assessed: i.The construction is expected to be completed by 2051. ii. To ensure the proposed road network is evaluated and validated against long-term growth and planned transportation infrastructure identified in the Town's MMTMP and Future Caledon Official Plan (OP).	Crozier	The analysis within the Transportation Assessment has been updated to reflect a 2051 horizon. The phasing of development has been updated to reflect the additional horizon.
Transportation Engineering	Section 4.2 Horizon Years	8.b	The report lacks a phasing plan. It should provide approximate buildout projections for each phase, and identify corresponding transportation improvements needed to support ultimate buildout.	Crozier	Phasing of development has been proposed solely for the purposes of this assessment. Please reference Figure 4 within the February 2026 Transportation Assessment for the phasing plan. The timing of development will ultimately be based on the progression of individual Draft Plans.
Transportation Engineering	Section 4.4 Background Developments	9	Please include the Mount Hope West Development, located in the northwest quadrant of Columbia Way and Mount Hope Road, as it will generate traffic on Columbia Way, Mount Hope Road and Highway 50.	Crozier	Noted. The development has been added as a background development within Section 4.4 of the February 2026 Transportation Assessment.

Transportation Engineering	Section 4.6 Future Background Recommended Network Improvements	10	Please clarify whether the proposed signal optimization at the Highway 50 and Columbia Way intersection, as well as the widening of Highway 50 north of Emil Kolb Parkway, were included in the future background scenario models and the future total conditions models.	Crozier	As triggered by Future Background volumes, the widening of Highway 50 north of Emil Kolb was accounted for in the Future Background and Future Total models. Signal optimization at Highway 50 and Columbia Way is only included in the Future Total Scenario in the 2026 Transportation Assessment Update.
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.1 Rights-of-Way	11.a	The required ROW width for the roads are as follows: 23.5 m for Residential Collector Road, and 26 m for Major Collector Roads (Emil Kolb Parkway Extension, Kingsview Dr Extension, and Duffys Lane).	Crozier	Please reference Section 5.1 for review of ROWs. Please note collector roadways provide a MUP to support off-road cycling connectivity.
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.1 Rights-of-Way	11.b	The proposed lane width of 3.3 m for shared cycling is insufficient. According to the MMTMP, shared lanes with cyclists should be at least 4.5 m wide.	Crozier	Please reference Section 5.1 for review of ROWs. Please note collector roadways provide a MUP to support off-road cycling
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.1 Rights-of-Way	11.c	To accommodate transit operations on collector roads, the outer travel line should be at least 3.5 m wide.	Crozier	Please reference Section 5.1 for review of ROWs. The 22 m and 26 m collector road cross-sections illustrate lanes 3.5 m or wider. The 22 m and 26 m collector road cross-sections illustrate lanes 3.5 m or
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.1 Rights-of-Way	11.d	The Future Caledon Official Plan (Schedule C1) identifies 26 m ROW for Duffys Lane. Please explain how the recommend ROW width will be protected with the proposed 20 m ROW width.	Crozier	Duffy's lane has been illustrated with a 26 m ROW on the included Tertiary Plan.
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.1 Rights-of-Way	11.e	In consideration for Operations and Maintenance capacity, local roads only require sidewalks on one side of the road, with the exception of areas in close proximity to main generators of pedestrian traffic. Please see section 4.2.10 of the ATMP for details.	Crozier	Please reference Section 5.1 for review of ROWs and cross-sections. The 18 m ROW is proposed for sidewalks on both sides of the roadway.
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.1 Rights-of-Way	11.f	The collector roads are terminating as local roads, resulting in a transition in their cross-section. Active transportation (AT) facilities should be seamless and continuous throughout.	Crozier	All collector roads terminate at the existing road network or at proposed internal collector road. MUP facility on collector roads will connect to each other. Pedestrians can transition to sidewalks and cyclists to local roadways as required for their journeys.
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.2 Collector Roadways	12	The report outlines traffic calming features and references design elements such as stop-controlled intersections, on-street bike lanes, and visual narrowing techniques. However, the key design parameters considered in developing the internal road layout—such as block lengths, design speeds, intersection spacing, and curb radii—should also be clearly outlined to demonstrate how the layout supports safety, connectivity, and traffic calming through its foundational design.	Crozier	Traffic calming features are mentioned within the report. As the mentioned items - block length, design speeds and curb radii - are all dependant on the Draft Plans and detailed design proposed, they are not been discussed further at the Secondary Plan stage.
