TECHNICAL COMMENT RESPOSE MATRIX
TRIPLE CROWN LINE DEVELOPMENT

September 13, 2018

TOWN OF CALEDON COMMENTS

Town of Caledon Comments	Response	✓
General Comments:		
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 changed at 100% labour and material without advanced notice having been received	Prior to and during the construction process, all Hydro One standard practices will be implemented and followed.	✓
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)*	Acknowledged. The subject properties will be taxed accordingly based on the type of housing units and the number of housing units.	✓
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	Acknowledged. Upon registration, development charges will be paid to the Town of Caledon, Region of Peel, GO Transit and to the Education Boards as per the current rates as stated in the current Development Charge By-Law.	✓

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)*	Pressurized Fire Hydrants have been included in our engineering resubmission as per Region of Peel standards.	✓
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)*	Prior to any works commencing on-site, a permit will be obtained from the TRCA.	✓
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)*	A higher density designation will be applied to the subject block to achieve an apartment style development concept. This development concept will achieve an amount of 17 to 30 units on this block. The density of this block will achieve 49 to 85 u/ha. Additional design and detail will be explored with an architect or designer to implement this density on this specific block. This block will go through a site plan process.	✓
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)*	Majority of the proposed development will take place within the existing settlement boundary, and as a result, Guideline 36 does not apply to the proposed residential development portion (i.e., the MDS setback calculation is not required for proposed land-use changes within the existing Settlement Boundary). The MDS calculation does apply when livestock barns and manure facilities are located on the lot to be severed or re-zoned for residential usage that could result in an odour conflict; however, as	✓

	the proposed severance is for infrastructure (e.g., stormwater management pond), the MDS calculation is not required for the south parcel. This is due to the fact that infrastructure would not be impacted by existing livestock facilities. Although the MDS calculation was not required for the residential development portion or the stormwater management pond, the MDS assessment was conducted in order to demonstrate that the proposed development activities would meet the MDS requirements; and as a means to evaluate impacts related to agricultural activities.	
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)*	Acknowledged. The second submission materials are consistent in their description of the lands.	✓
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)*	The submitted Archeological Report evaluates all lands within the current draft plan. The report has been included in the submission.	✓
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")	A revised draft plan has been completed, please refer to the most up to date draft plan of subdivision which is part of this resubmission.	✓
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)*	Changes have been reflected in the updated draft plan. Block 575 has been included in the draft plan. The intention is for Block 575, Block 572, 578 and Block 579 to be dedicated to a public agency.	✓
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,	There are many factors that are taken into consideration in selecting the pond location. Natural grading is only one of these factors and does not necessarily govern where the pond will be located. It	✓

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)*	is also beneficial to have the storm sewers draining in the same direction as the sanitary sewers, which they are in this scenario. Other factors were considered as well in determining the most ideal pond location.	
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)	a) Additional justification has been provided in the Planning justification report as the opinion letter from MGP. b) Justification has been provided in the SWMF policy response regarding its proposed location. Please reference ***Schedule R*** within the Planning Justification Report. c) This area was staked on-site by TRCA as it is typically done in the preliminary stages of a project in order to identify areas that required further analysis/evaluation using applicable criteria. Dillon utilized the staked limit and feedback from the TRCA to assess this area using applicable criteria, and found this area did not meet the criteria to be considered a natural heritage feature and did not contain a permanent or intermittent watercourse. Furthermore, based on the lack of surface flow within the depression, and the lack of a connection to downstream watercourses, no Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) is present.	✓

	As a result, the staked Top of Bank in this particular area is not applicable and not carried through Figures 3-5. The entire Top of Bank staked by TRCA has been included in Figure 2 for reference. Refer to updated Figures 2 & 4, in *Attachment B*. As stated by the TRCA's Living City Policies (LCP) (2014), *"Confined systems, regardless of whether or not they contain a watercourse, are those depressional features associated with a river or stream that are well defined valley walls."* Although this "feature" has some similar characteristics to a confined system (see example of a confined river or stream valley on page 96 of the LCP), typical of areas of rolling topography, it was assessed for presence of an HDF as well as evaluated based on available guidance on valleylands and valley systems. As a result, it was determined that this "feature" is not a valleyland, nor does it contain an HDF. In order to be considered a Confined River or Stream Valley, the feature must be associated with a watercourse, which this is not. Further, as stated by TRCA in Comment 15, as well as in the TRCA and CVC Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guidelines (2014), HDF's are not typically associated with valleylands. This feature was also analyzed through a Landform Conservation Plan, required for portions of the Study Area located within the Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM), and it did not meet the criteria for a significant landform feature as per the ORM Conservation Plan policies (Technical Paper #4). Refer to figures in	

	Attachment C. Furthermore, this "feature" does not meet the criteria for a significant valleyland (or valleyland in general) as per the criteria within the Natural Heritage Reference Manual of the PPS (MNRF 2005). The NHRM describes valleylands as the following: Valleylands: Means a natural area that occurs in a valley or other landform depression that has water flowing through or standing for some period of the year. Significance criteria includes: - Surface water functions (catchment areas of 50 ha or greater, eroded riverbanks, wetlands etc.) - Groundwater functions (contribution to groundwater infiltration and release) - Landform prominence (floodplains, meander belts, valley slopes 25 m or more) - Distinctive geomorphic landforms (oxbows, bottomlands, terraces, deltas etc.) As a result, no valleyland, HDF, or intermittent/permanent watercourse exists in this area. Therefore, no KNHF is present. Lastly, through development of the lands to the west of Airport Road, a SWM infrastructure pipe was permitted and installed bypassing this "feature", outletting at a constructed headwall into Tributary A to the east. If water were flowing within this "feature" in the past, it is assumed that this would have been incorporated into the SWM management facility and not bypassed by the pipe.	

	The LCP policies apply to valleylands, landform features, and other designated feature types. This "feature" is not associated with a river or stream that is well defined by valley walls; rather it exists within the rolling topography of the area characteristic of the Caledon landscape and therefore does not meet the criteria/definition for Confined Valley System within the LCP (p.96). All appropriate evaluations were completed (landform analysis, valleyland evaluation, HDF) and it was determined that this feature is not considered a valleyland or landform feature, and does not contain an HDF. Therefore, based on our findings, a Top of Bank limit is not warranted in this particular area. d) Please reference comment 4c.	
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).*	The proposed Development does not require any expansion of the settlement area, however minor boundary adjustments based on site specific evaluation is permitted as justified in Planning Justification Report (Section 6.7) and MGP's Planning Opinion Letter (Section 1).	✓
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)*	The revised draft plan has a diverse housing mix. The plan has introduced, deck and courtyard towns, as well as additional lane-based singles. Further information on housing typology can be found in the planning justification report. Universal design options will be made available as per Town Standards.	✓
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)*	All travel routes will be a minimum of 1.5m as per the details in engineering submission. (We don't show sidewalks width on the draft plan of subdivision).	✓

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)*	A minimum unobstructed area of 3.0m x 4.0m has been provided on each lot.	✓
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)*	Further discussion required during detailed design for specifics of the in-valley trail system. Additional details can be found in our parks and open space concept plan.	✓
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)*	The proposed cul-de-sac islands have been removed from the draft plan included in this submission.	✓
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)	Figure 4 and 5 of the EIS illustrate all KNHF, HSF, natural hazards, and their applicable buffers; where KNHF, HSF and natural hazards are not shown (e.g. northern Property boundary and southwest area where the SWM Facility is proposed) it is because KNHF, HSF, and natural hazards are not present. The southwest area does not meet KNHF or HSF criteria (see Comment 4 response), nor does it meet natural hazard criteria. The LCP policies apply to natural hazards as defined in the PPS as *hazardous lands* and *hazardous sites*. As stated in the TRCA's LCP, "*Hazardous lands are lands that could be unsafe for development due to flooding hazards, erosion hazards, or dynamic beach hazards. Hazardous sites are lands that could be unsafe for development due to unstable soil or unstable bedrock*". The EIS update will provide the survey and date during which lines were staked. The entire Top of Bank staked by TRCA has been included in Figure 2 for reference (see *Attachment B*). In addition, a slope stability analysis is currently underway.	✓

	Information from the analysis will be included in the EIS update.	
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)	See revised Slope Stability Analysis Report that was issued on September 11, 2018.	✓
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)	All KNHFs, HSFs and their respective MVPZ should be placed into public ownership and gratuitously dedicated to the Town of Caledon.	✓
Traffic and Road Network Comments:		
1. Please include a description of the proposed development in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). *(TOC, CS, Planning)*	The revised TIS includes the description of the proposed development.	✓
2. The TIS is not satisfactory for the reasons set out in the attached letter from the Region of Peel. *(Region of Peel)*	All comments in the letter have been addressed in the revised TIS.	✓
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.	The section of the roadway has been widened to accommodate the proposed left and right turn storage lanes and tapers from the intersection of Street M to Airport Road. The roadway will be constructed in accordance with current Town standards including curb and gutter, storm sewers, sidewalk, street lighting and landscaping. Please refer to the revised Draft Plan.	
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)*	All intersection angles have been revised to be in the range of 85 degrees to 95 degrees.	✓
5. The width of Street B road must match the existing width of Mountcrest Road. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*	The width of Street B matches the existing width of Mountcrest Road.	✓
6. Please clarify the purpose of Laneway "C". *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*	The purpose of Laneway "C" (original Draft Plan) or Laneway 3 in the updated Draft Plan is to reduce the length of the row of	✓

	single detached houses facing Street M and to provide access for the townhouse blocks fronting on Airport Road, to Street M.	
7. The curve on Laneway "A" is to be designed to accommodate turning movements of Town snow plows. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*	All curves meet the requirement for turning movements of snow plows.	✓
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)*	All elbows have been revised to meet Town Standards, and more specifically Local Elbow Design Standard 214.	✓
9. Street "U" and "R" are to be designed with temporary cul-de sacs. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*	Street "R" has been eliminated, and Street "U" circles back on to Street "A". Street "T' is designed with a permanent cul-de sac.	✓
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)*	Land to the south which was not included in the original submission has now been purchased and included in the ultimate development. Street "S" or Street "R" on the updated draft plan is now a functional road.	✓
11. The cul de sacs on Streets "R" and "E" do not meet Town standards and need to be revised. *(TOC, CS & FIS, Engineering)*	All cul de sacs on the updated draft plan now meet the Town Standards.	✓
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)*	All curve Radii are now per Town Standard.	✓
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)*	We will be proceeding independently of the Town owned lands to the North, until the Town of Caledon provides further direction.	✓
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)*	LID techniques are no longer proposed in the cul-de-sacs.	✓
15. The daylight triangles at Airport Road and Street A are too small. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*	All daylight triangles have been updated and are as per Town Standards.	✓
16. All required daylighting triangles and roundings are required to adhere to current Town standards. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*	All daylight triangles have been updated and are as per Town Standards.	✓

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)*	All sidewalks have been revised to be as per Town Standards. Please reference the sidewalk plan included as a part of this submission.	✓
18. As per current Town standards, all proposed street lighting shall be LED. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*	All lighting proposed is LED as per Town Standards.	✓
19. A minimum 15 metre tangent is required at all intersections. *(TOC, CS, Engineering)*	15m tangents have been revised and provided at all intersections.	✓
20. The applicant is required to provide Parking Plans as per Section 5.12 of the Town's Development Standards.	A parking plan has been prepared and is included in this submission.	✓
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, Engineering)*	a) Bike lanes have been proposed for Street A. b) There is a future development block that provides a potential future connection opportunity to the commercial plaza. c) In the Functional Design Exercise included in this report speaks specifically to the intersection of Street A, Airport Road, and the Caledon Public School exit. Enhanced safety measures have been proposed. Please reference the Functional Design Exercise for further details. d) Both intersections referenced have been evaluated in the Functional Design Exercise	✓
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	All laneways have been revised based on The Town of Caledon Standards. Only infrastructure allowed in the laneway is proposed.	✓

be located on private property subject to an easement. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*		
Servicing Comments that 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)*	The FSR has been revised to reflect the current draft plan dated September 11, 2018.	✓
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)*	Laneway servicing has been adjusted so that only a storm sewer is in the lanes. Grinder pumps have been eliminated and a portion of the site is now proposed to be serviced via a sanitary pump station. No individual lot connections to existing Airport Road infrastructure are proposed any longer.	✓
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	The design of the roads and grading plan were revised to minimize grading into the buffers and to minimize the use of retaining walls. The pond can still be constructed at the same location to service the majority of the site. A relatively small area at the south-east corner of the property will be serviced by super-pipes and OGS as originally proposed. Discharge from the superpipes to the valley will be provided through vista blocks that will be graded without the use of retaining walls.	✓

