

Last Updated on May 15th, 2026				The Biglieri Group Ltd.	Address: 0 Nicholas Street, Caledon
					TBG File No.: 16420
					Town of Caledon File No.: DART 21T-24001C
Item #	Commenting Department	Topic	Comment	Comment	Response
1	Town of Caledon Development Engineering December 13, 2024	General	1	Provide the existing grades of adjacent properties up to 10m beyond the site limits. Currently, none of the existing structures and trees are shown on the engineering plans.	Additional topographic information has been added to the Functional Grading Plan.
			2	A 3:1 slope is used throughout the entire development, which is not acceptable. The Town Standard permits a maximum slope of 4:1.	The slopes on the Functional Grading Plan have been adjusted.
			3	The proposed retaining walls within the ROW are unacceptable as they pose unnecessary liability for the Town. Furthermore, in accordance with the Town Standard, retaining walls must be constructed entirely on the upper side to ensure that tie-backs do not cross property boundaries.	As indicated in section 9.2 of the FSR, due to the existing topography, retaining walls will be required within the Town's existing road allowances for Spring Street, Amelia Street and Nicholas Street. These retaining walls can be constructed using systems that do not require tie backs. No retaining walls are required within the proposed road allowance within the subject site. We have added cross sections to the Functional Grading Plan to illustrate the extent of the retaining walls. It may be possible to reduce / eliminate some of the retaining walls if 4:1 slopes can be incorporated within the boulevards. The grading design will be refined at the detailed subdivision engineering design stage.
			4	Please note that the Town Standard requires a vertical curve if the road grade changes by more than 1.5%.	The proposed centre line of road elevations have been revised to incorporate vertical curves.
			5	The proposed residential lots will be serviced by septic tanks located in the rear yard. The sizing and placement of these septic tanks must comply with the latest Ontario Building Code.	Detailed design of the septic systems will be prepared at the Building Permit Stage in accordance with OBC.
			6	For Lots 8 to 15, the back-to-front drainage pattern is concerning because the houses are at a lower elevation than the septic tanks in the backyard. In the event of a septic tank overflow, runoff would drain toward the house, which is unacceptable.	It is not uncommon to have a pump tank downstream of the septic tank to pump up to the septic bed that is located at a higher elevation. Detailed design of the septic systems will be prepared at the Building Permit Stage.
			7	The proposed drainage plan for the eastern half of Lots 1 to 4 does not align with the existing drainage pattern. Under pre-development conditions, runoff from these lots would disperse as sheet flow. However, the developer plans to construct a swale along the back of these lots, directing concentrated flow to an adjacent property without the homeowner's consent or easement, which could lead to localized flooding or erosion.	Existing drainage from the south and west currently drains into the existing swale along the back of lots 1 to 4. Under proposed conditions, external drainage south of the site will be captured via a proposed swale and therefore bypass the existing swale located behind lots 1 to 4. There will be significantly less flows entering the existing swale from the rear yards of lots 1 to 4.
			8	Similarly, the proposed culvert under Spring Street would convey concentrated flow to the side yard of 19934 Main Street without adequate erosion protection.	Erosion protection in the form of rip-rap has been indicated on the plans.
			9	Please note that all proposed culverts should be HDPE and have a minimum diameter of 450mm.	The specification for the proposed culvert will be provided at the detailed subdivision engineering design stage.
			10	Nicholas Street should be fully extended to connect to Main Street.	The functional plans have been revised to indicate the re-construction of Nicholas Street from Main Street to the subject site.
			11	Amelia Street from the proposed development should connect to the existing Amelia Street. If there is a misalignment of the centerline between the proposed and existing roads, a centerline transition design should be provided at the detailed design stage, including a tapering of the pavement width.	The functional plans have been revised to indicate the transition from the proposed pavement width in the subdivision to the existing pavement of existing Amelia Street.
			12	The silt fences on the ESC plan should be revised to encompass the entire construction area.	The extent of the silt fence has been updated on the Functional ESC Plan.
			13	Provide a cross-sectional drawing of the infiltration trench on Lot 7.	Infiltration trench locations have been updated. A typical infiltration trench detail has been provided in Figure 5. The infiltration trench on Lot 7 has been deleted.
			14	Provide a modified 20m ROW cross-section specific to the subject development.	As requested, a modified cross section for the 20.0m road allowance has been added to Appendix "G" of the Functional Servicing Report indicating a 7.9m pavement width.
		Street Lighting	15	Street lighting will be required throughout the development. Street lighting design is to confirm to the Town of Caledon Outdoor Lighting Standard Manual dated September 19, 2019. Submission of detail design and photometric drawings for the street lighting system shall form a condition of draft approval of the subdivision.	The street lighting design will be prepared at the detailed subdivision engineering design stage after Draft Plan Approval.
		Site Servicing	16	Based on the servicing drawings, cross section, and data in the FSR, it is unclear what horizontal clearance is proposed between the box culvert and the external drainage pipe and whether the separation meets all applicable technical standards.	The horizontal clearance between the box culvert and the storm sewer for external drainage will be established at the detailed engineering design stage in conjunction with the sizing of sewers.
			17	The Town staff is of the opinion that additional DCBs are required to successfully capture road runoff. Per the Town standard, the maximum spacing between catch basins should be less than 70m.	The location of catchbasins will be determined at the detailed subdivision engineering design stage after draft plan approval.
			18	It is not clear in the first submission documents if frost depth for the superpipe will be achieved. Storm pipes proposed at depths less than 1.4m will require insulation. Preference is for pipe sewers to be installed at sufficient depth to not require insulation.	The requirement for pipe insulation will be determined at the detailed subdivision engineering design stage after draft plan approval.
			19	Considering the risk of surcharging of the system and the requirement to demonstrate how the site grading and drainage will be accomplished, servicing plans are to be updated to show proposed CB and RLCB locations. Acknowledge that CB and RLCB locations may be considered conceptual at this stage of design and will be further refined at detail design.	The storm sewer will surcharge due to the orifice control in conjunction with the SWM detention system. The proposed houses will have sump pumps. The overland flow route and catchbasins have been indicated on the Functional Grading Plan. Specific catchbasins will be sized to capture the 100 year storm event. The sizing and placement of catchbasins will be provided at the detailed design stage after draft plan approval.
			20	To ensure self-cleaning velocities are achieved and to assist with future flushing and maintenance of the storm system, Development Engineering requests the applicant investigate implementing a non-standard cross section for the box culvert storm sewer with a curved bottom. Note that a circular or elliptical superpipe will also achieve this requirement but may be problematic considering storage requirements and space constraints in the ROW. Acknowledge that detail design of the storm sewer will be addressed through the engineering submission.	We have indicated in section 6.3 of the FSR that the type of SWM detention pipe (box culvert, circular or elliptical) will be reviewed at the detailed subdivision engineering design stage for consideration with respect to future flushing and maintenance.

		Functional Servicing Report	21	The Functional Servicing Report (FSR), prepared by Valdor Engineering Inc. and dated April 2022, was submitted for the Town's review. Please ensure the FSR adheres to the findings and recommendations of the Alton Village Drainage Study – Phase 2, completed by RJ Burnside.	The FSR adheres to the findings of Alton Village Drainage Study - Phase 2.
			22	Section 4.1 of the FSR indicates that the minor system from the subject site may connect to the future storm sewer on Main Street once the Main Street urbanization is completed. However, please note that any runoff from the subject site was not included in the scope of the Main Street storm sewer.	The minor system from the subject site will discharge to the existing 750mm culvert under Main Street, based on the findings from Alton Village Drainage Study - Phase 2.
			23	According to the FSR, the existing 750mm culvert under Main Street will serve as the outlet for the subject site. At the detailed design stage, the developer should investigate and confirm if this culvert is still in adequate operating condition, free from blockages or collapses.	The condition of the existing culvert will be assessed at the detailed subdivision engineering design stage.
			24	Confirm that the elevation of the existing culvert is adequate to be used as an outlet for the proposed storm sewer.	The invert of the culvert has been indicated on the plans.
			25	According to the ETV Canada website, the STC 300 does not have ETV certification. Please select one of the ETV-certified oil grit separators. Also, OK-110 is the wrong PSD; please use the correct ETV PSD.	An OGS with ETV Certification has been specified as requested.
			26	Given that the subject site is located within the CVC's regulated area, a hydrodynamic oil grit separator alone will not achieve 80% TSS removal without a treatment train approach. If implementing a treatment train approach is not feasible, the developer may use a filter system, such as Jellyfish Filter or StormFilter, to meet the 80% TSS removal criteria.	A treatment train approach using an catch basin infiltration trenches pretreated with goss traps in conjunction with the OGS.
			27	To prevent a reduction in active storage volume inside the box culvert due to sediment accumulation, the Town recommends installing catch basin insert devices, such as CB Shields, at all catch basins. Please note that the Town does not credit 80% TSS removal for the combined use of catch basin insert devices and oil grit separators (OGSs) since both devices target similar particle sizes and are unable to capture finer sediments.	The use of catchbasin insert devices have been noted in section 6.3 of the FSR.
			28	Stormwater quantity control is to be provided by a 2.4m x 2.4m box culvert storage tank under Amelia Street, using an orifice diameter of 141mm. Please include an overflow pipe for the storage system with 0.3m of freeboard above the HWL. According to Table E4-F, there is currently no freeboard inside the box culverts.	Overflow for the SWM detention dank will be provided by the street catchbasins. The freeboard will be incorporated into the design at the detailed subdivision engineering stage.
			29	The proposed box culvert is 85m long, and according to the Grading Plan, the centerline elevation of Amelia Street drops by 6m along this stretch. Given that the box culvert will be under the road, please confirm how the box culvert will be designed to accommodate the change in elevation (e.g., stage storage).	The box culvert will be at a constant slope with minimum cover at the downstream end. The slope of the box culvert as well as the width, height and length will be optimized at the detailed subdivision engineering stage.
