



Comment Response Table
12211, 12213 and 12231 Hurontario Street
Town of Caledon
POPA 2022-0005, RZ 2022-0008, 21T-22005C
Date: November 28, 2023

NO.	COMMENT	RESPONSE
COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX - TOWN OF CALEDON COMMENTS Argo Summer Valley – Comments Response Matrix		
Town of Caledon Tanjot Bal Tanjot.Bal@caledon.ca Date: October 4, 2023		
Town of Caledon, Planning, Development		
1	Staff acknowledge that the concept plan has been revised to provide an interior road connection (Lighthouse Drive) and the reduction in density through the removal of townhomes.	Acknowledged.
2	Please increase the proposed front yard setback to a minimum of 4.5 metres as 2.5 metres is not an appropriate setback and will not provide sufficient landscaping.	<p>The increase to 4.5 metres exceeds the minimum front yard depth which the Town has accepted in other areas of the Town. For example, Mayfield West 2 allows for 3 metre front yards.</p> <p>The reduction from 3 metres to 2.5 metres is appropriate as it continues to accommodate a workable building envelope, as well as landscaping within the front yard as explained in the 17m Review Discussion Meeting with Town staff (on October 4th, 2023).</p> <p>As per our meeting with the Town on October 11, 2023, concerns with respect to grading has been addressed in the FSR and the 30% landscaping requirement has been provided in the draft zoning by-law to continue to provide sufficient landscaping.</p>
3	Please increase the exterior side yard setback to a minimum of 3.0 metres as 2.0 metres is not sufficient or appropriate for a corner lot condition.	<p>The increase to the 3 metres exceeds the minimum exterior side yard depth which the Town has accepted in other areas of the Town. For example, Mayfield West 2 allows for 2.4 metre exterior side yards.</p> <p>The reduction from 2.4 metres to 2.0 metres continues to accommodate a workable building envelope, as well as landscaping within the side yard as explained in the 17m Review Discussion Meeting with Town staff (on October 4th, 2023).</p> <p>As per our meeting with the Town on October 11, 2023, concerns with respect to grading has been addressed in the FSR and the 30% landscaping requirement has been provided in the draft zoning by-law to continue to provide sufficient landscaping.</p>
4	Please provide justification for the proposed 14 metre height. Please provide a rendering depicting the relationship of the proposed height versus the height of adjacent dwellings/uses.	Reduction to 13m in updated bylaw. The 13m is due to the back to front draining lots (that the Town has requested) as well as the steeper roofs due to the finished attic space that provides more livable square footage for homeowners. We have included a cross-section in the submission to show the proposed height compared to the existing homes.
5	The request to increase the encroachment of bay windows to up-to 1 metre within the rear yard will result in 5 metre rear yards. Please confirm at what height these bay windows will be and if this will impact the functionality of the amenity area.	As discussed in our meeting with Town staff on October 11, 2023, Town staff were advised that the encroachment is only applicable to the first storey. The encroachment will not impact the functionality of the amenity area.

6	Please demonstrate that the further reduction in the parking space size by 0.5 of a metre within the garage provides sufficient space to park a vehicle	The garage the builders are providing is 6m in length per site templates (provided in FSR). This is greater than the enclosed parking garage space requirements of 5.8m in length.
7	As a condition of draft plan approval, the Town will require that the reserves be lifted along Highwood Road.	Acknowledged.
8	As a condition of draft plan approval, the retaining wall along Highwood Road will need to be removed.	Acknowledged.
9	Applicant to obtain confirmation from Town's Engineering Department that they have no concerns with the proposed elimination of the requirements of a site triangle from the Zoning By-law.	Section 2.2 of the TIS Memorandum provides justification and calculations as to where site triangles have been placed to meet Town and safety requirements. In the bylaw we reference "chamfers" to represent the 6m x 6m site triangle on two lots. This is due to the fact that the other corner lots do not require a site triangle per Stopping Site Distances and meet safety requirements, therefore we cannot mention "daylighting triangle" in the bylaw as it would then suggest it would apply to the other corner lots. Since the site is tightly constrained, other corner lots cannot accommodate the 6m x 6m daylighting triangle, however we trust that the rounding applied to the lots (that is typical) is sufficient for staff as there is sufficient site distance provided and that daylighting triangles will not be required on all lots
10	The next submission should include details of the berm and acoustic/noise walls, to assess the usability of the rear yards along these walls.	This level of detail to be provided during detailed design.
11	Please note that the Town requires the Record of Site Condition prior to approving the ZBLA application (see comments from Development Engineering).	We trust this comment will be a condition of draft approval.
Municipal Numbering and Street Names		
12	The applicant is proposing to establish a subdivision on a vacant lot. Municipal numbers shall be issued in accordance with the Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines. These numbers will be issued in accordance with these documents, based on approved driveway locations.	Acknowledged.
13	Municipal numbers will be issued at the earliest of grading approval, servicing approval or if applicable, Final Site Plan Approval.	Acknowledged.
14	Upon issuance of one of the above-noted approvals, the Lead Planner will forward a copy of the approval package to municipal numbering staff to work with the owner to issue the required number and post any required signage of the number in accordance with the Town's Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines	Acknowledged.
15	In accordance the Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines, the municipal numbers must be posted on the exterior of the building that faces the road on which the building is numbered. The elevation drawings shall identify the location of the municipal addresses on the elevations and those drawings shall form part of the approval package. The number shall be identified in accordance with the By-law and Guidelines. Should the owner require clarification on the requirements of the By-law, please contact municipal numbering staff at municipalnumbers@caledon.ca or 905-584-2272 extension 7338.	We trust this comment will be a condition of draft approval.
16	As part of the street naming requirements for The Town, at least one street name of historical significance must be used.	Acknowledged.
17	The street name provided "McAlpine Road" is sufficient as it is a Heritage street name and is from the current list of approved street names from The Town. It has been reserved to be used by this subdivision.	Acknowledged.
Finance		
18	If the amended proposed development (includes a residential subdivision with 57 single detached dwellings) were to proceed as planned, the property's taxable assessment value would change to reflect the developments that would have taken place.	Acknowledged.

19	<p>Development Charges will be levied at the Residential rates that will be effect on the date of building permit issuance. Those rates are currently:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Town of Caledon: \$53,113.61 per single detached dwelling. b. Region of Peel: \$73,917.14 per single detached dwelling. Effective February 1, 2016, the Region of Peel began collecting directly for most hard service development charges (i.e. water, wastewater and roads) for residential developments, at the time of subdivision agreement execution. c. Transit: \$760.26 per single detached dwelling. d. School Boards: \$4,572 per any residential unit. 	Acknowledged.
20	<p>The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as of July 21, 2023, and are based upon information provided to the Town by the applicant, current By-laws in effect, and current rates, which are indexed twice a year. For site plan or rezoning applications dated on or after January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated at rates applicable on the date when an application is determined to be complete; and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. Interest charges will apply for affected applications. For site plan or rezoning applications dated prior to January 1, 2020, Development Charges are calculated and payable at building permit issuance date. Development Charge by-laws and rates are subject to change. Further, proposed developments may change from the current proposal to the building permit stage. Any estimates provided will be updated based on changes in actual information related to the construction as provided in the building permit application.</p>	Acknowledged.
Legal Services		
21	Instrument Number PR3831221 is a site grading agreement registered on May 10, 2021. The Owner is bound by this agreement.	Acknowledged.
22	Instrument Number PR4018421 is a Certificate of Requirement under subsections 168.2 and 197(2) of the Environmental Protection Act relating to the Certificate of Property Use number 0840-CCHJ8T (linked here Microsoft Word - MGRA CPU 0840-CCHJ8T rev 16Mar2022 (gov.on.ca)) with respect to a Risk Assessment and certain Rick Management Measures and other preventative measure requirements on the property.	Acknowledged.
23	Search Record of Site Condition (gov.on.ca)	Acknowledged.
24	Access to the site to Light Heart Drive is proposed over private lands. (see image in comment file)	As discussed with staff, the lands are not private. The lands are owned by the Crown and will be owned by the Town in the future.
25	No comments on the Draft official plan amendment.	Acknowledged.
26	Remove the additional 's' from Concession on the appendix of the Zoning By-law. (see image in comment file)	The Draft Zoning By-law has been updated to remove the additional 's' from Concession in the appendix.
Urban Design		
27	<p>Please update and coordinate drawings for the next submission to ensure there are no discrepancies and differences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The sidewalk crosses at lot 15 and 38 are not shown on the draft plan or landscape plan. Please coordinate drawings b. The landscape plan should be updated to show the proposed berm and retaining wall information mentioned in the Urban Design Brief c. The Urban Design Brief shows a 1.8m wood screen fence along lot 26, please update the landscape plan to reflect this as well d. The sidewalk cross locations proposed in the Parking and Pedestrian Plan do not match with the cross locations on the Landscape Plan (Lots 15 and 38). The crosswalk and tree planting locations must be coordinated 	The landscape plan has been revised to addressed this comment.
28	<p>Clarity is needed on what the darker hatch represents on the landscape plan. It does not align with the driveway locations shown on the parking and pedestrian plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Strive to pair driveways as much as possible. Flip building plans as needed to maximize adjacencies of garages between different lots. This maintains better proximity of house entrances/porches 	Landscape plan has been updated and coordinated with the Parking and Pedestrian Plan.