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.	This will be addressed in the overall policy response. Please see Section 6 and Schedule "R" of the PJR.	✓
c. The design indicates slopes at 3:1 etc. which do not meet Town or MOE criteria which would make the facility undersized.	The pond design has been revised to provide for 5:1 slopes as per MOE criteria.	✓
d. The Region of Peel will not likely permit access to this facility from Airport Road and additional road widenings may be necessary.	There are no direct accesses proposed to Airport Road for this facility or the proposed residential development. However, a pedestrian walkway which can also function as a maintenance access for the Town of Caledon is proposed.	✓
e. The SWMF is proposing an emergency spillway from the sediment forebay, which is not acceptable.	The emergency spillway is now proposed from the wet cell.	✓
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)*	The existing storm sewer will be relocated to run through the pond block with manholes located along the maintenance road.	✓
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)*	The roads and grading design have been revised to minimize the height and length of retaining walls. The maximum height of the retaining walls does not exceed the Town of Caledon maximum height of 2.5m.	✓
27. The emergency spillway cannot be from the sediment forebay as shows in Section 5.3 of the FSR. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*	The emergency spillway is now proposed from the wet cell.	✓

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)*	A treatment train approach is proposed for quality control. Pre-treatment will be achieved by Catchbasin Shields for up to 50% TSS removal. The deficit will be achieved by an infiltration trench at the downstream end of the superpipe to get 60% TSS removal. Furthermore, as a precautionary measure, an OGS unit is proposed downstream of the control structure.	✓
29. Pipes cannot be located under retaining walls, as shown on Figure 5-2 of the FSR. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*	The roads and grading design have been revised to eliminate most of the retaining walls so that no pipes are located under the retaining walls with the exception of the emergency spillway pipe from the sanitary pumping station. This emergency spillway will be protected with concrete encasement to withstand the load.	✓
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)	There are no longer any LID measures proposed on cul-de-sac islands.	✓
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)*	There are no longer any watermain or sanitary sewers proposed in the laneways.	✓
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)*	Grinder pumps have been eliminated and a portion of the site is now proposed to be serviced via a sanitary pump station.	✓
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)*	External drainage north of Street E will be accommodated at the site plan application stage for the condo development. Control manhole is provided at the street line for a future connection.	✓

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)*	All storm sewers will be designed in accordance with the Town criteria at the detail design stage.	✓
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)*	A post to pre water balance has been presented in the FSR. Infiltration is being proposed throughout backyards and some front yards with house roof direct connections. Furthermore, additional topsoil thickness is proposed, as well as roof leader discharge to lawn areas where feasible.	✓
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.	A comparison table has been provided in the FSR. Please refer to Table 5-4 in the FSR. Modelling results are presented in Appendix D. Please note that the 12 Hour AES storm distributions present the more conservative design.	✓
b. The calculated allowable release rates in Table 5-6 (Superpipe) are not in line with Humber Unit Flow relations.	Please note that the design takes into account the time to peak based on the size of the drainage areas. The ultimate goal of the design is that the total discharge from the site during each return period is below the release rates determined by the Humber Unit Flow relations. This has been demonstrated in the report. Table 5-8 provides a summary of expected peak release rates through each storage facility, and the sum total of these are below the allowable release rates.	✓
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.	A detailed erosion assessment report will be provided at a later date as required.	✓
Grading Comments that 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	The grading along the north limit of the site has been revised and the current proposed retaining walls are within the Town's standard maximum height of	✓

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)*	2.5m. A number of cross-sections have been prepared to demonstrate existing and proposed conditions at the boundary of the site.	
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.	The grading in this area has been adjusted to eliminate most of these retaining walls. The retaining walls that remain are within the Town's standard maximum height of 2.5m. The grading encroachments into the buffers have been reduced as well as per discussions with the TRCA. Based on these discussions, the full width of the buffer is never fully utilized for grading and in most instances the grading encroachment into the buffer is a very small percentage of the total buffer width.	✓
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)*	The interface and unit type adjacent to the plaza have been significantly changed. The current proposed units conform to grading and noise report requirements. A small retaining wall along the laneway will still be required to mitigate grade difference.	✓

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)*	The roads and grading design were revised to eliminate most of the retaining walls. Superpipe storm sewer outfalls are located within vista blocks that will be graded without retaining walls.	✓
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)*	The roads and grading design were revised to eliminate most of the retaining walls. Superpipe storm sewer outfalls are located within vista blocks that will be graded without retaining walls.	✓
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)*	There are many factors that are taken into consideration in selecting the pond location. Natural grading is only one of these factors and does not necessarily govern where the pond will be located. It is also beneficial to have the storm sewers draining in the same direction as the sanitary sewers, which they are in this scenario. Other factors were considered as well in determining the most ideal pond location.	✓
43. Proposed emergency spillway from proposed pond is from the sediment forebay. This is not acceptable. *(TOC, FIS, Engineering)*	The emergency spillway is now proposed from the wet cell.	✓
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)*	Only a portion of the existing outlet pipe from the SWMP west of Airport Road needs to be re-aligned. The headwall where this pipe outlets will remain in its location and will be utilized. Further, the realignment will ensure that the pipe remains within the pond block, thus eliminating the need for easements over the pipe.	✓
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)*	The grading has been amended and the referenced retaining walls are no longer shown. All sections with retaining walls shown on the amended Grading Plan have been analyzed and/or commented on in the Revised Slope Stability report (September 11, 2018) and have been confirmed to be stable.	✓
46. There are concerns with the proposed infiltration (swales) behind the armourstone	Geofabric are installed behind the armourstone to prevent soil loss. The	✓

retaining walls, which can trigger failure. Please evaluate a solution for drainage that does not include infiltration behind the retaining walls. *(TRCA)*	swale should be lined or clay plug installed under the swale.	
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)*	Please see Appendix A of the Hydrogeological Report (June 14, 2017) for the requested information.	✓
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)*	Amended and included in Revised Slope Stability Report (September 11, 2018). The existing slope has been determined to be stable and will act as the long-term stable top of slope.	✓
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)*	Amended and included in Revised Slope Stability Report (September 11, 2018).	✓
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)*	Please see the revised Slope Stability report issued on September 11, 2018.	✓
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)*	Swale was provided on the top of wall, which will collect surface water to prevent overflow.	✓
52. Specify the side slope for the proposed grading on GR-4. Please remove grading encroachments into the buffer. *(TRCA)*	The roads and grading design have been revised to minimize grading in the buffer. Design of the future condominium site will be reviewed at the site plan application stage.	✓
53. Recommend the proposed side slope of 5H:1V be extended to an addition 1 ft. above the 100-year water level. *(TRCA)*	The pond design is updated to provide an additional 1 foot freeboard with 5:1 slope above 100Yr level.	✓

54. Please show the clay liner on Section 101 of Drawing SWM-1. *(TRCA)*	Drawings have been revised to show the clay liner below the 100Yr storm level.	✓
Hydrogeology Comments that 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)*	One year of monitoring is currently ongoing and will be complete in September 2018. The report will be supplemented with the results when the monitoring is complete.	✓
56. Please update the dewatering estimates based on the invert levels for both storm and sanitary sewers provided in the FSR. *(TRCA)*	One year of monitoring is currently ongoing and will be complete in September 2018. The report will be supplemented with the results when the monitoring is complete. The report will also include updated rates for both sanitary and storm sewers.	✓
57. Please indicate which boreholes may have been drilled at the proposed SWM pond location. *(TRCA)*	Boreholes 1, 2, 3 and 4 are in the SWMP Area.	✓
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)*	No further action. This rate will be moved forward to the detailed design stage.	✓
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)*	One year of monitoring is currently ongoing. The report will be supplemented with the results when the monitoring is complete. The report will incorporate a monitoring and mitigation plan.	✓
Noise Comments that 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)*	Please reference an appropriately revised noise report found in this submission. All noise requirements meet MOECC and Town standards.	✓
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)*	All Regional concerns have been addressed on page 69 on this matrix.	✓

Planning Justification comments that 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)*	All lands included in this application have been included in the proposal description.	✓
b. All schedules should delineate the entire parcel (East Parcel, South Parcel and Northeast Parcel)	All schedules have been modified to include all acquired parcels.	✓
c. Provides more details about the proposed medium density block. *(TOC, CS, Planning)*	A higher density designation will be applied to the subject block to achieve an apartment style development concept. This development concept will achieve an amount in the neighbourhood of 17 to 30 units on this block. The density of this block will achieve 49 to 85 u/ha. Additional design and detail will be explored with an architect or designer to implement this density on this specific block. This information has been included in the Planning Justification Report (Section 1.2).	✓
d. Addresses the updated 2017 provincial policy framework. *(Peel Region, TRCA & TOC, CS, Planning)*	The Planning Justification Report has been revised and addresses the updated provincial policy framework. Please reference section 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of the PJR.	✓
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)*	The Planning Justification Report has been revised to meet the adjusted density requirements set out in the updated Provincial Plans. The current density is 23.0 units per net hectare which is within the requirements.	✓
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	The Planning Justification Report has been revised to include all minor lot line adjustments. Please reference Planning Justification Report (Section 6.7) and MGP's Planning Opinion Letter (Section 1). These adjustments are supported by the	✓

adjustments supported by the Provincial, Regional and Municipal policies without the requirement for a Municipal Comprehensive Review. *(Region of Peel & TOC-CS, Planning)*	Provincial, Regional and Municipal policies.	
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)*	Mix of housing types have now been included in the updated Draft Plan. Supporting justifications have been provided in the Planning Justification Report. Please reference Section 1.2 and Section 4.	✓
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)*	The Planning Justification Report has been updated to include discussion of these policies from the Town of Caledon Official Plan. Please reference section 4 of the PJR.	✓
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)*	The proposed density is now 23.0 units per net hectare, and it does include all residential units proposed within the subject land.	✓
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)*	Yes, the Official Plan Amendment has been updated to reflect the ultimate housing mix and lot types.	✓
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)*	The current Draft By-Law is for discussion purposes only, and will be refined as the responses to other comments are dealt with. The Draft ZBA has been updated to reflect the revised draft plan of subdivision.	✓
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	The Planning Justification report section dealing with this provision has been updated and enhanced to demonstrate that the By-Law already contemplates SWMF in other zones. We have addressed this in the overall policy response.	✓

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 polices 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)*	The Planning Justification Report has been revised to enhance the responses to these policy sections. This will be addressed in the overall policy response for the SWMF justification, please reference section 6 and Schedule "R" of the PJR.	✓
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)*	The boundary adjustment has been reviewed and updated accordingly. Please reference Planning Justification Report (Section 6.7) and MGP's Planning Opinion Letter (Section 1).	✓
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)*	Alternatives have been evaluated. A more robust review of alternative locations was under taken and the Planning Justification Report has been updated and enhanced to include the review. Reference section 6 of the PJR.	✓
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)*	In order to facilitate submission timing, the Planning Justification Report was finalized prior to receiving those final reports. The PJR has been updated to refer to those now completed reports.	✓
Heritage Impact comments that 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).	The study area will be revised to include all parcels of land that make up this application.	✓
75. Staff have significant concerns with the Heritage Impact Assessment for 15717 Airport Road prepared by Scarlett Janusas Archaeology	Acknowledged	✓

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	Acknowledged	✓
c. Misinterpretation of historic mapping	Acknowledged	✓
d. Irrelevant documentation of the modern c. 1995 farmhouse	Acknowledged	✓
e. Misidentification of key attributes and inaccurate interpretation of cultural heritage value of the c.1860 farmhouse	Acknowledged	✓
f. Misidentification of the age and attributes of the main barn	We will continue to work with Town of Caledon Staff.	✓
g. Misidentification of the 19th century timber frame driveshed as a modern structure	We will continue to work with Town of Caledon Staff.	✓
h. Redundant repetition of the property's heritage status in descriptions of individual structures	Acknowledged. We will continue to work with Town of Caledon Staff.	✓
i. Misinterpretation of Town of Caledon cultural heritage landscapes methodology and application to subject property	We will continue to work with Town of Caledon Staff.	✓
j. Inappropriate assessment of the property's modern structures under Regulation 9/06	We will continue to work with Town of Caledon Staff.	✓
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.	We will continue to work with Town of Caledon Staff.	✓
Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment comments that 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,	The Phase 1 ESA investigated lands within the settlement boundary, and the lands to the east, described as forested land. Therefore, all lands have been included in the study.	✓

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)*	This is a Phase II ESA. Remediation will be by excavation and disposal during early stages of earthworks. Anticipated removal amount is estimated at 90 m^3.	✓
Open Space/Landscaping comments that 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.	The plan has been updated with finalized locations of the parkette/look-outs and open space. All connections to existing Caledon Trailway have been included in the new plan. Additionally, a cost estimate has been provided.	✓
b. Extend sidewalk requirement along the entire frontage of the parkette at the end of Street R.	The sidewalk has been extended 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.	The former Street E alignment has been redesigned in the current submission.	✓
d. Add note below legend: 'Conceptual only. Subject to change at detail design stage.'	The note has been added on the revised plans.	✓
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 labeled facilities.	Plans have been revised and included in the appropriate sections as requested.	✓

b. Parkland calculations for future lands to be purchased shall be updated once confirmed and addressed on the plans.	Parkland calculations have been revised to reflect all purchased lands.	✓
c. Any over-dedication of parkland must be given gratuitously to the Town by the developer.	Any over-dedication of parkland will be given gratuitously to the Town.	✓
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.	i. Park will be referenced as "Community Park" moving forward, notwithstanding that the designation in the Official Plan is specifically named "Neighbourhood Park". ii. The design of the park has been revised. There are no longer any lots within the community park. iii. Facility fit features will be updated to include and label the identified features.	✓
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.	e/f - The updated plan has been revised to include only 3 smaller park blocks and one open space look-out block (next to pumping station). The facility fits of these blocks are mainly to facilitate passive recreation including a connection to the in-valley trail system.	✓
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.	The 3 smaller parks will all be able to provide connections to the in-valley trail system without any conflicts with retaining walls based on the updated grading plan.	✓
h. Reflect all proposed retaining walls within the parkette/look-out blocks.	We will include all retaining walls that show up in any of the vignettes.	✓
Urban Design comments that 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	This was a mapping error and has been revised.	✓

