

STAFF COMMENTS		ACTION BY	RESPONSE
TRCA Jason Wagler – March 5, 2021			
	Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff have now had the opportunity to review the above noted revised applications received on January 14, 2021. Please find TRCA staff's general comments below, and our detailed comments in Appendix A. We would be pleased to discuss this correspondence to assist the Region, Town and the applicant in addressing the comments.	NO ACTION	
Subject Proposal			
	We understand that the Official Plan Amendment proposes to redesignate the lands from Prime Agricultural Area and Environmental Policy Area (EPA) to a Residential Policy Area to permit the development of single detached, semi-detached and various forms of townhouse units with a site-specific density.	NO ACTION	
	We note the Draft Plan of Subdivision proposes to create 154 dwellings consisting of 3 single detached dwellings, 151 rear lane townhouse dwellings, a stormwater management pond, environmental blocks and a park block. The Zoning By-law Amendment proposes to rezone the lands from Agricultural (A 1), Rural Residential (RR), Open Space (OS) and Environmental Policy Area 2 Zone (EPA2) to Mixed Density Residential-Exception XXX (RMD-XXX), Rural Residential (RR), Open Space (OS) and Environmental Policy Area 2 Zone (EPA2) to permit site specific uses and standards to implement the draft plan of subdivision.	NO ACTION	
TRCA Recommendation			
	Based on our review of the materials listed on the January 12, 2021 circulation letter from the Town of Caledon, many of our previous comments have been addressed. However, there are several matters that need to be addressed prior to draft plan approval. The key issues remaining are as follows:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Confirmation of Stormwater Block Sizing</li></ul>	NO ACTION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Hydrologic modelling</li></ul>	NO ACTION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Stormwater facility erosion control</li></ul>	NO ACTION	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Additional modelling or extended detention required for valley outlet</li></ul>	NO ACTION	
	Based on the above key issues and comments noted in <b>Appendix A</b> , TRCA staff are of the opinion that the application is premature as currently submitted. Note that only remaining, outstanding comments are included in the appendix.	CANDEVCON	Noted.
	As noted in the introductory paragraph, TRCA staff remain committed to work with the applicant, Region, and Town with respect to the proposed urban expansion. We are available to meet with the Region, Town, applicant and their team of consultants in an effort to find solutions to the comments in this letter. We trust these comments are of assistance. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.	ALL	Noted.
<b>APPENDIX A: TRCA COMMENTS ON Region File # ROPA-20-001C - FIRST SUBMISSION (TRCA FILE # CFN 63000)</b>			
	To facilitate our timely review, the table below should be expanded and used by the applicant to respond to TRCA staff comments in future submissions.	NO ACTION	
	<b>First Submission (date received March 19, 2020)</b>	<b>Second Submission (date received January 14, 2021)</b>	
	<b>TRCA Staff Comments (May 15, 2020)</b>	<b>TRCA Staff Comments (March 2, 2021)</b>	
<b>Water Resources Engineering</b>			
1.	It was noted that the proposed stormwater management pond will provide water quantity controls for the site for 2 100-year storms. We note that this proposed urban expansion was not included as future development area in the current 2017 Humber Hydrology Update. Any urban expansion and its associated Regional storm peak flows excluded in the approved Hydrology Update, must be controlled to the existing Regional storm peak flows. Please adjust the hydrologic model and SWM Sizing calculations to include the Regional Storm event.	The hydrologic calculations and associated storage requirements for the Regional storm event were deferred to the detailed design stage. Please note that a preliminary SWM pond sizing including the required Regional storage component and associated hydrogeologic and hydraulic supporting calculations must be provided at the functional servicing stage. It must be demonstrated that the proposed pond block would be large enough to achieve the TRCA and MOECP SWM requirements and appropriate buffers before proceeding to detailed design.	SWM Pond design is revised to include Regional Storm. <div>TOWN OF CALEDON PLANNING RECEIVED September 1, 2021</div>

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	(Delegated Authority/Regulator/Public Body/MOU/RMA)		
2.	<p>As identified in the Humber River Hydrology update, the 6-hour or 12-hour AES storm distributions must be utilized for hydrologic assessment within this watershed. The storm requiring the greater storage volume to provide quantity control should be chosen. Please re-run the hydrologic model using both 6-hour and 12-hour storm distributions and select the most conservative, for sizing purposes. Please provide a digital copy of the model for review. Please contact Jairo Morelli, TRCA engineer at <a href="mailto:jmorelli@trca.on.ca">jmorelli@trca.on.ca</a> if the AES storm distribution files are needed (Delegated Authority/Regulator/Public Body/MOU/RMA)</p>	<p>This item is still outstanding. Please provide a digital copy of the hydrologic modeling including both; the 6 and 12-hour AES storm distributions and select the storm that required the greater storage. Please include the Regional storm event and associated hydrologic parameters and assumptions.</p> <p>Proposed outflows are based on unit flow rates and consistent with TRCA SWM Criteria. This is acceptable.</p> <p>Please include in the route reservoir command of the Visual Otthymo model, the storage and outflow for the 2 to 100 years and Regional storm events, consistent with the values illustrated in the SWM Pond Control Structure Design table, provided in Appendix H.</p>	<p>CANDEVCON</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital Model provided with resubmission materials.</li> <li>The route reservoir command updated as per control structure rating curve</li> </ul>
3.	<p>It appears that a portion of the subject area drains to northwest and the remaining drains to the east; however, there is not a clear indication on the existing and proposed drainage patterns or divides. Please provide a drainage plan for both the existing and post-development conditions along with associated hydrologic parameters and drainage patterns. Please provide a discussion on why only 7.0 out of the total 10.08 hectares would be treated by the proposed stormwater management facility. It should be noted that overcontrol would be required within the pond should any area be left uncontrolled, due to existing topographic constraints (Delegated Authority/Regulator/Public Body/MOU/RMA).</p>	<p>Only 7.0 out of the 10.08 hectares on the property will be developed. Please provide a drainage plan illustrating the catchments and associated imperviousness level, flow direction, etc. for both: the existing and proposed scenarios.</p>	<p>CANDEVCON</p> <p>Refer to Drawing PD-1 (Pre-Development Drainage Area Plan) and Drawing ST-1 (Storm Drainage Plan) for Pre &amp; Post Development Drainage Conditions.</p>
4.	<p>Table III of the submitted FSR shows that the proposed SWM pond will provide enhanced level (80% removal of total suspended solids) treatment. This is acceptable. (Regulator/Public Body/MOU/RMA)</p>	<p>Proposed permanent pool volume requirements are consistent with Table 3.2 of the MOECP manual.</p> <p>It should be noted that the erosion control for this site should be based on the detention of the runoff from a 25mm storm event in 48 hours. The required storage would be like the one the proposed SWM facility has been sized for. (Distributed Runoff Control of DRC). Please adjust the extended detention storage using the appropriate-mentioned criteria instead of the assumed DRC (2/3 of the 2-year storm). Staff suggested the consultant increasing the orifice to a minimum of 75 mm.</p> <p>The information provided in Appendix H of the FSR prepared by Candevcon Ltd. (Revised on January 4, 2021) indicates that the proposed SWM facility will</p>	<p>CANDEVCON</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Erosion Control Criteria for SWM Pond revised for 25mm Erosion Control. Refer to VO Results for 25mm (4hr) Chicago Storm and associated calcs for Storage volume and drawdown time.</li> <li>Minimum orifice size revised accordingly.</li> <li>Appendix H revised with correct information</li> <li>Refer to IT-1 Plan for Infiltration Trench Cross-section</li> </ul> <p>Cross Sections and Details of infiltration trench provided on Drawings IT-1 and IT-1A.</p>

	STAFF COMMENTS		ACTION BY	RESPONSE
		<p>not be able to provide the required extended detention volume (erosion control) at the proposed elevation of 255.25masl (2,193/1,149 m3, required/provided storage). Staff is of the opinion that the required extended detention storage based on the runoff generated by the 25mm storm event may be lower than the one estimated within the FSR. Please provide clarification or calculations and adjust all relevant documents accordingly.</p> <p>Preliminary calculations show that approximately 570 metres of 1.2x 1.2m infiltration trenches will be provided to fulfill the required 5.0 mm onsite retention. At the detail design stage, please provide a cross-section of the proposed trenches along with locations and the approximate seasonally high groundwater level. The proponent may refer to TRCA Low Impact Development Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide (2010) for further details and guidance.</p>		
5.	<p>It is noted the proposed SWM pond outlets to the HDF running northwest. It is our understanding that the discharge from the SWM Pond to the HDF may cause significant stream erosion which will lead to gully development within the valley. A full-fledged erosion assessment should be conducted using a continuous hydrology model to determine the erosion control criteria for the site. Please note that this erosion assessment should be completed a per the methodology referenced in Section 4 and Appendix B of TRCA’s SWM Criteria Document (<i>Delegated Authority/Regulator/Public Body/MOU/RMA</i>)</p>	<p>An erosion assessment for the adjacent reaches (A5 and D2) has been completed. The proposed erosion threshold does not fully meet TRCA erosion control requirements for the subject site. TO address this, please consider the following options:</p> <p><b>Option 1:</b> An erosion threshold of 0.058 m3/s has been established for the reached where the outfall is proposed. The 2-year target peak flow for the site is 0.057 m3/s. Therefore, the critical erosion threshold discharge is almost the same as that of the 2-year allowable outflow. Typically, the erosion threshold discharge should be between the 0.5 year and 1.35-year peak flows. However, the erosion threshold discharge established for the site is way higher than that of the typical values. Please consider revising the estimated erosion threshold. Once the erosion threshold discharge is revised, it can be utilized in the continuous hydrologic modeling (as requested in previous comments) to set the extended detention criteria for the proposed development. Please provide staff with a copy of the continuous hydrologic model consistent with the procedure described in Appendix B of the TRCA SWM criteria.</p> <p><b>Option 2:</b> To address potential erosion issues resulting from the proposed development, the applicant could also</p>	<p>PALMER/ CANDEVCON</p>	<p>Refer to Palmer updated Memo dated August 27<sup>th</sup> 2021 on Erosion Threshold which confirmed the Erosion Threshold of 0.058 m³/s for the headwater tributary that is proposed for the SWM pond outlet. Based on the updated FSR (August 27<sup>th</sup> 2021), the outflow rate for a 25mm 4 hour Chicago Storm event is 0.011 m³/s and the 2 year storm outflow rate is 0.056 m³/s. A continuous hydrologic model can be completed if required as part of the detailed engineering design.</p>

	STAFF COMMENTS		ACTION BY	RESPONSE
		provide detention of the <b>25mm event for a period of 48 hour</b> (already provided within the proposed SWM facility) and <b>on-site retention of 25mm</b> of runoff from the entire impervious surfaces within the proposed Low Impact Development (LID) measures. If this is the case, please provided supporting calculations that show the proposed LIDs can accommodate and infiltrate/evapotranspire a minimum of 25mm within the underlying soils. Preliminary calculations and locations would be acceptable at the Functional Servicing stage.		
	Geotechnical Engineering			
6.	<p>EIS Report &amp; FSR Drawing IT-1: the drawing shows an outfall discharging from Block 30 SWM pond to a steep slope; this is a potential significant issue due to the following: (i) Discharge can cause erosion and/or saturation of the steep slopes with potential risk of instability, and additionally (ii) the outfall, pipes and facilities associated for the proposed work are located within the erosion hazard as they encroach into the LTSTOS line as shown on both the Drawing IT-1 and Drawing No. 7 of the geotechnical report showing the LTSTOS line. Therefore, they will likely be undermined by the erosion hazard and slope instability process in the long-term.</p> <p>If possible, please revise the plan to avoid the outfall encroaching and/or discharging into the steep valleys.</p> <p>Should a potential relocation of the discharge point for the site not be possible, the slope stability analysis must be revised to address the outfall and discharge's impact on the adjacent slope's stability both in the short and long-term. (<i>Delegated Authority/Regulator/Public Body/MOU/RMA</i>)</p>	As previously requested, if the outlet is unable to avoid the slope, the slope stability analysis must be revised to address the outfall and discharge's impact on the adjacent slope's stability both in the short and long-term.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Soil Engineers Ltd. Letter Report dated March 23rd 2021 included with this submission
	Natural Heritage			
7.	Please note that infrastructure (e.g SWM Ponds), and all supporting components (e.g outfalls/spillways), should be located outside of all KNHFs and their associated MVPZs unless it has been demonstrated that there are no other alternatives. There appears to be enough area to locate the SWM pond outside of the MVPZ. Moreover, there may be opportunities to coordinate any potential outfalls with existing municipal infrastructure (e.g roadside ditches, roadside spillways etc.) and/or split slows in efforts to reduce centralized concentrated flow and minimize cumulative impacts to the natural System and TRCA property/ ( <i>Public Body/MOU/RMA</i> )	Previous Comment #37 – Partially addressed – Thank you for removing the SWM Block from the required setbacks, however, please note that staff still has concerns regarding all the proposed outfall location options (i.e 1, 2 and 3) as shown on Figure 1 of the FSR, as they are all proposed to encroach/bisect the NHS. While ultimately, the outfall structures are permitted under current policy where all feasible options have been explored and impacts minimized, each proposed option will have similar construction related impacts (tree removal, risk of erosion, sedimentation of the watercourses, etc.) as well as long-term maintenance impacts (e.g access, repair,	PALMER	Two other options were explored by Palmer and Candevcon and ultimately ruled out as being not feasible or higher risk than the three options provided, n particular option #2 which in our opinion is the best location for the SWM outfall. The first option was to tie into the existing municipal storm sewer or drainage pathways along Emil Kolb parkway near the site. Due to the depth of the SWM pond and the need for a bottom draw, there was no practical way to drain to the nearby storm sewer or drainage pathways along Emil Kolb parkway. In addition, adding additional discharge at this location, in our opinion, has a much higher potential to exacerbate the significant existing erosion along Reach B that is already underway.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<p>reconstruction etc.) for the proposed infrastructure to avoid the above impacts? Have other options away from this section of the valley been explored?</p> <p>Please provide a response regarding other outlet alternatives, demonstrating that any less intrusive options are not feasible, note that removals will need to be quantified and appropriately mitigates at detailed design.</p>		
8.	<p>The receiving watercourse, the main Humber River, supports cold water species. Coldwater species are intolerant of temperatures exceeding 22 degrees Celsius and outflow from the stormwater management pond would exceed this temperature during the summer months. Please identify the measures to be incorporated to mitigate thermal impacts from stormwater released from the proposed stormwater management facility. For more information on mitigation measures, please visit TRCA's STEP website. (<i>Public Body/MOU/RMA</i>)</p>	<p>9. Ongoing – Please note that staff recognise the bottom draw as a partial mitigation measure forever, we recommend further cooling technologies (e.g colling trenches) be provided at detailed design in efforts to further mitigate potential cumulative thermal impacts to the receiving cold-water system.</p>	<p>PALMER</p> <p>Acknowledged. We will review potential cooling options at detailed design. However, please note, due to the steep slopes and deep well treed valleylands for the discharge location, it may be difficult to employ additional engineering measures such as cooling trenches for this project. The proposed discharge location is within a deeply incised valley, that has a continuous tree canopy along its length and is located approx. 300 m upstream of the Humber River. These conditions will provide additional thermal buffering of the stormwater from the bottom draw system that will further mitigate water temperature before reaching the cold-water Humber River.</p>
<b>Golder – Hydrogeological Peer Reviewer</b> <b>Sean McFarland – April 29, 2021</b>			
Regional Geology and Hydrogeology			
1.	<p>The hydrogeological report includes an overview of the regional setting including the physiography and regional geology and the geological setting. The report notes that the site is located within the South Slope physiographic region that is noted South of the Oak Ridges Moraine and North of the Peel Plain. The report indicates that surficial geology at the site consists of the Halton Till which is comprised of clayey to silt textured sediments based on Ontario Geological Survey (OGS) mapping. The report notes that the Halton Till and underlying Newmarket Till represent regional aquitards of fine-grained sediments.</p>	<p>PALMER</p>	<p>No Action Required.</p>
2.	<p>The report is considered to adequately characterize the regional physiography, surficial geology and Hydrostratigraphy based on available published sources of information. The report indicates that the study area is situated within the main Humber River Subwatershed, with a groundwater flow regime with a low likelihood of Coldwater habitats for aquatic organisms based on a cited TRCA source. There are 34 water well records within a 500 m radius of the site based on a search of the MECP water well database, as noted in the report. The report further indicates a roadside water well screening identified up to 14 properties within 500 m that have the potential to rely on potable water rather than the municipal supply, although municipal water is known to be available along Chickadee Lane, Glasgow Pond, Emil Kolb Parkway on King Street.</p>	<p>PALMER</p>	<p>No Action Required.</p>
Groundwater Use			
1.	<p>The report notes that a detailed door-to-door water well survey will be completed at detailed design to document existing potable groundwater use near the site and to collect baseline data on groundwater quality and quantity.</p> <p>We agree with the completion of this well survey. The report further notes the presence of a series of deep municipal test wells along Glasgow Road adjacent to the site which are not used for municipal water. The site geology and hydrogeology was assessed through the drilling of 14 boreholes, by Soil Engineers Ltd., to depths ranging from 6.1 mbgs (metres below ground surface) to 32.0 mbgs.</p>	<p>PALMER</p>	<p>No Action Required.</p>
Site Geology and Hydrogeology			
1.	<p>The site geology was described in the report to consist of silty clay of the Halton Till formation, while five boreholes encountered fill materials. Six of the boreholes were instrumented with monitoring wells. Groundwater levels were measured in the monitoring wells. The report indicates that the perched water table</p>	<p>PALMER</p>	<p>No Action Required.</p>



