



December 11, 2017

Design Plan Services Inc.  
900 The West Mall Suite 100  
Toronto, ON M9B 6K2

Dear Mr. TJ Cieciora :

**Re: Proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment  
Design Plan Services Inc. (c/o TJ Cieciora) on behalf of Triple Crown Line Developments Inc.  
Part Lots 18, 19 and 20, Concession 1 (Albion), Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel  
15717 & 15505 Airport Road and 0 Innis Lake Road  
File Numbers: 21T-17004, POPA 17-01, RZ 17-06**

---

Planning staff received applications for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision on June 14, 2017 and revised materials on August 4, 2017 and September 28, 2017. Staff determined the applications to be complete on June 27, 2017. The submission packages received by the Town included the following:

- Cover letter by Design Plan Services dated June 9, 2017;
- Pre-Consultation (DART) Meeting Form date-stamped June 14, 2017;
- Official Plan/Zoning By-law Amendment Application date stamped June 14, 2017;
- Subdivision Application Form date-stamped June 14, 2017;
- Draft Official Plan Amendment date-stamped June 14, 2017;
- Draft Zoning By-law Amendment date-stamped June 14, 2017;
- Draft Plan of Subdivision prepared by Design Plan Services Inc. dated May 1, 2017;
- Plan of Survey prepared by Holding Jones Venderveen Inc. dated November 28, 2016;
- Parks and Open Space Concept Plan prepared by MBTW dated June 1, 2017;
- Trail, Walkway & Pedestrian Plan prepared by MBTW dated June 1, 2017;
- Planning Justification Report prepared by Design Plan Services dated May 2017;
- Urban Design Brief prepared by MBTW dated June 1, 2017;
- Preliminary Environmental Impact Study prepared by Dillon Consulting dated June 2017;
- Region of Peel Healthy Development Assessment date-stamped June 14, 2017;
- Drawing GR-1, Overall Grading Plan prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers dated May 2017;
- Drawing GR-2, Grading Plan (Part 1 of 4) prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers dated May 2017;
- Drawing GR-3, Grading Plan (Part 2 of 4) prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers dated May 2017;
- Drawing GR-4, Grading Plan (Part 3 of 4) prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers dated May 2017;
- Drawing GR-5, Grading Plan (Part 4 of 4) prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers dated May 2017;
- Minimum Distance Separation Memo prepared by Dillon Consulting dated June 5, 2017;
- Functional Servicing Report prepared by Schaeffers Consulting Engineers dated May 2017;
- Traffic Impact Study prepared by Cole Engineering dated June 2017;

- Preliminary Pre- and Post-Development Site Water Balance Assessment prepared by EXP Services Inc. dated June 14, 2017;
- Geotechnical Investigation prepared by EXP Services Inc. dated June 8, 2017;
- Preliminary Hydrogeological Investigation prepared by EXP Services Inc. dated June 14, 2017;
- Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment prepared by The Archaeologists Inc. dated June 1, 2017;
- Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Scarlett Janusas Archaeology Inc. dated April 21, 2017;
- Phase I Environmental Site assessment prepared by EXP Services Inc., dated September 20, 2016;
- Subsurface Environmental Investigation prepared by EXP Services Inc. dated September 27, 2016;
- Environmental Noise Feasibility Study prepared by Valcoustics Canada Ltd., dated June 1, 2017;
- Agricultural Opinion Report prepared by Dillon Consulting dated July 27, 2017;
- Slope Stability Analysis prepared by EXP Services Inc., dated July 25, 2017; and
- Chemical Testing prepared by EXP Services Inc., dated July 25, 2017.

## Proposal

---

The subject property is located within and directly adjacent to Caledon East, on the east side of Airport Road. The site is bounded by agricultural lands to the south, environmental lands to the south and east, existing residential along the north and a commercial plaza in the north-west corner.

The **Draft Plan of Subdivision** currently proposes to create 562 single detached residential lots with frontages ranging from 9.75m (32 foot) to 15.2m (75 foot), including 62 laneway singles fronting onto Airport Road and the parallel internal street. The Draft Plan also illustrates the potential development of an additional 63 residential lots on abutting lands to the northeast and south not owned by the applicant at the time of the submission ("Additional Lands"). These Additional Lands lie within the 2021 Caledon East Settlement Boundary, and, if developed as shown, would result in the total build out of 625 residential units in this location. The applicant recently received approval for a consent (B-012-17) to adjust the boundary of the subject lands to include 3.8 ha of the lands to the south. The proposal is also requesting minor adjustments to the southern and eastern settlement boundary limits.

A 0.39 ha future development block is proposed at the proposed intersection of Airport Road and Street A and intended to accommodate a medium density residential use for future seniors residence or affordable housing.

A 1.96 ha neighbourhood park is centrally located on the Draft Plan as well as four parkettes totaling 0.33 ha in size.

Access to the site is proposed at two locations along Airport Road; the northerly access aligns with the school access on the west side of Airport Road and the southerly access aligns with Cranston Drive. A stormwater management facility is currently proposed to the south of and currently outside of the settlement boundary and Draft Plan of Subdivision.

The **Official Plan Amendment** applies to the subject lands and the Additional Lands. The purpose of the Official Plan Amendment is to relocate the Neighbourhood Park to a central location, redesignate the northeast portion from Open Space Policy Area to Low Density Residential and increase the permitted net density from 16.6 units per hectare to 22.0 units per net hectare.

The **Zoning By-law Amendment** proposes to rezone the lands from Agricultural (A1), Environmental Policy Area 2 (EPA-2) and Agricultural – ORM (A1-ORM) to site specific Residential 1 (R1-X) and Residential 2 (R2-X, R2-Y) zones and an Open Space (OS) zone for the parks.

## Executive Summary of Comments

The resubmission has been reviewed by external agencies and internal commenting departments and detailed comments are listed below. At this time, the applications cannot be supported for the reasons set out in the letter, which include but are not limited to the following:

- The stormwater management pond and grading as currently proposed is not technically supported and has not been adequately justified from a policy standpoint. A technology sound solution is required that is supported by the current policy framework, without adverse impact to prime agricultural lands or key natural heritage features.
- There are several inconsistencies between the reports with respect to subject site description (boundary, size) as well as the number of units being proposed. Please ensure consistency between the proposed planning instruments and supporting technical studies.
- A revised submission is required that considers and complies with the current provincial policy context.
- Additional justification is needed to support the Official Plan Amendment, including proposed modifications to the settlement boundary.
- The heritage attributes of the property have not been adequately assessed.
- A number of the technical studies, including but not limited to servicing, grading, geotechnical, hydrogeology, traffic and noise are inconsistent with Town, TRCA, Regional and Provincial standards.

