

January 18, 2019

MJJJ Developments Inc.  
4 Holland Drive, Units 8 & 9  
Bolton, Ontario L7E 1G1  
Attention: Jodi Sirai

Dear Ms Sirai,

Re: Proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Application (Full Stream)  
MJJJ Developments Inc. – Proposed Office Building and Hot Mix Asphalt Plant  
12415 Coleraine Drive – Part Lot 3, Concession 6 (Albion)  
Files: POPA 18-02, RZ 18-04, SPA 18-58

---

Town of Caledon staff received applications for Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Site Plan Approval (Full) on July 3, 2018. Staff notified you the applications were complete on July 25, 2018. The applications propose to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law to permit a 2-storey, 1,042 m<sup>2</sup> office building fronting onto Coleraine Drive and a Hot Mix Asphalt Plant (“HMA Plant”) with associated open storage and 1-storey, 46 m<sup>2</sup> seasonal office building accessed from Simpson Drive. The submission packages received by the Town included the following:

- Cover Letter from MJJJ Developments dated June 25, 2018
- Pre-Consultation (DART) Meeting Form
- Completed Application Forms (OPA/ZBA and SPA)
- Planning Justification Report prepared by SGL Planning & Design Inc. dated June, 2018
- Survey (Built Features and Grades) prepared by Young & Young Surveying Inc. dated March 13, 2017
- Survey (Topo) prepared by Young & Young Surveying Inc. dated February 12, 2016
- Site Plan Package:
  - Drawing A101 (Site Context Aerial Views and Project Information) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated May 17, 2018
  - Drawing A102 (Overall Site Plan and Front Office Component) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated May 17, 2018
  - Drawing A103 (Office Building Floor Plans, Building Sections & Roof Plan) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated May 17, 2018
  - Drawing A104 (Office Building Elevations and Perspective View) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated May 17, 2018
  - Drawing A105 (Overall Site Elevations and Reference Perspective Views) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated May 17, 2018
  - Drawing A106 (Material Storage Screens and Fence Details & Profiles) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated May 17, 2018
  - Drawing A107 (Production Facility Site Plan and Partial Site Profile) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated April 27, 2018
  - Drawing A108 (Production Area Screening and Production Supervision Office) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated April 27, 2018
  - Drawing A109 (Simpson Road Access and Screening) prepared by J. Gorka Architect dated April 27, 2018

- Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report prepared by Crozier Consulting Engineers dated May 2018
- Air Quality Study prepared by BCX Environmental Consulting dated May 2018
- Air Quality Study Addendum prepared by BCX Environmental Consulting dated June 19, 2018
- Cost Estimate (Engineering) prepared by Crozier and Associates dated May 11, 2018
- Cost Estimate (Landscaping) prepared by terraplan landscape architects dated May 11, 2018
- Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Davroc Testing Laboratories Inc., dated April 7, 2017
- Hydrogeological Investigation prepared by Watermark Environmental dated April 2018
- Engineering Plans:
  - Drawing C101A (Preliminary Site Grading Plan – South West) prepared by Crozier & Associates dated May 22, 2018
  - Drawing C101B (Preliminary Site Grading Plan – North East) prepared by Crozier & Associates dated May 22, 2018
  - Drawing FIG.1(Pre-Development Drainage Plan) prepared by Crozier & Associates dated May 22, 2018
  - Drawing FIG.2 (Post Development Drainage Plan) prepared by Crozier & Associates dated May 22, 2018
  - Drawing C102A (Preliminary Site Servicing Plan – South West) prepared by Crozier & Associates dated May 22, 2018
  - Drawing C102B (Preliminary Site Servicing Plan – North East) prepared by Crozier & Associates dated May 22, 2018
- Landscape Plans:
  - Drawing LP-100 (Landscape Plan) prepared by terraplan landscape architects dated April 3, 2017
  - Drawing LP-101 (Landscape Enlargement Plan) prepared by terraplan landscape architects dated April 3, 2017
  - Drawing LP-100 (Landscape Details) prepared by terraplan landscape architects dated April 3, 2017
  - Drawing LP-100 (Landscape Details) prepared by terraplan landscape architects dated April 3, 2017
- Arborist Report prepared by Davey Resource Group dated February 17, 2016
- Arborist Letter prepared by Davey Resource Group dated February 16, 2016
- Peel Healthy Development Assessment (Small-Scale) date-stamped June 26, 2018
- Certificates of Training for Transportation of Dangerous Goods date-stamped June 26, 2018
- Material Safety Data Sheet for Asphalt Cements – Performance Graded date-stamped June 26, 2018
- Environmental Noise Impact Study prepared by aercoustics dated September 11, 2017
- Acoustic Assessment Report prepared by aercoustics dated September 11, 2017
- Addendum to Acoustic Assessment Report prepared by aercoustics dated June 20, 2018
- Statement of Vibration Emissions prepared by aercoustics dated January 9, 2017
- Photometric Plans, Summary and Details prepared by RC Lighting dated May 24, 2018
- Traffic Impact Study prepared by TMIG (The Municipal Infrastructure Group Ltd) dated September 2017
- Urban Design Brief prepared by SGL Planning & Design dated May 2018

## General Comments

---

- 1) For property tax purposes, 12415 Coleraine Drive, (Part Lot 3, Con 6 ALB) is currently assessed as Commercial & Residential (\$1.61 mn. CVA). The Town's share of taxes levied, based on current value assessment is approximately \$5,450. The property tax account as at January 15, 2019 is determined to be current. If the

proposed development were to proceed as planned, (two office buildings as accessory to an asphalt plant), the property's taxable assessment value would change to reflect the developments that would have taken place.

Future developments would be subject to Town of Caledon development charges as per By-law No. 2014-054, or as amended, and currently at \$39.57 per square metre of added floor space (will be \$40.90 per m<sup>2</sup> effective February 1, 2019). Any development would also be subject to Region of Peel development charges, currently \$144.48 per square metre of added floor space (will be \$149.28 per m<sup>2</sup> effective February 1, 2019). Also applicable would be development charges for Education, currently \$10.87 per square metre of added floor space. Those charges are supported by their respective Development Charges By-laws. For the purposes of Development Charges, the term 'industrial space' should comply with the definition of an 'industrial building', as outlined in the Town's By-law No. 2014-054, or as amended.

The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at January 15, 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. (*Town of Caledon, Finance Services*)

- 2) Based on the circulation material, the proposal includes the demolition of the existing building on site. Based on municipal numbering records, the address of "12415 Coleraine Drive" was issued using the existing northern access for the existing building. Should a development be approved, a new municipal number will be issued for Building 'A' from Coleraine Drive and for Building 'B' from Simpson Road. The existing address of 12415 Coleraine Drive will no longer be applicable.

Staff require confirmation from the applicant that each municipal number will be identified on a ground sign or sign located on the buildings. It is strongly suggested that the buildings be clearly identified to assist in emergency service response. The signage location is to be demonstrated on the site plan and/or elevations to be reviewed as part of the site plan approval process.

A municipal number(s) will be issued at the earliest of: site grading approval, site servicing approval, or satisfactory site plan approval and once the driveway locations have been approved by the Region and Town.

- 3) Site plan application (SPA) number (SPA-2018-0058) should have been included within the title block of all drawings.