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	is 5 m to 8 m below ground surface based on a change in soil colour from brown to grey at three boreholes. The report indicates the majority of the boreholes were dug upon completion. Contouring of groundwater levels indicates that the shallow groundwater flow at the site and either flows in a northeast direction or northwest toward the Humber River tributary (shown on Figure 5 of the report). From our perspective, the site area appears to contain an inferred groundwater divide through the central portion of the site where groundwater from the western portion of the site flows to the west while groundwater from the eastern portion of the site flows to the East (see Figure 5 of the report).		
2.	Four single well response tests (slug tests) were completed in the monitoring wells. The hydraulic conductivity testing estimates ranged from $3.5 \times 10^{-6}$ m/s to $4.4 \times 10^{-8}$ m/s, with a geometric mean of $1.1 \times 10^{-7}$ m/s. Infiltration estimates were developed using the Low Impact Development (LID) Stormwater Management Planning and Design Guide. The percolation rate was calculated to be 40 mml/hr. The report indicates that site-specific infiltration testing will be completed at a later design stage once the LID locations and design have been finalized. We agree with the completion of site-specific infiltration testing.	PALMER	Acknowledged.
3.	Groundwater samples were collected from one weU (MW6) and analyzed for a suite of parameters and compared against Provincial Water Quality Objectives (PWQO). Of the parameters analyzed, the results exceed the PWQO for aluminum and iron, which the report indicates is likely the result of high TSS (total suspended solids) in the sample.	PALMER	No Action Required.
Site Geology and Hydrogeology			
1.	Pre- development and post- development water balances were completed for the site using a monthly soil moisture balance approach. We consider the approach and methodology to be appropriate. The results of the water balance analysis indicate that, without mitigation, the post-development runoff is expected to increase by 110 percent, with a 53 percent reduction in infiltration, due to the introduction of impervious surfaces.	PALMER	No Action Required.
2.	The report indicates that the completed pre-to-post development water balance is provided separately in the Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP), which provides the design measures to maintain post-development infiltration through the addition of at least 4.929 m <sup>3</sup> /year. The report does recommend (Section 5.3) the use of Low Impact Development Measures as part of the overall management plan.	PALMER	No Action Required.
3.	We are in general agreement with this principle. The report indicates that the site has low permeability soils, is poorly drained and with a water table 5 m to 8 m below groundwater surface. The report further indicates that under these conditions, infiltration trenches, vegetated swales, and bioretention areas can all be effective. It is not clear from the report specifically how these measures would be effective in thick low permeability Halton Till. The hydrogeological report notes that the details on the design and use of the LID measures is provided by Candevcon in in the FSR report an the CEISMP report, which have not been reviewed as part of this peer review of the hydrogeological report by Palmer.	PALMER	No Action Required.
4.	The hydrogeological report indicates that based on available source water protection information and mapping the site is not located in a High Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA) nor Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA). A small portion of the site is noted to be characterized as a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area with a low vulnerability score of two. The report indicates that no activities in these areas have been identified that could pose a threat to groundwater based on the 2017 Tables of Drinking Water Threats for Pathogens and Chemicals. Although we do not have specific hydrogeological concerns, we note that this information should be reviewed by the appropriate Source Water Protection policy planners.	PALMER	No Action Required.
Construction Dewatering			
1.	The report indicates that the site servicing and house foundation excavations are expected to be completed above the water table, which is interpreted to range from approximately 4.5 m to 8 m below ground surface. As a result, only minor seepage from potential perched groundwater is expected. A preliminary dewatering assessment was completed to assess perched seepage. The results indicate an estimated seepage rate of 4,256 Uday. The Zone of Influence from the dewatering is estimated to range from 16.6 to 27.9 m. The report indicates that "no private wells or natural features will be impacted by dewatering for this project".	PALMER	No Action Required.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
2.	We agree that it is unlikely that the surrounding water wells be impacted by dewatering, the developer should be prepared to respond to well Interference complaints to ensure that there are no impacts on the water supply, and in the event that there are unanticipated impacts, provide mitigation measures to provide a temporary supply during construction. In addition, the dewatering impact assessment focused on the drawdown from the dewatering and not the discharge of pumped water from calculations. Although this is not a hydrogeological issue, these potential impacts should be considered as part of the dewatering plan.	PALMER	Acknowledged.
Conclusions			
1.	The basement excavations are expected to be constructed above the water table and if they are excavated below the perched water table then the surrounding wells are outside the calculated area of groundwater influence. Therefore, we are agreed that there are not expected to be impacts to surrounding wells related to construction dewatering activities.	PALMER	No Action Required.
2.	The site will be serviced by a municipal water supply without individual wells. Therefore, there will not be hydrogeological impacts associated with pumping of water supply wells.	PALMER	No Action Required.
3.	The site will be serviced by municipal sewage and therefore, there will not be hydrogeological issues associated with private sector septic systems.	PALMER	No Action Required.
Recommendations			
1.	The performance of the LID measures in the low permeability Halton Till deposits should be confirmed in the detailed design stages.	PALMER / CANDEVCON	Acknowledged.
<b>Region of Peel</b>			
<b>Wayne Koethe, May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2021</b>			
<b>Planning Justification Report General Comments</b>			
1.	The PJR must be updated to reflect the most recent Bolton Residential Expansion Study (BRES) ROPA 30 status and applicable policies.	HPGI	PJR has been revised to reflect most recent BRES RPRA 30 status and applicable policies.
2.	As per ROPA 30 policy 5.4.3.2.9.1, phasing needs to be provided for the lands within ROPA 30 and the PJR should consider this.	HPGI	Addressed in the revised PJR. Refer to section 4.5
3.	Page 47 – This section discusses a “minimum Greenfield target of 80 people and jobs per hectare.” This was a 2017 Provincial growth standard which has now been updated with the 2019 Growth Plan. This report should revise this statement and included a recommended density for this development. References to the Growth Plan should be updated.	HPGI	PJR was revised to included correct target numbers as updated per 2019 Growth Plan. Refer to Section 4.4.
<b>Affordable Housing</b>			
1.	The current Regional Official Plan highlights the need for a mix and diversity of housing types. Further, the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan (PHHP), which was endorsed by Regional Council in 2018, the needs assessment states that approximately 13.3% of all new housing in the Region should be affordable to middle income families (a sale price of approximately \$423,000 in 2019). The applicant should consider opportunities of how this development could contribute to this target.	HPGI	The proposed development brings the proposed housing closer to the affordability threshold by providing a product that is more affordable than the current average price of other existing ground-related typologies in Caledon.  The applicant remains committed to the provision of affordable housing options, including partnerships with all levels of government, through financial tools and incentives that encourage the development of affordable housing, including development charges grants and cash-in-lieu provisions which recognize affordable housing as a community benefit.
2.	The PHHP also establishes a tenure target that states that 25% of all new housing in the Region should be rental. The applicant should consider opportunities of how this development could contribute to the rental housing need in Caledon.	HPGI	The applicant is exploring options of establishing a ratio of approximately 15% rental through the construction of basement secondary suites. However, due to site limitations and spatial constraints it would be difficult to provide the required parking spaces on a properly surfaced driveway or garage or carport. This issue can be offset based on the site proximity to a future MTSA with the proposed GO Transit Hub proposed to be located north of King Street and east of Humber Station Road – approximately 1.2 km from the subject site. Other options to accommodate secondary suites in larger townhouse end-units is also being evaluated.
3.	The Planning Justification Report should be updated to reference how the development will contribute to these Regionally endorsed targets.	HPGI	The applicant is interested in a potential partnership with the Region in order to help to meet the identified affordable housing targets. As discussed above, a financial incentive program would

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
			<p>improve the feasibility of providing an affordable housing project. These incentives and tools may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land donation (Regionally owned parcel located between Chickadee Ln &amp; Emil Kolb Pkwy)</li> <li>• Grant in lieu of Region of Peel development charges</li> <li>• Grant in lieu of local municipal development charges</li> <li>• Grant in lieu of parkland dedication fees</li> <li>• Grant in lieu of municipal planning and building permit fees</li> <li>• Alternative parking standards</li> </ul> <p>-</p>
<b>Greenbelt Plan</b>			
1.	The application is proposing a stormwater management approach consisting of a 0.60 ha stormwater management pond block to the north of the development that captures drainage the proposed development area. The proposed stormwater management pond is located inside of the greenbelt plan area. The lands in which the pond is proposed is designated in the Region's Official Plan as Protected Countryside (Natural Heritage System) of the Greenbelt Plan (Schedule D3). A park, open space, restoration area also proposed in is area.	HPGI / PALMER	Refer to TRCA Recommendations Comment #1 and Development Planning and Permitting Comment #15.
2.	Pond: Figure 13 of the CEISMP shows the woodland as a key natural heritage feature, and Section 10.3 defines these areas as significant woodlands. Section 3.2.2.3 of the Greenbelt Plan states that new development must demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on key natural heritage features or their functions. Further, Section 4.2.3.3 states that "stormwater management systems are prohibited in key natural heritage features ... and their associated vegetation protection zones". Figure 13 of the CEISMP shows a minimum VPZ, as per Section 4.2.5.4 of the Greenbelt Plan. Please note that this is a minimum, and per Section 4.2.5.5, a natural heritage evaluation is required to determine the extent. As the pond is proposed to be located adjacent to the minimum VPZ, the PJR must be updated to speak to Section 4.2.3.3 and if the minimum is appropriate.	HPGI / PALMER	CEISMP provides conformity review with the policies of the Greenbelt Plan. Analysis of Section 4.2.3.3 is found on page 80 of the CEISMP prepared by Palmer Environmental Consulting Group. Refer to TRCA Recommendations Comments #1 and #2. The SWM Pond location has been revised to be located outside of the VPZ (also referred to as the MVPZ).
3.	Parkland: The description of the north-west quadrant of the development includes reference to providing a public park in the Greenbelt Plan. This portion of the Greenbelt Plan Area is also located within the Natural Heritage System overlay. If parkland dedications are being proposed in conjunction with the park/open space block creation, please note that Policy 2.2.10.4.17 of the Region of Peel Official Plan does not permit parkland dedication within the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan as a condition of approval for development within an urban settlement area. A similar policy (Policy 7.13.3.2.1.5 (p. 7-213)) is included in the Town of Caledon Official Plan. Further discussion with the Town and applicant is recommended to clarify parkland dedication requirements for the Chickadee Lane expansion.	HPGI / PALMER	Noted. ROPA to be updated to include exemption to Policy 2.2.10.4.7 of the Region of Peel OP in order to permit parkland dedication within the Natural Heritage. Refer to Development Planning and Permitting Comment #15
<b>Agriculture in the PJR</b>			
1.	The PJR should speak to whether the proposed lot boundaries to recognize the existing dwellings, stormwater management blocks, open space blocks and parkland blocks would be permitted in the prime agricultural area designation in the Greenbelt Plan. Further comments on the AIA are provided below.	HPGI	The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. A standalone AIA and CESIMP was been submitted in support of the proposal. Key policies and summaries within those documents including how policy conformity to the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan has been addressed and demonstrated. Summaries of the background technical studies have been provided as a courtesy and to provide additional context. No further updates to these Sections are required.
<b>CEISMP section of the PJR</b>			
1.	This section of the PJR (page 35) should be enhanced to address how the proposed uses and lot creation for parkland dedication, public park uses, and active recreation uses in the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside and Natural Heritage System conform with the Greenbelt Plan. If the proposed use is dependent on these uses and facilities being permitted, it is recommended that the PJR address how policy conformity is being addressed and demonstrated. The report must be revised to provide the justification in a clear, organized	HPGI	See response above. The document has been updated



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	fashion indicating the corresponding provincial and regional planning documents and each relevant policy number/requirement.		
<b>Agricultural Impact Assessment</b>			
1.	Section 2.2 Field Inventories There is reference to agricultural and non-agricultural land uses within the Study Area. Definitions for agricultural and non-agricultural land uses and sources should be included.		The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed.
2.	Section 3.0 Policy Framework Section 3.1 Provincial Policy Statement should be updated to reference and address the applicable policies of the 2020 PPS (Section 1.7.1.i and 2.3)		The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. Policies in Section 1.1.3.8, 1.7.1.i) and 2.3 can be addressed in the AIA report, however its findings and conclusions will not change. –
3.	Section 3.2 Growth Plan - this section should be updated to reference and address the applicable policies of the of the 2019 Growth Plan (Section 4.2.6).		The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. Findings and conclusions respecting Policies in Section 2.2.8 3. f), g), h) & j) and 4.2.6) will not change
4.	Section 3.3 Greenbelt Plan – this section should be updated to reference and address the applicable policies of the 2017 Greenbelt Plan as indicated below to clarify how the non-agricultural uses in the Greenbelt portion are being justified (Policies in Section 3.1.3, 3.1.6, 4.1.1)		The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. Findings and conclusions of policies in Section 3.1.3, 3.1.6, 4.1.1 and 4.6 of the AIA report as previously filed will not change.
5.	With respect to conformity to the 2019 Growth Plan and 2017 Greenbelt Plan, the AIA should reference and review the most recent version of the “Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in Ontario’s Greater Golden Horseshoe”, which was released on March 2020, and confirm the current agricultural land base mapping and specifically the prime agricultural area designations that are applicable. An analysis on the viability of these lands should be provided.		See above response. The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in Ontario’s Greater Golden Horseshoe, released March 2020 confirm the current agricultural land base mapping and specifically the prime agricultural area designations applicable to the Chickadee Lane expansion, the general findings and conclusions have not changed.
6.	Policies in the 2020 PPS (Sections 2.3.6.1 and 2.3.4.1) and 2019 Growth Plan that do not permit non-agricultural uses in prime agricultural areas, such as the proposed municipal active or passive recreational blocks should be addressed.		The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. The PJR has been updated to reflect current policy.
7.	Section 6.0 Assessment of Impacts to Agriculture Location of Stormwater Infrastructure in Prime Agricultural Areas • Stormwater management facilities in the north-east quadrant appear to be located in the Prime Agricultural Area designation in the Greenbelt. The AIA will need to provide the required justification in accordance with policies 3.1.3.3 and 4.2.1.2 f) of the 2017 Greenbelt Plan. Policy 4.2.1.2 f) specifically requires a demonstration that there are no other reasonable alternatives than the proposed location.		Addressed. Greenbelt Plan policy 4.2.1.2 f) directs that new or expanding infrastructure shall avoid specialty crop areas and other prime agricultural areas in that order of priority, unless need has been demonstrated and it has been established that there is no reasonable alternative. The proposed development has evaluated alternative locations for the provision of stormwater management infrastructure and it was determined that the Greenbelt area were preferred from the standpoint of maximizing the utility of the development lands, providing infrastructure to support planned growth and, avoidance of higher quality agricultural land and selecting lower priority lands. Based on the evaluation of the above noted factors, there are no other reasonable alternatives to locate infrastructure elsewhere.
8.	Both the AIA and PJR should clarify if it is intended that prime agricultural areas are to be redesignated within the Greenbelt for non-agricultural uses. Regional staff will have further comments when revised materials are received.	HPGI	The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed. Non-agricultural uses including infrastructure, natural resource use, existing uses and lot creation may be permitted in the Agricultural Systems of the Protected Countryside subject to the policies of sections 4.2 to 4.6 of the Greenbelt Plan. These non-agricultural uses are generally discouraged in specialty crop areas and may only be permitted after the completion of an Agricultural Impact Assessment.  Section 4.2 states that:  All existing, expanded or new infrastructure is permitted within the Protected Countryside, subject to the policies of this section and provided it meets one of the following two objectives:

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
			<p>a) It supports agriculture, recreation and tourism, Towns/Villages and Hamlets, resource use or the rural economic activity that exists and is permitted within the Greenbelt; or</p> <p>b) It serves the significant growth and economic development expected in southern Ontario beyond the Greenbelt by providing for the appropriate infrastructure connections among urban centres and between these centres and Ontario's borders.</p> <p>Section 4.6 states that:</p> <p>Lot creation is discouraged and may only be permitted for:</p> <p>a) Outside prime agricultural areas, including specialty crop areas, the range of uses permitted by the policies of this Plan;</p> <p>b) Within prime agricultural areas, including specialty crop areas:</p> <p>c) Acquiring land for infrastructure purposes, subject to the infrastructure policies of section 4.2;</p> <p>As such, the proposed non-agricultural uses are permitted in the agricultural areas of the Greenbelt Plan as they support growth by providing appropriate infrastructure (i.e. SWM facility) and serve to recognize existing uses (i.e. single detached residential dwellings) which are permitted in accordance with Section 4.5 of the Greenbelt Plan. See Section 4.2 of the PJR (pg. 11 -13).</p>
9.	Section 7.0 Recommendations and Mitigation Measures The Growth Plan contains policies that require any impacts to the Agricultural System to be identified and mitigated.		Addressed. The Chickadee Lands are not locally owned or agriculturally operated, and are comprised of eight existing lots with rural/estate residential development, located immediately adjacent to the existing built-up boundary with no abutting agricultural operations, no mitigation measures have been proposed. No significant adverse impacts associated with the agricultural system are expected from the proposed development during construction or operational phases, so no mitigation measures are required.
10.	The recommendation that edges planning mitigation along the Greenbelt Plan boundary with the Greenbelt is not required should be expanded to further explain why mitigation is not required (e.g., lands will abut non-agricultural uses and valley lands or lands that are being protected, restored or enhanced for natural heritage system purposes, etc.).		Addressed. The determination that no edge planning treatments would be needed was based on the assessment that no areas have been identified where there may be potential for long term compatibility issues. Primary consideration included the absence of existing surrounding agricultural operations which warrant unique consideration and edge planning protection. It is also noted that the agricultural boundary is already protected in this location through the Natural Heritage System of the Greenbelt Plan which is found in the north-west quadrant and to the east of the Chickadee Lands. These permanently protected areas already function as a rural urban edge and offer a natural buffer between non-agricultural uses.
11.	In addition to comments noted above, the following additional issues need to be addressed in both the AIA and PJR: The AIA should include an opinion that the relevant provincial agricultural policies and guidelines have been considered and addressed including: a. OMAFRA's Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in Ontario's Greater Golden Horseshoe, Publication 856 dated March 2020		<p>The ROPA was approved by the LPAT per its Decision issued on November 10, 2020 re file PL10058 and therefore deemed to have been addressed.</p> <p>OMAFRA's Implementation Procedures for the Agricultural System in Ontario's Greater Golden Horseshoe, Publication 856 was released in March 2020. The PJR and AIA predate the release of this document.</p>
b.	OMAFRA's Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Guidance Document dated February 2018		The AIA study methodology included a review of all existing and available background information and filed inventories. Background data was collected and reviewed from a variety of sources. This includes provincial and municipal planning documents, provincial resource information and recent air photography. A list of the information sources review is provided in Section 10 of the AIA report