A resubmission is required to address the comments provided herein. Please ensure the resubmission package includes a cover letter explaining how each comment has been addressed and the resubmission fee of \$5300, as per our current Fee By-law.

## General Comments

*(TOC=Town of Caledon; CS=Community Services; FIS=Finance & Infrastructure Services; CORP=Corporate Services; TRCA=Toronto and Region Conservation Authority)*

1. **Hydro One** doesn't have any conflicts with this project providing 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
  - Ensure all industry standard utility separations and clearance minimums are maintained.
  - Any grade changes are brought to the attention of Hydro One and addressed prior to commencing work
  - Any poles affected by grading requiring a pole setting adjustment will be charged at 100% labour and material without advanced notice having been received.
2. With the exception of the Town of Caledon property at 0 Innis Lake Road, which is exempt from taxation, the subject properties are currently assessed as farmland and residential and the property tax accounts are current as of August 25, 2017. If this development were to proceed as proposed with the creation of 562 single detached residential lots and possibly 63 additional residential lots the taxable assessment value of the properties would change to reflect the creation of this new development.  
*(TOC, FIS, Finance)*
3. Any future development would be subject to Town of Caledon development charges as per By-law No. 2014-54 as amended, currently \$24,492.26/unit residential. Any development would also be subject to Region of Peel development charges, currently \$50,741.59/unit residential, GO Transit development charges \$521.56/unit residential and Education development charges, currently \$4,567.00/unit residential as per the respective development charge by-laws. Effective February 1, 2016 the Region of Peel began collecting hard service development charges (i.e. water, wastewater and roads) directly for residential developments,

except townhouses and apartments, at the time of subdivision agreement execution. Development charges will be indexed next on February 1/August 1, 2018. All development charges are payable prior to issuance of a building permit with the exception of the change from the Region of Peel noted above. *(TOC, FIS, Finance)*

4. Pressurized Fire Hydrants shall be installed in accordance with the Region of Peel standards. *(TOC, CS, Fire)*
5. The proposed development is located within the Regulated Area of the Humber River Watershed; as such, a permit is required from the TRCA prior to any works commencing on-site. *(TRCA – Attached)*
6. More information is needed regarding the potential mid-rise building at the southeast corner of Airport Road and Street A, identified as Block 506 on the Draft Plan (i.e. concept plan). This block/use should be considered in the supporting technical studies. *(TOC – Planning, TOC – Policy, Region of Peel, Healthy Assessment)*
7. The applications are supported by an MDS study dated June 5, 2017. Please comment on whether guideline 36 (Non-Application of MDS within Settlement Areas) applies to the applications. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
8. Please ensure consistency between all submission materials in terms of the subject site (which should include the additional lands to the east and south) and proposal details (i.e. number of units). *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
9. Please ensure all supporting reports incorporate and review the additional lands acquired to the South, including but not limited to the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Report. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*

**General Comments to be Addressed Prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

1. A revised application is required that captures the newly acquired lands to the south (“South Parcel”).
2. Please amend the boundary of the subdivision to include the recently acquired South Parcel as well as the balance of the subject lands to the east (“East Parcel”), outside of the settlement boundary. As indicated in the Planning Justification Report, the East Parcel is intended to be dedicated to a public agency. As such, it should be placed into a Block on the Draft Plan to facilitate future conveyance. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
3. The proposed location of the stormwater management pond (“SWM pond”) is not located at the lower point of the development area. Natural grading is to the south east whereas the pond is proposed on high ground to the west, which will require significant grading operations to drain to the proposed site. The pond should be relocated to the lowest point of the development area *(TOC, FIS & CS - Engineering & TRCA)*
4. The proposed location of the SWM pond is outside the settlement boundary of Caledon East, within the natural features and buffer of the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan and within the ‘Prime Agricultural Area’ designation in the Region’s and Town’s Official Plans.
  - a. Staff do not support the justification that farm practices on a farm site has the same net effect; in this case, the SWM pond would not be considered an agricultural-related or secondary use as it exclusively services urban development. *(Region of Peel, TRCA, TOC)*
  - b. The proposed location does not conform to the Greenbelt’s Plan or Region’s Official Plan policies on Infrastructure within the Greenbelt (i.e. reasonable alternative locations within the settlement area were not explored). *(Region of Peel)*
  - c. The proposed SWM pond is located within a Key Natural Heritage Feature (KMHF) and Hydrologically Sensitive Features (HSF) and below the TRCA-staked top of bank, which is prohibited by the Greenbelt Plan. As per the TRCA’s Living City Policies (LCP), which may be more restrictive, the SWM pond must be located 10m inland from the greater of the TRCA staked top of bank, long-term stable slope, Regulatory Floodplain and associated vegetated dripline. *(TRCA)*
  - d. Potential impacts on Key Natural Heritage and Hydrological Features were not addressed. *(Region of Peel)*

Relocation of the SWM pond within the settlement boundary is recommended. (*Region of Peel, TRCA, TOC, CS, Policy & Development*)

5. The Draft Plan is showing new residential lots that partially encroach beyond the settlement area boundary for Caledon East to the south and east. These minor boundary adjustments have not been adequately addressed in the Planning Justification Report. (*TOC, CS, Policy & Region of Peel*)
6. The proposal needs to be revised to provide a diverse housing mix, as well as affordable housing and universal design options. (*TOC, CS, Policy, Region of Peel – HDA*)
7. Confirm all exterior travel routes (sidewalks) will be a minimum of 1.5 m wide as per the Design of Public Spaces legislation of the AODA, pertaining to exterior travel routes. (*TOC, CORP, Accessibility*)
8. All street tree plantings are to be installed entirely within the Town boulevard. In order to accommodate double row street tree plantings on streets A & B, a minimum unobstructed area of 3.0, x 4.0m is required for each lot. (*TOC, CS, Landscape*)
9. All proposed ‘in valley trails’ are to be 3.0m wide asphalt. All paths are to be a minimum 4.0m away from rear property boundaries. (*TOC, CS, Landscape*)
10. It is recommended that all proposed cul-de-sac islands be removed from the plans as they represent future maintenance issues. If required, then the preference is to have them surfaced with patterned concrete. (*TOC, CS, Landscape*)
11. Revised mapping is required that demonstrates all KNHF and HSF and the applicable buffers as well as the full length of the staked valley corridor to determine the limits of development. (*TRCA*)
12. A slope stability report is required that delineates the location of the existing conditions long-term stable top of slope with a safety factor of 1.50 on the tableland to ensure appropriate buffers have been incorporated into the draft plan. (*TRCA*)
13. All KNHFs, HSFs and their respective MVPZ should be placed into public ownership and gratuitously dedicated to the TRCA or Town of Caledon. This includes “Additional Lands in Which the Applicant Has an Interest”. (*TRCA & TOC, CS, Development*)