### **The following comments pertain to the Official Plan Amendment Application**

---

The Town retained Wood Environmental to undertake a peer review of the applicant's **Air Quality Study**. The results of that peer review are attached hereto; however, notable findings include:

- a. The Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) does not consider HMA plants to be “low risk” or “low odour” and require their emission reports to be reviewed by a Senior Air Quality Engineer at MECP prior to receiving Environmental Compliance Approval under the Ontario Environmental Protection Area (EPA).
  - b. The study has not adequately assessed the following:
    - i. An inventory of all sensitive uses within the potential influence zone (i.e. food processing, research facilities, recreational facilities, day cares)
    - ii. Existing air quality in the study area
    - iii. Size and operating capacity of the proposed HMA Plant
    - iv. Anticipated truck volumes or protocols to avoid idling and queuing;
    - v. Designation of the HMA Plant should be Class III, not a combination of Class II and Class III
    - vi. A comprehensive list of potential air contaminants (i.e. fine particulate matter, odour, asphalt fume, sulphur dioxide, etc.)
    - vii. Supporting calculations and modelling were absent
    - viii. Potential nuisance effects of odour and fugitive dust from a quantitative perspective
    - ix. An acceptable Best Management Practices Plan
    - x. Providing a useful comparable HMA Plant without any complaints or air quality effects
    - xi. The corporate profile of Dig-Con and examples of similar operations adhering to BMPS
  - c. The Peer Reviewer is unable to conclude there will be no air quality impacts, the study has not fully addressed the requirements to evaluate potential air quality impacts and should be expanded to include other contaminants (i.e. odour, fine particulate matter, inhalable particulate matter) and all sources (point, fugitive and mobile).
  - d. As detailed in the attached letter, the Region of Peel requires the Study be revised to:
    - i. determine if there are cumulative impacts to existing background air quality levels
    - ii. account for all sensitive receptors in the area (i.e. schools)
    - iii. clarify the air dispersion modelling assessment
    - iv. account for the schools in the assessment of the wind roses
- 4) The Town retained Valcoustics to undertake a peer review of the applicant’s **Environmental Noise Impact** Study. The results of that peer review are attached hereto; however, notably, the Peer Reviewer finds the study has failed to demonstrate there will be no adverse noise impacts associated with the proposed change in use based on the applicable noise guidelines. Key points in the review include:

- a. Insufficient information provided with respect to: the purpose of the “High Level Screen Wall” that largely surrounds the asphalt plant area; operating hours as nighttime operations are implied; inconsistent reference sound levels; and, confirmation of the sample ambient sound level calculation.
  - b. Certain assumptions could not be supported that may require additional noise mitigation measures being required, such as a conservative predictable worse case hour, an unjustified 10dBA sound level reduction and exclusion of sound level by some variable sources such as the drum dryer.
  - c. Certain recommended sound barriers are not supportable and/or do not meet Town Standards including the proposed use of shipping containers and RAP piles as noise barriers and 4.8m high barrier (Town Standards are a maximum 2.4m high fence atop a maximum 2.4m high berm).
- 5) The Town retained Cole Engineering to undertake a peer review of the applicant’s **Hydrogeological Investigation Report** (prepared by Watermark Environmental) . The results of that peer review are attached hereto; however, notable findings include:
- a. The report does not meet applicable policies, regulations and industry best practices and the findings cannot be supported for the following reasons:
    - i. Local cross-sections should be constructed showing borehole logs;
    - ii. Clarification is needed to differentiate and separately assess groundwater flow for shallow and deep groundwater systems – additional groundwater monitors may need to be installed;
    - iii. Groundwater flow direction must be discussed and specified on a flow direction map;
    - iv. A borehole and monitoring well program is required;
    - v. Monitoring wells required to assess impact on quality and quantity of groundwater aquifers;
    - vi. Maximum trench excavation depths for site servicing has not been reviewed and any dewatering requirements have not been investigated; and
    - vii. A water balance assessment is required.
  - b. The study meets the requirements of the Region of Peel requirements (see attached).
- 6) The Town cannot accept the findings of the **Traffic Impact** Study prepared by The Municipal Infrastructure Group (TMIG) for the following reasons:
- a. Insufficient commentary has been provided to describe the daily number of truck traffic movements anticipated for the proposed HMA Plant; (*TOC, FIS, Transportation*)
  - b. Clarification is needed with respect to the annual operation days and hours of operation per day. (*TOC, FIS, Transportation*)

- c. A breakdown of the assumptions for both average and peak times should have been provided. *(TOC, FIS, Transportation)*
  - d. The report has not assessed the average truck volume or the timing and extent of the anticipated peak output times. A more comprehensive breakdown of the yearly average of 300,000 tonnes/year and comparison to truck traffic at a comparable medium to large HMA Plants would have been a helpful tool in verifying the trip generation assumptions. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  - e. It is unclear if the number of anticipated “supply trucks” in Table 5-1 includes pick-ups from other contractors (as noted in Appendix C) and the delivery of preprocessed RAP material in addition to the delivery of aggregate (limestone, gravel, sand) and cement. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  - f. Section 5.1 of the report anticipates a maximum of 18 office employees for the purposes of determining the number of inbound and outbound trips; however, clarification is required as to why the potential inbound and outbound trips did not account for the proposed parking supply of 56 spaces. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  - g. As per the attached comments, the Region of Peel requires the Total Traffic Volumes be updated to reflect the trip generation volumes noted in the report.
- 7) The Town retained M. Behar Planning & Design Inc. to undertake a peer review of the applicant's **Urban Design Brief** and Site Plan. The results of that peer review are attached hereto; however, notable findings include:
- a. The Urban Design Brief is not satisfactory as it does not reference key design policies and principals with respect to exposure of the proposed HMA Plant from Coleraine Drive, Simpson Road and George Bolton Parkway and does not address CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principals along the Simpson Road frontage,
  - b. The impacts of the fencing, screening walls and berms associated with the proposed HMA Plant are significant and not appropriate from an urban design standpoint;
  - c. Additional opportunities to enhance the landscape open space in front of the proposed office building should be explored by reducing the driveway width, shifting parking spaces back and in line with the proposed office building (not in front), reducing the number of parking spaces and lowering the corporate sign so that the building maintains prominence in the streetscape; and
  - d. Additional visuals (i.e. elevations) are required to understand whether further articulation of the office building elevations is required.
- 8) The Town has provided additional **Urban Design** comments as follows: *(TOC, Policy – Urban Design)*
- a. The Design Brief submitted by the proponent does not provide enough detail throughout in how the developments proposal meets the Town-wide Design Guidelines (TWDG), the Official Plan or the South

Simpson Industrial Secondary Plan. There is little emphasis on Community Design which should be a substantive section in the Design Brief.

- b. Direct reference should be made to the TWDG, specifically Section 11. This Section provides comprehensive guidelines on developing industrial prestige lands. The Design Brief should reference Section 11 and explain how the proposed development meets and exceeds the guideline recommendations. As such consistent reference to the property being designated as Prestige Industrial is an important part of the design brief as it guides the high architectural intent of the guidelines for this area.
  - c. Urban Design has concerns regarding the proposed use of an Asphalt Plant in a Prestige Industrial Area, specifically Coleraine Drive. The Design Brief does not adequately explore the Prestige Industrial Use designation and the ramifications of the outflow and environmental and noise pollution that has the distinct possibility of preventing further development in this area.
  - d. There is no Visual Impact Assessment provided that shows street views looking into the site from Coleraine Drive and Simpson Road. The Design Brief is deceiving in its visualizations of the actual plant and the exceedingly large walls that are proposed as screens to the plant machinery.
  - e. Urban Design has significant concerns regarding the heights, design and visual impact of both the “high level metal screens” (10.5m high) and the wood panels fences at 3.6-3.8 meters high. Please reference relevant Town guidelines and standards for maximum fence and berm heights. What is the function of the metal screens in their location when the asphalt plant machinery is 22.5 meters high? A Visual Impact Assessment should have been included showing the metal fence in situ and the production machinery beyond from views taken along George Bolton Boulevard, the junction of George Bolton and Simpson, and Simpson Road ensuring that industry standards of scale and perspective are adhered to and site photos are used as part of the submission.
  - f. Staff area concerned that if the proposed screening were not there, would the use of the production machinery and outdoor storage comply with the community design policies for the Prestige Industrial designation.
- 9) Staff are not satisfied with the findings in the Geotechnical Report for the following reasons:
- a. The subsurface conditions require further analysis as the topsoil layer was frozen at the time of the field work;
  - b. Each of the 12 boreholes was not drilled deep enough to intercept the groundwater such that long term groundwater levels could not be assessed or monitored. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
- 10) The **Economic Development & Tourism** Division is supportive of the growth of industrial and commercial assessment growth and for the attraction and growth of quality jobs within Caledon. The proposal has identified that the site is 2.78 hectares (6.9 acres) in size and the proposed building on the site is 1,042 square metres (11,216 square feet) and the use will create 11 to 18 jobs. The proposal fails to meet the potential of the Prestige

Industrial designated site. If the site was developed to maximize the size of the building, it would create both more jobs and assessment growth.