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
12.	If the AIA is relying on the AIA study prepared by Colville Consulting in 2014 a copy of the report should be included with the submission as an appendix to the report for easier reference and completeness of documentation. As well, analysis or materials that are referenced in the Stantec AIA have not been included.		No further action required. The lands are now contained within the settlement boundary through the LPAT approval of ROPA 30.
<b>Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement</b>			
1.	The Region relies on the environmental expertise of the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) staff for the review of development applications located within or adjacent to the Greenland Systems in Peel and their potential impacts on the natural environment	NO ACTION	
2.	Technical comments from the TRCA indicate some questions, comments, concerns, and requests for information. A response to the TRCA should be provided in the revised submission.	NO ACTION	
<b>Functional Service Report</b>			
<b>Water</b>			
1.	The current modelling analysis shows that the existing system is sufficient to meet only the domestic water demand (MDD demand). The submitted hydrant flow test suggests that there will be available fire flow of 134.2 L/s at 20 psi which is less than the estimated 180 L/s fire flow that is required. This indicates concerns with inadequate fire flow available to service the proposed development with existing water infrastructure. Revised materials will be required to respond to this concern.	CANDEVCON	A Water Hydraulic analysis was completed by AECOM (October 28th 2020) which concluded that the existing water system would provide adequate fire flow (230 L/s) for the development. The analysis recommended that a second connection be provided for resiliency to the existing watermain system west of Emil Kolb Parkway in the event that the existing watermain on Chickadee Lane is out of service. The connection locations and pipe sizing will be determined as part of the detailed engineering design.
<b>Wastewater</b>			
1.	Regional staff have no objection for discharging sanitary flow from the proposed development to the existing 375 mm sewer on Emil Kolb Parkway; however, the below information is to be provided prior as part of the next submission.	CANDEVCON	Noted
2.	The discrepancy between the estimated population is to be addressed/corrected, and peak sanitary flow and sanitary design sheet is to be corrected accordingly: - The estimated equivalent population is 490 in the report, based on 3.5 people per unit (FSR- Table 1); however, population is reported at 1094 on the sanitary design sheet, based on 175 people per hectare for 6.25 ha area. The report must all be consistent – including the demand table/Appendix E.	CANDEVCON	Sanitary Design Sheet has been revised.
<b>Stormwater Management</b>			
<b>Low Impact Development</b>			
1.	Regional staff recommend that low impact development best practices be utilized, over and above the minimum requirements, in a manner that is acceptable to the Town of Caledon. Regional staff recommend that any storm water management pond design utilize pre-treatment sediment separation systems that are acceptable to the Town of Caledon.	CANDEVCON	Noted
<b>Traffic Impact Study</b>			
<b>Traffic Development</b>			
1.	We acknowledge that there are no new accesses proposed to Emil Kolb Parkway (EMP)	GHD	Noted.
2.	We require further clarification as to why the northbound and southbound PM future background volumes were directly derived from the Bolton Residential Expansion Study; however, the AM future background volumes were derived by applying the growth percentage to the PM 2017 traffic counts.	GHD	Addressed. The BRES study completed by Paradigm only forecasted future traffic volumes for the PM peak hour as such PM peak hour represents the highest generated traffic volumes. As a result, GHD had to estimate the AM peak hour volumes from the PM peak hour data.
3.	The study notes capacity issues for the westbound left turning movement during the AM and PM peak hours, and suggests the signalization of EMP at the Connecting Road to mitigate; we require a signal warrant analysis to be completed and provided for our review.	GHD	Addressed. A signal warrant for the intersection of Emil Kolb Parkway and the Connecting Road was completed and resulted in traffic signals not being warranted. The warrant has been provided with this submission.
<b>Sustainable Transportation</b>			
1.	The revised study must discuss how the plan may promote active transportation and public transit.	GHD	Addressed. The revised study can include discussion on active transportation, as for public transit there is no local public transit available nearby that is easily accessible to residents from this area. Future GO transit use will most likely be accessed via vehicle traffic. Please refer to updated TIS dated August 25 2021 by GHD
2.	Active transportation facilities proposed within the development should connect, or support a future connection, to the Regional active transportation network with appropriate crossings (there is a Multi-Use Trail (MUT) along Emil Kolb Parkway).	GHD	Noted. Review of potential connections has been reviewed and noted in the revision submission package inclusive of trailway connections and extensions.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
3.	Bicycle Parking: The development is adjacent to a paved multi-use trail along Emil Kolb Pkwy and within proximity of signed bike routes. Please consider recommending bike parking for this site. Typically, 1-5 bicycle parking spaces can substitute for a parking space, up to a maximum of 25-30% of total required parking spaces. Consider visible, well-lit bicycle parking for visitors as well as secure, indoor bike storage for residents/tenants.	GHD	Addressed. The development is comprised of townhouse units which will have bicycle parking provided in the garage of each unit. Bicycle parking spaces and reductions in parking are typically only sought on higher density sites comprised of condo units or stacked townhouses with a common underground parking garage.
<b>Sustainable Communities</b>			
1.	Section 1.3.5 of the Regional Official Plan provides a framework for sustainable development. Section 3.7 of the Regional Official Plan provides policy direction on energy, including energy conservation, energy efficiency, and diversity through the use of renewable and alternative energy systems. The Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 [e.g., 1.1.3.2 c) & d), and 1.8] and the Growth Plan, 2019 [e.g., 2.2.1.4 f)] provides policies related to climate change mitigation and adaptation and sustainable community development.	HPGI	The requirements of this study regarding community design, density and mix has been covered off in the HPGI PJR in Sections 5.3.2 and 7 and the CDP, the infrastructure requirements in Candevcon's FSR/SWM Report in Section 5 and natural heritage requirements in Palmers CEISMP in Section 3 and 4.  Further a Notice of Complete Application was issued by the Region of Peel dated April 20, 2020, which indicated that all required studies identified by Staff in the Planning Application Requirements Checklist were received and that the Official Plan Amendment Application was found to be 'complete' in accordance with Sections 22 (40 and 950 of the Planning Act. This precedes the Notice of Incomplete whereby a number of comments were provided by Regional Staff which resulted in formal response and updates to the application support materials.
2.	It is intended that the applicant demonstrate, through the Planning Justification Report (PJR) or supporting study, how the proposed development includes the sustainable community requirements from Provincial policy and the Regional Official Plan. As an example, with regards to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the report should consider how opportunities related to GHG emissions reduction are being incorporated (e.g., planned energy efficiency, building design, transportation, lighting, protecting/enhancing natural heritage, inclusion of alternative and renewable energy systems) into the proposed development to mitigate and adapt to climate change.	HPGI	The requirements of this study regarding community design, density and mix has been covered off in the HPGI PJR in Sections 5.3.2 and 7 and the CDP, the infrastructure requirements in Candevcon's FSR/SWM Report in Section 5 and natural heritage requirements in Palmers CEISMP in Section 3 and 4.  Further a Notice of Complete Application was issued by the Region of Peel dated April 20, 2020, which indicated that all required studies identified by Staff in the Planning Application Requirements Checklist were received and that the Official Plan Amendment Application was found to be 'complete' in accordance with Sections 22 (40 and 950 of the Planning Act. This precedes the Notice of Incomplete whereby a number of comments were provided by Regional Staff which resulted in formal response and updates to the application support materials. –
<b>Healthy Communities</b>			
1.	Should the application advance to the draft plan stage, prior to the first engineering submission an updated report with a contingency plan will be required.	CANDEVCON	To be provided prior to first detailed engineering submission.
<b>Hydrogeological Study</b>			
2.	Should the application advance to the draft plan stage, prior to the first engineering submission an updated report with a contingency plan will be required.	PALMER	An updated Hydrogeological Assessment Report was provided in December 2020 that included a commitment to complete a local water well survey and monitoring program during detailed design as a contingency plan.
<b>Noise Study</b>			
3.	Should the application advance to the draft plan stage, technical comments will be provided under separate cover.	NO ACTION	
<b>Concluding Remarks</b>			
1.	Please be advised that further comments may be provided once new and updated materials have been provided.	HPGI	Acknowledged, further comments may be provided
2.	Comments on the draft plan of subdivision application will be provided when a response to the above comments has been received.	HPGI	Acknowledged, subdivision comments will be forthcoming.
<b>Bell Canada</b>			
<b>Ryan Courville, January 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021</b>			
1.	"The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada.	OWNER	Acknowledged.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
2.	The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."	OWNER	Acknowledged.
3.	The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
4.	It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada's existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
5.	If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
6.	To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculation's.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
7.	Please note that WSP operates Bell's development tracking system, which includes the intake of municipal circulations. WSP is mandated to notify Bell when a municipal request for comments or for information, such as a request for clearance, has been received. All responses to these municipal circulations are generated by Bell, but submitted by WSP on Bell's behalf. WSP is not responsible for Bell's responses and for any of the content herein.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
<b>Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board</b> <b>Krystina Koops, January 15, 2021</b>			
1.	That the applicant shall agree in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to include the following warning clauses in all offers of purchase and sale of residential lots until the permanent school for the area has been completed.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
a.	"Whereas, despite the best efforts of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside of the neighborhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighborhood school."	OWNER	Acknowledged.
b.	"That the purchasers agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, the residents of the subdivision shall agree that children will meet the bus on roads presently in existence or at another place designated by the Board."	OWNER	Acknowledged.
<b>Enbridge</b> <b>Casey O'Neil, February 18, 2021</b>			
1.	This response does not constitute a pipe locate, clearance for construction or availability of gas.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
2.	The applicant shall contact Enbridge Gas Inc.'s Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea20@Enbridge.com to determine gas availability, service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping (including, but not limited to: tree planting, silva cells, and/or soil trenches) and/or asphalt paving.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
3.	In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, and any future adjacent developments, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas Inc. at no cost.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
<b>Town of Caledon</b> <b>Casandra Jasinski, February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021</b>			
1.	Applications RZ 2020-0004 and SBD 21T-2001C are incomplete, as they do not include a minimum Stage 2 archaeological assessment(s) and associated Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) acceptance letter(s) or a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS).	OWNER	Stage 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
<b>Heritage Policy Framework</b>			
<b>Planning Act</b>			
1.	Legislation in the Planning Act includes having regard to the conservation of significant cultural heritage resources: Provincial Interest	OWNER	Acknowledged, Stage 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
2.	The Minister, the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board and the Tribunal, in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act, shall have regard to, among other matters, matters of provincial interest such as,	OWNER	Acknowledged, Stage 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
3.	the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest.	OWNER	Stage 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared and concluded that the Subject Lands have been sufficiently assessed and is free of further archaeological concern.
<b>Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)</b>			
<b>Relevant heritage policies in the PPS include, but not limited to:</b>			
1.	1.7.1 Long-term economic prosperity should be supported by: encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes	HPGI	Noted
2.	2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.	HPGI	No significant resources have been identified on site.
3.	2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.	HPGI	No significant resources have been identified on site. Please refer to Stage 1 and 2 Archeological Assessment dated August 4 2021 completed by Irvin Heritage.
4.	2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.	HPGI	No significant resources have been identified on site.
5.	2.6.5 Planning authorities shall engage with Indigenous communities and consider their interests when identifying, protecting and managing cultural heritage and archaeological resources.	HPGI	No significant resources have been identified on site.
<b>A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan)</b>			
1.	Relevant heritage policies in the Growth Plan include, but are not limited to: 4.2.7.1 Cultural heritage resources will be conserved in order to foster a sense of place and benefit communities, particularly in strategic growth areas.	HPGI	Noted
<b>Town of Caledon Official Plan</b>			
<b>Relevant heritage policies in the Town of Caledon Official Plan include, but are not limited to:</b>			
<b>3.3.3.1.5 Cultural Heritage Impact Statements</b>			
1.	Where it is determined that further investigations of cultural heritage resources beyond a Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement are required, a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement may be required. The determination of whether a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement is required will be based on the following:	HPGI	No Action required
a.	the extent and significance of cultural heritage resources identified, including archaeological resources and potential, in the Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage planning Statement and the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement;	HPGI	No Action required
b.	the potential for adverse impacts on cultural heritage resources; and,	HPGI	No Action required
c.	the appropriateness of following other approval processes that consider and address impacts of cultural heritage resources.	HPGI	No Action required
<b>Where it is determined that a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement should be prepared, the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with expertise in heritage studies and contain the following:</b>			
1.	a description of the proposed development;		No Action required
2.	a description of the cultural heritage resource(s) to be affected by the development;		No Action required
3.	a description of the effects upon the cultural heritage resource(s) by the proposed development;		No Action required
4.	a description of the measures necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of the development upon the cultural heritage resource(s); and,		No Action required
5.	a description of how the policies and guidelines of any relevant Cultural Heritage Planning Statement have been incorporated and satisfied.		No Action required

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
6.	Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement is required, the proponent is encouraged to consult with the Town and other relevant agencies concerning the scope of work to be undertaken.		No Action required
7.	<u>3.3.1.6 Appropriate Mitigation</u> Where a Cultural Heritage Survey, Cultural Heritage Planning Statement or Cultural Heritage Impact Statement has identified a development property as having archaeological potential, no pre-approval site grading, servicing or other soil disturbance shall take place prior to the Town and/or appropriate Provincial Ministry confirming that all archaeological resource concerns have met licensing and resource conservation.		No Action required
8.	<u>3.3.3.1.14 Cultural and Natural Landscapes</u> In its consideration of all development and redevelopment proposals, the Town will have regard for the interrelationship between cultural heritage landscapes and scenic natural landscapes, in accordance with Section 3.2.3.5 of this Plan.		No Action required
9.	<u>3.3.3.2.2 Archaeological Assessment Requirements and Proposed Development</u> Where an acceptable Cultural Heritage Survey, carried out in accordance with Section 3.3.3.1.4, identifies archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential on lands proposed for development or redevelopment, or on adjacent lands, the Town shall require archaeological assessments of the lands proposed for development to be undertaken by a licensed archaeologist as a condition of approval. The archaeological assessment shall be carried out in accordance with current Provincial guidelines.		No Action required
10.	<u>3.3.3.2.3</u> Where it is demonstrated that an identified archaeological site, feature or artifacts cannot be left undisturbed, appropriate mitigation will be required on the advice of a licensed archaeologist according to current Provincial guidelines.		No Action required
11.	<u>3.3.3.2.4</u> In order to ensure that archaeological sites are protected, the Town may consider zoning restrictions, density bonuses, site purchases, acceptance of archaeological sites under parkland dedication, and/or designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.		No Action required
<b>Information – Heritage Register</b>			
1.	The subject lands are not listed or designated on the Town of Caledon's Heritage Register.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
<b>Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS)</b>			
1.	A CHIS evaluating the impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage resources was not provided as part of the above noted applications.		No Action required
2.	The Cultural Heritage Assessment Report submitted as part of the May 29, 2020 materials was prepared by the Town of Caledon for the Bolton Residential Expansion Study and is not the same as a CHIS. It does not assess the impact of the proposed development on the cultural heritage resources in the vicinity of the subject lands.		No Action required
3.	As part of a complete OPA/ZBA and Draft Plan of Subdivision application, the proponent shall provide a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS), undertaken by a qualified professional with expertise in heritage studies, to assess the impact of the proposed development on, and its compatibility with, the cultural heritage resources adjacent to and near the subject lands to the satisfaction of Heritage staff at the Town of Caledon. The CHIS shall include the requirements set out in the Town of Caledon Official Plan, policy 3.3.3.1.5 b). Any mitigative measures, as specified in the CHIS and/or by Town of Caledon Heritage staff, shall be undertaken to the satisfaction of Heritage staff at the Town of Caledon.		No Action required
4.	The recommendations of the CHIS, both those of the qualified professional with expertise in heritage studies and those of Town of Caledon Heritage staff, shall inform the overall design of the development and be incorporated into the Draft Plan of Subdivision and any associated agreements.		No Action required
5.	Should the development proposal change significantly in scope or design, a revised CHIS or additional cultural heritage investigations may be required.		No Action required
<b>Archeological Assessment</b>			
1.	A minimum Stage 2 archaeological assessment(s) for the subject lands was not submitted as part of the above noted applications.	IRVIN	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, dated August 4 2021. See resubmission package.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
2.	While there is reference to archaeological comments being addressed in the ROPA Comment Response Matrix, the archaeological assessment provided as part of the May 29, 2020 materials is limited to a Stage 1 and was prepared for the Town of Caledon as part of the Bolton Residential Expansion Study. The submission of this initial assessment does not address the requirement for complete archaeological assessment and clearance prior to ground disturbance.	IRVIN	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
3.	The comments below are provided in accordance with the Town of Caledon's standard archaeological requirements for complete applications.	IRVIN	Acknowledged.
4.	The proponent shall retain an archaeologist, licensed by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) under the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O 2005 as amended) to carry out and submit a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment for the entirety of the subject lands as part of a complete OPA/ZBA application and Draft Plan of Subdivision application.	IRVIN	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
5.	The proponent shall follow through on MHSTCI and Town of Caledon Heritage staff recommendations to mitigate, through preservation or resource removal and documentation, adverse impacts to any significant archaeological resources found (Stages 3-4) to the satisfaction of the MHSTCI and the Town of Caledon Heritage staff prior to development approval. The archaeological assessment(s) must be completed in accordance with the most current Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.	IRVIN	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
6.	No demolition, construction, grading or other soil disturbances shall take place on the subject lands prior to the Town of Caledon Heritage staff receiving, to their satisfaction, all completed archaeological assessment(s), in both hard copy and PDF format, and the MHSTCI compliance letter(s) indicating that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied and the report(s) has been entered into the Public Registry.	IRVIN	Stage1 and 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
7.	Significant archaeological resources will be incorporated into the proposed development through either in situ preservation or interpretation where feasible or may be commemorated and interpreted through exhibition development on site including, but not limited to, commemorative plaquing.	IRVIN	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
8.	If the subject lands were previously assessed, the proponent must provide a copy of the archaeological assessment(s) and the associated MHSTCI compliance letter(s) indicating that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied and the report(s) has been entered into the Public Registry.	IRVIN	Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological assessment has been prepared, see resubmission package.
9.	Additional Heritage comments and requirements may be provided for the Draft Plan of Subdivision application and any associated development agreements once the CHIS and Archaeological Assessment(s) are received and approved, depending on the results and recommendations of these documents.	IRVIN	Acknowledged.
<b>Landscape Architect</b> <b>Nick Pirzas, February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021</b>			
<b>Internal Memorandum</b>			
1.	The Town is willing to accept the portion of Block 29 highlighting in the Draft Plan of Subdivision (refer to document) that is not encumbered by the Greenbelt 30m VPZ, the proposed restoration area and the TRCA's regulation limit.	HPGI	The proposed parkette block is located outside the greenbelt 30m VPZ and the proposed SWM Block.
2.	Documents submitted show conflicting information in the highlighted section of the Draft Plan.	ALL	All documents have been coordinated.
a.	Some of the documents (eg. SWM-1) show the proposed Block 30 SWM pond design (Block 30) adjacent the Lot 27 Existing Residential property line, while other documents (eg. ST-1 and The Community Design Plan) indicate a smaller pond design with Park Block 29 separating the two blocks. Please confirm the correct information.	ALL	All documents have been coordinated with the correct Draft Plan of Subdivision with the correct SWM pond design.
b.	In the event that a park block can be provided in the location shown in the marked up Draft Plan of Subdivision, the remainder of Park Block 29 shall be renamed as an open space block. This block will not be accepted as a park block nor will it be count towards the parkland requirement.	HPGI	A proposed parkette block (Block 29) is being provided which is located outside the greenbelt 30m VPZ. The remainder of the open space area has been relabeled as VPZ (Block 36).