**The following traffic and road network comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

1. Please include a description of the proposed development in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). (*TOC, CS, Planning*)
2. The TIS is not satisfactory for the reasons set out in the attached letter from the Region of Peel. (*Region of Peel*)
3. The developer is proposing eighteen 18.0m right-of-way local roads, two 20m right-of-way collector roads, and three 8.0m wide laneways. Street A right of way will widen to 23m in width from the intersection of Street B to Airport Road. It should be noted the Town does not have a standard for a 23m right of way. The Region of Peel will be required to review and approve any proposed improvements to any Regional roads. The roads within the noted plan shall be designed and constructed in accordance with current Town standards including curb and gutter, storm sewers, sidewalk, street lighting and landscaping.
4. All intersection angles shall be in the range of 85 degrees to 95 degrees. The sharp angle at the intersections of Streets A/E, A/Q and the sharp bends along Street H are not acceptable. (*TOC, FIS & CS, Engineering*)
5. The width of Street B road must match the existing width of Mountcrest Road. (*TOC, CS, Engineering*)
6. Please clarify the purpose of Laneway “C”. (*TOC, FIS, Engineering*)
7. The curve on Laneway “A” is to be designed to accommodate turning movements of Town snow plows. (*TOC, FIS, Engineering*)
8. All elbow designs are to meet Town standards. The elbow design on Street D does not meet and needs to be revised. Please utilize Local Elbow Design Standard 214 for Local Residential Roads. (*TOC, CS & FIS, Engineering*)
9. Street “U” and “R” are to be designed with temporary cul-de sacs. (*TOC, FIS, Engineering*)
10. Street “S” is to be a Block dedicated to the Town for a future R.O.W. Driveway for Lot 165 to be from Street “R”. (*TOC, FIS, Engineering*)
11. The cul de sacs on Streets “R” and “E” do not meet Town standards and need to be revised. (*TOC, CS & FIS, Engineering*)

12. Curve Radii are to meet Town Standards. Please note Street “A” is a collector road. Centerline curve radius on Street A is too small – minimum radius for a collector road is 130m *(TOC, FIS & CS, Engineering)*
13. Street “F” is to be a Block dedicated to the Town for a future Right of Way. Driveway for Lot 117 is to be from Street “E”. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
14. LID measures have been proposed on a few cul de sacs. The Town does not support implementing these measures in the cul de sac as they will be problematic with respect to snow removal. Please investigate other locations for the LID measures. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
15. The daylight triangles at Airport Road and Street A are too small. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
16. All required daylighting triangles and roundings are required to adhere to current Town standards. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
17. Where possible all sidewalks should be located on either the north or east side of the road. As per current Town standards, local roads only require a sidewalk on one side of the road. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
18. As per current Town standards, all proposed street lighting shall be LED. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
19. A minimum 15 metre tangent is required at all intersections. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
20. The applicant is required to provide Parking Plans as per Section 5.12 of the Town’s Development Standards.
21. According to the Traffic Impact Study (TIS), the proposed development will have a minor impact on the study area intersections during weekday AM and PM peak hours but will continue to operate at a good level of service. The TIS recommends signalization of the north access and Airport Road intersection to mitigate poor operations and high pedestrian volume. As Airport Road is under the jurisdiction of the Region, all Regional standards (i.e. spacing) should be met. Comments include:
  - a. The potential for bike lanes should be investigated, specifically Street A;
  - b. The potential for direct connection to the existing nearby plaza should be explored;
  - c. To enhance pedestrian safety and facilitate walking/cycling to school, pedestrian signals (PXO) should be considered. See page 15 of MTO book for more information; and
  - d. Functional design of the intersection of Airport Road and Cranston Drive/Street A and northerly Street A connection must be included. (i.e. Street A) *(TOC, FIS, Transportation)*
22. The standard for Laneway A and B is an 8m right of way width with 5.4 metres pavement, widened at the curves to accommodate snow plow turning. Only a storm sewer is allowed within the right of way. Street lights will need to be located on private property subject to an easement. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*

**The following servicing comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

23. The Preliminary Functional Servicing Report (FSR) is based on a subdivision consisting of 606 single family lots. This is inconsistent with the Draft Plan of Subdivision at 562 units and the Planning Justification Report’s ultimate build out at 625 units. The FSR should also consider the future medium density block. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
24. The Region of Peel has determined the study is not satisfactory for the reasons set out in the attached letter (i.e. all lots to be serviced via the internal road system, servicing from laneways is not permitted, gravity sanitary sewers are required and sanitary sewer forcemains are not permitted). *(Region of Peel)*
25. The Functional Servicing Report (“FSR”) recommends a stormwater management pond to provide water quantity, quality and erosion control for a majority of the site. The proposed location for this facility is in the south-west portion of the site adjacent to Airport Road. The report makes reference that due to grading constraints, drainage from the south-east portion of the site, will not be able to drain to the SWM facility. As such, it is proposed that water quantity and quality for this area would be treated by use of a superpipe, orifice control, oil/grit separator and LID measures within the cul de sac. All stormwater modelling outlined within this report has been reviewed by the TRCA (see comments herein and attached). The superpipe, on Street R, is designed

to outlet in the valley lands, in two locations, both of which are beneath a 4.0m high retaining wall. The Town is not supportive of the proposed stormwater pond location for the following reasons:

- a. The logical location for the stormwater management facility is in lowest part of the development which is the south east corner. Locating the pond in the south-west corner is what causes grading constraints. If the pond is located in the south east corner the entire site would be treated in one facility, not two, as proposed. This would be less costly for the Town to maintain and operate. It also eliminates a superpipe, OGS, and storm pipes under retaining walls. In the event of plugged catchbasins on Street R drainage would overtop the retaining walls, which is not acceptable.
  - b. The pond is outside of the Caledon East Settlement Boundary.
  - c. The design indicates slopes at 3:1 etc. which do not meet Town or MOE criteria which would make the facility undersized.
  - d. The Region of Peel will not likely permit access to this facility from Airport Road and additional road widenings may be necessary.
  - e. The SWMF is proposing an emergency spillway from the sediment forebay, which is not acceptable.
  - f. An existing storm sewer on the Innis lands needs to be re-located due to the development. This pipe is also proposed to be re-located outside the settlement boundary. *(TOC, CS, Engineering & FIS, Engineering)*
26. Section 2.2 of the Functional Servicing Report ("FSR") states all boundary grades will be maintained with minimal cutting and filling; however, many retaining walls are proposed, some exceeding 4.5 metres. Staff are concerned about the ability of future homeowners to maintain these walls particularly where walls are proposed to be located at the rear property lines. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
  27. The emergency spillway cannot be from the sediment forebay as shows in Section 5.3 of the FSR. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
  28. A super pipe and orifice control/Oil-Grit Separator (OGS) are proposed for those areas not being serviced by the pond. An OGS can only achieve 50% TSS removal. This does not adequately address quality control. *(TRCA & TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
  29. Pipes cannot be located under retaining walls, as shown on Figure 5-2 of the FSR. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
  30. Staff are not supportive of most of the proposed LID measures in the cul-de-sacs listed in Section 5-7 of FSR. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)* *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
  31. Watermain or sanitary sewer servicing cannot locate within the right-of-way for Laneways A and B, only a storm sewer is allowed. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
  32. The FSR advises the majority of the site will drain to one connection to the existing 525mm diameter sanitary sewer on Airport Road. Each individual lot fronting Airport Road would require individual servicing to the existing sanitary sewer. The south-east portion of the site is too low to drain wastewater via gravity sewers, therefore approximately 90 lots would require use of a grinder pump to convey flows into the forcemain system. The Region of Peel has advised individual lot grinder pumps to convey sanitary sewer to the sanitary sewer forcemain will not be permitted. *(Region of Peel)*
  33. The applicant is required to accommodate external storm drainage that currently drains though the property, which includes lands to the north of Street E. All major overland flows must be accommodated and conveyed on public lands. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
  34. The storm sewers will be sized using the 10 year return frequency and Town IDF curves. All storm flows to be treated for water quantity and quality in accordance with MOE guidelines. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
  35. A water balance analysis needs to be submitted for the subject lands. The developer should also investigate the possibility of incorporating some form of LID measures throughout the development. The Developer should refer to the TRCA's LID Manual for the different measures. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
  36. The TRCA (see attached) has provided the following comments on the FSR:

- a. Supporting calculations are needed to support the Otthymo Modeling output table and comparison table showing storage requirements for 6 hour and 12 hour AES storms.
- b. The calculated allowable release rates in Table 5-6 (Superpipe) are not in line with Humber Unit Flow relations.
- c. As there is a significant change proposed from the pre and post-development drainage pattern, which will introduce an additional large volume of water to the south watercourse, an erosion assessment is required to assess erosion risk to the watercourse and establish the erosion target.

**The following grading comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

37. The boundary grades will change dramatically along the north limit and sections of the east and south limits. Along the north side of the site, retaining walls are proposed within future backyards that back onto the Valewood Drive properties. These walls approach 5.0m in height at some locations. While the Town does support the effort to eliminate drainage from the site onto the Valewood properties, further effort in design is required to eliminate or greatly minimize the height of the retaining walls as it exceeds the Town's standards. Additional cross-sections are required around the perimeter of the site. The change in grade along this boundary may have a detrimental effect on the existing trees. Staff are also concerned about how future homeowners will maintain these walls. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
38. Extensive filling is proposed in the south-east corner, however the future lots (approximately 90) would be still be too low to drain by gravity to the existing sanitary sewer on Airport Road, therefore grinder pumps and a forcemain would be necessary. The filling that would occur in this area necessitates the need for excessively high retaining walls upwards of 5.0m in height, exceeding the Town's standards, across the rear of numerous backyards and Town Blocks. Walls of this height can be very onerous to maintain for the Town and homeowners. These walls would be adjacent to the buffer zone to the valley lands, please see TRCA comments below. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
  - a. TRCA staff are not supportive of the proposed grading encroachments within the buffers; rather, all grading should occur within the development envelope. Also, the use of retaining walls is to be minimized or removed entirely to avoid future impacts to the buffer as a result of maintenance access.
39. Engineering drawings reference a retaining wall along the rear of the lots adjacent to the plaza; this does not align with the noise report. Engineering drawings show slopes at 3:1 whereas Town standards are 4:1. Also maximum grade is 5.0%, this is being exceeded in some areas. Please refer to Town Development Standards for grading details. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
40. Oversized pipe from Street "R" and Street "Q" goes under a 4.25 metre retaining wall. This is unacceptable. Overland flow route for major storms will cascade over this wall. This too is unacceptable. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
41. Oversized pipe from Street "R" at Street "T" also goes under a retaining wall 4.5 metres high. This too is unacceptable. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
42. Pre development conditions have overland flow going north west to south east. Pond is therefore to be located in south east corner of the subdivision. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
43. Proposed emergency spillway from proposed pond is from the sediment forebay. This is not acceptable. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
44. For the construction of the proposed pond, realignment of the existing outlet pipe from the Storm Pond west of Airport Road has to be realigned. We are not in favour of this re-alignment. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*
45. There are concerns about the global stability of the armourstone retaining wall and proposed grading on SEC-1, SEC-2 and SEC -3 of the FSR. Grade differentials should be achieved without the need for retaining structures. *(TRCA)*
46. There are concerns with the proposed infiltration (swales) behind the armourstone retaining walls, which can trigger failure. Please evaluate a solution for drainage that does not include infiltration behind the retaining walls. *(TRCA)*