29	Separate delineation should be made on the Landscape Plan between the Noise Attenuation Wall and the Acoustic Fence. Please label these directly on the drawings and ensure that the location and type of fence is consistent across all the submitted documents.	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
30	Include a dimension of the internal sidewalk and green boulevard on the landscape and pedestrian plan	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
31	Show all potential community mailbox location on the landscape plan	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
32	Once more detail is available, the landscape plan should show all streetscape utilities and lighting to ensure the street trees can be accommodated as shown	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
33	Corner Lot Zoning Analysis: The applicant needs to label where front entrances and garages are to be located, and what they are implying the dashed lines to represent a. Further confirmation is needed to ensure the priority lot locations have sufficient space for priority lot features such as porches, side entrances, and landscaping	Corner lot sittings have been updated. They are to be read in conjunction with the Zoning bylaw.
Urban Design - Urban Design Brief		
34	The Urban Design Brief shall include images for the design of the mentioned retaining wall	Retaining wall has been removed from plan. Urban Design Brief has been revised to include an image of the acoustical fence and height details of berm / fence.
35	Page 11: principle 1.3.3 should be removed since the townhouses have been removed	Urban Design Brief has been revised to remove this section.
36	Part 3 Built form Principles: Ensure there is no repetitive design for adjacent homes. A gap of 3-4 homes is required between similar designs to avoid monotony.	Urban Design Brief has been revised to include this guideline.
Urban Design - Accessibility		
37	Please note that the Town will require as a condition of draft approval, that 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.	Acknowledged.
38	Exterior paths of travel, including outdoor sidewalks and walkways, shall have a minimum clear width of 1.5 metres, a surface which is firm, stable and slip resistant and otherwise comply with the Integrated Accessibility Standards (IAS) within the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA).	Acknowledged.
39	Where a path of travel has any opening, such as a sewer grate, the opening must not allow passage of an object that has a diameter of more than 20 mm and such opening must be oriented perpendicular to the direction of travel.	Acknowledged.
40	All exterior paths of travel shall be accessible, such as when crossing over from one street to another street, by inclusion of features such as a curb ramp with a minimum clear width of 1,200 mm exclusive of any flared sides. Curb ramps shall have raised profile tactile walking surface indicators located at the bottom of the curb ramp and extending the full width of the ramp. Curb ramps shall comply fully with Section 80.26 of the IAS within the AODA.	Acknowledged.
41	If a community mailbox is installed, the area shall be well lit via a light standard and a curb depression, complying with Section 80.27 of the IAS within the AODA, shall be provided from the sidewalk and/or roadway to the mailbox landing area.	Acknowledged.
42	Any lighting on exterior routes of travel shall comply with the Town's lighting standard.	Acknowledged.
Development Engineering		
Development Engineering - Storm Water Management/Storm Drainage		

43	<p>The comments provided herein assume that the design criteria for the subject lands mirrors that of the surrounding developments for erosion mitigation, namely extended detention control of the 25mm design storm event and no other quantity controls are required. Water quality criteria is subject to current standards and the CLIECA performance criteria. See comments below related to water quality. Also, please note that while the following comments should be addressed to the satisfaction of the Town, confirmation from the City of Brampton on the acceptability of the SWM strategy and additional drainage to the existing SWM Pond (i.e. potential for downstream impacts) is required prior to draft plan approval.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
44	<p>The Town of Caledon has recently been granted a Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approval 324-S701 (CLI ECA) which authorizes the Town approve alterations to the municipal stormwater management system. Please see the attached copy of the Town's CLI ECA along with the associated Design Criteria. In order to gain approval, the Proponent will need to meet the stormwater criteria presented in Table A1. Performance Criteria. The following comments should be addressed in the FSR:</p> <p>a. Section 9.2 should be revised to include the Town's CLI ECA Performance Criteria and identify how the criteria will be met. Any requirements to meet stormwater quality, quantity and/or water balance criteria are to be on public property and under public ownership.</p> <p>b. With respect to water balance performance criteria, the Town is satisfied that the reduction in impervious cover as a result in the change in landuse from commercial to residential lands is sufficient to meet the CLI ECA water balance criteria. Nothing further is required.</p> <p>c. Prior to servicing the Town will require the Developer to provide a letter of consent from the City of Brampton that storm water from Caledon can enter Brampton's network.</p>	<p>a. FSR updated to include reference to Town criteria per CLI ECA. b. Acknowledged. c. Acknowledged</p>
<p>Development Engineering - Functional Servicing Report</p>		
45	<p>Development Engineering met with Burnside on September 27th to discuss and clarify the below comments and the methodology used to determine the quantity control requirements. The FSR is to be revised and comments addressed prior to Draft Plan Approval:</p> <p>a. The methodology used to calculate or obtain the available storage volume in the receiving SWM pond should be described and justified in Section 9 and Appendix C.</p> <p>b. The FSR should confirm and/or clarify the source of the 1.021ha at 7.0% imperviousness in Section 9.2.2 and Table 9 (pg.26) and relate it to a drainage area plan. Please provide justification and/or relevant details and excerpts from the previous subdivision reports demonstrating that 1.021ha at 7.0% was considered and is currently accommodated in the SWM Pond for the 25mm extended detention.</p> <p>c. Please elaborate and explain where the area of 0.54ha at 43% imperviousness in Section 9.2.1, 9.2.2 and Table 9 (pg.26) was derived from. It is Development Engineering's understanding that this was derived from the Creeks Edge Storm Drainage Plan area of 0.84 (0.47 + 0.37) and subtracting the area that is outside of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision. This represents the impervious drainage area already accounted for in the sizing of the SWM facility that overlaps the subject lands.</p> <p>d. It is understood that the runoff co-efficient and % imperviousness were calculated based on the provided lot plans and reflected on each of the respective lot types and sizes. Please clarify, elaborate and explain within the report how the runoff co-efficient and % imperviousness was obtained/calculated. The impervious area assumptions described in Appendix C must be discussed and confirmed to be accurate. Please also consider that at a meeting held on August 30, 2022, Argo informed the group of their plans for 24.4 m lot depths with reduced rear yards setbacks to provide more internal living area on less land.</p>	<p>a, b, c, d - sections of the FSR have been updated to provide the required clarification and justification for the various volumes and calculations were obtained.</p>
46	<p>The final paragraph of Section 8.1 should also reference the Donal JV Limited Subdivision and associated storm drainage plan to reflect the overall existing conditions. Please elaborate and provide supporting information and relevant excerpts in Section 8.1 detailing how the proposed DPOS was considered and accommodated through the surrounding subdivisions (Creek's Edge & Donal JV Limited).</p>	<p>This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.</p>

47	Section 8.1 identifies that the downstream invert elevation of the storm sewer at EX.MH07 is 253.21m. The downstream invert elevation of EX.MH107 is 253.99 according to the As-Constructed plans included in Appendix A. Please confirm.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.
48	Section 8.1 identifies that the downstream invert elevation of the existing storm sewer on Lighthouse Drive is situated at 253.92m. However, the As-Constructed plans identify that the west invert of DCB MH17 is at 254.13. Please confirm.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.
49	Section 8.3 identifies that based on the As-Constructed Drainage Area Plan, the direct frontage of the subject property on Highwood Road, was accommodated in the Creek's Edge Subdivision as single detached lots, totaling 0.52 ha. Please confirm and clarify how this area was obtained and if 0.54ha was intended to be referenced as identified in comment 3c above	The 0.52 is for the residential lots only the 0.02 ha conveyance of Highwood Rd is excluded from the calculation.
50	Section 8.3 identifies that the proposed grading for the site has provision for emergency overland flow conveyance to the external ROW while maintaining a maximum ponding depth of 0.30 m. However, review of the Grading Plan (G1) identifies that the RLCBs on Lots 42/43 and Lots 39/40 would pond up to the existing rear property line elevation and discharge overland to the lots in the subdivision in the City of Brampton to the south. It is understood that this is the existing drainage pattern for the area, however please elaborate and provide justification for the proposed design within the report and clearly identify the overland flow routes. Confirmation is required from the City of Brampton for any drainage or overland flow routes to lands within the City of Brampton. a. Additionally, the site grading identifies the lots are graded and drain towards the rear yards with no identified outlet. Burnside has indicated that RLCBs will be implemented at detailed design. Please note that ponding is not permitted over 0.3m before following an overland flow route and where an overland flow route is not available the RLCBs must be design for the 100yr capture at 50% blockage. Please clarify and update the report accordingly.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FRT and RLCBs will be identified in detailed design and implemented in accordance with Town and City criteria.
51	Storm sewer sizing information was not provided for the existing 750mm storm sewer on Lighthouse Drive. Please confirm and provide justification that the existing storm sewer had consideration for the 2.707ha post development drainage area to this outlet location. It is understood following a meeting with Burnside that the storm sewer is designed to convey up to the 10yr event, with major flows up to the 100yr event conveyed overland via the ROW. Please update the final paragraph of Section 8.4 to clarify how both major and minor storm events will be conveyed and provide references to support that there is sufficient capacity in the downstream system.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.
52	Section 8.4 identifies that "to confirm capacity in the existing system, the relevant pipes were included in the storm sewer design sheet for the proposed development (Appendix C)", however storm sewer design sheets do not appear to have been included. Storm sewer design sheets for the 10yr and 100yr storm events were provided by the Engineering Consultant separately via email. Comments on the Storm Sewer Design Sheets have been provided directly to RJ Burnside via email on September 6, 2023.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR and will be further examined during detailed design.
53	Figure 8 identifies a runoff co-efficient of 0.62 for Area POST2, however the Post-Dev Imperviousness / Runoff Coefficient Calculations in Appendix C identify a runoff co-efficient of 0.66. Please confirm and revise to correlate.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.
54	Figure 8 identifies a runoff co-efficient of 0.50 for Area POST3, however the Post-Dev Imperviousness / Runoff Coefficient Calculations in Appendix C identify a runoff co-efficient of 0.66. Please confirm and revise to correlate.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.
55	Please include the size of the proposed drainage area that the pond was designed for through the Creeks Edge Subdivision and Donal JV Limited subdivision within the second sentence in the first paragraph of Section 9.1. Provide reference to support the assumptions.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.