The Town of Caledon has designated the property and surrounding properties as Prestige Industrial which is described in the Caledon Official Plan section 5.5.3.21 a) “Prestige Industrial applies to employment lands with full municipal water and sanitary services which provide for clean industry as well as office uses on landscaped lots in a park-like setting.” The purpose of having this area designated and zoned prestige industrial is to not only protect the aesthetic qualities of the area to retain and attract prestigious companies and investment but to also protect existing and future companies from noise, air and vibration pollution that would disrupt their operations.

There are many businesses, clients and especially advanced manufacturing uses that require exceptionally clean outside air without any particulate matter to ensure their equipment, products and services are not impacted and enable them to meet their quality standards. Introducing any uses within the Prestige Industrial area that produce any amounts of particulate matter will have a detrimental impact to existing industrial operations.

The Planning Rationale Report indicates that some surrounding homes are former residential dwellings, this is inaccurate in that the uses on these properties remain residential regardless of their designation or zone.

Economic Development understands the need for facilities such as the asphalt plant and it being located close to job sites, however an asphalt plant needs to be located in an area that does not impact the businesses, residents and other uses that surrounds it. Economic Development & Tourism through its business retention and expansion program and business attraction programs understands the importance of providing quality of life and the importance of offering its businesses an environment without dust, odour, visual and any other form of pollution that negatively impacts business attraction, retention or expansion. (*Town of Caledon, Economic Development*)

Planning and Policy staff have reviewed the **municipal policy framework** and find the application to permit an unenclosed Hot Mix Asphalt plant (“HMA Plant”) within the Prestige Industrial designation inconsistent with Town’s Official Plan:

- 11) **Hierarchy of Industrial Uses** - The Town of Caledon Official Plan sets out a hierarchy of employment area land uses as follows:

“5.5.3.21 Employment Areas may be further classified as: Prestige Industrial; General Industrial; and Dry Industrial, with each type of land use being identified in separate industrial classifications in the implementing Zoning By-law. These designations are generally described as follows:

- a) Prestige Industrial applies to employment lands with full municipal water and sewer services which provide for clean industry as well as office uses on landscaped lots in a park-like surrounding.
- b) General Industrial applies to employment lands with full municipal water and sewer services which provide for various industrial uses including manufacturing, fabricating, and accessory outside storage.

- c) Dry Industrial applies to employment lands which provide for “dry type” industrial uses developed on the basis of private sanitary sewage and water services, or partial Regional piped services.”

**Consistency Test:** The proposed application and supporting materials to permit an HMA plant, including the Air Quality, Noise, Hydrogeological and Urban Design Reports have not satisfactorily established the proposed use can operate as a clean industry, as per Section 5.5.3.21a) and without adverse impacts on the surrounding area.

The proposed site layout, including the proposed screening walls, opaque fencing and RAP stockpiles visible from multiple frontages including Coleraine Drive do not achieve the prestige industrial community design principles of a landscaped lot in a park-like setting.

The proposed asphalt plant is unenclosed with the exception of a seasonal field office and storage silos. The anticipated water demand and sanitary flow for the HMA Plant as indicated in the Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report represents a “dry type” industrial use contrary to the prestige industrial policies that anticipate uses that utilize full municipal water and sewer services.

- 12) **Prestige Industrial (Use) Policies:** The policies that apply to the lands designated as Prestige Industrial in the Town’s Official Plan are as follows:

“5.5.4 Prestige Industrial

...Prestige uses will be located within enclosed buildings with no outside storage and uses shall be encouraged to occupy prominent locations along major roads and highways. Prestige Industrial uses shall be developed on full regional piped water and sewer services.”

“5.5.4.1 The Prestige Industrial classification of land shall permit the following uses:

- a. Manufacturing, fabricating, printing, processing, assembling and packaging operations;
- b. Warehousing and wholesale operations;
- c. Laboratories,
- d. Computer and data processing;
- e. Research and development facilities;
- f. Corporate offices;
- g. Offices related to permitted industrial uses;
- h. Complementary uses, such as open space and recreation facilities, public uses and utilities, which do not detract from, and which are compatible with the development and operation of prestige industrial uses;
- i. Day care facility; and,
- j. Commercial uses in accordance with Section 5.5.3.

5.5.3.8 “The predominant use of lands designated Industrial in this Plan shall be for employment uses subject to the provisions of Sections 5.5.3, 5.5.4, 5.5.5, 5.5.6 and 5.5.7 of this Plan, provided that such uses are identified as industrial in an implementing Zoning By-law.”

5.5.4.2 “Automotive uses shall not be permitted in Prestige Industrial or Business/Office Park areas.”

7.9.2a “Specific goals for the South Simpson Industrial Area include the following: To provide for a mix of high quality industrial uses that contribute to the Town’s employment and commercial/industrial assessment base”

**Consistency Test:** Throughout the Official Plan, there are more specific policies that address the question of whether an asphalt plant conforms with or is consistent with the policies of the Town’s OP. This Official Plan development application has been reviewed based on the following policy themes including: open space storage, use, density, prominent location and servicing.

13) **Open Storage:**

5.5.4.4 “Unless otherwise specified in Section 5.5 (employment areas) or 5.10 (settlement areas), open storage shall not be permitted within any Prestige Industrial designations.”

5.5.7.3 “Open storage shall be discouraged from locating on lands with prominent visual exposure from streets, roads and highways or adjacent to nonindustrial uses.”

7.9.3 “The South Simpson Industrial Secondary Plan provides for prestige industrial and general industrial uses. Within the Prestige Industrial Areas, which generally abut major roads, limited open storage is permitted, except on lands adjacent to Coleraine Drive and Mayfield Road, where open storage shall not be permitted. Interior lands within the Secondary Plan boundaries are planned for general industrial uses with provisions for open storage.”

**Consistency Test:** The proposed application to allow an HMA plant in an area designated prestige industrial is inconsistent with the open storage policy framework that specifically prohibits open storage on lands abutting Coleraine Drive. The entirety of the HMA Plant use, with the exception of the 46 m<sup>2</sup> (495 ft<sup>2</sup>) seasonal field office and silos, is considered an unenclosed use. Open storage includes all lands used for the unenclosed storage of equipment (i.e. bins, conveyors, tanks, rotary drum/mixer, front-end loaders, tanker truck), goods or materials (i.e. stock piles of limestone, gravel, sand, Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement). Accordingly, Staff do not support that open storage is limited to 7.8% of the site as noted on Page 32 of the Planning Rationale Report (PRR). The Official Plan Application is inconsistent with the Town’s open storage policies.

