

June 29, 2020



Pluribus Mid-Rise Town Square

THIRD SUBMISSION

AGENCY COMMENTS RESPONSE MATRIX, JUNE 2020





Table of Contents

1. Town of Caledon Comments	3
2. Urban Design Peer Review Comments	37
3. Public Comments, June 2019	42
4. Region of Peel Comments	47

1

Town of Caledon
Comments



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

Town of Caledon September 4, 2019				
No.	Comment	Comment by:	Response by:	Response:
General Comments				
1	For property tax purposes, 0 Atchison Drive, Block 164 on Plan 43M-1840, is currently assessed as Commercial (1.3 mn CVA). The Town's share of taxes levied, based on current value assessment is approximately \$2,000. The property tax account as at June 3, 2019 is determined to be current.	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
a	If the proposed development were to proceed as planned (includes an 87 unit residential building, and a 700m ² commercial space), the taxable assessment value of the property would change to reflect the development that would have taken place.	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted. Current proposal involves 83 units and 650 m2 commercial space.
b	Development charges would be applied at the Residential, and Non-Residential, Other rates. Currently, those are:	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
i	Town of Caledon: (a) \$18,183.17 per residential apartment > 70 m ² ; (b) \$10,672.32 per residential apartment = 70 m ² ; and (c) \$40.89 per m ² of commercial floor space. Building permits issued on or after June 25, 2019 will be subject to increased Development Charges.	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
	Region of Peel: (a) \$33,079.07 per residential apartment > 70 m ² ; (b) \$21,879.82 per residential apartment = 70m ² ; and (c) \$222.51 per m ² of commercial floor space.	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
ii	Go-transit: (a) \$396.84 per residential apartment > 70 m ² ; and (b) \$205.65 per residential apartment = 70 m ² .	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

iii	School Boards: (a) \$4,567 per residential apartment; and (b) \$10.87 per m ² of commercial floor space.	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
iv	Development Charges By-laws for the Region of Peel, and School Boards are subject to review this year. It is likely that coming out of those reviews, there may be revisions to their rates, which may in turn have an impact on overall charges.	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
v	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at June 3, 2019 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. Development Charges are calculated and payable at the time of building permit issuance. 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 the Development Charges By-law and rates in effect at the time of building permit, and actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application.	Finance	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
2	A Public Meeting under the Planning Act was held on June 18, 2019, at which time several comments were made by members of the public and Town of Caledon Council. A focused residents' meeting was also held at Town Hall on June 27, 2019. Attached are the written comments received at the Public meeting. The resubmission will need to include a public comments response matrix that responds to the themes raised in the written and verbal public comments.	Development Planning	MDTR	Please refer to responses provided under the Public Comments.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

Official Plan Amendment				
3	The Draft Official Plan Amendment should be revised to:	Development Planning	MDTR	
a	The “Basis” of the amendment should identify the underground parking in addition to the surface parking area.	Development Planning	MDTR	Revised
4	The Planning Justification Report should be revised to address the following:	Development-Planning, Policy and Sustainability	MDTR	
a	The original concept plan for the subject lands that was prepared in 2008 (see attached concept plan), contemplated two mixed use buildings. The current Official Plan designation and Zoning by-law reflects the concept by permitting two 3-4 storey mixed-use buildings with ground level commercial uses and 12 residential units. Please address how the proposed development meets the residential intensification policy 5.10.3.14 of the Official Plan. This policy outlines criteria that must be satisfied to support residential intensification within settlements, which include the ability of the site to accommodate the form of the proposed development, compatibility with the surrounding community, services to support the additional households, and the demand for the housing types based on the needs of the municipality as identified through an appropriate housing study.	Development-Planning, Policy and Sustainability	MDTR	<p>The proposed design is the outcome of ongoing consultations with Town staff, most recently in February 2020.</p> <p>The proposed development meets Policy 5.10.3.14 of the Official Plan and this is discussed in Section 3.3.1 of the PJR Addendum.</p>
b	There is population currently available within Caledon East for the proposed development. Factoring in other in-process applications, the proposed units can be accommodated strictly from a population allocation	Development-Planning, Policy and Sustainability	MDTR	The proposal has been revised to 83 units, thus the Town’s comment regarding population



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	perspective. However, the proposed 274 people for the mixed-used high-rise development (i.e. 87 units at 3.15 ppu) must be justified by the applicant and the development must be supported by services (e.g. water and wastewater) as per our OP policies (including policy 5.10.3.14).			availability would remain applicable. Please refer to Section 3.3.2 of the PJR Addendum for a detailed discussion, including ppu values that base the population calculation.
c	Additional details are required to justify the demand for the housing types. Please revise the Planning Justification Report to reflect the emerging affordable and accessible housing policies found within Peel's Housing and Homeless Plan; and Region of Peel's Official Plan, Section 5.8 (Housing) in terms of affordable ownership, social housing target and environmental housing initiatives.	Development- Planning, Policy and Sustainability	MDTR	Please refer to Sections 3.3.3, 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 of the PJR Addendum.
d	Current research demonstrates that Caledon housing will need to accommodate new and/or younger families and an older population that is downsizing their homes. The housing mix for the proposed development includes 52 units of 1-bedroom plus den units, which represents 59.8% of the units. A rationale must be provided that supports the demand for the proposed housing type mix. Furthermore, Town staff prefer to see more 2-bedroom plus den units (there are currently 12 units proposed) and one or two 3-bedroom units at a minimum size of 1,200 ft ² . Furthermore, the 1-bedroom units should be at least 1,000 ft ² , and units larger than 2-bedroom should be at least 1,200 ft ² in size.	Development- Planning, Policy and Sustainability	MDTR	<p>The applicant is proposing 83 units, and more 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units are projected. The projected unit composition is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 - 1B (~16%) • 38 - 1B+D (~46%) • 16 - 2B (~19%) • 11 - 2B+D (~13%) • 5 - 3B (6%) <p>Unit size is market driven, as determined by Project Architect. Sample unit plans are also provided on Drawing A302 of Site Plan Drawings Package by Architecture Unfolded.</p>



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

5	Further to the Control Architect's comments, which are attached, Town of Caledon staff provide the following Urban Design comments	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	The revised landscape concept now reflects our discussions with staff and addresses staff concerns related to design.
a	Please revise the design to provide reference to the original concept for two buildings through implementing the following design elements:	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Refer to response to comment no. 5
i	Terraced levels: Please terrace the building at the 2nd storey with an additional terrace, possibly at the 5th storey, which could accommodate the mechanical penthouse and larger rooftop units.	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Terraces have been expanded
ii	Centrally located double-accessed foyer: The foyer would serve as the main service corridor for accessing upper level units and centralizing building services, and allows for access from parking to commercial and town square at a centralized location. The foyer would create the image of two separate buildings and break up building massing. Public access to residential uses would be restricted to residents of the building.	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Per our discussion with Town staff on Dec 19/19 and Feb 5/20, the proposed centralized foyer is to serve condo residents only to mitigate privacy and security concerns.
b	To help demonstrate the visual fit of the building with the existing community, please provide a streetscape view (front and rear elevations) to demonstrate how the building materials and colours matches and/or compliments the existing townhouse built form that fronts Old Church Rd and the adjacent residences (i.e. Atchison Rd, Fallis Cr, and McElroy Ct).	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Front and rear elevations are provided in this submission. High quality building materials and complementary colors are proposed, including neutral toned masonry and precast stone.
c	Ground floor plan should be limited in ground floor occupancy and used for community space such as game space, party room, visitor accommodations and residential units 2nd floor and above.	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Per our discussion with Town staff of Feb 5/20, proposed residential ground floor units have been limited to the north portion of the building.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

6	The shadow studies must be revised as follows:	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	
a	Shadow Study – winter shadows demonstrate extensive shadowing impacts on surrounding properties (A602 – as proposed). The Ground floor units on east side of building would be in shade from approximately 9am onward during the day. In comparison, June shading starts at 11am. Staff are concerned with the extensive shading over the ground floor units and patios.	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Shadow study has been revised to reflect the current proposal. Ground floor units are now limited to the north portion of building, as discussed with Town staff.
b	Titles of Shadow Study need to be clarified (e.g. Dec-June should be Dec and June).	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Revised
c	A604 – title says March-September and it shows Dec and June. Please clarify. June at 19:00 hr (7pm) shows a full overcast and dark. Is this actually 7pm or a later time in the day?	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Revised
d	Once the months and times of the shadow study drawings are updated, please update the Urban Design Brief to summarize the impacts on surrounding properties and mitigation measures to reduce and where possible eliminate extended shadowing on neighbouring properties.	Urban Design, Development Planning	Architecture Unfolded	Please refer to Section 3.9 of the revised Urban Design Brief. The impact on surrounding properties is minimal. The majority of additional shadows fall on the parking lot.
7	Retail Store Parking Requirements: The applicant needs to provide a quantitative commentary/justification on the ability and capacity of nearby streets to accommodate required additional 14 parking spaces as an on-street parking. Also see the Zoning comments related to parking requirements.	Development- Planning, FIS Transportation	MDTR	Refer to response to Town comment no. 14 herein