			30	According to FGP-1, the inlet invert of the 750mm culvert is approximately 403m, which matches the future centerline elevation of Nicholas Street. Based on this information, it may not be feasible to use the existing culvert as an outlet for the proposed STM system.	The invert of the culvert has been indicated on the plans.
			31	There is a pair of DCBs on both sides of the road above the existing 750mm culvert on Main Street, which is not shown on the submitted drawings.	The pair of existing DCBs have been indicated on the functional plans.
			32	Section 8.1 of the FSR states that the road slopes will vary from 0.5% to 6%; note that the minimum allowable slope is 0.75% per Town standards.	The minimum road slope has been revised in the FSR and on the Functional Grading Plan.
			33	Tables E4-C to E4-E show incorrect storm events.	Tables E4-C to E4-E have been updated accordingly.
			34	All E5 tables reference the "City of Pickering." The storm event names are also incorrect.	The reference to the municipality has been revised.
		Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Investigation	35	Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Sirati & Partners, dated September 6, 2017, and Hydrogeological Investigation Report, prepared by Palmer, dated January 24, 2022 was submitted to the Town in support of this application. Please note that the hydrogeological report will be peer reviewed at the Developer's expense. However, Town Development Engineering believes it is premature to proceed with the peer review at this stage, based on the comments provided in this memo.	Acknowledged.
		Noise Impact Study	36	The Noise Impact Study prepared by YCA Engineering, dated April 2022, did not identify any potential noise sources. Therefore, daytime rear yard sound levels are expected to remain below 55 dBA without the need for any noise mitigation measures. The Town has no further comments.	Acknowledged.
		Environmental Site Assessment	37	A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by Palmer, dated December 3, 2021, was prepared and submitted in support of the application. The report found that the subject land has remained vacant and undisturbed and thus no PCAs have been identified. A Phase 2 ESA is not required for this site.	Acknowledged.
			38	The Town will require a Record of Site Condition be filed for the subject properties as a part of draft plan conditions.	Acknowledged.
2	Town of Caledon Transportation, Engineering Public Works & Transportation Department December 13, 2024		1	Transportation Staff have reviewed the submitted Transportation documents for the DART Application 21T-24001C.	
			2	While the report states that the Town was consulted prior to its preparation, this correspondence is not included in the report. To confirm any results, the Town requests that any such correspondence be included as part of the report.	The scope correspondence for the updated TIS has been included in the Appendix of this letter
			3	Additionally, the analysis years used in the report (existing 2017, future background/total 2024) do not accurately reflect current or future conditions. The Town kindly requests that the analysis years be updated to reflect the current existing year and a more realistic full build-out assumption. This update may also impact the background developments considered in the report.	The TIS has been revised to include up-to-date traffic data and adjacent development information. Analysis years have been updated to reflect accurate existing and future built-out scenarios (2026 and 2031).
			4	Due to the potential substantial changes that may arise from these comments, transportation staff did not thoroughly review the analysis presented in the submitted document. Transportation Engineering reserves the right to provide additional comments based on a revised submission. Transportation Engineering requests that the Traffic Consultant provide a response letter with the re-submission package, clearly reiterating the Town's comments in order and detailing how each comment has been addressed.	Acknowledged.

3	Town of Caledon Heritage, Planning & Development Department Dec. 13, 2024	General Comments – Alton Pinnacle and Impacts	1	Heritage staff note that the subject lands include a portion of the Alton Pinnacle, identified as a landmark in the Alton and Environs Cultural Heritage Landscape. As further elaborated on by the Town’s Environmental Planning staff and Engineering staff, there are major concerns related to the development, including, but not limited to, impact to the natural heritage features on property and the nature of the proposed grading and water disbursement. Both large-scale issues would also directly affect the character of the Pinnacle and adjacent cultural heritage resources within the Village of Alton. As such, at this time, Heritage staff cannot support the proposed application.	Acknowledged. Discussion of impacts to the character of the Pinnacle and adjacent cultural heritage resources is included in the CHIS Addendum by The Biglieri Group Ltd. The scope of impacts resulting from the proposed development to such features is discussed, and the CHIS Addendum concludes that the proposed development provides an "appropriate relationship to its setting within the broader Alton and Environs Cultural Heritage Landscape in terms of setbacks, orientation, scale, and height". Accordingly, despite the anticipated impacts to the Pinnacle and adjacent cultural heritage resources in the Village of Alton, the proposed development is appropriate such that it implements the recommendations of the CHIS Addendum to mitigate potential adverse impacts to massing, proportion, rhythm and materials by way of locally-rooted design.
		Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS)	2	Heritage staff are in receipt of the “Cultural Heritage Impact Statement 0 Nicholas Street, Caledon, Ontario”, prepared by WSP, dated April 25, 2022.	Acknowledged.
			3	Since the completion of the report, the Province has made changes to the Ontario Heritage Act through Bill 23 and Bill 200. The structures at 19904 Main Street were also demolished and the property removed from the Register.	Acknowledged. The CHIS Addendum (May 2026) reflects these changes since the initial CHIS by WSP (2022) was completed, including those changes which have been made to the Ontario Heritage Act , as amended by Bills 23 and 200, and that 19904 Main Street's structure is now de-listed and that the property is no longer on the heritage register.
			4	A CHIS addendum is required to address the following:	The CHIS Addendum enclosed in the submission package, dated May 2026, by The Biglieri Group Ltd., acknowledges the following comments and addresses these respective items:
				a. Note for the benefit of the report that the structures at 19904 Main Street were lost to demolition and the property was subsequently removed from the Heritage Register.	As previously mentioned, the CHIS Addendum reflects the changes to the Ontario Heritage Act and that 19904 Main Street's structure is now de-listed. Recommendations have been updated accordingly.
				b. Update all recommendations in consideration of the de-listing of 19904 Main Street and the recent changes to the Ontario Heritage Act.	
				c. Include discussion of impacts related to any proposed retaining walls and how the appearance of these retaining walls would affect the Village of Alton.	The CHIS Addendum specifically discusses impacts resulting from the proposed retaining walls, and provides design recommendations pertaining to material selection (among other considerations) to mitigate any potential adverse impacts.
				d. Include recommendations addressing the following, should the development be approved:	The CHIS addendum has provided additional recommendations pertaining to dwelling design, and the design of retaining walls. This includes recommending new buildings adopt height, massing and scales consistent with the adjacent historic fabric, and that the retaining walls are designed to blend into and reinforce the natural character of the Pinnacle's slope, while utilizing materials which respect the existing historic character of the Alton village.
				i. design the new houses to reflect the historic character of the area. They should be of their time while reflecting common architectural characteristics seen in the Village of Alton.	
				ii. The design of retaining walls; they should be naturalized, like the retaining walls in place at other properties, and should not be composed of armoustone.	
			5	Should application move forward, the proponent will be required to adhere to the applicable recommendations set out in the CHIS, and any other related recommendations required by the Town.	It is acknowledged that the proposed development will be required to adhere to the recommendations of the CHIS, and any pertinent recommendations from the Town thereto. This will be implemented as a draft plan condition.
		Urban Design Brief	6	The following revisions are required and should be coordinated alongside revisions required by Urban Design staff:	The revised Urban Design Brief, dated May 4, 2026, contains an overview of Alton's heritage characteristics, specifically found in Section 3.6. <i>Cultural Heritage Impact Statement Summary</i> .
				a. Include a heritage section within the Urban Design Brief, providing an overview of the heritage character of the Village of Alton, both environmental and built features, and identify key styles and examples of buildings found throughout the Village, including those adjacent to the subject lands.	
				b. Change references to the ‘Alton Heritage Conservation District’ throughout to ‘proposed Alton Heritage Conservation District’.	References have been updated to refer to the " <u>proposed</u> Alton Heritage Conservation District" throughout the enclosed Urban Design Brief.
				c. Accurately identify location images on pg. 11. Include a view from 19876 Main Street looking towards the subject site.	The location images on page 11 have been updated to correctly indicate their addresses and locations, including a key map for greater clarity, within the revised Urban Design Brief. The image showcasing 19876 Main Street has also been updated to be looking towards the subject site.
				d. Include lighting examples that are more rural in nature. The Region of Peel roadwork example (on the right of pg. 26) was not favoured by Heritage staff or by the village as a whole.	The lighting examples have been updated to better meet the rural character of the surrounding Alton Village community.
				e. Fix images with wording (e.g., pg. 31) as the labels are difficult to read.	The wording labels on top of the conceptual dwelling drawings have been revised for clarity, as is visible on page 29 of the revised Urban Design Brief.
				f. Buildings should have a variety of setbacks to avoid uniformity and to align with the character of the village.	Section 3.4.1 <i>Streetscape</i> to the Urban Design Brief has been updated to state "A variety of building setbacks will be provided to avoid uniformity and mirror the existing character of the village."
				g. Ontario Heritage is not an architectural style; Ontario Gothic should be referenced instead.	The reference to "Ontario Heritage" in Section 3.5 <i>Building Design</i> (on page 34 of the previously-submitted Urban Design Brief) has been revised to "Ontario Gothic" on page 32 of the revised Urban Design Brief.
				h. Pg. 40: i. three car garages are not necessary nor are they part of the fabric of Alton. ii. State that the garages should be set back from the front façade.	The revised Urban Design Brief is updated to state that each dwelling will have a <i>two-</i> car garage, not <i>two- or three-</i> car garages.
		Architectural Control Guidelines	7	The architectural control guidelines should include clear direction for the architectural design proposed for the subject lands, and as with other comments above, should take design cues from the existing historic houses in the Village of Alton.	The Architectural Control Guidelines ("ACGs") are intended to serve as a directional guide for the architectural design of the proposed development. It is noted that these guidelines have not been updated from the previously-submitted ACGs, dated April 5, 2024, at this time, and updates to the ACGs will be provided for as a Draft Plan Condition for approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision.

