

Humber Station Villages - CEISMP Comment Response Matrix				
File #: POPA 2024 -0002 (Secondary Plan) Related Files #s: 21T-24014C + RZ 2024-0032		Submission No. 5 Comments		
			Updated: April 20, 2026	Updated: July 20, 2026
Comments Received From: Monika Dhungana (Development Engineering) - April 16, 2026				
No.	Comment	Response - May 27, 2026	Responsibility	Reviewer Response
CEISMP PHASE 2				
1	Provide the rationale for Figure 4.4, Proposed SWM Plan Option 2. Town is in an understanding that SWM 1 and SWM 2 will be standard wet pond, however the FSR section 4.8 and Figure 4.4 discuss replacing the ponds with 5 underground storage tanks. SWM 1 and SWM 2 have to meet minimum flow required for the online wetlands and the realigned channel and therefore underground tank can not be supported in place of wet ponds SWM 1 and SWM 2. SWM 1 needs to control to Regional Controls where a Tank solution may not be viable for Regional Storm. The alternate SWM solution discussion can be deferred to the Draft Plan of Subdivision 21T-24014C.	Comment noted. Section 4.8 and Figure 4.4 of the SWM Report were included to present an alternative decentralized underground SWM tank solution as a preliminary concept, in recognition of evolving stormwater management practices and the increasing consideration of underground storage systems in lieu of traditional centralized wet pond facilities. The intent was to document that this alternative had been evaluated at the MESP stage and to present the associated storage volume requirements for informational purposes. Regardless of whether wet ponds or underground SWM tanks are ultimately selected, the treated and attenuated stormwater will continue to discharge to the online wetlands and/or realigned channel, as applicable. The facility type does not alter the receiving watercourse or the hydraulic connectivity to those downstream features; the required minimum low-flow release rates to sustain the function of the online wetlands and realigned channel will be maintained under either approach. Regardless of the facility type selected, the TRCA unitary release rates will be respected and proposed peak flows will be maintained at or below unitary levels for all design storm events. With respect to Regional Storm control, it is acknowledged that this is a requirement for SWM 1. The preliminary sizing of the underground SWM tanks presented in Section 4.8 has been developed with recognition of this requirement, and the tank storage volumes have been sized to account for the Regional Storm release rate capacity. Should underground tanks be advanced at the Draft Plan stage, the detailed design will be required to formally demonstrate compliance with Regional Storm control criteria to the satisfaction of the Town and TRCA. In accordance with the Town's direction, the alternative underground tank discussion will be deferred to the Draft Plan of Subdivision stage (21T-24014C), at which time the selected SWM facility type will be confirmed.	SCE/GEI	Town acknowledges that proposed underground storage tanks in place of SWM 1 and SWM 2 were an alternate solution to the Stormwater Management. It is our understanding that these Tanks (SWM Facilities) will be owned and maintained privately. The tanks shall be sized to the required level of control, and the release rate will be maintained to the satisfaction of the Town and the TRCA. Tank design, sizing and outfall situation will be reviewed as part of Detailed design of Plan of Subdivision. Comment addressed.
2	The PNJ Geotechnical Report Page 43 recommends need of a clay liner due to high groundwater table elevation. The SWM Ponds are proposed with Infiltration Cells to meet CLI-ECA requirements which are demonstrated in Drawing SWM-3-2. Given there is 1m of clay liner under the Cells, demonstrate that the cells will yield the target infiltration rate through the liner. Also discuss whether the infiltration cells are not fed by the groundwater table. These information can be deferred to the detailed subdivision stage.	Comment noted. It is important to clarify that infiltration cells are not proposed within the SWM Facilities. In alignment with groundwater considerations and the presence of primarily tight clay soils (Halton Till) across the site, the SWM ponds have been designed with filtration cells (sand media filter beds) rather than infiltration units. The purpose of these filtration cells is to assist in meeting CLI-ECA requirements (specifically managing the 90th percentile/27mm storm) and providing thermal mitigation/cooling before discharge. As these are filtration systems, they utilize an internal underdrain system to convey treated water; therefore, the implementation of a clay liner to mitigate high groundwater concerns will not impact the performance of the facility, nor will the cells be fed by the groundwater table. Please note that Drawing SWM-3-2 in Appendix E labels these features as "Filtration Cells." The revised SWM report will ensure all text and labels are consistent with this filtration-based approach.	SCE/PNJ	Comment addressed.