**The following geotechnical comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**



47. The Region of Peel advise the study is not satisfactory and must provide the MOECC WWR's database survey and hydrogeology information for the area. *(See Attached – Region of Peel)*
48. The slope stability analysis was limited in scope to the post development scenario with retaining walls. Please evaluate the existing slope geometry for the entire site to evaluate if the existing slope is stable in the long-term and, if not, the appropriate setback to delineate the long-term stable top of slope.
  - a. The limit of development and grading may need to be revised as per the position of the long-term stable top of slope. As such, site grading plans will be reviewed following completion of the revised slope stability report. *(TRCA)*
49. A revised Borehole Location Plan showing the location of the cross sections studied is required to determine whether they are satisfactory or if supplementary cross-sections are needed. *(TRCA)*
50. Significant grading is proposed into the buffer and in some instances, below top of bank, which may aggravate the slope stability (GR-3 and GR-5). The revised report must confirm the works do not further destabilize the valley slope and will meet minimum safety factor. *(TRCA)*
51. GR-3 and GR-5 show riprap pads in proximity to Cross-Sections 2 and 5, potentially draining and directing water towards the adjacent toe of the slope and triggering further erosion hazards. Please clarify. *(TRCA)*
52. Specify the side slope for the proposed grading on GR-4. Please remove grading encroachments into the buffer. *(TRCA)*
53. Recommend the proposed side slope of 5H:1V be extended to an addition 1 ft. above the 100-year water level. *(TRCA)*
54. Please show the clay liner on Section 101 of Drawing SWM-1. *(TRCA)*

**The following hydrogeology comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

55. One complete year of groundwater level monitoring is required. Please continue monitoring and provide a report. Please consider installing data loggers in selected monitoring wells, in consultation with TRCA staff. *(TRCA)*
56. Please update the dewatering estimates based on the invert levels for both storm and sanitary sewers provided in the FSR. *(TRCA)*
57. Please indicate which boreholes may have been drilled at the proposed SWM pond location. *(TRCA)*
58. The water budget estimates infiltration rate at approximately 85mm per annum and is considered low level. This factor is typically used for tight impervious clay soils whereas the silty infiltration rate is about 143mm per annum. This rate matches TRCA's groundwater model output and is acceptable to staff. No further analysis is required if this infiltration rate is moved forward to detailed design stage. *(TRCA)*
59. A hydrogeology investigation is required that includes a monitoring and contingency plan, to the satisfaction of the Region of Peel. *(See Attached – Region of Peel)*

**The following noise comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

60. All noise requirements must meet MOECC and Town criteria. Please note that a peer review of the Environment Noise Feasibility Study will be required at the Owner's expense. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*
61. The Region has not accepted the study and requires revisions as outlined in the attached letter, including: revised warning clauses, confirmation of Outdoor Living Area for Laneway Singles, further information and cross sections of the noise wall. *(Region of Peel)*

**The following planning justification comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

62. A revised Planning Justification Report (PJR) is required that:

- a. Updates the subject lands description to reflect recently acquired lands (South Parcel) and the northeast parcel as well as the proposal description. Please ensure the policy context includes a review of all lands, not just the lands subject to the Draft Plan of Subdivision application. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  - b. All schedules should delineate the entire parcel (East Parcel, South Parcel and Northeast Parcel)
  - c. Provides more details about the proposed medium density block. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  - d. Addresses the updated 2017 provincial policy framework. *(Peel Region, TRCA & TOC, CS, Planning)*
  - e. The PJR needs to be revised to meet the adjusted density requirements for settlement areas set out in the updated Provincial Plans. *(Region of Peel)*
63. The proposal is requesting minor lot line adjustments around the southern and east property limits of the applicant's lands. These adjustments have not been addressed in the Planning Justification Report. Additional justification is required, specifically how are the adjustments supported by the Provincial, Regional and Municipal policies without the requirement for a Municipal Comprehensive Review. *(Region of Peel & TOC-CS, Planning)*
  64. The report identifies the policy direction for a mix of housing types and tenure to meet the current and future needs of residents; however, relies on four different lot frontages as delivery that mix. The policy clearly states a mix of housing type and tenure, not mix of lot types. Please incorporate a mix of housing types and tenures into the proposal and provide a discussion in the report, noting also the need for more information about the medium density block. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  65. Please include a discussion of the following policies from the Town of Caledon Official Plan: 7.7.2(e), 7.7.2(g), 7.7.3, 7.7.4, 7.7.5.2.3, 7.7.5.1.7, 7.7.12, 7.7.14, 7.7.15, 7.7.16 *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  66. Please confirm whether the proposed density of 22.0 units per net hectare in the Official Plan Amendment includes the future development block. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  67. Please discuss whether the Official Plan Amendment should include provisions for the proposed lot frontages and uniform housing type. *(TOC, CS, Planning) (TOC, CS, Planning)*
  68. Section 5 of the report (Zoning By-law) needs to be augmented and more information is needed to ensure the draft Zoning By-law Amendment contains the necessary standards to implement the proposal. At this time, the By-law Amendment is considered too premature to be considered at a By-law Review Meeting. A revised, detailed By-law Amendment will need to be considered at a future By-law Review Meeting. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  69. Page 27 refers to Section 4.17 of the Zoning By-law wherein nothing in the By-law prevents the use of land for stormwater management facilities.... Please note the remainder of that provision reads "provided that the location of such [structure] has been approved by the [Town] or the Region. As per the comments provided herein, the Town and Region have concerns about the proposed location of the stormwater management pond. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  70. Page 28 includes a section "Region of Peel Official Plan Policies Pertaining to SWMF Locations"; however, no Regional Official Plan policies were addressed. Please revise and include a discussion of municipal, regional and provincial policies related to Prime Agricultural Area, General Non-Agricultural Use, Infrastructure, Stormwater Management, Greenbelt Plan and any applicable environmental policies including key hydrological and heritage features. *(Region of Peel, TOC-CS, Development)*
  71. More discussion is needed to support the Interpretation of designation boundaries, i.e. field work results that support the adjustment, how is it minor, etc. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
  72. Further discussion is required with respect to the PPS Policy 2.3.6 (Non-Agricultural Uses in Prime Agricultural Areas), including but not limited to what alternative locations have been evaluated and whether there are any reasonable alternatives. For example, are there technical solutions to locating such infrastructure within the settlement boundary? Have other methods been explored, such as Low Impact Development (LID) methods? *(TOC, CS, Planning)*