14) **Land Use Compatibility/Noxious Use:**

5.5.2.5 “To prevent the development of noxious uses that will conflict with the orderly development of the Town and be detrimental to the natural and cultural environment.”

5.5.3.15 “Employment uses that are noxious by reason of the emission of noise, smoke, odour, and pollution shall be discouraged.”

5.5.4.2 “Automotive uses shall not be permitted in Prestige Industrial or Business/Office Park areas.”

5.11.2.2.4 “The permitted uses for lands designated Extractive Industrial Area...on Schedule A are...the extraction of mineral aggregate resources from licensed sand and gravel pits and quarries...accessory uses essential to extractive operation...Asphalt plants...and similar uses may also be permitted subject to a site-specific Zoning By-law”

7.9.2c “Specific goals for the South Simpson Industrial Area include the following: to ensure land use compatibility with adjacent uses”

**Consistency Test:** The supporting materials have not adequately determined there will be no negative impacts associated with the HMA Plant. As noted in the attached Peer Reviews of the applicant’s Air Quality Study, Hydrogeology Report and Noise Study, there has been insufficient analysis and failure to demonstrate there will be no adverse impacts associated with the proposed HMA plant on surrounding areas.

The Town’s Official Plan only considers an asphalt plant in an Extractive Industrial Area designation, which is not currently identified for this site, or within Bolton, and could only be established through an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for a new licensed extractive industrial operation.

As per the attached comments from the Region of Peel, the PRR has not satisfactorily discussed land use compatibility in the South Simpson Industrial Secondary Plan area and it cannot yet be determined if the proposed HMA Plant is an appropriate and supportable use. Further, conformity with Section 5.1.3.1 of the Regional Official Plan regarding compatibility between major facilities and sensitive land uses has not been established.

Accordingly, the proposed development fails to conform to the Town’s and Region’s land use compatibility policies.

15) **Density:**

5.5.3.5 “Through its community planning for employment lands, Caledon will develop employment areas at a density that contributes to achieving the overall Greenfield Density Target for Caledon as per Policy 4.2.2.1 and Policy 4.2.2.3.1.”

5.5.3.6 “Nodes and corridors for office and high density employment uses will be identified in planning and employment areas within the Designated Greenfield Areas in settlements.”

4.2.2.2.1 “To optimize the use of the Designated Greenfield Area.”

4.2.2.3.1 “Development within the Designated Greenfield Area shall be designed to meet or exceed the minimum overall density of 42 residents and jobs combined per hectare.”

**Consistency Test:** The applicant’s PRR identifies a combined employment number of 11 to 18 peoples; however, it is unclear how many employees are associated with the proposed 2-storey office and warehouse

building versus the HMA plant. The Traffic Report estimates 5 to 8 office employees whereas Site Plan Drawing A102 identifies approximately 13 offices. Based on the Site Plan, it is anticipated that much of the employment density derives from the office/warehouse building.

The PRR estimates the combined proposal will achieve 4 to 6 jobs per hectare and notes on Page 28 that the projected employment density “will be on the lower end, compared to many other forms of employment uses. However, by nature, this type of use will have a low density no matter where it is located...”. Staff submit this type of low-density employment be situated in an employment area designated and planned for lower density uses, such as Dry Industrial or Extractive Industrial and not an area planned to support higher density uses.

As noted in the attached Region of Peel comments, the proposed HMA Plant does not conform to the greenfield density targets noted in Section 5.5.4 of the Regional Official Plan.

The HMA Plant represents a low-density employment use and underutilization of vacant, serviced prestige employment lands planned for office and other high density employment uses. As such, it does not conform to the Town’s and Region’s employment density policies.

16) **Community Design & Prominent Location:** The framework pertaining to the Town’s prominent location policies include:

5.5.3.7 “Office development will be encouraged to locate in Major Transit Station Areas and areas with existing frequent transit service or existing or planned higher order transit service.”

5.5.3.16 “Employment lands with a prominent visual exposure and lands adjacent to major roads and highway routes shall be encouraged to be developed for prestige industrial uses.”

5.5.4.5.1 “Business/Office Parks shall be encouraged within the Prestige Industrial designation. These parks shall comprise higher order industrial and/or office commercial uses. Permitted uses include corporate and head office uses, laboratories, computer and data processing, research and development facilities.”

5.5.4.5.2 “Business/Office Parks are encouraged to:

- a. Be developed as part of a comprehensive concept plan which focuses on a particular function, such as research and development facilities, corporate head offices, or major office development; and,
- b. To locate in areas with excellent exposure to major roads/highways, at the intersection of major roads/highways, at locations representing gateways into the Town and areas served by public transit.”

7.9.2d) “Specific goals for the South Simpson Industrial Area include...to ensure a high standard of community design is provided along the arterial roads and George Bolton Parkway”

7.9.4 “In recognition of the location of these lands at the entrance to the Town of Caledon, at the gateway to Bolton and in proximity to arterial roads, the streetscape and community design of the area shall be of a consistently high quality”

**Consistency Test:** The South Simpson Industrial Secondary Plan seeks to attract offices and higher density prestige employment uses along key corridors, such as Coleraine Drive because of the prominent visual exposure offered by these major corridors and its gateway location to Bolton. An example of this is the Equity Prestige Business Park at Parr Boulevard and Coleraine Drive, approximately 0.5km south of the subject site. Development along Coleraine Drive should reflect the area's focus as a gateway to Caledon.

The retaining walls (2.8m), berming (3.4m), wood fencing (3.8m) and metal screening (in excess of 10m high) along much of the perimeter of the proposed HMA plant will create a major, imposing negative presence on the surrounding streetscapes of Simpson, George Bolton and Coleraine.

The applicant's urban design report identifies that screening is required for outdoor storage and the HMA Plant. If the majority or entirety of a proposed use requires full screening from all streetscapes then the use may not be appropriate in the prestige industrial designation. Further, the proposed screening elements do not meet Town standards, are not supported by the Town-wide urban design and are not consistent with the Town's community design policies.

17) **Servicing:**

7.9.2b) "Specific goals for the South Simpson Industrial Area include the following: To provide for logical and orderly development on full urban services."

7.9.9.1 "All development in the South Simpson Industrial Secondary Plan area shall be serviced by full municipal water and sanitary sewers, municipal roads, hydro and other utilities. An integrated stormwater management system shall be required as envisioned in the South Bolton Industrial Park Secondary Plan Area Master Environmental Servicing Plan."

**Consistency Test:** As per the Functional Servicing Report prepared by Crozier Consulting Engineers, the average and peak water demand table and sanitary design flows for the proposed HMA Plant (field office) is consistent with the existing single-detached residential use. These figures indicate a "dry type" industrial use.

The proposed HMA Plant is more representative of a Dry Industrial Use and represents an underutilization of the municipal servicing planned to support this Prestige Industrial area. The proposed applications do not support the servicing policies of the Official Plan.

18) The Region of Peel has provided comments on the PRR from a **regional policy framework** which are attached and summarized below:

- a. The PRR must be revised to address the Bolton Residential Expansion Study/Regional Official Plan Amendment 30 (ROPA 30), currently under appeal and, if approved, would incorporate lands west and north of Coleraine into the Bolton Rural Service Centre Boundary for development with sensitive uses.
- b. The PRR must be updated to reflect updated findings/revisions to the supporting studies (Air Quality, Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report, Traffic Impact Study,

Geotechnical, Hydrogeology, Noise, Urban Design and Tree Inventory and Preservation Report) as they do not currently determine the proposed HMA Plant is an appropriate and supportable use.