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	We are in ongoing discussion with Erin to finalize the proposed gateway feature.	✓
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)*	We are in ongoing discussion with Erin to finalize the proposed gateway feature.	✓
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)*	According to the recently approved Town Wide Design Guidelines (Section 6.3.3 – Page 43) one row of trees is to be within the public boulevard and the other is to be within the private front yard. The front yard space required for this second row of trees will need to be included within the zoning by-law.	✓
83. 3.6 Locals Streets/ Figure 12: Relocate the street tree graphic into the boulevard. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*	ROW cross sections will be updated based on final discussion regarding street trees.	✓
84. Section 3.8 Landscape: k. Remove the word 'native' in the second paragraph.	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓
l. Remove 'On lot landscaping and tree planting will be encouraged to promote cohesiveness between the private and public realm' in the second paragraph.	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓
m. Remove any references to the 'masonry wall' in the third paragraph.	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓
n. Remove second photo on page 15 and replace with a chain link fence graphic instead of wood farm fence. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓
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)*	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓

86. 4.5 Stormwater Management Pond: Update Gateway information as referenced above. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓
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)*	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓
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)*	Acknowledged. Text and images have been revised.	✓
Environmental comments that 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)*	We will be proceeding independently of the Town owned lands to the North. As there is no clear direction on what is to be done with these lands. No works will be completed on these lands until the Town indicates a clear direction.	✓
90. The EIS should be updated to consider the updated provincial policy documents (Greenbelt, Oak Ridges Moraine, Growth Plan) *(TOC, CS, Planning)*	The EIS has been updated to comply with all updated provincial policy documents.	✓
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)*	All spring/summer field work has been completed and is included in the revised EIS.	✓
92. 9.2 Landscaping and Planting Plan:*(TOC, CS, Landscape)* a. Compensation at 2:1 (See Appendix F comments).	Acknowledged.	✓
b. Monitoring and maintenance as outlined in this section will be included as a condition of draft plan approval.	Acknowledged.	✓
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.	Trees within the southern parcel are limited to the hedgerow between the north and south parcels. These trees were included in the tree inventory. As the site plan and engineering work are updated the Tree Inventory will be updated to reflect changes in the proposed development area relating to tree	✓

	preservation and removals for consistency.	
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)*	Acknowledged. The text has been revised.	✓
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)*	Acknowledged. The text has been revised.	✓
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.	The previous Tree Inventory was completed prior to development of the grading plans (including the proposed retaining wall to the north). The updated Tree Inventory reflects the most up to date engineering drawings including retaining walls.	✓
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.	Acknowledged, however, the proposed retaining wall would require the removal of these trees.	✓
c. Trees 226 & 227 are proposed for removal. Look into the preservation of these trees.	Acknowledged, however, the proposed retaining wall would require the removal of these trees.	✓
d. Tree preservation, edge management and monitoring clauses will be addressed in the conditions of draft plan approval.	Acknowledged.	✓
97. An Ecological Land Classification (ELC) is required for the subject property, especially the communities located within the valley corridor. *(TRCA)*	This information is addressed in the EIS update.	✓

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)*	Historical aerial imagery was reviewed and considered in our evaluation. Although a "flow path" of sorts was visible on the historical air photos, the results of Dillon's assessment illustrated that there is no connection to the tributary downstream at the location of the constructed outfall. It should also be noted that due to the lack of snow melt in the spring, site visits were conducted after periods of heavy rainfall, to capture spring freshet-like conditions, when flow would have been observed. In addition, Ontario Stream Assessment Protocol Module 10 (Assessing HDF) states that HDF assessment applies to features that have sufficient seasonal flow to have the potential to move bedload. This was not observed on any of our survey dates in 2017, including after large rain events. Furthermore, the TRCA and CVC Guidelines and TRCA's Comment 15 states that HDFs are not typically associated with valley systems, consequently the HDF guidelines do not apply to features within a valley. As previously discussed (see Comment 4 response), this "feature" is neither a valley feature nor an HDF. The TRCA and CVC Guidelines define HDFs as "non-permanently flowing drainage features that may not have defined bed or banks; they are first-order and zero-order intermittent and ephemeral channels, swales and connected headwater wetlands, but do not include rills or furrows." Furthermore, the HDF Guidelines note that HDFs located in farm fields are typically evident due to lack of plowing, tractor inaccessibility due to wetness, and unsuitable conditions for crop growth, which is not the case in this area (entire "feature" is cropped with no evidence of stunted crop growth). As per the TRCA and CVC Guidelines, in order for this "feature" to receive a	✓

	management recommendation of "Mitigation" it would have to have "Contributing Functions", defined as *"Provides ephemeral flow or water storage after spring freshet and following large rain events only. "*This was not demonstrated through our site investigations. Under the HDF Guidelines, "No Management is Required" for "Limited Functions," which are defined as: "*The pre-screened drainage feature has been field verified to confirm that no flow occurs during any of the flow assessment periods outlined. Generally characterized by no flow, no groundwater seepage or wetland functions, and evidence of cultivation, furrowing, presence of a seasonal crop, lack of natural vegetation, and fine textured soils (clay, silts, etc.)."* Existing conditions meet the criteria for "Limited Functions" based on the 2017 site investigations, which found there to be no flow, no defined bed or banks, no evidence of previous downstream flow, and no connections upstream or downstream (EIS, Section 5.1). Lastly, as previously mentioned, a SWM infrastructure pipe was constructed as part of a previous development to the west of Airport Road which completely bypasses this area. If a drainage feature were present here it is presumed that it would have been incorporated into the SWM facility, instead of being bypassed. Consequently, "No Management Required" is an appropriate management recommendation, as no HDF (or other natural feature) is present.	
99. The TRCA (see attached) has provided the following comments on the Environmental Impact Study (EIS):	Ecological functions for Tributary A have been recorded in the updated EIS. Tributary B is >50m outside of the development limit and located in a valley	✓

a. Include a discussion related to Tributary A and B and their ecological functions.	slope; therefore, a Tributary B stream assessment was not conducted. TRCA requested a specific stream assessment within Tributary A, and did not flag Tributary B. This is specified in our Terms of Reference, confirmed by TRCA in March 2017.	
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.	The grading is proposed in currently disturbed areas only. There is no proposed encroachment into natural areas for these activities (farm fields). Updated grading plans and retaining wall locations are being prepared to reduce grading impacts on the buffers. Special attention is being paid to avoid grading in 100% of the buffer width in certain areas. Further information on this has been provided in the updated FSR.	✓
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.	This information will be provided as part of Detailed Design in the Landscaping and Planting Plan, or in consultation with TRCA and the Town.	✓
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.	An update to the FSR has been prepared by Schaeffers. Further details surrounding the potential diversion of surface flows and infiltration are provided in Section 8.0 along with mitigation measures and discussion in Section 9.0. In general, potential impacts are being addressed through LID measure (infiltration chambers and gallery), a 2-system super pipe approach which outlets to Tributary A and Tributary B, and the SWM pond. Erosion control requirements and proper release rates have been calculated at each outfall location in accordance with TRCA Guidelines to mitigate any changes in flow. The SWM flows from the west of Airport Road will remain pipe, although in a new alignment, and will continue to outlet at	✓

	the existing headwall at Tributary A. The flows from LID System 2 will be connected to this pipe and outfall; the total allowable release rate has been calculated in accordance with TRCA Guidelines. Further analysis of the erosion thresholds of the receiving features will be provided during Detail Design.	
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.	An update to the FSR has been prepared by Schaeffers. Further details regarding the eastern outfall from the LID System 1 have been provided in the FSR and EIS (Section 9.0). Calculations regarding required storage and allowable release rates have been provided in the FSR and the design of the LID system is reflective of these TRCA requirements to mitigate erosion. Further analysis of the erosion thresholds of the receiving features will be provided during Detail Design.	✓
f. Discuss the potential impacts of the southern SWM Pond outfall to Tributary A and it ecological function. Clarify how erosion will be prevented as a result of increased flows in Tributary A.	An update to the FSR has been prepared by Schaeffers. Further details regarding the SWM Pond outfall have been provided in the FSR and EIS (Section 9.0). Calculations regarding required Erosion Control Requirements have been provided in the FSR and the design of the pond outfall is reflective of these TRCA requirements to mitigate erosion. Further analysis of the erosion thresholds of the receiving features will be provided during Detail Design.	✓
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.	These details will be addressed at the detail design stage.	✓
Comments that must be addressed prior to Zoning By-Law Amendment Approval:		
100. The legal description through the By-law should read "(Albion)" *(TOC, CORP, Legal)*	The by-law has been updated to read "Albion".	✓

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)*	An unobstructed 3.0m x 4.0m area has been provided for each lot.	✓
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)*	A revised Tree Preservation Report and revised grading plans have been included in this submission. They are no longer contradictory.	✓
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)*	All natural feature and hazard lands, including their associated buffers have been zoned EPA1 as requested.	✓
104. Clarification is needed as to the stormwater management ponds, which should be zoned EPA 1-403 or EPA1-405. (TOC, CS, Planning & Zoning)	The Draft ZBA has been revised accordingly.	✓
105. Please clarify if all OS Zones are proposed to be parks. *(TOC, CS, Zoning)*	Yes, the intention is that all parks are zoned OS. However, we will work with the town to implement the Zoning By-Law that is consistent with the town's desire and we will revise accordingly.	✓
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)*	The RM zone with a site specific exception will be applied to the appropriate block to permit the proposed density range.	✓
Comments that must be addressed prior to the Official Plan Amendment Approval:		
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 scheduled. The limits of the development must be verified and a revised Draft OPA is required that includes the	The OPA has been revised to match the draft plan of subdivision, showing associated buffers and designations. This has been included in this submission, please reference Schedule Q of the Planning Justification Report.	✓

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)*	The OPA will be updated accordingly.	✓
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)*	Site specific policies will be proposed to permit the lots as shown on the draft plan of subdivision.	✓
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)*	The proposed housing mix has been amended, types and sizes are as follows: 15.24m (50') wide singles, 13.7m (45') singles, 11.6m (38') singles, 9.75m (32') singles (laneway units), 6.7m (22') decked towns, 6.7m (22') courtyard towns, a medium density block, and 18m/21m (60'/70') condominium singles.	✓
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)*	Additional justification has been added to the Planning Justification Report to support the proposed density increase and proposed changes to the settlement boundary in terms of open space and buffer limits. Please reference Section 4 of the Planning Justification Report.	✓
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.	Schedule A has been updated to reflect the revised draft plan of subdivision. The settlement boundary has not been changed, but has been verified through site specific studies and investigations.	✓
Detailed Comments to be Addressed Through 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	Acknowledged. The Developer will work with Bell Canada throughout the construction process.	✓

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	The revised urban design brief has been submitted as a part of this application.	✓

Airport Road, the Town shall secure twice the cost of the construction value to the Town for future maintenance/replacement purposes. *(TOC, CS, Landscape)*	However, entry feature walls are not being proposed.	
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.	Conformity with the Caledon East Streetscape study will be considered and followed at the time of detailed design.	✓
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)	All proposed "in valley trail" zones have been amended accordingly.	✓
116. The applicant shall provide a Record of Site Condition for the Park Blocks to ensure no encumbrances on the site. (TOC, CS, Landscape)	An RSC for the entire site will be prepared. Updated Phase I and II ESA reports will be prepared to RSC standards. Following soil remediation, a clean-up report will be prepared and included in the updated Phase II ESA report. Filing of the RSC will follow.	✓
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)*	Acknowledged. Information will be displayed and provided and made available for all purchasers.	✓
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 tactilesurfaces and curb ramps	Acknowledged. Detailed drawings shall be prepared as per Town Standards.	✓
b. Lighting on exterior routes of travel shall comply with the Town's lighting standard.	Acknowledged. Lighting shall be prepared and installed as per Town Standards.	✓
c. If a community mail box is installed, the area shall be well lit via a light standard and a curb depression from thesidewalk and/or roadway to the mail box landing area	Acknowledged. Community mailboxes shall be built as per Town Standards.	✓
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	Acknowledged. Lighting shall be prepared and installed as per Town Standards.	✓

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)*	An Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan and Topsoil Storage Plan will be included in the detailed design of this project.	✓