73. Section 7 of the report is to provide a review of supporting reports and studies; however, a number of summaries are absent including Traffic Impact Study, Environmental Impact Study, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Noise Study, etc. Please provide an updated summary for each of the key reports supporting the applications. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*

**The following heritage impact comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

74. Please revise the study area to include the entirety of the proposed applications (i.e. South Parcel and Northeast Parcel).
75. Staff have significant concerns with the Heritage Impact Assessment for 15717 Airport Road prepared by Scarlett Janusas Archaeology Inc., dated April 21, 2017, including but not limited to the following:
- a. inclusion of irrelevant Official Plan policies
  - b. inclusion of extraneous archival information
  - c. misinterpretation of historic mapping
  - d. irrelevant documentation of the modern c.1995 farmhouse
  - e. misidentification of key attributes and inaccurate interpretation of cultural heritage value of the c.1860 farmhouse
  - f. misidentification of the age and attributes of the main barn
  - g. misidentification of the 19th century timber frame driveshed as a modern structure
  - h. redundant repetition of the property's heritage status in descriptions of individual structures
  - i. misinterpretation of Town of Caledon cultural heritage landscapes methodology and application to subject property
  - j. inappropriate assessment of the property's modern structures under Regulation 9/06
  - k. inappropriate assessment and lack of direction in mitigation recommendations for heritage resources

In light of the above, staff request a meeting with the consultant to discuss key concerns and overall content of the report.

**The following comments on the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

76. The Planning Justification Report notes that the East Parcel outside the settlement boundary will be dedicated to a public agency; however, it is unclear whether the Phase I ESA investigated the entire parcel or only the 100 acres within the settlement boundary. Figure 1 identifies the entire site (less the South Parcel); however, the Site Description (Section 1.2) describes the site as 40 ha (100 acres) in size. In Section 5.2, Neighboring Properties, the lands to the east are described as forested land. Confirmation is required. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
77. A Phase II ESA is recommended. Please confirm if the report entitled "Subsurface Environmental Investigation" is a Phase II ESA.
- a. This report identifies the need for remediation to bring soil conditions into conformance with the MOECC Standards. Please elaborate (i.e. timing, method, work plan, anticipated removal amount). *(TOC, CS, Planning)*

**The following open space/landscaping comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

78. The following comments pertain to the Trail, Walkway and Pedestrian Plan by MBTW (June 1, 2017) *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
- a. Plan to be updated once parkette/look-outs/open space locations are finalized. The plan is to also include the entire connection from the proposed development to the existing Caledon Trailway. The developer is to provide a cost estimate outlining the construction costs (trail, bridge, footings, tree removals, tree preservation measures, etc.) for the section of trail beyond the proposed development limits connecting to the Caledon Trailway.
  - b. Extend sidewalk requirement along the entire frontage of the parkette at the end of Street R.
  - c. Extend sidewalk requirement to where it aligns with the parkette walkway at the end of Street E.
  - d. Add note below legend: 'Conceptual only. Subject to change at detail design stage.'
79. The following comments pertain to Parks and Open Space Concept Plan by MBTW (June 1, 2017): *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*

- a. Plans shall be taken out of the Urban Design Brief and added to this section. Each facility fit plan shall be simplified to only show the labelled facilities.
- b. Parkland calculations for future lands to be purchased shall be updated once confirmed and addressed on the plans.
- c. Any over-dedication of parkland must be given gratuitously to the Town by the developer.
- d. Comments for Blk. 516 (Neighbourhood Park):
  - i. To be referenced as a 'Community Park' on all documents.
  - ii. Please remove lots 371 & 372 and re-align lots 373 & 374 to front Easterly on to Street H.
  - iii. Facility fit features include: Junior/senior play equipment, paved hard court, parking lot, baseball diamond, washroom building, splash pad, seating pavilion, benches, picnic tables, internal walkway connection to all amenities, passive grasses play area & typical park planting.
- e. Comments for Parkettes:
- f. Further discussions with the Open Space Section will be required to properly address the locations and facility fit plans for each parkette block. Some parkette blocks may be downgraded to 'lookout blocks' based on size, location, site grading and presence/absence of retaining walls.
- g. The engineering drawings propose retaining walls either within or bordering the parkette blocks. This conflicts with the trail connection shown on the parkette plans. Further discussion with the Town will be required.
- h. Reflect all proposed retaining walls within the parkette/look-out blocks.

**The following urban design comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

80. 2.3 Development Proposal/ Figure 5: With the acquisition of the South Parcel, the proposed gateway feature shall be moved to the most southerly end of the subject property. Ensure that changes are reflected on all other Figures within the document. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
81. 3.2 Caledon East Gateway/ Figure 8:
  - i. The proposed gateway feature design shall conform to the Town's latest Sign Study. Please contact Erin Britnell at Ex. 4072 or by email at Erin.Britnell@caledon.ca
  - j. Remove the seating area and masonry feature wall references. The gateway feature will be stand alone with only accent planting. Any require noise walls shall confirm to the Town standards. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
82. 3.5 Streets A and B/ Figure 11: The double row of street trees are a requirement of TOC Urban Design staff. Staff need to ensure adequate space/soil volume be provided for street trees. To accommodate a street tree, a minimum 3m x 4m unobstructed front yard area is require and will need to be incorporated into the Zoning By-law Amendment *(TOC, CS, Landscape & Planning)*
83. 3.6 Locals Streets/ Figure 12: Relocate the street tree graphic into the boulevard. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
84. Section 3.8 Landscape:
  - k. Remove the word 'native' in the second paragraph.
  - l. Remove 'On lot landscaping and tree planting will be encouraged to promote cohesiveness between the private and public realm' in the second paragraph.
  - m. Remove any references to the 'masonry wall' in the third paragraph.
  - n. Remove second photo on page 15 and replace with a chain link fence graphic instead of wood farm fence. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
85. Pull out section 4.2 & 4.3 entirely and reflect all items within the 'Parks and Open Space Concept Plan(s)'. See Parks and Open Space Concept section for further notes. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
86. 4.5 Stormwater Management Pond: Update Gateway information as referenced above. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*

87. Section 5.2.6 - Please clarify if any lots are proposed to front onto parks/open spaces. If not, please remove as it is not relevant to the proposed applications. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
88. Section 5.3 - Fencing/ B. Wood Privacy Fence: Add the following note: 'Privacy fencing shall be offered as an upgrade between the builder and homeowner. The privacy fence design shall be consistent throughout the development.' *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*