CEISMP PHASE 3				
1	Section 3.2 Phased Buildout and Site Accessibility describes that MTO has retained Parcels 4 and 5 for Highway 413 corridor. SWM 3 and wetland compensation area 2 are located within these parcels. In the event the MTO acquires Parcels 4 & 5, the Town may require an amendment to CEISMP to determine an appropriate location for SWM 3 and wetland compensation area 2. Any development, except for Prologis Phase 1 (21T-24014C), will not be permitted until the land ownership is finalized and the Town approves the location of the facilities.	Noted.	-	-
Comments Received From: Cassie Schembri (Manager) & Hadiseh Bolkhari (Senior Project Manager) (Water Resources) - April 17, 2026				
No.	Comment	Response - May 27, 2026	Responsibility	Reviewer Response
CEISMP PHASE 1				
1	Please note that the Town is currently undertaking updated hydrologic and hydraulic modelling, along with a detailed survey of structures in accordance with the MNRF Technical Bulletin: Flood Hazard Data Surveying and Mapping Guidance (2023). Once the results of these studies become available, they are expected to supersede the current analysis.	Noted.	-	No action required.
2	The current topographic characterization within Section 3.1.1 and Figure A2-1 appears to be inconsistent when compared to 2023 LIDAR data. The report cites a minimum elevation of approximately 230 masl at the southern boundary, 2023 LIDAR confirms elevations as low as 220 masl at Mayfield Road. Furthermore, Figure 1 (Topographic Survey Review) shows that the survey data appears to terminate at George Bolton Parkway, covering only the northern half of the Study Area. Please provide a map of participating and non-participating lands. It must be clarified if the non-participating lands are situated primarily in the southern portion of the Study Area.	RESPONSE UPDATED: Figure A2-1 and the text will be revised to be consistent with the 2023 LIDAR data. Figure 1 (Topographic Survey Review) was previously prepared to demonstrate the discrepancies in elevations between the 2014 LIDAR topo surface and the detailed topo survey that was available for the Prologis lands, through the preparation of their Draft Plan submission. However, the current 2023 LIDAR data has been obtained as requested by the Town of Caledon, and the modelling has been revised. As such, Figure 1 is no longer relevant. Participating lands are shown in Figure 2, Appendix A1 and detailed topographic surveys are expected to be completed at Draft Plan stage.	SCE/Arcadis	Noted. The Town will review the updated Figure A2-1 and revised text once submitted.

3	Please clarify whether the groundwater elevations presented in Figure A2-8 represent an average of monitoring events, a single monitoring period, or a composite dataset. Table C2-2 summarizes monitoring well information; however, to support verification of the groundwater contour mapping (Figure A2-8), please provide the GIS shapefile of monitoring well locations, including associated attributes (e.g., well ID, coordinates, ground elevation, and groundwater elevations). In addition, please confirm the vertical and horizontal datum used for Monitoring well elevations.	Figure A2-8 was constructed using the highest available groundwater levels from 2024 and 2025. Two years of data were incorporated because not all wells were installed in 2024 and not all wells were monitored in 2025. Where well nests were present, the shallow monitoring well data were used. Figure A2 -8 reflects a kriged interpolation of the high groundwater dataset. The figure presents a defensible representation of the high groundwater surface for 2024 and 2025 based on the available dataset and professional judgement. The interpolated surface is a representation of the high groundwater condition but is not expected to replicate individual measured water levels with exact precision. This approach is standard practice for regional hydrogeological interpretation and is consistent with methodologies documented in ORMGP technical reports. A shapefile of the monitoring wells, including attribute data, and an Excel file of the measured groundwater levels has been provided in the supplemental materials folder. Horizontal datum: NAD 1983 CSRS UTM Zone 17N Vertical datum: CGVD 1928.	Arcadis	The response is generally acceptable. Please provide the referenced shapefile of monitoring well locations, including all associated attributes (well ID, coordinates, ground elevation, groundwater elevations, screen depths, etc.), along with the Excel file containing the measured groundwater level data.
CEISMP PHASE 2				
4	Floodplain Impact / Hydraulic Analysis Please clarify the inconsistency between Table 2-6 (Appendix F) and the existing HEC-RAS model flow file. Specifically, peak flows for HDF-8 are reported at cross sections 36 and 31; however, within the HEC-RAS model, only cross section 30 is shown for this reach.	To adopt a conservative approach, the section of HDF-8 south of the proposed wetland compensation (starting from Station # 30) area was modeled using existing condition peak flows. As a result of this approach, no differences were noted in either water level or channel bed level within HDF-8. Comment noted. As shown in Figure 2 (Floodplain Report), the upstream drainage area of Node "A" (47.38 ha) lies outside the regulatory floodplain. Accordingly, the regulatory floodplain for HDF-8 begins at Node "A" (approximately HEC-RAS Station #36). The total length of the watercourse is approximately 900 m, with the first 340 m (between Node "A" and Node "B") located within the subject area and the remainder extending into the proposed Highway 413 corridor. The channel storage volume within the subject area (between Node "A" and Node "B") is estimated at 1,750 m³. Under proposed conditions, this portion of the natural channel will be removed, as flows north of Node "B" will be redirected to the proposed SWM Facility #3. To offset this loss, Wetland Compensation Area 2 (refer to Figure 5, Floodplain Report) has been designed to provide equivalent storage, compensating for the 1,750 m³ of channel volume. Under existing conditions, HDF-8 originates at Node "A" (HEC-RAS Station #36) and extends downstream to the south. For a conservative assessment, the peak flow at Node "B" was applied to the upstream HEC-RAS cross-section (#36), while the outlet peak flow was applied at the downstream cross-section near Node "B" (HEC-RAS #31). Under proposed conditions, the analysis focuses on the reach of HDF-8 located south of Wetland Compensation Area 2. The upstream channel segment (above HEC-RAS Station #30) will be removed, and runoff from the subject area will be redirected to SWM Facility #3. The lost channel storage (1,750 m³) will be fully compensated within the proposed wetland, which will be sustained by controlled releases from the SWM facility. Consequently, the upstream boundary for the proposed condition model is defined at HEC-RAS cross-section #30. To maintain a conservative approach, the downstream reach of HDF-8 (south of Station #30) was modeled using existing condition peak flows. The results indicate no change in water surface elevations or channel bed levels within HDF-8.	SCE	Noted. The Town may have additional comments following completion of the FHIMP ongoing study by town.