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
<b>The portion of Park Block 29 as indicated on the marked up Draft Plan of Subdivision will not be accepted by the Town for the following reasons:</b>			
1.	The current proposed Park Block does not conform to Section 2.2 in the Town of Caledon Parkland By-law 2013-104 as its states: “The location and the configuration of land required to be conveyed shall be determined by and at the discretion of the Town. All conveyances shall be free of any and all encumbrances.” A majority of block 29 is within the TRCA regulated limit, Greenbelt 30m VPZ and proposed restoration zone, which are encumbrances as they put limitations on what can be constructed on site and requires a TRCA permit to do any of the allowable works.	HPGI	The new proposed parkette block (Block 29) is located outside the TRCA regulated limit and the Greenbelt 30m VPZ and proposed restoration area.
<b>The current proposed park Block 29 does not conform to Section 2.1.2 ‘Parks Classifications’ in the Town of Caledon Development Standards Manual for the following reasons:</b>			
1.	Provide a minimum 50% lot frontage onto adjacent street(s) for maximum visibility and safety	HPGI	The development location and configuration presents a unique opportunity. The parkette as proposed fronts onto the NHS and SWM. The SWM pond has significant frontage on a public street with integrated trail system / maintenance road which provides pedestrian circulation around the SWM block along the perimeter of the natural heritage system including access to the passive parkette area.
2.	The shape and configuration of the park shall be in a useable form and centrally located within a residential neighborhood.	HPGI	The parkette is located in an appropriate location that is easily accessible by the proposed residential development and provides passive activity while being interconnected with a broader trail system.
3.	Parks shall be proposed on table lands where the overall grade of the property does not exceed 6.6%.	CANDEVCON	This will be addressed as part of the detailed design for the development.
<b>Park Block Alternative:</b>			
1.	In the event that the SWM Pond Block 30 is directly adjacent the existing residential Block 27, and the highlighted area on the Draft Plan of Subdivision is no longer an option, then a minimum 0.25 Acre (0.10 Ha.) parkette shall be proposed elsewhere within the proposed development.	HPGI	The proposed parkette is proposed on the north side of the SWM pond adjacent to the existing residential block (Block 27). The proposed parkette is connected through the proposed trail system surrounding the pond.
2.	The parkette block should be centrally located within the development and shall conform to Section 2.1.2 ‘Parks Classifications’ in the Town of Caledon Development Standards Manual.	HPGI	The proposed parkette is considered a Type 1 – Neighbourhood Park. The size of the parkette is .040 ha but is connected to a trial system which provides an overall larger benefit reaching beyond the block itself as it is integrated in a a location between the NHS and SWM pond facility.
3.	The remaining parkland (5% minus 0.25 Ha.) shall be paid out in cash-in-lieu. In order to determine the remaining value, an appraisal by a certified AACI appraiser for the value of land the day before draft approval will be required. The purpose of the proposed parkette block is to provide the development with a junior/senior play pit, a half court and some seating opportunities for the new community. Once the parkette block location is confirm, a facility fit plan shall be provided to the Town prior to draft plan approval.	OWNER	Acknowledged, remainder of parkland will be paid out in cash-in-lieu.
<b>Dick’s Damn Park</b>			
1.	Approximately 1.2km walking/biking distance to the actual playground facilities and requires residents to travel along Glasgow Road which does not contain sidewalks and is unlit for a majority of the distance.	HPGI	Noted.
<b>Foundry Park</b>			
2.	Approximately 1.4km walking/biking distance to the actual playground facilities and requires residents to travel along Glasgow Road and Deer Valley Drive which do not contain sidewalks and are unlit for a majority of the distance.	HPGI	Noted.
<b>Adam Wallace Park</b>			
3.	Approximately 1.8km walking/biking distance to the playground facilities and requires residents to cross Emil Kolb Parkway which is a high traffic roadway.	HPGI	Noted.
<b>Blocks 29,31.32 &amp; 34:</b>			
1.	Conveyance of all blocks should go to the TRCA.	OWNER	Acknowledged, blocks will be conveyed to the TRCA.
<b>Redlined Comments</b>			
1.	Refer to Architectural Control Guidelines – Landscape Redlined	HPGI	Comments addressed, refer to revised ACGs.
2.	Refer to Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief – Landscape Redlined	HPGI	Comments addressed, refer to revised CDP.
3.	Refer to Arborist Report – Landscape Redlined	PALMER	The Arborist Report has been updated based on the redlined comments. Please see the updated report dated August 2021.
4.	Refer to Signed Draft Plan of Subdivision (Drawing A1) – Landscape Redlined	HPGI	SWM pond is designed to meet Town standards, park block as illustrated is not feasible.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
<b>Peel District School Board</b> <b>Julian Wigle, March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021</b>			
1.	Prior to final approval, the Town of Caledon shall be advised by the School Board(s) that satisfactory arrangements regarding the provision and distribution of educational facilities have been made between the developer/applicant and the School Board(s) for this plan.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
2.	The Peel District School Board requires the following clause be placed in any agreement of purchase and sale entered into with respect to any units on this plan, within a period of five years from the date of registration of the development agreement:	OWNER	Acknowledged.
a.	"Whereas, despite the efforts of the Peel District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students in the neighborhood schools, you are hereby notified that some students may be accommodated in temporary facilities or bused to schools outside of the area, according to the Board's Transportation Policy. You are advised to contact the School Accommodation department of the Peel District School Board to determine the exact schools."	OWNER	Acknowledged.
b.	"The purchaser agrees that for the purposes of transportation to school the residents of the development shall agree that the children will meet the school bus on roads presently in existence or at another designated place convenient to the Peel District School Board."	OWNER	Acknowledged.
3.	The developer shall agree to erect and maintain signs at the entrances to the development which shall advise prospective purchases that due to present school facilities, some of the children from the development may have to be accommodated in temporary facilities or bused to schools, according to the Peel District School Board's Transportation Policy."	OWNER	Acknowledged.
4.	The Board wishes to be notified of the decision of Council with respect to this proposed application.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
<b>Town of Caledon – Public Comment Response</b> <b>May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021</b>			
<b>Impact on DeRose Avenue</b>			
1.	It is unclear from the notice whether the proposal includes changing the current access to DeRose from Emil Kolb. The plan enclosed with the notice fails to depict the current entrance. Can you please clarify?	NO ACTION	DeRose Avenue is located to the south of the proposed development, no changes to the lands south of the development are currently proposed.
<b>Glasgow Road Right of Way, Bridge and Resurfacing</b>			
1.	Glasgow Road's Right of Way width varies from approximately 20m wide near Chickadee Lane to approximately 11m wide at the bottom of the hill as it turns south towards the Edelweiss soccer fields. The potential for Urban Reconstruction of the road that includes a sidewalk and bike lane is challenging given existing slope stability issues on the hill and river section. The lower section of roadway also passes through TRCA flood plain.	NO ACTION	(All) These comments were forwarded to the Applicant's Traffic Consultant to be addressed and will be reviewed by Town staff.
2.	The one lane bridge is hazardous for several reasons: A one-way bridge for a well-used road is a safety concern in itself. As well, there is a high fence on the north side of the road immediately east of the bridge which makes the visibility impossible so this makes this hazardous to both cars from either direction and for pedestrians who might be on the bridge at a time when a car approach. Thus, one would hope that the Town would be concerned that increased traffic on foot or in vehicle would need to be addressed before increasing traffic flow in such circumstances. There may be options to improve the traffic flow and circumstances. Will these be considered before further development is permitted? Possible improvements might consider replacing the Heritage Bridge for a two-lane bridge with increased visibility; clearing the roadbed on the western hill into the valley to include space for pedestrians on the sides.	NO ACTION	Town Engineering staff have requested further analysis of the traffic impact on Glasgow Road, from both a vehicular traffic and active transportation user standpoint from the consultant. The analysis of Glasgow Road will also address whether the existing single-lane bridge on Glasgow Road will be able to accommodate future traffic volumes associated with the proposed development.
3.	Glasgow Rd. Resurfacing: The Infrastructure Costs Covered in the D.C. Calculation Services Related to a Highway study section that was undertaken by Watson & Associates Economists in 2019, states that Glasgow Rd. is scheduled for resurfacing and storm water mitigation measures in 2022 at a gross capital cost of \$3,414,309 in 2019 dollars. The project encompasses approximately 1 km. section of Glasgow Rd. starting at the intersection of Chickadee Lane and ending at the intersection of Deer Valley Dr. The project does not include sidewalks or street lighting for the pedestrians & cyclists from surrounding subdivisions who currently	NO ACTION	Engineering staff have also requested that an internal sidewalk plan be provided and that a multi-use trail walkway be provided to connect between the development's internal sidewalk network and the sidewalk on Emil Kolb Parkway. The requested Traffic Impact Study updates appear to align with the concerns outlined above and once addressed, should resolve the concerns listed above.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	use this scenic section of road on a daily basis. Nor does it include sidewalks or street lights beyond the single lane heritage bridge crossing the Humber River to Hickman St.		
4.	Glasgow Rd. Bolton: There are many hundreds of people who currently use Glasgow Rd. as a walking, jogging & cycling route on a daily basis. Zancor's development proposal & future BRES proposals to the west will add many hundreds more. As the Town's & Zancor's GHD traffic studies are lacking many details to make Glasgow Rd. safe for "Active Transportation", the Town should commission a supplementary peer reviewed Traffic Study paid for by Zancor Homes. The Study should be undertaken by a consultant with no previous business dealings with the applicant. Whatever recommendations come out of this separate study should be incorporated into the Bolton Master Transportation Study Plan (BMTSP) and the approval process for Zancor's Region Official Plan Amendment (ROPA), Local Official Plan Amendment (LOPA) and Development Charges Bylaw (DCB).	NO ACTION	The Town will continue to pursue opportunities during the design process for the future construction of Glasgow Rd from Chickadee Lane to Derry Valley Drive to identify and accommodate a pedestrian facility, however further work is required given the early stage of the process. It should be noted the Town's Transportation Master Plan currently recommends on road cycling with appropriate signage enhancements in place.
5.	There is currently no transportation expertise available to evaluate improvements necessitated by peak traffic numbers from 151 townhouses and three single detached dwellings using two 2 Minor Collector roads, one of which should be classified as a Scenic Road. Therefore, a DCB Amendment cannot be properly assessed at this time.	GHD	Existing condition – see above
6.	Glasgow Rd. between the east end of the proposal and Hickman Street, a 1.4 km. section of road, includes two blind sight lines as it descends to the valley floor, another as it crosses the single lane heritage bridge, and three more between the bridge and Hickman Street.	HPGI	Existing condition.
7.	Glasgow Road features a number of deer crossing paths between TRCA lands on the north side of Glasgow Road and private properties on the south side and TRCA lands on either side of the road as it descends into the valley.	HPGI	Existing condition.
8.	Winter driving conditions on the hill section of Glasgow Road can be treacherous for both drivers and pedestrians.	HPGI	Existing condition.
9.	There are currently no new sidewalks, lighting or road improvements proposed on Glasgow Road east of the proposal to Hickman Street.	HPGI	Existing condition.
10.	There is no proposal to upgrade the single lane heritage bridge on Glasgow Road to accommodate additional traffic.	HPGI	Existing condition.
11.	Drivers routinely exceed the 40 km/hr speed limit along the entire length of the street from Chickadee Lane to Hickman Street and routinely ignore the digital speed signs of 40Km./hr. installed on both sides of Glasgow Rd. in front of Dick's Dam park.	HPGI	Existing condition.
<b>Impact on Emil Kolb Parkway</b>			
1.	Will there be any noise mitigation measures to address the existing and increased noise associated with this development for existing lots on Emil Kolb Parkway? The traffic signal proposed on Emil Kolb parkway will increase noise due to trucks using jack breaks and the acceleration and deceleration of vehicles.	NO ACTION	The increase in traffic noise from the proposed subdivision is deemed to be insignificant to warrant any new or additional noise mitigation measures for the DeRose subdivision properties. Emil Kolb Parkway is under the jurisdiction of the Region of Peel and therefore, the Town defers to the Region of Peel to address all noise related issues for Lots along Emil Kolb Parkway.
<b>Active Transportation</b>			
1.	The MMM Group's BTMPS Section 3.0 Assessment of Existing Conditions states that the average household size in Bolton is 3.3 persons. That average translates into an additional 508 people from the Zancor proposal added to the area of ROAB. Since TWH proposals usually attract young families that number could ultimately end up being in the 600 plus range. The lack of public transit in Bolton makes it necessary for most households to have at least 2 cars. Zancor's proposal would add a minimum of 308 (plus) vehicles to ROAB. Local residents' letter to the Region dated July 21, 2020, expands on the road safety concerns of the proposed development and future BRES developments to the west.	NO ACTION	(All) These comments were forwarded to the Applicant's Traffic Consultant to be addressed and will be reviewed by Town staff.
2.	I frequently walk and hike in that area and have observed several issues of concern which I would need to be addressed in the area if there is to be an increase in population and traffic on the existing Glasgow Road. The road is very narrow and there is no space for pedestrians to safely walk down the hill into the valley. Many people already walk up and down the hill to attend the recreation facilities in the valley for soccer and tennis as well to attend the parks and the Humber Valley trail entrance.	NO ACTION	<u>General Response to questions:</u> Engineering staff have requested further analysis of the traffic impact on Glasgow Road, from both a vehicular traffic and active transportation user standpoint. Engineering Staff have requested that a Multi-Use Trail walkway be established to connect the internal sidewalk network of the proposed subdivision with Emil Kolb Parkway, as close as possible to the roundabout.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
3.	Active Transportation: The Region of Peel Official Plan Section 5.9.10.1.2 Active Transportation Objectives seeks "To encourage and support the development of a safe, attractive, accessible and integrated network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities that enhances the quality of life, and promotes the improved health of Peel residents."	NO ACTION	<u>General Response to questions:</u> The Town will continue to pursue opportunities during the design process for the future construction of Glasgow Rd from Chickadee Lane to Derry Valley Drive to identify and accommodate a pedestrian facility, however further work is required given the early stage of the process. It should be noted the Town's Transportation Master Plan currently recommends on road cycling with appropriate signage enhancements in place.
4.	Glasgow Road is a popular walking, jogging and cycling route for area residents. It draws people from surrounding valley streets, the Valleyview Estates subdivision immediately south of Chickadee Lane, and Harvest Moon Drive subdivisions on the west side of Emil Kolb Parkway. Seniors from the 53-unit Riverview Terrace, a Region of Peel seniors' building at 121 Glasgow Road and River's Edge adult condominium at nearby 60 Ann Street, often walk along the winding Humber River stretch on lower Glasgow Rd. A new 73-unit Brookfield Devpt. condominium is currently under construction at 50 Anne Street will attract additional pedestrians	HPGI	Observation
5.	When weather permits, motorcyclists out for a country drive cruise along Glasgow Road, following the Humber River from Queen St. N. (Hwy. 50) and Hickman Street, up the hill to Chickadee Lane and exit onto Emil Kolb Parkway.	HPGI	Observation
6.	This flawed development proposal needs more study, specifically in regards to road safety on the 1.4 km. stretch of Glasgow Rd. between the east end of the Zancor proposal to Hickman St. The undersigned oppose the above noted Urban Boundary Expansion and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications by Zancor Homes (Bolton) Ltd. pending the results of a peer reviewed Traffic Impact Study to be commissioned by the Town of Caledon. The study needs to address and provide solutions to all the traffic safety concerns noted above. Given current provincial restrictions regarding social distancing during the COVID-19 crisis, many commuters are either not working or working from home and the Bolton Wanderers Soccer is temporarily shut down. The Town's review should take these factors into account when undertaking its study.	HPGI	The project and work are subject to review as part of the application process whereby this is being considered.
<b>Environmental Impacts and Stormwater Management</b>			
1.	Environmental Impact Study: The identification of existing environmental problems and identification of alternative solutions in the case of ROAB and Glasgow Rd. in particular have not been addressed in the BTMP or Zancor's GHD Traffic Study. As the road is in the Environmental Protection Area (EPA) of the Town it should require an Environmental Impact Study before proceeding with any "reconstruction work".	NO ACTION	The location of Street C/Glasgow Road is already disturbed by the existing closed municipal road allowance. The Glasgow Road lands are outside of the Greenbelt Plan and are located outside of key natural heritage and key hydrologic features. The vegetation protection zone of the Greenbelt Plan does not apply to Street C as it is outside of the Greenbelt Plan. As technical advisors to the Town, the TRCA found that the proposed 10m setback instead of the 30m vegetation protection zone is appropriate in this location.
2.	Improved storm water management on the hill will impact water quality, especially from winter road salting, for Humber River fish habitat. Caledon's Official Plan (OP) sections 3.2.5.10.4 and 3.2.5.12.4 state "The quality and quantity of surface water entering Core Fishery Resource Areas shall be maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced and restored, to the satisfaction of the Town, the relevant Conservation Authority, the Niagara Escarpment Commission, where applicable, and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. The quality and quantity of surface water entering Valley and Stream Corridors shall be maintained, and, where appropriate, enhanced and restored to the satisfaction of the Town, the relevant Conservation Authority, the Niagara Escarpment Commission, where applicable and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry".	NO ACTION	Stormwater management was considered through the Environmental Impact Study and Functional Servicing Report. As technical advisors to the Town, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) is in the process of reviewing the proposed stormwater management (SWM) methodologies to ensure that SWM measures are appropriately designed and incorporated into development designs to achieve both development and environmental goals. The Town will continue to work with the TRCA to ensure that the stormwater management is designated appropriately on the site.
3.	Under the heading Natural Slopes OP sections 3.2.5.15.1 and 3.2.15.2 state "The Town encourages the conservation of steep slopes and slope instability areas. Slopes which form part of a Valley and Stream Corridor are designated EPA in accordance with Section 3.2.4.4 and are subject to the detailed policies of Section 5.7 of this Plan. In all other instances, slopes which form part of Supportive Natural Systems and Linkages shall be assessed regarding their contribution to ecosystem form, function and integrity. Based on this assessment, such slopes may be excluded from development and placed in an appropriate restrictive designation, such as EPA."	PALMER	Acknowledged.
<b>Planning Application Evaluation</b>			