**The following environmental comments must be addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:**

89. The study area/subject site identified in the Preliminary Environmental Impact Study (EIS) does not include the Northeast Parcel. In light of the request to transfer those lands it would be appropriate to include the Northeast Parcel in the assessment. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
90. The EIS should be updated to consider the updated provincial policy documents (Greenbelt, Oak Ridges Moraine, Growth Plan) *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
91. The EIS identifies that a full suite of field studies was planned for the spring/summer of 2017. Please submit an updated EIS that incorporates the findings of those field studies. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
92. 9.2 Landscaping and Planting Plan: *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
- a. Compensation at 2:1 (See Appendix F comments).
  - b. Monitoring and maintenance as outlined in this section will be included as a condition of draft plan approval.
93. Appendix F: Tree Inventory: *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
- a. "Additional lands in which the applicant has an interest" shall be included in the scope of work and updated in this document once acquired.
94. 5.4 Post-Construction Tree Maintenance and Monitoring: Modify the final paragraph to read the following 'Within 12 months of the completion of construction and prior to assumption, an assessment of preserved trees will be conducted with the consulting arborist and the Open Space Design department.' *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
95. 5.5 Compensation: In the first paragraph remove 'site plan approval stage' and replace with 'detail design stage'. This section is to reference the requirement of 2:1 compensation for tree removals and that the tree compensation planting will be in addition to the standard required planting. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
96. Appendix D: Replace OPSD detail with Town Standard detail 707. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
- a. Existing trees to be preserved within this document contradict the engineering drawings which show proposed retaining walls in the same location. Please consider alternate grading options to minimize interference or removals of the existing trees along the northern boundary adjacent the Valewood rear yards.
  - b. The Town recognizes that Manitoba Maples are considered an invasive species. For the sake of minimizing any interferences existing buffer block along the northern boundary, the preservation of trees 223, 224 & 225 shall be considered. Confirm with TRCA.
  - c. Trees 226 & 227 are proposed for removal. Look into the preservation of these trees.
  - d. Tree preservation, edge management and monitoring clauses will be addressed in the conditions of draft plan approval.
97. An Ecological Land Classification (ELC) is required for the subject property, especially the communities located within the valley corridor. *(TRCA)*
98. The Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) Assessment needs to be revised to include a discussion on the recent historical conditions (defined flow path apparent in 2014 aerial photography). As it appears it is located within the valley feature, the management and protection strategies for the Natural Heritage System should reflect the presence of the valley corridor in this location. *(TRCA)*
99. The TRCA (see attached) has provided the following comments on the Environmental Impact Study (EIS):

- a. Include a discussion related to Tributary A and B and their ecological functions.
- b. Grading encroachments are proposed within the buffers and often into steepened slopes with retaining walls. All grading should occur within the development envelope; no grading should occur within the buffers. Also, the use of retaining walls is to be minimized or removed entirely to avoid future impacts to the buffer as a result of maintenance access.
- c. It is not possible to utilize the 10m buffers for both full coverage with woody species to mitigate adjacent development and provide compensatory plantings. Alternative strategies for compensation plantings outside the buffers is required.
- d. Section 8.1.3 provides a discussion on surface water flows but not appear to sufficiently discuss impacts to adjacent natural features, i.e. how will changes in flow impact various natural features, in particular wetland communities. Further discussion is required.
- e. Provide an analysis of the ecological impacts associated with the eastern SWM pond outfall at the top of bank that appears to discharge into wooded areas associated with a wetland, including a demonstration that erosion will not occur at or downstream of the outfall. A Feature Based Water Balance may be required.
- f. Discuss the potential impacts of the southern SWM Pond outfall to Tributary A and its ecological function. Clarify how erosion will be prevented as a result of increased flows in Tributary A.
- g. Provide recommendations for design and location of the proposed trail that considers the ecological sensitivities of the Natural Heritage System, appropriate location for connections and mitigation.

**Comments to be Addressed Prior to Recommending Approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment:**

100. The legal description through the By-law should read "(Albion)" (*TOC, CORP, Legal*)
101. In order to accommodate double row street tree plantings on streets A & B, a minimum unobstructed area of 3.0m x 4.0m is required for each lot. (*TOC, CS, Planning & Landscape*)
102. The Tree Preservation Report (Dillon) contradicts the proposed grading plans (Schaeffers) along the existing rear yard residential properties on Valewood Drive. Existing trees are being proposed for preservation in the same areas where retaining walls are being proposed. It is the Town's preference to preserve existing trees where retaining walls are proposed. Requirements to preserve existing trees may affect zoning requirements. Further discussions with Town staff required. (*TOC, CS, Landscaping*)
103. All natural features and hazards lands, including their associated buffer, shall be zoned "Environmental Policy Area 1 (EPA1)" to prohibit future development and structural encroachment. (*TRCA & TOC, CS, Development*)
104. Clarification is needed as to the stormwater management ponds, which should be zoned EPA 1-403 or EPA1-405. (*TOC, CS, Planning & Zoning*)
105. Please clarify if all OS Zones are proposed to be parks. (*TOC, CS, Zoning*)
106. Please note there is an existing zone that permits apartment buildings: the RM Zone. Please revise and provide more information to ensure zoning compliance (i.e. Site Plan/Concept Plan). (*TOC, CS, Planning & Zoning*)

**Comments to be Addressed Prior to Recommending Approval of the Official Plan Amendment**

107. A significant portion of the northeast section of the site is proposed to be redesignated 'Low Density Residential'; please note the buffers associated with the 'Environmental Policy Area' outside of the '2021 Settlement Boundary' on Schedule A of the TCOP have not been incorporated into the revised schedule. The limits of the development must be verified and a revised Draft OPA is required that includes the EPA designation and its buffer areas. (*TRCA, TOC, CS, Development*)
108. The OPA should be revised to redesignate the proposed future block as Medium Density Residential. (*TOC, CS, Planning*)

109. The Town's Official Plan speaks to single residential lots generally ranging from 15m to 23m; whereas the application is proposing lots frontages ranging from 9.75m to 15.2m. Please comment on whether the proposed OPA should include site specific permissions for the proposed range of frontages. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
110. Several Town policies speak to the need for a range of housing types (i.e. 3.5.2.1 and 7.7.5.2.3. Please consider providing such range in housing types and/or commenting on whether the OPA needs to address the lack of proposed housing mix. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*
111. The Planning Justification Report needs to be updated to specifically address and justify the proposed amendments to the Official Plan policies, including those in the Caledon East Secondary Plan.
- a. Additional justification is needed to support the proposed density increase
  - b. Additional information and justification is needed to support the proposed changes to the settlement boundary in terms of open space and buffer limits. *(TOC, CS, Policy)*
112. The OPA does not discuss refinement of the Settlement Boundary. Please clarify whether Schedule "A" maintains the existing boundary or the proposed refined boundary.