- c. The PRR should include a discussion of how the proposed use meets the greenfield density targets noted in Section 5.5.4, specifically 5.5.4.2.2 of the Regional Official Plan as well as the land use compatibility policies for major facilities in Section 5.1.3.1 of the Regional Official Plan.
- d. **Consistency Test:** The applications as currently proposed do not conform to the Regional Official Plan.

19) Planning and Policy staff have reviewed the **provincial policy framework** and find the application to permit the proposed HMA Plant inconsistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and Places to Grow planning documents.

**a. Provincial Policy Statement 2014**

The Town of Caledon's Official Plan complies and is consistent with Provincial Policies including the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) as follows:

Policy 1.1.1 states, "Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:...accommodating an appropriate range and mix of...employment (including industrial and commercial)...uses to meet long-term needs" and "avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns"

Policy 1.1.3.2 states, "Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:...densities and a mix of land uses which...efficiently use land and resources...are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available...minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change"

Policy 1.2.6.1 states, "Major facilities and sensitive land uses should be planned to ensure they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term viability of major facilities."

Policy 1.3.1 states municipalities "shall promote economic development and competitiveness by...providing for an appropriate mix and range of employment...uses to meet long-term needs...providing opportunities for a diversified economic base, including maintaining a range and choice of suitable sites for employment uses which support a wide range of economic activities and ancillary uses, and take into account the needs of existing and future businesses...encouraging compact, mixed-use development that incorporates compatible employment uses to support liveable and resilient communities..."

Policy 1.3.2.1 states, "Planning authorities shall plan for, protect and preserve employment areas for current and future uses and ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided to support current and projected needs."

Policy 1.3.2.3 states, “Planning authorities shall protect employment areas in proximity to major goods movement facilities and corridors for employment uses that require those locations.”

Policy 1.7.1a) states, “Long-term economic prosperity should be supported by promoting opportunities for economic development and community investment-readiness.”

**Consistency Test:** The Town of Caledon Official Plan establishes a hierarchy of employment areas that distinguishes between prestige, general, dry and extractive industrial uses to ensure compatibility within planned employment areas and avoid adverse impacts from odour, noise and other contaminants. As per the attached peer reviews, the applicant has not established the proposed HMA Plant can operate without adversely impacting existing and future sensitive lands uses in the area as well as existing and future planned employment uses in the Prestige and General Industrial designation. The proposed HMA Plant is not a desirable employment use within this planned Prestige Industrial area and is inconsistent with the provincial policy framework set out in the PPS 2014.

The attached comments from the Region of Peel highlight that the applicant has not demonstrated compliance with PPS policies, including 1.1.1c and 1.2.6.1.

**b. Growth Plan 2017**

Policies within Growth Plan 2017 promote economic development and competitiveness of employment areas, the more efficient use of existing employment areas and vacant and underutilized employment lands and increasing employment densities (2.2.5.1).

**Consistency Test:** The proposed HMA Plant is inconsistent with the Growth Plan 2017 as it represents an underutilization of the planned function for this area (in terms of density and servicing) and jeopardizes the competitiveness of the larger prestige industrial area by introducing a potentially noxious use with visual impacts (i.e. open storage and intrusive screening along prominent corridors) and a range of potential environmental impacts (air quality, noise, groundwater).

20) The Town offers the following comments on the **Planning Rationale Report** (“PRR”):

- a. Staff do not agree with the interpretation in Section 4.1 of the PRR that the Mineral Aggregate Resources policies of the PPS apply to proposed HMA plant. To meet the PPS definition of a mineral aggregate resource operation the HMA plant would need to be an accessory/secondary use to the primary extraction operation and not a stand-alone plant. Further, the Region’s Official Plan prohibits new mineral aggregate extraction sites (including accessory uses thereto) from locating within approved settlement areas.
- b. Staff do not support the findings in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the PRR that the proposed HMA Plant conforms to Provincial Policy:
  - i. The proposed use does not contribute to a desirable range of employment uses in a prestige industrial area in terms of employment density, visual impact and potential noise, air quality and hydrogeological impacts;

- ii. The proposed use represents an underutilization of vacant, serviced designated employment lands; and
  - iii. The proposed use jeopardizes economic development strategies to retain and attract investment and employment in a planned prestige and general industrial community (South Simpson and Coleraine West Employment Areas).
- c. Staff do not support the findings in Section 4.3 of the PRR that the proposed HMA Plant conforms to Regional Official Plan Policy:
  - i. As per the attached comments, the Region of Peel identify the propose applications as not conforming to the Regional Official Plan, including the greenfield density targets (Section 5.5.4) and land use compatibility (Section 5.1.3.1) policies..
- d. Staff do not support the findings in Section 4.4 of the PRR that the proposed HMA Plant conforms to Town of Caledon Official Plan Policy:
  - i. The site design, including the “walls along the side perimeters of the site” (page 29) designed to conceal views of the asphalt plant will not contribute to an attractive street frontage along Coleraine, George Bolton Parkway and Simpsons Road. Fencing and other screening tools can provide desirable buffers to certain accessory and secondary uses, such as open storage, but not as a means to conceal an entire principal use. If the proposed use were appropriate in a prestige employment area then it would not require a barricade to shield the use from public view.
  - ii. The applicant has failed to demonstrate the proposed HMA Plant will not adversely impact the natural and cultural environment from noise, air quality, traffic and hydrogeological perspectives. Accordingly, as currently proposed, the HMA Plant is considered a noxious use that threatens the orderly development and investment of this employment area.
  - iii. The proposed HMA Plant does not conform to the community design, open storage and land use compatibility policy framework established by the South Simpson Industrial Secondary Plan.
- e. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment will not adequately implement the policies of the Official Plan.

### The following comments pertain to the Zoning By-law Amendment Application

---

- 21) It is premature to comment on the Draft Zoning By-law in light of the policy conformity concerns described above; however, please note the following:
- a. The Town of Caledon Comprehensive Zoning By-law 2006-50, Section 4.28 lists an asphalt manufacturing or refining use as a prohibited use within the Zoned Area of the Town of Caledon. Accordingly, no person is to use any land or building for the purpose of an HMA Plant. *(TOC, Planning)*
  - b. The proposed HMA Plant should not be placed in the same MP Zone as the proposed office building as the use could encroach closer to Coleraine Drive, Simpson Road and/or George Bolton Parkway (via the north lot line setback) through minor variance applications. *(TOC, Planning & Zoning)*
  - c. The proposed By-law does not adequately incorporate site layout (buffers) and restricted activities (i.e. no processing of RAP and aggregate) for the HMA Plant. *(TOC, Planning)*
  - d. Site Plan Drawing A101 does not provide a satisfactory Zoning By-law Matrix. The table should include columns for “Required” and “Proposed” standards each applicable standard; *(TOC, Planning)*
  - e. The application has not reviewed/confirmed compliance with all applicable standards in Sections 4 (General Provisions) and 5 (Parking, Loading and Delivery) of Zoning By-law 2006-50; *(TOC, Planning)*
  - f. Further justification is needed to understand the provision of 56 parking spaces whereas the Site Plan indicates 34 spaces are required, particularly when the PRR identifies the proposed uses will employ 11 to 18 people; *(TOC, Planning)*
  - g. The legal description in the By-law should be revised to: Part Lot 3 Concession 6 (Albion); together with an easement over Part 4, Plan 43R36307 as in PR2782264; Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel. *(TOC, CORP, Legal)*
- 22) A detailed cross section is required to illustrate the minimum 3.0m planting strip width along the applicable lot lines are inclusive of retaining walls, trees, noise wall and berm. *(TOC, Open Space Design)*