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
1.	The Region never gave notice of a public meeting in regards to Zancor's ROPA-(ROP-20-001) application and now local residents are being notified of new Zancor applications without having had the opportunity to be heard on ROPA (ROP-20-001). The Zancor Homes applications for an Official Plan Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment on its Glasgow Rd. & Chickadee Lane properties have been submitted with The Town of Caledon having no Secondary Plan policies in place for the BRES lands that the Zancor properties are a part of. Please advise how the Town plans to evaluate these applications within a 180-day time frame of their submission that would include a public forum. After this period has lapsed Zancor has the option of appealing their applications to the LPAT as mandated under The Planning Act. If this were to occur local residents would again be shut out of the opportunity to voice their concerns based on the rules of the Act.	NO ACTION	The time to process an application is dependent on a number of factors including the quality and timeliness of the submission(s) by the applicant to address comments of various departments and agencies. The Town is hosting a Residents Meeting on April 29, 2021 and will be hosting a Public Meeting in June. While the applicant will have the ability to appeal a non-decision to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) if a decision is not made within the appropriate timeframe, this does not always occur. Residents are able to participate in LPAT appeals/hearings by taking interest in and attending the hearings and/or requesting for party or participant status in a hearing.
<b>John G. Williams Limited, February 8<sup>th</sup>, 2021</b>			
<b>Urban Design Comments</b>			
<b>Plan of Subdivision</b>			
1.	The majority of the subject lands are designated “Prime Agricultural Area” with portions of the site designated “Environmental Policy Area” and located with the Greenbelt Plan. The area to be redeveloped is currently situated outside the Settlement Boundary. The applicant has applied for Regional and a Local Official Plan Amendments to incorporate the lands within the settlement boundary and is seeking a Zoning By-Law Amendment to facilitate the development as provided in the Draft Plan of Subdivision.	HPGI	ROPA 30 (BRES) was approved by the OLT; formally the LPAT, on November 10, 2020 which includes the subject lands in the Settlement boundary.
2.	The design of the subdivision plan is influenced by:	HPGI	The proposed subdivision plan provides the most optimal built out of the subject lands while respecting the adjacent natural area and existing character area.
b.	a. existing Glasgow Road and Chickadee Lane alignment which informs the street and lotting pattern for the development;	HPGI	Only the existing residential dwellings are located within the Greenbelt plan.
c.	b. two existing residential dwellings that will be incorporated into the subdivision design with dedicated lots; and,	HPGI	Draft Plan of Subdivision includes a passive parkette block in greenbelt area along with a trail system that also functions as the SWM maintenance road.
3.	c. existing and proposed open space features in the northern and eastern portions of the site which include open space blocks, a park, a stormwater management pond and restoration areas, which are generally located within the designated Greenbelt area.	HPGI	Correct.
4.	The subdivision and proposed/ existing dwellings are accessible from Glasgow Road and Chickadee Lane which are classified as 20.0m Minor Collector Roads and a modified grid network of new public local roads with right-of-way widths of 16.0m and 18.0m. A single loaded road will face Emil Kolb Parkway and a remnant parcel of land (former regional road right-of-way).	HPGI	Correct.
5.	A total of 154 residential units are proposed for the subject lands, including 2 existing single detached dwellings. Proposed built form will include 151 new townhouse units on lot frontages of 6.0m (132 units) and 7.62m (19 units) and 1 new single detached dwelling.	HPGI	Correct.
6.	The proposed townhouses will provide a denser housing form within the local area than currently exists. The proposed built form generally maintains the character of newer residential forms located on the west side of Emil Kolb Parkway (within the West Bolton Secondary Plan Area) that consists primarily of single detached dwellings with a mix of street townhouses and semi-detached dwellings. The proposed townhouses provide a transit-supportive housing form that will add diversity to the available housing options within the Bolton community (primarily single detached housing).	HPGI	Correct.
7.	The 6.0m townhouses units will have front loaded, single-car garages. The 7.62m townhouse units are proposed to have front loaded double-car garages accessed from the street (to be discussed in further detail within this report).	HPGI	Correct.
	Wider lot frontages have been provided for corner lots to accommodate flankage yard space for wall articulation, building projections and wraparound porches which are desirable features for corner lot dwellings.	HPGI	Correct.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
8.	While the subdivision design is compact and provides for an efficient lotting pattern, there are some areas of concern that should be considered: a. The Applicant should provide demonstration sittings for the following lots/ blocks:	HPGI	Acknowledged.
a.	Lot 1 – this single detached lot is situated on irregular triangular—shaped lot in a high-profile location with public exposure from Chickadee Lane, Street ‘C’ and Emil Kolb Parkway. The dwelling on this lot will require all elevations to be upgraded in a similar manner as the front and the exterior side facades.	HPGI	Lot 1 elevations on front, rear and exterior side will be upgraded to accommodate exposure to public ROWs.
b.	Block 8 – This block will have frontage on both Chickadee Lane and Street ‘C’ creating a ‘through-lot’ / “reverse frontage” condition backing onto Street ‘C’. Reverse frontage lotting is generally discouraged because the rear façade / backyards will face a public street. Given the heightened public visibility of this buildings, appropriate architectural upgrades shall be applied to the applicable exposed rear and side facades. This can be implemented through the architectural control process.	HPGI	These lots are considered as “High-exposure” as they back in proximity to Emil Kolb Parkway. Appropriate architectural upgrades will be provided.
c.	2-car garages are proposed for 7.62m townhouses. While this lot size is larger than typical, Sec. 8.1.3 of the Town of Caledon’s Comprehensive Town-Wide Design Guidelines (TWDG) discourages two-car garages and states: “Garage doors should be single-car door widths, were possible”. Further design criteria should be applied to ensure the garages do not “overwhelm” the streetscape / front façade.	HPGI	Double-car garages will be provided to accommodate larger families. Double car garages will be providing on larger lots in the proposed development where additional soft landscaping can be provided. Corner lots with sufficient flankage will provide the opportunity for additional landscaping screening measures to minimize presence of garages and driveways. Refer to revised AGCs.
<b>Community Design Plan &amp; Urban Design Brief</b> The CDP/UDB is well-written and provides a detailed overview of the development proposal. We have marked up a PDF of the document and have the following minor comments:			
9.	Pg. 8 - Revise number of units to reflect latest version of the Draft Plan.	HPGI	Revised to reflect correct unit counts.
10.	Pg. 10 - All diagrams throughout the document should be updated to reflect the latest draft plan.	HPGI	Revised to reflect latest draft plan.
11.	Pg 37 - The proposed trail loop within the park should be shown on Fig. 14.	HPGI	Revised to show trail loop around proposed SWM pond.
12.	Pg. 37-38 - According to Fig. 14 of the CDP/UDB, sidewalks will be provided on both sides of the existing minor collector roads (Glasgow Road and Chickadee Lane), both sides of the 18m local roads and one side of the 16m local road (Street ‘C’). The text on the following pages is contradictory. The applicant shall verify sidewalk locations and coordinate for consistency.	HPGI	Revised. Sidewalks will be provided on both sides of 18m local roads and one sidewalk will be provided on the east side of Street ‘C’ (local road – 16m) as per Town standards.
13.	Pg. 42 - The Priority Lot Plan (PLP) should be updated. Refer to comments made on pg. 20 of ADG.	HPGI	Revised to reflect comments from Town.
14.	Pg. 43 – Updated unit count based on latest draft plan.	HPGI	Updated to reflect correct unit counts.
15.	Pg. 43 – Further design criteria should be established for 7.62m townhouse units with proposed 2-car garages so that garages do not dominate the streetscape.	HPGI	Design criteria provided, refer to revised ACGs.
16.	Pg. 43 – Provide built form design criteria for the proposed single detached dwelling (Lot 1).	HPGI	Design criteria provided for single detached dwelling.
17.	Figure 18 – The flanking side elevation of a typical corner unit should be provided.	HUNT	Figure 18 has been updated
18.	Pg. 48 – Proposed Zoning. We recommend zoning that permits the front wall of the main building to be a lesser setback than the garage setback (i.e 4.5m)	HPGI	Revised to have lesser setback for wall of main building (4.5m).
19.	Refer to Architectural Control Guidelines – Urban Design Redlined	HPGI	Revised. Refer to updated ACGs.
20.	Refer to Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief – Urban Design Redlined	HPGI	Revised. Refer to updated CDP.
21.	Refer to Elevations Drawing (A1) – Urban Design Redlined	HUNT	document has been updated.
<b>Architectural Design Guidelines - Generally, we find this document acceptable, however the following items should be expanded upon:</b>			
19.	Pg. 4 - Section 1.0 (Introduction); please introduce reference that new development shall comply with the Town of Caledon’s Comprehensive Town-Wide Design Guidelines (TWDG).	HPGI	Revised to reflect statement.
20.	Pg. 6 - All diagrams and images throughout the document should include a figure number and caption to indicate what is being portrayed.	HPGI	Revised to include figure captions.
21.	Pg. 7 - Update all diagrams throughout the document with the latest version of the Draft Plan.	HPGI	Revised to include latest draft plan.
22.	Pg. 7 - Section 1.6 (Development Proposal); this section should be updated as per the latest version of the Draft Plan and should also include a description of the proposed single detached dwelling (Lot 1) and the proposed 7.62m townhouse units.	HPGI	Revised per latest draft plan and included description for single detached and 7.62m townhouse units.
23.	Pg. 10 - Section 2.3 (Built Form – Street Townhouse Dwellings); please provide discussion regarding the	HPGI	Discussion provided above and within revised AGCs.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	proposed 7.62m wide townhouse units with potential for double-car garages as stated in the Community Design Plan & Urban Design Brief (CDP & UDB). Please confirm if the image at the bottom of page 10 represents the proposed 7.62m double-car garage townhouse units. We recommend introducing some single-car garages into the block.		
24.	Pg. 11 - Under Sections 2.4 (Building and Street Relationship) and 2.5 (Streetscape Variety and Massing) please include discussion for the proposed single detached lot (Lot 1).	HPGI	Discussion regarding single detached lot provided in revised AGCs.
25.	Pg. 13 - Section 2.6 (Garages and Driveway); please introduce design criteria for the potential use of double-car garages for 7.62m wide townhouse units. In addition to 7.62m units being proposed for Blocks 9, 10, 11 and 26, the Builder should confirm if double-car garages are to be used in other blocks where end unit conditions offer extra frontage. Although Section 8.1.4 of the TWDG discourages the use of 2-car garages for townhouse units, since 7.62m units are being proposed on a limited basis, the following design parameters, which are derived from a successful housing development in nearby King City, are recommended to ensure garages and driveways do not become a dominate feature within the streetscape:	HPGI	Double-car garages only included in 7.62m units. Criteria added in the revised AGCs.
a.	Double driveways should not be paired together within the townhouse block. Double driveways paired with single driveways are discouraged unless necessary to for on-street parking. An on-street parking plan should be provided to ensure sufficient space.	HPGI	Added, refer to revised AGCs.
b.	A maximum of 2/3 (67%) of dwellings within a townhouse block will be permitted to have a double-car garage. A minimum of 1/3 (33%) of dwellings within a townhouse block shall have a single-car garage.	HPGI	Due to the limited quantity of 7.62m townhouse units, all 7.62m units will have double-car garages.
c.	Garages shall not project beyond the front face of either the main wall, porch or portico.	HPGI	Added, refer to revised AGCs.
d.	The design of the front elevation shall have sufficient massing, articulation and detailing to visually dominate the massing of the garage.	HPGI	Added, refer to revised AGCs.
26.	Pg 14 – 2.6.2 (Driveways); This section should provide guidance addressing double-car garages on 7.62m wide townhouse units.	HPGI	Discussion provided addressing double-car garages, refer to revised ACGs.
27.	Pg. 17 - Section 2.11 (Materials Colours); language in this section is more geared to single or semidetached built form, please revised to include separation requirements for townhouse buildings.	HPGI	Added, refer to revised AGCs.
28.	Pg. 20 - Section 3.0 (Priority Lot Dwellings); please update the Priority Lot Plan as per marked-up redline comments on page 20. Also note, the legend should reflect the various priority lot categories mentioned in Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.	HPGI	Priority Lot dwellings figure has been revised to address comments.
29.	Pg. 21 - Section 3.2 (Community Window Dwellings); the design objectives under bullet #1 may not be feasible for the proposed built form type (front-loaded street accessed townhouse dwellings); please revise these points accordingly. Under the last bullet, revise reference from “Line 6”.	HPGI	Revised to include correct locational reference.
30.	Pg. 23 - Section 4.0 (Streetscape / Public Realm Elements); to better understand the proposed public realm treatments within the subdivision, it is highly recommended that a landscape concept plan be added to this section.	HPGI	Detailed landscape plans will be provided with detailed engineering submission prior to registration.
31.	Pg. 23 - Section 4.1 (Street Trees), Second Bullet; street trees shall also be located along Street’s ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘D’.	HPGI	Trees will be planted in accordance with Town’s standards and guidelines.
32.	Pg. 23 - Section 4.2 (Community Edges); for consistency with CDP & UDB, please include the southern entrance to the neighborhood from Chickadee Lane as a main entrance point to the development. In addition, landscape treatments at these main entry points may be limited as there are no dedicated landscape blocks and any proposed landscape treatments may have to be placed on the private lots.	HPGI	Revised, refer to revised AGCs.
<b>Conceptual Block Elevations</b>			
33.	The proposed block elevations indicate an adequate level of design quality to complement the recently built homes in the area. Elevations demonstrate intent to:	HUNT	No action required
a.	utilize primarily traditional design detailing and massing, yet the larger window openings and layouts reflect a more contemporary intent;	HUNT	No action required
b.	employ brick and stone facades with precast accents;	HUNT	No action required



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
c.	incorporate the garage into the main massing of the dwelling;	HUNT	No action required
d.	provide articulated public-facing facades; and,	HUNT	No action required
e.	provide front porches, including a side facing entrance for the corner unit.	HUNT	No action required
34.	The following items should be considered for the typical block elevations:	HUNT	No action required
a.	Relabel the drawings as “Typical Block Elevations” as the elevations do not reflect the current conditions of Blocks 1 and 2 on the Draft Plan.	HUNT	Document has been updated
b.	Please provide municipal address plaques to establish a coordinated design approach and theme for the development;	HUNT	Noted
C.	Provide a variety of garage door styles for the alternate elevations; and,	HUNT	Noted
d.	The utility meter placement on the corner upgrade unit should be revisited to ensure proper screening measures are applied as stated within the Architectural Design Guidelines for the development.	HUNT	Noted
35.	Sample elevations for the 7.62m wide units should be submitted for review and should consider the design recommendations outlined in our comments to the Architectural Design Guidelines.	HUNT	To be addressed as a condition of draft plan approval.
<b>Town of Caledon – Zancor summary of comments letter</b>			
<b>Aleah Clarke, May 13, 2021</b>			
1.	At this time staff are unable to support the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment, for reasons detailed within this letter and summarized briefly below:	NO ACTION	
a.	ROPA 30 as revised, approved and in-effect November 30, 2020, has brought a significant portion of the subject lands into the Bolton Rural Service Centre. The applications should be properly justified with regards to the Region’s Rural Service Centre Policies and the Town’s Settlement Area policies throughout all supporting documents including the Planning Justification Report.	HPGI	Planning justification report has been revised to properly justify the proposed development with regards to the Region’s Rural service centre policies and the town’s settlement area policies.
b.	All supporting studies and plans must be consistent with the most recent draft plan of subdivision.	ALL	All supporting documents related to the resubmission have been coordinated with the most recent draft plan.
c.	Amendments are required to various material to address comments contained in this letter.	HPGI	Noted.
2.	This comment letter has been formatted to identify those comments to be addressed in each milestone as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General (Advisory) Comments</li> <li>• Comments to be Addressed Prior to the Official Plan Amendment</li> <li>• Comments to be Addressed Prior to the Draft Plan Approval</li> <li>• Comments to be Addressed as Conditions of Draft Plan Approval</li> <li>• Comments to be Addressed During Detailed Design of the Subdivision</li> <li>• Comments to be Addressed Prior to the Zoning By-law Amendment</li> </ul>	NO ACTION	
<b>General (Advisory) Comments</b>			
1.	For property tax purposes, these eight sites (0 Emile Kolb Parkway/0 King Street W, 550 Glasgow Road, 600 Glasgow Road, 615 Glasgow Road, 13935 Chickadee Lane, 13951 Chickadee Lane, 13977 Chickadee Lane and 13999 Chickadee Lane) are currently assessed as Residential (\$9.8 million CVA combined). The Town’s share of taxes levied, based on current value assessment is approximately \$40,500 combined. As at February 12 2021, the property tax accounts are determined to be current. (Town of Caledon, Finance Department)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
2.	If the proposed development were to proceed as planned, (includes 154 residential dwellings), each property’s taxable assessment value would change, to reflect the developments that would have taken place. (Town of Caledon, Finance Department)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
3.	Development Charges would apply as follows:	OWNER	Acknowledged, development charges will be paid during subdivision registration/agreement execution.
a.	Town of Caledon: (a) \$31,656.69 per single detached dwelling; and (b) \$24,100.85 per townhouse dwelling.		
b.	Region of Peel: (a) \$60,093.31 per single detached dwelling; and (b) \$ 47, 594.15 per townhouse dwelling. Effective February 1, 2016, the Region of Peel began collecting directly for most hard service development charges (i.e., water, wastewater and roads) for residential developments, at the time of subdivision agreement execution.		
c.	Go-transit: (a) \$587.64 per single detached dwelling. The same rate applies to per townhouse dwelling.		

