

Comment Response Table

<i>COMMENTOR</i>	<i>COMMENT</i>	<i>RESPONSE</i>
<p>Credit Valley Conservation Authority Trisha Hughes 905-670-1615 ext. 3250 M: 437-855-4056 trisha.hughes@cvc.ca </p>	<p>FSR for Tertiary Plan – Phase 1 CVC previously reviewed and provided comments on the FSR by email on October 17, 2024. The stormwater management and engineering comments that still need to be addressed from our previous review (of the Subwatershed Study, the Scoped Servicing Study, and the FSR for Phase 1) are copied below.</p> <p>1. The quantity control and erosion control target release rate and target storage requirements as identified in Table 52, 55, and 56 of LSWS Phase 3 for future SWM facilities tributary to West Huttonville Creek are consistent with the latest version of Phase 2 of Heritage Heights Subwatershed study (March 2022), that is being revised/updated as mentioned in current submission. The erosion control and quantity control targets for West Huttonville Creek subwatershed will be revisited at EIR stage to confirm these targets at EIR stage. Please update the Section 17.3.1 and 17.3.2 and the Scoped Servicing Study accordingly.</p>	<p>This comment is being addressed in the revised Scoped Servicing Study and Phase 1 Tertiary Plan FSR in support of the approved Secondary Plan and endorsed Tertiary Plan.</p>

Comment Response Table

2. The approved Mount Pleasant Subwatershed Study (HFSWS) identifies quantity and erosion control targets at flow nodes and identifies the target storage and release rates for erosion control and 2 to 100-year storm events, however, it does not provide target discharge rate for SWM Ponds during Regional storm event. According to the “EIR Requirements” identified in HFSWS Phase 3 report (Phase 3: Management Strategies and Implementation Plan, Subwatershed Study for The Huttonville and Fletcher’s Creeks, North West Brampton, Section 3.3.1), verification of post to pre-development flow at target flow nodes and verification of critical flow durations meeting existing durations at target flow nodes will be required using the HFSWS subwatershed study HSP-F hydrologic model. Please update 17.3.1 and 17.3.2 of the LSWS Phase 3 report and the Scoped Servicing Study to reflect these requirements. Please also update the Phase 1 FSR accordingly.

The LSWS has been updated accordingly.

3. Section 18.1.2. Stormwater Management (LSWS Phase 3) indicates “Urbantech Drawing 2.4 (See Figure 29) shows multiple employment blocks in the southwest corner of the subject area, which drain to flow node H3 in the East Huttonville Creek, and flow node F2 in Fletcher’s Creek”. However, according to URBANTECH Drawing 2.4 (Figure 29) and Section 2.3 of the submitted Scoped Servicing Study, some of these employment blocks drain

The LSWS, SSS, and Phase 1 FSR have been updated accordingly.

Comment Response Table

<p>to Flow Node HW. Please update section 18.1.2 of LSWS consistent with the submitted Scoped Servicing Study (Urbantech, July 2024).</p>	
<p>4. Assessing the capacity of the conveyance downstream of the proposed SWM facilities, including safe conveyance of emergency overflow will be reviewed at EIR stage. Please update LSWS Phase 3 report the Scoped Servicing Study accordingly.</p>	<p>The LSWS and SSS have been accordingly.</p>
<p>5. Private on-site SWM facilities are proposed for employment blocks in the southwest corner of the subject area and for blocks of medium and high-rise development adjacent to Chinguacousy Road. Based on Table 56 and the Scoped Servicing Study, all these facilities are required to provide Regional control. Note that CVC do not support the provision of Regional control using SWM quantity control facilities in private ownership and it is our understanding that MECP requires individual ECA for SWM facilities in private ownership. Please consult with MECP and Town of Caledon for their requirements for Regional control facilities in private ownership, and update LSWS Phase 3 report and the Scoped Servicing Study accordingly. Please also update Section 2.5.5 of the Phase 1 FSR accordingly.</p>	<p>The LSWS, SSS, and Phase 1 FSR have been updated accordingly.</p>

Comment Response Table

Staff have also reviewed the FSR – Phase 1 Tertiary Plan by Urbantech and provide the following comments:

6. Section 2.1 of the FSR indicates “The guidelines established in the Local SWS form the foundation for the integrated stormwater management strategy proposed for the Phase 1 Tertiary Plan area”. The Alloa Secondary Plan Area and the Scoped Servicing Study for Alloa Secondary Plan Area were reviewed and the above comments are to be addressed in both studies at this stage

The LSWS and SSS have been updated accordingly.

7. Section 2.5.6 of the FSR indicates that the proposed SWM ponds will have multiple outlets including an emergency outlet structure. Please provide a preliminary design of the pond outlet structure to include the emergency overflow and demonstrate through preliminary calculations that the emergency outlet structure and the downstream crossing can safely convey the greater of post development uncontrolled 100-year and Regional peak flows.