		Archaeological Assessment	8	Heritage staff are in receipt of the “Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment for the Proposed Residential Subdivision Development Within the Part of Lot 23, Concession 4 West of Hurontario Street In the Geographic Township of Caledon Former County of Peel Now in the Town of Caledon regional Municipality of peel Ontario”, prepared by Archeoworks Inc., dated August 28, 2017, which was included as part of the submission materials.	Acknowledged.
			9	As part of the any subsequent submissions, the proponent shall submit the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) acceptance letter associated with this archaeological assessment.	The acceptance letter from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (now Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Gaming), dated October 19, 2017, has been enclosed in this submission package.
	Town of Caledon, Natural Heritage, Planning & Development Department Dec. 13, 2024	European Larch Plantation Assessment	1	5.1.1 Terrestrial System and Fig. 2 - Fencerow (TAGM5): the TAGM5 community should be characterized as an inclusion community within the surrounding community. It is not appropriate to identify it as a Fencerow/Hedgerow, as it is currently part of the larger woodland feature & community, irrespective of its history or origins.	Admittedly, the TAGM5 definition is not the best of descriptors. However, this area is a wide swath that is straight and distinctly different from the surrounding ecosites. The TAGM5 code was selected to note the anthropogenic nature of the clearing and character of the area. It would not be appropriate to map this as CUP/plantation area.
			2	5.2.4 Vegetation Structure and Health & 5.2.5 Distribution and Ecology of Successional Species: Alternative explanations should also be considered/presented, including that slow successional growth is beneficial to trees in the long-term, as it allows stronger wood tissue growth as the tree matures, conferring longevity to slow-growing hardwood species which are poised to take advantage of canopy openings which may occur as taller conifers eventually/gradually subside.	While alternative explanations are possible, visual evidence of "over tall" saplings indicates that in general, native species are not being afforded adequate replacement opportunities and are compensating to survive. That, paired with European Larch replacement indicates that succession by native species may be significantly delayed.
			3	5.2.6 Regeneration of Native Tree Seedlings and Stems Per Hectare: The 10 cm DBH metric is a distinct criterion used in by-laws for separate purposes. The applicable policy is based on a height criterion and cannot be reinterpreted by introducing other criteria based on opinion.	The report notes this, and does not attempt to mask that the "of any size" criteria for Caledon (Sections 5.2.6, 3.2 and 3.3). All stems are reported. The use of the 10 cm criteria comes from an attempt to define "regenerated" in the Region of Peel Naturalized Plantation definition of "approximately 100 or more stems per hectare of regenerated native trees that have attained a minimum height of 1.37 metres. The reason for the discussion and use of the 10 cm criteria is to consider if the natural regeneration in the plantation will lead to a native woodland community as per the Naturalized Plantation definition. In terms of naturalization and likely succession, the European Larch are dominant and well established in the Plantation. The larch are unlikely to allow native species succession without competition from its own self-replacement/succession, and native species comprise far less than 10% of the tree crown cover. Summarizing, this plantation is almost entirely tall European Larch, with native species only present as little more than saplings. The continued presence to the larch make the establishment of these saplings into a noted part of the canopy problematic, and the transition to a native woodland community unlikely. As such, the features and functions of the plantation area are lower than a native forest.
			4	5.3 Breeding Bird Results: The observation of Eastern Wood Pewee (SC) should not be dismissed, as its presence indicates candidate SWH. Although plantations may constitute suboptimal habitat for this species, they are known to breed in them sometimes and although the ELC community it was observed in is distinct from the Larch community, the SWH may be larger than the ELC unit. Further assessment of this feature as SWH is warranted.	One Eastern Wood-pewee (<i>Contopus virens</i>) was heard singing near the southwestern property boundary on June 18, 2020, and not within the European Larch Plantation CUP3-6 area. This species was not observed during the first-round survey. This observation is not within the proposed development area, and breeding status would not be confirmed, even for the areas outside the proposed development area.
			5	5.6 Functional Relationship with Adjacent Woodlands: • The break created by Credit Street is not large enough to constitute a habitat break and woodlands cannot be “partially severed” for these purposes. • The plantation features in question are considered part of the larger contiguous woodland extending westward. • While the Larch plantation in question does not itself contain interior habitat, Woodland feature with a 100m buffer, and would also impact its interior habitat with a 200m buffer, reducing this aspect of the woodland habitat in both cases. • Bat Maternity Colonies: Since suitable trees are often inconspicuous, this type would remain candidate SWH until assessed, notwithstanding the general observation that they are “unlikely” to exceed criteria thresholds. Also, trees are explicitly noted as potential habitat for Little Brown Myotis, so the potential habitat must be assumed to be present until assessment demonstrates otherwise.	While Credit Street might not be a wide habitat break, it does break up the overall woodland. Regardless, any connectivity at Credit Street is only ~150 m wide, and thus portions of interior woodland at that point would not connect. This makes the woodlands on and immediately adjacent to the Subject Property distinct for the purposes of the SWH evaluation. SLR maintains its evaluation of interior habitat. In light of the above widths at Credit Street - any contiguous woodlands would not add interior habitat relative to the proposed development area. In response to this comment, a bat habitat (snag) survey was completed in May 2026. As expected, due to tree species and quality, only two snag were observed in the Subject Property/proposed development area. At far less than 10 snags/ha, this area would not be considered Bat Maternity Colony SWH.
			6	6. Analysis Summary: Please clarify the reference to NHS policies and OP sections 3.1 and 3.2.	The reference should have been Sections 3.2 and 3.3 (of the document), where exceptions for plantations are described in the Peel and Caledon OPs.
			7	6.2 Stand Composition: Basal Area is not a criterion for evaluating whether the plantation is included in the Core Woodland feature.	Basal area and observations of canopy cover/composition were both taken in the field. As basal area is a less subjective measure, both were presented.
			8	6.3 Vegetation Structure and Health: as noted above, the 10 cm DBH is not an appropriate criterion for this assessment and does not relate to the relevant policies. The qualitative “over-tall” and “leaning” observations do not negate the degree of native species regeneration present.	Response in Comment 3 (RE: 5.2.6 Regeneration of Native Tree Seedlings and Stems Per Hectare).
			9	5.4 and 6.5.3, Species at Risk: • Butternuts require further assessment by a Butternut Health Assessor, subject to MECP direction, including a dedicated search for nearby seedlings to establish management recommendations and an area of protection. • Three bat species (Tri-colored Bat, Eastern Small-footed Myotis and Northern Myotis) are listed as possible (“P”) in the SAR screening, while Little Brown Bat is listed incorrectly as ‘N’, on the basis that buildings are absent while the use of trees as habitat is explicitly noted. All bat species would require further study and evaluation to draw conclusions about the presence or absence of bat habitat present.	The author is a Butternut Health Assessor (#571). The butternuts observed, including their habitat protection zones (25 m) are outside the development area (Figure 4). For these specific trees, even cursory observations showed a very high degree of canker, and are certainly Class 1 trees. No seedlings were observed. Due to stand composition, being a high degree of needle-bearing tree species, there is a marginal potential for SAR bat habitat.

Assessment	10	6.6 Regeneration of Native Tree Seedlings and Stems Per Hectare: • Include Sorbus sp. (Mountain Ash) and Populus tremuloides (Trembling Aspen) in the assessment as these are also trees and are included in the Flora inventory. Sorbus sp. may be excluded from the native regeneration assessment if positively identified as a non-native Mountain Ash species. • Manitoba Maple may be included, since it has a S5 rank in Ontario, although it is treated as an invasive in some cases. • Even excluding Manitoba Maple, however, the 644 native stem density (actual density is even higher once Aspen and Mountain Maple numbers are included) demonstrates that the plantation clearly exceeds the OP policy criterion for being included in the Core Woodland (“Communities where native tree species comprise approximately 10 percent or less of the tree crown cover and approximately 100 or fewer stems of native tree species of any size per hectare would be candidates for exclusion.”). This demonstrates that the plantation is not a candidate for exclusion from the Core Woodland.	While noted in the area, Mountain Ash and Trembling Aspen are present in low quantities, and were not observed in the random plots established for stem density counts (Figure 2). With 4 points established in the European Larch area (6 overall), adequate representation of the site has been achieved. Calculations have been provided that include Manitoba Maple. SLR maintains our position on the composition and character of the European Larch Plantation. Meeting the OP policy criterion and purpose is undetermined. The area exceeds 90% European Larch canopy cover (dominant species by far), and while the stem count does exceed the noted criteria, it does not present a guarantee that the area will achieve native regeneration.
	11	7.1 Conclusions: Given that the plantation has some aspects that do meet the criteria for being considered a naturalized plantation, as correctly indicated in the report, it must be considered as such, and therefore is part of the Core Woodland feature. Staff note further that the plantation does not meet any of the Town OP criteria for exclusion from the Core Woodland feature (i.e., actively managed tree farms or features dominated by a highly invasive species, which Larch is not). As per OP policy, the crown cover proportion alone does not make this community a candidate for exclusion from the Core Woodland. As indicated by the report, there are several native species present (White Ash, Black Cherry, Trembling Aspen, Mountain Ash, White Pine, Manitoba Maple and especially Sugar Maple) in sufficient density (> 600 stems/ha) to demonstrate that the plantation is naturalizing and meets the OP policy test for being included in the Core Woodland. Note that Peel OP 2.14.28 states “Plantations shall be identified as a Core Area woodland if they are a naturalized plantation and they meet one or more criteria for Core Area woodland in Table 1. For the purpose of measuring woodland patch size when woodlands contain Core Area woodland and non-Core Area plantation communities, patch size shall be measured to include all contiguous woodland communities.” Table 1 Core Woodland criteria that are met in this woodland include size and Significant Species/Communities (supports S2 species and Species At Risk). The “Age” criterion would require further studies to draw any conclusions. Additionally, the CUP3-2 Pine Plantation which is east of the Larch plantation is also part of the whole feature and could not have been orphaned by the removal of the Larch plantation in any event.	SLR maintains our position and interpretation.