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
d.	School Boards: (a) \$4,572 per any residential unit. (Town of Caledon, Finance Department)		
4.	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at February 12, 2021 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; and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. Interest charges will apply for affected applications. For site plan or rezoning applications dated prior to January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated and payable at building permit issuance date. Development Charge by-laws and rates are subject to change. Further, proposed developments may change from the current proposal to the building permit stage. Any estimates provided will be updated based on changes in actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application. (Town of Caledon, Finance Department)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
5.	The land qualifier on all the Properties is LT Conversion Qualified and must be converted to LT Absolute Plus in order to register a plan of subdivision. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Development Review Services)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
6.	An application to Consolidate 550 and 600 Glasgow Road and 13935, 13951, 13977 and 13999 Chickadee Lane has been registered but not yet certified by the LRO. An application to Consolidate 615 Glasgow Road and 0 Emil Kolb Parkway has been registered but not yet certified by the LRO. When these applications have been certified the Properties will be consolidated into two legal parcels and new PINs will be made. All references to PIN will need to be updated upon certification. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Development Review Services)	OWNER	Acknowledged, will advise when new legal parcels and pins are created.
7.	No objection to the proposed application at this time. The applicant shall contact Enbridge Gas Inc.'s Customer Connections department by emailing SalesArea20@Enbridge.com to determine gas availability, service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping (including, but not limited to: tree planting, silva cells, and/or soil trenches) and/or asphalt paving. In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, and any future adjacent developments, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas Inc. at no cost. (Enbridge Gas Inc.)	OWNER	Acknowledged, noted above.
8.	Location and installation of pressurized fire hydrants shall be provided in accordance with the Region of Peel Standards. (Town of Caledon, Fire and Emergency Services)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
9.	The current addresses of all properties will cease to exist and will be renumbered in accordance with the proposed development and approved driveway locations. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Municipal Numbering)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
10.	A municipal number will be issued to each dwelling, in accordance with the Town's Municipal Number By-law and Guidelines. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Municipal Numbering)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
11.	Municipal numbers are issued at draft approval, site servicing approval and prior to registration (clearing of conditions). In order for municipal numbers to be issued, staff will require digital copies of the plan (pdf and cad) in accordance with the submission standards, a certificate of lot area and lot frontage and confirmation of approved street names. Please note that once the required information is received, it will take staff a minimum of 2 weeks to issue the numbers. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Municipal Numbering)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
12.	Please refer to the attached Urban Design comments letter and marked-up PDF copy of the Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief, Elevation Drawings, and Architectural Control Guidelines documents for detailed urban design comments. (Town of Caledon, Urban Design)	HPGI	Urban Design comments have been addressed in the revised CDP and ACGs. See responses above.
13.	Please refer to the attached Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board letter. (Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board)	OWNER	Acknowledged, DPCDSB comments have been addressed above.
14.	Please refer to the attached Peel District School Board Letter. (Peel District School Board)	OWNER	Acknowledged, PDSB comments have been addressed above.
<b>Comments to be addressed prior to the official plan amendment</b>			
1.	Various letters, emails and telephone calls have been received from members of the public raising their concerns with the proposed applications. Attached to this letter are comments that have been received, please prepare a document with your resubmission that addresses these comments. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Development Review Services)	OWNER	Comments have been summarized in the comment response matrix provided. Responses were provided to address comments from members of the public.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
2.	Prior to a recommendation report being brought forward, the tax account must be current. (Town of Caledon, Finance Department)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
<b>Planning Justification Report (PJR) and official plan amendment (“OPA”) comments:</b>			
1.	The most recent Draft Plan of Subdivision should be reflected throughout the PJR, including references to unit counts and the location of development within the Greenbelt MVPZ.	HPGI	Most recent draft plan reflected on all documents including PJR.
2.	ROPA 30 was approved by the LPAT in November of 2020, therefore, the entire Planning Justification Report should be revised to address how the proposed development meets the requirements of the PPS, Growth Plan, Region of Peel Official Plan and Town of Caledon Official Plan Policies now that a large portion of the subject lands are included in the Region of Peel’s Bolton Rural Service Centre and the various plans settlement area policies apply. More specifically, this policy change should be reflected in the following sections of the PJR:	HPGI	Entirety of the PJR was revised to reflect the requirements of the most current PPS, Growth Plan, Region OP and Town OP with regards to settlement area policies.
A.	Introduction and Executive Summary	HPGI	Revised, refer to updated PJR provided herein.
b.	Proposal		Revised, refer to updated PJR provided herein.
c.	Current Policy review and Analysis		Revised, refer to updated PJR provided herein.
d.	Proposed Regional and Official Plan Amendments		Revised, refer to updated PJR provided herein.
e.	Conclusion		Revised, refer to updated PJR provided herein.
3.	Please provide clarification regarding whether the Open Space blocks will be transferred to public ownership.	HPGI	Open space blocks will be transferred into public ownership.
4.	When analyzing the regional Planning Framework, please include analysis of Section 5.4.3 of the Region of Peel Official Plan.	HPGI	Analysis of Section 5.4.3 of the ROP is provided in the updated PJR.
5.	Section 4.1 of the PJR needs to be revised to include a detailed analysis of how the proposed development meets the settlement Area Policies of the Provincial Policy Statement.	HPGI	Section 4.2 (Provincial Policy Statement 2020) was revised to include additional analysis of settlement area policies.
6.	Section 4.3 of the PJR needs to be revised to include a detailed analysis of how the proposed development meets the settlement Area Policies of the Growth Plan.	HPGI	Section 4.4 (Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2020) of the PJR was revised to include detailed analysis with regard to settlement area policies in the Growth Plan 2020.
7.	The PJR should demonstrate how the draft plan of subdivision meets section 51(24) of the Planning Act.	HPGI	Section 4.1 (Planning Act) of the PJR was added with analysis of Section 51(24).
8.	Section 4.4 and 5.2.1 of the PJR needs to be revised to include a detailed analysis of how the proposed development meets the Rural Service Centre Policies of the Region of Peel Official Plan.	HPGI	Section 4.5 (Region of Peel Official Plan, December 2018 Office Consolidation) was revised to provide analysis with regard to Rural Centre policies in the ROP.
9.	The PJR and all other supporting documents should be revised throughout to apply a specific Official Plan Designation to the Subject lands. The proposed Residential Policy Area Designation typically only applies on lands where residential uses are intended, but additional studies are required. Based on the proposed density, the lands should instead be redesignated as Medium Density Residential.	HPGI	This has been accommodated in the documents
A.	Further analysis of section 5.10.3.27.8 a) and b) is required to address the proposed designation.	HPGI	Analysis to Section 5.10.3.27.8 a) and b) of the Town’s OP has been provided in revised PJR report.
b.	Analysis should be provided for whether site specific clauses relating to the Medium Density residential Designation are required for items such as uses or density?	HPGI	This has been addressed.
c	Section 4.5 and 5.2.2 of the PJR should be revised to include detailed analysis of how the proposed development meets the Bolton Rural Service Centre policies of the Town of Caledon Official Plan now that ROPA 30 is approved and in effect.	HPGI	Section 4.6 (Caledon Official Plan) has been revised to include detailed analysis of Bolton Rural Service Centre policies.
d.	Sections 5.10.1 through 5.10.4 of the Town of Caledon Official Plan should be analyzed, including discussion relating to density	HPGI	Analysis to Section 5.10.1 of the Town’s OP is provided in the revised PJR report. Section 5.10.4 of the Town’s OP provides policies to existing Rural Service Centres and the BRES is not included. Analysis of the BRES as it relates to the Subject Lands are provided in the PJR report.
e.	Section 4.2 of the Town of Caledon Official Plan should be further analyzed, including discussion of settlement expansions and population allocation.	HPGI	Analysis to Section 4.2 of the Town’s OP is provided in the revised PJR report.
10.	Staff have reviewed the Agricultural Impact Assessment by Stantec Consulting, dated June 7, 2019. Please provide a map indicating that MDS (Minimum Distance Separation) arcs do not impact the subject lands. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Development Review Services)		Not required as indicated on Agricultural Impact Assessment, Section 4.5.2.
11.	Heritage staff have concerns relating to a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS):		
a.	A CHIS evaluating the impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage resources was not provided as part of the above noted applications.		An archeological study was completed and contained with this submission.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
b.	The Cultural Heritage Assessment Report submitted as part of the May 29, 2020 materials was prepared by the Town of Caledon for the Bolton Residential Expansion Study and is not the same as a CHIS. It does not assess the impact of the proposed development on the cultural heritage resources in the vicinity of the subject lands.		No action required
c.	As part of a complete OPA/ZBA and Draft Plan of Subdivision application, the proponent shall provide a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS), undertaken by a qualified professional with expertise in heritage studies, to assess the impact of the proposed development on, and its compatibility with, the cultural heritage resources adjacent to and near the subject lands to the satisfaction of Heritage staff at the Town of Caledon. The CHIS shall include the requirements set out in the Town of Caledon Official Plan, policy 3.3.3.1.5 b). Any mitigative measures, as specified in the CHIS and/or by Town of Caledon Heritage staff, shall be undertaken to the satisfaction of Heritage staff at the Town of Caledon.		No action required.
d.	The recommendations of the CHIS, both those of the qualified professional with expertise in heritage studies and those of Town of Caledon Heritage staff, shall inform the overall design of the development and be incorporated into the Draft Plan of Subdivision and any associated agreements.		No action required.
e.	Should the development proposal change significantly in scope or design, a revised CHIS or additional cultural heritage investigations may be required.		No action required.
12.	Heritage staff have the following concerns relating to an Archaeological Assessment:		
a.	A minimum Stage 2 archaeological assessment(s) for the subject lands was not submitted as part of the above noted applications.		This has been undertaken and forms part of this submission.
b.	While there is reference to archaeological comments being addressed in the ROPA Comment Response Matrix, the archaeological assessment provided as part of the May 29, 2020 materials is limited to a Stage 1 and was prepared for the Town of Caledon as part of the Bolton Residential Expansion Study. The submission of this initial assessment does not address the requirement for complete archaeological assessment and clearance prior to ground disturbance.		No action required.
c.	The comments below are provided in accordance with the Town of Caledon's standard archaeological requirements for complete applications.		No action required.
d.	The proponent shall retain an archaeologist, licensed by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) under the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act (R.S.O 2005 as amended) to carry out and submit a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment for the entirety of the subject lands as part of a complete OPA/ZBA application and Draft Plan of Subdivision application.		This has been undertaken and forms part of this submission.
13.	Additional Heritage comments and requirements may be provided for the Draft Plan of Subdivision application and any associated development agreements once the CHIS and Archaeological Assessment(s) are received and approved, depending on the results and recommendations of these documents. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Heritage)		No action required.
14.	Please refer to attached Heritage and Design Services comments for information relating to the Heritage Policy Framework. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Heritage)		No action required.
15.	Please confirm the correct location of Block 30 SWM pond design as highlighted on the attached Drawing A1. Please confirm if a Park Block can be provided in the marked-up location on attached drawing A1. The existing Park Block 29 does not conform to the Town of Caledon Parkland By-law or Development Standards Manual. Please see attached Landscape Letter dated February 18, 2021 for additional detail. Park Block 29 will not be accepted or count towards the parkland requirement and should be renamed as an Open Space Block. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	HPGI	The proposed SWM block has been redesigned based on the Town's engineering requirements and a parkette block (Block 29) has been provided outside the Greenbelt's required VPZ. A proposed trail system is located along the maintenance road around the proposed SWM pond that connects the Parkette block to Street "C".
16.	If the highlighted section on attached Drawing A1 is not an option for a Park Block, then a minimum 0.25-acre (0.10 ha) parkette shall be proposed elsewhere in the development in a central location and in conformity with the Town of Caledon Development Standards Manual. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	HPGI	See previous comment above – this is a repeat comment
17.	The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) trip distribution calculations should be revised to reflect that Glasgow Road will not be connected to Emil Kolb Parkway. (Town of Caledon, Engineering Services Department, Transportation Engineering)	GHD	This was never assumed in the report and it was made clear that access would be from Emil Kolb Parkway and De Rose Avenue.
18.	The TIS must be revised to include consideration of incoming/outgoing trips using Glasgow Road, including the following considerations:	GHD	Addressed. Report has been updated to speak to this issue.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
a.	The report's trip distribution section should provide rational for trips using both Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road.	GHD	Addressed. Rational for why all site trips have been assigned to Emil Kolb and De Rose Avenue has been provided.
b.	The TIS should compare potential trips with existing traffic volume on Glasgow road and should identify whether total future traffic will trigger improvements to Glasgow road, for example, to accommodate active transportation road users, etc.?	GHD	As per the trip distribution, this is not required and will be addressed in the study being initiated by the Town.
c.	Will the total traffic volume on Glasgow Road still be within typical traffic volume on roads with the same characteristics?	GHD	As per the trip distribution, this is not required and will be addressed in the study being initiated by the Town.
d.	Can the single lane bridge on Glasgow Road accommodate the additional trips generated?	GHD	As per the trip distribution, this is not required and will be addressed in the study being initiated by the Town.
e.	Will the existing shared cycling infrastructure on Glasgow Road be appropriate when considering additional trips?	GHD	As per the trip distribution, this is not required and will be addressed in the study being initiated by the Town.
19.	The legal description in Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment should read "Part of Lot 10, Concession 5 (Albion) and Part of Lot 10, Concession 6 (Albion), Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel". Municipal addresses referenced should be 13935, 13951, 13977 and 13999 Chickadee Lane; 0 Emil Kolb Parkway; and 550, 600 and 615 Glasgow Road. Please see marked up Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment attached. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Development Review Services)	HPGI	Zoning By-law Amendment was revised to include correct legal description.
20.	Please refer to the attached Urban Design comments letter and marked-up PDF copy of the Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief, Elevation Drawings, and Architectural Control Guidelines documents for detailed urban design comments. (Town of Caledon, Urban Design)	HPGI	CDP and AGCs were revised to address urban design comments.
<b>Comments to be addressed prior to draft plan approval</b>			
1.	Prior to a recommendation report being brought forward, the tax account must be current. (Town of Caledon, Finance Department)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
2.	Digital drawings must be revised to meet the Town's Digital Submission Standards. (Town of Caledon, Information Technology, GIS and Planning Departments, Development Review Services)	HPGI	Acknowledged. Digital submission standards will be adhered to when preparing formal re-submission of the applications.
3.	Please refer to attached Drawing A1: Draft Plan of Subdivision with integrated staff comments. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	HPGI	Park area as marked-up in redlined Draft Plan of Subdivision is not feasible based on the current size and shape of the proposed SWM pond. The size and shape is based on Town's requirements.
4.	Remaining parkland shall be paid out in cash-in-lieu. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
5.	An internal sidewalk plan must be provided including a multi-use trail walkway connecting the internal sidewalk network with Emil Kolb Parkway. The walkway connection to Emil Kolb Parkway should be provided as close as possible to the roundabout. (Town of Caledon, Engineering Services Department, Transportation Engineering)	HPGI	Refer to Figure 14 – Street Hierarchy which displays sidewalks on both sides of the proposed local roads (18m) and on one side of Street "C" (16m). Sidewalks are provided as per Town's ROW standards. Refer to Figure 6 – Existing and Proposed Road Network which shows a potential trail system that connects the proposed development to the existing Living Urban trail system along Emil Kolb Parkway. The connection will be provide via De Rose Avenue.
6.	Development Engineering has concerns relating to the Functional Service Report:	CANDEVCON	Comment noted; since the Town will be completing a Study on upgrading Glasgow Road the design will be coordinated with the Town.
a.	The report should clearly identify theoretical flows from each catchment and confirm that suitable overland corridors can be accommodated within the overall design. Given that Chickadee lane and Glasgow Road are existing roads, Town staff is concerned that the ability to control the overland flow direction could be restricted by the existing road grades. This approach is applicable to all overland flows and confirmation that this measure is addressed at this initial stage is required in support of Draft Plan approval. This component would be further reviewed at detailed design stage.		
b.	The tables shown in Section 6.3 are incomplete. Please revise the tables to include SWM pond design information for all storm events from 2-yr to 100-yr.	CANDEVCON	2 to 100-year storm events are reflected in the design. Refer to Table III of FSR.
c.	Please show the percolation rate and longevity factor used to determine the infiltration trench dimensions in Section 6.4. Also, the infiltration trench dimensions shown in the FSR (1.2m x 1.2m) does not match the dimension (0.8m x 0.6m) shown in the CEISMP – Section 8.3.1. 1..	CANDEVCON	FSR dimension governs; sizing is based on storing 5mm of rainfall. Percolation rates and longevity factor will be addressed at detailed design
d.	As per the TOC Design Guideline, the minimum orifice size shall be 75mm in diameter. All hydraulic calculations should be revised accordingly.	CANDEVCON	Design revised to address the comment



