


#	1st Submission Comment	1st Submission Response (Feb. 3, 2026)	Report and Section	Status	2nd Submission Comment
RE: First Submission Comments					
Official Plan Amendment Application to Establish Wildfield Village Secondary Plan					
SGL Planning & Design Inc. on behalf of the Wildfield Village Landowners Group					
	This letter summarizes all comments received to date from internal departments, external agencies, and other commenting authorities on the first submission of the Official Plan Amendment Application to establish Wildfield Village Secondary Plan (POPA 2024-0010). Several of these comments may be appropriately addressed through the Draft Plan of Subdivision process. We would be happy to conduct a comment review meeting after you have had a chance to review this letter. Please submit a meeting agenda along with dates and times that work best for your team.	Noted.			
Planning - Draft Official Plan Amendment					
1	Please provide a Draft Official Plan Amendment that aligns with the Town's format in word format	Revised OPA will be provided with Town's template.			
2	Policies should be included within the Secondary Plan with respect to the number of schools, minimum lot sizes, and other requirements (e.g. street frontage) requested by the 2 school boards.	This has been added to the policies			
3	Additional comments will be provided once a revised OPA is provided.	Noted.			
Planning - Planning Justification and Housing Assessment					
4	In sections 6.1 Land Use Mix and 6.2 Housing Options, please include comments on the provision of housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households. Table 4 – Peel-Wide New Housing Unit Targets of the Region of Peel Official Plan includes targets for affordability	This has been updated and addressed in the Planning Justification Report.			
5	In section 6.7 Natural Environment System, please include comments on the ongoing Local Subwatershed Study and the anticipated mitigation measures to ensure consistency with the PPS and conformity with Official Plans.	This has been updated and addressed in the Planning Justification Report.			
6	Please provide more details on the public engagement strategy (e.g., Public Information Centres) in section 7 Public Engagement and Indigenous Consultation	This comment has been discussed with the Town and the section of the Planning Justification Report has been updated to detail the public consultation that has occurred.			
7	Please include comments on planning for sewage and water services.	This has been updated and addressed in the Planning Justification Report.			
8	Please include comments on archaeological resources and any proposed or anticipated conservation measures.	This has been addressed through the policies.			
9	In the resubmission, please include a comment matrix that responds to all internal and external comments, as well as public and council comments and questions from the public meeting and received via email to date.	Noted.			
Strategic Policy Planning - General Comments					
10	Strategic Policy Planning has reviewed the submitted materials provided on December 10, 2024 and note that the components identified as part of the proposed Wildfield Secondary Plan are in general alignment with the requirements of the adopted Future Caledon Official Plan. It is noted that technical studies, such as the Local Subwatershed Study and its related reviews, are currently underway. These studies are required to be completed to inform the resulting policy framework for the proposed Secondary Plan. Additionally, comments provided by other reviewing agencies and departments request further information and clarification from the applicant. As such, Strategic Policy Planning may revise or provide additional comments on the Secondary Plan through the review of subsequent submissions for the application	Noted.			
11	An updated Draft Official Plan Amendment is required for Strategic Policy Planning's further review with respect to specific requirement of policies and applicable Schedules and Figures. Direction for preparing the Official Plan Amendment is provided throughout the adopted Future Caledon Official Plan and specifically in Chapters 21, 24 and 27. Strategic Policy Planning will provide a draft template that should be generally followed for overall structuring of the Draft Official Plan Amendment.	Noted. The Secondary Plan policies have been updated with the draft template, which reflects the Future Caledon Official Plan policies as appropriate.			
Strategic Policy Planning - Planning Justification and Housing Assessment					
12	Section 3.2.2 Neighbourhood Centre – The proposed maximum height of 20 storeys within the Neighbourhood Centre land use designation does not align with the maximum height of 12 storeys specified in the adopted Future Caledon Official Plan's Policy 22.4.3 (d). Further justification for the proposed maximum heights is required to support Strategic Policy Planning's review	The Neighbourhood Centre maximum height will be revised from 20 storeys to 12 storeys to align with the Future Caledon Official Plan.			
13	Section 7 Public Engagement and Indigenous Consultation - states that the public, stakeholders and Indigenous communities with interests in the Wildfield Village Secondary Plan Area will be consulted throughout the process. Please provide a consultation summary for Strategic Policy Planning's review	This comment has been discussed with the Town and the section of the Planning Justification Report has been updated to detail the public consultation that has occurred.			

14	Section 3.3 Housing and Job mix – Elaborate further as per the requirements outlined in the Town’s Housing Assessment Terms of Reference. Specifically, information on how the proposed housing mix supports the Region and Town’s achievement of the minimum housing targets with respect to social housing, affordable rental, affordable ownership and/or market housing should be included. Strategic Policy Planning further notes that the Region’s Housing Development Office should also be engaged to evaluate the provision of affordable housing as part of the proposed development	This has been updated and addressed in the Planning Justificaiton Report.			
15	Please include information on the phasing plan that outlines how the secondary plan area will be phased in a logical manner, ensuring it meets the requirement of both Region and Town’s reviewing departments.	A Development Staging and Sequencing Plan will be submitted as part of the resubmission materials.			
Urban Deisgn					
16	Please assess the impact of the potential Highway 413 access ramp on The Gore Road. The land uses along the Highway should carefully consider the mitigation measures.	Noted. To be detailed in draft plans of subdivision.			
17	We’d recommend a Design Charrette with relevant Town departments along with the consultants in the near future for better understanding of the design principles and its implementation.	The concept of a Design Charrette has been discussed with the Town. A Design Charrette will not be held at this point in the process, however comments provided on the Land Use Plan have been reflected through updates.			
18	The Community Design Guidelines is at a very high level. Further amendments may be required as all studies for the Secondary Plan are completed to inform the structuring elements as well as comments received from all Town staff.	Noted.			
19	HDA document requires further details and coordination with relevant Town staff (policy, transportation, landscape) for its review and evaluation at this stage.	Noted.			
20	Please also refer to the redlined comments from UD and Landscape on the attached CDG.	Updated Urban Design Guideliens have been revised.			
Parks					
21	The park system for new communities should be designed as part of a comprehensive planning process with all landowners at the table so that parks can sized and located with consideration of the other future developable lands and to support the assembly of larger park blocks that support larger recreational amenities.	This has been done.			
22	Park blocks should be characterized by a broad and deep developable area, and having generally a regular rectangular square shape, as opposed to elongated, truncated, or complex parcel shapes, to maximize park design flexibility and programmability	Noted. Parks are shown conceptually on the Land Use Plan and their size and shape will be further refined through individual Draft Plans of Subdivision where specific comments for each park block can be accomodated.			
23	Parks should be placed in prominent locations to ensure high visibility from an adjacent streets. Parks should have frontage on a minimum of two streets and be located on major arterial or collector roads. This positioning will facilitate ease of access and increase the likelihood of frequent use.	Noted. Parks have been placed within a 400 metre radius of one another and have been located with frontage onto either one or two Collector Roads. Through Draft Plans of Subdivision, parks will also be located with frontage on local roads. The Community Park has been located along an Arterial Road, with frontage onto two other Collector Roads.			
24	Demonstrate parkland service radius buffers to all Neighbourhood (800 metres) and Community Park (15,000 to 20,000 residents) blocks in the secondary plan area.	See the Community Design Guidelines and Planning Justification Report. The Land Use Plan incorporates five Neighbourhood Parks with a minimum service radius of 500 metres, exceeding the 800 metre requirement. The Community Park will service the estimated 24,500 new residents.			
25	Town is generally not supportive of locating parks within designated Greenbelt lands and the natural heritage system due to Official Plan policies limiting the use of the lands	Parks have not been located within designated Greenbelt lands nor the natural heritage system.			
26	Provide trail connections to public parks to ensure accessibility and connectivity throughout the secondary plan area.	Connections to future trails are noted in the Community Design Guidelines, to be further defined as part of Draft Plans of Subdivision.			