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

8	Transportation staff is of the opinion that the rate outlined in the current CV-507 zoning (i.e. 2 spaces per dwelling unit), will reflect the parking requirements of Households in Caledon East and is not in support of reduction in Parking requirements rate. Also see the Zoning comments related to parking requirements.	Development-Planning, FIS Transportation	MDTR	Refer to response to Town comment no. 14 herein
9	The Market Opportunity and Impact Analysis peer review letter will be provided at a later date under a separate cover	Development-Planning	MDTR	The proposal has been revised to limit commercial GFA to 650 m2 and thus a peer review will no longer be required.
10	Dialogue with the applicant and appropriate Town of Caledon departments are on-going regarding the private-public partnership opportunities for the programing and use of the Town Square	Development-Planning	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
11	The revised noise study prepared by Swallow Acoustics dated April 29, 2019 is to be peer reviewed at the applicant's expense. Costs for the peer review will be forwarded under a separate cover	Development Engineering	MDTR	The peer review fee was provided to Town staff on Nov 18/19. Reliance letter from Swallow relating to the June 2020 site plan is included in this submission—the same recommendations from the April 29, 2019 report remain applicable.
Zoning By-law Amendment				
12	The draft Zoning By-law incorrectly references the existing OS exception zone as OS-509. Please revise the draft By-law to note OS-505 instead.	Planning and Development Comments	MDTR	Revised
13	According to the Site Plan statistics, the total site area is 5,985.86 m2. The OS-509 area is 1,000m2. Please clarify the "Lot Area (minimum)". Also see Zoning Staff Comments.	Planning and Development Comments	MDTR	Minimum areas for each zone revised as follows in draft by-law: (a) OS-505 area: 1,000 m2



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

				(a) (b) CV-507 area: 4,500 m2
14	Staff does not support the reduction to the parking standards. Please refer to the Zoning Comments below regarding the calculation of parking requirements for the proposed building (i.e. Building, Apartment) and non-residential uses. Consideration must be given to the parking needs for the private park that will be publicly accessible.	Planning and Development Comments	MDTR	<p>Per our discussion with Town staff on Sep 18/19, the proposed parking is as follows:</p> <p>a) <u>Residential</u>:</p> <p>135 spaces for 83 units</p> <p>a. 126 parking spaces for residents, exceeding requirements by 1 (1.5 per unit for residents = 125)</p> <p>b. 21 parking spaces for visitors, meeting requirements (0.25 per unit for visitors =21). Designated visitor parking is proposed underground and at surface.</p> <p>b) <u>Commercial</u>:</p> <p>All required 22 spaces for 650 GFA are proposed at surface (based on 1 per 30 m2 net floor area).</p>
15	Please submit a revised By-law in both word and pdf formats. Please submit the schedule to the By-law in accordance with the attached digital submission	Planning and Development Comments	MDTR	Revised and included.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	standards. The revised By-law will need to be reviewed at a By-law Review Team Meeting.			
16	Please clarify if the applicant wishes to include Open Space standards if the proposal does not comply with standards. If so, please include proposed OS standards in the draft By-law.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Proposed OS standards have been included in the draft by-law pertaining to: (1) Building Area Maximum (2) All Yards (3) Parking (4) Permitted Encroachments (restaurant patios, lights, buildings)
17	Site Plan is to include the split zoning overlay.	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded / MDTR	Included. Also shown on zoning schedule.
18	Zoning matrix is to include the zoned area for each zone.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Revised
19	Staff is suggesting that the draft zoning by-law include building setbacks and remove the S.E. Map	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Minimum building setbacks revised per our discussion of Dec 11/19 April 7/20 with staff: (a) Old Church Road – 0.7m to 1.2m (b) Atchison Drive - 2.5 m (c) OS zone boundary - 0m & 1.2m (d) from any other lot line - 7m
20	Site Plan A 101: Loading spaces in Statistics is to be removed	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Noted
21	Parking Plan 1 - A 201: Staff require a revised plan that identifies the correct accessibility parking space requirements. The note on site plan for accessibility parking space size is not correct. Please revise the note	Planning & Zoning	MDTR / Architecture Unfolded	Revised per Schedule K of By-law No. 2015-058.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	according to the by-law. Identify the number of parking spaces in each row. Staff is seeking clarification regarding the parking space located by the Mechanical/Electric Room as it appears the parking space does not meet the 5.8 metres size. Please confirm number of parking spaces in underground garage.			
22	Parking does not comply. Retail use requires 2.5 spaces for each 100m2 of net floor area. Visitor spaces are strictly for visitor parking and cannot be included for the retail requirement. Staff require a Parking space update and revised site plan to indicate that the proposal can comply with all the parking requirements.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR/ Architecture Unfolded	Separate retail and visitor parking has been provided. Please refer to response to Town comment no. 14 herein regarding retail parking requirements.
23	Indicate snow storage area.	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Indicated on site plan.
24	Staff seeking clarification if the draft zoning by-law should include S.E. map and explanation. Please refer to the attached red line suggested changes.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Building setbacks and all minimum yards required to implement the proposed design have been included in revised draft by-law.
25	Should the landscaping area be included in the CV Zone?	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Minimum landscaping area has been revised to 20%.
26	Staff seeking clarification as to privacy screens and the amount they may protrude (no dimension indicated on site plan. Staff suggesting 2 m and appears to extend 3 m).	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Draft by-law has been clarified to include 3 m.
27	Site plan to be updated to read Delivery Space and remove retail service space (noted in first submission comments)	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Noted
28	Staff seeking clarification that the location of required delivery spaces should be 3 metres from any street line and a minimum of 6 metres from any residential zone	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Draft by-law has been revised to minimum 3 m setback from street and residential zone. This



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	boundary (noted in first submission comments). Staff is concerned with the way the delivery space will function.			would permit the delivery space in the current proposed location (north of the building) or, alternatively, east of the building as a dual use to the garbage pick-up driveway should it be deemed appropriate.
29	Staff seeking clarification whether accessory buildings for the apartments on the ground floor are proposed to be permitted. Staff have added a standard to draft by-law that they are not permitted (noted in first comments).	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	No accessory buildings are proposed on ground floor and draft by-law has been revised accordingly.
30	Staff suggest a standard be included as a minimum size for the apartment units.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Unit size shall take into consideration changing market conditions.
31	Staff have a concern with the Farmer's Market proposal. Can extra parking for the Market or other public uses in the town square be accommodated? Where would vendors stop to unload their wares? Does Atchison Dr. permit on street parking? Will they require tables and chairs? Type of recreation is not identified (e.g. non-intensive, proposed patio(s) for commercial component).	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	As per our discussion with staff on Sep 18/19, no additional parking is required for the square. Further, per the draft by-law provided, restaurant patios shall be limited so as not to require additional parking.
32	Draft zoning by-law indicates that garbage is to be stored internally. Where is note on site plan indicating this?	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	See note on upper right side of The 2020 site plan. Please also refer to P1 Plan.
33	Comment response matrix (Town comments) – Item 46 requires changes if the applicants is now proposing 87 units.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	83 units are proposed. As noted in Section 5.0 after Table 5.1 of the June 26, 2019 dated TIS Addendum by Nextrans, the study intersection and proposed access is expected to continue