TRCA COMMENTS

TRCA Comments, October 5 2017	Response	
Planning and Development		
1. The Planning Justification Report should be revised to address the updated provincial policy framework.	Acknowledged. The PJR has been revised to include the updated provincial policy framework.	✓
2. The EIS indicates that as per policy 3.4.2.1, the Greenbelt does not apply to lands within the boundaries of Settlement Area. Also, the EIS states that the Greenbelt Plan defers to the municipal OP for detailed delineation of settlement boundaries and to govern land use within these areas. Further, the Planning Justification Report concludes that this development respects the established settlement boundary for Caledon East. However, the SWM pond is proposed outside of the settlement boundary and within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan. We understand a Town-initiated Regional Official Plan Amendment (ROPA) and subsequent Local Official Plan Amendment (LOPA) must be approved before any further modifications could be made to this boundary. Please relocate the SWM pond to an appropriate location within the existing settlement boundary.	Additional justification and rationale have been provided after discussions with Town and Regional staff and further review of the applicable policies. Please reference Planning Justification Report (Section 6.7) and MGP's Planning Opinion Letter (Section 1).	✓
3. The proposed SWM pond is located within lands designated "Prime Agricultural Area" asidentified on both Schedule B of the Region's OP and Schedule A of the Town's OP. ln ouropinion, prime agricultural lands are not intended for non-agricultural uses associated with urban development. Although there may be exceptions for SWM ponds, it is also our position that the Greenbelt did not envision infrastructure to support urban development be exclusively outside lands designated for development.	The proposed stormwater management (SWM) pond is located in a field that is currently designated as Prime Agricultural Area. However, the northern portion of the field in which the SWM pond is proposed has limitations for agriculture due to the rolling topography of the field. Agricultural equipment cannot easily traverse this topography. Cultivation of these slopes by farm equipment does occur, but extreme caution is required to avoid tractor roll-over. The location of this depression is consistent with the Canada Land Inventory mapping that designates 30% of land in the area as Class 3 with a limitation of topography. In contrast, the southern portion of the field (outside the proposed SWM pond area) maintains its Class 1 status as it has relatively even topography and a topsoil depth consistent	✓

	with the control soil pit and the County soil maps. Development of the SWM pond in the northern portion of the field will have a minimal impact on the long-term agricultural production in the area.	
4. The EIS identifies the limits of the valley corridor on Figures 4 and 5. These limits were staked by TRCA. However, the figures do not appear to reflect the entire length of the valley corridor staked by TRCA adjacent to Airport Road. The draft plan identifies the TRCA staked top of bank and confirms that the SWM pond is located within a KNHF and potential HSF, which is prohibited by the Greenbelt Plan.	This area was staked on-site by TRCA as it is typically done in the preliminary stages of a project in order to identify areas that require further analysis/evaluation using applicable criteria. Dillon utilized the staked limit and feedback from the TRCA to assess this area using applicable criteria, and found this area did not meet the criteria to be considered a natural heritage feature and did not contain a permanent or intermittent watercourse. Furthermore, based on the lack of surface flow within the depression, and the lack of a connection to downstream watercourses, no Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) is present. As a result, the staked Top of Bank in this particular area is not applicable and not carried through Figures 3-5. The entire Top of Bank staked by TRCA has been included in Figure 2 for reference. Refer to updated Figures 2 & 4. As stated by the TRCA's Living City Policies (LCP) (2014), *"Confined systems, regardless of whether or not they contain a watercourse, are those depressional features associated with a river or stream that are well defined valley walls."* Although this "feature" has some similar characteristics to a confined system (see example of a confined river or stream valley on page 96 of the LCP), typical of areas of rolling topography, it was assessed for presence of an HDF as well as evaluated based on available guidance on valleylands and valley systems.	✓

	In order to be considered a Confined River or Stream Valley, the feature must be associated with a watercourse, which this is not. Further, as stated by TRCA in Comment 15, as well as in the TRCA and CVC Evaluation, Classification and Management of Headwater Drainage Features Guidelines (2014), HDF's are not typically associated with valleylands. This feature was also analyzed through a Landform Conservation Plan, required for portions of the Study Area located within the Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM), and it did not meet the criteria for a significant landform feature as per the ORM Conservation Plan policies (Technical Paper #4). Refer to figures in *Attachment C*. Furthermore, this "feature" does not meet the criteria for a significant valleyland (or valleyland in general) as per the criteria within the Natural Heritage Reference Manual of the PPS (MNRF 2005). The NHRM describes valleylands as the following: Valleylands: Means a natural area that occurs in a valley or other landform depression that has water flowing through or standing for some period of the year. Significance criteria includes: - Surface water functions (catchment areas of 50 ha or greater, eroded riverbanks, wetlands etc.) - Groundwater functions (contribution to groundwater infiltration and release) - Landform prominence (floodplains, meander belts, valley slopes 25 m or more) - Distinctive geomorphic landforms (oxbows, bottomlands, terraces, deltas etc.)	

	As a result, no valleyland, HDF, or intermittent/permanent watercourse exists in this area. Therefore, no KNHF is present. Lastly, through development of the lands to the west of Airport Road, a SWM infrastructure pipe was permitted and installed bypassing this "feature", outletting at a constructed headwall into Tributary A to the east. If water were flowing within this "feature" in the past, it is assumed that this would have been incorporated into the SWM management facility and not bypassed by the pipe. The LCP policies apply to valleylands, landform features, and other designated feature types. This "feature" is not associated with a river or stream that is well defined by valley walls; rather it exists within the rolling topography of the area characteristic of the Caledon landscape and therefore does not meet the criteria/definition for Confined Valley System within the LCP (p.96). All appropriate evaluations were completed (landform analysis, valleyland evaluation, HDF) and it was determined that this feature is not considered a valleyland or landform feature, and does not contain an HDF. Therefore, based on our findings, a Top of Bank limit is not warranted in this particular area.	
5.TRCA's LCP requirements must also be addressed, which is some cases are more restrictive policies. As such, it is our position that the SWM pond must be located 10 m inland from the greater of the TRCA staked top of bank, long-term stable top of slope, Regulatory Floodplain and associated vegetated dripline.	The LCP policies apply to valleylands, landform features, and other designated feature types. This "feature" is not associated with a river or stream that is well defined by valley walls; rather it exists within the rolling topography of the area	✓

	characteristic of the Caledon landscape and therefore does not meet the criteria/definition for Confined Valley System within the LCP (p. 96). All appropriate evaluations were completed (landform analysis, valleyland evaluation, HDF) and it was determined that this feature is not considered a valleyland or landform feature, and does not contain an HDF. Therefore, based on our findings, a Top of Bank limit is not warranted in this particular area.	
6. The concept provided in the FSR locates the SWM pond within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt Plan, but also proposes to locate the SWM pond within the natural features and buffer. This is not supported by TRCA.	The Greenbelt Plan provides guidance for infrastructure, which includes stormwater management systems. Policy 4.2.1.1 allows new infrastructure within the Protected Countryside that is approved under the Planning Act or other acts, by energy boards or receive similar environmental approvals. Permission is subject to meeting one of the following tests: a) it supports agriculture, recreation and tourism, Towns/Villages and Hamlets, resource use or the rural economic activity that exists and is permitted within the Greenbelt or b) it serves significant growth and economic development expected in southern Ontario beyond the Greenbelt by providing for the appropriate infrastructure connections among urban centres and between these centres and Ontario's borders. The proposed location of the SWM pond does not traverse or occupy the Natural Heritage System or Water Resources System. Its location and design minimize its footprint within the Greenbelt, it is not expected to increase impacts on the landscape as the SWM pond is intended as a passive use.	✓
7. Based on the Draft Official Plan Amendment (OPA), it appears a significant portion of the existing "Open Space Policy Area" in the northeast portion of the site is proposed to be redesignated "Low Density Residential". While it is recognized that this is to accommodate the	Draft OPA has been revised to reflect the limits of development and updated draft plan of subdivision.	✓

proposed relocation of the "Conceptual Neigbourhood Park Location" to the central portion of the site, the buffers associated with the "Environmental Policy Area" outside of the "2021 Settlement Boundary" as shown on Schedule A of the Town's OP have not been incorporated into the revised Schedule. Once the limits of development have been verified, please revise the Draft OPA to identify the buffer areas in an "Environmental Policy Area" designation.		
8. Once the limits of development have been verified, it is our expectation that the implementing Zoning By-law will recognize all natural features and hazard lands, including their buffer, in an "Environmental Policy Area 1" (EPA1) zoning category which has the effect of prohibiting development and structural encroachment. Through the Town's broader zoning update in 2006, environmental features were uniformly placed into an EPA2 zone given that on-site field analysis and confirmation of the limits could not be completed for the entire municipality. As such, it has always been the intent to refine the boundary of EPA2 lands through the planning process and rezone these areas to EPA 1. This application provides the opportunity to implement this objective, which is supported by the Town's environmental policies.	Environmental features were uniformly placed into an EPA2 zone given that specific field studies could not be completed for the entire municipality. As a result, these areas identified through the desktop analysis should be refined as more detailed environmental information becomes available (through the site-specific EIS phased, as stated in the OP). This area was evaluated through all applicable policies and available guidance documents and was determined not to be a significant or defined feature (see response to Comment 4, above). Therefore, the results of our site specific EIS suggests that this area does not warrant inclusion in an EPA designation. Furthermore, a SWM infrastructure pipe has already been constructed which bypasses this area. As the SWM facility did not incorporate this area, this suggests it is not considered an important feature.	✓
9. As an element of this application, it is our expectation that the KNHFs and HSFs and their respective MVPZ will be placed into public ownership and gratuitously dedicated to the TRCA or Town of Caledon.	All non-developable lands will be gratuitously dedicated to the Town of Caledon	✓
10. The draft plan identifies a portion of the land that is within the NHS as "Additional Lands in Which the Applicant Has an Interest". As these lands are entirely within the NHS, they are not developable and should be placed into public ownership to allow for consistent management of the NHS.	All non-developable lands will be gratuitously dedicated to the Town of Caledon	✓

Limits of Development		
11. As noted above, Figure 4 and 5 of the EIS does not illustrate all KNHF and HSF, natural hazards (i.e., Regulatory Floodplain, long-term stable top of slope, etc.) and the applicable buffer. To ensure that the proposed development is appropriately setback from all development constraints and the applicable MVPZ requirement is incorporated into the draft plan, please provide mapping that demonstrates what natural feature or hazard constraints is being buffered to determine the limit of development. Typically, this is done by showing the constraint line (i.e., TRCA staked top of bank, floodplain, dripline, etc.) as a wider line. The Ultimate Constraint line is then shown as a narrower line so it is clear what constraint is applied in all locations. For staked lines, please reference the survey and date the lines were staked. TRCA has concerns regarding the accuracy of some of the lines in the submitted documents. For example, the staked line on Figure 4 of the EIS abruptly stops and does not reflect the entire top of bank staked by TRCA.	Figure 4 and 5 of the EIS illustrate all KNHF, HSF, natural hazards, and their applicable buffers; where KNHF, HSF and natural hazards are not shown (e.g. northern Property boundary and southwest area where the SWM Facility is proposed) it is because KNHF, HSF, and natural hazards are not present. The southwest area does not meet KNHF or HSF criteria (see Comment 4 response), nor does it meet natural hazard criteria. The LCP policies apply to natural hazards as defined in the PPS as hazardous lands and hazardous sites. As stated in the TRCA's LCP, "Hazardous lands are lands that could be unsafe for development due to flooding hazards, erosion hazards, or dynamic beach hazards. Hazardous sites are lands that could be unsafe for development due to unstable soil or unstable bedrock." The updated EIS provides the survey and date during which the lines were staked. The entire Top of Bank staked by the TRCA has been included. In addition, a slope stability analysis has been conducted. Information from the analysis has been included in the updated EIS.	
12. The review of existing topographic information shows that there exist relatively steep slope segments along the valley corridor. Although a slope stability report has been submitted for our review, the study only provides an analysis on the proposed development conditions. It is required that a slope stability report be completed to delineate the location of the existing conditions long-term stable top of slope with a safety factor of 1.50 on the tableland and to verify the limits of development as shown on the draft plan. The long-term stable top of slope line also needs to be accurately plotted on the plan to compare the other constraints and ensure appropriate buffers have been incorporated.	Amended and included in Revised Slope Stability Report (September 11, 2018). The existing slope has been determined to be stable and will act as the long-term stable top of slope.	✓