	12	7.2 Constraints Mapping: • As noted above, the Larch Plantation is a naturalized plantation and cannot be excluded from the Core Woodland. It therefore cannot be removed for development. • The Plantation assessment and/or the EIS must include a rationale for the proposed buffer as a Vegetation Protection Zone. Applying the minimum 10m buffer to a large Core Woodland which has not been fully assessed and which is demonstrated to support SWH, SAR, an HDF and potentially other significant features is not ecologically appropriate. A larger buffer to be densely planted with native species according to an Edge Management Plan would be needed to provide adequate confidence that the ecological integrity of the feature will be protected and enhanced. • As noted in comments above, the White Pine Plantation is also part of the woodland, cannot be removed and is therefore also a constraint.	SLR maintains our position and interpretation.
	13	Appendices: • Please append ELC or other field notes/data sheets for all fieldwork conducted. • Flora Lists: <i>Juglans cinerea</i> (Butternut) seems to be omitted. All observed species should be included. • Significant Wildlife Habitat Screening: SC species habitat should be P or Y, as Eastern Wood-Pewee was observed within the woodland and can use plantations for nesting and foraging habitat. Wood Thrush habitat is also identified in the report as potentially present (SAR Screening section) and would require further assessment.	Appendices: • ELC or other field notes/data sheets can be sent as a separate digital file • Flora Lists: <i>Juglans cinerea</i> (Butternut) was not observed in the European Larch area, so not included in species list in this report. It is included in EIS species list. • Significant Wildlife Habitat Screening: as above (Item 4), Eastern Wood-Pewee presence/use of habitat was not supported by BBS observations. Wood Thrush habitat is screened as potentially present, based on initial habitat characteristics. However, this species was not identified on or near the site during formal Breeding Birds Surveys, and is therefore not considered present.
	EIS	Much of the EIS subject matter is covered in the Larch Plantation Assessment comments above, and for concision, those are generally not repeated below. Other comments are as follows:	
	14	Introduction: • The general comments about the policy context are partially correct. The Town does not identify an NHS in the context of the subject property, except in terms of the adjacent Greenbelt Plan NHS. However, the property is subject to the GBP Protected Countryside policies. • Re: “The Region of Peel OP maps the Subject Property as Core Area of the Regional NHS. Yet there are provisions in the Regional and Town OPs that may allow a non-naturalized, non-native plantation to be removed from the NHS.” Clarification: There is an allowance in the OP for excluding non-native communities from plantations only if they are dominated by highly invasive species, such as Buckthorn or Norway Maple. Note that this does not include European Larch.	• NOTE: Policy sections have been updated with new relevant policies. • Flora Lists: <i>Juglans cinerea</i> (Butternut) was not observed in the European Larch area, It is included in EIS species list. • The exception policy 2.14.32 is documented in this section verbatim.

15	Policy Review: • Include the Ontario Fish & Wildlife Conservation Act as part of the policy context. • Caledon OP - Note: 3.2.5.3.5 Management and restoration of Woodland Core Areas and Other Woodlands shall adhere to the Town's ecosystem principle, goal, objectives, policies and performance measures...	• Mention of the FAWCA has added to policy review under MBCA. • Caledon OP section revised to reflect the new OP.
16	4.6 Species at Risk: Full assessments of Butternut and Bat habitats are required to support the proposed removal of identified or candidate habitat, or impacting potential buffer or adjacent lands area. Supporting correspondence with the MECP would be required, as well as any further field data or other relevant material.	Consultation requirements with MECP are discussed in Sections 7.2 and 8.4 of the report.
17	4.8 Headwater Drainage Feature: Further details are required outlining the dates and methods used to investigate this feature, following the prescribed HDFA methodology, especially as it pertains to timing vis-à-vis spring freshet and/or significant precipitation events, as these are critical periods for an assessment of HDF function. The connection to wetlands/wetland pockets upstream and downstream within 400m is part of the assessment. Clarify how this was assessment was conducted and the findings.	Per HDF methods, no water was seen during any survey in 2020 (March 31, May 26 and 27, and June 30). This is an ephemeral collection feature, and no other features were noted on the tablelands above the Subject Property, nor within the private properties below it.
18	5.3 Significant Wildlife Habitat - Habitat of Species of Special Concern: Eastern Wood pewee was observed and Wood Thrush potential habitat was identified through the SAR screening. Both SC species habitats must be assessed through the SWHECS (SWH Ecoregion Criteria Schedule) to determine the extent of habitat to be delineated and protected.	Refer to Items 4 and 13 above.
19	5.4 Headwater Drainage Feature: The basis for the various assessments is not clear. For example, what is the 'limited function' of the Terrestrial Habitat? Please clarify with additional details and field notes.	This section has been expanded and revised, to link the functional classification to the criteria within the <i>Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guidelines</i> (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and Credit Valley Conservation, 2014)
20	6. Proposed Development: References to the NHS should instead be reconsidered with respect to the Core Woodland/Area, as per the OP, which does not identify an NHS at this location.	Noted and Revised
21	7.1.1 Potential Impacts: All impacts to a natural feature are required to be avoided or mitigated. An 8% loss of treed area from a feature results in a loss of the form and function of that woodland, which would have to be compensated if the impact/removal were to be approved. Otherwise, attritional losses and degradation would be the result, contrary to the ecological principles set out in the OP. As noted in the Plantation Assessment comments above, the Larch plantation is a naturalized plantation and therefore not eligible to be removed from the Core Woodland.	Section 8.3 now reflects the new Caledon OP, including Policy 13.12.6 that requires that <i>woodland removal be accompanied by a woodland enhancement plan that demonstrates an enhancement in woodland area is achieved, either on the same property or in a reasonable proximity</i> . The Proponent is open to discussing an appropriate enhancement plan with the Town and/or CVC, to be determined as part of detailed design. This offsetting would compensate for the loss of woodland.
22	7.1.2 Buffers and Setbacks: The EIS must include a rationale for any proposed buffer as a Vegetation Protection Zone. Applying the minimum 10m buffer to a large Core Woodland which has not been fully assessed and which is demonstrated to support SWH, SAR, an HDF and potentially other significant features is not ecologically appropriate. A larger buffer to be densely planted with native species according to an Edge Management Plan would be needed to provide adequate confidence that the ecological integrity of the feature will be protected and enhanced.	A setback analysis is provided in Section 8.3.1 of the revised EIS.
23	7.1.3 Timing Windows: Note that the Ontario Fish & Wildlife Conservation Act also includes policies which must be considered with respect to timing windows.	The FAWCA has been included in Section 2 - it has been determined that no changes to timing windows are needed.
24	7.1.4 Edge Management: Include an Invasive Species Management Plan in addition to proposed methods, to control invasive species in the area of the restoration/buffer plantings, so as to minimize the risk to the feature as well as to the new restoration works.	Invasive Species Control recommendations have been added to the EIS.
25	7.2.1 Butternut: Dying/declining trees may do so slowly and may still be reproducing during their last years, so a BHA assessment should be conducted in consultation with the MECP prior to management decisions being undertaken.	See Section 8.4 of the EIS.
26	7.2.2 SAR Bats: Since some bat species may utilize coniferous trees as habitat. Assessment in consultation with the MECP needs to be completed prior to management decisions being undertaken.	See Section 8.4 of the EIS, as revised.
27	7.3 Significant Wildlife Habitat : As noted above, the feature is considered candidate SWH for Eastern Wood-pewee and Wood Thrush until a full assessment demonstrates that SWHECS criteria are not met.	Refer to Items 4 and 13 above.
28	7.4 Headwater Drainage Feature: Note that for mitigation level management, the full recommendations include: • Replicate or enhance functions through enhanced lot level conveyance measures, such as well-vegetated swales (herbaceous, shrub and tree material) to mimic online wet vegetation pockets, or replicate through constructed wetland features connected to downstream; • Replicate on-site flow and outlet flows at the top end of system to maintain feature functions with vegetated swales, bioswales, etc. If catchment drainage has been previously removed due to diversion of stormwater flows, restore lost functions through enhanced lot level controls (i.e., restore original catchment using clean roof drainage); • Replicate functions by lot level conveyance measures (e.g., vegetated swales) connected to the natural heritage system, as feasible and/or Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater options (refer to Conservation Authority Water Management Guidelines for details);	Noted - The recommendations were paraphrased for the report. That the mitigations must follow the requirements of the <i>Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guidelines</i> has been added.
29	7.5 Breeding Birds: see Timing Window comment above.	The FAWCA has been included in Section 2 - it has been determined that no changes to timing windows are needed.
30	8.1.1 Natural Heritage Features: per comments above, the Larch Plantation cannot be removed from the Core Woodland/Significant Woodland.	SLR maintains our position and interpretation.
31	8.1.2 No Negative Impact Test: The suggestion that a woodland can be considered not to have been impacted on the basis that more than the minimum threshold area still exists is incorrect. Removal of 8% of a woodland area is an impact to that feature, reducing its size and therefore function through attrition. The proposal to remove this amount of the feature without replacement does not meet the no impact test.	See response to Item 21.

			32	8.3 Town of Caledon Official Plan: As the feature is demonstrated to be a Core Woodland feature, it is designated EPA. New development is prohibited in EPA lands (per s. 5.7.3.1.1), excepting the permitted (limited) uses specified in policy 5.7.3.1.2.	SLR maintains our position and interpretation.