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.3 Site Accesses	13.a	The section should be revised to address intersection spacing rather than spacing between site accesses. For the minimum spacing requirements referenced, please cite the appropriate table/figure and chapter number from the TAC guidelines. Also, include a map that clearly illustrates the spacing between the proposed intersections.	Crozier	The purpose of the Secondary Plan is to assess the proposed collector road network and the proposed access intersection for the development lands. The detailed review of intersection spacing within the development lands is a level of detail beyond the Secondary Plan. Each individual Draft Plan should be required to show that they adhere to the requirements of the Town and the standards outlined in
Transportation Engineering	Section 5.3 Site Accesses	13.b	We understand that the proposed roads are relatively straight and flat; however, preliminary review of sight distance and intersection angles for all the proposed new roads along Columbia Way, Mount Hope Road and the Regional Roads (at the discretion of the Region) is required at this stage to ensure feasibility. A detailed assessment can be deferred to detailed design stage.	Crozier	Noted. Please reference Section 5.4 in the February 2026 Transportation Assessment.
Transportation Engineering	Section 7.2.2 Signal Warrant Analysis	14	Please confirm whether the intersections warranted for signals under 2041 traffic conditions (e.g., Highway 50 and Street A intersection) were also assessed for signal warrant analysis at earlier horizon.	Crozier	Signalization has been proposed for the warranted horizon with the exception of Duffy's Lane and Emil Kolb Parkway which is recommended based on forecasted operations and not the signal warrant. Please reference Table 25 for a breakdown signalization through the horizon years.
Transportation Engineering	Section 7.3 Future Total Recommended Network Improvements	15.a	Figure 13 should clearly indicate which improvements are planned/recommended for the years 2031 and 2041.	Crozier	Noted. Figure 20 (updated figure number) has been revised.

Transportation Engineering	Section 7.3 Future Total Recommended Network Improvements	15.b	The proposed improvements along Highway 50 are not consistent with the Region of Peel's Complete Corridor Study and the Preliminary Design for Queen Street.	Crozier	Noted. Our recommendation for a road widening south of Columbia Way has been removed from the assessment to reflect the current corridor study finding.
Transportation Engineering	Section 7.3 Future Total Recommended Network Improvements	15.c	No mitigation measures have been proposed to address the poor westbound (WB) operations at the Emil Kolb Parkway/Street B and Highway 50. The WB queue is expected to spill back to the upstream intersection.	Crozier	The fourth leg of the roundabout will be a dual entry, therefore no further mitigation measures can be provided at the intersection. The poor westbound operations are due to the high volumes of through and eastbound left turning volumes in conflict with westbound entry. The operational forecast of a roundabout in the Arcady model is dependant on the geometry of the model. As design of the roundabout proceeds the model can be updated to better forecast the expected
Transportation Engineering	Section 7.3 Future Total Recommended Network Improvements	15.d	Please confirm whether the proposed network improvements under Future Background conditions were considered in the Future Total Conditions analysis. Table 24 should be updated accordingly.	Crozier	Table 27 (updated table number) outlines the "Additional Future Total Roadway Improvements" which are in addition to the Future Background improvements and planned improvements already introduced to the analysis.
Transportation Engineering	Section 8.1 Intersection Operations	16.a	Please correct the headers of Table 25 and Table 26.	Crozier	Revised. Please note the table numbers have changed in the February 2026 Transportation Assessment
Transportation Engineering	Section 8.1 Intersection Operations	16.b	Report the WBL queue for the Highway 50 and Columbia Way intersection for the 2041 Future Total Conditions in Table 28.	Crozier	With the widening of the Columbia Way to 4 lanes, the WBL movement is an independent lane, without a storage length. The queueing assessment reviews the 95th percentile queues in relation to the available storage lengths. As such the WBL movement is not included in the table.
Transportation Engineering	Section 8.1 Intersection Operations	16.c	SB queues for Emil Kolb Parkway intersections with Street E and Street F should be reported for the 2041 Future Total Conditions. Revise Table 28 accordingly.	Crozier	The southbound queueing at Street F and Street E is within a continuous lane and is not compared to a storage length within the summary tables. It is noted that the queueing in the 2051 horizon is
Transportation Engineering	Section 9.2 Accessible Parking	17	Revise it according to the Town's new Traffic By-Law, BL-2024-48, Schedule O.	Crozier	Noted. Section 9.2 references BL-2024-48.
Transportation Engineering	Section 10.1 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities	18.a	Please ensure the comments listed under Item #7 are incorporated.	Crozier	Comment 7.a and 7.b relate to transit and don't impact the zoning by-law review. We have done our best to incorporate all applicable comments. Should Item 7 refer to something additional, it can be addressed through the future Tertiary Plan application.