Planning Ecology		
13. Please provide Ecological Land Classification (ELC) for the various ecological communities on the subject property, especially the communities located within the valley corridor.	This information has been added to the EIS update.	✓
14. Further to above, the SWM pond is proposed below the top of bank staked by TRCA. TRCA staff is not supportive of the SWM pond being below top of bank within the valley corridor. Please relocate the proposed facility outside of the natural heritage system (NHS) and its associated buffer.	Through analysis it was determined that the area of the proposed SWM pond is not considered a valley feature. Moreover, this area is not part of any NHS identified through background review (not part of the Greenbelt NHS or the Peel Region Greenlands system). See comprehensive response above under "Comments to be addressed prior to Draft Plan approval" #4.c)	✓
15. A Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF) Assessment has been conducted which concludes that there is no downstream connection. While this feature was not flowing at the time of TRCA's site visit, aerial photography from 2014 and earlier appears to indicate a more defined flow path that would appear to connect directly to Tributary A. If this were the case, it would appear to shift the management recommendation into the "Mitigation" category. Please provide additional discussion related to the apparent recent historical conditions. It should, however, be noted that features within valley corridors are not typically treated as an HDF. As mentioned previously, TRCA staked the limits of the valley corridor and it would appear that this HDF is located within the valley feature. As such, the management and protection strategies for the NHS should reflect the presence of the valley corridor in this location as opposed to what would often be a more isolated tableland HDF.	Historical aerial imagery was reviewed and considered in our evaluation. Although a "flow path" of sorts was visible on the historical air photos, the results of Dillon's assessment illustrated that there is no connection to the tributary downstream at the location of the constructed outfall. It should also be noted that due to the lack of snow melt in the spring, site visits were conducted after periods of heavy rainfall, to capture spring freshest-like conditions, when flow would have been observed. In addition, Ontario Stream Assessment Protocol Module 10 (Assessing HDF) states that HDF assessment applies to features that have sufficient seasonal flow to have the potential to move bedload. This was not observed on any of our survey dates in 2017, including after large rain events. Furthermore, the TRCA and CVC Guidelines and TRCA's Comment 15 states that HDFs are not typically associated with valley systems, consequently the HDF guidelines do not apply to features within a valley. As previously discussed (see Comment 4 response), this "feature" is neither a valley feature nor an HDF. The TRCA and CVC Guidelines define HDFs as "non-permanently flowing drainage features that may not have defined bed or	✓

	banks; they are first-order and zero-order intermittent and ephemeral channels, swales and connected headwater wetlands, but do not include rills or furrows." Furthermore, the HDF Guidelines note that HDFs located in farm fields are typically evident due to lack of plowing, tractor inaccessibility due to wetness, and unsuitable conditions for crop growth, which is not the case in this area (entire "feature" is cropped with no evidence of stunted crop growth). As per the TRCA and CVC Guidelines, in order for this "feature" to receive a management recommendation of "Mitigation" it would have to have "Contributing Functions", defined as *"Provides ephemeral flow or water storage after spring freshet and following large rain events only. "*This was not demonstrated through our site investigations. Under the HDF Guidelines, "No Management is Required" for "Limited Functions," which are defined as: "*The pre-screened drainage feature has been field verified to confirm that no flow occurs during any of the flow assessment periods outlined. Generally characterized by no flow, no groundwater seepage or wetland functions, and evidence of cultivation, furrowing, presence of a seasonal crop, lack of natural vegetation, and fine textured soils (clay, silts, etc.)."* Existing conditions meet the criteria for "Limited Functions" based on the 2017 site investigations, which found there to be no flow, no defined bed or banks, no evidence of previous downstream flow, and no connections upstream or downstream (EIS, Section 5.1). Lastly, as previously mentioned, a SWM infrastructure pipe was constructed as part of a previous development to the west of Airport Road which	

	completely bypasses this area. If a drainage feature were present here it is presumed that it would have been incorporated into the SWM facility, instead of being bypassed. Consequently, "No Management Required" is an appropriate management recommendation, as no HDF (or other natural feature) is present.	
16. The EIS does not include a discussion related to Tributary A and B. Please ensure that further analysis related to the ecological functions of Tributary A and B are provided in the next submission.	Ecological functions for Tributary A have been recorded in the updated EIS. Tributary B is >50m outside of the development limit and located in a valley slope; therefore, a Tributary B stream assessment was not conducted. TRCA requested a specific stream assessment within Tributary A, and did not flag Tributary B. This is specified in our Terms of Reference, confirmed by TRCA in March 2017.	✓
17. Grading encroachment of 10 m is proposed within the buffers for the purpose of grading. In some areas, the entire buffer (i.e., Greenbelt Plan lands) will be graded, often into a steepened slope. Additionally, given the significant change in elevations, retaining walls are proposed adjacent to the buffer. These retaining walls will require access for maintenance. The effectiveness of the buffers will be significantly reduced as a result of the grading encroachments. Please ensure that all grading is contained within the development envelope and that no grading occurs within the buffers. Please ensure that the use of retaining walls is minimized or removed entirely to avoid future impacts to the buffer as a result of maintenance access.	The grading is proposed in currently disturbed areas only. There is no proposed encroachment into natural areas for these activities (farm fields). Updated grading plans and retaining wall locations have been prepared to reduce grading impacts on the buffers. Special attention is being paid to avoid grading in 100% of the buffer width in certain areas. Further information on this has been provided in the updated FSR.	✓
18. The EIS indicates that compensation plantings will be provided within the buffer. The buffer should be fully vegetated in an effort to help mitigate the impacts of the change in adjacent land use. This is the most common treatment of buffers for this purpose and helps to rationalize why the minimum buffer width is being implemented. As such, it is not possible to utilize	This information will be provided in the Detailed Design of the Landscaping and Planting Plan, or in consultation with the TRCA (if compensation is required).	✓

a minimum 10 m buffer for both the full coverage with woody species to mitigate the adjacent development and provide compensatory plantings. Please identify alternative strategies for managing required compensation plantings that are not within the buffers.		
19. The EIS includes a discussion on surface water flows (Section 8.1.3) but does not appear to discuss the impacts to the adjacent natural features in sufficient depth. It is unclear what impacts the changes in flow will have on the various natural features. The FSR appears to recommend significant changes to the existing drainage with significant increases in yearly runoff. Please provide a discussion within the EIS related to the impact of these changes related to the function of the adjacent natural features, in particular the wetland communities. Please also clarify how the removal of the drainage for the 4. 73 ha of land west of Airport Road will impact Tributary A and the associated valley corridor.	An update to the FSR has been prepared by Schaeffers. Further details surrounding the potential diversion of surface flows and infiltration are provided in Section 8.0 along with mitigation measures and discussion in Section 9.0. In general, potential impacts are being addressed through LID measure (infiltration chambers and gallery), a 2-system super pipe approach which outlets to Tributary A and Tributary B, and the SWM pond. Erosion control requirements and proper release rates have been calculated at each outfall location in accordance with TRCA Guidelines to mitigate any changes in flow. The SWM flows from the west of Airport Road will remain pipe, although in a new alignment, and will continue to outlet at the existing headwall at Tributary A. The flows from LID System 2 will be connected to this pipe and outfall; the total allowable release rate has been calculated in accordance with TRCA Guidelines. Further analysis of the erosion thresholds of the receiving features will be provided during Detail Design.	✓
20. The eastern SWM pond outfall at the top of bank appears to discharge into wooded areas associated with a wetland. Please provide an analysis of ecological impacts associated with this outfall including any changes in hydrology. A Features-Based Water Balance may be required. Please also demonstrate that erosion will not occur at or downstream of the outfall.	An update to the FSR has been prepared by Schaeffers. Further details regarding the eastern outfall from the LID System 1 have been provided in the FSR and EIS (Section 9.0). Calculations regarding required storage and allowable release rates have been provided in the FSR and the design of the LID system is reflective of these TRCA requirements to mitigate erosion. Further analysis of the erosion	✓

	thresholds of the receiving features will be provided during Detail Design.	
21. The southern SWM pond outfall discharges to a draw feature of Tributary A and the SWM pond outfall discharges directly to Tributary A. Please provide a discussion related to the impacts of these discharge locations on the ecological function of Tributary A. Please also clarify how erosion will be prevented as a result of the increased flows in Tributary A.	An update to the FSR has been prepared by Schaeffers. Further details regarding the SWM Pond outfall have been provided in the FSR and EIS (Section 9.0). Calculations regarding required Erosion Control Requirements have been provided in the FSR and the design of the pond outfall is reflective of these TRCA requirements to mitigate erosion. Further analysis of the erosion thresholds of the receiving features will be provided during Detail Design.	✓
22. A trail has been proposed within the buffer areas and the NHS. The trail alignment should be refined as the process moves forward. However, the EIS should provide recommendations for the design and location that consider the ecological sensitivities of the NHS (i.e., the trail should be located within the buffer except where connections are required, should be as close to the development side of the buffer as possible, and the trail width should be minimized to the extent possible). Where connections are required within the NHS, the EIS should identify at a high level appropriate locations for those connections. Please provide a discussion related to the trails impacts and mitigation within the EIS.	This will be addressed at the Detail Design stage.	✓
Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management: Area 1 – Draining to the Stormwater Management Pond		
23. Typically, SWM ponds are located at the lowest point of the development area. However, the proposed SWM pond is located at the southwest portion of the site, which will require significant grading operations to drain the site. TRCA strongly recommends that the proposed SWM facility be relocated to the lowest point of the development area.	There are many factors that are taken into consideration in selecting the pond location. Natural grading is only one of these factors and does not necessarily govern where the pond will be located. It is also beneficial to have the storm sewers draining in the same direction as the sanitary sewers, which they are in this scenario. Other factors were considered as well in determining the most ideal pond location.	✓

24. It is noted that the visual Otthymo Modeling output table shows that the percentages of total (TIMP) and directly (XIMP) connected impervious areas for 43.73 ha of the site are 56% and 25% respectively. In our opinion, these values are low for the proposed land use. As such, please provide supporting calculations that show how these values are calculated.	Please note that the calculations have been revised. The average TIMP and XIMP's are in the range of 0.55-0.65 for TIMP and 0.44-0.50 for XIMP.	✓
25. It is noted that the visual Otthymo Modeling output table shows that CN value of 74 was used to run the model. Please submit supporting calculations that show how this number is calculated.	Please note that a CN of 70 has been used. Based on the Geotechnical studies, the soils are very good for infiltration and is therefore considered to be of Hydrological Group B. Based on the National Engineering Handbook of Hydrology Table 2-2, for open spaces the recommended CN is 69.	✓
26. It is noted that 6 hour and 12 hour AES storms run to determine the storage requirements, but there is not a comparison table. Please include a table that shows the storage requirements for 6 hour and 12 hour AES storms.	A comparison table has been provided in Table 5-4.	✓
Functional Servicing & Stormwater Management: Area 2 – Area Drainage to the Superpipe Storage		
27. TRCA staff will defer to Town staff if the proposed superpipe storage within the local road is acceptable.	Noted.	✓
28. Table 5-6: Required Active Storage Volumes and Release Rates of the FSR shows the calculated allowable release rates for the proposed superpipe storage and orifice control that wlll provide quantity control for 3.96 ha. Please note that the calculated allowable release rates are not in line with the Humber Unit Flow relations.	Please note that the allowable release rates for the LID structures are based on pro-rating the allowable release rates. Our hydrologic modelling demonstrates that during 2 to 100 year storm events, our peak discharges will be less than our allowable release rates. This is summarized in Table 5-8.	✓
29. It is noted that the visual Otthymo Modeling output table shows that the percentages of total {TIMP) and directly (XIMP) connected impervious areas for 3.96 ha of the site are 56% and 17% respectively. It appears that these values seem low for the proposed land use. Please provide supporting calculations that show how this number is calculated.	Please note that the calculations have been revised. The average TIMP and XIMP's are in the range of 0.55-0.65 for TIMP and 0.44-0.50 for XIMP.	✓
30. It is noted that the visual Otthymo Modeling output shows that CN value of 74 was used to run	Please note that a CN of 70 has been used. Based on the Geotechnical studies, the soils are very good for infiltration and is	✓

the model. Please submit supporting calculations that show how this number is calculated.	therefore considered to be of Hydrological Group B. Based on the National Engineering Handbook of Hydrology Table 2-2, for open spaces the recommended CN is 69.	
31. lt is noted that an oil/grit separator (OGS} is proposed to treat runoff from the 3.96 ha area not being directed towards the proposed stormwater management pond. Please note that an OGS as a stand-alone measure can only achieve up to 50% TSS removal. As such, TRCA requires an additional water quality treatment on top of the OGS.	Please note that a treatment train approach is proposed. Catchbasin shields and infiltration trenches will be used to achieve 50% and 60% TSS removal in series. Furthermore, as precautionary measure an OGS will be incorporated at the downstream end for additional treatment.	✓
32. It is noted that an erosion control criteria of detaining 25mm of rainfall for 24 hours. Please note that this criterion applies when there is insignificant change on the pre and post-development drainage pattern. According to Figure 5-1 -Pre-Development Drainage Plan, over37 ha of the site drain to the west and southwest of the site and it is only 1.6 ha of land from the site drains to the south watercourse where the proposed pond will discharge. However, under proposed conditions, over 43 ha of the site will be discharged to the proposed SWM pond and the pond will release to the watercourse located south of the site. This configuration will introduce an additional large volume of water to the south watercourse and this additional large volume of runoff may cause significant erosion risk to the watercourse. Please conduct an erosion assessment to establish the erosion target for the receiving feature should the applicant continue to proposed the SWM pond in the currently proposed location.	A detailed erosion assessment report will be provided at a later date as required.	✓
Geotechnical Engineering		
33. The slope stability analysis for delineating the long-term stable top of slope first needs to be conducted on the existing slope geometry for the entire site to evaluate if the existing slope is stable in the long-term. If not, the report must identify the appropriate setback (erosion allowance) to delineate the long-term stable top of slope. It was noted from the slope stability	Amended and included in Revised Slope Stability Report (September 11, 2018). The existing slope has been determined to be stable and will act as the long-term stable top of slope.	✓