## Public Comments

---

- 23) Written submissions from the public and corporate citizens relating to the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment are attached for your review and consideration in any future revised submission.
- 24) A Petition has been initiated via Change.Org with over 1,200 signatures to date: [https://www.change.org/p/say-no-to-rezoning-for-the-asphalt-plant-12415-coleraine-drive-bolton-caledon?recruiter=596808176&utm\\_source=share\\_petition&utm\\_medium=facebook&utm\\_campaign=share\\_petition&utm\\_term=Search%3ESAP%3ECA%3ENonBrand-Tier%201%3EDiscovery%3EBMM&utm\\_content=fht-13731704-en-ca%3Av5](https://www.change.org/p/say-no-to-rezoning-for-the-asphalt-plant-12415-coleraine-drive-bolton-caledon?recruiter=596808176&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=facebook&utm_campaign=share_petition&utm_term=Search%3ESAP%3ECA%3ENonBrand-Tier%201%3EDiscovery%3EBMM&utm_content=fht-13731704-en-ca%3Av5)
- 25) A public open house and meeting was held January 15, 2019 and attended by more than 200 members of the public and 24 verbal submissions expressing the following concerns:
- a. Unsuitable/Incompatible Location:
    - i. This type of use should not be close to where we live, work, play and go to school;
    - ii. Insufficient separation from sensitive uses (residences, schools, future Bolton Residential Expansion);
    - iii. Not compatible with prestige industrial area. Prestige Industrial area should be protected from nuisance uses such as this;
    - iv. Threatens significant investment by existing and future industries in the prestige industrial area (expansion, new buildings, lease renewals).
  - b. Potential Negative Impacts:
    - i. Air quality impacts (toxic fumes, dust and pollution from nitrogen oxide, PAHs, arsenic) both in the short and long term to both residents and industrial operations (food, packaging, outdoor business inventory);
    - ii. Health and safety impacts for residents and employees in the area, including future employees of an HMA Plant (pollution, smog, dust, cancer, respiratory disease, premature deaths, premature births)
    - iii. Traffic impacts in terms of volume (congestion) and safety;
    - iv. View/vista impacts on an area planned for high quality community design;
    - v. Property value impacts (residential and employment) – US Study found property values decreased 11 – 56% near asphalt plants;

- c. Concerns about:
  - i. Lack of information on fiscal impacts, i.e. is there a net revenue after accounting for wear and tear of trucks on road;
  - ii. Lack of information on the average truck traffic;
  - iii. Lack of clarity on hours of operations (12 hour days versus 24-hour operations);
  - iv. Trucking Idling;
  - v. Spills and Spill Management Plans (human error);
  - vi. Hydrogeological concerns;
  - vii. Extensive tree removal (retaining 9 of 45 trees).
- d. Plant Hours – normal operations (7am to 7pm) versus emergency operations (24 hours)
  - i. Concerned if governments are the primary consumer and they primarily paving through the night
- e. Negative precedent for undeveloped lands in area, including lands directly to the north – what is the likelihood a prestige industrial use will develop beside an asphalt plant?
- f. Zoning does not permit this use anywhere.
- g. Official Plan conformity concerns: employment density, clean industry. As part of MCR, Town and Region should identify lands suitable for this type of employment .
- h. No support in the community for this use.

26) An audio recording of the Public Meeting will be made available on the Town's website at:

<https://www.caledon.ca/en/Calendar/Meetings/Default.aspx>

**The following comments pertain to the Site Plan Application:**

---

- 1) It is premature to comment on the Site Plan Application in light of the policy conformity concerns described above; however, please note the following:

**Urban Design Peer Review, Moiz Behar Planning & Urban Design Inc. (see attached)**

- 2) The driveway from Coleraine Drive currently proposed at 13.8m should be reduced to provide increased soft landscaped space;
- 3) The proposed parking area for the office use should be in-line with the building and the overall number of parking spaces reduced in favour of a landscaped screen;
- 4) Alternatives to reduce the height of the wood fencing and metal screening should be explored;
- 5) Coloured elevations of the office building are required to assess whether further articulation is warranted, particularly along the north elevation;
- 6) The proposed sign should be reduced in height to ensure the building is the more prominent feature in the streetscape.

**Town of Caledon, Urban Design**

- 7) Section 5.2.4 of the Industrial/Commercial Design Guidelines have been integrated and in places updated in Section 11 of the Town wide Design Guidelines (TWDG). All references to the ICDG should be updated and their application confirmed in the development proposal and Design Brief.
- 8) Urban Design has concerns about the functionality of the site through the two access points shown on the Site Plan, with Simpson Road being designated as the main trucking access. How will access to Coleraine Drive be mitigated when there is internal access from the front to the rear of the site?
- 9) The parking lot should be moved behind or at least in line with the front facade. The development has 22 more parking spaces than required. Removing the parking spaces from the rear island and 16 more spaces from the front of the parking lot will help to re-align the parking area to the front façade and provide substantially more landscaping. See Section 11 of the TWDG for the “desirable” side parking location in relation to the building.
- 10) Drawing A101 notes that “All structures denoted on above plan as production equipment ‘J’ are not included in site statistics tables below.” Please explain.
- 11) Drawing A107 notes that equipment sideyard setbacks are to be verified. Please explain.
- 12) Ensure that all screening for rooftop units are contiguous with the building’s design.

- 13) It appears that the RAP Stockpiles and Production Facility are visible from Coleraine Drive. Describe what measures will be taken to screen these features.
- 14) The Production Office are also visible from Coleraine Drive. A better solution for its architectural form is required.
- 15) Please update the reference to the "Roof PI" as it does not reference the correct roof plane.
- 16) Please review Section 11.3.2 of the TWDG for wall articulation and openings specifically in reference to large unarticulated facades.

#### **Town of Caledon, Legal Services**

- 17) Instrument No. PR2782264 is a Transfer registered on September 8, 2015 in favour of the Town over Part 4 on Plan 43R-36307 for the purpose of vehicular and pedestrian egress and ingress until such time that Part 4 on Plan 43R-36307 is dedicated as a public road allowance by Municipal By-Law. The Owner is bound by the terms and obligations contained in this easement. All easements are to be shown on the Site Plan.

#### **Town of Caledon, Development Engineering**

- 18) The Functional Servicing and Preliminary Stormwater Management Report is to be revised as follows:
  - a. Future submissions of the report are to remove "preliminary" from the report title.
  - b. Future submissions of the report are to include OGS sizing calculations.
  - c. The Region of Peel is to approve all drainage to the Coleraine Drive right-of-way.
  - d. The SWM report is to provide comment on how the proposed SWM plan is consistent with previous studies and reports prepared in the South Bolton Industrial Area. Specifically, the report should comment on the following reports:
    - i. Bolton South Industrial Lands Master Environmental Servicing Plan prepared by Burnside Development Services dated May 2000;
    - ii. Equity Prestige Business Park West Phase Stormwater Management Report by a.m. candaras associates inc. dated July 2004;
    - iii. Simpson Road Extension GWL Industrial Subdivision Stormwater Management Design Brief prepared by Pitura Husson Limited dated June 2008;
    - iv. Coleraine Drive Detail Design Drainage & Stormwater Management Report prepared by MRC dated January 2009;