56	Further clarification is required as to why the proposed strategy has been revised to now assume that the SWM Pond provides 0% TSS removal efficiency for the subject lands. Under existing conditions and based on the storm drainage plans for the Creeks Edge Subdivision and Donal JV Limited Subdivision, the subject property currently drains to the SWM Pond. Development Engineering understands that whether the SWM pond was adequately sized to treat drainage from the subject property, it appears to currently treat a larger drainage area of approximately 30.0ha, rather than the just the 27.226ha (22.00ha existing Creek's Edge Subdivision plus 5.226ha through the proposed Donal JV Subdivision) identified in the Donal JV Limited SWM Report. Thus, the SWM pond appears to be providing some quality control for the subject property, albeit not Level 1 (80% TSS removal). Please explore achieving Level 1 quality control (80% TSS removal) through a combination of the existing SWM pond and a manufactured treatment device.	The quality approach has been modified to include the "calculated" efficiency of the SWM pond (68% removal) in combination with the introduction of an OGS at each of the connection points. Resulting in an overall treatment efficiency of 84% for the development site. All measures proposed and accounted for in the treatment train are located on public property.
57	Municipal ROWs are required to achieve 80% TSS removal within public property in accordance with the Towns CLI ECA. Additionally, please note that where two or more manufactured treatment devices (MTD) are proposed to be installed in series, no additional removal credit may be assumed beyond the removal efficiency of the MTD with the highest removal efficiency. Therefore, the Town does not support the total removal efficiency of 75% for the CB Shield in line with the OGS.	With the treatment train introduced, the ROW will achieve 80% removal through OGS and the existing pond capacity.
58	A treatment train approach through a combination of lot level infiltration, CB Shields and an OGS is identified in Table 7. Please clarify why the sub catchment description of "Pervious Area" is only treated by infiltration and the OGS.	This comment is no longer relevant.
59	Table 7 identifies that the roof/driveway area is 12.7ha, for catchment POST4 which appears it may be a typo and was intended to be 1.27ha. Please clarify.	No longer relevant, please refer to updated FSR report.
60	Development Engineering supports the cash in lieu alternative identified in Section 9.2.1.1 comprising of an OGS as part of the existing SWM pond to achieve a net TSS removal efficiency of 83% for the entire watershed, however we defer to the City of Brampton.	Acknowledged - this would provide the most comprehensive solution for the watershed.
Development Engineering - Grading and Servicing		
61	The Grading Plan identifies grading extending onto lands owned by the MTO. Any grading and drainage to or within MTO Lands will require review and approval from the MTO. Please provide confirmation from the MTO that there are no concerns with the proposed grading encroachment.	Acknowledged.
62	Confirm the elevation of 258.66 at the southeast corner of lot 26 as it appears to be closer to 258.00.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.
63	Please confirm and revise the invert elevations and top elevation for EX. DCB MH17 as they appear to be incorrect. Clearly identify the proposed and existing invert elevations.	This comment has been addressed in the updated FSR.
Development Engineering - Road Network		
64	The development proposal has been revised to include the required vehicular connection to Lighthouse Drive to the east through Block 80 on Plan 43M-1615. Town maps identify that Block 80 is currently owned by 1360287 Ontario Limited, however it is understood from recent discussions with the applicant that Block 80 is now owned by the Crown. There is a clause in the subdivision agreement for 43M-1615 that requires Block 80 to be conveyed to the Town free and clear of all encumbrances when required by the Town for a future road connection. Discussion is ongoing between the Town and the applicant regarding timing, requirements and conveyance of this block.	Acknowledged. Please use the submitted noise report in latest submission dated November 23, 2023 for the Peer Review.

65	<p>The roadway geometric design is to be in conformance with Town Standards Section 1.5.2.1.</p> <p>a. The southern limit of the right of way connection should be aligned with the southern limit of the future road internal to the subdivision.</p> <p>b. As per Town Standards, all intersection angles should be in the range of 85 degrees to 95 degrees and the minimum horizontal centerline (CL) curve radius of the roadway is to be 65 m. Ensure all centerline radii meet this standard and are labelled on the draft plan. i. Section 6.1.1 of the Traffic Impact and Parking Study identifies that the proposed realignment is in compliance with the Town of Caledon CL radius of 65m, which is maintained at the ROW and that the cross section has a 1.5m offset CL between the pavement CL, which results in the 65m ROW radius becoming a 63.5 and 66.5 pavement CL radius for the reverse curves. Please note that the minimum CL curve radius of 65m is measured at the CL of the pavement and not the ROW. Revise accordingly.</p> <p>c. As per Town Standards, minimum road grade is 0.75%. Please provide justification for the proposed road grades of 0.5% and that the overland flow route will function and not be impacted. A minimum of 0.75% grade at gutters along all bends is required.</p>	<p>a. The southern limit of the right of way connection is aligned with the southern limit of the future road internal to the subdivision.</p> <p>b. The minimum inside curve radius as labelled on the draft plan is 56.5 metres. Based on a right-of-way width of 17 metres, the centreline curve radius is 65 metres and conforms with the Town's requirement.</p> <p>C. Please refer to updated FSR report, Section 8.3.</p>
66	<p>The Town acknowledges that other ROWs within this area are 17.0m and therefore have no concern with this right of way width if it can be demonstrated that all required infrastructure (including street trees and landscaping requirements) can be accommodated within this ROW width.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
Development Engineering - Environmental Noise		
67	<p>The Noise Study was revised to include the design for the future Highway 410 interchange to the north.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
68	<p>The Noise Study identifies that warning clauses are required. This will be captured through conditions of Draft Approval.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
69	<p>The Environmental Noise Feasibility Study prepared by Valcoustics Canada Ltd, dated May 24, 2023 will be peer reviewed at the applicant's expense. Costs for the Peer review will be provided under a separate cover.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
Development Engineering - Environmental Site Assessments		
70	<p>The Phase Two ESA and Phase Two CSM identifies that soil exceedances of the Table 4 SCS were identified for PHC fraction F2 and for EC/SAR and that groundwater exceedances of the Table 4 SCS were identified for sodium and chloride. The Phase Two ESA indicates that to address the exceedances, a Risk Assessment (RA) will be performed and submitted to MECP as part of a Record of Site Condition for the site located within Caledon.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. A MGRA was submitted and accepted by the MECP. An RSC has been filed dated July 18, 2022.</p>