results (Figure 1 to 4) that the analysis is only for the post-development scenario with retaining walls. Please first evaluate the existing slope through its critical cross-sections along the site and determine the long-term stable top of slope throughout the site with a minimum factor of1.50. Also, the slope stability report also needs to be completed for the proposed development to confirm that the proposed works also meet a minimum safety factor of 1.50 for the static condition and 1.10 for seismic condition.		
34. The Borehole Location Plan should show the location of the cross-sections studied to enable verifying if the selected cross-sections are the critical cross-sections for the analysis. The slope stability report does not show the location of the cross-sections including those selected to conduct the slope stability analysis. Therefore, TRCA staff is unable to verify if the selected cross-sections are satisfactory or if supplementary cross-sections need to be analyzed for other critical slope segments.	All cross sections analyzed or commented on are shown in the Revised Slope Stability report (September 11, 2018).	✓
35. Depending on the results of revised slope stability report to be submitted as part of the next submission, the limit of development and grading may need to be revised as per the position of the long-term stable top of slope. It is therefore required that the site grading plan be reviewed after the completion of the slope stability report and be revised to adjust to development limits and buffer, where required.	Amended and included in Revised Slope Stability Report (September 11, 2018). The existing slope has been determined to be stable and will act as the long-term stable top of slope.	✓
36. Drawing No. GR-3 and GR-5 shows significant grading into the buffer and in some segments below top of bank. Please specify the side slope of the proposed grading on the drawing. Also, the significant grading into the buffer may potentially act as a surcharge on the slope and aggravate the slope stability. Should the applicant continue to propose the grading, the revised slope stability report must confirm that the works do not further destabilize the valley slope and the slope still meet a minimum safety factor of 1.50 against slope instability considering the impact of the grading into the buffer in the proximity of the slope.	All post construction configurations at the slopes identified on the revised grading plan have been analyzed and/or commented on in the Revised Slope Stability report (September 11, 2018) and have been confirmed to be stable.	✓

37. Drawing No. GR-3 shows a riprap pad in the proximity of Cross-Section 2 and Drawing No. GR-5 shows a riprap pad in the proximity of Cross-Section 5, which potentially drains and directs water towards the adjacent toe of the slope. This may trigger undercutting and further toe erosion, which can result in over steepened slope and the initiation of slope instability and further erosion hazards. In the event that the slope stability report does not provide a discussion on this, please provide clarification and also evaluate how the toe of the slope in this area will be protected against undercutting and erosion caused by drainage from the riprap pad.	Revised grading plan shows no riprap at these two locations.	✓
38. On Drawing No. GR-4 please specify the side slope for the proposed grading. Additionally, it appears that some grading encroaches into the buffer.	The roads and grading design have been revised to minimize grading in the buffer. Design of the future condominium site will be reviewed at the site plan application stage.	✓
39. Drawing No. SEC-1, SEC-2 and SEC-3 of the FSR shows an armourstone retaining wall with an exposed height of approximately 3.5m, 4.3 m and 2.5 m respectively, where the toe of the retaining wall is located on sloped grading. There are concerns about the global stability of the armourstone retaining wall and the proposed grading. In the event that the retaining wall is undermined by global instability or deep-seated sliding by the significant grading, the areas within the buffer located at the toe of the retaining wall may also be impacted. Also, the failed retaining wall can impact the buffer area located immediately at the toe of the retaining wall. Therefore, grade differentials should be achieved without the need for retaining structures.	The grading has been amended and the referenced retaining walls are no longer shown. All sections with retaining walls shown on the amended Grading Plan have been analyzed and/or commented on in the Revised Slope Stability report (September 11, 2018) and have been confirmed to be stable.	✓
40. Swales are proposed behind the armourstone walls. Staff have concerns with the infiltration proposed behind the retaining wall, which can trigger failure of the retaining wall and cause subsequent adverse impacts to the surrounding area and the buffer within the immediate base of the wall. Please evaluate a solution for the drainage that does not include infiltration behind the retaining walls.	Geofabric are installed behind the armourstone to prevent soil loss. The swale should be lined or clay plug installed under the swale.	✓

41. It Is recommended that the proposed side slope of 5H:1V be extended to an additional 1 ft. above the 100-year water level.	The pond design is updated to provide an additional 1 foot freeboard with 5:1 slope above 100Yr level.	✓
42. The geotechnical report recommends a clay liner provide the native soil stratigraphy for the subject site. Please show the clay liner on Section 1-1 of the Drawing SWM-1.	The clay liner is now shown on the drawings.	✓
Hydrogeology/Ground Water Resources		
43. Based on our review, 63 boreholes were drilled on the site which includes 24 monitoring wells. Five (5) of the monitoring wells are nested where shallow and deeper monitors were installed. Single Well Response Tests (SWRT) were conducted on 11 monitoring wells. Groundwater quality was determined based on single water sampling from BH41. Native soils were intersected below the topsoil and fill and includes sand, silty sand, clayey silt, clayey silt till, and sandy silt till. Peat was observed in some boreholes. It appears that the native soil at shallow depth consist of Halton Till with sand lenses within the till. Groundwater monitoring has been conducted for a short duration {May 24, 2017 and May 26, 2017). From the limited groundwater level measurements, it appears that the downward gradient exists and groundwater is flowing towards Innis Lake in the southeastern part of the site. SWRTs indicates that hydraulic conductivity for the geologic formation screened is about 7.8 x 10-7 m/s. The water budget indicates a pre-development infiltration rate of 38,855 m3 per annum whereas the FSR indicates the same at 62,659 m3 per annum. For a 43.64 ha area the infiltration works at as 143 per annum. Although TRCA staff do not have significant hydrogeology related issues, we have concern with the water budget where It estimates pre-development infiltration rate at approximately 85 mm per annum and is considered lower level. This is due to the infiltration factor for the soil assumed as 0.1. This factor is usually used for tight impervious clay soils whereas silty infiltration rate at about 143 mm per annum. This infiltration rate matches TRCA's	No further action is required. This infiltration rate will be moved forward to the detailed design stage.	✓

groundwater model output and is acceptable to staff. No further analysis is required if this infiltration rate is moved forward to the detailed design stage.		
44. It is not clear which boreholes were completed at the proposed stormwater management pond location. Please indicate boreholes that may have been drilled at the proposed pond location. Based on geology at the pond location, additional comments can be provided at the detailed design stage.	Boreholes 1, 2, 3 and 4 are in the SWMP Area.	✓
45. Table 1: Summary of Groundwater Level Measurements in Section 3.2 of the Hydrogeology Report is not included. TRCA staff require one complete year of groundwater level monitoring. Please continue groundwater monitoring and provide a report at the end. Consideration should be given to install data loggers in selected monitoring wells, in consultation with TRCA staff. The one year of groundwater level monitoring and report are required prior to draft plan approval.	One year of monitoring is currently ongoing and will be complete in September. The report will be supplemented with monitoring results.	✓
46. Section 4.1 of the Hydrogeology Report indicates that sewer and watermain invert levels are not yet available. Dewatering requirements were prepared in absence of the storm and sewer invert levels. However, the FSR does include invert levels for both the storm and sanitary sewers. We recommend that dewatering estimates be updated based on the available information.	One year of monitoring is currently ongoing and will be complete in September 2018. The report will be supplemented with monitoring results. The report will also be updated to include rates for both sanitary and storm sewers.	✓

REGION OF PEEL COMMENTS

Region of Peel Comments	Response	
Technical Comments		
1.Prior to execution of the Subdivision Agreement by the Region, the Developer shall: a) obtain and submit to the Region a Residential Development Charges Payment Form completed to the best of the Developer's knowledge at the time of the submission and to the satisfaction of the Region in accordance with the engineering drawings and final draft M-plan;	A Residential Development Charges Payment Form will be completed prior to the execution of the subdivision agreement.	✓
b) pay to the Region the appropriate hard service residential development charges (water, wastewater and road service components), pursuant to the Region's Development Charges By-law, as amended from time to time, calculated based on the information provided in the Residential Development Charges Payment Form.	Payment to the Region will be submitted accordingly based on current development charge rates.	✓
2. Provisions shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement with respect to: a) pay to the Region the appropriate hard service residential development charges (water, wastewater and road service components), pursuant to the Region's Development Charges By-law, as amended from time to time, calculated based on the information provided in the Residential Development Charges Payment Form.	Acknowledged.	✓
b) collection of development charges for future residential development blocks (non-freehold townhouses or apartment blocks); pursuant to the Region's Development Charges By-law, as amended from time to time.	Acknowledged.	✓
3. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that: a) prior to release of the subdivision plan for registration, the Developer shall pay to the Region the appropriate water meter fees, in accordance with the Region's Fees By-law, as amended from time to time for residential building lots (singles, semi-detached and freehold townhomes) to the satisfaction of the Region in accordance with the engineering drawings and final draft M-plan for the Lands;	Payment to the Region will be submitted accordingly based on water meter fees.	✓
b) Payment of water meter fees for future residential development (non-freehold townhouses or apartment blocks) and commercial blocks shall	Payment to the Region will be submitted accordingly based on water meter fees and Region Standards.	✓

be payable prior to issuance of building permits, in accordance with the Region's Fees By-law, as amended from time to time;		
c) If it is determined that there is an underpayment of water meter fees, the Developer will be responsible for payment thereof forthwith upon request.	Acknowledged.	✓
4. Prior to construction the applicant's engineer shall submit all engineering drawings in the digital format, pursuant to the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines.	All Engineering drawings will be submitted as per Regional Standards.	✓
5. Within (60) days of preliminary acceptance of the underground services, the applicant engineer is required to submit As-Constructed drawings in the digital format, pursuant to the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines. The applicant engineer is also required to provide ties to all main line valves, ties to individual water service boxes, linear ties to sanitary sewer services and GPS coordinates of all watermain and sanitary sewer appurtenances in accordance with the latest requirements of the Region "Development Procedure Manual."	The Region will receive As-Constructed drawings in digital format, ties to all main line valves, ties to individual water service boxes, linear ties to sanitary sewer services and GPS coordinates of all watermain and sanitary sewer appurtenances within 60 days of preliminary acceptance.	✓
6. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer shall ensure that sufficient widening along Airport Road is gratuitously dedicated as public highway to the Region free and clear of all encumbrances. The Region will require gratuitous dedication of lands to meet the Official Plan mid-block requirement of 45 metres along Airport Road (Regional Road 7). An additional 5.5 metres (for a total Right of Way width of 50.5 metres, 25.25 metres from the centreline) will be required within 245 metres of intersections to protect for the provision of but not limited to; utilities, sidewalks, multi use pathways and transit bay /shelters. Also, prior to final approval a 4.5m buffer block along the frontage of Airport Road (Reginal Road 7), 15m x 15m daylight triangles on Regional roads at the approved intersection location and 0.3 mere reserves along the property and behind the 15 x15 metre daylight triangles shall be conveyed gratuitously to the Region. All costs associated with the transfer are the responsibility of the Developer. The Developer	The applicant has completed a Functional Design Exercise as per Region of Peel Standards. All details relating to the Airport Road ROW will be discussed within this exercise. We will continue to work with Regional Staff on this topic.	✓

must provide the Region with the necessary title documents and reference plan(s) to confirm the Region's right-of-way.		
7. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer gratuitously dedicates all temporary /permanent easements as required by the Region in support of Airport Road (Regional Road 7) Environmental Assessment (EA) to the Region, free and clear of all encumbrances.	The applicant has completed a Functional Design Exercise as per Region of Peel Standards. All details relating to the Airport Road ROW will be discussed within this exercise. We will continue to work with Regional Staff on this topic.	✓
8. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer acknowledges and agrees that should the development proceeds prior to the Region's Capital Project #16-4360, interim road works will be required at the intersection of Airport Road and Cranston Drive/Street A at 100% the expense of the Developer (including design and construction costs) to facilitate the development. A detailed engineering submission shall be submitted to the Region for review and approval prior to construction within the Region's right of way. The engineering submission must include removals, new construction and grading, typical cross sections, pavement and signage drawings, plan and profile drawings.	The applicant has completed a Functional Design Exercise as per Region of Peel Standards. All details relating to the Airport Road ROW will be discussed within this exercise. We will continue to work with Regional Staff on this topic.	✓
9. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that any interim Regional road improvements including but not limited to interim traffic control signals, auxiliary lanes etc., required to service this development, shall be 100% at the expense of the Developer. A Letter of Credit based on 100% of the estimated construction costs will be required by the Region.	The applicant has completed a Functional Design Exercise as per Region of Peel Standards. All details relating to the Airport Road ROW will be discussed within this exercise. We will continue to work with Regional Staff on this topic.	✓
10. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Region will not allow residential lots/blocks fronting Airport Road direct connections to a 300mm watermain and 525/450 sanitary sewers on Airport Road.	There are no direct connections proposed in the resubmission.	✓
11. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that all lots or blocks within the Plan shall be serviced by the gravity sanitary sewers only. No individual lot's grinder pumps to convey sanitary sewer to the sanitary sewer forcemain will be permitted by the Region.	There are no longer any grinder pumps proposed in this submission. A central pumping station has been proposed. This concept has been discussed with Region of Peel Engineering Staff and has been approved in principle.	✓
12. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that noise walls adjacent to Regional	Noise walls are to be installed on the property line in accordance with the	✓