- 19) More information is to be provided in the report regarding the external drainage to the north. The Town acknowledges that future quality and quantity control for the external drainage will be addressed through site plan control on the adjacent lots. Notwithstanding the above, the report should address the following:
- a. Provide drainage design sheets to confirm the capacity of the pipes and that the pipes will maintain self-cleaning velocities.
  - b. Provide information regarding the capacity of the storm sewer service connection on the south property to accept the external uncontrolled flows in addition to the treated flow and the flows from the property to the south.
  - c. Confirm ponding is not expected to occur at proposed CB locations along north property line.
- 20) Future submissions are to include detailed erosion and sediment control plans conforming to Town of Caledon Standards and the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area Conservation Authorities' Erosion and Sediment Control Guideline for Urban Construction.
- 21) Future submissions are to provide the following details in the Engineering Plans:
- a. Details for the proposed underground storage system adjacent to the proposed office building including cross sections and infiltration gallery details.
  - b. Details for the proposed dry pond including cross sections and infiltration gallery details
  - c. Details of the proposed retaining walls adjacent to the north and south property limits. Include details of any tie backs or footings, as required.
  - d. Details of the proposed noise barriers. Note that noise barriers are to conform to Town Standard 609. Any deviations from town standard are to be approved by Town Staff.
  - e. Details of the proposed screening walls in the NE quadrant of the property.
  - f. Future submissions are to include a detailed engineering cost estimate for the proposed site works. The cost estimate is to be signed and stamped by a professional engineer.
- 22) Grading Drawings C101A and C101B:
- a. Proposed entrance to Coleraine Drive is to be reviewed and approved by the Region of Peel.
  - b. Entrance at Simpson Road is to conform to OPSD 350.010. Curbs along Simpson Road are to be continuous through entrances.
  - c. Provide typical cross sections for the landscape buffer areas at the north and south property limits. Cross section to demonstrate how landscape area is proposed to be graded, how grades tie in to existing grades on adjacent properties, how retaining wall, fence, noise barrier, swale, CB's, are to be configured in buffer area.

- d. Proposed TW and BW elevations for the retaining walls at the north and south limits do not appear to match the rest of the proposed site grading. TW and BW Elevations appear to be noted on the opposite side of the walls. Review elevations and revise on plans, as necessary.
- e. Review fencing and noise barrier locations for north and south limits. Noise barriers are to be located outside of proposed swales.
- f. Provide additional elevations for the existing grades on adjacent property to the south (12393 Coleraine Drive) to confirm no impacts to the existing drainage are expected. Note that town standards are to include existing grades 20m outside of the property limits.

23) Servicing Drawings C102A and C102B:

- a. Simpson Road Storm sewer outlet is proposed through the stub / MH on the adjacent south property. A servicing easement will be required over the proposed service connection as a condition of site plan approval.
- b. Drainage Design Sheets are to be provided for the proposed storm sewers. Design sheets are required to confirm proposed sewers will have capacity and will maintain self-cleaning velocities to prevent upstream impacts on the external drainage areas.

**Town of Caledon, Fire Prevention**

- 24) Location of the Fire Department connection to be indicated on the site plan. Shall be located as required by OBC 3.2.5.16.
- 25) Site plan to indicate the entire fire department access route. FD access route shall be designed as outlined in the OBC 3.2.5.6.
- 26) Site plan to indicate the location of fire access route signage. Signage shall be provided as outlined in the Town of Caledon By-law 2015-058
- 27) Fire hydrant(s) shall be located within 45 m of a fire department connection or with 90 m horizontally of any portion of a building required to face a street.
- 28) Private hydrants have been indicated on the site plan, please the location of the nearest municipal hydrants.

**Building & Support Services Section, Building**

- 29) Provide building classification number for the proposed F1 type. Also, it appears a fire alarm system will be required based on occupant load shown for the classification type. Revise and resubmit OBC matrix or provide clarification.
- 30) Verify spatial separation for the proposed structure at the north face and conform to tables 3.2.3 of the OBC for the matrix.

- 31) The fire route access shall conform to 3.2.5.6. of the OBC are as follows:
  - a. A clear width of 6m is required.
  - b. A minimum centreline radius of 12m is required.
- 32) An overhead clearance of 5m is required.
- 33) A maximum of 15m shall be provided for fire route access at main entrance location. Provide verification.
- 34) Provide location of fire department connection. Ensure the proposed fire hydrant is within 45m of FD connection without obstruction.
- 35) The proposed development will be reviewed under the Ontario Building Code through the review of the Building Permit application.

### **Building & Support Services Section, Signage**

- 36) It appears a ground sign is proposed that exceeds the maximum ground sign area and height for an Industrial Zone as per schedule A to Sign Bylaw 2017-54 . The subject property does not fall in the areas outlined in schedules B or C to the Sign Bylaw which permit an increase to the maximum sign area and height. A sign variance may be required.
- 37) All proposed signs will require building permits in accordance with Sign Bylaw 2017-54.

### **Town of Caledon, Open Space Design**

- 38) Please provide a Landscape Letter of Conformance as requested at the Development Application Review Team (DART) meeting. The Landscape Letter of Conformance is to be stamped, signed and dated by a full member of the Ontario Association of Landscape Architects (OALA) in good standing. The standard template for the Landscape Letter of Conformance can be found within the Town of Caledon Site Plan Control Manual.
- 39) Please enlarge the caliper of the Quercus Robur 'Fastigiata' to a minimum 70mm cal. as per the Town of Caledon Site Plan Control Manual.
- 40) Please review the LP-101 'Plant Schedule' in relation to the planting plan. It was noted that 8 Skyline Honey Locust were noted within the 'Plant Schedule', however only 6 were shown on the landscape plans.
- 41) Please identify via a key the 2 deciduous trees adjacent Coleraine Drive, at the Western edge of the site – no key currently provided on the 1/LP-101 drawing.
- 42) Please substitute the 2 Red Oak shown within the LP-101 'Plant Schedule' for 2 Burr Oak.
- 43) Please provide a solid block of shrubs and/or perennial planting within the parking island under the 1 Skyline Honey Locust, at the South West end of the site.

- 44) Please omit the 3/LD-101 detail from the landscape drawing set and include within the engineering drawing set. Landscape plans key should reference engineering detail. i.e. "Concrete sidewalk – see engineering plans".
- 45) Please specify and nurse crop species and nurse crop seed application rate (kg/ha) within the 2/LD-101 detail.
- 46) Please include the full Town of Caledon Standard Landscape Notes, as shown on pages 17 and 18 of the Town of Caledon Site Plan Control Manual. Please note the name of the Consulting Landscape Architectural firm is required to be updated within the 'General' section.
- 47) Please show the zoning of adjacent properties on the landscape plans.
- 48) Please show the location of the noise fence / noise walls on the landscape drawings and identify accordingly.
- 49) Please identify on all landscape drawings and within the legend of the title block the property line of the site.
- 50) Please identify on all landscape drawings and within the legend of the title block the light standards and/or site lighting.
- 51) Please provide a construction detail of the 'metal screen panels' noted on the LP-100 drawing.
- 52) Please provide a construction detail of the 'opaque screen fence' noted on the LP-100 drawing.
- 53) Please provide a construction detail for the picnic tables and trash receptacle noted on the LP-100 drawing.
- 54) Please note the height of the 'bulk material storage' bins on the landscape drawings.
- 55) Please correct the typo of "2st office building" on the landscape drawings.
- 56) Please note the height and location of all retaining walls on the landscape drawings.
- 57) Please note the height and type of all fencing proposed on site on the landscape drawings.
- 58) Please provide a 'match line' on the LP-100 drawing, correlating with the 1/LP-101 detail and 2/LP-101 detail.
- 59) Please update the LP-101 'Plant Schedule' to read 'cal.' as opposed to '70' within the deciduous trees and coniferous trees heading.
- 60) Please relocate the 'General Notes' from the LP-100 drawing to the LD-101 drawing.
- 61) Please enlarge the size of the LP-101 'Plant Schedule' for greater ease of legibility and relocate to the LP-100 drawing.
- 62) Please provide landscape peninsulas (minimum 5m width) for every 20 parking stalls, as per the Town of Caledon Industrial Commercial Design Guidelines.