5	Floodplain Impact / Hydraulic Analysis The analysis in Section 3.2.2 and Table 3-3 and Humber Station Water Elevation for Cut and Fill Volume Calculations Drainage Feature: HDF – 3, shows increases in WSEL. Along HDF-3, increases of up to ~1.97 m (RS 993.63), 0.39 m (RS 994.82), and 0.29 m (RS 1000) are reported, while the Clarkway Tributary shows increase up to 0.19 m (RS 1528) and ~0.16–0.18 m near the proposed bridge. Please clarify as it is required to demonstrate no increase in WSEL and no loss of flood storage across all cross-sections and events and provide confirmation of no downstream impacts for the full range of design storms (2- to 100-year and regional events).	Comment noted. The water surface elevation differences referenced in the Floodplain Report (Section 3.2.2 and Table 3-3) have been reviewed. •Water Level Increase HDF-3: Reported WSEL increases include up to approximately 1.97 m (RS 993.63), 0.39 m (RS 994.82), and 0.29 m (RS 1000). Water surface and channel bed comparisons were carried out along the channel alignment where identical HEC-RAS cross-sections exist for both existing and proposed conditions. However, in areas with proposed channel realignment, such comparisons are not applicable because cross-sections are typically defined at different locations. The stations noted above fall within these realignment areas; therefore, direct comparison is not valid. The values previously presented in the table were due to a typographical error and have now been corrected. Please refer to the revised report. •Water Level Increase – Clarkway Tributary Proposed Bridge: Under proposed conditions, water levels increase by approximately 0.19 m (RS 1528) and about 0.16–0.18 m upstream of the proposed George Bolton Parkway bridge relative to existing conditions. The bridge itself has been determined to have an insignificant impact on water levels, as it provides sufficient conveyance capacity without causing backwater effects. The observed increase in water levels is attributed to higher peak flows under future uncontrolled regional conditions, with proposed peak flow at 66.52 m³/s compared to 54.06 m³/s under existing conditions. Despite this minor increase, it has been confirmed that flooding remains contained within the valley limits, with no encroachment on existing or proposed grading. Furthermore within the SWM Report, regional controls are proposed for the developments discharging to the Clarkway Tributary in the ultimate post development scenario	SCE	The response regarding HDF-3 is noted. Confirmation through the HEC-RAS model will be required in future submissions to show that the proposed works result in no adverse impacts, including no increase in (WSEL) and no loss of flood storage, consistent with the Town's and TRCA's requirements.
CEISMP PHASE 3				
6	Section 3.2 of the report indicates that Parcels 4 and 5 are to be retained by MTO for the Highway 413 corridor, resulting in restricted access to lands currently identified for SWM Facility 3 and Wetland Compensation Area 2. For any future development proposed, the CEISMP will need to be revised to identify a suitable location for these features and confirm that drainage areas, routing, pond configuration, and downstream impacts remain valid under the updated land ownership conditions.	Noted.	-	No action required.
7	Please provide a list of studies, analyses, and design components deferred to the Draft Plan and/or subsequent detailed design stages.	In-situ permeameter testing to confirm infiltration rates at LID/SWM facilities. Review of groundwater - surface water interactions HDF-3, HDF-8 and the Clarkway Drive tributary Dewatering requirements for specific areas during future tendering Revised pre- and post-development water balance evaluation	ALL	No action required.
8	The Phase 3 CEISMP climate change feature-based water balance assessment is limited to the 2041–2070 period. The Town requests that evaluation of be done for a longer-term, specifically 2071–2100, for wetlands, the broader Natural Heritage System, or stormwater management features beyond mid century conditions as part of future planning applications.	After discussion with the Town (email dated May 20, 2026, from Hadiseh Bolkhari), it was decided that the Town is comfortable not requiring this comment to be addressed, given the uncertainty around future conditions.	GEI/SCE	Noted. The Town agreed that this comment does not need to be addressed at the current stage given the uncertainty surrounding future conditions. The comment is considered resolved.