27	<p>Neighbourhood Park Blocks:</p> <p>a. Neighbourhood Parks are to be sized between 1 ha and 2 ha</p> <p>b. Parks should be located centrally to the population (1,000 – 2,000 people) they serve (please see markup).</p> <p>c. Parks should be strategically separated from school blocks to prevent the overlap of amenities.</p> <p>d. Potential Facilities can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Playground ii. Seating Area with shade structure iii. Courts (basketball, pickleball courts) iv. Amenities (bike racks, benches, trees, signage, garbage receptacles) v. Outdoor fitness stations vi. Free play areas 	<p>The Neighbourhood Park blocks are all approximately 2 hectares in size. See the Community Design Guidelines. They have been centrally located to provide a good distribution. The strategic separation from school blocks comment contradicts the Future Caledon Official Plan where co-location is encouraged. A mix of separated and co-located parks have been provided.</p> <p>Details on potential facilities are provided in the Future Caledon Official Plan and the Community Design Guidelines.</p>			
28	<p>Community Park Block:</p> <p>a. Community Park should be a minimum of 8 ha in size to meet parkland dedication requirement.</p> <p>b. Parks should be located centrally to the population they serve (15,000 – 20,000 people) and avoid being located on lands with non-participating landowners (please see markup).</p> <p>c. Potential Facilities can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Splash Pad/Misting Station ii. Courts (basketball, pickleball, multi-use courts) iii. Sport Fields (minimum two fields – including a Junior Cricket Pitch) iv. Skatepark and BMX pump track v. Large playground vi. Washroom Building vii. Shade structure and seating area viii. Amenities (parking lot, bike racks, water fountain, benches, trees, signage, interpretive signs, garbage receptacles) ix. Community Gardens x. Off-Leash Dog Park xi. Outdoor fitness stations xii. Skateboard Park/Pump Track xiii. Ice rinks or skating loop xiv. Free play areas xv. Picnic Areas 	<p>Based on feedback received and discussions with the Town, a 6 hectare Community Park block has been located along the west side of the The Gore Road, within the centre of the community.</p>			
29	<p>Parkland Dedication</p> <p>a. The Wildfield Village Landowners Group shall enter into a Financial Parkland Agreement prepared with the Town and will be calculated on a collective basis for the subject lands, pursuant to s.51.1 of the Planning Act.</p> <p>b. Parkland dedication will be calculated from the total land area at 5% of the total area of the land or 1 hectare per 600 residential units, whichever is higher.</p> <p>c. Town Staff will be calculating Parkland Dedication requirements for all of the land within a development application, with a credit given to natural heritage lands.</p> <p>d. Parkland dedication requirements will be met through land dedication within the Wildfield Village community.</p>	<p>Based on the Town’s updated Parkland Dedication By-law, 17.44 hectares of parkland is required to service the Secondary Plan Area. The Landowners Group will enter into a Financial Parkland Agreement with the Town. The entire Secondary Plan Area will be serviced by one community park, five neighbourhood parks and one parkette.</p>			
Heritage - Official Plan Amendment					
30	See tracked changes document for requested revisions to the proposed Cultural Heritage Conservation Policies.	Requested changes have been incorporated into the OPA.			
Heritage - Cultural Heritage Assessment Report Comments					
31	Heritage staff provided comments on the CHAR to the applicant via email on November 22, 2024. Heritage staff’s comments are to be addressed as part of the second submission of the secondary plan application.	The CHAR has been updated based on Heritage comments and resubmitted to the Town.			
Heritage - Archaeological Assessment					

32	<p>The proponent submitted the following Stage 1 archaeological assessments for participating properties:</p> <p>a. "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for the Proposed Development of 12561 Centreville Road Within Part of Lot 3, Concession 3 in the Geographic Township of Albion Historic County of Peel Now in the Town of Caledon Regional Municipality of Peel Ontario", prepared by Archeoworks Inc., dated December 13, 2024.</p> <p>b. "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for the Proposed Development of 12735 Centreville Creek Road Within Part of Lot 4, Concession 3 in the Geographic Township of Albion Historic Pell County now in the Town of Caledon Regional Municipality of Peel Ontario", prepared by Archeoworks Inc., dated May 17, 2023.</p> <p>c. Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Proposed Wildfield Parcel 11 Development Part of Lot 1, Concession 3, Town of Caledon, Historic Township of Albion, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario", prepared by Archaeological Consultants Canada, dated December 12, 2024.</p> <p>d. "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Proposed Wildfield Parcel 9 Development Part of Lot 2, Concession 3, Town of Caledon, Historic Township of Albion, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario", prepared by Archaeological Consultants Canada, dated December 12, 2024.</p> <p>e. "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for the Proposed Development of Two Parcels: 1) A 40-Hectare (98.8-Acre) Parcel at 12494 The Gore Road and, 2) A 10.8-Hectare (26.7-Acre) Parcel to the Southwest Within Part of Lots 2 and 3, Concession 3 In the Geographic Township of Albion Historic Peel County Now in the Town of Caledon Regional Municipality of Peel Ontario", prepare by Archeoworks Inc., dated May 1, 2023</p>	Noted.			
33	<p>The five archaeological assessments collectively represent six parcels (see Map 1 below):</p>  <p>Map 1: Parcels with Stage 1 Archaeological Assessments (Yellow)</p>	Noted.			
34	<p>For these parcels, Heritage staff are agreeable to Stage 2 (and further) assessments being submitted as part of future draft plan of subdivision and/or site plan applications.</p>	Noted.			
35	<p>Archaeological assessments were not completed for all participating properties; no archaeological assessments were completed for non-participating properties.</p>	Archaeological assessments are being completed for all participating properties by the individual proponents. For non-participating properties assessments will be completed when the proponents proceed with development applications.			
36	<p>Heritage staff strongly encourage the proponent to:</p> <p>a. have the additional archaeological assessments for participating properties completed as soon as possible; and,</p> <p>b. engage non-participating property owners to have archaeological assessment completed for non-participating lands as well</p>	<p>a. Acknowledged.</p> <p>b. For non-participating properties, archaeological assessments will be completed when the proponents proceed with development applications.</p>			
37	<p>Policies will be included in OPA requiring archaeological assessment as part of any future application within the subject lands.</p>	Revised based on City edits to policies.			
38	<p>No demolition, construction, grading or other soil disturbances shall take place prior to the Town of Caledon Heritage staff receiving, to their satisfaction, all completed archaeological assessment(s) and the MCM compliance letter(s) indicating that all archaeological licensing and technical review requirements have been satisfied and the report(s) has been entered into the Public Registry.</p>	Noted.			
Energy and Environment - Community Energy and Emissions Plan					