- 63) Please remove the following note from the landscape drawings as landscape strip width shall be approved through zoning, prior to SPA. "Note: Berm/landscape strip width not less than 3m. Dimensions could vary pending site conditions."
- 64) Please provide additional plant material and armour stone groupings along the Coleraine Drive and Simpson Road frontages to aid in screening.
- 65) Please re-label the 'Asphalt Sidewalk' shown on the Simpson Road side of the LP-101 drawing as 'Asphalt Splash Strip'.
- 66) Please identify any existing trees proposed for removal with an appropriate symbol and label within the legend of the landscape drawings.
- 67) Please provide a detail of the 'security fence and sliding access gate' shown on the 1/LP-101 drawing.
- 68) Please remove the 'rockery and river stone bed detail' areas from the edges of the Simpson Road and Coleraine Drive entrances. Please provide topsoil and sod in place of the rockery and river stone.
- 69) Please clarify the 'Conclusions' section of the Arborists Letter, dated February 16, 2018 prepared by Davey Resource Group. The conclusions section of the letter states "No trees were found on Part of Lot 3, Concession 6 on February 16th 2016. No trees should be impacted by the proposed construction and therefore no preservation methods need to be taken." This is contradictory to the Arborists Report, dated February 17, 2016, prepared by Davey Resource Group.
- 70) Please update the 'Recommendations' section of the Arborists Report, dated February 17, 2016, prepared by Davey Resource Group to be more specific and detailed – i.e. how many trees to be removed from the property, how many trees on neighboring properties to be retained.
- 71) Please update 'Appendix 1 – Tree Protection Action Key' to include a 'Retain' column adjacent to the red 'Removal' column.
- 72) Please clarify the rationale for removal of tree #1 and tree #6 as identified within 'Appendix 1 – Tree Protection Action Key'.
- 73) Please add the Town of Caledon standard detail #707 to the Arborists Report, dated February 17, 2016, prepared by Davey Resource Group, and make note of the detail within the written Arborist Report.
- 74) Please revise 'Appendix 2 – Tree Preservation Plans (Preview)' to increase image and print quality as currently the image is not readable. Please also provide a separate copy on 24"x36" paper.
- 75) Please update the Arborists Report, dated February 17, 2016, prepared by Davey Resource Group to note that no grading is to occur within the drip line of any existing trees to remain.

- 76) Please update the description of 'Figure 3: Hedges' found within the Arborist Report to note where on site the hedge is located. Please also correlate with the 'Appendix 2 – Tree Preservation Plan'.
- 77) Please update the Arborists Report, dated February 17, 2016, prepared by Davey Resource Group to note the diameter at breast height (d.b.h.) used to classify trees on site.
- 78) 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 an AACI Long Form 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 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 2% of the approved appraised value of the subject lands.
- 79) 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 an OALA licensed landscape architect. The amount of landscape securities the Town requires is based on 100% of the total cost of the landscape works.
- 80) Please note that for final approval, two full size sets of landscape plans with an original stamp, signature and date are required.

#### **Town of Caledon, Legislative Services Section, Accessibility**

- 81) Overall Site Plan shall note that the main entrance of the office building is barrier-free with either a power door operator or an automatic sliding door feature as per the barrier free section of the Ontario Building Code.
- 82) Site plan shall indicate each accessible access aisle that directly lead to an access route or walkway shall contain curb ramps at the top of the access aisle that meet the provision of the Ontario Building Code as it relates to curb ramps.
- 83) Site Plan shall indicate that exterior lighting at the main entrance and in close proximity to the accessible parking space(s) shall be a minimum lighting level of 35 lux.
- 84) Site Plan shall illustrate snow storage to ensure the accessibility provisions on the site are maintained.

#### **Region of Peel**

- 85) As detailed in the attached letter, the Region of Peel requires the following revisions:
- c. Site access moved to southerly limit;

- d. Documentation of gratuitous dedication of the Region's land (ROW) dedication requirements, including 0.3m reserve;
  - e. Detailed servicing comments to be sent directly to consultant under separate cover; and
  - f. Clearly mark carpool parking spaces.
- 86) Please provide 2 copies of the PINS for the property.
- 87) A functional design is required for the access, clearly noting the right turn-lane storage and taper requirements as per TAC guidelines.

### Canada Post

- 88) Mail delivery will be provided for this address to the current delivery point to an existing Community Mailbox site in the vicinity as is pre-existing. The address is already included in the existing range – postal code L7E 3B4. For mail delivery inquiry please contact the local Post office at 905-846-4814X 2003

### Hydro One

- 89) Hydro One has no objections at this point. Please ensure that all private electrical infrastructure on the property have owner agreements/easements placed on them when impacted by property severances/easements to ensure all land owners/tenants legal rights are maintained. Ensure all industry standard utility separations and clearance minimums are maintained.
- 90) Prior to beginning work please ensure that:
- Underground locates are obtained prior to excavation
  - No open trenching within 1.5m of Hydro poles and/or anchors.
  - Maintain 1m clearance from Hydro One Plant if trenchless horizontal drilling.
  - PUCC owner is responsible to address all conflicts with Hydro One plant and request conflict corrections through appropriate channels
  - Any grade changes are brought to the attention of Hydro One and addressed prior to commencing work

Comments from the following agencies and departments are attached for your review:

- Region of Peel – January 14, 2019
- Urban Design Peer Review, M. Behar Planning & Design Inc – January 14, 2019
- Peer Review of Air Quality Study, Wood Environmental & Infrastructure Solutions – December 21, 2018
- Peer Review of Hydrogeological Investigation Report, Cole Engineering Group Ltd – January 2, 2019
- Peer Review of Noise Impact Study, Valcoustics Canada Ltd – January 2, 2019
- Enbridge – August 7, 2018

The following agencies and departments have no comments at this time:

- Rogers Communications – August 10, 2018

- Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board – August 1, 2018

Comments from the following agencies remain outstanding and will be provided upon receipt of same:

- Bell Canada
- MPAC
- OPP
- Peel District School Board

## Conclusion

The proposed applications cannot be supported as proposed as they do not conform to the applicable provincial, regional and municipal policy framework, as noted in the comments provided herein and attached hereto. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me at 905-584-2272 ext. 4223 or [mary.nordstrom@caledon](mailto:mary.nordstrom@caledon).

Yours truly,



Mary T. Nordstrom, MCIP RPP  
Senior Development Planner

c.

Peggy Tollett, General Manager of Community Services  
Casey Blakely, Manager of Development – East  
Sylvia Kirkwood, Manager, Policy & Sustainability  
Angie Mitchell, Chief Building Official/Manager  
Eric Chan, Manager, Transportation Engineering, Finance & Infrastructure  
Amanda Fusco, Manager, Legislative & Information Services/Interim Town Clerk, Corporate Services  
Akhil Bhalla, Assistant Town Solicitor  
Ben Roberts, Manager, Business Development, Tourism & Culture  
Brian Baird, Manager, Parks/Landscape Architect  
Tiffany McClain, Law Clerk  
Gaetano De Pasqua, Lead Plans Examiner  
Kyle Poole, Landscape Architect  
Margherita Bialy, Senior Policy Planner  
Douglas McGlynn, Planner, Heritage & Urban Design  
Arash Olia, Coordinator, Transportation Development  
Jay Menary, Technologist, Development Engineering  
Cindy Pillsworth, Zoning Examiner  
Joy Simms, Region of Peel  
Ann-Leham-Allison, MPAC  
Ontario Provincial Police (OPP), Caledon Detachment  
Bell Canada, Development & Municipal Services Control Centre