9	As part of future planning stages Water Resources will further analysis and development of adaptive management practices for natural areas. As part of this, the Town will need a performance-based interpretation of the water balance results, particularly with respect to wetland persistence under prolonged droughts, NHS function during extended heat events. In addition, modeled minimum hydroperiods indicating residual water depths on the order of a few centimeters, though technically "wet," are functionally vulnerable to complete evaporative loss during hot and dry periods.	After discussion with the Town (email dated May 20, 2026, from Hadiseh Bolkhari), it was decided that the Town is comfortable not requiring this comment to be addressed, given the uncertainty around future conditions.	SCE/GEI	Noted. The Town agreed that this comment does not need to be addressed at the current stage given the uncertainty surrounding future conditions. The comment is considered resolved.
10	The CAMP monitoring plan is very high level and misses a sufficient level of detail to help inform the monitoring strategy from a Water Resource perspective. Water Resources will provide detailed comments as part of the plan of subdivision to ensure long-term monitoring locations are identified and implemented.	Noted.	-	No action required.
Comments Received From: Jason Elliot (Senior Environmental Planner) (Natural Heritage) - April 15, 2026				
No.	Comment	Response - May 27, 2026	Responsibility	Reviewer Response
1	The response to Comment #137 indicates that the NHS limits were revised in the CEISMP as per previous Comment #15 and will be updated in all figures and supporting drawings, including the civil drawings. However, the revision to the Preliminary NHS limit was not completed. Refer to the area circled in red in the snip below (from close to Healy Rd) and revise the Preliminary NHS limit in Figure 8.3 in the Phase 2 report and Figure 3 in the Phase 3 report to match the Fish Habitat + 15 m line. Similarly, revise the NHS limit displayed on the civil drawings in Appendix E of the Phase 2 report and Drawing G-01 of the Phase 3 report to match.	The comments refers to an area adjacent to the retained woodland and watercourse south of Healy Road where the NHS does not currently align with the 100-year / Regional flood hazards. It was agreed that the flood hazards would not be included in the NHS along the length of the proposed HDF-3 realignment, as it is understood that the detailed channel design would consider the required regional flood hazard. However, the NHS and relevant figures have been updated accordingly.	GEI/SCE	Via email on June 4, 2026, GEI clarified that the NHS limit will be revised in the area outlined in the comment. Response accepted provided all figures/drawings outlined in the comment are revised.
2	Despite Response #140 indicating that the list of SWH in Section 2.1.4 of the Phase 3 report will be revised to be consistent with the Phase 1 report, it was not done. Revise for consistency.	Section 2.1.4 of Phase 3 has been updated to add the following SWH: Candidate overwintering Turtle over-wintering habitat in the OA ponds in northwestern FOD community; and Candidate amphibian breeding habitat (wetland) within the pond just east of Humebr Station Road;	GEI	Response accepted
Comments Received From: Paul Nunes (Senior Project Manager) (Ministry of Transportation) - April 17, 2026				
No.	Comment	Response - May 27, 2026	Responsibility	Reviewer Response
	Environmental			
1	The block plan requires area would require an archaeological assessment (Stage 1 and beyond) to determine potential for archaeological resources as a result of the proposed construction.	To date, this has been completed on a Parcel/Development Application Basis and was approved under previous submissions. We and the previous reviewers, have agreed this would be acceptable as no construction would progress ahead of these applications.	LEA	No Concerns
2	The proposed submission area is constrained by provincial and federal Species at Risk, including bats and possibly habitat for Eastern Meadowlark, Bobolink. It is therefore required that the proponent share this plan with both provincial and federal agencies (MECP, CWS/ECCC, DFO, etc.) as the area is within critical habitat and may require further avoidance/mitigation/compensation discussions with the agencies.	Requirements for agency consultation have been outlined in the CEISMP and are to be completed at the draft plan/site plan stage where applicable. New Species at Risk legislation was enacted as of March 31, 2026 - Provincial protection no longer provided to federally protected migratory birds; SAR birds protected under SARA and the Migratory Bird Convention Act. Impacts to bat habitat may require a registration with MECP; this is a self-registration process to be completed by land owner. CEISMP also requires consultation with DFO for the HDF realignment, which will also be completed through the future planning stages.	GEI	No Concerns
3	Potential impacts to adjacent watercourses and requirements to obtain authorizations under the Fisheries Act.	Except for the realignment and future crossings, development adjacent to watercourses has been designed to protect fish and fish habitat and likely would not require project review under the Fisheries Act. However, this should be confirmed at draft plan/site plan stage for all parcels. DFO authorization will be required for channel realignment and/or channel crossings and will be required as part of the future planning stages.	GEI	No Concerns