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

				operating with excellent level of service during peak periods. Thus, 1 egress is to remain. A copy of the 2019 Addendum is provided in this submission for reference.
34	Plan A 306 (Roof Plan) does not indicate any mechanical use or any other purposes.	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Label added to roof plan (A306).
35	Staff seeking clarification that the proposal will meet all the Open Space standards, or should there be site-specific standards included in draft zoning by-law?	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Site-specific standards have been added to Draft by-law, with respect to lighting setbacks, all yard setbacks, maximum building coverage, permitted encroachment by retail patios and parking.
36	Staff seeking clarification as to where the air conditions will be located for dwelling/apartment units on ground floor.	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Air conditions will be part of the overall system on the rooftop.
37	Should sight triangle be included in zoning by-law or does the S.E. Map identify it correctly (Region also need to address)?	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Sight triangle included in draft by-law.
38	Should by-law identify the lot frontage versus the S.E. Map?	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Lot frontage included in draft by-law
39	Per section 4.19.3 for all lots that are divided into more than one zone, compliance with standards shall be determined in accordance with the following:	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	
a	When calculating lot area, the entire lot area will be used and the most restrictive of the minimum lot area standards shall apply;	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Noted
b	When calculating lot frontage, the zone standard for the zone in which the frontage is located shall apply. If the	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	frontage extends through more than one zone, the most restrictive of the minimum lot frontage standards shall apply;			Noted
c	When calculating landscaping area, the entire lot will be used and the most restrictive of the minimum landscaping area standards shall apply;	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Noted. CV zone landscaping area has been revised to 20%
d	When calculating any other zone standard that is expressed as a percentage, it shall be calculated as a percentage of the zoned area and not as a percentage of the lot area. CV zone -+	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Noted
40	Section 5.2.19 Illumination is not indicated on site plan.	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Revised – see note on upper right side of plan.
41	Staff seeking clarification as to what structures, concrete pads, etc. are being proposed for the Open Space area and patio. Staff note that draft by-law has indicated standards and staff is seeking clarification.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Roofed shelter, unit paving and walkway are proposed. Please refer to Plan L1-02 – Enlargement of Town Square Landscape Plan by BTI.
42	Please see the attached marked-up comments on the draft Zoning By-law.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Noted and draft by-law has been revised.
43	The following tables summarize staff's comments on the proposed zoning provisions:	Planning & Zoning		
	Section 4.3 Access Regulations Complies. One entrance proposed	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Noted
	Section 5.1 Building, Apartment Does not comply 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit and 0.25 spaces per unit for visitor parking in a designated visitor parking area. Business Office	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Refer to response to Town comment no. 14 herein



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	<p>Proposed in rezoning by-law Non-residential uses 2.5 spaces for each 100m² of net floor area or portion thereof.</p> <p>Financial Institution Require per application 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. $1.5 \times 87 = 130.5$ rounded up to 131 parking spaces (dwelling units)</p> <p>Visitor $0.25 \times 87 = 21.75$ round up to 22 parking spaces Non-residential uses Staff note that the zoning table on A101 does not reflect correctly what is proposed</p>			
	<p>5.2.6 Barrier Free Parking Does not comply. Site plan must be revised as per Schedule K and shown on site plan the correct accessibility design. Space A and B must be identified</p>	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Revised as per Schedule K
	<p>5.2.10 Parking for Outdoor Patios Seeking clarification as to proposed patio size (for restaurant, any other uses). If at this time no outdoor patio is proposed staff want to advise that parking may be a concern.</p>	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Draft by-law has been revised to limit restaurant patios so as not to require additional parking.
	<p>5.2.12 Size of Parking Spaces Parking spaces on ground level comply with 2.75 x 6 m. Parking spaces in underground parking comply. The width and length of a parking space shall be measured exclusive of the width or length of any painted lines marking such parking space and noted on site plan.</p>	Planning & Zoning	MDTR / Architecture Unfolded	Draft by-law is seeking an amendment to permit width and length of a parking space to include painted lines.
	<p>5.2.13 Width of Aisles Complies plan indicates 6 metres between parking spaces</p>	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Noted



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	5.2.14 With of Access Ramps and Driveways Seeking clarification	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Access ramp and driveways are both 6m wide as shown on Site Plan (A101) and P1 plan (A201).
	5.2.16 Surface Treatment Complies	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Noted
	5.2.17 Parking Garages Seeking clarification	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Confirmed
	5.2.18 Parking Area Location on a Non-Residential Lot Complies Per site plan no parking spaces are proposed near any building or structure	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Noted
	Section 5.2.19 Illumination Does not comply. Site plan to reflect this provision.	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Complies with height and setback from lot line.
	5.3.2 Loading Space Requirements Zoning By-law indicates NIL (will comply after By-law is approved)	Planning & Zoning	MDTR	Noted
	5.4 Delivery Restriction on Use of Land, Buildings and Structures	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	1 provided per Table 5.4,
	5.4.2 Delivery Space Requirements Zoning By-law indicates 1 per building per lot (will comply after By-law is approved, site plan to be amended as to read delivery space)	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Delivery space is labelled
	5.4.3 Size Appears to comply.	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Confirmed
	5.4.5 Exclusive Use of a Delivery Space Seeking clarification staff have a concern as to the access delivery space and how close it is to the entrance	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Delivery space is over 8m from access and drop-off area is provided immediately east.
	5.4.6 Location of Required Delivery Spaces Required <i>delivery spaces</i> shall be minimum of 3 m from any <i>street line</i> and a minimum of 6m from any <i>Residential zone</i> boundary. Seeking clarification.	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Confirmed



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	5.4.7 Surface Treatment	Planning & Zoning	Architecture Unfolded	Complies
Landscape				
44	Please provide a minimum 3.0m planting strip width (minimum) along all lot lines adjacent to a residential use to permit placement of trees. This was noted within the 1st submission comment review and the comment response matrix notes a 3.0m planting strip is provided, however currently the 1:200 L1 Landscape Plan does not reflect a 3m planting strip. Please revise accordingly.	Open Space	Architecture Unfolded BTI	Planting strip revised with the exception of areas subject to easements.
45	<u>Previous comment:</u> Please confirm a permanent public easement over the Open Space (OS) zone shall be provided along with ownership retained by the condominium corporation. <u>Applicant's response:</u> This has been discussed with the Town and we await further direction. <u>New comment:</u> Please confirm if the applicant has any objection to a public easement over the Open Space zone.	Open Space	MDTR	Refer to staff comment 10 herein from Development Planning. Ownership of the square will be retained by the condo corp and restricted public access will be provided.
46	<u>Previous comment:</u> Please illustrate on all landscape drawings and within the legend of the title bar, the extents of the underground parking area. <u>Applicant's response:</u> The extents of UG is noted and illustrated as per the architects site plan. <u>New comment:</u> The extents of underground parking not provided on landscape drawing(s) – please update the landscape plan(s) accordingly.	Open Space	BTI	Revised
47	<u>Previous comment:</u> Please clarify and provide relevant details as to how the outdoor garbage area on the North East side of the site will be screened. <u>Applicant's response:</u> This side of the property is screened with proposed columnar trees pf Pyramidal Oaks and existing	Open Space	BTI	The revised landscape concept proposes trees along eastern lot boundary (Acer rubrum 'Burgundy Belle') in addition to the existing wooden fence.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	wood fence. <u>New comment:</u> The wood fence noted is on private property of the adjacent residential home owner and therefore cannot be considered screening on site. Please provide an opaque garbage enclosure as per the Town of Caledon Site Plan Control Manual.			
Stormwater Management and Servicing Comments				
48	The runoff up to the 100-year storm to 5-year predevelopment levels. The runoff The Site Servicing Plan prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., dated February 2018, is to be revised to address the following:	Development – Engineering	Stantec	
a	Indicate how all the area drains are connected to the ultimate outlet: Comments provided by Pluribus Corp noted that a mechanical plan will be provided separately. Plan is required to be submitted to development engineering prior to site plan approval.	Development – Engineering	Stantec	Storm events up to 100 years will be captured on site for the area south of the building. The runoff from the building and area north of the building drains uncontrolled from the site. The controlled and uncontrolled minor runoff from the site drains by the storm sewer system along Atchison Drive to the SWM pond. A schematic deisgin of the storm sewer system connecting the SE drain to the swm tank and then to Manhole 116. the internal plubming will be confirmed by the mechanical engineer.
49	Comments on the stormwater management report regarding the proposed runoff coefficients and potential for impacts to the downstream infrastructure remain outstanding. No on-site controls are proposed for the	Development – Engineering	Stantec	



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	catchment area north of the building or for the building footprint. The catchment area south of the building is proposed to use an underground storage tank to control coefficients noted in the SWM report for the north and south catchment areas is 0.75 and the building catchment is 0.9. The subdivision level SWM report assumed a runoff coefficient of 0.7 for the entire site. The footprint of the underground parking covers the entire site which will restrict infiltration and potentially require the use of a higher runoff coefficient. Considering the above, the SWM report is to be revised to address the following:			
a	Demonstrate how the 0.75 runoff coefficient was calculated for the catchment area north of the building. Include commentary on the underground parking structure, fill placed over the structure, landscape areas, parking and other hard surface areas, etc.	Development – Engineering	Stantec	<p>Stantec's responses from second submission:</p> <p>According to the Town of Caledon standards for future industrial, medium-high density residential or commercial development, a runoff coefficient of 0.75 should be used.</p> <p>The runoff coefficient has been revised based on the latest site plan, which includes paved and landscaped areas. The area-weighted runoff coefficient of the area north of the building is 0.84. See design calculations in the FSR.</p>