### Detailed Comments to be Addressed Through Conditions of Draft Approval

In addition to our standard conditions of draft approval, please find below some additional details that will be addressed in the conditions of draft approval:

113. **Bell Canada** has provided the following to be included as a condition of approval: *(Bell Canada)*

"The Owner shall indicate in the Agreement, in words satisfactory to Bell Canada, that it will grant to Bell Canada any easements that may be required, which may include a blanket easement, for communication/telecommunication infrastructure. In the event of any conflict with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities or easements".

We hereby advise the Developer to contact Bell Canada during detailed design to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.

As you may be aware, Bell Canada is Ontario's principal telecommunications infrastructure provider, developing and maintaining an essential public service. It is incumbent upon the Municipality and the Developer to ensure that the development is serviced with communication/telecommunication infrastructure. In fact, the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires the development of coordinated, efficient and cost-effective infrastructure, including telecommunications systems (Section 1.6.1).

The Developer is hereby advised that prior to commencing any work, the Developer must confirm that sufficient wire-line communication/telecommunication infrastructure is available. In the event that such infrastructure is unavailable, the Developer shall be required to pay for the connection to and/or extension of the existing communication/telecommunication infrastructure.

If the Developer elects not to pay for the above noted connection, then the Developer will be required to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Municipality that sufficient alternative communication/telecommunication will be provided to enable, at a minimum, the effective delivery of communication/telecommunication services for emergency management services (i.e., 911 Emergency Services).

114. If the developer chooses to propose entry feature walls at either or both entrances off of Airport Road, the Town shall secure twice the cost of the construction value to the Town for future maintenance/replacement purposes. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*
115. At the detailed design stage, the landscape drawings will need to demonstrate the following:
- a. Conformity with the Caledon East Streetscape study along Airport Road.
  - b. All proposed 'in valley trail' zones shall include native planting and signage as required by the Town and TRCA at the developers cost. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*

116. The applicant shall provide a Record of Site Condition for the Park Blocks to ensure no encumbrances on the site. (TOC, CS, Landscape)
117. Prior to offering units for sale and in a place readily available to the public, the owner will display information regarding universal design options that may be available for purchase within the development prior to offering units for sale. (TOC, CORP, Legislative – Accessibility)
118. As a Condition of Draft Approval, staff will require detailed drawings that demonstrate the following:
- a. All sidewalks shall be connected, when crossing over to another street, with accessible features such as tactile surfaces and curb ramps
  - b. Lighting on exterior routes of travel shall comply with the Town's lighting standard.
  - c. 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
119. Street lighting will be required throughout the development including the two intersections with Airport Road. Street lighting design shall be undertaken by a qualified electrical engineer and all streetlights are to be LED. (TOC, CS, Engineering)
120. Prior to the initiation of grading or stripping of topsoil, the Owner shall submit an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan including a topsoil storage plan detailing the location, size, side slopes, stabilization methods and time period, for approval by the Town. Topsoil storage shall be limited to the amount required for final grading, with excess removed from site. (TOC, CS, Engineering)

**The following agencies/departments have comments that are attached for your review:**

- Region of Peel – October 5, 2017 (Planning), November 1, 2017 (Noise), November 9, 2017 (Geotechnical) & December 5, 2017 (Traffic, Healthy Development Assessment, Functional Servicing) (Comments to be Addressed)
- TRCA – October 5, 2017 (Comments to be Addressed)
- David Stewart at John G Williams Limited Architect – Urban Design Review – July 21, 2017 (Comments to be Addressed)
- Rogers Communications – July 31, 2017 (Comments for Information)

**The following agencies have no concerns and their comments/recommended conditions of draft approval are attached:**

- Canada Post – July 14, 2017
- Peel District School Board – July 12, 2017
- Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board – July 6, 2017
- Enbridge Gas Distribution – July 5, 2017

**The following agencies have no comments or concerns:**

- Town of Caledon, Corporate Services, Legal – July 27, 2017
- Ontario Provincial Policy, Caledon Detachment – August 8, 2017

**The following agencies have not provided comments and will be forwarded upon receipt:**

- MPAC

**Conclusion**

As per the comments provided herein, the Proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications cannot be supported as presently proposed and a resubmission is required to address the comments contained in this letter.



A Resubmission Checklist will be forwarded under separate cover. Please note that as the applicant it is your responsibility to sort the packages as outlined in the Resubmission Checklist. Staff will not accept or review incomplete submission or submissions received via email. The resubmission is to include a cover letter explaining how all comments have been addressed and the recirculation fee of \$5300.

Staff will be in contact to arrange a further meeting to discuss the comments contained herein.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me anytime at 905-584-2272 ext. 4223 or [mary.nordstrom@caledon.ca](mailto:mary.nordstrom@caledon.ca)

Sincerely,



Mary T. Nordstrom, MCIP RPP  
Senior Development Planner, Planning & Development  
Community Services  
**TOWN OF CALEDON**

c: Casey Blakely, Manager of Development – East  
Konstantine Stavrakos, Solicitor/Manager of Legal  
Mark Atkinson, Senior Development Engineering Coordinator  
Nick Pirzas, Landscape Architect  
Ryan Grodecki, Manager, Engineering Services  
Sally Drummond, Heritage Resource Officer  
Paula Strachan, Senior Planner/Urban Design  
Dave Pelayo, Chief Fire Prevention Officer  
Cindy Pillsworth, Zoning Administrator  
Daniela Busca, Law Clerk  
Brian Baird, Manager of Parks  
Adam Miller & Quentin Hanchard, TRCA  
Wayne Koethe & Ryan Vandenburg, Region of Peel