The Phase 1 FSR has been updated accordingly.

EIS/EIR for Tertiary Plan – Phase 1

8. A hydrologic verification was completed by Urbantech for wetland W19 as part of the Mount Pleasant Block Plan 51-2 (Brampton) development, and in addition to roof drainage from the subdivision within Block 51-2, a flow splitter and a clean water pipe was installed to convey up to 2-year peak flow from approximately 31 ha of external undeveloped

The Phase 1 EIR / FSR has been updated accordingly.

Comment Response Table

areas north of Mayfield Road to wetland W19. Based on the Alloa Phase 1 FSR, the existing flow from undeveloped areas north of Mayfield will be replaced by outflow from a SWM pond with a slightly larger drainage area (36.5 ha). In the FSR and EIR/FSR, please provide calculations as part of an updated feature based water balance for wetland W19 (within Block 51-2 in Brampton), and discuss potential impacts and mitigation measures to demonstrate how the hydrology will be maintained.

9. Appendix I (Fluvial Geomorphology Figures and Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment Report, GEO Morphix, October 29, 2024) of the EIS/EIR includes HDF management recommendations for the different reaches. The proposed management for Reaches FC-1A to FC-1E (portions on non-participating properties at this time) appear to be unresolved. Although reach FC-1B and FC-1D were assessed as Conservation, because the reach is piped downstream for 600m, the report recommends that the management of this feature be revised to Mitigation in consultation with the Town and CVC. There is also mention of exploring opportunities to realign or replicate this tributary elsewhere in the Secondary Plan Area. Further, reach FC-1C (non-participatory) does not appear to be fully assessed. We need clarification on how Reaches FC-1A to FC-1E will be treated, especially since the Phase 1 Tertiary Plan shows these areas proposed for

We understand the consultants have met and discussed this matter with the CVC.

Comment Response Table

<p>development, the feature traverses nonparticipating properties, and Draft Plan 21T-24016C shows proposed development disconnecting reaches FC-1C and FC-1E. A meeting should be scheduled with the applicant's consultants and the appropriate Town and CVC staff to discuss further.</p>	
<p>10.The EIS/EIR doesn't appear to complete its plan for reaches FC-2B/FC-2A (wetland offsetting area). There was also no conceptual drawing for the replacement of drainage feature FC-2A (of 194m). This should be reviewed and discussed in the EIS/EIR.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Please note that CVC staff continue to advocate for an upstream connection by way of enhancing linkage to the northern system, thus creating a North-South linkage, and supporting the existing water resource system south of Mayfield Road. This would be a similar approach to the north-south linkage in the Mount Pleasant Secondary Plan Area of Brampton (Block Plan 51-2) and can help to further the function of water resource systems downstream.</p>	<p>The Phase 1 EIR has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p>11.There is an inconsistency on the planning of the wetland offset at 1850 Mayfield Road. Although the landuse plans of the NHS (Compensation) block do show an area of 3900m², page 75 of the EIS/EIR mentions that the removal of 2070m² of wetland will be offset with an area of 2083m²; while page 86 states</p>	<p>The Phase 1 EIR / FSR have been updated accordingly.</p>

Comment Response Table

	<p>that the offset will be 1:1. Please confirm. Please also provide a conceptual offsetting plan for this wetland in the FSR and the EIS/EIR.</p>	
	<p>12. According to Figure 2.4A of the FSR, a clean water pipe is proposed to collect 0.75 ha roofs/foundations to provide inflow to the proposed wetland compensation area; however, no calculations are provided to support the proposed source. As an alternative to the proposed roof/foundation drain, outflow from the stormwater pond can be explored as a source of water. We understand that identifying the required water (volume, frequency, duration) to support the proposed wetland compensation may not be feasible at this stage. CVC staff suggest an adaptive management approach be discussed in the EIS/EIR, to incorporate flexibility to adjust the flow towards the future wetland, and leave it to detailed design to confirm the source.</p>	<p>The Phase 1 EIR / FSR have being updated accordingly.</p>
	<p>13. CVC staff recommend the use of our Buffer Planting Guideline (https://cvc.ca/document/57660/) to determine planting densities within our jurisdiction, particularly within regulated areas.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Town of Caledon- Finance Glendon Turner, Senior Financial Analyst</p>	<p>If the proposed rezoning amendment application were to proceed as planned (to facilitate the development of three residential subdivisions), the taxable assessment value of</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Comment Response Table

the properties will change, to reflect any development that would have taken place.

Development Charges will be levied through the related subdivision agreements. The date on which the Zoning Bylaw Amendment is deemed complete will serve as the application completion date, on which ‘frozen’ Development Charges will be determined

Noted, DC is not payable for the proposed rezoning.

The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at February 14, 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,

Noted, DC is not payable for the proposed rezoning.