39	<p>Executive Summary</p> <p>a. Table 1: Why weren't heat pumps (e.g. heat pumps with VRF) considered for stacked townhomes building archetype baseline?</p> <p>b. How does the air source DW Heat pump with gas backup have a greater reduction than the geothermal heat pump? Please provide more details in your methodology and calculation</p>	<p>a. Based on the density target as outlined in site project statistics, it was assumed that stacked townhomes to be four storeys in height and would not fall into the low rise category and so heat pumps would not be a mandatory baseline requirement however they were considered as a potential upgrade for this archetype</p> <p>b. When applying the geothermal heat pump ECM to the baseline, the savings primarily result from upgrading most heat pump-based heating to geothermal heat pumps. However, when implementing the DHW HP ECM, we are upgrading domestic hot water (DHW) heating from natural gas to heat pumps. Since the baseline already uses heat pumps for space heating but relies on natural gas for DHW, ECMs targeting DHW result in a greater reduction potential.</p>																																							
40	<p>Introduction and Study Context</p> <p>a. The GDS performance targets in Table 6 seem to be mixed up. Please ensure the correct metrics are being used in the study, please refer to the GDS Guide and revise. For ease the 2024 GDS energy performance metrics are provided below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="193 571 795 896"> <thead> <tr> <th>Building Type</th> <th>2024 EUI</th> <th>2024 TEDI</th> <th>2024 GHGI</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Low Rise Residential (<3 storeys)</td> <td>Energy Star or equivalent OR NBC Tier 3 performance</td> <td></td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>AND</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>20% reduction in GHG emissions from OBC</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-unit Residential >6 storeys)</td> <td>135</td> <td>50</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multi-unit Residential <6 storeys)</td> <td>130</td> <td>40</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial Office</td> <td>130</td> <td>30</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial Retail</td> <td>120</td> <td>40</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industrial</td> <td>130</td> <td>60</td> <td>15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>b. Does the Architect Peter Wheeler (2016) study account for rising temperatures as a result of climate change?</p>	Building Type	2024 EUI	2024 TEDI	2024 GHGI	Low Rise Residential (<3 storeys)	Energy Star or equivalent OR NBC Tier 3 performance		15		AND				20% reduction in GHG emissions from OBC			Multi-unit Residential >6 storeys)	135	50	15	Multi-unit Residential <6 storeys)	130	40	15	Commercial Office	130	30	15	Commercial Retail	120	40	10	Industrial	130	60	15	<p>a. Noted. The table will be updated to reflect the correct GDS energy performance metrics. The correct metrics have been used within the study.</p>			
Building Type	2024 EUI	2024 TEDI	2024 GHGI																																						
Low Rise Residential (<3 storeys)	Energy Star or equivalent OR NBC Tier 3 performance		15																																						
	AND																																								
	20% reduction in GHG emissions from OBC																																								
Multi-unit Residential >6 storeys)	135	50	15																																						
Multi-unit Residential <6 storeys)	130	40	15																																						
Commercial Office	130	30	15																																						
Commercial Retail	120	40	10																																						
Industrial	130	60	15																																						
41	<p>Methodology and Assumptions</p> <p>Why weren't the neighbourhood areas considered for geothermal district energy, specifically the medium density townhomes?</p> <p>Methodology and Assumptions</p> <p>3.3.1.2. The 3-season heat pump is an alternative pathway in the GDS and not mandated. If a single-family home is built to Energy Star equivalent or NBC Tier 3 performance plus a 20% reduction in GHG emissions from OBC, how does that impact the efficiency of a district system?</p> <p>Methodology and Assumptions</p> <p>3.3.2. Which Town of Caledon policy does not permit the drilling of geothermal boreholes?</p> <p>i. If this was an opportunity that the landowner would like to pursue, further conversations for investigation could be arranged with the Town and school board.</p>	<p>The neighborhood consists of a mix of medium-density townhomes and low-rise residential buildings, resulting in a blended density of approximately 30.45 units per hectare. Notably, medium-density buildings make up around 15% of the area, while low-rise residential accounts for about 80%. This distribution, combined with the uncertain spatial configuration of the units, limits the feasibility of a District Energy System (DES) in this area.</p> <p>The 3-season heat pump option was selected for modeling purposes. There are multiple potential pathways to meet the other options (NBC Tier 3 and 20% reduction in GHG), which increase the complexity of modeling while providing no additional value. The use of the heat pump scenario enabled us to establish a consistent and defensible baseline condition. The selection of the three 3-season heat pump is also one of the simplest options for developers to implement, and will likely be a preferred strategy for meeting the GDS.</p> <p>The Town and School board lands are not under the Landowner Group's control. Language has been updated to be less definite reflecting that Town / School property may house these systems if supported by the Town / School.</p>																																							

	<p>Methodology and Assumptions Assumptions as they relate to your calculations are not shared – can you please share in an Appendix? Assumptions of interest are: electricity and natural gas emissions factor; cost assumptions for all HVAC systems.</p>	<p>Costing assumptions were added in Appendix G and emission factors were added in carbon section of Appendix C</p>			
42	<p>Results Can you please expand on what is meant by and how the conclusion of the following was reached: Since the majority of the site consists of low-rise residential buildings, the TED) for the entire site is lower than the overall demand for DHW. As a result, measures aimed at improving DHW efficiency are more effective than those focused on heat pumps</p>	<p>TEDI represents the heat loss through a building, whereas DHW refers to the energy required for hot water—these are two unrelated metrics.</p> <p>The intent of this statement was to highlight that domestic hot water (DHW) loads are more dominant than space heating loads. As a result, energy conservation measures (ECMs) targeting DHW are likely to have a greater impact on overall energy consumption and GHG performance compared to heating-focused ECMs.</p>			
	<p>Results “In contrast, measures focused on heating have a lesser impact on the GHG intensity compared to DHW measures. This is because a significant portion of the heating in the Baseline Scenario was assumed to already be electric due to the GDS requirement for three season air heat pumps in low-rise residential areas” - Please note that three season air heat pumps are an option in the GDS and not a requirement. Can modelling results be provided if the landowner decides to construct to Energy Star or equivalent OR NBC Tier 3 performance plus a 20% reduction in GHG emissions from OBC and uses a gas-fired HVAC heating source?</p>	<p>It is understood that the heat pumps are one of three possible options for meeting the GDS. As described previously, there are multiple approaches exist to meet the other two approaches, which makes scenario modeling and cost estimation challenging, especially at this early stage of planning. The wide range of variables—especially those related to the building enclosure—would necessitate detailed iterative parametric analysis to evaluate the multiple combinations of measures that facilitate compliance. In our opinion this level of analysis is not appropriate at this early stage of planning.</p> <p>Moreover, using an air source heat pump design offers the clearest means of compliance with EnergyStar or NBC Tier 3 standards, largely due to its significant energy savings.</p>			
	<p>Results “Consequently, there is less room for improvement in GHGI beyond the baseline through heating measures.” - Can you please clarify what is meant by this statement? All measures except for hybrid heating have a lower GHGI in the results</p>	<p>Due to the dominance of low-rise residential buildings on the site (approximately 88%), the majority of the heating demand is met by three-season air-source heat pumps (see rationale above for why this option was selected), which are primarily electric-powered. Since electricity has a lower emissions factor, the overall GHG emissions arising from heating in the baseline scenario (that uses 3-season heat pumps_ was relatively low compared to other end uses, such as DHW consumption. As a result, the potential for further GHG reduction in heating was limited for heating.</p> <p>For hybrid heating, a significant portion of electric heating was shifted to natural gas, leading to higher GHG emissions compared to other measures where heating remained predominantly electric(3 season air source heat pumps).</p>			
	<p>Results I interpret NPV costs as a positive return on investment. Is this the right terminology to describe the calculation?</p>	<p>For the purposes of this particular NPV costing study, every cost is accounted for as an expense. When both capital and operational costs are accounted for without a corresponding increase in revenue or substantial long-term savings, the result is a negative NPV, which may seem unusual however this is simply a reflection of a lack of direct revenue or positive cashflow expected to the developer.</p>			
	<p>Results What are the annual costs for each HVAC strategy?</p>	<p>The NPV costs incorporate operation and maintenance costs (which we interpret as the annual costs requested). The costing was completed at a Class D level, which is an order of magnitude estimate.</p>			
	<p>Results Table 11: i. Why is the Baseline HVAC traditional natural gas heating systems, where elsewhere throughout the report the baseline was a 3-season ASHP? ii. Why is the baseline HVAC option missing the incremental net zero cost? iii. What is the annual cost for each HVAC system? iv. Can you describe what is represented by the Incremental cost of near net zero condition? Shouldn't the cost be reduced where there is a greater GHG reduction impact of the HVAC option? v. Why is rooftop solar described as having a negligible impact on GHGs? What if it powers an all-electric ASHP for heating and</p>	<p>i. This issue identified has been resolved, and the updates are now reflected in the report.</p> <p>ii. The baseline scenario serves as the reference point for determining the incremental costs of all other HVAC strategies. For example, if a geothermal heat pump has an incremental cost of \$0.5M, it means the cost of the geothermal heat pump is \$0.5M higher than that required by the Town GDS under the baseline scenario.</p> <p>iii. Refer to response to prior comment.</p>			