			33	Appendices: Provide ELC or other field notes/data sheets for all fieldwork conducted.	ELC or other field notes/data sheets can be sent as a separate digital file
5	Town of Caledon, Landscape, Planning & Development Department Dec. 13, 2024	General Comments	1	Previous comments indicated that development is not permitted on these lands. Please confirm that this has been addressed and that development is permitted on this site. This is needed first to inform tree preservation and landscape plans.	The revised submission package, which this Comments Response Matrix composes in part, seeks to demonstrate the (revised) proposed development is permitted on these lands, pursuant to any necessary planning applications therein. See enclosed Planning Rationale Report for further details.
			2	Additional clarification and information is required regarding the scope of the intended tree preservation requirements for this project.	It is the applicant's intent that as many trees which can be retained and/or preserved upon the subject site, shall be retained and/or preserved, as best possible. The enclosed revised Environmental Impact Study (EIS) by SLR, dated May 14 2026, provides a high-level overview of the various treed areas upon the subject site which contain trees that can be acceptably removed, and those which should be retained and protected. Further detail regarding the intended tree preservation measures for the proposed development are to be provided as part of an Arborist's Report and Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan (TIPP) as a condition of draft approval, pursuant to discussions with town staff.
		Detailed Comments		In the event the applicant wishes to proceed with submitting an application without staff support, the following detailed comments are provided:	
			3	Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision does not provide a 30m MVPZ with respect to preservation of existing natural heritage features (10m shown), and provision of enhanced linkages between Key Natural Heritage Features. Provide structure envelopes where necessary to achieve the 30m MVPZ.	The Caledon Official Plan requires a 20m VPZ to significant woodlands within settlement areas. The enclosed EIS by SLR provides a more detailed site-level analysis, and ultimately supports a 10m VPZ, as is proposed. While the Caledon Official Plan requires greater VPZs than proposed, it is TBG's professional opinion the findings of the enclosed EIS offers the necessary information and sufficient rationale to support a reduced VPZ. It is noted an EIS is a common and effective basis to evaluate such modifications in various municipalities; as such, the proposed Official Plan Amendment seeks to implement such as policy on a site-specific basis to implement the recommendations of the EIS.
			4	Natural heritage features are to be conveyed to the Town where feasible.	Acknowledged. At this time, natural heritage features upon the subject site (within the Conservation Easement) are proposed to remain in private ownership, as the landowner has not expressed explicit interest in conveyance. However, opportunities to convey such lands are and potential for such conveyance may be explored at the discretion of/in conjunction with the landowner, at a later date.
			5	Please provide access block(s) to the NHS and Open Space Blocks for Operations staff to provide forest management and hazard tree removals.	Access blocks to the NHS and Open Space blocks are not proposed at this time. However, this is not to preclude opportunities to introduce such access blocks, subject to future discussions with town staff and the landowner.
			6	There's an existing trailhead connection to the regional Grand Valley Trail identified that traverses this property. The Town would like to maintain a connection to this trail. Please provide an access route and trailhead for this trail.	A trail connection is not proposed at this time, as per the Draft Plan of Subdivision enclosed in this submission package. However, the nature of the present application is to provide the prerequisite land use permissions to enable the proposed development. A trail connection is not precluded going forward, and will be considered for inclusion as part of a subsequent application, as these considerations are best finalized once said land use permissions are implemented.
			7	Provide an Arborist Report and Tree Preservation Plan as per the Town of Caledon Terms of Reference for Arborist Reports, Tree Preservation Plans, and Tableland Tree Removal Compensation, 2020. The Terms of Reference can be found at the following link: https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/landscape-requirements.aspx#Planning-and-Design . Please include the arborist's name and certification number on all associated documents.	The need to provide these studies is acknowledged. It is TBG's professional opinion that an Arborist's report, Tree [Inventory and] Preservation Plan (TPP/TIPP), and any/all other plans pertaining to tree preservation, conservation, restoration, and/or compensation, would be premature at this time, and so are not part of this submission. This is decided on the basis that completing these studies at the detailed design stage will provide the most complete basis for an Arborist's report and TIPP, and most appropriately satisfy Town expectations for both studies, which involve a heightened scope of work and detail for the proposed development than can be established at this time. The enclosed applications for OPA and DPS provide prerequisite land use permissions to enable the proposal; only by achieving these is a detailed design phase justified. Therefore, the requirement for an Arborist's report and TIPP is best fulfilled as a Draft Plan Condition.
			8	Please indicate the work zone limit of disturbance on the separate Tree Preservation Plan and include any trees within 6m of the limit of disturbance (including construction access and equipment/material storage areas) or that will be impacted by the proposed development in order to help determine the limits of tree protection fencing. Include trees on adjacent properties as necessary.	Acknowledged. See above for further details pertaining to completion of an Arborist's Report & TPP/TIPP at this time.
			9	All retained trees in and adjacent to the work zone will need to be protected, either as individual trees or in groupings as determined by the arborist. Where the Tree Protection Fencing follows the same path as Erosion Control Fencing, they can be combined in a complimentary manner that does not impede the function of each other. Label all tree protection fencing accordingly.	Acknowledged. Retained trees will be protected, and coordinated with engineering measures for erosion control as part of the detailed design stage, such that they are complementary to one another. See above for further details pertaining to completion of an Arborist's Report & TPP/TIPP at this time.
			10	The Tree Preservation Plan is to include Town of Caledon standard tree preservation notes and details on the Tree Preservation Plan (Refer to standard design details #606, 710, and 711, which can be found at the following link: Standards, Policies and Guidelines - Town of Caledon).	Acknowledged. See above for further details pertaining to completion of an Arborist's Report & TPP/TIPP at this time.

			11	If trees larger than 10cm DBH are proposed to be removed as a part of this project, tree compensation will be required. If trees are to be removed then please indicate the number of the trees to be compensated in the arborist report provided. Please indicate the species, number and size of the proposed tree compensation and clearly show the proposed locations of all compensation trees to be planted on the Reforestation and Restoration Plans. Trees already required as part of proposed developments, such as street trees and reforestation will not be accepted as compensation trees. Trees that cannot be accommodated on site in accordance with Town practice will require cash-in-lieu for each compensation tree. Include Town standard planting details as applicable at the following link: Standards, Policies and Guidelines - Town of Caledon).	Acknowledged; TBD. See above for further details pertaining to completion of an Arborist's Report & TPP/TIPP at this time.
		Additional Supporting Documents	12	The following additional plans, reports or studies are required to support this application: • Reforestation and Restoration Plans • Woodland Management Plan • Conceptual Landscape Plans Additional comments may be provided according to the responses provided for the above, as well as any additional information provided.	Acknowledged. See above for further details pertaining to completion of an Arborist's Report & TPP/TIPP at this time. These considerations also apply to these additional studies listed, which are best completed and finalized as part of a detailed design stage.
6	Town of Caledon, Parks, Planning & Development Department Dec. 13, 2024		1	Payment in lieu of conveyance of parkland will be required for the proposed development, pursuant to s.51.1 of the Planning Act, prior to registration of the plan of subdivision.	Acknowledged. Payment in lieu of a parkland conveyance for the proposed development will be provided in accordance with section 51.1 of the Planning Act, and is to be included as a Draft Plan Condition prior to registration of the plan of subdivision.
			2	The payment in lieu of parkland amount is calculated at equivalent market value of 5% of the land included in the plan. Please refer to Park Dedication for more information.	Acknowledged; see preceding response.
			3	To determine the current market value of the development land, the Owner will be required to obtain and furnish the Town with a comprehensive narrative appraisal, in accordance with the Town of Caledon's Parkland Conveyance By-law - 2022-042 and appraisal guidelines. The value of the land shall be determined as of the day before the day of the approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision. Appraisal is considered valid for a maximum period of six months.	Acknowledged. Fulfillment of these requirements will be implemented as a Draft Plan Condition, This shall provide to ensure a Comprehensive narrative appraisal is conducted (in accordance with By-law 2022-042, the appraisal guidelines, and in compliance with the most current CUSPAP of the AIC) by a certified professional appraiser of real estate (as designated by the AIC and is a member in good standing) prior to the approval of the Draft Plan of Subdivision.
			4	The appraisal needs to be prepared by a certified professional appraiser of real estate who is designated as an Accredited Appraiser by the Appraisal Institute of Canada (AIC), and who is a member in good standing of the AIC, at no expense to the Town. All appraisals must comply with the current Canadian Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (CUSPAP) as adopted by the Appraisal Institute of Canada.	
7	Town of Caledon, Policy, Planning & Development Department Dec. 13, 2024		1	Applicable Land Designations • Village and Natural Heritage System in the Protected Countryside as per Schedule B-5; • Greenlands System Overlay as per Schedule C-1; • Core Areas of the Greenlands System as per Schedule C-2; • Rural Land and Rural Settlement Areas as per Schedule D-1; • Rural System as per Schedule E-1; • Rural Settlement Area as per Schedule E-3; As such, we recommend that you consider the following Policies: • Region of Peel Official Plan - 2.14.5 – 2.14.17 - o Highlights the importance of protecting and restoring Core Areas of the Greenlands and limiting development that negatively effects these lands • Greenbelt Plan – 3.2.2 - o Limit of new development that has negative impacts on the Natural Heritage System	These policies have been addressed in the enclosed Planning Rationale Report, dated May 15, 2026.