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

b	Demonstrate that there will not be any impacts to the downstream storm sewers due to the increase in runoff coefficient from the site from 0.7 to 0.75-0.9.	Development – Engineering	Stantec	<p>Stantec's responses from second submission:</p> <p>According to the Town of Caledon standards for future industrial, medium-high density residential or commercial development, a runoff coefficient of 0.75 should be used.</p> <p>The runoff coefficient has been revised based on the latest site plan, which includes paved and landscaped areas. The area-weighted runoff coefficient of the area north of the building is 0.84. See design calculations in the FSR.</p>
c	Demonstrate that the subdivision SWM pond has sufficient capacity to accept the uncontrolled runoff from the site with the increased 0.75-0.9 runoff coefficient.	Development – Engineering	Stantec	<p>Stantec's response from second submission:</p> <p>In Section 4.3 of the FSR the hydrologic impact of the proposed development on the existing SWM pond has been discussed.</p>
Proposed Site Plan Application				
50	Please note that the Town will require that prior to offering units for sale and in a place readily available to the public, the owner will display information regarding	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Pluribus Corp.	Noted



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	universal design options that may be available for purchase within the development prior to offering units for sale			
51	Accessible parking space requirements shall comply with Traffic By-law 2015-058 – Schedule “K”	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Pluribus Corp.	Revised
52	Accessible Aisles on each side of accessible parking spaces	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded	Revised
53	Lighting on exterior routes of travel shall comply with the Town’s lighting standard	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded	Revised
54	If a Community Mail Box is installed, the area shall be well lit via a light standard and a curb depression from the sidewalk and/or roadway to the mail box landing area	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded	Mailbox proposed inside residential lobby
55	Site Plan shall indicate that that the exterior travel routes (sidewalks) servicing the building shall be a minimum of 1.5 m wide as per the Design of Public Spaces legislation of the AODA, pertaining to exterior travel routes	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded BTI	Clear, level 1.5m wide exterior pathways have been provided
56	Site Plan shall outline snow storage areas on the plan to ensure the accessibility provisions on the site are maintained	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded	Snow storage has been added to site plan. Total of 160 m2 provided on north and east side of site.
57	Site Plan shall indicate that all main entrances and the res/firefighter entrance be barrier-free with an automatic sliding door or push button operating feature	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded	Revised
58	If patio is to be used as an outdoor public use eating area, please follow Section 80.16 and 80.17 of the IASR	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded	Revised



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

59	Site Plan shall indicate the appropriate curb depressions be identified on walkways and lifted areas.	Legislative Services (Accessibility)	Architecture Unfolded / Stantec	See revised Grading Plan
60	The Grading Plan prepared by Stantec Consulting Ltd., dated February 2018, is to be revised to address the following:	Engineerin	Stantec	
a	Regional approval for the proposed emergency overland flow route is required; Confirmation of regional approval of flows to Old Church Road is required prior to site plan approval.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Noted
b	Indicate areas where curbs are depressed and where they are full barrier curbs. Grading plan to clearly label drop curb locations and/or provide symbol or linetype in legend for drop curbs. TC and BC elevations to be noted for the start and end of drop curbs. Plan to note OPSD number for different curb types and to note location of transitions between curb type.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Drop curbs identified with a different line type on Grading Plan
61	The revised Light Trespass Analysis prepared by RTG Systems Inc, dated April 30, 2019 includes illumination values of 7.4, 5.0, and 5.7 lux on the north property line then immediately change to zero. Existing fencing on the property line is chain link fence. Consultant is to confirm the lux values are correct and is to provide an explanation for how values have been calculated at the north property line.	Development Engineering	RTG	<p>1.8m privacy fence proposed for property line where currently does not exist.</p> <p>Light trespass analysis includes a 1.8m privacy fence around shared perimeter of development, including north property line.</p> <p>PHOTO-1 shows lux values of 4.4, 4.5, 4.75.5 at north parking spaces near property line.</p>



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

62	The revised noise study notes that mitigation measures may be required for the underground parking exhaust fan and mechanical equipment. Mitigation measures are dependent on the sound levels of the equipment is selected. Be advised that clauses will be included in the site plan agreement to require certification from the noise consultant of the equipment installed on site and any mitigation measures installed prior to release of engineering securities.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Noted
63	Separate construction management plans are to be provided for foundation construction works and for above ground works.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Construction Management for foundation works and above ground works are included in this submission
64	Many items requested by the Town to be included in the CMP were noted as “will be provided separately”. Note that the CMP is to address all requirements previously advised prior to SPA approval. Outstanding items still to be addressed include the following:	Development Engineering	Stantec	CMP has been revised.
a	Construction material delivery and storage areas;	Development Engineering		Added
b	Excavation, hoarding and tie back systems;	Development Engineering		Shoring design (by others) will be provided under a separate cover.
c	The report is to indicate how the storage tank will be drained;	Development Engineering		Added
d	Construction crane operations;	Development Engineering		Will be provided under a separate cover by others.
e	Emergency contact info.	Development Engineering		Added
65	Add the following notes to the CMP:	Development Engineering		



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

66	Working Hours for site works are to be 7am to 7pm, Monday to Friday. No work is to take place on statutory holidays.	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	
a	No off-loading of equipment or materials within the Town Right-of-Way	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	Added
b	No storage of equipment or materials is permitted within the Town Right-of-Way	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	Added
c	Site parking is to conform to all Town parking regulations.	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	Added
d	No reversing without a flagman present.	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	Added
e	The flagman is to be a full-time dedicated person.	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	Added
f	Workers and delivery vehicles are required to follow the Town idling by-law BL-2014-078. Idling for longer than 2 minutes is prohibited.	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	Added
67	Revise ESC plans to show separate ESC plans for foundation construction and for above ground works.	Development Engineering	Stantec	ESC plans are revised. Separate plans for below and above ground are included in this submission.
68	Revise the ESC notes to be consistent with the latest version of the Town ESC notes. The latest version of the ESC notes is attached to this document.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Revised
69	The proposed temporary lot riser drain shown in the SE corner of the property shown on the ESC plan appears to encroach into the utility easement in the SE corner of the site. Confirm works will not impact the utility easement and transformer or relocate the riser drain.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Revised
70	Revise the General Notes and Details Plan to address the following:	Development Engineering	Stantec	



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

a	Revise notes to reflect latest Town Standard Notes. Town Standard General Notes are attached to this document.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Latest Town Notes have been included.
b	Many of the notes address requirements for road work within the Town of Caledon. Currently proposed works in the ROW will be limited to construction of entrances, sidewalk connections, and service connections. Revise notes as required to be applicable to internal site works.	Development Engineering	Stantec	The watermeter chamber has been moved to the north side of the underground garage due to insufficient space for the watermeter chamber at the existing watermain service connection location. Due to this new water service connection these notes will apply.
c	Clarify in notes or in the grading plan the types of curbs proposed to be constructed on site. Currently plans note curbs are to conform to OPSD 600.040 (standard curb with gutters). Clarify if OPSD 600.110 (barrier curb) is proposed to be used for curbing internal to the site. Provide details and notes as required to clarify the scope of work.	Development Engineering	Stan	Grading Notes and OPSD detail have been included on the General Notes & Details drawing. All internal curbs are barrier curbs.
d	Clarify where the subdrain is proposed to be installed on site.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Detail has been removed.
71	Grading Plans are to be revised to address the following:	Development Engineering	Stantec	
a	Provide additional existing grades 10m outside of property limits.	Development Engineering	Stantec	As discussed with staff, Cole grading plan was used for existing grading information
b	Provide cross section for retaining wall at east property limits. Show any proposed railing on fence. Note that plans for walls greater than 1.0m are required to be stamped by a licensed engineer.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Cross section are provided on General Notes and Details drawing. Max wall height is less tha 1.0m.
c	Show limits of sidewalk to be replaced at entrance or confirm exiting sidewalk is 200mm thick at entrance.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Construction limit is shown on the plan.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