	Results Note that Caledon's interim emissions reduction target of 36% by 2030 is a Town-wide target encompassing both existing and new communities. The target specific to new development is that all new buildings are built to net zero emissions standards by 2030	Noted. Text will be updated to reflect this commitment.			
43	Traffic Vehicles and EV Charging To clarify, the EV requirements in the Town's GDS for low-rise development is a minimum of one EV-ready parking space per residential dwelling unit. There are no requirements to install a Level 3 EV charging station	Noted. The text will be updated to reflect the EV-ready requirement and references to installation requirements will be removed.			
44	District Energy Were parameters other than minimum floor area evaluated to deem the neighbourhood centre as infeasible to district energy?	The Neighborhood Centre (NC) was deemed potentially feasible for a District Energy System (DES), but with conditions. The feasibility depends on zoning the medium-density archetypes at the periphery of the region, adjacent to the urban corridor. If structured this way, the medium-to-high density archetypes within both the Neighborhood Centre and the urban corridor may be considered viable for a DES. This would require further discussion and exploration with developers of DES systems, and ultimately a detailed design and costing analysis beyond the scope of this study.			
	District Energy 4.3.4.1 could the total area required of the geothermal district energy system be integrated into the development areas instead of as an area on its own?	To clarify, the total area required for the DES installation was considered to be integrated into the development area. The land area was separated out solely to demonstrate that it would require a small minority of the land footprint and therefore could easily be integrated into the planned development.			
	District Energy Which documents are referred to stating that Town and School board lands restrict solar PV? Why are just public lands considered for solar? Was battery storage considered? How was the "low energy generation potential" finding determined?	The Town and School board lands are not under the Landowner Group's control. Language has been updated to be less definite reflecting that Town / School property may house these systems if supported by the Town / School.			
45	Roadmap to Near Net Zero Discussion How does the air source DHW HP with gas backup have a greater EUI and GHG reduction potential compared to the geothermal heat pump?	Heating demand is already met by high-efficiency three-season heat pumps in the baseline scenario that was analyzed, while DHW demand relies on natural gas. This creates greater potential for improvement in DHW end-use, both in terms of energy efficiency and GHG emissions reduction, reflecting that much of the reductions that could be achieved from space heating are already present in the baseline scenario.			
	Roadmap to Near Net Zero Discussion I am surprised to see that air source DHW HP with gas back up is within range of the same costs of geothermal heat pumps, as already noted above, can you please share your assumptions on costs?	Since the majority of the site consists of low-rise residential buildings, we considered that the baseline heating demand is met by three-season air-source heat pumps in the baseline scenario. When evaluating the cost of the DHW HP HVAC strategy, we must account for two separate heat pumps: one for space heating and another for DHW. In contrast, when analyzing geothermal heat pumps, we only account for the geothermal system, while DHW remains natural gas-based. This distinction—having two heat pumps in the DHW HP strategy versus a single geothermal heat pump—results in comparable upfront costs for both scenarios.			
	Roadmap to Near Net Zero Discussion Which costs were factored in for the near net zero scenario total cost of \$2.3B?	The costs factored in for total costs in Net Zero scenario are: upfront capital cost + annual energy cost + annual maintenance cost + replacement cost + carbon cost.			
46	Implementation shouldn't actions #1, #2 responsibility include the Landowners Group?	The Landowners Group was added to these actions.			
47	Appendices Futureproofing HVAC systems – these are good findings and recommendations; can it be brought into the main body of the report?	This information was placed in the appendices in an effort to reduce the length and improve readability of the report and its findings. This section was moved per the Town's request.			
Finance					
48	If the proposed development (towards facilitating a major residential community) were to proceed as planned, the taxable assessment value of the properties would change to reflect any developments that would have taken place.	Noted.			
49	Proposed new residential dwellings will attract Development Charges at the Residential rates. Those charges will be 'frozen' at the rates that will be in effect on the date when the first zoning amendment application is deemed complete (the application completion date), provided that the first zoning amendment took place after January 1, 2020. Otherwise, Development Charges will be determined on the date of building permit issuance.	Noted.			

50	If frozen rates apply, interest on Development Charges will accrue for the period starting one day after the application completion date, through to the date on which the charges are received by the Town.	Noted.			
51	Currently, applicable Development Charge (Residential) rates are as follows: a. Town of Caledon: i. \$59,199.60 per single or semi-detached unit; ii. \$40,701.64 per apartment > 70 sq. metres; iii. \$23,887.18 per apartment <= 70 sq. metres; and iv. \$53,669.14 per townhouse dwelling. Stacked townhouses will attract Development Charges at the large apartment rates. All other townhouses will attract Development Charges at the Residential (Other) rates. b. Region of Peel: i. \$73,810.29 per single or semi-detached unit; ii. \$53,539.73 per apartment > 70 sq. metres; iii. \$28,315.65 per apartment <= 70 sq. metres; and iv. \$58,458.07 per townhouse dwelling. c. School Boards: i. \$5,076 per any residential unit. d. GO Transit: i. \$829.20 per single or semi-detached unit ii. \$592.33 per apartment > 70 sq. metres; iii. \$306.96 per apartment <= 70 sq. metres; and iv. \$829.20 per townhouse dwelling	Noted.			
52	On February 1, 2025, Development Charge rates (residential and non-residential) will increase by 1.75% over current rates listed above. Those February 1, 2025 indexed rates will be valid for building permits to be issued in the period February 1, 2025, through to July 31, 2025.	Noted.			
53	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.	Noted.			
54	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at January 10, 2025, and are based upon information provided to the Town by the applicant, current By-laws in effect and current rates, which are indexed twice a year. For site plan or rezoning applications dated on or after January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated at rates applicable on the date when an application is determined to be complete (the application completion date); and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. That determination of rates is valid for 18 months after application approval date. Interest charges will apply for affected applications. For applications other than site plan or rezoning applications; and site plan or rezoning applications dated prior to January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated and payable at building permit issuance date. Development Charge by-laws and rates are subject to change. Further, proposed developments may change from the current proposal to the building permit stage. Any estimates provided will be updated based on changes in actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application.	Noted.			
Fire and Emergency Services					
55	The Community Risk Assessment indicates a significant gap in the delivery of an appropriate level of fire suppression services within this development area	Noted.			
56	The 2022 amended Fire Station Location Study has identified this area as under serviced and an ideal location for a new fire station equipped with apparatus and staffed by a minimum of 4 firefighter 24/7	Noted.			
57	Fire Service does not recommend increasing this risk until further strides are made in the fire suppression deployment benchmarks including a minimum of 10 firefighters responding within a 10-minute response time (turnout time + travel time) to 80% of the fire related incidents within this response area	Noted.			
58	Pressurized Fire Hydrants with adequate fire flow must be provided in accordance with Region of Peel Standards.	Noted.			
Transportation - General					
59	Town of Caledon Staff differ to the Region of Peel for comments on Roadways under their Jurisdiction at the time comments were sent to the lead planner				

Transportation - Draft Wildfield Village Secondary Plan				
60	Section 12.5.3 Sidewalks in the Secondary Plan Area – Revise point a) to remain consistent with cross sections in Appendix B. As per the MMTMP, ATMP, and proposed cross sections in Appendix b, Collector roads will have either multi-use paths on both sides of the road, or a combination of sidewalk and cycle track.	Policies revised.		
61	Consideration should be given for policy language supporting an internal multi-use trail system outside of collector road right of way (ROW).	Policies added to the secondary plan		
62	Include policy language to speak towards the following: a. Landowners to include traffic calming features and protected intersections within the roadway design and construction to the satisfaction of Town Staff. b. Landowners to support transit design and implementation. This should be both financially and in the construction of infrastructure as part of subdivision works. This will be done to the satisfaction of Town Staff.	These matters will be addressed through future draft plans of subdivision and through updated policy.		
Transportation - Land use Plan				
63	Please be aware that the Town is undertaking an update to the MMTMP (Multi-Modal Transportation Master Plan), or equivalent EA study, to assess the need for east-west collector roadways. Town staff recommend awaiting the findings of this study. Should the applicant wish to proceed they do so at their own risk.	The urban corridor reflects the alignment proposed by the Town in its TMP update.		
64	Lands to the east of the Gore Road lack a collector road network. Revise to include a collector road(s) in the proposal as required	This is part of Issue 63. SWK - The revised plan shows this road.		
Transportation - Typical Cross-Sections/Community Design Guidelines				
65	Please be advised that proposed cross sections are subject to a multidisciplinary review, therefore comments from other departments and divisions should be collected.	The town has confirmed the 18m local, 23.5m minor collector, and 26m major collector rights-of-way are acceptable. There may be minor comments related to elements within the cross-section.		
66	Include a road classification map with the location of each type of ROW cross section for collector and arterial roads.	Will do		
67	In consideration for Operations and Maintenance capacity, local roads only require sidewalks on one side of the road, with the exception of areas in close proximity to main generators of pedestrian traffic. Please see section 4.2.10 of the Active Transportation Master Plan (ATMP) for detail	The town has confirmed they want sidewalks on both sides of local roads.		
68	18 m Local Road - 6.0 m is the minimum clear width required for Emergency vehicles, while only 5.5m is proposed. Furthermore, minimum widths for curbside and through lanes should be considered. Revise to meet standards, this could require increasing the proposed ROW.	See comment 65 above.		
69	22.0 m Collector - The MMTMP proposes two side parking on collector roads while this proposed cross section proposes only 1 side parking, justify this is sufficient or revise so these minimum standards are met, this could require increasing the proposed ROW. Development Standards Parking requirements should be considered in the review of on street parking spaces	See comment 65 above.		
70	Joint Utility Corridors are proposed under Multi use paths and sidewalks. For Safety reasons the associated infrastructure (access points, transformers, ext.) must be designed in a manner to facilitate safe travel	SCS / BA should look at the cross-sections jointly.		
Transportation - Transportation Study				
71	Missing items, which were requested in the Terms of Reference Response: a. Provide a high-level trail plan within the secondary plan area. This could be included in the missing high-level map of existing and proposed internal and external active transportation facilities. This map should ensure connectivity to boundary roads. b. A scenario without the GTA West corridor to assess the network requirements must be completed. c. Traffic controls for the internal collector to collector roadways were not proposed. Propose Traffic Controls for all internal collector to collector road intersections. Complete analysis as required. Consider where roundabouts are recommended. d. Infrastructure improvements and missing links have not been identified. Provide a diagram illustrating the proposed lane layouts and storage lengths for all arterial-to-arterial, collector-to-arterial, and collector-to-collector intersections within the study area. This diagram must clearly differentiate between previously planned improvements and those recommended as part of this proposal. e. A phasing plan with interim improvements for the broader road network should be established until the ultimate secondary plan network	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.		
72	Please address the following additional comments: Confirm that the public engagement process as part of the MCEA has been followed. Town Transportation Impact Study guidelines require the study to include the seal of the author.	The town has done a public consultation for Phases 1 and 2 of the EA as part of their TMP update. Future phases will be confirmed through discussions with the Town. These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.		