Transportation Engineering	Section 10.1 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities	18.b	Clearly distinguish between the existing and planned facilities, particularly within the existing SABE area.	Crozier	Existing and planned active transportation facilities are reviewed in separate sections of the report. Table 4 review the existing facilities, while Table 36 review the planned facilities.
Transportation Engineering	Section 10.1 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities	18.c	The proposed active transportation facilities on Duffys Lane do not align with Section 5.1. As a collector road, it should include pedestrian and cycling infrastructure on both	Crozier	Noted. Table 36 has been updated to note a future multi-use trail on Duffy's lane.
Transportation Engineering	Section 10.1 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities	18.d	Verify that the proposed cycling facilities along Columbia Way are consistent with the Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP).	Crozier	Noted. Table 36 has been updated to note a future multi-use trail on Columbia Way.
Transportation Engineering	Section 10.1 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities	18.e	Revise Figure 16 and Table 31 to reflect the updates.	Crozier	Noted these items have been revised.
Transportation Engineering	Section 10.1 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities	19	The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) section only mentions the planned active transportation and transit improvements but does not specify high-level TDM strategies (e.g., carpooling incentives, bike amenities, and shared parking) that could support the Town's modal split targets and reduce single-occupant vehicle reliance, as	Crozier	Please reference Section 10.2 in the February 2026 Transportation Assessment.
Transportation Engineering	Section 10.1 Pedestrian and Cycling Facilities	20	20. Please include the following separate Schedules in the next submission:-a. Road Network and Road Related Infrastructure (e.g., control type and intersection spacing)b. Active Transportation Facilitiesc. Transit Network	Crozier	Please refer to Figure 12, Figure 20, Figure 24 and Figure 25, respectively, for the proposed roadway spacing, network configuration, future active transportation network and, transit route
Flagship Development					

Jeff Greene					
Flagship Development Group	-	-	Flagship Development Group represents the owner of the property located at 14291 Highway 50, located within the proposed Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan.	Bousfields	Noted.
Flagship Development Group	-	-	Our site is identified as Parcel 20 in the submission materials from the applicant, located at the southern limit of the secondary plan boundary. The current design concept and draft secondary plan have identified our site as having part of SWMP 7, part of Park 7 and limited residential permissions.	Bousfields	The Owner's lands contain both parkland and a mix of medium and low density residential uses.
Flagship Development Group	-	-	While we do not oppose the broader Secondary Plan process that is being pursued by the applicant, we wish to continue to find constructive ways to work with the applicant on identifying opportunities to enhance our site's ability to accommodate residential uses.	Bousfields	The BNHLG has maintained communication with the Owner and remains open to the Owner joining the cost sharing group.
Flagship Development Group	-	-	We have engaged with the Bolton North Hill Landowners Group and look forward to an open dialogue on this application as it advances through the planning process.	Bousfields	Acknowledged
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., Sarah Clark					
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Information	-	Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. (GSAI) is pleased to make this submission to the Town of Caledon on behalf of our Clients, Sundial Homes (Duffy's Lane) Limited, owners of 14674 Duffy's Lane. We make this submission in relation to the Official Plan Amendment for the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan as submitted by Bousfields Inc. on behalf of the Bolton North Landowners Group. This correspondence was intended to form part of the Agenda for the formal Public Meeting scheduled for May 13, 2025, however, staff issued a Notice of Cancellation for the Public Meeting (notice dated May 9, 2025). It is our understanding that staff had issued the Notice of Cancellation in order to continue review of the submission materials. We anticipate that this correspondence can be received and reviewed for consideration and ultimately, responded to through the next (rescheduled) Public Meeting associated with the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Information	-	The entirety of the property municipally addressed as 14674 Duffy's Lane consists of approximately 142 acres; however, for the purposes of this submission, our Client is primarily commenting on the ~35 acres which were brought into the Urban Area through the Region of Peel Official Plan and which form part of the lands within the limits of the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan. These lands are generally located in the most north westerly portion of the Secondary Plan Area and are the only lands within the Secondary Plan Area on the west side of Duffy's Lane.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Information	-	We have reviewed the submission items made available on the Town's website related to the Official Plan Amendment filed for the lands known as the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan. We are very supportive of the advancement of this Secondary Plan, and we are pleased to have the opportunity to provide some comments.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Glen Schnarr &	Comments	-	Our comments at this time, are as follows:		
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Timing for Adoption of this Secondary Plan:	-	We note that this Official Plan Amendment (OPA) has been written as an amendment to the current in-effect Town of Caledon Official Plan.. Is it anticipated that the timing for this Secondary Plan will advance to adoption and approval in advance of the Ministry's final consideration and ultimate approval of Future Caledon Official Plan? And if so, are there adequate provisions in Future Caledon that will allow the Secondary Plan to be readily absorbed by the new OP once it has been approved by the Ministry?	Bousfields	The current BNHSP is an amendment to Future Caledon OP.

Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Community Wide Development Staging and Sequencing Plan (DSSP):	-	We request clarity on the status of the Community-Wide Development Staging and Sequencing Plan (DSSP) which appears to be a requirement prior to approval of this Secondary Plan. The requirement for a DSSP appears to be "Noted" in the submitted Comment Response Matrix; however, is not provided in the list of submission items available on the Town website. We request clarity on the status of the DSSP and that a copy be made available once it has been prepared/submitted.	Bousfields	The DSSP will continue to be refined through finalization of the Tertiary Plan studies and reports. Specifically as it relates to the ongoing discussions regarding infrastructure funding and construction timing as the infrastructure extends along Emil Kolb Parkway.
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Park	-	We are also seeking clarity on the proposed "Park" identified on our Clients' lands as shown on Schedule C-9 – Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan. Specifically, we request clarification on the determination of the proposed size as well as the proposed location of the park. We wish to better understand the proposed Park location in light of Section 7.17.6.1.1 (Institutional - General Policies) which provides the following language related to the location of parks "schools have been located nearby to Parks to provide opportunities to co-locate facilities". In light of this policy, we would be interested to know if siting the Park on the east side of Duffy's Lane, beyond the High Density Residential Area, closer to the proposed school and more central to the Plan Area was considered. We believe this location would provide greater exposure, and ease of access to residents/students considering the higher density land use and the location of the school facility, further supporting the co-location policy. We appreciate the flexibility of Policy 7.17.7.1.3 related to the relocation of parks without an amendment to the plan, however, we request further clarification on the siting and sizing of the Park as currently shown.	Bousfields	The Applicant has met with Sundial and revised the park location in size to approximately 1 hectare. The park is identified as a Neighbourhood Park symbol on the proposed land use plan which is consistent with the Town of Caledon's approach.
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Park	-	As well, we acknowledge Policy 7.17.7.1.3 d) which provides: "Minor adjustments to the location and configuration of Parks and Environmental Policy Areas may be considered to reflect the differences in scale and level of detail available through the preparation of future draft plans of subdivision. Minor adjustments to the location and configuration of the park sites shall be permitted without requiring an amendment to this Plan, provided: d) Does not reduce the statutory amount of parkland required or an amount less than what was agreed to in any existing agreement with the Town."	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Park	-	We are seeking further information on the status of a Master Parkland Agreement related to parkland requirements. More specifically, if one has not already been prepared, does the Town plan to enter into an Agreement with the Landowner Group? Please provide clarity on the parkland obligations for this area (through a Master Parkland Agreement or otherwise) as well as the criteria used to determine siting and sizing for the Park on our Clients' site, as currently shown.	Bousfields	Acknowledged. A Master Parkland Agreement is anticipated to be entered into with Town Staff following the approval of the Secondary Plan. More information could be provided subject to joining the Bolton North Hill Landowners group.
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Water Efficiency:	-	Our final comment relates to Policy 7.17.11.2.1 Water Efficiency, which provides: "New development in the Plan Area will consider the achievement of greater energy and water efficiency in all new buildings, beyond the above minimum requirements in the Ontario Building Code."	Bousfields	Policy has been amended in the BNHSP LOPA.
Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Water Efficiency:	-	Including a policy directive that requires something to go above minimum requirements in the OBC is challenging and we question the purpose and enforceability of this policy, outside of the Town's Green Development Standards (currently being piloted), and the enforceability thereof. For this reason, we seek clarity on the appropriateness, rationale and intent of this policy and how the Town plans to enforce this through the development	Bousfields	Policy has been amended in the BNHSP LOPA.

Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.	Comments	-	As always, we thank staff for the opportunity to provide comments on the Official Plan Amendment - Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan and look forward to the rescheduled Public Meeting, which we expect would include a response to this submission. Alternatively (or additionally), should staff wish to discuss the content of this submission prior to the rescheduled Public Meeting, we would be happy to meet.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
MHBC, September Dave Aston and Stephanie Mirtitsch					
MHBC	Information	-	We are pleased to provide this letter regarding the Bolton North Hill Secondary Plan OPA (Town File No. POPA 2022-0001) on behalf with James Dick Construction for their lands located at the southwest corner of Hwy 50 and Emil Kolb Parkway.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
MHBC	Information	-	We have been monitoring the Secondary Plan process and reviewed the first and second draft of the Secondary Plan, Land Use Plan Functional Servicing and Stormwater Report and Facility Fit Report. We have also reviewed the new draft Secondary Plan text submitted in May, 2025.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
MHBC	Land Use Plan Comments	-	We are generally supportive of the proposed Land Use Plan, and offer the following comments for consideration, based on the attached concept plan prepared by MHBC:	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
MHBC	Land Use Plan Comments	-	The entire block adjacent to Emil Kolb Parkway and Regional Road 50 should be designated 'Mixed Use Area' to reflect the zoning applied to the area (RM-690) and allow the entire block to develop comprehensively.	Bousfields	Through refinement of the Draft Tertiary Plan and land use plan, the extent of Mixed Use Areas has been modified to reflect a similar extent. It is acknowledged that while the Secondary Plan land use designation of Mixed Use Areas and Neighbourhood Areas applies to the area MHBC has identified, the underlying zoning will continue to permit a range of uses.