4	Requirements under Section 28 of the Conservation Authorities Act for impacts within regulation limits.	TRCA has reviewed the CEISMP; permits will be required at draft plan/site plan stage where applicable (including HDF-3 realignment)	GEI	No Concerns
5	MTO recommends the proponent carefully review the Highway 413 Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) posted on the project website for information related to the Highway 413 Preliminary Design and environmental impacts, including prescribed mitigation measures and future commitments of the surrounding area.	It is the project team's understanding that all impacts and mitigation related to the future construction of Highway 413 will be the responsibility of the MTO. Accordingly, the CEISMP has not provided recommendations for the future Highway 413 corridor.	GEI	No Concerns
6	Please review Appendix C – Community Value Plan of the EIAR for illustrations on proposed landscaping opportunities for the Highway 413 corridor	See comment above.	GEI	No Concerns
Drainage				
1	The SWMP references the use of rooftop storage as part of the stormwater management strategy. Please note that rooftop storage is not considered a permanent quantity control measure by MTO and cannot be relied upon to demonstrate compliance with post-to-predevelopment flow control requirements. It should be confirmed that the stormwater management system meets quantity control criteria without reliance on rooftop storage and that there is no impact to the MTO drainage system under this condition.	Comment noted. Rooftop storage is primarily discussed as a component for the Wetland Compensation Area 2. The SWM facilities are designed to meet quantity control targets independently of rooftop controls to ensure a conservative design.	SCE	No further comments or concerns

2	Please confirm the major overland flow direction do not impact MTO infrastructure.	Figure 4.2 of the SWM Report illustrates the post-development tributary areas and demonstrates the major system overland flow routes for the subject site. As shown, overland flow is generally directed toward the proposed internal drainage network and centralized outlets, specifically the emergency spillways of the proposed SWM Facilities and the realigned channel corridor. These flow routes are designed to contain and convey major storm events within the site's dedicated conveyance systems, safely discharging them to the receiving tributaries. Consequently, the overland flow routes are directed away from the proposed Highway 413 corridor and should have no adverse impact on MTO infrastructure.	SCE	No further comments or concerns
Major Project Office (Hwy 413)				
1	The Hwy 413 project team has no concerns regarding lands within this proposal that are outside of the Highway 413 designated lands and proposed MTO Right-of-Way.	MTO to review this comment and comment below as they are in direct conflict with each other. Regardless, construction will not commence without detailed design and appropriate approvals)	DUI	To clarify our initial comments that I sent, the MTO 413 team in general, has no concerns regarding most of the lands as they are outside the Hwy 413 designated lands and MTO right-of-way. However, as mentioned, there are concerns with the southeast portion of the Humber Station Employment Area lands where lands are in direct conflict with the proposed future Hwy 413 interchange and transit lands. The Humber Station Employment Area lands in conflict would need to be amicably purchased by the MTO for the construction of the 413 highway and the Humber Station Employment Area lands would have to be realigned along the MTO designated lands. Currently the expected time to acquire the impacted properties is Dec 2027. The acquisition process has already begun, and some properties have already been purchased.
2	There is conflict in the southeast portion of the Humber Station Employment Area lands where lands are in direct conflict with the proposed future Hwy 413 interchange and transit lands.	MTO to review this comment and comment below as they are in direct conflict with each other. Regardless, construction will not commence without detailed design and appropriate approvals)	DUI	Acknowledged
3	Some properties on the southern portion of the lands are affected by the future 413 row and their access may possibly be impacted due to that.	Noted.	DUI	
4	No construction/development is permitted within of the Hwy 413 designated lands.	Noted.	DUI	
Comments Received From: Michael Hynes- (Senior Project) (TRCA Development Planning and Permits) - April 14, 2026				
No.	Comment	Response - May 27, 2026	Responsibility	Reviewer Response
Ecology				
5	*New Comment* Please clarify where Wetland Compensation Area 1 is on Figure 4	Figure 4 has been updated to clearly label Wetland Compensation Area 1.	GEI	Addressed
6	*New Comment* Wetland Compensation Area 2 is currently proposed on MTO lands. Please confirm if this will be relocated to other lands.	RESPONSE UPDATED: Wetland Compensation Area 2, currently shown on the MTO lands, was identified under previous land ownership as a suitable location for compensation. However, as discussed with the Town of Caledon, both the CEISMP will be amended at a later date to identify new suitable locations for SWM3 and Wetland Compensation Area 2. The amended plan will ensure suitable compensation targets are achieved.	-	No response on whether the Wetland Compensation Area 2 will be relocated to other lands.