roads must be installed on property line, shall be to the Town of Caledon's Noise Wall specifications with steel posts. Region's requirements must be referenced in the noise abatement report and on all applicable drawings.	Town of Caledon's Noise Wall specifications with steel posts. The Region's requirements are referenced in the noise abatement report and on all applicable drawings.	
13. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer will include in any agreement of purchase and sale for the Units and undeveloped Blocks or in any Lease or other Tenancy Agreement, a notice of the Subdivision Agreement and access restrictions	All required notices will be included in the Subdivision Agreement.	✓
14. The Developer will be required to enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the local Municipality and Region for the construction of municipal sewer, water, and Regional roads associated with the lands. These services will be constructed and designed in accordance with the latest Region standards and requirements.	The Developer will enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the local Municipality and Region for the construction of municipal sewer, water, and Regional roads associated with the lands. These services will be constructed and designed in accordance with the latest Region standards and requirements.	✓
15. The applicant must submit a Functional Servicing Report to the Region for review and approval, showing the proposed sanitary sewer and water servicing plans for the development, prior to the first engineering submission.	A revised Functional Servicing Report has been included in this submission for the Region of Peel's review.	✓
16. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer pay the Region's costs for updating its electronic "as constructed" information for the infrastructure installed by the Developer. The cost will be based on a "per kilometre" basis for combined watermains and sanitary sewers installed pursuant to the Region's User Fees By-law.	Acknowledged. The Developer agrees to pay all costs associated with updating the as-constructed drawings.	✓
17. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer must ensure that the proposed Lots or Blocks fronting Laneways within the Plan can be serviced by municipal water and wastewater services and are in accordance with Regional Standards and Specifications. Due to maintenance and operation issues/concerns for Laneways, servicing Lots and Blocks fronting Laneways must be from the approved public R.O.W. in accordance with the Town of Caledon standard drawings where Region's underground services are permitted.	All servicing will be in accordance with Town of Caledon and Region of Peel Standards.	✓

18. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement with respect to construction and looping of watermains in all locations within and outside of the Plan to the satisfaction of the Region.	All looping of watermains will be as per the satisfaction of the Region.	✓
19. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Region may require the Developer to construct a sampling hydrant (at the Developers cost) within the proposed Plan. Location and the requirement for sampling hydrant will be determined at the engineering review stage.	The Developer will construct a sampling hydrant if required.	✓
20. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that all lots or blocks must be serviced via internal road system or servicing easements.	All lots and blocks will be serviced via internal road systems.	✓
21. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer acknowledges that an amount shall be held back on the Letter of Credit to cover the costs of services completed by the Region that are covered under time and material basis pursuant to the current Region's User Fee by-Law.	The developer acknowledges that a Letter of Credit will be submitted to the Region to cover the costs of services.	✓
22. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer will maintain adequate chlorine residuals in the watermains within the subdivision from the time the watermains are connected to the municipal system until such time as the Region issues final acceptance. In order to maintain adequate chlorine residuals, the Developer will be required to either install automatic flushing devices or retain Regional staff to carry out manual flushing. Regional staff will conduct the monitoring and testing for chlorine residual. The costs associated with the monitoring and flushing will be the responsibility of the Developer pursuant to the current Region's User Fee by-Law.	The Developer will maintain adequate chlorine residuals and the mandatory equipment to monitor chlorine residuals at their own expense as per the Region's User Fee By-Law.	✓
23. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement with respect to servicing of the existing properties within the zone of influence should the existing private services (wells) deteriorate due to the servicing of the proposed development.	The developer acknowledges that provisions will be made will respect to existing properties within the zone of influence and their existing private wells.	✓
24. Provision will be required in the Subdivision Agreement for the following clause: "An amount shall be held in the Letter of Credit until final acceptance of the subdivision by the	A Letter of Credit in the amount of $20,000.00 will be provided to the Municipality for the protection of private wells. Temporary water supply	✓

Municipality to serve as protection for the private wells in the zone of influence of the subdivision plan. The amount shall be based on the anticipated cost of replacing water supplies within the zone of influence as shown in the schedules of the agreement. The minimum amount shall be $20,000.00. If the private well systems in the zone of influence deteriorate due to the servicing of the plan of subdivision the developer will provide temporary water supply to the residents upon notice by the Region and it will continue supplying the water to the effected residents until the issue is resolved to the satisfaction of involved parties. If the quantity of water in the existing wells is not restored to its original condition within a month after first identification of the problem, the developer will engage the services of a recognized hydrogeologist to evaluate the wells and recommend solutions including deepening the wells or providing a permanent water service connection from the watermain to the dwelling unit."	will be provided if needed as per the Region's notice.	
25. Developer shall inspect, evaluate and monitor all wells within the zone of influence prior to, during and after the construction has been completed. Progress Reports should be submitted to the Region as follows: 1. Base line well condition and monitoring report shall be submitted to the Region prior to the pre-servicing or registration of the plan (whichever occurs first) and shall include as a minimum requirement the following tests: a) Bacteriological Analysis - Total coliform and E-coli counts b) Chemical Analysis - Nitrate Test c) Water level measurement below existing grade	Inspections will occur as outlined by the Region and Progress Reports will be prepared and submitted as per Regional standards.	✓
2. In the event that the test results are not within the Ontario Drinking Water Standards, the Developer shall notify in writing the Homeowner, the Region of Peel's Health Department (Manager - Environmental Health) and Public Works Department (Development Supervisor) within 24 Hours of the test results.	Acknowledged.	✓
3. Well monitoring shall continue during construction and an interim report shall be	Monitoring will continue as set out by the Region and a Report will be	✓

submitted to the Region of Peel for records. Well monitoring shall continue for one year after the completion of construction and a summary report shall be submitted to the Region of Peel prior to final acceptance.	submitted to the Region prior to final acceptance.	
26. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer agrees that neither he nor any Builder will apply for Building Permits for any lots or blocks within the development until the Region's, Public Works Department has given written notice to the local municipality that the internal and/or external sanitary sewers and watermains, including fire protection are completed to the Region's satisfaction. Alternately the Developer's Consulting Engineer can certify in writing that the internal/external sanitary sewers and watermains, including fire protection were constructed, inspected and will function as per the detailed design.	Acknowledged.	✓
27. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that no lots or blocks shall have direct access to the Regional roads. Any existing driveways/accesses along Regional roads frontage not approved as part of this subdivision must be removed as part of the subdivision works at 100% the Developer's cost.	No lots or blocks will have any direct access to Regional roads. All existing driveways will be removed as a part of the subdivision works.	✓
28. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that any access to the Regional road shall comply with the spacing requirements as identified in the Region's Controlled Access By-law Number 62-2013, as amended or replaced from time to time, as well as the Secondary Plan and Block Plan.	Accesses to Airport Road will comply with the Region's spacing requirements, as well as the Secondary Plan and Block Plan.	✓
29. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer obtains from the Region's Public Works Department a road occupancy permit and construction access permit for all works within the Region's road right-of-way, including access works, and obtains such permit at least 48 hours prior to the commencement of work. Additional documentation, fees and securities will be required with respect to the works for which the permit was obtained. All costs associated with the access and road works within the Region's right-of-way shall be borne entirely by the Developer. The	The Developer will obtain all applicable permits for all works for the satisfaction of the Region.	✓

location, design and implementation of the construction access must be acceptable to the Region.		
30. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that prior to the registration of the subdivision Plan or any phase thereof, the Developer provides to the Region's Public Works Department a Letter of Credit in the amount of $10,000.00 for interim pavement markings at the Regional road intersection along the frontage of proposed development. The Developer will also be responsible for pavement markings maintenance. The Letter of Credit will be released once all necessary pavement markings are completed and the intersection improvement works are assumed by the Region. Pavement markings on Regional roads shall be in accordance with the Region's specifications.	A Letter of Credit in the amount of $10,000.00 will be submitted to the Region for interim pavement markings. All markings will be in accordance with the Region's standards.	✓
31. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer agrees that neither he nor any Builder will make any alterations to the grading within Regional road right-of-way along the frontage of proposed development.	All grading will be completed as per the submitted and approved engineering drawings.	✓
32. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that prior to final engineering approval; a storm drainage study report is required to determine the affect of the proposal on the existing structures and drainage along Regional roads.	The developer acknowledges that a storm drainage study will be required to determine the affects of the proposal on Regional roads.	✓
33. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer agrees that storm water flow shall be looked at in a holistic manner for all developments along Regional roadways. The relocation of storm systems across Regional roadways shall be done symmetrically, so that the distance between the inlet and outlet of the system onto the Regional roadway are the same or less as compared to the pre-development condition. Under no circumstance should the flow of storm water be diverted along the Regional right of way (by pipe or channel), in order to accomplish the relocation of a drainage feature with-in or adjacent to the Regional right of way, without the prior written consent of the Region.	Discussion with Region is ongoing. We will continue to work with Regional Staff on this topic after the current submission is reviewed.	✓
34. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that prior to the approval of the	A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted as apart of the first	✓

subdivision Plan or any phase thereof, the Developer shall submit to the Region a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) detailing the impact of the Development on the Regional road network and identifying any mitigation measures. The intersection geometrics and turning lanes requirements will be provided at such time the TIS is acceptable to the Region.	submission, and a revised version has been included as a part of this submission.	
35. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that prior to final approval of the subdivision plan, a noise abatement report is required for lots adjacent to Regional roads.	Prior to Registration, a Noise Abatement report will be provided for the lots adjacent to Airport Road.	✓
36. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer shall indemnify and hold the Region harmless from and against any and all actions, suites, claims, demands, and damages which may arise either directly or indirectly by reason of the development of the subject lands and/ or construction of works, save and except for any actions, causes of action, claims, demands and damages arising out of the negligence of the Region or those for whom it is in law responsible.	Acknowledged.	✓
37. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that a restriction on transfer or charge for all lots and blocks within the Plan of subdivision, save and except those to be conveyed to the Town and/or the Region, shall be registered on title to the said lots and blocks prohibiting any transfer or charge of said lots and blocks without the consent of the Region until all external Airport Road intersection improvement works/watermains and sanitary sewers to service this development have been completed to the Region's satisfaction. The Developer shall be responsible for all costs in relation to said restriction on title.	Acknowledged.	✓
38. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that landscaping, signs, fences, gateway features or any other encroachments will not be permitted within the Region's easements and/or Right-of-Way limits.	Acknowledged.	✓

39. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer shall grant/obtain (at no cost to the Region) all necessary easements for proposed/existing Regional infrastructures located in the vicinity of the proposed development, as this may be required by the Region to service proposed development and/or external lands.	All necessary easements will be granted or obtained for Regional infrastructures in order for the Region to service the proposed development/ or external lands.	✓
40. Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement that the Developer will be required to submit draft reference plan(s) for Region's review and approval prior to the Plans being deposited. All costs associated with preparation of the plans and transfer of the lands will be solely at the expense of the Developer.	All draft reference plans are to be sent to the Region for review and approval before receiving the final plan.	✓
41. All streets shall be named to the satisfaction of the Town of Caledon and the Region of Peel. In this regard, proposed street names must be submitted as soon as possible after draft approval has been granted so that finalization of the plan is not unduly delayed.	A list of street names has been submitted to the Town and Region.	✓
42. Prior to the Region granting clearance of the draft plan conditions of subdivision approval, the following must be forwarded to the Region's Legal Services Division: a) A copy of the final M-plan,	Acknowledged.	✓
b) A copy of the final R-plans; and,		✓
c) the documents required as per Schedules of the Subdivision Agreement.		✓
Development Engineering		
Please note that all lots or blocks within the Plan shall be serviced by the gravity sanitary sewers only. No individual lot's grinder pumps to convey sanitary sewer to the sanitary sewer forcemain will be permitted by the Region.	No grinder pumps are proposed in the revised submission. A portion of the site will be serviced through a sanitary pumping station.	✓
Waste Management		
The Region's waste management standards are currently not demonstrated to be met. The Region will provide curbside collection of garbage, recyclable materials, household organics and yard waste subject to the revised plans showing the following conditions are met: 1.*Waste Collection Vehicle Access Route Comments (Curbside):*	The revised plan has been updated to meet all Regional Waste Management Standards.	✓