d	Provide a cross section showing the proposed foundation construction in the NW corner of the property to ensure the foundation is entirely within private property. Limits of the underground parking in the NW corner of the property are less than 1m from the property limits. Note that the works for the underground parking including any piles, shoring, tiebacks, etc., are not to encroach into the Town ROW.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Shoring design (by others) will be provided under a separate cover which will ensure that there will be no tie backs within the Town ROW.
e	Provide a cross section showing the proposed foundation construction in the SE corner of the property to ensure foundation does not impact existing utilities. Confirm if relocation of the existing transformer is required for foundation construction.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Shoring design (by others) will be provided under a separate cover that will ensure that there will be no impact to the foundation of the existing transformer.
72	Town Development Engineering have reviewed the Phase One Environmental Site Assessment prepared by G2S Environmental Consulting Inc. and have no concerns with the submitted report.	Development Engineering	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
73	Future submissions are to include a revised engineering cost estimate to address all changes to the site works.	Development Engineering	Stantec	Cost estimate is included with this submission.
74	<u>Previous comment: Please label with directional arrows on all landscape drawings, the entrance and exit from the underground parking garage. Applicant's response: This landscape plan is based on the architects site plan information. New comment: The directional arrows not provided –please update base and/or plans accordingly.</u>	Landscape	BTI.	Access and exit points (pedestrian and vehicular) labelled on drawing L1-01 with a note.
75	<u>Previous comment: Please incorporate strata cells, silva cells or approved equal into the design so as to ensure adequate soil volumes for trees are provided above the underground parking garage. Applicant's Response: Soil infrastructure cell note has been added to provide where</u>	Landscape	BTI.	Soil cells are not proposed in this design.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	<u>required for trees to meet soil volumes. New comment: A general note on the landscape drawings is not sufficient detail to review for the technical aspects of site plan approval. Please provide exact locations, dimensions and layout information for the soil cell areas proposed on site – please see comment #90 below. Alternatively, if soil cells are not thought necessary, please illustrate how appropriate soil volumes will be achieved above the parking garage area on site.</u>			
76	<u>Previous comment: Please specify make, model, colours and paving patterns for the unit pavers proposed. Applicant’s response: It has been noted on the paver detail that the colour chosen to be the same as or to compliment that paver colour in the public right of way. New comment: Please specify exact make model and colour of unit paver(s) proposed – please see comment #95 below.</u>	Landscape	BTI.	See Drawing L3-01 by Baker Turner for exact make, model, color and paving pattern of all unit pavers proposed.
77	<u>Previous comment: Please label all fencing on site, both existing and proposed, including type and height. Applicant’s response: All fencing has been identified as per architects site plan. New comment: Please update the landscape plans accordingly.</u>	Landscape	BTI.	All fencing labelled on drawings L1-01 and L1-02 and detailed on drawing L3-01 by Baker Turner.
78	<u>Previous comment: Please identify on the landscape plans the existing armour stone and perennial planting treatment on the corner of Old Church Road and Atchison Drive. Please clarify if they are to remain (incorporated into design) or be removed. Applicant’s response: The landscape plan indicates the existing armourstone. New comment: Coordination is required with the Town to determine if armourstone is to remain. Please clarify if the armour stone and associated planting</u>	Landscape	BTI.	Revised landscape concept includes retaining existing armourstone wall, adding ornamental planting and replacing existing coniferous trees with deciduous trees.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	<u>is to be removed or incorporated into the new design for the Open Space portion of the site. Please update the landscape plans accordingly.</u>			
79	<u>Previous comment: Please identify any existing trees for removal within the site or regional right of way, noting common name, Latin name and diameter at breast height (dbh). Applicant's response: No tree removals are proposed with this submission. Further coordination is required with the Town to determine if existing trees are to remain. New comment: Please clarify how, if the existing coniferous trees along Old Church Road are to remain, the trees will be appropriately protected during construction to ensure sustained health of the trees. Please update the landscape plans accordingly to show tree species and dbh.</u>	Landscape	BTI.	The existing coniferous trees along Old Church Road will be removed to accommodate construction per arborist drawings/reports (not provided by Baker Turner)
80	<u>Previous comment: Please revise the layout of plant material within the 2 plant beds on the North side of the condominium to eliminate sod and provide a continuous plant bed of plant material. Applicant's response: Plantings on the North side removed due to new layout site conditions. New comment: Please explore opportunities on site to incorporate foundation plantings at the edges of the building to soften the buildings presence – please see comment #86 below.</u>	Landscape	BTI.	Planting has been revised per the revised site plan layout. See drawings L1-01 and L1-02 by Baker Turner.
81	<u>Previous comment: Please provide a complete construction set for review, following Landscape Architectural industry standards. i.e. Cover Sheet, Layout Plan, Planting Plan, Grading Plan, Construction Details, etc. Applicant's response: Please reference plans by others for further information. New comment: Additional information and/or plans are required within the</u>	Landscape	BTI.	A complete detailed design set of drawings has been submitted with this submission



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	<u>landscape drawings to provide sufficient detail to review for the technical aspects of site plan approval, in particular the Open Space portion of the site.</u>			
82	Please clarify if the noted 3 conceptual designs for the Open Space portion of the site are still be forth coming. Please note that these 3 concepts were discussed via conference call on February 28, 2018. In addition to clarifying the design intent of the town square portion of the site, these concepts were requested for review prior to proceeding to detailed design.	Landscape	BTI.	The applicant has provided 3 design concepts with respect to the square and these were discussed on Feb 5/20. The complete detailed design set reflects the “hybrid concept” directed by the Town.
83	Please clarify with reference to the landscape design, how the town square park space is to be animated, utilized and sub-divided into smaller programable areas. Please clearly explain this in a succinct section of the urban design brief, explaining the design rational and the expected programing of the town square in relation to the design.	Landscape	BTI.	The revised landscape concept reflects our discussions with staff to date and addresses staff concerns related to design.
84	Please note that it is the expectation of the Town of Caledon for the town square portion of the site to have a high degree of detailing, craftsmanship and strong design principles.	Landscape	Plurbis Corp. BTI.	The revised landscape concept reflects our discussions with staff to date addresses staff concerns related to design.
85	Please verify the scale of the L1 Landscape Plan. Currently the plan notes a 1:200 scale, with 6.2m typ. being shown on the South edge of the site from building edge to planting bed. When measured with a scale at 1:200, this dimension shows as 5.0m.	Landscape	BTI.	Drawing L1-01 is at 1:300 while the enlargement on L1-02 is 1:150
86	Please provide plant material in the form of foundation plantings around the exterior of the 5-story mixed use building, to soften the edge of the building. Please explore options for climbing plant material to be incorporated into these planting areas.	Landscape	BTI.	Refer to revised Landscape Concept



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

87	Within the landscape drawings, please illustrate terraces of the building as dashed lines or utilizing an alternative method, as opportunities exist below the terraces for planting and/or paving options to be detailed within the landscape plans.	Landscape	BTI.	Refer to Revised Landscape Concept
88	Please explore opportunities to incorporate the same unit paving application as shown on the South edge of the building around the West and North side of the building. Please note the materials surfacing type along the East and West edge of the building is not currently specified. Please clarify.	Landscape	BTI.	All landscaping, hard or soft, is shown up to the building face.
89	Please remove the following note from the landscape plans, as soil cells and soil volumes should be addressed through Comment #90 below: Note: soil infrastructure cells to be used where needed to meet minimum soil volume requirements, (typ)	Landscape	BTI.	Removed
90	Please indicate on the landscape plans, or provide a separate plan noting the locations and dimensions of the silva-cells, strata-cells or approved equal on site. A detail outlining the installation of the soil cells should also be provided, noting depth of soil cells and how these soil cells work in relation to the concrete parking garage. Please consult with the appropriate manufacture regarding the design and construction documentation required for appropriate installation. Alternatively, if soil cells are not thought necessary, please illustrate how appropriate soil volumes will be achieved above the parking garage area on site.	Landscape	BTI.	Soil infrastructure is not proposed as part of the revised landscape concept.
91	Please show on the landscape plans the locations of all man holes (MH) and catch basins (CB) on site. Please	Landscape	Stantec BTI.	Servicing plans shown on landscape plans



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	identify both CB's and MH's within the legend of the landscape plans with a distinct symbol.			
92	Please provide a separate irrigation plan or note the location of all irrigation lines and sprinkler heads on the landscape plans.	Landscape	Pluribus Corp.	To be discussed. Irrigation plan may not be needed.
93	Please provide a separate electrical plan or note the location of all light standards, illuminated bollards and/or light fixtures on the landscape plans.	Landscape	BTI. RTG	Refer to Site Lighting Plan by RTG.
94	Please identify the property line within the legend of all landscape drawings, utilizing a unique and distinguishable line weight.	Landscape	BTI.	Revised on landscape plans
95	Please specify a make, model and colour of the unit pavers proposed on site. Please update the D5/L2 (Proposed Unit Pavers) Detail accordingly.	Landscape	BTI.	Revised on landscape plans
96	Please specify polymeric sand for use between the unit pavers on site, for all paving areas.	Landscape	BTI.	Per detail
97	Please provide a detail illustrating installation of unit pavers on top of the concrete parking structure, inclusive of bedding material, top of parking structure and paving material.	Landscape	BTI.	See drawing L3-01 by Baker Turner
98	Please indicate the paving patterns proposed on site for the unit pavers. Please provide a detail illustrating the paving pattern. Please update the legend of the landscape plans accordingly as the current legend specifies "Paver A" and "Paver B".	Landscape	BTI.	See drawing L1-01, L1-02 and L3-01 by Baker Turner.
99	If applicable to the design, please add a detail for tree grates, including the make, model, colour and type. If applicable, please include a line item within the Landscape Cost Estimate for the tree grates.	Landscape	BTI.	Not applicable
100	Within the D8/L2 Detail (Proposed Garbage Receptacle) please specify surface mount.	Landscape	BTI.	Not applicable