	Consider the impacts of diverted of east-west traffic from Healey Road / Mayfield Road through the collector road network.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Conduct a high-level review of on-street parking to ensure the development meets future residents' needs and adheres to the Town's	This will be completed as part of future draft plan applications.			
	Provide a map of recommended traffic calming locations and features	The Town has confirmed formal, physical traffic calming will not be implemented.			
73	The following comments are specific to sections in the submitted Traffic Study	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 1.4.3 - Active Transportation Plan should also reference the ATMP in addition to the MMTMP				
	Section 1.6 and Section 5.2 – The unit counts differ between the Transportation Study and the planning justification report. Revise for consistency as materially impacts the conclusions of the report.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 1.7 - The Terms of Reference in Appendix A lacks Staff responses. Revise to include.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 4.1 and Appendix B - See above for comments.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 5.1 and Figure 9 - Revise for clarity, additionally ensure all supporting documentation is referenced or included. Items requiring further information are as follows: i. Some midblock volumes differ (are less) than the A.M. peak hour volumes in Appendix C. Review and revise for consistency as required. ii. Include the methodology utilized to transform midblock volumes into turning movements in the report or appendix. iii. Report states volumes were projected into the 2051 horizon year using TMP volumes. Which volumes were projected to the 2051 horizon year? Clarify by providing additional information in the report or appendix.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 5.1 and Table 3 – Items for revision are as follows: i. TTS Zones in Brampton were used rather than the zone in Caledon in which the proposed development is located. This assumption should be clearly stated in the report, ideally accompanied by justification. ii. Considering the surrounding SABE area, are east-west trips within Caledon anticipated? iii. In this specific context the impacts of rounding to the nearest 5% are not conservative, thusly staff prefer rounding to 1%. Between the Appendix and Table 3 the trip distributions were rounded to the nearest 5%. This causes westbound trips on Healey Road to round from 1% down to 0%. Considering the high trip generation of the site (4500 two way trips) this means 450 two way trips are rounded down to 0.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 4, Figure 6 - Propose Specific Transit Routes along the collector road network. Additionally transit supportive policies should be summarized in this section.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 5.1 - Consider the impact of the proposed schools. Ensure the impacts of the schools are included in the site generated trips and associated trip assignment	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 5.2.2 – Revise as follows: i. Provide a reference for the commercial floor area. ii. Trips from the proposed commercial area were assumed to be internal to the secondary plan area therefore trips were not generated nor internal trip capture assumed. However, the proposed commercial use area is located near the edge of the secondary plan therefore trips from G1/Brampton are likely to occur. Consideration for the likely trip interactions between adjacent secondary plan areas be included. iii. Furthermore, internal trips are likely to impact traffic along internal collector roadways. As is feasible, ensure the impacts of the commercial area within the Wildfield Villages Secondary Plan are included in the trip generation and distribution	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Section 6 - revise as follows: i. Include reports of queue lengths. Highlight where queuing is forecasted to exceed the storage capacity. Utilize SimTraffic where required to eliminate errors with synchro modeling of queues. ii. For signalized intersections the critical movements (maximum v/c) should be reported. iii. Signals are proposed at Arterial to collector intersections, were roundabouts considered? If so, please elaborate on feasibility / capacity.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			
	Appendix E synchro Report: i. 15.11.1. Lost time Adjustment factors were applied without adequate studies to establish the validity and necessity. Revise, preferably remove.	These issues will be addressed in the community-wide transportation study.			

School Boards					
74	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board Based on the projected student yields, 1 Catholic elementary school site and 1 Catholic secondary school site will be required in the Wildfield Village Secondary Plan. DPCDSB requests a minimum site size of 2.4 ha (6 acres) on a 22 m right of way for the elementary site and 6.5 ha (16 acres) for the secondary school site.	One Catholic elementary school has been provided within the Secondary Plan Area, at a size of 2.4 hectares. Based on discussions and agreements with the Town, a Catholic secondary school will be provided in an alternative new community.			
75	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board The need for a Catholic secondary school site, in this Education Service Area has been identified in the Board's Educational Development Charges Background Study, completed in April 2024. The catchment areas for Catholic secondary schools often extend beyond a secondary plan area and serve surrounding communities. Currently DPCDSB operates 2 secondary schools in the Town of Caledon: Robert F. Hall Catholic Secondary School (CSS) located in Caledon East and St. Michael CSS located in Bolton. Together, these two secondary schools are currently operating at 99% utilization, meaning they are at capacity without room to accommodate additional students.	See above response.			
76	Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board Based on the growth areas identified in the Town of Caledon's Official Plan, Wildfield Village is the most centrally located to accommodate students generated from the growth areas	See above response.			
77	Peel District School Board Request the following be included as a policy: PDSB requests three (3) elementary school sites for this secondary plan consisting of 8 acres (3.24 ha) with two street frontages.	This has been added to the policies.			
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority Comments					
78	A significant portion of the subject lands are within TRCA's Regulated Area as they are traversed by multiple watercourse features and contain several wetlands associated with the Humber River Watershed. A permit pursuant to Section 28.1 of the CA Act and Ontario Regulation 41/24 is required from this authority prior to any development activity taking place within a regulated area. Based on our review, the proposed works will require several permits from TRCA. Further details regarding TRCA's permitted requirements (including fee) will be provided to the applicant at an appropriate stage in the planning process	Noted. No response required.			