Hydrogeology				
6	The response indicates that the SWM report is available in 'Phase 2- SWM page 12, (PDF28)'. It is staff understanding that it references Section 4.0 of the Phase 2 report. There is no stand-alone SWM report of twenty-eight pages available within the March 2026 circulation. Figure 4.6 of the Phase 2 report (201 of 872) shows proposed LID areas. However, the figure does not clearly indicate areas where LIDs can be successfully implemented. This map should be revised, and only those areas should be indicated where infiltration measures can be implemented. The revised map shall also show the groundwater monitoring wells installed in the area, along with the highest groundwater level observed and approximate post-development grading elevations.	The references to the "PDF28" pertain to Section 4.0 of the Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP) Phase 2 report. Regarding Figure 4.6 (LID Feasibility Locations), the areas shown with green hatching are identified as "Areas Indicated where infiltration is feasible". The green hatching represents area where the vertical separation between the proposed grade and the water table is sufficient to make infiltration technically feasible (typically greater than 3m). These zones were determined through an overlay analysis of the proposed post-development grading elevations and the available seasonally high groundwater information. While the current map already includes Groundwater Contours and Elevations, SCE will revise Figure 4.6 in the updated submission to include the following additional data for improved clarity: -As requested, the physical locations of the groundwater monitoring wells installed within the study area. -Approximate preliminary post-development grade elevations in these zones to demonstrate the vertical separation distances -Additional hatching to demonstrate where the groundwater to proposed grade separation is not sufficient for infiltration.	Arcadis/SCE	Addressed

7	The response references Figure 4.5 of the updated SWM report. It is staff's understanding that it is a typo and instead references Figure 4.6 of the report as mentioned under Item 6 above. Although the response indicates that the first 5mm retention target could be achieved through infiltration measures, it is the staff's understanding that, based on current investigations, it has not been demonstrated that the entire 5mm of the precipitation can be infiltrated. The TRCA 5mm retention target is not exclusively based on infiltration measures. Section 4.2 of the report (Page 199 of 872) indicates that the first 2.75mm of the annual precipitation can achieve the pre-development infiltration target.	See response above for the clarifications on the Figure 4.6 which demonstrates feasibility of infiltration. Please note, Section 4.10, indicates an infiltration depth of 2.75 mm from the private development blocks would satisfy the site-wide water balance target. However, SCE confirms that the more stringent 5 mm retention strategy has been adopted for all site plan blocks to remain in full alignment with TRCA policy. It is acknowledged that the TRCA 5 mm retention target is not exclusively limited to infiltration. Accordingly, the updated SWM report will be revised to specify that a minimum of 2.75 mm will be required to be infiltrated to maintain the existing water balance. The remaining 2.25 mm of retention (to reach the 5 mm target) will be achieved through additional infiltration, rainwater reuse, or evapotranspiration, depending on the constraints and opportunities identified during the detailed Site Plan Application process. Where site conditions permit, the entire 5 mm target can be achieved through infiltration.	SCE	Addressed
10	It appears that the updated report, as mentioned earlier, for the proposed channel realignment around the wetlands is not available. The response indicates that if required, it should be completed at the draft plan stage. The hydrogeology staff has no concerns if the investigations are conducted at the Draft Plan stage. However, it recommends that the scope of required investigations should be determined and documented.	Groundwater levels, gradients and potential connectivity to wetland features along the proposed channel realignment should be investigated as part of the draft plan stage. This will be completed by installing mini-piezometers at the inlet and outlet of the created wetlands with quarterly monitoring for one year as part of the draft plan stage. These recommendations will be provided in the Phase 3 report.	GEI/Arcadis	Addressed
11	Confirmation is required that monitoring will occur at the identified locations, and Table 11 will be updated.	The March 23, 2026 CRM indicated that Table 11 has been updated with this information; however additional details will be provided. As outlined in Table 11, the following wells are proposed for groundwater level monitoring: MW4-17D, MW5-17D, MW25-1A, MR25-3A, and MW25-CR1. The wells are of sufficient depth to allow for the required monitoring and stated drawdown threshold. Table 11 has been updated to include specific details related to water quality monitoring: MW4-17D, MW5-17D, MW25-1A, MW25-3A, MW25-CR1. Table 11 has been updated to include details re ecohydrology monitoring (P25/D-CW-2025, WL2-17, and SF6-17).	Arcadis	Addressed