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
e.	There are two catchments labelled 17 in the Storm Drainage Area Plan. Also, the plan does not show how the catchment areas are divided and determined.	CANDEVCON	Drawing updated to show the Drainage Areas (print was too light in previous Submission).
f.	Based on the existing topography, the northern half of Catchment ID#19 will drain uncontrolled to the existing creek at the northern limit of the development and remain undisturbed. If so, please justify the runoff coefficient (0.75) of Catchment ID#19.	CANDEVCON	Runoff coefficient revised to reflect hard and soft surfaces.
g.	There are two external drainages identified in the Storm Drainage Plan. Please provide supportive documents (ie. surveys etc.) and justify how those tributary areas were calculated.	CANDEVCON	Noted
h.	ESC facilities shall be designed in accordance with current Town, TRCA and MECP standards and that regular inspection, maintenance and repair as well as submission of weekly reports will be required.	CANDEVCON	Noted
i.	Please show the LTSSL and Erosion Hazard Limit on all drawings.	ALL	LTSSL shown on drawings; Erosion Hazard Limit is not applicable
j.	Please add 'Conclusion' section to the FSR.	CANDEVCON	Conclusion section added to the FSR
7.	Development Engineering has concerns relating to the Stormwater Management and Grading Plan:	CANDEVCON	Design revised to address the comment
a.	As per the TOC Design Guideline, no decrease of pipe size from a larger upstream to a smaller size downstream will be allowed regardless of the increase in grade. Please revise storm sewer pipe sizes from MH2 to MH12.		
b.	The overall grading scheme of the proposed stormwater management (SWM) pond does not meet the grading requirements laid out in the TOC Design Guideline which indicates that this pond is undersized. Use of 3:1 sloping and retaining walls are not permitted within and around the SWM pond.	CANDEVCON	SWM Pond slopes revised as agreed to by Andrew Pearce which are consistent with the slopes approved by the Town for the Mayfield West SWM ponds as well as the MOE SWM Design Guidelines.
c.	The maximum slope requirements for the various components of the facility are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4:1 (H: V) from the bottom of the permanent pool to up to 0.5m below the normal water level (NWL)</li> <li>• 7:1 above the 4:1 sloping zone up to the berm/maintenance access road.</li> <li>• 4:1 where the slope backs on to the rear yard lot line, adjacent road system or valley.</li> </ul>	CANDEVCON	See response to (b) above.
d.	Please show the groundwater elevation on the SWM pond cross-sectional drawings.	CANDEVCON	Borehole Locations shown on Drawing SWM-1; Groundwater information also included.
E	The maintenance access road for the SWM pond must be min. 5.0m wide a maximum grade of 8%. As well, a maintenance access ramp into the forebay must be added.	CANDEVCON	Maintenance Road proposed at 4m which exceeds the width agreed to by A. Pearce.
F	The pond elevation for the 100-yr storm (256.23m) exceeds the access road elevation (256.03m). This is not acceptable. The top of the SWM facility berm shall be located a minimum of 0.30 m above the highest design water level in the facility to provide adequate freeboard.	CANDEVCON	SWM Pond config. and Road grades revised to address Town's Comment
G	The bypass storm sewer system for maintenance shall be included in the SWM pond design.	CANDEVCON	Bypass System added to Pond Design, Refer to Plan SWM-1
H	An emergency overland spillway from Street C with a permanent erosion mitigation measure must be added.	CANDEVCON	Shown on revised drawings.
I	An emergency spillway for the SWM pond must be proposed to an acceptable outlet.	CANDEVCON	Shown on revised Drawing SWM-1.
J	The proposed outlet sewer system for the pond traverses through the TRCA regulated land. This must be consulted with TRCA. The Town also requires a vehicular access road as per the Town's standard to the headwall and manholes.	CANDEVCON	Noted; FSR reviewed by TRCA.
K	The Owner shall be responsible to secure an adequate and acceptable outlet for all stormwater flows from the plan in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Report, to the satisfaction of the Town and TRCA.	CANDEVCON	Noted.
L	There are two Storm Drainage Plans (ST-1 and Preliminary Storm Drainage Plan) with two different SWM pond designs presented in this submission. Please clarify.	CANDEVCON	Drawings updated and coordinated.
M	The storm sewer inverts shown on Preliminary Storm Drainage Plan match the sanitary sewer inverts shown on Preliminary Servicing Plan. Please clarify.	CANDEVCON	Drawings updated.
N	The existing drainage plan (pre-development plan) was not included in this submission.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Plan PD-1 (Pre-Development Drainage Area Plan)
O	Water balance measures (soakaway pits/infiltration trenches) alluded in the Functional Servicing Report will need to be further evaluated within the stormwater management report in concert with detailed design.	PALMER/CANDEVCON	Acknowledged.
P	Please note that the headwall outlet pipe should be a min. 450mm in Dia. with a horizontal grate.	CANDEVCON	Noted; will be addressed at detailed design.
Q	Numerous important engineering drawings were not included in this submission. As a result, Develop Engineering was not able to complete a full review of this application at this time. Please ensure the following plans are included in the next submission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-development Storm Drainage Plan</li> </ul>	CANDEVCON	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-Development Drainage Plan PD-1 included.</li> <li>• Preliminary grading shown on and Drawing PS-1.</li> <li>• Erosion and sediment control requirements specified in FSR; details will be shown on Engineering Drawings at Subdivision Design (acceptable to TRCA).</li> </ul>

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grading Plan (s)</li> <li>Erosion and Sediment Control Plan</li> <li>Preliminary grading plan of the Emil Kolb Parkway and Street C intersection.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Street “C” does not intersect with Emil Kolb Parkway.</li> </ul>
R	The submitted survey plan is unsatisfactory as it shows the elevation within the subject development only. The survey plan must be updated to existing grades extending min. 10 meters beyond all property lines to assist the consultant with identifying any existing external drainages entering the subject development.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Draft Plan Drawing A1 (August 20 <sup>th</sup> 2021) and Drawing PD-1.
8.	Development Engineering has concerns relating to the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation: a) A Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd., dated July 2018 was submitted for the development which included a drilling program that consisted of 12 boreholes across the subject lands which ranged from 2.9m to 7.6m in depth. Groundwater was recorded in six boreholes, at a depth of 0.3 m to 6.1 m from the ground surface, or El. 252.2 m to 259.7 m.	SOILS ENG	To be addressed at detailed design.
b.	Upon reviewing the borehole location plan, the Town recommends that additional borehole investigations are required at the proposed SWM pond location. The consultant shall provide recommendations on a clay liner or geosynthetic liner to prevent impact on the effective storage volume of the pond. It should be noted that any imported clay must meet acceptable Provincial and Town standards. During detail design, a revised soil report will be required that will address the issue of the clay liner or membrane. The geotechnical report shall also address the proposed slopes of the pond.	SOILS ENG	Noted; additional boreholes will be completed for detailed design.
c.	The slope analysis recommends that any new development will have to be set back a minimum of 6m from the long-term stable slope line (LTSSL). Please discuss potential risks and engineering constraints of constructing a SWM pond in a close proximity to the LTSSL.	SOILS ENG	Refer to Soil Engineers Ltd. Letter dated March 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2021.
d.	During detail design, a comprehensive soils report will be required that addresses as a minimum, pavement and road design, design of building footings, design of the storm pond and the design of infiltration trenches.	SOILS ENG	To be addressed at detailed design.
e.	It should be noted that the draft plan used in the geotechnical report is outdated and should be updated.	SOILS ENG	To be addressed at detailed design.
9.	Development Engineering has concerns relating to the Hydrogeological Investigation: a) The Hydrogeological Assessment prepared by Palmar, dated December 29th, 2020 is currently under a peer review. Once completed, the peer reviewer’s comments will be circulated under a separate cover.	PALMER	No Action.
b.	The report discusses the suitability of the soils in this subdivision for the construction of infiltration trenches that will be installed on the lots. During the detail design, a soils report will be required that addresses the size, depth and location of these trenches and will need to be mindful that residents could be installing pools, patios etc. in the rear yards which may impact or even destroy these trenches.	PALMER	Acknowledged.
c.	During detail design, a comprehensive soils report will be required that addresses as a minimum, pavement and road design, design of building footings, design of the storm pond and the design of infiltration trenches.	PALMER	Acknowledged.
10.	Development Engineering has concerns relating to the Environmental Noise Report: The Environmental Noise Feasibility Study prepared by Candevcon Ltd., dated March 26th, 2019 is currently under a peer review. Once completed, the peer reviewer’s comments will be circulated under a separate cover.	CANDEVCON	Comments received.
b.	Figure 4 of the Noise Report suggests that 3.1m high acoustic fences are required for Block 2. Please note that as per the TOC Development Standard, the maximum allowable height for noise fences is 2.4m. The difference in the required fence height should be achieved with the use of a berm.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
c.	The study should also assess the potential impact of the increased traffic noise on the existing DeRose subdivision and investigate if any upgrades or new noise attenuation measures are required.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
11.	Development Engineering has concerns relating to the Road Network/Draft Plan: a) The Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was prepared by GHD, dated March 21st, 2019. The TIS suggests that the portion of Street C will be extended to be connected to Emil Kolb Parkway with a signalized intersection. However, this future intersection is not shown on all other engineering drawings (servicing, drainage plan etc.). Please confirm.	GHD	The TIS prepared by GHD did not suggest that the portion of Street C would be extended to Emil Kolb Parkway. It has always been assumed that access to the development would occur from the Emil Kolb Parkway and De Rose Way intersection.
b.	Section 7 of the report makes a reference of the City of Hamilton’s Traffic Impact Study Guidelines. Please revise.	GHD	This has been corrected.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
c.	The Town has reviewed the explanation provided in Section 8.6 regarding the sub-standard intersection angle of Street A and Street B. However, please note that all intersection angles must be in the range of 85 degrees to 95 degrees as per the Town's Design Standards Manual.	GHD	The intersection angle has been revised to 70 degrees. The report continues to support this angle.
d.	The applicant will be required to completely urbanize the section of Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road along the development's entire frontage. Also, due to the total amount of proposed servicing required along Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road, the applicant will also be required to place a layer of top course asphalt along the entire width of the road, all to the satisfaction of the Town.	OWNER	Acknowledged, sections of Chickadee Lane and Glasgow Road will be urbanized to facilitate the proposed subdivision.
e.	Street C road width must match the existing road width of Glasgow Road.	GHD	The portion of Street 'C' facing Glasgow Road will match the existing road width of Glasgow Road.
f.	All required daylighting triangles and rounding's are required to adhere to current Town standards.	HUNT	
g.	Please show the location of all sidewalks. Where possible all sidewalks should be located on either the north or east side of the road. As per current Town standards, local roads only require a sidewalk on one side of the road.	HPGI	Sidewalks will be provided on both sides of Chickadee Lane, Glasgow Road the proposed local roads with 18.0m ROW. One sidewalk will be provided on the portion of Street "C" that measures 16.0m ROW. The sidewalks will be shown on detailed engineering drawings.
h.	All intersection angles must be in the range of 85 degrees to 95 degrees as per the Town's Design Standards Manual.	GHD	<p>The intersection angles of the proposed intersections are generally designed to not fall outside of the Town's standard ranges (85 to 95 degrees). However, the centerline intersection angle of Street 'B' at Street 'A' is measured at 70 degrees. This is not considered a significant issue for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peak hour volumes turning at this intersection are expected to be negligible. Motorists residing on Street 'A' are expected to travel directly to either Chickadee Lane or Glasgow Road, and not utilize Street 'B', and furthermore motorists residing on Street 'B' are expected to travel directly to Chickadee Lane.</li> <li>With an intersecting centerline angle of 70 degrees, this intersection is classified as a "right-angled" intersection as per the TAC Geometric Design Guide (70 to 110 degrees) and is considered an acceptable intersection type.</li> </ul>
i.	A minimum 15 metre tangent is required at all intersections.	GHD	
j.	The applicant is required to provide, along with the Parking Plan, written justification as to how the noted plan meets the requirements set out in Section 5.12(On Street Parking in Settlement Areas) of the Town of Caledon's Development Standards, Policies and Guidelines. The Parking Plan must clearly show proposed sidewalks and where parking is to be restricted.	GHD	This will be prepared when a suitable site plan is available with sufficient details to prepare such a plan.
k.	Please show a multi-use trail (MUT) that connects the internal sidewalks system to the existing sidewalks on Emil Kolb Parkway.	HPGI	Multi-use trail is shown on Figure 6 on Community Design Plan. Details will be provided on detailed drawings.
12.	Prior to draft plan approval, the following issues must be addressed:		
a.	Confirmation of Stormwater Block Sizing	CANDEVCON	SWM pond modified.
b.	Hydrologic modelling	CANDEVCON	Refer to response to TRCA Comment 5.
c.	Stormwater facility erosion control	CANDEVCON	Refer to response to TRCA Comment 5.
d.	Additional modelling or extended detention required for valley outlet	CANDEVCON	Refer to updated Palmer Report on Erosion Threshold.
13.	Please refer to the attached TRCA comments letter and Appendix A for detailed TRCA comments. (Toronto Region Conservation Authority)	OWNER	TRCA comments summarized and addressed to herein. Refer to TRCA comments and responses above.
14.	Prior to draft plan approval, street names are to be issued to the satisfaction of the Town. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Municipal Numbering)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
15.	Please confirm if municipal numbers are to be issued for any environmental and open space blocks, by working with the appropriate agency. Please inform municipal numbering staff accordingly. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Municipal Numbering)	OWNER	TRCA will advise.
16.	Please refer to the attached Urban Design comments letter and marked-up PDF copy of the Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief, Elevation Drawings, and Architectural Control Guidelines documents for detailed urban design comments. (Town of Caledon, Urban Design)	HPGI	Urban Design comments addressed. Refer to responses above.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
<b>Comments to be Addressed as Conditions of Draft Plan Approval</b>			
<b>Should the Official Plan Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision be approved, the following conditions of draft plan approval are required.</b>			
1.	Prior to a recommendation report being brought forward, the tax account must be current. (Town of Caledon, Finance Department)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
2.	Blocks 29, 31, 32 and 34 shall be conveyed to the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	OWNER	Blocks have been renumbered on revised draft plan of subdivision. Blocks 29, 31, 32 and 33 will be conveyed to the Town of Caledon.
3.	Blocks 29, 31, 32 and 34 shall be conveyed to the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, subject to Tangible Asset Management Committee Approval. (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority)	OWNER	Blocks have been renumbered on revised draft plan of subdivision. Blocks 34, 35, 36 will be conveyed to the TRCA.
4.	The following preliminary conditions for draft plan of subdivision are provided for the Owner's information only and are subject to change.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
a.	Street lighting will be required throughout the development including the entrance from Emil Kolb Parkway to Chickadee Lane. Chickadee Lane. Street lighting design shall be undertaken by a qualified electrical engineer and must comply with the TOC Outdoor Lighting Standard.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
b.	Prior to any site alteration of the Plan, the Owner shall submit a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) report for all the lands included in the Plan, prepared in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 153/04 under the Environmental Protection Act (as amended) and a Phase 2 ESA report, if such a report has been recommended in the Phase 1 ESA report, and shall reimburse the Town for the cost of a peer review, if one is required.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
c.	Prior to grading or site alteration, whichever occurs first, the Owner is required to submit a Ministry of Environment ("MOE") Record of Site Condition, in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 153/04 under the Environmental Protection Act (as amended), certifying all lands included in this Plan area meet MOE standards, all to the satisfaction of the Town. The Owner shall reimburse the Town for the cost of peer review of any reports, if required.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
D.	Prior to the initiation of grading or stripping of topsoil, the Owner shall submit an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan including a topsoil storage plan detailing the location, size, side slopes, stabilization methods and time period, for approval by the Town. Topsoil storage shall be limited to the amount required for final grading, with excess removed from site. The Owner shall undertake periodic inspections at the request of the Town to ensure maintenance of the erosion and sediment control facilities and submit reports to the Town upon completion of inspection	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
e.	Prior to any grading, the Owner shall submit an Environmental Noise Impact Study, prepared by a qualified professional, to the satisfaction of the Town. The study shall include an assessment of noise levels from Emil Kolb Parkway, the ultimate traffic volumes associated with the surrounding road network and the effect of stationary source noise on the subject property. The study should also assess the potential impact of the increased traffic noise on the existing DeRose subdivision and investigate if any upgrades or new noise attenuation measures are required, The Owner shall reimburse the Town for the cost of any peer review, as required of the above noted report.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
f.	Prior to any grading, the Owner shall submit the Hydrogeologic Study, prepared by a qualified professional, to the satisfaction of the Town. The Owner shall reimburse the Town for the cost of any peer review, as required of the above noted report. (Town of Caledon, Engineering Services Department, Development Engineering)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
5.	Heritage staff have the following concerns relating to an Archaeological Assessment:		
a.	The proponent shall follow through on MHSTCI and Town of Caledon Heritage staff recommendations to mitigate, through preservation or resource removal and documentation, adverse impacts to any significant archaeological resources found (Stages 3-4) to the satisfaction of the MHSTCI and the Town of Caledon Heritage staff prior to development approval. The archaeological assessment(s) must be completed in accordance with the most current Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.		An archeological assessment has been completed.
b.	No demolition, construction, grading or other soil disturbances shall take place on the subject lands prior to the Town of Caledon Heritage staff receiving, to their satisfaction, all completed archaeological assessment(s), in both hard copy and PDF format, and the MHSTCI compliance letter(s) indicating that all archaeological		An archeological assessment has been completed and included with this submission.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied and the report(s) has been entered into the Public Registry.		
c.	Significant archaeological resources will be incorporated into the proposed development through either in situ preservation or interpretation where feasible or may be commemorated and interpreted through exhibition development on site including, but not limited to, commemorative plaquing.		No Action required at this time.
d.	If the subject lands were previously assessed, the proponent must provide a copy of the archaeological assessment(s) and the associated MHSTCI compliance letter(s) indicating that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied and the report(s) has been entered into the Public Registry. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Heritage)		See above
6.	As a condition of Draft Plan Approval, the Town will require that the owner display information regarding universal design options that may be available for purchase within the development prior to offering units for sale and in a place readily available to the public. (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
7.	The following conditions should be added as part of the draft approved conditions. These conditions are to be cleared by the Legal Services Office prior to final approval and registration of the M-plan.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
a.	The Owner shall enter into a Town of Caledon Subdivision Agreement or any other necessary agreements executed by the Owner, the Town and the Region or any other appropriate authority prior to any development within the plan to satisfy all financial, legal and engineering matters including land dedications, grading, easements, fencing, landscaping, provision of roads, stormwater management facilities, installation of municipal services, securities, parkland and cash contributions, and other matters of the Town and the Region respecting the development of these lands in accordance with the latest standards, including the payment of Town and Regional development charges in accordance with their applicable Development Charges By-laws.	OWNER	Acknowledged. Subdivision agreement and all other necessary agreements to be entered into with the Town of Caledon.
b.	Prior to the preparation of any agreement, the Owner shall pay to the Town all fees and costs set out in the Fees By-law for the preparation and registration of the agreement and all documents necessary to give effect to the approval of the Plan of Subdivision.	OWNER	Acknowledged, fees/costs to be paid as part of Draft Plan registration.
c.	The Owner shall convey/dedicate, gratuitously and free and clear of all encumbrances, any required parks, open space, trails, road or highway widenings, 0.3m (1 ft.) reserves, walkways, daylight triangles, buffer blocks, stormwater management facilities, maintenance blocks and utility or drainage easements or any other easements as required to the satisfaction of the Town, the Region or other authority.	OWNER	Acknowledged.
d.	The Owner shall provide the Town with postponements for any and all encumbrances of the subject lands postponing such encumbrance(s) and subordinating it in all respects, to any and all agreements entered into between the Owner and the Town, or, the Owner, the Town and the Region, as required by the Town. (Town of Caledon, Legal Services)	OWNER	Acknowledged.
8.	The following condition is required: a) Prior to assumption, the Owner shall provide:	OWNER	Acknowledged.
a.	A chart outlining all the terms and conditions of the Subdivision Agreement that must be fulfilled prior to assumption; and	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided during Draft Plan approval process.
b.	evidence of compliance with all terms and conditions of the subdivision agreement and any other applicable agreement, at its sole cost and expense. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Development Review Services)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided during Draft Plan approval process.
9.	Staff require a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor, along with a Draft M-Plan prepared by an Ontario Land Surveyor to the satisfaction of the Town in order to determine zoning compliance with lot frontage and lot area requirements. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided during Draft Plan approval process.
10.	The following conditions are to be incorporated in the conditions of draft approval: That the applicant agrees in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to include the following clauses in all offers of purchase and sale of residential lots until the permanent school for the area has been completed.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided during Draft Plan approval process.
a.	Whereas, despite the best efforts of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, sufficient accommodation may be ne available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be include within future purchase and sale agreement.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside the neighborhood, and further, that students may later be bussed to a school outside the neighborhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighborhood school.”		
b.	“That the purchasers agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, the residents of the subdivision shall agree that children will meet the bus on roads presently in existence or at another place designated by the Board.” (Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board)	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be added within future offers of purchase and sale agreements.
11.	The following conditions are to be included in the Development Agreement as well as the Engineering Agreement:	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be added within future development agreements.
a.	Prior to final approval, the Town of Caledon shall be advised by the school Board(s) that satisfactory agreements regarding the provision and distribution of educational facilities have been made between the developer/applicant and the school Board(s) for this plan.	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be added within future development agreements.
b.	The Peel District School Board requires the following clause be placed in any agreement of purchase and sale entered into with respect to any units on this plan, within a period of five years from the date of registration of the development agreement:	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be added within future offers of purchase and sale agreements.
i.	“Whereas, despite the efforts of the Peel District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students in the neighborhood schools, you are hereby notified that some students may be accommodated in temporary facilities or bused to schools outside of the area, according to the Board’s Transportation Policy. You are advised to contact the School Accommodation department of the Peel District School Board to determine the exact schools.”	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be added within future offers of purchase and sale agreements.
ii.	“The purchaser agrees that for the purposes of transportation to school the residents of the development shall agree that the children will meet the school bus on roads presently in existence or at another designated place convenient to the Peel District School Board.”	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be added within future offers of purchase and sale agreements.
c.	The developer shall agree to erect and maintain signs at the entrances to the development which shall advise prospective purchases that due to present school facilities, some of the children from the development may have to be accommodated in temporary facilities or bused to schools, according to the Peel District School Board’s Transportation Policy. (Peel District School Board)	OWNER	Acknowledged. Clause to be added within future offers of purchase and sale agreements.
12.	The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval:	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be included as a condition of draft plan approval.
a.	“The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada.”	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be included as a condition of draft plan approval.
b.	“The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost.” (Bell Canada)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be included as a condition of draft plan approval.
13.	The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at <a href="mailto:planninganddevelopment@bell.ca">planninganddevelopment@bell.ca</a> during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development. (Bell Canada)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be included as a condition of draft plan approval.
14.	It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada’s existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure. If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development. (Bell Canada)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be included as a condition of draft plan approval.
15.	Prior to registration, the Owner shall provide a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor, to the satisfaction of the Town.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be provided during registration process.
a.	Prior to registration, the Owner shall obtain municipal address numbers from the Town.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be obtained during registration process.
b.	A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement requiring that these numbers be permanently embedded in or attached to the exterior of each dwelling once the dwelling is built and/or a permanent municipal address number sign be installed immediately upon receipt of a Building Permit as per the Town’s Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines.	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be included as a clause within subdivision agreement.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
c.	A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement requiring that both the lot or block/unit number and corresponding municipal address be displayed on all lots and blocks in a prominent location, until such time that the lot/block is transferred. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Municipal Numbering)	OWNER	Acknowledged. To be included as a clause within subdivision agreement.
16.	Please refer to attached Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief with integrated staff comments. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	HPGI	Redlined comments addressed on CDP and urban design brief. Refer to revised CDP within resubmission package.
17.	Please refer to attached Architectural Design Guidelines with integrated staff comments. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	HPGI	Redlined comments addressed on ACGs. Refer to revised ACGs within resubmission package.
18.	Please refer to attached Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan with integrated staff comments. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape)	PALMER	See revised Arborist Report.
19.	Please refer to the attached Urban Design comments letter and marked-up PDF copy of the Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief, Elevation Drawings, and Architectural Control Guidelines documents for detailed urban design comments. (Town of Caledon, Urban Design)	HPGI	Redlined comments addressed on CDP and ACGs. Refer to revised CDP and ACGs within resubmission package.
<b>Comments to be Addressed During Detailed Design of the Subdivision</b>			
<b>Should the Official Plan Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision be approved, the following comments are to be addressed during detailed design.</b>			
1.	All exterior paths of travel, including outdoor sidewalks and walkways, shall have a minimum clear width of 1.5 metres, a surface which is firm, stable and slip resistant and otherwise comply with the Integrated Accessibility Standards (IAS) within the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	HUNT / CANDEVCON	To be addressed during detailed design.
2.	Any opening on a path of travel, such as a sewer grate, must not allow the passage of an object with a diameter of more than 20mm and such opening must be oriented perpendicular to the direction of travel. (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	CANDEVCON	To be addressed during detailed design.
3.	All exterior paths of travel including crossings from one side of a street to another shall be accessible, through the inclusion of features such as a curb ramp with a minimum clear width of 1,200 mm exclusive of any flared sides. Curb ramps shall have raised profile tactile walking surface indicators located at the bottom of the curb ramp and extending the full width of the ramp. Curb ramps shall comply fully with the IAS within the AODA. (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	CANDEVCON	To be addressed during detailed design.
4.	If a community mail box is installed, the area shall be well lit via a light standard and a curb depression, complying with the IAS within the AODA, shall be provided from the sidewalk and/or roadway to the mail box landing area. (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	CANDEVCON	To be addressed during detailed design.
5.	Any lighting on exterior routes of travel shall comply with the Town's lighting standard. (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	CANDEVCON	To be addressed during detailed design.
6.	Should the Park Block or Open Space areas include an outdoor play space, the design shall incorporate accessibility features such as sensory and active play components for children and caregivers with various disabilities. Such outdoor play space shall have a ground surface that is firm, stable and has impact attenuating properties for injury prevention and sufficient clearance to provide children and caregivers with various disabilities the ability to move through, in and around the outdoor play space. (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	CANDEVCON	To be addressed during detailed design.
7.	Should any traffic control signal systems with pedestrian controls be newly installed or replaced, they shall comply fully with the requirements of the IAS such as by inclusion of features like tactile arrows that align with the direction of crossing and audible and vibro-tactile walk indicators. (Town of Caledon, Corporate Services Department, Accessibility)	CANDEVCON / GHD	To be addressed during detailed design.
8.	Significant archaeological resources will be incorporated into the proposed development through either in situ preservation or interpretation where feasible or may be commemorated and interpreted through exhibition development on site including, but not limited to, commemorative plaquing. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Heritage)	IRVIN	To be addressed during detailed design.
9.	Please refer to the attached Urban Design comments letter and marked-up PDF copy of the Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief, Elevation Drawings, and Architectural Control Guidelines documents for detailed urban design comments. (Town of Caledon, Urban Design)	HPGI	Redlined comments addressed on CDP and ACGs. Refer to revised CDP and ACGs within resubmission package.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
<b>Comments to be Addressed Prior to Zoning By-law Amendment</b> <b>Should the Official Plan Amendment be approved, the following comments are to be addressed prior to the Zoning By-law Amendment.</b>			
1.	Staff have reviewed the Agricultural Impact Assessment by Stantec Consulting, dated June 7, 2019. Please provide a map indicating that MDS (Minimum Distance Separation) arcs do not impact the subject lands. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)		See response above, repeated comment.
2.	Please note the specific uses proposed in each proposed zone. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	HPGI	Specific uses are specified in the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and within the Zoning Matrix provided with the resubmission of materials.
3.	Please note that the requested permitted uses include uses that are not defined in Section 3 of Zoning By-law 2006-50. Please confirm the requested permitted uses. Where a use is proposed and not defined in By-law 2006-50, a definition is required. Please refer to Section 13.1 to determine if there is a site-specific definition existing in another zone which can be utilized in the proposed site-specific zone. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	HPGI	“Dwelling, Stack Townhouse” has been removed from the permitted uses table in the proposed Zoning By-law. All other permitted uses are defined in the Zoning By-law.
4.	Please confirm if the provided Lot Frontages are calculated as defined by By-law 2006-50, as amended. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	HPGI	Lot Frontages calculated as defined by By-law 2006-50 (Lot, Frontage).
5.	No detailed site plans with proposed Townhouse Dwellings / Single Family Dwellings were reviewed. Further zoning comments will be required if such plans are provided in future submissions. Compliance with zoning standards (setbacks, building area, encroachments, etc.) cannot be determined at this time. As such, proposed dwellings will be required to comply with the parent “RMD” zone requirements (as amended). (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	HUNT	Site plan provided.
6.	Please provide building height dimensions on the elevation drawings. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	HUNT	Elevation drawings provided.
7.	Please review the attached draft zoning by-law template. Please make future changes to the draft by-law utilizing the tracked changes feature. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	HPGI	The resubmitted ZBLA will utilize track-changes.
8.	Please refer to the attached draft Zoning By-law Amendment document for track change comments. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning)	HPGI	Updated, see revised ZBLA.
9.	The legal description in Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment should read “Part of Lot 10, Concession 5 (Albion) and Part of Lot 10, Concession 6 (Albion), Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel”. Municipal addresses referenced should be 13935, 13951, 13977 and 13999 Chickadee Lane; 0 Emil Kolb Parkway; and 550, 600 and 615 Glasgow Road. Please see marked up Zoning By-law Amendment and Official Plan Amendment attached. (Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Development Review Services)	HPGI	Updated, see revised ZBLA.
10.	Please refer to the attached Urban Design comments letter and marked-up PDF copy of the Community Design Plan and Urban Design Brief document for detailed urban design comments. (Town of Caledon, Urban Design)	HPGI	Redlined comments addressed on CDP and ACGs. Refer to revised CDP and ACGs within resubmission package.
1.	Comments from the following agencies remain outstanding and will be forwarded to you upon receipt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Street Naming</li> <li>• Canada Post</li> <li>• Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC)</li> <li>• GO Transit</li> <li>• Rogers Communications</li> </ul>	OWNER	Acknowledged.
2.	The following agencies and departments have no concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OPP (Caledon Detachment) – January 18, 2021</li> <li>• Hydro One – January 22, 2021</li> <li>• Credit Valley Conservation</li> </ul> Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Heritage – February 16, 2021 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TRCA – March 5, 2021</li> <li>• Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Zoning – February 12, 2021</li> <li>• Town of Caledon, Planning Department, Landscape – February 18, 2021</li> <li>• Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board letter – January 15, 2021</li> <li>• Peel District School Board Letter – March 3, 2021</li> <li>• Town of Caledon, Urban Design Peer Review Letter – February 8, 2021</li> </ul>	OWNER	Acknowledged.