79	<p>Section 2.3.7.1 of the Phase 1 Local Subwatershed Study (LSS) states that the “Regional Storm floodlines have been included on Figure 2.11 (Appendix B1), noting that these drainage features do not have defined bed and banks and therefore, cannot be classified as a watercourse under O. Reg. 41/24. As such, there is no regulatory floodplain associated with these features and should not be considered flood hazards.”</p> <p>However, the applicant is advised that the presence of a watercourse is not the sole determining factor of whether a feature contains a hazard or is regulated by a Conservation Authority. In particular, Section 2(1) of Ontario Regulation 41/24 states: “For the purposes of subparagraph 2 iii of subsection 28 (1) of the Act, river or stream valleys include river or stream valleys that have depressional features associated with a river or stream, whether or not they contain a watercourse, the limits of which are determined as follows:...</p> <p>a. Where the river or stream valley is not apparent, the valley exists.</p> <p>i. to the furthest of the following distances:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the distance from a point outside the edge of the maximum extent of the flood plain under the applicable flood event standard to a similar point on the opposite side, and 2. the distance from the predicted meander belt of a watercourse, expanded as required to convey the flood flows under the applicable flood even standard to a similar point on the opposite side. <p>ii. an additional 15-metre allowance on each side.</p> <p>It is noted that drainage features with a catchment area of 50 hectares or greater are generally considered significant for flood hazard assessment. Smaller areas may still require evaluation, especially in urbanized settings, steep terrain, or locations with historical flooding issues. Even without defined bed and banks, features that contribute to overland flow, or connectivity to larger water systems can pose flood risk. As such, any drainage feature receiving runoff from a drainage area of 50 hectares</p>	<p>As established through several meetings with TRCA and confirmed via email communication from Mr. Dilnesaw Chekol dated June 16, 2025 (Appendix B8 of the Phase 1 LSS), HDFs within the WVSP area will not be subject to regulation by TRCA under current floodplain management policies. Where the features have been identified as a watercourse, there is an associated floodplain that is regulated by TRCA. This includes Reaches H5S1/S2/S3, the southern portion of Reach H5S4 within the hedgerow and the northern portion of Reach WHT2(1)1-1. TRCA also regulates the East Tributary and the West Humber River. Refer to Section 2.3.3.1 of the phase 1 LSS for additional information on flood hazards.</p>	<p>Phase 1 LSS, Section 2.3.3.1 and Appendix B8</p>		
80	<p>While a Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) assessment was completed for the study area, it did not include a review of the features in accordance with the definition of a watercourse per Ontario Regulation 41/24. The applicant is asked to revised the HDF assessment accordingly and include photographic evidence within the LSS. In conjunction with comment 1, this exercise will assist TRCA staff in determining the appropriateness of proposed management options for these features.</p>	<p>The Watercourse and Drainage Feature Assessment Letter Report (May 2025: Appendix B8) reviews the features in accordance with the definition of a watercourse per Ontario Regulation 41/24. The Letter Report also includes a photographic record of the aquatic features.</p>	<p>Phase 1 LSS, Appendix B8</p>		
81	<p>Section 2.4.2 of the LSS outlines the geomorphic assessment process. However, this section does not address the critical need to monitor flows in the receiving feature. Monitoring flow data is essential for calibrating the continuous hydrology model, which is a prerequisite for accurately assessing erosion potential for identified sensitive reaches. In order to ensure robust and reliable erosion assessments, it is required that the study explicitly incorporate the requirement for flow monitoring in receiving features and emphasize the use of this data for model calibration. Inclusion of this step will improve the precision and validity of the erosion assessment and support the development of effective management strategies for sensitive reaches.</p>	<p>Flow monitoring has commenced as part of the LSS to assist with the calibration of the continuous hydrology model which will occur as part of the future CSSS. The LSS has been updated to include discussion and results of the monitoring to date. Refer to Section 4.4 of the Phase 1 LSS.</p>	<p>Phase 1 LSS, Section 4.4</p>		

82	Based on the submitted Land Use Plan, the entire portion of the Secondary Plan east of The Gore Road is within the Neighbourhood Area designation. However this area contains, as determined by the Preliminary Slope Stability Assessment of the LSS. It is TRCA's understanding that field assessments of these features were not conducted as the landowners are non-participating.	The Land Use Plan has been revised based on the latest NHS which includes the preliminary long term stable top of slope and 10 m setback, east of The Gore Road. Detailed Slope Stability Assessments will be required for non-participating landowners, along with floodplain updates to establish the limit of the NHS east of The Gore Road when development proceeds. Refer to Section 2.3.2.4 of the Phase 1 LSS for commentary on future slope stability requirements and Section 2.3.3.1 for future floodplain updates. Future study requirements will be further outlined in the Phase 3 LSS.	Phase 1 LSS, Sections 2.3.2.4 and 2.3.3.1		
83	In lieu of detailed assessment of the features, a conservative approach should be taken whereby results from desktop analysis (e.g. the Preliminary Slope Stability Assessment) and various mapping resources (e.g. TRCA's hazard constrain layers, MNR wetland layers etc.) are used to define the limits of TRCA regulated features and hazards in this area. All regulated features, hazards and applicable setbacks should be placed in a protective land use designation (Natural Features and Areas). In addition, policy can be included within the Secondary Plan which speaks to future study requirements to further refine the Natural Features and Areas designation for non-participating landowners. Both the LSS and Secondary Plan should be revised accordingly.	A conservative approach has been taken for the preliminary slope stability assessment. Refer to Section 2.3.2 of the Phase 1 LSS. All features, hazards and setbacks have been placed in the Natural Features and Areas on the approved Secondary Plan, in addition to policy being included that speaks to future study requirements.	Phase 1 LSS, Section 2.3.2		
84	Section 4.3 of the Phase 2 LSS outlines the feature-based water balance assessment process. However this section does not address the critical need to monitor water levels within a wetland, as well as the inflows and outflows associated with it. Monitoring data is essential for calibrating the continuous hydrology model, particularly wetlands identified as medium and high risk. Accurate calibration is a prerequisite for assessing the potential impacts of the proposed development or hydroperiods. In order to ensure a robust and reliable feature-based water balance assessment, it is imperative that the study explicitly includes the requirement to monitor water levels and flows in and out of wetlands. This data should be emphasized as vital for calibrating the hydrology model, improving the precision and reliability of the assessment. Incorporating these measures will enhance the validity of the analysis and support the development of effective management strategies for medium and high-risk wetlands. The LSS should be revised accordingly	Section 4.3.2 of the Phase 1 LSS has been created to discuss the feature-based water balance continuous simulation hydrologic modelling including monitoring and calibration. Section 4.4.4 has been added to the Phase 1 LSS describing the monitoring to be completed within the retained wetlands to support the hydrologic modelling.	Phase 1 LSS, Sections 4.3.2 and 4.4.4		
85	Several wetland features have been identified on a non-participating parcel at the north-west corner of the Secondary Plan area. However, these features have not been identified on the Land Use Plan. In lieu of a detailed field assessment of these wetlands, a conservative approach should be taken whereby the features and their associated setbacks are placed within a protective land use designation (Natural Features and Areas). Similar to comment 4, policies can be integrated into the Secondary Plan which speak to future study requirements to assess these features. Both the LSS and Secondary Plan should be revised accordingly.	All natural heritage features and their buffers on non-participating lands are shown on Figure 2.5 (Phase 1 Report) and the Land Use Plan as "Non-participant Natural Heritage Features and Buffers - For Further Study".	Phase 1 LSS, Figure 2.5		
86	The proposed Land Use Plan does not appear to account for the wetland feature (and associated setbacks) located within the woodland on the south-central portion of the subject lands. The applicant is asked to revise Figure 2.5 of the LLS and the Land Use Plan accordingly	Figure 2.5 of the Phase 1 LSS includes the final wetland staking exercise carried out in September 2024, and shows a 30 m Significant Wetland buffer and 10 m Other Wetland buffer. This is also shown on Figure 2.2 of the Phase 2 LSS.	Phase 1 LSS, Figure 2.5		
87	The applicant is asked to clarify why the existing wetland at located at the south-east corner of the subject lands have been identified as "wetlands for removal" on Figure 2.5 of the LSS. This conflicts the Land Use Plan, which identifies the area as being within the Natural Features and Areas land use designation	The wetland in the south-east corner is not proposed for removal, and is included in the NHS. The hatching for 'wetlands for removal' has been excluded for this wetland in Figure 2.5 of the Phase 1 LSS.	Phase 1 LSS, Figure 2.5		
88	The applicant is asked to provide a map within the LSS which indicates which wetlands are groundwater fed and which are surface water fed. The map should also include any areas where groundwater discharge is occurring.	The hydrogeological appendix (Appendix C) has been revised to include a map showing the hydrogeological categorization of the wetlands. Areas of potential groundwater discharge have been identified on this figure as well.	Phase 1 Appendix C		