71	<p>The Modified Generic Risk Assessment (MGRA) prepared by EXP that was provided appears to be an incomplete document with track changes and the title and date of the MGRA provided does not match the title or date of the Risk Assessment Confirmation Letter Reference No. 6236-C5QQWK provided by the MECP. Please submit to the Town, the final copy of the MECP accepted MGRA for review to determine if there will be additional requirements by the Town. The Town reserves the right to peer review the MGRA at the applicant's expense.</p> <p>a. The MGRA identifies in the Introduction and General Approach that Table 4 SCS is utilized, however other sections of the MGRA identifies that the applicable SCS is Table 5 medium/fine soil texture. Please clarify the applicable SCS as there are a number of inconsistencies between all reports.</p> <p>b. The MGRA identifies that the number of stories below grade is slab on grade, however it is assumed that the proposed residential dwellings will have basements. Please clarify.</p> <p>c. The MGRA identifies that it will support the filing of the RSC and that the Risk Management Measures (RMM) required for this property include:</p> <p>i. A restriction prohibiting the use of groundwater for drinking water.</p> <p>ii. A Soil Management Plan (SMP) is also required to ensure surface and subsurface soils remain within appropriate PSS during potential future earthworks.</p> <p>Please note that the SMP is to be provided and reviewed prior to Grading. This will be captured through conditions of draft approval.</p>	<p>The MGRA dated February 14, 2022 is the final version of the report. The MECP requires tracked changes for Risk Assessment revisions and accepts the marked up version of the report as the final version of the report.</p> <p>As per the Town's discussion with the Applicant, a clean version of the report will not be provided.</p> <p>a. Table 4 is applicable to the non-volatile parameters at the MGRA property, and Table 6 is applicable to the volatile parameters based on the assumptions of the applicable models used in MGRAs. EXP notes that the MGRA states Table 5 within the model as the "no groundwater use for drinking water" risk management measure is applied. As such, the applicable SCS in the MGRA is changed to Table 5 SCS as the direct contact with groundwater pathway is eliminated for the purposes of the MGRA evaluation only.</p> <p>b. Given the non-volatile nature of COCs, changes in the development plan for buildings with basements will not affect the conclusions of the MGRA. Please refer to Section 3.3 – Shallow Groundwater Consideration of the Phase Two CSM and the third paragraph in Section 5 of the Phase Two CSM for details.</p> <p>c. The SMP is included as a part of the MGRA as Appendix I.</p>
72	<p>A Risk Assessment Confirmation Letter from the MECP has been provided identifying that the MECP accepted the Risk Assessment (RA Number 6236-C5QQWK) relating to the Property in accordance with s. 168.5 of the Environmental Protection Act. Please provide the signed Certificate of Property Use Number 0840-CCHJ8T (CPU #0840-CCHJ8T) that was attached to the letter as it incorporates the risk management plan and additional conditions imposed by the Director on lands that may be owned by the Town and future residents. Please note that a RSC will be required prior to rezoning.</p>	<p>A signed version of the MGRA CPU has been included.</p>
Development Engineering - General		
73	<p>The 14.0m MTO setback has been identified on the plan as a buffer block (Block 58). Further discussion regarding ownership of this block is required prior to Draft Plan Approval. It is the Town's preference that MTO takes ownership of this block as it is adjacent to MTO lands, provides a drainage outlet for an external drainage area including 410 Interchange and there is no reasonable access from the private lots</p>	<p>It is proposed that the Town takes ownership of the block given that the MTO advised they will not take ownership, and these lands cannot be held under private ownership.</p>
74	<p>Development Engineering has concerns with the proposed zoning by-law amendment and specific standards as the rear yards of some of the lots contain a noise berm, noise barrier and retaining wall ranging in widths spanning from approximately 4.4m to 8.6m. The way the zoning by law is currently drafted, the minimum rear yard proposed of 6.0m is less than the width of the berm in some cases and would permit encroachments into the retaining walls and noise berm. These encroachments should not be permitted, and the draft zoning bylaw amendment should be revised to have consideration for the noise berm, noise barrier and retaining wall that are within the rear yard.</p> <p>a. Please note that rear yards in urban development areas must have a minimum of 75% of the yard area sufficiently level (2% to 5%) to be usable.</p>	<p>The draft Zoning By-law has been updated to require deeper setback standards for those lots containing berms.</p>
Landscape - Draft By-law		
75	<p>The minimum front yard setback should be 9.0m to allow enough space for tree planting, landscaping and parking.</p>	<p>9.0 metres conflicts with Provincial and Municipal objectives for implementing compact communities. 5.5 metre front yard depth is proposed to the garage to accommodate required parking. And the 2.5 metre front yard depth to the building allows for adequate landscaping. Tree planting will occur within the public boulevard.</p>
76	<p>Please ensure the minimum Landscaped Area will be 30% for all lots.</p>	<p>The proposed draft zoning by-law has been updated to include the minimum landscaped area for all lots.</p>
Landscape - Arborist Report		

77	Please consider the retention of trees #1878, 1879, 1880 along Hurontario if feasible, and flare grading to match existing grades at the edge of the tree protection zone. Update the arborist report accordingly and/or provide rationale for not retaining.	Trees are located within the MTO setback. In addition, Town staff have requested that grading be completed from back to front and as such, an increase in the berm slope encroachment within MTO lands is likely.
78	Please consider the retention of tree #1909 along Hurontario if feasible, and flare grading to match existing grades at the edge of the tree protection zone. Update the arborist report accordingly and/or provide rationale for not retaining.	Tree 1909 is located within the middle of a 2.1 m berm and as such, flaring of the grading is not a viable option. In addition, Town staff have requested that grading be completed from back to front and as such, an increase in the berm slope encroachment within MTO lands is likely.
79	Please update compensation tree calculations as part of the updated arborist report and include on the Landscape Plan.	Compensation tree calculations have been added to the Landscape plan per Arborist report.
Landscape - Draft Plan of Subdivision		
80	Road RoW is proposed to be 17.0m. This is acceptable provided the Town's standard soil depths and soil volumes for trees can be maintained at an acceptable level.	Acknowledged.
Landscape - Landscape Plan		
81	Please provide a Schedule of Quantities for all trees summarized by location typology (ie. Boulevard, Buffer Block, etc...) indicating numbers of trees, type (deciduous or conifer) and stature size	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
82	Please show and identify proposed compensation tree plantings on the Landscape Plan. Note that compensation trees are in addition to required street trees, and that preservation of larger, existing trees will reduce this (land) requirement.	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
83	Please dimension and label the sidewalks, driveways and crossing locations as appropriate	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
84	Please show the proposed berm and retaining wall information	Grading plan with berm and acoustic fence has been included into the landscape drawing.
85	Separate delineation should be made on the Landscape Plan between the Noise Attenuation Wall and the Acoustic Fence	Landscape plan now includes location of acoustic fence per Engineering drawings.
86	Please show the locations of light standards in relation to trees and driveways in accordance with Town standards to demonstrate the proper placement and adequate spacing of trees	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
87	Indicate where required trees are proposed on private front yards and add a note that a Town easement will be included to protect the trees and soil volumes	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
88	Please include soil volume calculations for proposed planting areas, sidewalks, boulevards and limit of ROW/property lines as part of detailed design	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
89	Note that for detailed design a gateway feature for the Town will be required facing Hurontario (Town Wide Design Guidelines 4.2 and 6.2). This will need to be designed in accordance with MTO requirements and in consideration of any required retaining and noise mitigation measures	Acknowledged.
90	Tree species to be selected from the Town's Preferred Street Tree List (see attached) and shall be comprised of a minimum 50% native and 'nativar' species, both in species and overall quantities	Acknowledged.
91	Please ensure trees are set back a min. of 1.5 -2.0m from back of curb	Landscape plans have been updated accordingly.
92	Please add a driveway for Lot 43	Driveways have been updated per site plan drawing.
93	Please see Urban Design notes for additional comments relating to the Landscape Plan	These details are to be addressed at the detailed design stage.
94	Additional tree locations have been marked on the Landscape Plan (see attached) to be appropriately spaced to create an effective canopy and strong streetscape presence in response to the Urban Design Brief.	Trees have been added where appropriate.
Park		

95	Payment of money in lieu of conveyance of parkland will be required at an equivalent market value of 5% of the land included in the draft plan. For the purpose of determining the amount of payment, the value of the land shall be determined as of the day before the day of the approval of the draft plan of subdivision.	Acknowledged.
Transportation Engineering		
96	It is noted that on street parking spaces range from a width of 5.4m to 6.7m. The comment response matrix acknowledges that parking spaces lower than 6m of length cannot accommodate the entry and exit of a design vehicle. Based on a review of parallel parking space required by surrounding municipalities, it is the Town's opinion that on-street parking spaces smaller than 6.5m should not be included in the total parking spaces. On this specific site, there are 16 on-street parking spaces that are smaller than 6.5m, as such, the true total parking spaces provided on site are 216, which satisfies the Town's requirements.	Acknowledged.
97	With the connection of Donherb Crescent and Lighthouse Drive, there is a concern that all 3 approaches are proposed to operate as free flow movements under ultimate build-out. Please propose a solution to mitigate this concern	As per the updated Pavement Marking Plan, a STOP Control has been proposed at Donherb Crescent and Lighthouse Drive.
98	Please update the Pavement Marking and Signage Plan per the attached red line markings (Pavement Marking and Signage Plan TE Markup).	As per the updated Pavement Marking Plan, a STOP Control has been proposed at Donherb Crescent and Lighthouse Drive.
99	Please show the sidewalk connection to Donherb Crescent in the submitted drawings.	The proposed eastern sidewalk on the Argo property aligns with the existing sidewalk in the Donherb/Lighthouse neighbourhood.
Heritage		
100	Heritage staff have reviewed the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment report for the subject lands (AMICK, dated 21 December, 2021) and concur with its recommendation that, since no archaeological resources were found, there are no further archaeological concerns with the property. The Town is also in receipt of a compliance letter from the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, dated December 22, 2021, confirming that this archaeological assessment report has been entered into the Public Register. Accordingly, there are no further heritage concerns with this application.	Acknowledged.
Zoning		
101	Parking and Pedestrian Plan dated June 5, 2023 has not been reviewed as Section 5 "Parking Loading and Delivery Standards" of By-law 2006-50 does not contain provisions for street parking. Be advised that 2 parking spaces are required per dwelling unit on each lot, as per Table 5.1 of Section 5.2.2 "Residential Parking Requirements" of By-law 2006-50. Zoning notes that Section 5.2.8 requires all provided parking to be located on the same lot that requires the parking spaces.	Acknowledged.
102	Final lot frontages and areas are to be confirmed at a later time when a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage has been prepared and signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor. At this time, Zoning staff acknowledge that the applicant confirms the lot areas and lot frontages on the Draft Plan of Subdivision (signed by Surveyor on February 15, 2022) are as per the definition within the Draft Bylaw.	Acknowledged.
103	Zoning standards (including lot frontages and lot areas) were reviewed for compliance and no concerns are noted at this time; however, certain zoning standards such as setbacks, building height, amenity area and landscaped area cannot be reviewed due to the preliminary nature of the application. Such standards may be reviewed at later stages in subsequent applications.	Acknowledged.