			2	Further, it should be clearly demonstrated that the limits of the proposed development fall out of the Natural Heritage System, otherwise the Town does not appear to support new development that has negative impacts on the Natural Heritage System within the Greenlands System.	It is acknowledged that the limits of the proposed development must fall outside of the NHS. Portions of the subject site which are currently classified as <i>Significant Woodlands</i> have been evaluated, and In accordance with Section 4.1.5 of the Provincial Planning Statement (2024), it is demonstrated that the proposed development will have <i>no negative impact</i> on the natural features or their ecological functions, as established by the enclosed EIS by SLR, dated May 14, 2026. As it pertains to Municipal policy, a portion of the subject site does not fulfill the Town of Caledon Official Plan's full criteria for reclassifying <i>Core area Woodland</i> features. Therefore, the proposed development will require an Official Plan Amendment to implement the findings of the enclosed EIS by SLR, dated May 14, 2026, to have a site-specific policy where a minimum of 6 of the 9 criteria are required to reclassify as a cultural and regenerating woodland and permit removal of the European Larch trees, as it has been demonstrated by this EIS there will be <i>no negative impact</i> in accordance with the PPS (2024).
8	Town of Caledon, Zoning, Planning & Development Department Dec. 13, 2024		1	Lot Frontages and Lot Areas were reviewed on Draft Plan of Subdivision dated March 8th, 2024 against the Rural Residential (RR) Zone standards.	Acknowledged.
			2	Final lot frontages and lot areas are to be confirmed at a later date when a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage has been prepared and signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor.	Acknowledged.
			3	Zoning standards (including minimum lot frontages and minimum lot areas) were reviewed against the Rural Residential (RR) Zone for compliance and no concerns are noted at this time; however, certain zoning standards such as setbacks, building height, amenity area and landscaping area etc. cannot be reviewed due to the preliminary nature of the application. Such standards may be reviewed at later stages in subsequent applications.	Acknowledged. Full compliance with the RR Zone regulations is proposed and will be confirmed at building permit stage.

9	Town of Caledon, Urban Design and Accessibility, Planning & Development Department Dec. 13, 2024	Site Plan	1	The proposal should firstly address the environmental and engineering issues with the site, upon clearance from the above departments, urban design has the following comments.	Acknowledged. See other responses, and enclosed supporting environmental and engineering materials to this end.
			2	Within section 2.4.1 of the Architectural Control Guidelines please provide specific examples of street trees and landscaping treatments	The recommended updates to the Architectural Control Guidelines ("ACGs") are acknowledged. The ACG will be updated as a condition of Draft Plan approval.
			3	Within section 2.4.3 of the ACG, please include language adding lighting to the community mailbox location, as required for accessibility standards	
			4	Within section 2.4.4 of the ACG please provide specific examples for street lighting and signage	
			5	Within section 2.4.5 of the ACG please include language stating that the main entries will be designed to relate to grade, reducing the number of stairs at the porch	
			6	Given the preexisting flooding concerns for the site, section 2.4.5 should include additional detail and specific examples of the proposed retaining walls and dwelling models that will appropriately fit within the grading.	
			7	Section 3 of the ACG should include a clear direction of the architectural design and choices proposed for the site. This includes specific examples for the design choices on porches, windows, materials, colours, roof design, etc. • We encourage you to review the application for 0 Agnes Street, which can be found on the Town website, for guidance on the design style encouraged by urban design and heritage staff for Alton	Moreover, both the enclosed Cultural Heritage Impact Study ("CHIS") Addendum, and revised Urban Design Brief (both by TBG, 2026) have updated contents pertaining to design measures.
			8	Within the Urban Design Brief on page 23, please additionally show the massing for the dwellings adjacent to the site. ie, 46 & 50 Amelia street, and the homes along main street that back on to the subject site	Page 21 of the revised Urban Design Brief by The Biglieri Group, dated May 4, 2026, now includes photos showcasing the massing of 46 and 50 Amelia Streets, and a selection of buildings along Main Street.
			9	The UDB was meant to have been combined with the cultural heritage brief, not be a repetition of the ACG. Going forward please remove all the content of section 3 with the UDB as it is already outlined within the ACG, and instead provide an overview of the heritage character and considerations for the site and how the Alton heritage is reflected within the architectural design • As mentioned above, we encourage you to review the application for 0 Agnes Street, which can be found on the Town website, for guidance	Acknowledged. In lieu of removing Section 3 of the UDB, this portion of the brief has been updated in lieu of updating the ACGs. The UDB now serves as the more up-to-date design document, with greater emphasis on the heritage role of proposed architectural designs. Furthermore, the application for 0 Agnes Street has been consulted for guidance. Given that the 0 Agnes Street application was for a medium density site with a site plan approval application submitted, it is acknowledged that that site has advanced building designs, landscape plans, and other plans with site plan approval level of detail.
		Accessibility	10	Please note that the Town will require as a condition of draft approval, that prior to offering units for sale and in a place readily available to the public, the owner will display information regarding universal design options that may be available for purchase within the development prior to offering units for sale.	Acknowledged; this will be implemented as a Draft Plan Condition.
			11	If a community mail box is installed, the area shall be well lit via a light standard and a curb depression, complying with Section 80.27 of the IAS within the AODA, shall be provided from the sidewalk and/or roadway to the mail box landing area.	Acknowledged. Location and details of a community mail box will be determined during detailed engineering in consultation with Canada Post.
10	Town of Caledon, Energy & Environment Dec. 13, 2024		1	Thank you for submitting a GDS Brief detailing the sustainability features that will be incorporated into this development. While the Town encourages adherence to the complete GDS checklist (https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/green-development-standards.aspx), please note that it is not mandatory at this stage. We strongly encourage implementation of the following metrics: • 1.7 Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging • 3.1 Operational Energy and GHG Emissions • 3.2 Building Resilience • 3.3 Solar Readiness	Acknowledged. The complete GDS Checklist has filled for the proposed development, and is enclosed in this submission package.
11	Town of Caledon, Economic Development Dec. 13, 2024		1	The Economic Development Division is supportive of initiatives and developments that increase the diversity of housing in Caledon to create accommodation for the local labour requirements. This includes the need for rental and affordable housing.	Acknowledged.
			2	Action 3.10 within the Economic Development Strategy states “Support a diversity of housing options and identify opportunities for multi-unit housing typologies to encourage growth and support affordability.”	The proposed development introduces a wider range and type of housing options to the Village of Alton, which represents growth and supports affordability within the community.
			3	This application is also of some significance related to the Alton Village Study in 2009. A Resident in this area, living on Main Street, had indicated that prior to the planting of the pine plantations on the slope of what is called Pinnacle Hill, the runoff had caused substantial flooding. The trees have worked effectively to stop the flooding in the area and provided slope stability in this area. This proposal with the removal of many of the trees in this area will be a concern to any of those residents that may still reside in this area. It is assumed however that the engineered solutions that have been proposed including berming, underground retention reservoirs and outlet to municipal storm drain will be enough to mitigate future flood events.	It is acknowledged that trees planted on the subject site have served as a flood control mechanism for the surrounding lands. Engineering solutions are proposed to mitigate any potential impacts from future flood events; see the enclosed Functional Grading Plan, Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, and Functional Servicing Report by Valdor Engineering Inc., dated April 17, 2026, for further details.
12	Town of Caledon, Finance Dec. 13, 2024		1	If the proposed development (to facilitate a residential subdivision for fifteen (15) lots) were to proceed as planned, the taxable assessment value of the property would change to reflect any development that would have taken place.	Acknowledged.
			2	For residential dwellings on those lots, Development Charges will be applicable at the Residential rates for single family dwellings that will be in effect on the dates of building permit issuance.	Acknowledged. The applicable development charge rate, as of April-May 2026, has increased compared to that which is indicated. Currently, the applicable development charge rates are as follows: - Peel (per dwelling unit): \$78,335.27 - Peel (per part lot): \$37,673.50 (Peel By-law #77-2020, effective February 01, 2026) - Caledon (per dwelling): \$62,828.87 (Caledon By-law 2024-042 & 2024-043, effective February 01, 2026) - Education (per dwelling): \$5376.00
			3	Currently, Development Charge rates (Residential) are as follows: • Town of Caledon: \$57,846.00 per single or semi-detached unit. • Region of Peel: \$72,122.63 per single or semi-detached unit. • School Boards: \$5,076.00 per any residential unit; and • GO Transit: \$810.24 per single or semi-detached unit.	
			4	Effective February 1, 2016, the Region of Peel began collecting directly for hard service development charges (i.e., water, wastewater, and roads) for residential developments, except apartments, at the time of subdivision agreement execution.	
			5	Development Charges will increase by 2.34% on August 1, 2024. In general, those charges are subject to indexing and review on February 1 and August 1 annually.	

			6	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at July 19, 2024, and are based upon information provided to the Town by the applicant, current By-laws in effect and current rates, which are indexed twice a year. For site plan or rezoning applications dated on or after January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated at rates applicable on the date when an application is determined to be complete (the application completion date); and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. That determination of rates is valid for 18 months after application approval date. Interest charges will apply for affected applications. For applications other than site plan or rezoning applications; and site plan or rezoning applications dated prior to January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated and payable at building permit issuance date. Development Charge by-laws and rates are subject to change. Further, proposed developments may change from the current proposal to the building permit stage. Any estimates provided will be updated based on changes in actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application.	- Education (per dwelling): \$3370.00 (2024 EDC By-law, July 1, 2025- June 30, 2026) For \$184,213.64 per dwelling unit, or \$2,763,204.60 for all 15 proposed dwelling units. It is noted that the GO Transit DCs are no longer included in the current rates for Peel Region, as compared to the rates effective August 01, 2025-January 31st, 2026. It is further acknowledged that these rates are subject to change. The applicable development charge fees, as calculated at the time they are payable, will be paid in full by the applicant.