89	Figure 3.12 of the LSS presents a groundwater contour map derived from data collected from both shallow and deep monitoring wells. The applicant is asked to provide separate groundwater contour maps for data obtained exclusively from shallow and deeper groundwater monitoring wells, respectively.	The contour map is based on data collected from the deep wells. Due to the high water levels obtained from the deep wells, it was considered unnecessary to differentiate between shallow and deep wells for the purpose of developing contours. Furthermore, the bulk of the instruments are installed in the same hydrologic unit (i.e., Halton till) and so differentiation on the basis of hydrostratigraphy is not necessary (nor feasible). The revised report therefore does not include two separate groundwater contour maps.	N/A		
90	Figure 3.11 of the LSS refers to a geologic cross-section labelled A-A, which is described as originating from Stouffville. The applicant is asked to confirm and correct if this is a typographical error (page 268 of 572).	Acknowledged. The label is a typo. The cross-section has been updated accordingly.	Phase 1 LSS, Figure 3.16A, Appendix C1		
91	Section 3.1.8 of the LSS states that the results of seepage meter testing are presented in Table 3.3 in Appendix C3 (Appendix C1). The applicant is asked to correct this reference, as the tables are located in Appendix C3.	Acknowledged. The reference has been corrected.			
92	Appendix C11 of the LSS uses data from the King City North Climatic Station for hydrograph reporting. However, the water budget analysis references the Woodbridge Climatic Station. The applicant is asked to provide clarification for this discrepancy. In addition, the applicant is asked to include a detailed discussion of the hydrograph data, focusing on what it reveals about the interaction between groundwater and surface features. The discussion should also include implications for future Low Impact Development (LID) facilities, specifically concerning shallow groundwater recorded at each station.	Implications of shallow groundwater with respect to LID has been discussed in the Phase 2 LSS report. Per discussion with the TRCA and Town, the water balance has been revised to utilize the Richmond Hill 1981-2010 climate normals. The Richmond Hill station was decommissioned in 2014, therefore, it is not possible to obtain current precipitation data from that station for hydrograph comparison. The revised Phase 1 LSS has therefore retained the King City North station data for the hydrographs. A more detailed discussion of hydrograph data regarding groundwater/surface water interaction has been provided in Section 3.4.2 of the revised Phase 1 LSS.	Water Balance: Phase 1 LSS, Section 3.2.1 Hydrographs: Phase 1 LSS, Section 3.4.2 GW Levels and LID Interaction: Phase 2 LSS, Section 3.5.3 and Section 4.4.1		
93	The applicant is asked to provide a discussion on the volumetric gain or loss observed between upstream and downstream gauging stations in the watercourses/HDFs. Please discuss how these variations correlate with the calculated pre-development infiltration rates for the area.	Discussion of the flow gauging data and its relation to the pre-development infiltration rates for the area has been added to Section 4.4.2 of the Phase 1 report.	Phase 1 LSS Section 4.4.2		

94	The infiltration factor of 0.2 is generally applicable for rolling land (slope 2.8-3.8m/km). However, the water budget calculation uses a factor of 0.15. Similarly, a factor of 0.1 is used for tight clay soils. The applicant is asked to provide justification for these values. In addition, the report recognizes that Halton Till is often fractured up to depths of 4-5 metres and includes soil type classifications in Tab2.15 (ranging from Clay and Silt Till to Sand and Silt Till). Section 3.1.7.2.2 notes that twenty-grain size analysis tests of Halton Till indicate it contains 0-14% gravel, 2-20% sand, 29-45% silt., and 41-67% clay. Based on this information, the applicant is asked to explain the rationale behind the infiltration factors used in the water budget.	The pre-development water balance has been revised, utilizing 0.15 for the topographic factor and 0.15 for the soil factor. Rationale regarding the factor selection has been provided in Section 3.2.4 of the Phase 1 LSS report.	Phase 1 LSS, Section 3.2.4		
95	Reference to natural hazard related policies should be included within the of the Natural Features and Areas section of the Secondary Plan	Natural hazards, including flood and erosion hazards, are included in the Natural Features and Areas designation of the approved Secondary Plan.			
Region of Peel Comments					
96	Planning Authority In accordance with Bill 185, beyond July 1, 2024, the Region's mandate will continue to include the provision of hard and soft services to the community, including but not limited to water and wastewater servicing, transportation, waste management, affordable housing, health services, emergency services, etc. To this end, the Region will continue to have an interest in community building to ensure the efficient, financially sustainable, and effective delivery of infrastructure and services.	Noted.			
97	Development Services Should the Town wish to include affordable housing policies in the Wildfield Secondary Plan, please advise so the Region's Housing Development Office can be engaged. To achieve an appropriate design and service needs mix, please note that the Region would require sites that are generally 2 acres in size, fully serviced with appropriate future access to transit and general amenities (i.e. commercial sites and schools/community centres), and unencumbered lands (i.e. one complete block).	The secondary plan has been updated to reflect the affordable housing policies of the Future Caledon Official Plan.			
Region of Peel - Development Engineering					
98	Sanitary Sewer Facilities The nearest available sanitary sewers are south of Mayfield Road.	Noted. No action required.			
	Sanitary Sewer Facilities Servicing of the Plan will require construction of large diameter sanitary sewer trunks which are the financial responsibility of the Region as per Development Charges By-law. The following sanitary sewer projects are proposed in the vicinity, the inclusion in the budget/ construction date is subject to change: i. 675mm dia. on McVean Road in Brampton (29-2169) year 2031 ii. 600mm dia. sanitary sewer on Centerville Creek Road (30-2199) year 2032 iii. 1200mm dia. sanitary trunk on The Gore Road. (24-2274) year 2025	Section 5.1 of the Phase 1 LSS has been updated to include these sanitary projects.	Phase 1 LSS, Section 5.1.		
	Sanitary Sewer Facilities A Functional Servicing Report (FSR) showing proposed sanitary sewer servicing plans for the development is required for review and approval by the Region.	Noted. No action required.			
99	Water Facilities The lands are located within Water Pressure Zone 6 supply system	Noted. No action required.			
	Water Facilities Existing infrastructure consist of 750mm and 300mm watermain on Mayfield Road, 200mm watermain on Centerville Creek Road and 200mm dia. on The Gore Road.	This information is included in Section 5.2 of the Phase 1 LSS.	Phase 1 LSS, Section 5.2		

	<p>Water Facilities</p> <p>Servicing of the Plan will require construction of large diameter watermain which are the financial responsibility of the Region as per Development Charges By-law. The following watermain project are proposed in the vicinity, the inclusion in the budget/construction date is subject to change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 400mm dia. on Centerville Creek Rd from Mayfield Rd to 1.5km north (25-1163) year 2026; ii. 400mm dia. on future west-east road (26-1164) year 2026 iii. 600mm dia. on the Gore Road (24-1193) year 2025 	Section 5.2 of the Phase 1 LSS has been updated to include the future watermain projects	Phase 1 LSS, Section 5.2		
	<p>Water Facilities</p> <p>A Functional Servicing Report (FSR) showing proposed water servicing plans for the development is required for review and approval by the Region.</p>	Noted. No action required.			
100	<p>General Note</p> <p>Construction of 375mm dia. and larger diameter of sanitary sewers, 400mm dia. and larger diameter of watermain are the financial responsibility of the Region as per Development Charges By-law and Policy F40. Should the Owners wish to proceed with these works at a time when the Region is not prepared to fund the works, then the Owners shall be required to enter into a Front-Ending Agreement prior to the construction of the works. This Agreement will be subject to the Region's determination that it has or will have sufficient funds to justify entering into the Front-Ending Agreement and Regional Council approval.</p>	Noted. No action required.			
Region of Peel - Stormwater Management					
101	The proposed Official Plan abuts Mayfield Road, Regional Road #14.	Noted. No action required.			
102	A Stormwater Management Report showing proposed storm water servicing plans for the development is required for review and approval by the Region.	Noted. Stormwater servicing plans will be provided as part of the Comprehensive Servicing and SWM Study.			
103	At this stage there is not enough information to provide detailed comments on Stormwater Management. Comments will be provided through additional submissions when a SWMR has been received.	Noted. Stormwater servicing plans will be provided as part of the Comprehensive Servicing and SWM Study.			
Region of Peel - Transportation Development					
104	The Transportation Study is under review by Peel Transportation Development staff. Additional time is required to provide detailed comments, and they will be forwarded under separate cover	Noted. No action required.			
Region of Peel - Transportation Planning					
105	The subject land in the Secondary Plan Area contains the regional roads Mayfield Road and The Gore Road, which are identified in the Region's Strategic Goods Movement Network (SGMN) as Primary Truck Routes. These regional roads in the SGMN may support better connectivity for trucks in the future	Noted. No action required.			
106	Most of the Secondary Plan Area beginning almost 1 km north of Mayfield Road, between Centreline Creek Road and east of The Gore Road, are in the Hwy 413 Route Planning Study Area (RPSA). MTO has reduced interest in this area. Applications can proceed through municipal development processes. MTO will continue to review all development applications in the study area (RPSA), but it is anticipated that applications in the green areas will not be impacted by the GTA West transportation corridor	Noted. No action required.			
107	A smaller portion in the north of the Secondary Plan Area, along the railroad between Centreline Creek Road and The Gore Road is within the Hwy 413 Focused Analysis Area (FAA), which surrounds the preferred route. Overlapping properties located within the FAA which could be directly impacted by Highway 413 Corridor, ancillary uses, or if refinements are made to the preferred route.	Noted. No action required.			
108	A Goods Movement section is recommended to be included within the Transportation Study, to show relevance of modern trends in increased deliveries, suggest policies related to community delivery hubs, space for safe delivery truck loading including off-peak deliveries, curbside management, encouraging the use of smaller delivery vehicles (such as cargo bikes), neighbourhood loading zones, parcel delivery lockers, and consolidated grocery pick-up and drop locations near transit.	Good movement will be addressed as follows. For low rise developments, which rely on curbside delivery, a signage plan will be developed through the Plan of Subdivision process that will confirm where delivery vehicles can stop curbside. For larger buildings (apartment buildings, schools, etc..) that go through a site plan process these will generally have on-site loading spaces that will be quantified through the rezoning process and designed through the Site Plan process.			
Region of Peel - Local Subwatershed study					