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

101	Within the D7/L2 Detail (Proposed Bench) please specify surface mount.	Landscape	BTI.	See drawing L3-01 by Baker Turner
102	Within the D6/L2 Detail (Proposed Bike Rack) please specify surface mount.	Landscape	BTI.	See drawing L3-01 by Baker Turner
103	Please remove the “or approved equal” reference statement from the following details:	Landscape	BTI.	Removed. See drawing L3-01 by Baker Turner
a	D5/L2 – Proposed Unit Pavers	Landscape	BTI.	See response above
b	D6/L2 – Proposed Bike Rack	Landscape	BTI.	See response above
c	D7/L2 – Proposed Bench	Landscape	BTI.	See response above
d	Construction fencing and hoarding;	Landscape	BTI.	See CMP by Stantec.
104	Please provide a line item within the Landscape Cost Estimate to account for the silva-cells, strata-cells or approved equal soil cell technology if proposed on site.	Landscape	BTI.	Soil cells are not proposed in this design.
105	Please revise the title block of the landscape drawings to specify “Atchison Drive” as opposed to “Atchison Blvd” currently noted.	Landscape	Architecture Unfolded BTI	Revised
106	Please specify snow storage areas on the landscape plans.	Landscape	BTI.	Shown on site plan
107	Please update and resubmit the Landscape Letter of Conformance with the next submission. Please note the SPA number within the updated Landscape Letter of Conformance.	Landscape	BTI.	Revised
108	Please remove the following note from the landscape plans, as Region of Peel right-of-way works should be addressed through Comment #109 below: Landscape	Landscape	BTI.	Removed



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	treatment beyond property line is shown for reference purposes only.			
109	Please note that prior to issuance of site plan approval, the applicant is to obtain sign off from the Region of Peel for all proposed landscape works within the regional right-of-way (ROW). Record of Region of Peel approval for ROW works is to be submitted to the Town of Caledon.	Landscape	BTI.	Noted
110	Please specify a materials type for the three at grade patio areas along the North-East edge of the site.	Landscape	BTI.	Concrete paving (natural and coloured) per landscape drawings by Baker Turner.
111	Please provide two sectional drawings through the Town Square (Open Space) portion of the site. One section should capture the North-South axis of the space and the other East-West. Please ensure these two sectional drawings have sufficient detail to illustrate the construction of the space atop the underground parking garage.	Landscape	BTI.	See drawing L2-01 by Baker Turner
112	Please note that is general notes are provided above and beyond the Town of Caledon standard notes, please ensure there are no conflicts with the Town of Caledon standard landscape notes.	Landscape	BTI.	Noted
113	Cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication ('CIL') is a requirement of the site plan process. The applicant must pay CIL prior to the issuance of a building permit. In order to determine the amount of CIL payment, the applicant shall have a market value appraisal completed for the subject property. The long form appraisal must be prepared by an AACI certified appraiser. The Town will review the appraisal and if there is a concern about the value of the appraisal then a peer review of the report	Landscape	Pluribus Corp.	Please note cash in lieu of parkland dedication was paid at registration of the Chateaux subdivision.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	may be required. The peer review shall be done at the cost of the applicant. An appraisal is only valid for six months, so the applicant should ensure that an appraisal is done at an appropriate time in the site plan process so as to not delay the issuance of a building permit or cause an updated appraisal to be done. CIL payment shall be based on 5% of the approved appraised value of the subject lands.			
114	Please revise and re-submit a cost estimate based on the proposed landscape materials and comments provided above. The cost estimate needs to be originally stamped, signed and dated by a full member of the OALA in good standing. The amount of landscape securities the Town requires is based on 100% of the total cost of the landscape works.	Landscape	BTI	Included in this submission.
115	Please note that for final approval, two full size sets of landscape plans with an original stamp, signature and date are required.	Landscape	BTI	Noted
116	As part of the next submission, please provide a detailed letter from the landscape architect summarizing how each of the above items have been addressed.	Landscape	BTI	Please refer to this matrix.

2

Urban Design Peer Review Comments

MBPD Inc.
May 24, 2019

Moiz Behar
Office: (905)470-6273 | Email: moiz@mbpd.ca

Comment No.	Comment:	Comment by:	Response by:	Response:
Urban Design Brief				
1	In the Urban Design Brief – Addendum Letter, prepared by Architecture unfolded, dated April 30, 2019, the applicant has stated that they have revised the date. Therefore, we no further comment. We recommend that staff should keep the addendum letter along with the initial Brief.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Revised urban design brief is provided with this submission.
2	The Urban Design Brief – Addendum Letter, prepared by Architecture unfolded, dated April 30, 2019, provides the sustainable building practices in keeping with the TWDG. Therefore, we have no further comments on this matter. We recommend that staff should keep the addendum letter along with the initial brief.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Noted
Site Plan and Landscape Plan				
3	The building has been revised and a setback of 4.5 metres is now provided from the property line. We have no further comments.	MBPD	MDTR	Building setbacks have been revised to 0.7m-1.2m from Old Church Rd, 2.5m from Atchison Dr, and 0m and 1.2m from the square boundary, as per our discussion of Dec 19/19 with Town staff and MBPD and April 7/20 discussion with Town staff.
4	A 3 metre landscape buffer has been provided; therefore, we have no further comments in this regard. The Comment-Response Matrix for Control	MBPD		Noted



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	Architect Comments dated May 2019 indicates that a wooden fence is located adjacent the garbage staging area and that garbage collection is exempt from impact assessment, as such we will defer to staff in this regard.			
5	Details have been provided on drawing L-2 Notes and Details and states that the pavers will match or complement the existing design within the municipal right-of-way. Therefore, we have no further comments.	MBPD	MDTR	Revised landscape concept included with this submission
6	A 3.2 metre landscape buffer is now indicated on the site plan and landscape plan drawings. Therefore, we have no further comments.	MBPD	MDTR	Noted
7	This information has now been removed. We have no further comments.	MBPD	MDTR	Noted
Building Plans, Massing and Elevations				
8	Generally, a mixed-use, 5 storey mid-rise building, with a public square, is an appropriate urban design response in this location. The building massing and façade cladding materials and treatments provide a contemporary design aesthetic. However, we recommend the following:	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Revised site plan package included with this submission.
	The applicant has only provided a step back at the 5th floor. We continue to recommend the applicant provide a step back at the 4th floor.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Step back at 4th floor has been provided on the east side of the building
	The applicant has corrected drawing A404, however it is still not clear what the colour and material of the building is between material 8 and 9. The building facades have been revised and are improved, primarily through the use of window	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Material is labelled; soldier courses are labelled on the elevations



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	wall/curtain wall glazing. Also, in keeping with out previous comments, we encourage the applicant to use soldier coursing.			
	The facades have been revised. However, canopies have not been indicated, which we continue to recommend.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Canopies have been labelled on the elevations and shown on site plan
	The drawings have been revised to show the residential entrance off Atchison Dr. only. The current plans are not clear, or detailed enough, to assess the treatment for this entrance, which should be emphasized particularly as seen from Atchison Dr. The applicant should add additional information for review.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Entrance from Atchison is marked with a canopy this is a secondary/pedestrian entrance. The main entrance is the through lobby between the town square and the parking area
	Generally, the elevation and renderings have improved in keeping with our previous comments, however, we note the following items noted below need to be coordinated:	MBPD		Renderings have been included in the drawings package
9	The floor plans, elevations and renderings do not match. Elevations and renderings show rounded corner treatments for the elevations facing Old Church Road and Atchison Dr., whereas the floor plans do not show the same information.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Revised site plan package included with this submission.
10	South Elevation drawing A403 shows taller windows and different material treatment/colour versus the rendering (drawing A405). The applicant should clarify.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Revised site plan package included with this submission.
11	On West Elevation drawing A403, the applicant should clarify what the light brown material is on the ground floor elevation above the retail entrance. If the intent was to create canopies	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Precast stone



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	projecting beyond the façade tis would provide an appropriate solution for retail entrances.			
12	We recommend that the cladding of the rooftop mechanical penthouse be the same/complimentary in colour and material used on the main face of the building.	MBPD	Architecture Unfolded	Currently proposed to be dark grey EIFS