In those situations where a waste collection vehicle must reverse, then the maximum straight back-up distance is 15 metres.		
2. The internal road layouts should be designed to permit continuous collection without reversing. Where the requirement for continuous collection cannot be met, a cul-de-sac or a "T"-turnaround will be permitted in accordance with the specifications shown in Appendix 2 and 3 of the WCDSM (Waste Collection Design Standards Manual), respectively.	The revised plan has been updated to meet all Regional Waste Management Standards.	✓
3. *Curbside Collection Area:* The set out area along the curb, adjacent to the driveway must be at least 3 square metres per unit in order to provide sufficient space for the placement of two carts: maximum 1 large garbage or recycling cart (360 litres) and 1 organics cart (100 litres), overflow waste (i.e. additional bags), yard waste receptacles and bulky items. Each unit within a development must have its own identifiable waste collection point (distinct set out area along the curb or the sod that cannot be shared with neighbouring units) as approved by Public Works Commissioner or Delegate.	Each unit will have a distinct set out area as approved by Public Works Commissioner or Delegate as per the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual.	✓
4. The waste set out location is to be as close as possible to the travelled portion of the roadway, directly adjacent to the private property of the unit occupier/owner, directly accessible to the waste collection vehicle and free of obstructions (i.e. parked cars).	The waste set out location will be satisfied through the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual.	✓
The Region's waste management standards are currently not demonstrated to be met. The Region will provide curbside collection of garbage, recyclable materials, household organics and yard waste subject to the revised plans showing the following conditions are met: 1.*Waste Collection Vehicle Access Route Comments (Curbside):* In those situations where a waste collection vehicle must reverse, then the maximum straight back-up distance is 15 metres.	The revised plan has been updated to meet all Regional Waste Management Standards.	✓

Region of Peel - Noise Impact Study Comments – 1st Review dated November 1st, 2017.		
a) Please change the noise warning clauses from 'may' to 'will' where appropriate in accordance with the Region's guidelines. This may involve creating a new warning clause. The warning clause for, Lot B, Lot C, Lot H, the first and second row of laneway singles (Lots A and F) will need to be revised, changing the word 'may' to 'will'.	These changes have been addressed and incorporated in the Noise Impact Study in table 3.	✓
b) Please revise clauses B and C to be consistent with the Region's guidelines wording.	These changes have been addressed and incorporated in the Noise Impact Study in table 3.	✓
c) Please clarify if the laneway singles will include an OLA. This is pertinent information and section 4.2.2 of the Report will need to confirm this.	Descriptions have been added about the locations of the OLA's.	✓
d) Table 2 will need to include the west facades for Lots I and J. Revised warning clauses may be required. Please also include the south west facades for Lot D. Laneway singles at the corners of Street A&N, A&U, V&U, and the north end of row of Lots F should be studied/highlighted.	More calculations along the internal roadways exposed to Airport Road have been added in the revised Noise Report.	✓
e) Further information on the noise wall in Figure 5 of the Report is needed. Please clarify is this wall is proposed and the timing. Please advise if there will be any gaps in the commercial noise wall, and the noise wall for Lot I. Lots J on Figure 2 may require noise walls.	The commercial noise wall reference in comment e) is no longer part of the mitigation concept. We are using the rear garages as sound barriers instead. Further information can be found in the revised Noise Report.	✓
f) Please provide the cross sections for noise walls at Lots B and I.	The draft plan has been changed in the vicinity of B and I. There are no longer sound barriers at those locations.	✓
g) Please note that noise statements registered on title will be required to implement any recommendations of this report in accordance with the Region's guidelines.	Acknowledged	✓
Region of Peel – Functional Servicing Report Comments – 1st Review dated December 5th, 2017.		
Watermain		
a) Direct connections of residential lots or blocks to the existing 300mm watermain on Airport Road will not be permitted by the Region. All lots or blocks must be serviced via internal road system or servicing easements.	The lots fronting onto Airport Road will be serviced via a new local watermain and no individual lot connections will be made to the existing watermain in Airport Road.	✓

b) Servicing of the lots/blocks from the laneways is not permitted by the Region. The proposed Lots or Blocks fronting Laneways within the subdivision must be serviced by municipal water in accordance with Regional Standards and Specifications. Due to maintenance and operation issues/concerns for Laneways, servicing Lots and Blocks fronting Laneways must be from the approved public R.O.W. in accordance with the Town of Caledon standard drawings where Region's underground services are permitted Looping of watermains in all locations within and outside the subdivision must be to the Region's satisfaction.	Only weeping tiles will be connected to the storm sewer on the laneway. Water, sanitary sewer connections and hydro will be provided from Airport Road. Local sanitary sewer and secondary watermain are proposed along the frontage of the townhouse units to provide services.	✓
c) The water servicing plan (figure 3-1) must be revised to accommodate Region's requirements.	The water servicing plan is updated to adhere to the Region's criteria.	✓
Sanitary Sewer		
a) All lots or blocks within the Plan must be serviced by the gravity sanitary sewers only.	Grinder pumps will no longer be used to service any lots on the site. The lots that were serviced by grinder pumps will now be serviced using a pumping station and force main that connect back into the local gravity system within the site.	✓
b) The sanitary sewer forcemains will not be permitted by the Region.	Grinder pumps will no longer be used to service any lots on the site. The lots that were serviced by grinder pumps will now be serviced using a pumping station and force main that connect back into the local gravity system within the site.	✓
c) Direct connections of residential lots to the 525/450 trunk sewer on Airport Road will not be permitted by the Region.	The lots fronting onto Airport Road will be serviced by a new local sanitary sewer. No connections from individual lots will be made to the existing trunk sewer on Airport Road.	✓
d) Servicing of the lots/blocks from the laneways is not permitted by the Region. The proposed Lots or Blocks fronting Laneways within the subdivision must be serviced by municipal sanitary sewer system in accordance with Regional Standards and Specifications. Due to maintenance and operation issues/concerns for Laneways, servicing Lots and Blocks fronting Laneways must be from the approved public R.O.W. in accordance with the Town of Caledon standard drawings where Region's underground services are permitted.	The laneways are no longer used to service lots with sanitary or water. Only storm sewers are contained within the laneways.	✓

e) The sanitary sewer servicing plan (Figure 4-1) must be revised to accommodate Region's requirements.	The sanitary servicing plan is updated accordingly.	
Region of Peel – Traffic Impact Study Comments – 1st Review dated December 5th, 2017.		
a) Section 7.3 Intersection Spacing and Internal Traffic Control Plan; Regional Municipality of Peel – Road Characterization Study should be referenced with regards to access spacing, oppose to the outdated By-law 75-2012. This section of Airport Road is a rural road designation. The minimum spacing requirement between full moves accesses along a Rural Road is 600 metres.	It should be noted that when the proposed subdivision is fully-built this section of Airport Road will be urbanized. Therefore, the proposed spacing is adequate. In addition, the proposed site accesses will be aligned with the existing Cranston Drive and School Driveway.	✓
b) The northerly Street A connection to Airport Road must be investigated in conjunction with the surrounding points of access (school on west side, existing accesses to the nearby plaza). A holistic approach must be undertaken with regards to this requested point of connection to Airport Road. Please update the study to reflect this.	Street A now aligns with the school access. Street B is connected to Street A and Mountcrest Road. Please refer to the Airport Road Functional Design exercise that was prepared by JD Northcote Engineering for additional information.	✓
c) Functional design of northerly Street A connection must also be included, including the surrounding existing connections to Airport Road. Any proposed access must align with the school access on the west side of Airport Road in order to be reviewed further.	Street A now aligns with the school access. Additional information can be found in the Functional Design Exercise submitted to the Region of Peel. Please refer to the Airport Road Functional Design exercise that was prepared by JD Northcote Engineering.	✓
d) At the current time there are no plans to signalize the northerly Street A connection to Airport Road. The study should consider accommodations/improvements to the north access to Street A, and Airport Road, to facilitate children walking and cycling to school. The options of pedestrian signals, multi-use trails, and cross rides should be explored.	We have proposed the northerly intersection to be signalized. We have also proposed an exclusive pedestrian phase at the intersection. This allows for maximum pedestrian safety. Additional information can be found in our Functional Design Exercise submitted to the Region of Peel, completed by JD Engineering, which has been included in this submission.	✓
e) Functional design of the intersection of Airport Road and Cranston Drive/Street A is to be provided within the updated study. Detailed proposed geometrics of the intersection are to be included. The Region wishes to request to investigate the feasibility of providing a round-a-bout at the southerly Street A connection to Airport Road. Please include this analysis within the updated	We have investigated the southerly intersection as a part of the Functional Design Exercise. We have also analysed the possibility of a turning circle in this location. Additional information and the results from the study can be found in our Functional Design Exercise submitted to the Region of Peel,	✓

report. This intersection is included within the Region's Development Charges to be signalized when warranted.	completed by JD Engineering, which has been included in this submission.	
f) Some form of direct connection to the existing nearby plaza should be investigated. This would provide ease of travel for residents to and from the existing development.	We agree that a direct connection to the plaza would be beneficial to the community. We have a future development block available for future expansion of the commercial plaza. Currently there is a Bell facility that restricts an access from the proposed community to the commercial plaza. Until this Bell facility is removed a connection to the plaza is not possible.	✓
g) Bicycle lanes should be explored. It is recommended that bicycle lanes be added to all roads 20m+ wide to allow for comfortable cycling connections in the neighbourhood. (i.e Street A is 20 metres wide and surrounds the neighbourhood).	Bicycle lanes have been proposed on all roads 20m+ wide.	✓
h) Please contact Damian Jamroz, Supervisor, Traffic Operations at extension 7856 for information on the round-a-bout screening tool.	We met with the Region of Peel once comments were received and arranged a further meeting with the Transportation Department. Once we met with the Transportation Department we were instructed to undertake a Functional Design Exercise.	✓
i) Appendix R – this figure indicates northerly Street A as signalized, this must be revised as future potential signals at southerly Street A intersection are currently in the future plans.	As a part of the functional design exercise we looked at both intersections on Airport Road. Due to safety concerns with pedestrians crossing Airport Road, we concluded it would be more beneficial to signalize the northern intersection. Additional information and the results from the study can be found in our Functional Design Exercise submitted to the Region of Peel, completed by JD Engineering, which has been included in this submission.	✓
Region of Peel – Geotechnical Report Comments – 1st Review dated November 9th, 2017.		
a) The report must provide the MOECC WWRs database survey. The report must provide the hydro-geological information on the area and 500 meter surrounding area. The developer must provide a hydrogeological investigation of the area and 500 meter surrounding area. A monitoring and	Please see Appendix A of the Hydrogeological Report (June 14, 2017) for the requested information.	✓

contingency plan is required in accordance with Regional requirements.			
Region of Peel – Healthy Development Assessment Comments – 1st Review dated December 5, 2017			
1.	The completed Healthy Development Assessment (HDA) received July 5, 2017 meets Regional submission requirements. Based on a review of the HAD, the total applicable score and achieved score were revised for a few standards (see attached). The revised score is no 32/47 (68%) instead of 34/45 (76%)	Acknowledged	✓
2.	The proposed development contains many of the attributes of a healthy community, including an interconnected pedestrian and cycling network, generous greenspace and a pedestrian-friendly, attractive streetscape along Airport Road. The following are recommended to enhance the complete, health promoting potential of the proposed development: a. Plan for an affordable housing site (midrise apartment building) at the south-east corner of Airport Road and Street A; b. Incorporate a greater mix of housing options for ageing in place and ensure community resiliency as household types evolve and change over time; c. Integrate sidewalks on both side of all streets.	a. We are currently proposing a high density building that contains 17-30 units. b. We have provided additional unit types in the revised submission. The current submission includes 6.7m decked town houses (Lane based), 6.7m courtyard town houses (Lane based), and 9.7m single detached dwellings (lane based) These products have all been added since the first submission. c. Sidewalks are located on every street and on both sides of Street A. The Town of Caledon road ROW standard does not call for sidewalks on 18.0m ROW.	✓
3.	The following are also recommended to be explored: a. The park and trail connections identified on the Secondary Plan policies should be further explored as a part of this plan;	a. The trail connections have been respected and go above and beyond what is recommended.	✓

	b. A connection from the subdivision to the cul de sac at the end of Valewood Drive should be explored;	b. We are currently proposing an in valley trail system that connects our property to Town Hall.	
4.	The recommendations are an opportunity to further integrate healthy design elements, and ensure closer alignment with Regional planning policies for compact, complete communities. If the recommendations are implemented, the draft plan application will achieve a Silver certification. This represents an enhancement in the health promoting potential of the community form 68% to 75% (See Table 1).	Acknowledged.	✓
5.	The Region is supportive of the proposal for an affordable housing building at the south-east corner of Airport Road and Street A, and requests that this be considered by the Town in the approval of policies and bylaws for the development area. The proposal for an affordable site is reflected in the scoring of the HAD, and assists in the achievement of a Bronze for the development.	Acknowledged. Additional detail for the high density block has been included in the Planning Justification Report and in the revised draft plan.	✓
6.	Reference is made by the applicant in the HDA to future development on lands outside of the subject property, i.e. the southernly relocation of the commercial block from its current location further north along Airport Road. In order to better understand the impact of development on the health of communities within Caledon East, the Region requests the status of those developments.	No further update on the redevelopment of the current commercial plaza.	✓