MHBC	Land Use Plan Comments	-	The blocks fronting Emil Kolb Parkway should be designated 'High Density Residential' to reflect the zoning applied to the area (RM-690) and allow these blocks to develop with apartment buildings and a range of townhouse uses.	Bousfields	High, Medium and Low Density land use designations have been consolidated into Neighbourhood Areas as per Future Caledon Future Plan. The permitted building typologies are dictated by the underlying Zoning.
MHBC	Land Use Plan Comments	-	The small block south of the E-W collector road, adjacent to Regional Road 50 should also be designated 'Mixed Use Area'	Bousfields	The Mixed Use Designation on this block is not consistent with the intention of the Neighbourhood Centre urban structure element as per Future Caledon. This area is designated as Neighbourhood Areas due to its irregular shape and will still be permitted to develop in a mixed use fashion given the zoning permissions.
MHBC	Land Use Plan Comments	-	We are supportive of the general location of Park Block 6; however, it should be refined in terms of its size and location as shown on the attached concept plan. Further, policy direction should note that ultimate parkland dedication will reflect Planning Act requirements at the draft plan of subdivision application stage.	Bousfields	BNHSP Policies provide for flexibility of parkland size and the location as well as the replacement of the park delineation with a symbol in the Secondary Plan Land use Schedule
MHBC	Stormwater Management Comments	-	We have outstanding concerns with the proposed stormwater strategy. It is generally our opinion that each individual landowner should be responsible to provide their own stormwater management facilities on their lands and not rely on the James Dick lands for ultimate stormwater management facility locations. While not formally engaged in the landowner group, we and our client have also been engaged with discussions with the landowner group. We understand through these discussions that the other landowners are exploring options to provide their own onsite stormwater management controls, which we would be supportive of. We are also supportive of the Secondary Plan text and the need for the landowner agreement and cost sharing to generally allow flexibility for the ultimate stormwater management facility locations.	Bousfields/Crozier	Addressed. A single SWM pond is proposed on James Dick property to manage runoff from those lands only. Drainage from all other development areas will be managed by on-site swm ponds, not reliant on the James Dick pond. A single storm pond has been identified with a blue dot on the Secondary Plan Land Use Schedule.

MHBC	Stormwater Management Comments	-	We offer the following specific comments on the proposed pond locations:	Bousfields/Crozier	Acknowledged.
MHBC	Stormwater Management Comments	-	SWM Pond 2 – We are not supportive of the location of this facility and suggest that any drainage from lands to the north should manage their stormwater on site. This pond should be removed from the final Land Use Plan.	Bousfields/Crozier	Acknowledged. Only a single SWM Pond is conceptually shown as a dot on the James Dick Lands. SWM Pond 2 has been removed.
MHBC	Stormwater Management Comments	-	SWM Pond 6 - These lands are located along Highway 50 are currently used for the James Dick head office and works yard and have no immediate plans for redevelopment. We understand that the adjacent land owner may require conveyance of stormwater at this location to a legal outlet, which would be subject to landowner group arrangements. A stormwater management facility in this location is not feasible and other options should be further explored by the other landowners.	Bousfields/Crozier	Acknowledged. Only a single SWM Pond is conceptually shown as a dot on the James Dick Lands.
MHBC	Summary	-	In summary, we would request that these comments be considered in the next iteration of the Secondary Plan. Please find attached a preliminary concept plan that is more reflective of the underlying base conditions, ongoing discussions with the landowner group and represents our client's vision for the development of the lands. We would request that this alternative land use concept be considered in the preferred land use plan for the Secondary Plan and that the Secondary Plan and application in its current state not be approved until the land use plan is updated and the SWM concerns are resolved.	Bousfields	Acknowledged.
MHBC	Summary	-	See attached markup.	Bousfields/Crozier	Acknowledged.