3

Public
Comments



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

Public Comments Response Matrix June 18, 2019		
Comment No.	Comment:	Response:
Oral Submissions		
1	Christopher Wapole noted that he moved to Caledon East for the small-town feel. Mr. Wapole stated he believes the project detracts from the original intentions of the community. He expressed concern with the parking study and indicated that in his opinion every homeowner owns 2 vehicles and there is not enough parking proposed. Mr. Wapole further expressed concerns with potential noise emanating from the building mechanical devices.	The subject lands are designated "Special Use Area C: Community Focus Area" which envisions a mixed-use building with higher density. The noise impact study concluded that the mechanical penthouse will meet applicable MECP guidelines.
2	Kathleen Killen inquired as to garbage pickup mitigation for both the residential and commercial units. Ms. Killen noted she started a petition one year ago in opposition to the proposed development. She indicated that she feels the residents in Caledon East are not supportive of the development. She read several comments received in the petition that related to traffic, garbage, and noise.	The Region requires private garbage collection for the commercial units - a private hauler will be retained for services. Residential garbage pickup will be provided by the Region. Noise related to garbage collection is exempt under MECP criteria as it is a public service and the same service is provided to the existing residences in the vicinity.
3	Robert Calazirone expressed concerns relating to the units being used for rental income, and the possibility that the properties will not be maintained.	Condominium tenure is proposed for this development and property management for the condo will be retained accordingly.
4	Geoff Lurkin expressed that in his opinion the current live work units are not being used for businesses and that the additional retail space in the application will not get used. Mr. Lurkin compared the proposal to the first proposal presented at meeting held by the developer noting the increase in units.	It is our understanding that the existing live work units located along Old Church Road are intended for home occupations which are smaller business offices, whereas the proposed commercial component as part of this development proposal is intended for larger business uses,



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

		including retail service uses. The proposal has been reduced to 83 residential units.
5	Julie Vengroff inquired as to whether the units are condominium units or an apartment building with rental space. The topic of garbage removal, and operations of the building was discussed. She expressed traffic concerns with transport trucks operating on Old Church Road, as well as safety concerns with respect to the town square and it operating in the evening.	The proposed development consists of condominium units. Garbage is stored underground and collected on the ground floor on garbage collection day.
6	Tony Cuccione expressed concerns relating to the safety of children as the school bus stop is located at the exit of the proposed development. He stated that in his opinion the proposed development is to not attractive to seniors and first-time home buyers. Mr. Cuccione expressed that the design does not fit with Caledon East.	The transportation consultant is of the opinion that there are no sight line concerns at the entrance of the proposed development. The proposed development offers a diverse housing option that currently does not exist in the community and is attractive to first-time home buyers as well as seniors looking to downsize. The design has been revised following discussions with Town staff to reflect a compatible, high quality design.
7	Doug Leslie stated that in his opinion the presenter did a poor job presenting the proposal and noted issues remaining from the previous project at the site. He expressed concerns with traffic, parking, noise and the height of the proposed building.	The proposal has been revised to meet Town parking requirements. The transportation study did not conclude significant traffic impacts. The design of the building has been revised to be more compatible and incorporate additional setbacks from adjoining properties.
8	Marta Kozakowska sought clarification relating to the minimum requirements and specifications.	The applicant is working with Town staff to seek technical amendments with regards to zoning to facilitate the design of the square and functionality of the mixed residential and commercial building. Notwithstanding this, the applicant feels the proposed development represents good planning and provides a new but compatible form of development for Caledon East.
9	Bill McEwen sought clarification with the uses of the main floor space and whether a new traffic study would be conducted to reflect the recent traffic and proposed traffic congestion.	The ground floor includes proposed retail units fronting Old Church Road and Atchison Drive, proposed residential units on the north end of the building, as well as a centralized



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

		condo lobby and condo amenity room. A revised traffic impact study is part of the resubmission and speaks to Town staff concerns.
10	Christopher Wapole sought clarification with respect to the visitor parking proposed for both the commercial and residential uses. He indicated that he believes 35 spots is not enough to accommodate both uses.	The revised proposal is meeting the Town's parking requirements for both residential and commercial uses, at a rate of 1.75 space per residential unit and 1 space per 30 m2 of commercial net floor area.
11	Wayne Noble sought clarification relating to the bicycle storage and whether each unit would have their own or if the storage consists of one main location. He also inquired on the amount of Development Charges that would come directly to the Town from the proposal.	Outdoor temporary bicycle parking is provided and one main location is provided for underground storage. The forecasted development charges from the proposal to be approx. \$4,932,883.50.
12	Sarah Reginato expressed concerns with the lack of green space in the proposed development.	The proposed public square will be accessible to the public and is intended to be a gathering space enabling socialization.
Written Submissions		
13	The Town should reconsider the 5 storey mixed use building that has been proposed by Paul King due to the negative impact it will have on the community. A major issue that is of concern for the residents that live on McElroy Court is the impact of garbage storage and disposal for such a large building with an extensive number of units (residential and commercial). The amount of garbage 87 residential units, and multiple large commercial retail spaces can create will only exacerbate the existing rodent problem in Town and attract more pests including raccoons and skunks. The structure proposed does not coincide with the aesthetics of the Town. The existing neighbourhoods are more traditional whereas this new structure is contemporary modern which looks out of place with the rest of the Town. Caledon East is a family oriented community, which is the exact opposite of the proposed apartment building. The developer stated at the previous town	The applicant has worked with Town staff to revise the development proposal to reflect a high quality design that is compatible with Caledon East. The unit mix has been revised to provide three bedroom units and more two bedroom units. The dwelling units will also be sized to be marketable and suitable for first-time homebuyers and individuals looking to downsize. Garbage storage is proposed in the underground garage and, as per Regional requirements, collection will be conducted by private haulers for commercial use and by the Region for residential use.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	meeting that the apartment complex will be an attraction for existing empty nesters looking to downsize but remain within the town and for new families starting out. The bachelor sized units, being less than 800 sq ft, will not be suitable for families, but rather single dwellers. This contradicts the proposed clientele the developer states they are trying to attract and, therefore, the town will be losing key members that have planted roots and wish to remain as part of the community.	
14	The town's infrastructure cannot handle the strain new developments being proposed. The massive increase in population cannot be handled by the single grocery store in town and it will only lead to more damage to our already turbulent roads. Since there is no public transit option available to residents, this will only lead to a mass increase in vehicles on the road way, which will cause further damage to the road way requiring more tax payers dollars to fix them. These proposed development will only cause strain on the town and cause existing residents to reconsider the area with which they chose to plant roots. Caledon East is not an area where a condominium is needed to support the lower income families. It will only decrease property values and effect moral within the community.	it is important to provide diverse housing options that support growth and create a vibrant, liveable community, as stated in the Town's Housing Study prepared in 2017 by SHS Consulting . The proposed development will provide an integrated, attractive new form of housing in the community. The proposal has been revised to meet the Town's parking requirements for both residential and commercial uses. Old Church Road has undergone road expansion improvements as part of the Chateaux subdivision. Further, the transportation consultant is of the opinion that traffic impacts are minimal.

4

Region of Peel Comments

Region of Peel July 9, 2019 Wayne Office: 905.584.2272 x.4228 Email: leilani.lee-yates@caledon.ca			
No.	Comment:	Response by:	Response:
Site Servicing			
1	Grading and servicing comments will be provided directly to the consultant. Grading must be satisfactory prior to site plan proposal.	MDTR / Stantec	Noted. The revised submission reflects our discussion with the Region on Jan 14/19.
2	<p>Prior to Site Plan approval, the applicant shall submit the non-refundable \$500 Report Fee as per current fee by-law 55-2017. The fee shall be made out to:</p> <p>Development Services Public Works, Region of Peel 10 Peel Centre Drive, Suite B, 4th Floor Brampton, ON L6T 4B9</p> <p>We will not be able to accept or process the payment without the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Person or company name, phone number, and full registered municipal address providing the funds. 2. The associated Planning File (e.g. Site Plan Application No.) and Regional Servicing File (C#.) 	Pluribus Corp.	<p>First submission fee was provided to the Region on Jan 17/19.</p> <p>Report fee was provided to the Region on Feb 1/19.</p>
Noise Study			
3	The applicant is advised to provide a table summarizing unmitigated and mitigated DBA sound levels.	Swallow	<p>The calculated outdoor sound levels at the critical noise receptors are listed in Table 3 (please refer to reliance letter included in this submission). In addition, please refer to our response provided to comment no. 7 below.</p> <p>The maximum difference in sound levels between the 2019 site plan version and the latest version is</p>