Comment Response Table

	<p>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.</p>	
<p>Parks and Natural Heritage, Planning Eva Li</p>	<p>Landscape comments for RZ 2024-0031 will be provided under Alloa Secondary Plan, Alloa Tertiary Plan and Draft Plans of Subdivision (21T-24103, 21T-24105 and 21T-24106).</p>	<p>Noted. Draft plan of subdivisions has been approved.</p>
<p>Region of Peel, Toronto & Region Conservation Authority- Development Engineering</p>	<p>Comments on RZ 2024-0031 will not be provided with respect to removal of the holding symbols on the Alloa lands until the Alloa Secondary Plan and Tertiary Plan studies have been reviewed and approved.</p>	<p>Noted, we are of the opinion that these studies have significantly advanced to proceed with the rezoning and lifting of the hold.</p>
<p>Town of Caledon Fire</p>	<p>The community Risk Assessment indicates a significant gap in the delivery of an appropriate level of fire suppression services within the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre. Fire Services does not recommend increasing this risk until further strides are made in the fire suppression deployment benchmarks including 10 firefighters responding within a 10 minute response time (turnout time + travel time) to 80% of the fire related incidents within the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre boundaries.</p>	<p>Noted. Appropriate conditions were incorporated into the draft plan approval.</p>

Comment Response Table

	In order to initiate timely, effective, efficient fire protection service a preliminary acceptance of critical infrastructure will be required including, firefighting water (pressurized hydrants) and adequate road network for emergency access.	Noted.
	Two entrances will be required to large development blocks. Single access roads shall be no longer than 150m to the furthest building unit and be provided with a turnaround for a firetruck.	Noted.
	Confirmation from an engineer that the proposed development can be serviced by the municipal water distribution system providing adequate water flow for fire protection, acceptable to Peel Region.	An FSR prepared by Urbantech confirms that services can be made available with the necessary municipal upgrades.
	Some comments may be better suited for next phase of planning approval process but it is good for the applicant to know what I will be asking for. The applicant can simply acknowledge the comments at this stage.	Noted.
Strategic Policy Planning Planning Department Bailey Loverock	Policy comments will not be provided on this application until the applicable Secondary Plan and Tertiary Plan are more significantly advanced	
Town of Caledon- Heritage	Heritage staff have reviewed RZ 2024-0031 and provide the following comments. It's a very limited ZBA. However, learning from our experience with Newlove House at 14275 The Gore Road, I have reiterated the need for collaboration on Lot Concept Plans for heritage	Noted.

Comment Response Table

<p>houses (i.e. Clark Farmhouse, 12455 Creditview Road).</p>	
<p>Heritage Register</p> <p>○ The subject lands contain two listed, non-designated properties on the Town of Caledon’s Heritage Register:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 12306 Chinguacousy Road <input type="checkbox"/> 12455 Creditview Road <p>○ Heritage staff will work with the applicant on heritage matters related to these listed properties through their related Draft Plan of Subdivision applications, for which Heritage Impact Assessment have been submitted.</p> <p>○ No Heritage Impact Assessments are required as part of this application.</p>	<p>Noted. Appropriate conditions were incorporated into the draft plan approval.</p>
<p>Proposed Zoning By-law Amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While Heritage staff have no specific concerns with the proposed reduction in front and rear yard setbacks for the majority of the subject lands, Heritage staff do note that additional setbacks may be required for the retention and integration of heritage resources on the subject lands. ○ Reduced front setbacks have resulted in concerns regarding separation from fencing and future maintenance of key heritage features for other heritage resources in the Town. 	<p>Appropriate conditions were incorporated into the draft plan approval.</p>

Comment Response Table

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As applicable through related Draft Plan applications, the proponent must work with Heritage staff on Lot Concept Plan(s) for heritage resource(s) to ensure the same issues are avoided for these heritage resources. 	
	<p>Archaeological Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Archaeological assessments are being completed as part of the related Draft Plan of Subdivision applications for the subject lands. No archaeological assessments are required as part of this application. 	The associated draft plans have been approved.
Town of Caledon- Urban Design	A minor amendment is proposed to the approved RMD-686 zone, in order to permit a 3.5 metre encroachment into rear yards of single detached, semi-detached, and townhouse dwellings (up to a maximum of 60% of the lot).	Noted.
	A second minor amendment is proposed to permit a 2 metre encroachment of a bay, bow or box window, or cold cellar into front yards (provided a setback of 0.5 metres is maintained to the lot line).	Noted.
Town of Caledon- Parks & Landscape	Comments to be provided with related files	Noted.

Comment Response Table

Town of Caledon- Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Redundant public uses listed as permitted uses• Exception 723 reserved for the future exception zone• All comments are provided in draft zoning by-law• Applicant responsible for accepting all tracked changes	Noted.
--------------------------------	--	--------