13	Town of Caledon, Legal, Corporate Services Department Dec. 13, 2024	Legal Description	1	PIN: 14277-0066 (LT) – Parcel 23-1, Section 43-Caledon-4; Part of Lot 23, Concession 4 WHS and Part of Lots 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37 & 59; Lots 27, 28, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57 & 58, Block 7, Plan CAL-5 and Parts of Spring Street, Nelson Street, Nicholas Street, Alfred Street and Ann Street (Stopped-up and closed by Judge’s order registered October 23, 1969 as VS124476), Plan CAL-5, Part 1 on 43R-9811; Except Parts 9 & 10 on 43R-11195; Subject-to Block 7, Plan CAL-5 as in CA24238; Town of Caledon; Regional Municipality of Peel	
		Name of Owner	2	Mount Nicholas Holdings Inc.	
		Mortgages	3	Instrument No. PR3558405 is a charge registered on October 23, 2019 in favour of 867394 Ontario Inc.	
		Additional Comment		Additional Comment (from Planning, Planning & Development Department, Town of Caledon) Please ensure all resubmission materials reflect the correct legal description and name of Owner. The correct mortgage information should be included in all future application forms.	Acknowledged, legal description and owner are updated accordingly, as with mortgage information, on all enclosed application forms.
14	Town of Caledon, Municipal Numbers, Corporate Services Department Dec. 13, 2024		1	The current property address is confirmed as 0 Nicholas Street	Acknowledged
			2	Should the application be approved, the existing municipal address will cease to exist and new municipal numbers shall be issued in accordance with the Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines. These numbers will be issued in accordance with these documents, based on approved driveway locations and a new street name.	Acknowledged
			3	Municipal numbers will be issued at the earliest of grading approval, servicing approval or Final Site Plan Approval.	Acknowledged
			4	Upon issuance of Final Site Plan Approval, the Lead Planner will forward a copy of the approval package to municipal numbering staff to work with the owner to issue the required numbers and post any required signage of the numbers in accordance with the Town’s Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines.	Acknowledged
			5	In accordance the Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines, the municipal number must be posted on the exterior of the building that faces the road on which the building is numbered. The owner is advised to post the number (once issued) on the townhouses in accordance with the By-law and Guidelines. Should the owner require clarification on the requirements of the By-law, please contact municipal numbering staff at municipalnumbers@caledon.ca or 905-584-2272 x. 7338.	Acknowledged
	Region of Peel, Development Engineering Review December 13, 2024	Sanitary Sewer Facilities	1	There is no municipal sanitary sewer infrastructure available to service the proposed development. Private wastewater servicing will be required.	Acknowledged
			2	The proposed wastewater collection system is on-site septic system and falls under the jurisdiction of the Building Code, therefore it will be looked after by the Town of Caledon.	Acknowledged
			3	Internal easements and external construction may be required.	Acknowledged
		Water Facilities	4	The lands are located within Water Pressure Zone AV12.	The water pressure zone has been indicated in the FSR.
			5	Municipal water supply infrastructure consists of a 150mm watermain on Amelia Street and a 150mm watermain on Nicholas Street.	The existing watermain sizes in the are noted in the FSR and on the Functional Servicing Plan.
			6	At this time the Region has no objections to servicing this development. This conclusion is subject to change should the proposed population change. A hydrant flow test must be conducted to confirm capacity.	The fire hydrant flow test will be completed as soon as winter weather conditions end.
			7	External easements and construction may be required.	Acknowledged
		Regional Roads	8	Regional roads are not adversely affected.	Acknowledged
			9	All costs associated with proposed development will be at the applicant’s expense.	Acknowledged.
			10	The Applicant may be required to enter into applicable development agreements with appropriate agencies.	Acknowledged.
		Source Water Protection	11	The applicant is required to provide the filled applicable source protection plan policy applicability screening form, and any supporting material related to the type of application (plan of subdivision, etc.).	TBG: The subject site is located in the Credit Valley-Toronto Region-Central Lake Ontario (CTC) Source Protection Region. The applicable screening form and information for the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision (and associated Official Plan Amendment) have been completed and enclosed in this submission package. The form was completed using information from the enclosed Functional Servicing Report by Valdor, the Phase 1 ESA, and Hydrogeological Investigation by SLR (formerly Palmer).
		Hydrogeological Report	12	Proponent will need to provide a contingency plan for potential adverse impacts to private wells.	Acknowledged; to be provided as a condition of draft approval.
			13	Given the elevated background nitrate levels in the area, the Region retains an interest in potential offsite impacts.	Acknowledged.
			14	Advisory comment. Septic System Servicing Assessment. Proponent will need to coordinate with local Conservation Authority regarding baseflow to a cold-water trout stream under D-5-4, and infiltration deficit and mitigation measures.	Acknowledged. Coordination with the CVC will proceed and be ensured via condition of draft approval.
			15	In addition to the above, the following items must be submitted: • Copy of the EASR/PTTW from MECP when available • Copy of permit to discharge from utility authority (if applicable, i.e. discharge directed towards municipal sewer) when available. • Copy of the dewatering discharge plan submitted to conservation authority (i.e. discharge directed towards NHS) when available.	Acknowledged; requirement to provide materials will be facilitated via condition(s) of draft approval.

Waste Management	16	Prior to registration of the plan of subdivision the Region will provide curbside collection of garbage, recyclable materials, household organics and yard waste subject to Section 2.0 and 3.0 of the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual (WCDSM) conditions being met and labelled on a Waste Management Plan:	Acknowledged. A Waste Management Plan will be prepared during detailed design, which demonstrates the described vehicle access route, identified collection points for each dwelling unit, and plans which show the required space for cart storage.
	17	The Waste Management Plan Must Demonstrate the Following: - Collection vehicle access route throughout the subdivisions must be shown on the drawing. See section 2.0 of the WCDSM for access route requirements. - Each dwelling unit within a development must have its own identifiable collection point depicted on the drawing. See Appendix 9 of the WCDSM. - A minimum of 3.75 square meters (2.5 meters by 1.5 meters) must be provided in the garage, backyard or side for storage of carts, with direct access to the collection point location.	
		For more information, please consult the Region of Peel Waste Collection Design Standards Manual available at: https://peelregion.ca/public-works/design-standards/pdf/wastecollection-design-standards-manual.pdf .	
Health Planning	18	Peel Public Health has implemented the Healthy Development Framework (HDF), a collection of Regional and local, context-specific tools that assess the health promoting potential of development applications. All tools in the HDF incorporate evidence-based health standards to assess the interconnected core elements of healthy design: density, service proximity, land use mix, street connectivity, streetscape characteristics and efficient parking. These health objectives are used to inform decision-makers of the health-promoting potential of the development and communicate opportunities to achieve closer alignment with the objective of healthy, complete communities within Peel.	Acknowledged.
	19	Peel Public Health will continue to work closely with the Town of Caledon in the assessment of the development proposal as our participation enables us to deliver on our mandate and achieve the goals set out by Ontario's Public Health Standards and our Peel Public Health 2020-2029 Strategic Priorities of Enabling Active Living and Healthy Eating and Reducing Health-Related Impacts of Climate Change. We are committed to participating in the review of community development in Peel to ensure we promote healthy built environments.	Acknowledged.
	20	After review of the completed Healthy Development Assessment, we are pleased to see the efforts made to create a healthy built environment through infill development, street tree plantings, and design considerations. In designing the subdivision, there is an opportunity to establish a well connected and serviced neighbourhood. Some additional considerations are below:	Acknowledged, it is the intent of the proposed development to provide for a healthy built environment by way of infill in the Village of Alton, which may feature a variety of design measures not limited to street plantings.
	a	Please confirm timelines regarding the development of the Spring St ROW. Peel Public Health is supportive of a fully connected road network, and we encourage the applicant to prioritize connection from Spring St to Main St to promote multiple pathways for active transportation and access to local services and amenities in the Alton community. Please also advise if opportunity to extend Nicholas St to Amelia St to support the proposed development has been explored.	The Spring Street right-of-way (ROW) will be developed/constructed as part of the plan of subdivision, and is subject to the timelines for the same as well as Town opening up the road allowance. The proposed connection to Spring Street via the Amelia Street extension will provide for a better-connected road network in the Village of Alton, offering multiple potential routes/pathways for active transportation users, and local access to services and amenities within Alton. Nicholas Street will also connect to Amelia Street in support of the proposed development.
	b	Please note that as per Figure C4 in the new draft Caledon Official Plan, local transit is proposed along Main St and Queen St S, which may service the proposed development in the future. We encourage the applicant to connect with Town staff to determine if a planned transit stop will be within 400m of the dwelling units for future consideration.	Acknowledged. Discussions with staff will be initiated regarding the potential for a transit stop within 400m of the proposed dwelling units.
Draft Plan Conditions - Development Charges	21	Prior to execution of the Subdivision Agreement by the Region, the Developer shall: - Obtain and submit to the Region a Residential Development Charges Payment Form completed to the best of the Developer's knowledge at the time of the submission and to the satisfaction of the Region in accordance with the engineering drawings and final draft M-plan; and - Pay to the Region the appropriate hard service residential development charges (water, wastewater and road service components), pursuant to the Region's Development Charges By-law, as amended from time to time, calculated based on the information provided in the Residential Development Charges Payment Form.	The respective residential development charges for hard services will be paid in accordance with the Region of Peel Development Charges By-law, as updated (By-law #77-2020, Appendix I.
	22	Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement with respect to: - Payment to the Region of appropriate soft service development charges and any outstanding hard service development charges; and - Collection of development charges for future residential development blocks (non-freehold townhouses or apartment blocks); pursuant to the Region's Development Charges By-law, as amended from time to time.	Acknowledged
Draft Plan Conditions - Water Meter Fees	23	In respect of the water meter fees: - Prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, the Developer shall pay to the Region the appropriate water meter fees, in accordance with the Region's Fees By-law, as amended from time to time for residential building lots (singles, semi-detached and freehold townhomes) to the satisfaction of the Region in accordance with the engineering drawings and final draft M-plan for the Lands; - A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement that water meter fees for future residential development (non-freehold townhouses or apartment blocks) and commercial blocks shall be payable to the Region prior to issuance of building permits, in accordance with the Region's Fees By-law, as amended from time to time; and - A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement that in the event of an underpayment of water meter fees, the Developer shall be responsible for payment thereof forthwith upon request.	Acknowledged. Payment of the appropriate water meter fees will be calculated and completed prior to registration of the proposed plan of subdivision, and prior to the issuance of any building permits, and facilitated by a Draft Plan Condition of approval, and an additional clause to account for the event of underpayment and associated responsibility upon the developer for providing the full payment.