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

			<p>only 1 dB. The noise control measures as summarised in Table 9 in the Noise Impact Study Addendum, dated April 26, 2019 are applicable.</p> <p>Due to the 1 dB increase in night-time sound level at POR1, the building envelope requirements that were summarised in the Noise Impact Study Addendum, dated April 26, 2019 are updated and provided in Table 4 below (please refer to reliance letter included in this submission).</p>
4	Table 1 indicates all receiver heights to be 4.5 metres or 13.5 metres from the ground. There are dwelling units on the ground floor, Regional guidelines require a receiver location to be 1.5 meters off the ground, located 3 meters from the real wall of the dwelling unit.	Swallow	As noted in Table 2 above (please refer to letter), the ground floor dwelling units proposed on the north side of the building and are shielded from Old Church Road by the building itself. They are not critical noise receptors. As all patios, terraces and balconies are less than 4 m deep and there is no shared outdoor living area, it is not applicable for this project.
5	The consultant has indicated the MOECC's indoor sound level limits (report section 6.2), but did not provide a calculated indoor sound level for this proposal. As a summary of sound levels with and without noise control measures is required, the consultant must state the mitigated indoor sound level after the application of building components. As per Region of Peel and MOECC standards, the night time (11:00 pm to 7:00 am) sound level limit is 40 dBA.	Swallow	With the recommended STC ratings of building components and assumed building component area percentages, the indoor sound levels will be 45 dBA during daytime and 40 dBA during night-time when all windows are closed. Note that only unmitigated outdoor sound levels on window planes are required to determine building component requirements to meet indoor sound level limits.
6	Please ensure that the Warning Clauses recommended in the study are consistent with the Region's guidelines. Once a table summarizing the unmitigated and mitigated resultant DBA sound levels is included, the warning clauses should be revised. Where the sound levels will exceed	Swallow	Unmitigated and mitigated sound level comparison is only required if a noise barrier is recommended for outdoor living area. This is not applicable in this project. An additional warning clause in the Region's guideline is included in the revised report and the



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	MOECC noise criteria by 5dBA, the wording stating that noise levels 'may' be of concern/interference must be replaced with 'will.		wording can be revised as requested, as follow: "Purchasers are advised that despite the inclusion of noise control features in this development area and within the building units, noise levels from increasing road traffic will continue to be of concern, occasionally interfering with some activities of the dwelling occupants as the noise level exceeds the Municipality's and the Ministry of the Environment's noise criteria."
7	The study must be satisfactory prior to site plan approval	Swallow	Noted
Waste Design			
8	Front-end collection of garbage and Semi-automated collection of recyclable materials will be provided for residential units by the Region of Peel subject to meeting the requirements of the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual, specifically Sections 2, 4, and 5.	Architecture Unfolded	Noted
9	Waste collection will be provided through a private waste hauler for the commercial units.	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
10	The waste collection vehicle access route into and throughout the site indicating the turning radii on all turns (minimum 13m) are to be clearly labelled on the drawing.	Architecture Unfolded	Revised
11	In those situations where a waste collection vehicle must reverse, the maximum straight back-up distance is 15 meters.	Architecture Unfolded	Provided
12	Outside the collection point, a clear height of 4.4 metres from the top of the access road, along the Waste Collection Vehicle access and egress route is required. The clear height of 4.4 metres is free of obstructions such a sprinkler systems, ducts, wires, trees or balconies.	Architecture Unfolded	Provided
Collection Point Requirements			



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

13	In the collection area an overhead clearance of 7.5 meters from obstructions such as sprinkler systems, ducts, balconies, wires and trees must be provided.	Architecture Unfolded	Provided
14	See Appendix 7 of the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual for frontend bin dimensions. For 3 cubic yard front-end bin, the minimum width required is 3 metres for every front-end bin present, with a minimum depth of 2 metres. For 4 cubic yard front-end bins, a minimum depth of 3 metres is required. For a 6-metre-wide collection point, front-end bins shall be placed in single file on one side of the collection point and the length of the collection point shall be adequate to accommodate the required number of front-end bins.	Architecture Unfolded	
15	The number, size and type of front-end bins to be used for garbage and recyclable materials shall be clearly shown and labelled on the site plan drawing. See Appendix 7 for front-end bin dimensions.	Architecture Unfolded	
16	The internal waste storage area shall be large enough to contain all the required number of front-end bins and allow for easy movement of the bins. In addition, sufficient space (a minimum of 10 square meters) shall be provided for the storage of bulky items. The location of the compactor (if present) is also to be shown and labelled.	Architecture Unfolded	
17	For developments requiring outdoor waste storage and collection, a concealed waste collection point must be provided with a solid level (+/- 2%) concrete pad. The concrete pad should extend a minimum of 1.5 meters in length outside the opening of the concealed waste collection point to accommodate the front wheels of the waste collection vehicle.	Architecture Unfolded	



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

Indoor Storage Requirements				
18	The number, size and type of front-end bins to be used for garbage and recyclable materials shall be clearly shown and labelled on the site plan drawing. See Appendix 7 for front-end bin dimensions.		Architecture Unfolded	
19	The internal waste storage area shall be large enough to contain all the required number of front-end bins and allow for easy movement of the bins. In addition, sufficient space (a minimum of 10 square meters) shall be provided for the storage of bulky items. The location of the compactor (if present) is also to be shown and labelled.		Architecture Unfolded	Sufficient space is provided for storage of bulky items as shown on P1 plan.
20	The collection of Recyclable Materials is mandatory within all residential Developments, and Waste Collection may be revoked by failing to comply. Recyclable Material is not to be compacted. The following methods may be used: 1. A single Garbage chute with an automated mechanical separation system to divert Garbage and Recyclable Materials into separate Front-End Bins; 2. Two separate chutes for Garbage and Recyclable Materials; or 3. Central room or facility provided there is no chute(s) and Waste is brought by Occupiers to the same facility, subject to approval by the Region.		Architecture Unfolded	Provided
Front End Collection Requirements				
21	The following table can be used as a guideline when calculating the number of front-end garbage and recycling bins required. The number, size and type of receptacles must be clearly labelled and shown on the site plan.		Architecture Unfolded	Noted
	Type of Garbage Bin	3 yd3	4 yd3	6 yd3



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	Compacted	54 units/bin	72 units/bin	-		
	Uncompact ed	18 units/bin	24 units/bin	36 units/bin		
	Type of Recycling Bin	3 yd3	4 yd3	6 yd3		
	Units/Bin	45	60	90		
22	The proposal must conform to the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual (WCDSM) prior to receiving Regional clearance. The WCDSM is available at: http://peelregion.ca/pw/standards/design/waste-collectiondesign-manual-2016.pdf				Pluribus Corp.	Noted
Legal Review						
23	Prior to Site Plan approval the applicant shall provide copies of all registered easement documents and Parcel Abstracts (PINS). Failure to submit the required information or failure to identify existing and proposed encroachments will result in delays in the review of this application.				MDTR	Included in this submission
24	The Region will enter into a Site Plan Agreement with the applicant. A processing fee will be required prior to its execution. As per By-law 55-2017, a certified cheque for \$2,000.00 can be made payable to the “Region of Peel”.				Pluribus Corp.	Noted
25	A Condominium Declaration and Description with a completed ‘Schedule A’ is required for review and approval prior to the registration of the Condominium.				Pluribus Corp.	Noted
Traffic Review – Property Requirements						
26	The Region requests supporting documentation of the gratuitous dedication of lands to meet the Regional Official Plan requirement for Regional Road 22 (Old Church Road)				Architecture Unfolded	Site plan revised to show conveyance of 17.75m from centerline of Old Church Road located on southeast side of property.



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	which has a right of way of 30.0 metres, 15.0 metres from the centreline of the road allowance. Additional property over and above the Official Plan requirement will be required within 245 metres of intersections to protect for the provision of but not limited to: utilities, sidewalks, multiuse pathways and transit bay/shelters: 35.5 metres, 17.75 metres from the centreline for a single left turn lane intersection configuration;		
27	The Region will require the gratuitous dedication of 15 x 15 metre daylight triangle at the intersection of Old Church Road and Atchison Drive;	Architecture Unfolded	Site plan revised
28	The Region will require the gratuitous dedication of 0.3 metre reserve along the entire frontage of Regional Road 22 (Old Church Road) and behind the daylight triangle;	MDTR	Registered reserve blocks of 43M-1840 adjacent to Old Church Road are noted on site plan. A new reserve block as shown on Site Plan will be required for a portion of Old Church Road as a result of the Region's road allowance requirements near intersections.
29	The applicant is required to gratuitously dedicate these lands to the Region, free and clear of all encumbrances. All costs associated with the transfer, including preparation of the necessary reference plan are the responsibility of the property owner. The property owner must provide the Region with the necessary title documents and a draft reference plan(s) for review and approval prior to deposit	Pluribus Corp.	Noted
30	Please revise all drawings to show the centreline of Old Church Road and the above noted requirements measured and labelled from that point.	Architecture Unfolded	Site plan revised
Landscaping/Encroachments			
31	The Owner acknowledges and agrees that landscaping, signs, fences, gateway features or any other encroachments are not be permitted within	Pluribus Corp.	Noted



Comments Response Matrix
June 2020

	the Region's easements and/or right-of-way limits unless appropriate landscaping drawings (or other drawings as appropriate) have been submitted to the Region for review and approval. Upon consideration, if approved, an encroachment agreement and Regional Council approval will also be required for encroachments within the right-of-way limits. All costs and fees associated therewith shall be the responsibility of the Owner.		
--	--	--	--