104	Please review the draft by-law comments provided. Any future copies of the draft by-law must be prepared with the template provided (no PDF to word conversions) and subsequent submissions be prepared in Word format only (with the exception of the schedule). Tracked changes are recommended but not required.	Acknowledged. The draft zoning by-law has been revised to address staff's comments.
105	Please note the following conditions for draft approval of the subdivision requested by zoning staff: a. Prior to registration, a Zoning By-law for the development of these lands is to be passed under Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, as amended, and be in full force and effect. b. Prior to registration, the Owner shall provide a Certificate of Lot Area and Lot Frontage prepared and signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor, to the satisfaction of the Town of Caledon.	Acknowledged.
Fire and Emergency Services		
106	Fire has no further comments for this POPA, RZ, Draft Plan but still expresses concern for any development that increases the community fire risk without increasing the level of fire suppression services in the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre. Fire does not recommend increasing this risk until improvements in fire suppression deployment reaches a service level of 10 firefighters responding in 10 minutes (turnout time + travel time) to 80% of fire related calls within the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre.	Acknowledged.
MTO		
107	As noted in MTO's previous comments, an EA has been completed regarding the Highway 410/Hurontario Interchange, with a new road proposed road (referred to as Spine Road/ Tim Manly Blvd.) intersecting Hurontario Street from the west. Please note that to the best of my knowledge, the detail design for this highway improvement has not been completed, and therefore the ROW limits for the interchange have not been finalized. As such, the limit of the property along the highway ramp is not yet finalized, which will also then impact the final required location of the MTO highway set-back. The timing of the completion of the design and the construction of the highway improvements is not yet known. Once the ROW limit in this location has been finalized, the draft plan of sub-division may need to be revised.	Acknowledged. Based on dialogue with Aecom whom have been tasked to undertake the design of the interchange, no additional lands from the subject lands are required to support the design.
108	The MTO 14m setback is to be measured from the future ROW limit, and the setback limit must be shown and detailed on all plans. MTO does not require that this be a Block on a plan, and will not take ownership of any such Block. The 14m setback is protected within MTO's permit control area under the Public Transportation and Highway Improvements Act. No facility that is essential to the viability of the site/development (such as, but not limited to structures, stormwater management ponds, access roads, fire routes, etc.) is permitted within the setback.	We expect the Town to take ownership of the 14-metre buffer block.
Next Steps		
109	Upon request, a comment review meeting will be arranged with the appropriate internal and external commenting agencies to discuss the comments in the letter, assisting you in ensuring that the next submission will be complete and address all comments as required. I ask that you provide an agenda a minimum of three (3) days prior to the comment review meeting.	Acknowledged. Meeting scheduled with staff on October 11, 2023 to discuss comments received.

110	<p>Partial resubmissions, which do not address all deficiencies listed in the letter, will not be accepted for processing. Please ensure that the revised submission included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Cover Letter • A Comment Response Matrix identifying how all comments have been addressed • Revised Site Plan • Revised Draft By-law • Revised Landscape Plans • Revised Urban Design Brief • Revised Draft Plan of Subdivision • Revised Arborist Report • Revised Landscape Plans • Conceptual 1st Floor Plan – garage • Rendering of proposed height in relation to adjacent dwellings/uses • Revised Functional Servicing Report • Revised Grading and Servicing Plan • Revised Modified Generic Risk Assessment • Certificate of Property Use Number 0840-CCHJ8T (CPU #0840-CCHJ8T) 	<p>Acknowledged. The revised submission includes the following supporting materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Cover Letter • A Comment Response Matrix identifying how all comments have been addressed • Revised Site Plan • Revised Draft By-law • Revised Landscape Plans • Revised Urban Design Brief • Revised Draft Plan of Subdivision • Revised Arborist Report • Revised Landscape Plans • Conceptual 1st Floor Plan – garage • Rendering of proposed height in relation to adjacent dwellings/uses • Revised Functional Servicing Report • Revised Grading and Servicing Plan • Revised Modified Generic Risk Assessment • Certificate of Property Use Number 0840-CCHJ8T (CPU #0840-CCHJ8T)
111	<p>The Town is only accepting electronic submissions. To assist, the Town has created a document which identifies how material is to be submitted. Please click here to access the Town’s website for details and ensure that any submission material you are preparing will meet the attached requirements. To submit a revised submission, please visit the Town’s website and complete the additional information form online at www.caledon.ca/development, under the heading “For Existing Applications” and click on either Zoning By-law Amendments or Official Plan Amendments. All links will bring you to the same form to complete. As the resubmission will be of a substantial file size, all supporting documents will be required to be uploaded to a secure Planning FTP site. Should you not have access to the folder, please let me know. Once a submission has been made as per above, please advise me for efficient processing.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>Town of Caledon - Development Engineering Alex Schittenhelm alex.schittenhelm@caledon.ca Date: September 29, 2023</p>		
<p>Storm Water Management/Storm Drainage</p>		
112	<p>Section 5.0 of the FSR identifies that the adoption of the proposed 17.0m Road Design Standard will be in line with the adjacent road design standard. While the ROW width is consistent, the road design standard being utilized (City of Brampton Std. 200) is different than that of the previous road design standard utilized for the adjacent and surrounding road designs in regards to infrastructure locations within the ROW and boulevard (i.e. sidewalk, joint use utility trench, etc.). The Towns preference would be to utilize the existing cross section that was used for the surrounding subdivisions for consistency and to be homogeneous. Further discussion with the City of Brampton is required.</p>	<p>As the City of Brampton has a standard 17m ROW it is our preference to continue with the Brampton standard through the Town in order to provide a consistent cross section within the subdivision and avoid an ADS for the DPOS in the City of Brampton - this can be finalized prior to detailed design but will not have an impact to the DPOS.</p>
113	<p>Storm sewer design sheets for the 10yr and 100yr storm events were provided by the Engineering Consultant separately via email. Comments on the Storm Sewer Design Sheets have been provided directly to RJ Burnside via email on September 6, 2023.</p>	<p>The general design sheet has been updated. The detailed storm sewer design will be addressed at detailed design.</p>
114	<p>At detailed design stage, an HGL analysis will be required to demonstrate a minimum of 0.3m separation is provided between the underside of footing and the 100 year HGL.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
115	<p>Please note that the review and approval of sanitary and water services is the responsibility of the Region of Peel and Development Engineering defers the review of these services to the Region.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Water Balance		
116	The notes under Table 3.4 in the Hydro G Report identify that a safety factor of 3.5 was applied, however it appears a safety factor of 2.5 was applied. Please confirm and revise accordingly.	Safety factor corrected to 2.5 in Table 3.4.
117	The sum of all the areas in Table 4.1 of the Hydro G Report does not add up to the provided total site area. Additionally, the total site area of 35,884m2 in Table 4.1 and 4.5, does not match the total site area of 36,245m2 as identified in Table 4.4. Please clarify and revise accordingly.	Total site area correctly indicated as 35,884 m2 across report and tables.
118	The Pre-Development Land Use areas per Table 4.1 of the Hydro G Report do not align with the areas in Appendix F.	Typo has been fixed on Table 4.1. Appendix G has been included in the hydrogeological report to avoid multiple versions.
119	The percentage values identified in the text for precipitation, evapotranspiration and infiltration under Table 4.4 in the Hydro G Report does not appear to align with the values contained within Table 4.4. Please clarify and revise.	Percentage values corrected across report and tables.
120	The Hydro G identifies in Table 4.4 that 8,439m2 is available for infiltration. However, this appears to be a typo and correlates to the pre development building area as per Table 4.1. Please clarify and revise.	8,439m2 is the correct value.
121	Section 4.3 of the Hydro G Report identifies that Meteoritical data for the Woodbridge (Station ID No. 6159575) climatic station was used. However, Section 4.5.1 and Appendix F identifies that the Georgetown WWTP was used over the period of 1977-2006. Please revise accordingly.	Climactic station corrected to Georgetown WWTP Station.
122	Section 9.2.4 identifies that mitigation measures are proposed for stormwater design to retain 5mm. Development Engineering understands that the requirement for the on-site retention of 5mm came from the City of Brampton as the TRCA requires a minimum of 5mm to be retained. Please note that the site does not appear to be regulated by the TRCA, but outlets to a TRCA regulated area and Development Engineering understands that "best efforts" for the 5mm retention is proposed and as such can be dealt with through detailed design. The Report identifies that only approximately 100m3 of the calculated 166m3 is achieved. Development Engineering has concerns with the proposed methodology for how the required 5mm retention volume was calculated and how the retention volume is proposed to be provided. Typically, the required retention volume is based on 5mm over the proposed impervious surfaces. Please provide calculations for how the required volume was obtained and clearly demonstrate the how the required volume is provided.	The calculations for the 5mm retention have been revised to provide the requested additional clarity. As noted, the proposed 5mm retention is based on a best efforts approach for retention of runoff from the impervious surfaces, with focus on the rooftop runoff, as this provides a clean source of water. The section and calculations are included in the updated report.
Grading and Servicing		
123	The Grading Plan identifies RLCBs on Lots 42/43 and Lots 30/40. Please relocate the conceptual locations of the RLCBs as they should not be located on the common shared property line and should be offset 1.0m from the property line and a minimum of 0.6m from the centerline of the pipe for the RLCB leads. Additionally, the maximum allowable ponding depth prior to storm drainage following an overland flow route is 0.3m. No overland flow route has been identified and it appears that the RLCBs shown would pond up to the existing rear property line elevation and discharge overland to the lots in the subdivision in the City of Brampton to the south. It is understood that this is the existing drainage pattern for the area, however please elaborate and provide justification for the proposed design within the report and clearly identify the overland flow routes. Confirmation is required from the City of Brampton for any drainage or overland flow routes to lands within the City of Brampton.	The RLCB has been updated to reflect Town standard location. For the RLCBs required in the lots on McAlpine Blvd, there is an overland flow route along the rear property line to Lightheart Drive with maximum ponding of 0.3m. For the lots along Lightheart Drive with RLCB, they will be sized for 100 year capture with an emergency only discharge to the existing outlets in the City of Brampton. This has been identified on the updated drawing G1.