15	TRCA appreciates the clarification provided regarding erosion control and the proposed use of filtration cells and extended detention. It is noted that the applicant states that infiltration-based LID measures may be unsuitable due to site geotechnical constraints, and that extended detention of the 25 mm event over 48 hours is proposed to address instream erosion control requirements. Please note that TRCA erosion control criteria also include a requirement for 5 mm onsite retention through LID measures. It is further noted that the filtration cells are intended solely to satisfy CLI ECA water quality requirements and are not being credited toward TRCA's erosion control volume target. However, the submission does not clearly demonstrate how TRCA's 5 mm erosion control / water balance retention target is being achieved across the site in the absence of infiltration or evapotranspiration-based LID measures. While the rationale for excluding infiltration is acknowledged, further clarification is required to quantify and demonstrate compliance with the 5 mm retention requirement using alternative approved methods such as evapotranspiration or reuse. Please provide a clear summary and supporting calculations demonstrating how the TRCA 5 mm erosion control target is satisfied under the proposed design.	Based on the CEISMP Phase 2 SWM Report and as documented in Section 4.10 of the SWM Report and supported by the water balance calculations provided in Appendix A of the SWM Report, a comprehensive water balance analysis was completed using the Thornthwaite and Mather method. The analysis compared pre-development and post-development conditions and established the site-wide infiltration deficit and mitigation requirements. The water balance analysis confirmed that a minimum infiltration depth of 2.34mm across the entire study area, or alternatively 2.75mm applied to the private development blocks alone, would be required to recover the post-to-pre infiltration deficit. However, to be consistent with TRCA requirements, a 5mm retention target has been adopted as the water balance and erosion control design standard within the study area. The 5mm retention target is to be achieved at the individual site plan level through the implementation of LIDs sized for each development block. We included preliminary calculations, as presented in the infiltration LID sizing calculations in Appendix A of the SWM Report. Individual infiltration systems have been sized for each site plan block (Sites 01 through 14). Required infiltration volume per block based on 5mm applied to the impervious drainage area. We also considered •72-hour drawdown time •Measured infiltration rate of 15 mm/hr with a safety factor of 2.5, yielding a design infiltration rate of 6.0 mm/hr •Maximum facility depth of 1.0m As noted in Section 4.10 of the SWM Report and illustrated in Figure 4.6, areas with sufficient separation between the groundwater table and proposed grade to support infiltration have been identified across the study area. The infiltration footprint required per site plan block represents approximately 1.25% to 2.5% of the respective development area, depending on facility depth (ie, 1m depth or 0.5m depth, respectively), which has been demonstrated to be achievable within the available site plan areas. It is noted that infiltration measures within the ROW are not required to satisfy the overall site-wide water balance target, as the private development blocks are sized to compensate for the ROW contribution. The actual 5mm retention strategy or LID to be implemented will be confirmed and detailed at the individual site plan application stage, where site-specific geotechnical and groundwater information will be available to finalize infiltration facility design. Each site plan applicant will be required to demonstrate compliance with the 5mm retention target as a condition of site plan approval, consistent with TRCA requirements. It is acknowledged that the TRCA 5 mm retention target is not exclusively limited to infiltration. Accordingly, the updated SWM report will be revised to specify that a minimum of 2.75 mm will be required to be infiltrated to maintain the existing water balance. The remaining 2.25 mm of retention (to reach the 5 mm target) will be achieved through additional infiltration, rainwater reuse, or evapotranspiration, depending on the constraints and opportunities identified during the detailed Site Plan Application process. Where site conditions permit, the entire 5 mm target can be achieved through infiltration.	SCE/GEI	TRCA acknowledges that the water balance analysis has identified the infiltration deficit associated with the proposed development and that the required mitigation measures will be implemented through future Site Plan Applications. The proposed approach, whereby individual development blocks will be required to demonstrate compliance with the applicable water balance retention targets through the implementation of Low Impact Development (LID) measures, is acceptable in principle. TRCA has no objection to deferring the detailed design and confirmation of the proposed retention measures to the Site Plan Application stage, provided that a condition is included requiring each Site Plan Application to demonstrate compliance with the approved water balance targets and associated retention requirements to the satisfaction of TRCA. This condition should ensure that the cumulative site-wide water balance objectives established through the Secondary Plan/Block Plan process are achieved through the detailed design of future development blocks.

Comments Received From: Dylan Prowse - (Region of Peel) (Intermediate Planner)- May 6, 2026				
No.	Comment	Response - May 27, 2026	Responsibility	Reviewer Response
Sanitary Sewer Infrastructure				
1	<u>Existing and Planned Services</u> The sanitary sewer network consists of the following: - Existing 750mm sanitary sewer on Clarkway Drive 750mm diameter sanitary sewer under construction on Humber Station Road. 600mm sanitary sewer under construction on Healey Road - Proposed local sanitary sewer on George Bolton Parkway - The sanitary sewer trunk on Humber Station Road is being constructed via microtunneling with a minimal number of manholes. Individual future development site plans along Humber Station Road and Healey Road will require local sanitary sewers for servicing connections. The sanitary sewer on George Bolton Parkway will service properties south of George Bolton Parkway.	Noted.	DUI	

2	<u>Modelling and Sanitary Capacity</u> - Region of Peel has no objection to the sanitary servicing plan for the Humber Station Secondary Plan area, serviced via the future Castlemore Road Diversion sewer from Highway 50 to the east-west Derry Road trunk sewer. - The sanitary sewer trunk on Humber Station Road is being constructed via microtunneling with a minimal number of manholes. Individual future development site plans along Humber Station Road and Healy Road will require local sanitary sewers for servicing connections. The sanitary sewer on George Bolton Parkway will service properties south of George Bolton Parkway. The FSR should include design calculations for future sanitary sewers on George Bolton Parkway and the north-south road. The sanitary sewer on George Bolton Parkway should be deep enough to ensure there are no sanitary sewer invert constraints for the southern sites. - Recommendations are subject to change should the proposed population and sanitary demands change.	Noted.	DUI	