109	Region of Peel Staff have reviewed the submitted Phase 1: Local Sub watershed Study from a Hydrogeological perspective and find it to be satisfactory. Detailed Hydrogeological Studies will be required for future Draft Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan applications within the Wildfield Secondary Plan area	Noted. No action required.			
Region of Peel - Waste Management					
110	At this stage the Region has no concerns with waste collection within the Wildfield Secondary Plan Area. Detailed Waste Management Plans will be required for future Draft Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan applications within the Wildfield Secondary Plan area.	Noted. No action required.			
Region of Peel - Health Planning					
111	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	Noted. No action required.			
112	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	Noted. No action required.			
113	In collaboration with the Town of Caledon, Peel Public Health has implemented policies requiring the submission of a health assessment with each development application. We acknowledge receipt of the Healthy Development Assessment submitted for the Wildfield Village Secondary Plan. The tool has met a Gold threshold with a self-reported score of 49/50. The Secondary Plan is on its way to creating a healthy built environment. Some additional comments for consideration are included below:	Noted. No action required.			
	With the proposed highway running along the Secondary Plan, we encourage buffering sensitive land uses away from the highway.	This will be dealt with through detailed design at the Draft Plan of Subdivision stage.			
	We encourage the applicant to plan for more mixed uses in the north part the Secondary Plan area to increase service proximity and land use mix.	The Neighbourhood Area designation permits supporting neighbourhood scale commercial uses and community facilities.			
	Regarding standard #14, based on our review of the proposed housing types and Table 1 in the Planning Justification Report and Housing Assessment, townhouses, multiplexes, and apartment buildings do not make up at least 50% of the total units. We encourage the applicant to meet or exceed this metric	Previously, 45% of the total housing units were planned as townhouses and apartment dwellings. The site statistics have been revised to plan for a minimum of 50% housing units in forms other than single and semi-detached dwellings.			
	We support the dispersion of park space, short block lengths, frequent intersections, and mid block connection, and an interconnected active transportation network	Noted. No action required.			
	We look forward to reviewing future Subdivision and Site Plan applications based on what will be provided in neighbourhood areas, mixed use blocks, and other urban corridor lands and we will have further comments at that time. Please be advised that future development may require submission of additional large-scale or small-scale HDA tools to confirm fulfillment of standards.	Noted. No action required.			
Ministry of Transportation					
114	The subject lands are partially within the Focused Analysis Area (FAA 2020 and Draft FAA 2024) land protection boundary for the Highway 413 project. The Highway 413 project team is currently unable to endorse the advancement of new developments within the FAA limits at this time. Lands within the FAA are being protected as they may be directly impacted by the Highway 413 transportation corridor, ancillary uses, or if refinements are made to the route during the preliminary design stage. The Highway 413 project is currently in the planning, preliminary design and assessment of environmental impacts phase. Property requirements and release of FAA lands for the project will be determined at the completion of the preliminary design phase.	Noted. No action required.			
115	The project team has no comments or concerns regarding lands within the proposal outside the FAA limits. We would encourage the applicant to review MTO's Highway Corridor Management Manual and ideally incorporate desirable spacing between new connections to the Gore Rd and any Hwy 413 interchange ramp terminals.	Noted. No action required.			
Ministry of Energy and Electrification					
116	The Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Study team has reviewed the Town of Caledon's Wildfield Village Land Use Plan. The subject lands are partially within the Northwest Greater Toronto Area Transmission Corridor Identification Study's 2020 Narrowed Area of Interest. Current mapping for the Corridor Study can be found here: https://data.ontario.ca/dataset/northwest-greater-toronto-area-transmission-corridor-study-area .	Noted. No action required.			
117	At this time, the Ministry of Energy and Electrification is unable to allow any development to proceed within the Narrowed Area of Interest as it could be impacted by the future transmission corridor.	Noted. No action required.			

118	The Ministry of Energy and Electrification and Independent Electricity System Operator continue to work with the Ministry of Transportation to co-locate the transmission corridor as refinements are being made to the Highway 413 transportation corridor.	Noted. No action required.			
Additional Comments					
119	Additional comments have been included as attachments from the following agencies and departments: 1. Town of Caledon, Urban Design and Landscape – Comments on Community Design Guidelines report. 2. Town of Caledon, Urban Design and Landscape – Comments on Draft Secondary Plan. 3. Town of Caledon, Parks and Natural Heritage – Park planning markup.	Noted. No action required.			
120	The following agencies and departments have no concerns: 1. Town of Caledon, Economic Development. 2. Town of Caledon, Legal Services.	Noted. No action required.			
121	Comments are outstanding from the following agencies and departments: 1. Town of Caledon, Capital Projects. 2. Town of Caledon, Engineering. 3. Town of Caledon, Environmental. Other Outstanding Comments: Peer Review Comments on Fiscal Impact Study	Noted. No action required.			
122	Conclusion Partial resubmissions, which do not address all deficiencies listed in the letter, will generally not be accepted for processing. All submissions must comply with the Electronic Submission Standards: The Town is only accepting electronic submissions. To assist, the Town has created a document which identifies how material is to be submitted. Please click here to access the Town's website for details and ensure that any submission material you are preparing will meet the attached requirements.	Noted. No action required.			
Additional Comments from Community Facilities (Kevin Kyle, Manager of Community Facilities)					
123	The Town's Facility Needs Assessment study is currently being finalized, which will determine the optimal location, size and features required to service Caledon's existing and new communities. The draft document outlines the requirement for land to service the Wildfield and surrounding community. As such, land is required within the Wildfield Secondary Plan for a future community centre. Staff recommend locating the community centre adjacent to the centralized community park. Please add a CC symbol to the proposed Land Use Plan. Please find our requirements below: The minimum lot size shall be 10 acres or 4.046 ha and shall be fully developable. The lot shape shall be more or less rectangular, to allow the full area of the to be effectively utilized. The frontage should provide site lines and neighbourhood connections while allowing for easy public access and egress to and from the multi-use community centre with full move vehicular access. The lot elevation and distance to the roadway shall be such that an entrance / exit driveway slopes are accessible to the general public. The lot shall be in a fully serviced area – water, sewer, electricity, natural gas, communication (i.e. Bell / Rogers). The soil conditions shall have suitable bearing capacity for the intended use. The ground water conditions shall be suitable for the intended use without the need for mitigation. The lot should be in close proximity to the residential neighbourhoods in which it serves and be safely accessible to and from parks and schools.	Based on discussions and agreements with the Town, a community centre will be provided in an alternative new community.			