124	<p>As per Town Standards back to front grading is preferred where feasible. Where this is not feasible the high point where the drainage is split from back to front should be located at the rear of the dwelling.</p> <p>a. Lots 1 through 26 identify split lot drainage, however the drainage directed to the rear of the lots does not appear to have an outlet and is directed towards a retaining wall, berm or adjacent residential property. Please provide justification as to why back to front grading is not feasible and demonstrate a viable outlet for lot drainage.</p> <p>b. Clarify how drainage for lots 27 through 57 is directed towards the municipal ROW as currently drainage is directed towards low spots at the rear of the lots with no positive outlet.</p>	<p>The grading plan has been updated such that the majority of the lots are back to front draining. There are some lots where this is not feasible so RLCBs are included on the grading plan as per the standards. The grading plan is not intended to be the detailed grading plan for the site but demonstrates that the site can be developed in accordance with the Town requirements.</p>
125	<p>Please identify the overland flow route for not only the roadway, but the proposed grading of the lots as well.</p>	<p>The overland flow route for the split draining lots has been identified on the grading plan, including the emergency overland flow route for the walkout lots. The remainder of the detail will be provided at detailed design.</p>
126	<p>Please refer to Town Standards Section 1.12.5 for rear lot catch basin requirements. Most requirements can be addressed through detailed design, however, please specifically confirm that the rear yard catch basins have a maximum drainage area not to exceed 1000m², as it appears that a much larger drainage area is currently proposed to drain to the RLCB on Lots 42/43. Please provide the drainage plan for the storm sewer design.</p>	<p>The required RLCBs have significantly less than 1000 sq.m of drainage area directed to them.</p>
127	<p>As per Town Standards Section 1.4.2.2.2, the minimum slope for storm sewers is 0.4%. Every effort should be made to achieve a minimum slope of 0.4%. Where conditions do not allow and a slope of 0.4% is not feasible then self-cleansing velocities of 0.75m/s must be maintained.</p>	<p>Acknowledged - to be addressed at detailed design - scour velocity is maintained in all sewers and the proposed approach of 0.3% slope is intended to minimize the fill requirements for the site and provide better interface with the surrounding grades.</p>
128	<p>Please identify the existing property line elevation adjacent to the RLCB on Lot42/43.</p>	<p>The existing property line grades are identified on the plan.</p>
129	<p>Please identify that the elevations along the surrounding shared property lines are to match the existing elevations.</p>	<p>The proposed grading matches into existing conditions at the property lines of the development.</p>
130	<p>The proposed 2.4m acoustic fence on top of the proposed berm along the northern and western boundaries of the site as identified in the Noise Report is to be shown on the Grading and Servicing Plans.</p>	<p>The proposed fence is identified in the updated FSR and on the grading plan.</p>
131	<p>Please provide the topographic survey</p>	<p>Please find the enclosed topographic survey in support of this re-submission.</p>
Hydrogeological Investigation and Water Balance Assessment		
132	<p>The Report identifies that groundwater monitoring with bimonthly events of water level measurements is ongoing and will be included under an updated report.</p>	<p>Groundwater monitoring discussed in Section 3.2 of updated report.</p>
133	<p>Section 6.3 and Section 7 identify that "As per the MECP technical requirement for EASRs, the geotechnical assessment of the stability of the soils due to water taking (ex: settlement, soil loss, subsidence etc.) is required. The water taking should not have unacceptable interference on soils and underground structures (foundations, utilities etc.). A letter related to geotechnical issues as it pertains to the Site is required to be completed under a separate cover." However, the report also identifies that an EASR will not be required. Please clarify and revise.</p>	<p>The statement has been removed from the updated report.</p>
134	<p>The Hydrogeological Investigation should incorporate any dewatering requirements associated with the Soil Management Plan as part of the Risk Assessment and CPU for the property required in order to support the Record of Site Condition (RSC).</p>	<p>No excavations are planned for environmental purposes as the Record of Site Condition has already been filed; no further dewatering requirements are anticipated to be associated with the RA or CPU.</p>

135	<p>The Report identifies high groundwater in several monitoring wells that will exceed the basement elevations of the residential dwellings. Section 5.5.2 identifies that the development plan includes permanent foundation sub-drain systems that will ultimately discharge to the municipal sewer system if conventional footings are installed. Section 5.5.2 also references sumps and it is not clear whether foundation drains or sumps are proposed and the associated impacts from the high ground water level on the basement foundation. Please clarify if foundation drains or sumps are proposed along with any associated design considerations and recommendations.</p> <p>a. The impacts of the high ground water level on dwelling basements and foundations are to be evaluated and discussed. Recommendations and requirements such as construction methods, foundation drainage, waterproofing, etc. in relation to the high ground water levels should be provided to ensure that there no adverse impacts to the basements/foundations.</p> <p>b. The report identifies long term dewatering with a safety factor of 2 of up to 2,000L/day per unit. The Town defers to the City of Brampton with regards to the long term dewatering and additional flows to existing storm infrastructure.</p>	<p>a. Please refer to the supporting civil drawings. The basements will have foundation drainage in all cases, and presence of sump is subject to elevation of sewer relative to foundation drainage elevation.</p> <p>b. Acknowledged.</p>
Geotechnical Investigation		
136	<p>Section 5.3.1.1 identifies that the sewer and watermain invert levels have not yet been determined at the time of investigation. The report should be updated to reflect the watermain and sewer elevations as per the FSR.</p>	<p>Sewer and watermain invert levels have been provided and the report has been updated to reflect these elevations. It is understood that the final grading plan has yet to be provided. The report will be further updated and submitted when we receive that information.</p>
137	<p>The Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by EXP, dated February 4, 2022, (revised June 8, 2023) identifies that the ex-situ remediated areas extend into lands that will come under future ownership of the Town. The report is to discuss and provide any recommendations required to ensure that subbase is appropriate for road construction and should incorporate any requirements associated with the Soil Management Plan as part of the Risk Assessment and CPU for the property required in order to support the Record of Site Condition (RSC).</p>	<p>This comment is addressed in Section 5.2 (third bullet point) of the updated Geotechnical Report.</p>
138	<p>The report identifies high groundwater in several boreholes that will exceed the future storm sewer and sanitary pipe. The report is to speak specifically to the high ground water level and any special construction methods to ensure the ground water does not infiltrate the pipe both during and post construction and to avoid creating potential groundwater pathways.</p>	<p>This has been discussed in Section 5.3.1.2. Pipe leaking, if any, would have to be discussed by Civil Designer.</p>
139	<p>Please update the recommended driveway pavement structure in Section 5.3.2 to be as per Town Standards Section 1.5.2.3.</p>	<p>This comment has been addressed with the updated Geotechnical Report.</p>
Environmental Noise		
140	<p>The Noise Study identifies that it is based on the grading plan dated May 18, 2023 prepared by RJ Burnside, however the grading plan provided as part of the FSR is dated May 30, 2023. The latest grading plan should be used/referenced and correlate with the grading plan per the FSR.</p>	<p>Latest grading plan is included in the updated Noise Report.</p>
Environmental Site Assessments		
141	<p>The following comments are to be addressed prior to rezoning and the required Record of Site Condition (RSC).</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Please note that the RSC has been obtained for the Caledon Parcel (RSC #232753)</p>
142	<p>All reports are to be final and signed, stamped and dated by a qualified person as per O.Reg.153/04.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

143	Please clarify the Site Condition Standards (SCS) selected by the QP for the site and ensure the reports reference the correct Standards.	<p>Please see response to Comment 71 pertaining to the Standards. The ESA report should indicate Table 4 SCS for the Caledon Parcel where required, and Table 6 for volatiles for MGRA considerations only within the CSM. Table 2 is referenced to describe the applicable standards for the Brampton Parcel</p> <p>*As per the Town's discussion with the Applicant on October 11, 2023, a clean version of the report will not be provided as the MGRA and RSC have been completed. Explanations of any discrepancies have been provided in this matrix to satisfy the comments from the Town.</p>
144	Section 2.4 of the Phase Two ESA (pg. 6) identifies that “the applicable site condition standards are Table 2 Generic Site Condition Standards for a residential/parkland/institutional land use with medium to fine textured soil in a potable groundwater condition.” However, other sections of the Phase Two ESA such as Table 2.2 and Figure 8E in Appendix D of the Supplemental Phase Two Environmental Site Assessment Memo, prepared by Amanda Catenaro dated December 13, 2021 reference that Table 4 SCS was used. While the Phase Two CSM identifies that Table 4 SCS was used while also referencing the use of Table 2 SCS and Table 6 SCS.	<p>Please see response to Comment 71 pertaining to the Standards. The ESA report should indicate Table 4 SCS for the Caledon Parcel where required, and Table 6 for volatiles for MGRA considerations only within the CSM. Table 2 is referenced to describe the applicable standards for the Brampton Parcel.</p> <p>*As per the Town's discussion with the Applicant on October 11, 2023, a clean version of the report will not be provided as the MGRA and RSC have been completed. Explanations of any discrepancies have been provided in this matrix to satisfy the comments from the Town.</p>
145	Pg. A8 identifies that “based on the information provided above, the generic Standards for the site and Phase Two CSM were determined to be the Table 2 SCS for residential/parkland/institutional land use with medium to fine textured soils (herein referred to as Table 4 SCS)”.	<p>Please see response to item 71 pertaining to the Standards. The ESA report should indicate Table 4 SCS for the Caledon Parcel where required, and Table 6 for volatiles for MGRA considerations only within the CSM. Table 2 is referenced to describe the applicable standards for the Brampton Parcel.</p> <p>*As per the Town's discussion with the Applicant on October 11, 2023, a clean version of the report will not be provided as the MGRA and RSC have been completed. Explanations of any discrepancies have been provided in this matrix to satisfy the comments from the Town.</p>
146	Figure 3B of the Phase Two SCM identifies APEC N, however no APEC N is listed in the report. Please clarify if this is a typo and meant to represent APEC K.	<p>APEC N should read APEC K for Figure 3B of the Phase Two CSM for the Caledon Parcel.</p> <p>*As per the Town's discussion with the Applicant on October 11, 2023, a clean version of the report will not be provided as the MGRA and RSC have been completed. Explanations of any discrepancies have been provided in this matrix to satisfy the comments from the Town.</p>