	24	Restriction on transfer or charge for all lots and blocks within the plan of subdivision, save and except those to be conveyed to the Town and the Region, shall be registered on title to said lots and blocks prohibiting any transfer or charge of said lots and blocks without the consent of the Region until all external sanitary sewers and watermain to service the Plan have been completed to the Region's satisfaction. The Developer shall be responsible for all costs in respect of said restriction on title. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged. A clause shall be included as a Draft Plan Condition to the subdivision agreement, which will restrict any transfer or charge for all lots and blocks within the proposed plan of subdivision without regional consent, until such time all described servicing works for the plan of subdivision are completed.
Draft Plan Conditions - Drawings - Servicing and "As Constructed"	25	Prior to servicing, the Developer's engineer shall submit all engineering drawings in the digital format to the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	26	Within (60) days of preliminary acceptance of the underground services, the Developer's engineer shall submit "As Constructed" drawings in digital format, pursuant to the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines. The Developer's engineer shall also provide ties to all main line valves, ties to individual water service boxes, linear ties to sanitary sewer services and GPS coordinates of all watermain and sanitary sewer appurtenances in accordance with the latest requirements of the Region "Development Procedure Manual". A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	27	Prior to registration of the subdivision, the Developer shall execute a Subdivision Agreement with the local municipality and Region for the construction of municipal sanitary sewer, water, and regional roads associated with the lands. The Developer shall construct and design these services in accordance with the latest Region standards and requirements.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	28	Prior to a satisfactory engineering submission, the Developer shall submit to the Region for review and approval: • Functional Servicing Report showing the proposed sanitary sewer, storm sewer and water servicing plans for the development; Clauses shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	29	Prior to servicing, the Developer shall submit a satisfactory engineering submission to the Region for review and approval.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	30	Prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, the Developer shall pay the Region's costs for updating its electronic "As Constructed" information for the infrastructure installed by the Developer. The cost shall be based on a "per kilometre" basis for combined watermain and sanitary sewers installed pursuant to the Region's latest User Fees By-law.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	31	Prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, the Developer shall ensure that: • All lots and blocks must be serviced via an internal road network; Clauses shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	32	Prior to servicing the Region may require the Developer to construct a sampling hydrant (at the Developers cost) within the proposed plan. Location and the requirement for sampling hydrant will be determined at the engineering review stage.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	33	The Developer agrees that the Region shall hold back a portion of the Letter of Credit to cover the costs of services completed by the Region on a time and material basis pursuant to the current Region's User Fee By-Law. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
	34	The Developer will maintain adequate chlorine residuals in the watermain within the plan from the time the watermain are connected to the municipal system until such time as the Region issues Final Acceptance. To maintain adequate chlorine residuals, the Developer shall either install automatic flushing devices or retain Regional staff to carry out manual flushing. Regional staff shall conduct the monitoring and testing for chlorine residuals. All costs associated with the monitoring and flushing shall be the responsibility of the Developer pursuant to the current Region's User Fee By-Law. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.

		Draft Plan Conditions - General Conditions	35 Provision will be required in the Subdivision Agreement for the following clauses in respect of servicing existing properties within the zone of influence in the event that existing private services (wells) deteriorate due to the servicing of the proposed plan of subdivision; • Until the issuance of Final Acceptance a portion of the Letter of Credit shall be held back to serve as protection for the private wells in the zone of influence of the plan of subdivision. This amount shall be based on the anticipated cost of replacing water supplies within the zone of influence as shown in the schedules of the agreement. The minimum amount shall be \$20,000.00. If the private well systems in the zone of influence deteriorate due to the servicing of the plan of subdivision the Developer shall provide temporary water supply to the residents upon notice by the Region and the Developer shall continue supplying the water to the effected residents until the issue is resolved to the satisfaction of involved parties. If the quantity of water in the existing wells is not restored to its original condition within a month after first identification of the problem, the Developer shall engage the services of a recognized hydrogeologist to evaluate the wells and recommend solutions including deepening the wells or providing a permanent water service connection from the watermain to the dwelling unit. • The Developer shall inspect, evaluate and monitor all wells within the zone of influence prior to, during and after the construction has been completed. Progress Reports should be submitted to the Region as follows: - o Base line well condition and monitoring report shall be submitted to the Region prior to the pre-servicing or registration of the plan (whichever occurs first) and shall include as a minimum requirement the following tests: - Bacteriological Analysis - Total coliform and E-coli counts - Chemical Analysis - Nitrate Test - Water level measurement below existing grade - o In the event the test results are not within the Ontario Drinking Water Standards, the Developer shall notify in writing the Homeowner, the Region of Peel’s Health Department (Manager - Environmental Health) and Public Works Department (Development Supervisor) within 24 Hours of the test results. - o Well monitoring shall continue during construction and an interim report shall be submitted to the Region for records. Well monitoring shall continue for one year after the completion of construction and a summary report shall be submitted to the Region prior to Final Acceptance. Clauses shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	To be addressed as Draft Plan Condition.
			36 The Developer shall agree that neither the Developer nor any Builder will apply for building permits for any lots or blocks within the plan of subdivision until the Region’s Public Works Department has issued Preliminary Acceptance and provided notice to the local municipality stating that internal and external sanitary sewers and watermain, including fire protection, have been completed to the Region’s satisfaction. The Developer’s Consulting Engineer shall certify in writing that the internal and external sanitary sewers and watermain, including fire protection, have been constructed, inspected and shall function in accordance with the detailed design as approved by the Region. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged.
			37 The Developer shall indemnify and hold the Region harmless from and against any and all actions, suites, claims, demands, and damages which may arise either directly or indirectly by reason of the development of the subject lands and/or construction of works, save and except for any actions, causes of action, claims, demands and damages arising out of the negligence of the Region or those for whom it is in law responsible. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged.
			38 Prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, the Developer shall submit draft reference plan(s) for the Region’s review and approval prior to such plans being deposited. All costs associated with preparation and depositing of the plans and transfer of lands shall be at the sole expense of the Developer.	Acknowledged.
			39 The Developer agrees that prior to the Region granting clearance of the draft plan conditions of subdivision approval, the following shall require to be forwarded to the Region’s Legal Services Division: • A copy of the final signed M-Plan • A copy of the final draft R-Plan(s); and • Easement and conveyance documents required pursuant to this Agreement and the registration of this plan. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged.
16	Bell Canada		1 Upon receipt of this comment letter, the Owner / Applicant is to provide Bell Canada with servicing plans / Composite Utility Plan (CUP) at their earliest convenience to planninganddevelopment@bell.ca to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.	Acknowledged.
			2 The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval for any Draft of Plan of Subdivision, Draft Plan of Condominium and/or Site Plan application(s): “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. 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.”	Acknowledged.
			3 The above-noted conditions will remain in effect until said conditions are officially cleared by Bell Canada as part of the formal approval process.	Acknowledged.

			4	To ensure that we can provide detailed provisioning comments, and to subsequently clear conditions, please ensure that all servicing plans / CUP, including updates to such plans, are sent to planninganddevelopment@bell.ca .	Acknowledged.														
17	CVC		1	The property is not regulated. Due to limitation of Bill 23, CVC can no longer provide comments on natural heritage matters (as pertains to this site). As such, we will defer review to the Town of Caledon.	Acknowledged.														
18	Peel District School Board		1	Conditions of approval will be provided following formal submission/circulation of the application.	Acknowledged.														
19	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board		1	The applicant proposes the development of 15 detached units, which are anticipated to yield: • 3 Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8 Students; and • 1 Grade 9 to Grade 12 Students															
			2	The proposed development is located within the following school catchment areas which currently operate under the following student accommodation conditions: <table><tr><th>Catchment Area</th><th>School</th><th>Enrolment</th><th>Capacity</th><th># of Portables / Temporary Classrooms</th></tr><tr><td>Elementary School</td><td>St. Peter</td><td>295</td><td>360</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Secondary School</td><td>Robert F. Hall</td><td>1434</td><td>1293</td><td>0</td></tr></table>	Catchment Area	School	Enrolment	Capacity	# of Portables / Temporary Classrooms	Elementary School	St. Peter	295	360	0	Secondary School	Robert F. Hall	1434	1293	0
		Catchment Area	School	Enrolment	Capacity	# of Portables / Temporary Classrooms													
		Elementary School	St. Peter	295	360	0													
		Secondary School	Robert F. Hall	1434	1293	0													
Conditions of Draft Approval	3	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. • "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 neighbourhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighbourhood school." • "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."	Acknowledged, these shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement as warning clauses.																
	4	DPCDSB will be reviewing the accommodation conditions in each elementary and secondary planning area on a regular basis and will provide updated comments if necessary.	Acknowledged.																
20	Enbridge		1	Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.	Acknowledged.														
			2	Please always call before you dig, see web link for additional details: https://www.enbridgegas.com/safety/digging-safety-for-contractors															
			3	The Owner agrees to provide Enbridge Gas Inc. (Enbridge Gas) the necessary easements at no cost and/or agreements required by Enbridge Gas for the provision of local gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Enbridge Gas.	Acknowledged.														
21	Hydro One		1	No comments or concerns.															