3	<u>Modelling and water capacity</u> - The estimated population is 9,022 people based on the 70 persons/ha for a 129.0 ha of developable lands. The subject site largely located in region SGUs 2124-5047 and 2124-5146 which are forecasted to grow by 3,180 employment by 2051. The proposed development exceeds the region growth estimate significantly within the SGUs. - The estimated domestic water demand for the Humber Station Employment Secondary Plan area is 43.8 L/s (MDD). The total MDD plus Fire Flow considered for analysis is 460.8 L/s, where fire flow of 417.0 L/s was assumed. It is proposed that Secondary Plan area lands will use the existing/proposed water infrastructure for water distribution and looping. Based on the submitted growth projections, following are the water servicing comments, at this time:	Noted.	DUI	
a	Based on hydraulic modeling results, the existing and proposed water supply system within Pressure Zone 6 does not have sufficient capacity to service the proposed Humber Station Employment Secondary Plan area. Under projected maximum day demand and fire flow conditions, the Pressure Zone 6 infrastructure cannot reliably meet required flow and pressure criteria.	A meeting was held on May 22nd, 2026 with Region of Peel staff to discuss available water supply capacity for the proposed Humber Station Employment Secondary Plan area. The Region of Peel staff confirmed in that meeting that the Region will be able to accommodate the Ultimate buildout conditions of the Secondary Plan area with infrastructure upgrades or modifications to be made, if necessary. It was also discussed that, prior to Ultimate buildout conditions, a preliminary plan identifying a development timeline within the Secondary Plan area will be provided as part of the next submission to ensure alignment with the Region's planning.	SCE	No Concerns. We will look for the updated studies to include the preliminary development timelines for the SP area and note that the additional comments related to hydrology and fire flows will be addressed through further studies.
b	As a result, it is recommended that the population and employment growth assumptions for the Secondary Plan Area be re-evaluated to ensure alignment with the Region's approved planning forecasts. Updated growth assumptions should then be used to revise water demand calculations and to confirm whether planned or additional water system upgrades will be required to support the proposed development.	(Same as above). A meeting was held on May 22nd, 2026 with Region of Peel staff to discuss available water supply capacity for the proposed Humber Station Employment Secondary Plan area. The Region of Peel staff confirmed in that meeting that the Region will be able to accommodate the Ultimate buildout conditions of the Secondary Plan area with infrastructure upgrades or modifications to be made, if necessary. It was also discussed that, prior to Ultimate buildout conditions, a preliminary plan identifying a development timeline within the Secondary Plan area will be provided as part of the next submission to ensure alignment with the Region's planning.	SCE	No Concerns. We will look for the updated studies to include the preliminary development timelines for the SP area and note that the additional comments related to hydrology and fire flows will be addressed through further studies.
c	Planned regional water capital watermain projects in the vicinity of subject site should be required prior to service the site. The inclusion in the budget/construction date is subject to change for the regional projects.	Noted.	DUI	
d	Detailed fire flow calculations should be provided when available in subsequent submission.	Noted & to be completed for servicing submissions, these details should not be included in the CEISMP.	DUI	No Concerns. We will look for the updated studies to include the preliminary development timelines for the SP area and note that the additional comments related to hydrology and fire flows will be addressed through further studies.
4	The subsequent submission for this site needs to be reviewed in more detail by the Region to confirm the water servicing for the site.	Noted & to be completed for servicing submissions, these details should not be included in the CEISMP.	DUI	No Concerns. We will look for the updated studies to include the preliminary development timelines for the SP area and note that the additional comments related to hydrology and fire flows will be addressed through further studies.
5	Recommendations are subject to change should the proposed population and water demand changes.	Noted.	DUI	
Hydrogeology				
6	A door-to-door well survey is required within a 500 m radius or the zone of influence (ZOI), whichever is greater, and a contingency plan needs to be provided	Noted & to be completed for servicing submissions, these details should not be included in the CEISMP.	DUI	No Concerns. We will look for the updated studies to include the preliminary development timelines for the SP area and note that the additional comments related to hydrology and fire flows will be addressed through further studies.
Regional Roads				

7	Hydraulic and flood plain modelling did not include the current road widening capital project on Mayfield Rd. Further hydraulic analysis of any proposed changes/upgrades to the road grade and crossings on Mayfield Rd must be taken into consideration. Please coordinate with the Region's Capital Project team for current detailed design of Mayfield Rd. Details of the project manager are given below:	Noted & to be completed for servicing submissions, however, these details and limits should not be included in the CEISMP.	DUI	No Concerns. We will look for the updated studies to include the preliminary development timelines for the SP area and note that the additional comments related to hydrology and fire flows will be addressed through further studies.
---	---	--	-----	---