147	<p>The Phase Two ESA and Phase Two CSM identifies that soil exceedances of the Table 4 SCS were identified for PHC fraction F2 and for EC/SAR and that groundwater exceedances of the Table 4 SCS were identified for sodium and chloride. The Phase Two ESA indicates that to address the exceedances, a Risk Assessment (RA) will be performed and submitted to MECP as part of a Record of Site Condition for the site located within Caledon. The following is a summary of the exceedances:</p> <p>a. The one soil exceedance of PHC Fraction 2 was identified at N7 and was horizontally and vertically delineated and remediated between September 2020 and May 2021 with confirmatory sampling meeting MECP Table 4 SCS. The excavations were backfilled with granular A material.</p> <p>b. EC and SAR soil exceedances were identified in the vicinity of the historic salt storage area and are present on the north and northeast portion of the site. The report notes that the extent of EC/SAR impacts extend to 1.5mbgs and it is noted that below 1.5mbgs EC and SAR have no applicable Table 4 SCS as these parameters are of concern to ecological (plants) only and it is not anticipated that plans will come into contact with soil below these depths. The EC and SAR exceedances were delineated and remediated between September 2020 and May 2021 with confirmatory sampling to within target Property Specific Standards (PSS) as derived in the modified generic risk assessment (MGRA) currently underway for the site.</p> <p>c. The groundwater exceedances were in the vicinity of the historic salt storage at the north and northeastern portions of the site. The report identifies that monitoring programs, including monitoring for the presence of non-aqueous phase liquid (NAPL) have been conducted at the site. NAPL has not been encountered at the site during any monitoring event.</p> <p>d. The report (Section 5 – CSM) identifies that EC and SAR appear to be parameters of ecological significant only, all human exposure pathways for soil COCs are considered incomplete. As the site is located in a potable groundwater condition, intentional ingestion and dermal contact with sodium and chloride impacted groundwater is consider a complete exposure pathway. Incidental indigestion and dermal contact with groundwater by construction workers is also considered a complete pathway. Given that sodium and chloride are not volatile, all air pathways are considered incomplete. Risk Management Measures (RMM) are intended for the protection of the potable water pathway.</p>	Acknowledged
<p>Region of Peel Dylan Prowse dylan.prowse@peelregion.ca Date: August 24, 2023</p>		
<p>Region of Peel Requirements</p>		
148	<p>Region of Peel Staff have reviewed the above-noted application for Draft Plan of Subdivision, Local Official Plan Amendment, and Zoning Bylaw Amendment. The following must be fulfilled prior to Regional Clearance:</p>	Acknowledged.
<p>Housing Assessment</p>		
149	<p>Table 4 of the Peel 2051 Regional Official Plan (RPOP) identifies Peel-wide housing unit targets on rental, density, and affordability. These targets are based on need as determined through the Peel Housing and Homelessness Plan and the Regional Housing Strategy. For planning applications of approximately 50 units or more, Peel Region policies require applicants to submit a housing assessment that is consistent with local and Regional housing objectives and demonstrates contributions towards the housing targets. The required housing assessment can be included as part of a planning justification report or housing report or as its own report.</p>	<p>The Application was filed prior to the April 2022 New Official Plan coming into effect. Further, the applicant is proposing detached dwellings to complete the existing community, and it will therefore be difficult to achieve affordability in this context. However, secondary suites will be offered at the time of purchase to provide some affordability housing options if there is market demand.</p> <p>Please find the enclosed Housing Assessment which has been prepared in support of this submission.</p>

150	<p>Affordability: To contribute to the Peel-wide affordable housing target, the applicant is encouraged to provide units at prices that are affordable to low- or moderate-income households. The definition of 'affordable housing' can be found in the Glossary section of the Regional Official Plan. Information on pricing (sale price) and affordability period (i.e., 25 years or more) of units can be provided. While it is anticipated that units identified to address moderate-income needs will be predominantly provided by the private sector, partnerships between the applicant, Peel Region, the Town of Caledon, and the non-profit sector could be explored to provide units that are affordable to low-income households.</p>	<p>Proposed dwelling units will be sold at market price. Proposed dwelling units will be sold at market price. Caivan will be offering a 2nd Suite basement option as an upgrade on all units in the community. This includes egress windows and a separate exterior access. This gives the homeowner an option to create a secondary unit in the future should they choose to.</p>
151	<p>Density: The applicant is encouraged to demonstrate a stronger contribution towards the density target that 50% of new units be a housing type other than detached or semi-detached. This could be achieved through the inclusion of townhouses in the proposed development, as permitted by the proposed Residential Area designation. In keeping with the initial proposal, the applicant is encouraged to propose rezoning a portion of the subject lands to permit townhouses.</p>	<p>When balancing the subject lands with other proposals in the Town, the Region continues to achieve higher densities than the density of the proposed development in isolation.</p>
152	<p>Rental: The applicant is encouraged to review opportunities for rental by incorporating additional residential units (ARUs) in a certain number of detached units, or having the option of ARU rough-ins, including providing separate entrances, fire and safety requirements (such as fire separation of separate entrance), larger basement windows, and adequate ceiling heights as part of preconstruction sales. Where feasible, design elements to accommodate future safe, legal, and livable ARUs should be considered.</p>	<p>Caivan will be offering a 2nd Suite basement option as an upgrade on all units in the community. This includes egress windows and a separate exterior access. This gives the homeowner an option to create a secondary unit in the future should they choose to.</p>
153	<p>The applicant is also encouraged to incorporate universal accessibility and design features into the proposed development.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
154	<p>Please note that this comment was not provided on the first submission as the Region of Peel 2051 Official Plan was not yet in effect. Peel staff can meet with applicants to clarify housing objectives and policies as needed. We look forward to working with the applicant to review opportunities to further contribute to Peel-wide new housing unit targets, including partnerships.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>Region of Peel Comments</p>		
155	<p>Region of Peel Staff have reviewed the above noted application for Site Plan Approval. The following comments are to support with preparation of the required resubmission:</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>Waste Management</p>		
156	<p>The Region of Peel will provide curbside collection of garbage, recyclable materials, household organics and yard waste subject to Section 2.0 and 3.0 of the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual (WCDSM) and the following conditions being met and labelled on the Draft Plan of Subdivision.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
157	<p>Each dwelling unit within a development must have its own identifiable collection point. See Appendix 9 (Waste Collection Design Standards Manual) for an example of a collection point. The collection point must be located along the curb, adjacent to the driveway, and must be directly accessible to the waste collection vehicle and free of obstructions such as parked cars. Please indicate the set-out area for each unit in subsequent submissions.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
158	<p>Each dwelling units' collection point along the curb must be at least 3 square metres, or 32 square feet in order to provide sufficient space for the placement of carts: maximum (1) large garbage cart or recycling cart (360 litres) and one (1) source separated organics carts (100 litres), overflow waste (i.e., additional bags), yard waste and bulky items.</p>	<p>As confirmed by Dylan Prowse at the Region of Peel on January 5th 2022, the waste management plan will be deferred to detailed design.</p>
159	<p>A minimum of 3.75 square meters (2.5 meters by 1.5 meters) must be provided in the garage, backyard or side for storage of carts, with direct access to the collection point location. Carts for each dwelling unit include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Maximum one (1) large Garbage Cart and o Maximum one (1) large Recycling Cart (360 litres or 95 US gallons); and o Maximum one (1) Source Separated Organic Cart (100 litres or 32 US gallons) 	<p>Per Region of Peel Waste Collection Design Standards Manual, garbage bins can be stored outside for single family dwellings. The Plan proposed includes only single family dwellings, and the rear yard meets region standards for garbage bin storage.</p>
160	<p>For more information, please consult the Region of Peel Waste Collection Design Standards Manual available at: https://peelregion.ca/public-works/designstandards/pdf/waste-collection-design-standards-manual.pdf</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>Development Engineering - Development Charges</p>		