	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
	• Region of Peel – May 13, 2021		
3.	A comment review meeting will be arranged with the appropriate internal and external commenting agencies to discuss the comments in the letter, assisting you in ensuring that the next submission will be complete and address all comments as required. I ask that you provide an agenda a minimum of three (3) days prior to the comment review meeting	HPGI	Noted
4.	Refer to Official Plan Amendment – Planning Redlined	HPGI	Comments have been addressed, see revised OPA.
<b>Proposed Official Plan Amendment – Zoning Comments</b> <b>Brandon Bell, February 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021</b>			
1.	Staff note that no commercial or industrial uses were proposed on the lands subject to this application.	OWNER	Correct.
2.	Staff have reviewed the Agricultural Impact Assessment by Stantec Consulting, dated June 7, 2019. Please provide a map indicating that MDS (Minimum Distance Separation) arcs do not impact the subject lands.		See response above, repeated comment.
3.	Please provide a complete zoning matrix for all zones proposed, indicating the required zoning provisions and what is being proposed, as required.	HPGI / HUNT	
4.	Please note the specific uses proposed in each proposed zone.	HPGI	Specific uses are specified in the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and within the Zoning Matrix provided with the resubmission of materials.
5.	Please note that the requested permitted uses include uses that are not defined by By-law 2006-50. Please confirm the requested permitted uses. Where a use is proposed and not defined in By-law 2006-50, a definition is required.	HPGI	“Dwelling, Stack Townhouse” has been removed from the permitted uses table in the proposed Zoning By-law. All other permitted uses are defined in the Zoning By-law.
6.	Please provide an overall site plan indicating the zone boundaries.	HPGI	Zoning By-law Amendment schedule provided that delineates the zone boundaries.
7.	Please confirm if the provided Lot Frontages are calculated as defined by By-law 2006-50, as amended.	HPGI	See response above, repeat comment.
8.	Staff require a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor, along with a Draft M-Plan prepared by an Ontario Land Surveyor to the satisfaction of the Town in order to determine zoning compliance with lot frontage and lot area requirements.	KRCMAR	
9.	No detailed site plans with proposed Townhouse Dwellings / Single Family Dwellings were reviewed. Further zoning comments will be required if such plans are provided in future submissions. Compliance with zoning standards (setbacks, building area, encroachments, etc.) cannot be determined at this time. As such, proposed dwellings will be required to comply with the parent “RMD” zone requirements (as amended).	HUNT	See response above, repeated comment.
10.	Please provide building height dimensions on the elevation drawings	HUNT	See response above, repeated comment.
11.	Please review the attached draft zoning by-law template. Please make future changes to the draft by-law utilizing the tracked changes feature	HPGI	Updated, see revised ZBLA.
<b>Redlined comments</b>			
12.	Refer to Zoning-By-Law Amendment – Zoning redlined	HPGI	Updated, see revised ZBLA.
<b>Thornton Tomasetti – Noise Impact Study</b> <b>June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2021</b>			
<b>SACL Peer Review Comments</b>			
<b>2.1. Section 2.1 Roadway Traffic Noise Sources</b>			
1.	The ultimate road traffic data used in the calculations are acceptable; however, the Town of Caledon requirements as noted in the Development Standards Manual, Version 5.0, 2019 (DSM) requires that traffic noise assessments are to be calculated based on a traffic speed of 10 km/h over the posted speed. The calculations, assessment, and noise mitigation requirements should be updated based on the increase in road speed limit.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
2.	A three-way roundabout is located to the west of the proposed development, with King Street extending south from the roundabout and Emil Kolb Parkway continuing to the west. King Street, which is an arterial road, has not been assessed in the NIS. The NIS should include the assumptions or justification on whether to assess the King Street traffic noise impact on the Site.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
<b>2.2. Section 2.4 Noise Criteria</b>			
1.	The DSM requirements for noise assessments and mitigation should be included as part of the noise criteria for the proposed development.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.

	STAFF COMMENTS	ACTION BY	RESPONSE
<b>2.3. Section 2.5 Projected Sound Levels and Appendix C</b>			
1.	Receptor location 10 and 11 are shown in Figure 3; however, the calculation results are not provided in Table 3.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
2.	The receptor heights for the daytime sound level calculations at the receptors should be at the 2nd storey height as a worst-case scenario.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
3.	The calculation output for R1 shows absorptive ground was used in the calculation. In consideration of Street C and green area shown between R1 and its closest point to the Emil Kolb Parkway, it may be more appropriate to model at least part of the ground between R1 and the Parkway as reflective.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
4.	It should be noted for clarity the assumed or planned fronting of the residential units and the location of Back-yard areas. For example, it may be assumed that Block 6 fronts on Street ‘C’; however, the direction of Lot 1 and Block 8 is not stated and it may affect the noise control recommendations for their backyards.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
<b>2.4. Section 3.1 Outdoor Recreation Areas</b>			
1.	The DSM requirements for daytime sound levels in outdoor areas to meet 55 dBA or lower should be noted, as they are more restrictive than the MECF NPC-300 guidelines.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
<b>2.5. Section 3.2 Minimum Barrier Requirements</b>			
1.	As noted in the DSM, a maximum noise barrier height is 2.4m and additional height may be provided by an earth berm. Additionally, the minimum requirements for a noise barrier (no gaps, surface density, etc.) should be noted in the NIS.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.
<b>Closing Remarks</b>			
1.	The Noise Impact Study prepared by Candevcon Limited, dated March 26, 2019 for the proposed residential development located at 13935,13951 and 13999 Chickadee Lane, 0 King Street and 500, 600 and 615 Glasgow Road, Part of Lot 10, Concession 5 and 6 in the Town of Caledon was reviewed. While the calculations and noise mitigation recommendations provided are in line with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and parks NPC-300 and Region of Peel noise assessment guidelines, the NIS should be updated to also include the town of Caledon Development Standards Manual requirements and criteria. Changes in the noise mitigation requirements may result from the updated sound level calculations.	CANDEVCON	Refer to Addendum to Noise Report dated August 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021.