161	The Developer acknowledges that the lands are subject to the Region's Development Charges By-law in effect from time to time. The applicable development charges shall be paid in the manner and at the times provided by this By-law.	Acknowledged.
Development Engineering - Functional Servicing		
162	The Functional Servicing Report dated May 2023, is satisfactory to the Region of Peel.	Acknowledged.
Development Engineering - Hydrological Report		
163	Report Consultant needs to update the report to include the results of the door-to door survey, the monitoring, and the contingency plan	Report updated to include completed door to door survey and seasonal monitoring included in Appendix H; additionally summarized in Section 6.2
Health Planning		
164	We recognize and commend the application on looking to meet many of the metrics within the Healthy Development Assessment and reaching a Gold threshold on the tool. The application is on its way to achieving a healthy built form.	Acknowledged.
165	We have a couple of points/questions for clarification: o For the properties backing on to Highway 410, will there be any additional landscaping beyond a berm and noise wall? o Please indicate how wide the sidewalks are in the proposed community.	No, the lands beyond the berm and noise wall are owned by MTO and will not accept landscaping within their lands. The proposed sidewalks are 1.5 metres in width.
Conditions of Draft Approval - Development Charges		
166	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; and 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.	Acknowledged.
167	Provision shall be made in the Subdivision Agreement with respect to: a) Payment to the Region of appropriate soft service development charges and any outstanding hard service development charges; and b) Collection of development charges for future residential development blocks (no freehold townhouses or apartment blocks); pursuant to the Region's Development Charges By-law, as amended from time to time.	Acknowledged.
Conditions of Draft Approval - Water Meter Fees		
168	3. In respect of the water meter fees: a) Prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, 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; b) A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement that water meter fees for future residential development (non-freehold townhouses or apartment blocks) and commercial blocks shall be payable to the Region prior to issuance of building permits, in accordance with the Region's Fees By-law, as amended from time to time; and c) A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement that in the event of an underpayment of water meter fees, the Developer shall be responsible for payment thereof forthwith upon request.	Acknowledged.
Conditions of Draft Approval - Land Dedications		

169	<p>A provision shall be made in the subdivision agreement that:</p> <p>a) The Developer shall gratuitously transfer to the Region free and clear of all encumbrances and to the satisfaction of the Region:</p> <p>i. All necessary easements for proposed and existing Regional infrastructures as required by the Region to service the proposed plan and external lands.</p> <p>b) All costs associated with land transfers and easements shall be 100% the responsibility of the Developer.</p>	Acknowledged.
Conditions of Draft Approval - Development Engineering Conditions		
170	<p>The Developer shall acknowledge and agree that landscaping, signs, fences, gateway features, and any other encroachments will not be permitted within the Region's easements and right-of-way limits. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of the same.</p>	Acknowledged.
171	<p>A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement stating that servicing may/will require the following. The Developer shall be responsible for all costs for the design and construction with the latest Region standards and requirements:</p> <p>a. External 250mm sanitary sewer construction and easement to provide a second outlet for the subject subdivision, through the lands on the southside, to the existing sewer along Highwood Road.</p> <p>b. Sanitary sewer easement will be required all as per Region of Peel standard.</p> <p>c. External watermain construction and easement to complete the watermain looping for the subject subdivision, through the lands on the southside, to the existing watermain along Highwood Road.</p>	Acknowledged.
172	<p>Restriction on transfer or charge for all lots and blocks within the plan of subdivision, save and except those to be conveyed to the City and the Region, shall be registered on title to said lots and blocks prohibiting any transfer or charge of said lots and blocks without the consent of the Region until sanitary outlet and looping of watermain to service this development has been constructed and preliminary approved to the Region's satisfaction. The Developer shall be responsible for all costs in respect of said restriction on title. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.</p>	Acknowledged.
Conditions of Draft Approval - Drawings - Servicing and "As Constructed"		
173	<p>Prior to servicing, the Developer's engineer shall submit all engineering drawings in the digital format to the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines.</p>	Acknowledged.
174	<p>Within (60) days of preliminary acceptance of the underground services, the Developer's engineer shall submit "As Constructed" drawings in digital format, pursuant to the latest Region's Digital Format Guidelines. The Developer's engineer shall also 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".</p> <p>A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.</p>	Acknowledged.
Conditions of Draft Approval - General Conditions		
175	<p>Prior to registration of the subdivision, the Developer shall execute a Subdivision Agreement with the local municipality and Region for the construction of municipal sanitary sewer, water, and regional roads associated with the lands. The Developer shall construct and design these services in accordance with the latest Region standards and requirements.</p>	Acknowledged.

176	The Developer acknowledges that the Contractor has full responsibility to comply with the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and all other legislative requirements including Ontario Regulation (O.Reg.) 406/19- Onsite and Excess Soil Management. The Developer shall construct and design these services in accordance with the latest Region standards and requirements. The Contractor shall be familiar with and meet the objectives of O.Reg. 406/19 for all work completed. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged.
177	The Environmental documents are currently under review; prior to servicing or registration of the Plan, whichever comes first, the Region may require that the Developer submits the following. A clause may be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same. a. A satisfactory Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (“ESA”) report for the Lands, prepared in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 153/04 under the Environmental Protection Act (as amended) and a Phase 2 ESA report. b. Record of site condition for the Lands, any lands and easements external to the Plan that are to be conveyed to the Region or any other governmental body, and to provide proof to the Region or such governmental body that the record of site condition has been acknowledged by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change and registered on the Environmental Site Registry; c. Certification that any fill material imported onto the Lands meets the requirements of Table 2 (Full Depth Generic Site Condition Standards in a Potable Groundwater Condition) of the Soil, Ground Water and Sediment Standards for Use under the Environmental Protection Act, as amended; and d. Certificates of Property Use associated with any conveyed lands that will impact or restrict the intended use of the conveyed lands or will result in any significant future cost implications or liability to the Region.	Acknowledged.
178	The Region will require a satisfactory Remedial Action Plan for the review and approval, if any remediation requires that soils within the public roads shall be remediated to applicable standards.	Acknowledged.
179	Prior to a satisfactory engineering submission, the Developer shall submit to the Region for review and approval a Functional Servicing Report (FSR) showing proposed watermain, sanitary and storm sewer servicing plan for the development and provision for the external lands. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged.
180	Prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, the Developer shall pay the Region’s costs for updating its electronic “As Constructed” information for the infrastructure installed by the Developer. The cost shall be based on a “per kilometre” basis for combined watermains and sanitary sewers installed pursuant to the Region’s latest User Fees By-law.	Acknowledged.
181	Prior to servicing, the Developer shall submit a satisfactory engineering submission to the Region to review and approval.	Acknowledged.
182	Prior to registration of the Plan of subdivision, the Developer shall ensure that all lots and blocks are serviced via an internal road network. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged.
183	Prior to servicing of the subdivision, the Region may require the Developer to construct a sampling hydrant (at 100% the Developer’s expense) within the proposed Plan. Location and the requirement for sampling hydrant will be determined at the engineering review stage.	Acknowledged.
184	The Developer agrees that the Region shall hold back a portion of the Letter of Credit to cover the costs of services completed by the Region on a time and material basis pursuant to the current Region’s User Fee By-Law. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same	Acknowledged.

185	<p>The Developer will maintain adequate chlorine residuals in the watermains within the Plan from the time the watermains are connected to the municipal system until such time as the Region issues Final Acceptance. To maintain adequate chlorine residuals, the Developer shall either install automatic flushing devices or retain Regional staff to carry out manual flushing. Regional staff shall conduct the monitoring and testing for chlorine residuals. All costs associated with the monitoring and flushing shall be the responsibility of the Developer pursuant to the current Region's User Fee By-Law. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.</p>	Acknowledged.
186	<p>Provision will be required in the Subdivision Agreement for the following clauses in respect of servicing existing properties within the zone of influence in the event that existing private services (wells) deteriorate due to the servicing of the proposed plan of subdivision;</p> <p>a) Until the issuance of Final Acceptance, a portion of the Letter of Credit shall be held back to serve as protection for the private wells in the zone of influence of the plan of subdivision. This 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 shall provide temporary water supply to the residents upon notice by the Region and the Developer shall 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 shall 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.</p> <p>b) The 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:</p> <p>i. 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:</p> <p>a) Bacteriological Analysis - Total coliform and E-coli counts b) Chemical Analysis - Nitrate Test c) Water level measurement below existing grade</p> <p>ii. 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.</p> <p>iii. Well monitoring shall continue during construction and an interim report shall be submitted to the Region for records. Well monitoring shall continue for one year after the completion of construction and a summary report shall be submitted to the Region prior to Final Acceptance.</p>	Acknowledged.
187	<p>The Developer shall agree that neither the Developer nor any Builder will apply for building permits for any lots or blocks within the plan of subdivision until the Region's Public Works Department has issued Preliminary Acceptance and provided notice to the local municipality stating that internal and external sanitary sewers and watermains, including fire protection, have been completed to the Region's satisfaction. The Developer's Consulting Engineer shall certify in writing that the internal and external sanitary sewers and watermains, including fire protection, have been constructed, inspected and shall function in accordance with the detailed design as approved by the Region. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.</p>	Acknowledged.
188	<p>The Developer shall acknowledge and agree that the Developer is responsible for all costs associated with the relocation and/or removal of existing services to accommodate the development, to the satisfaction of the Region. The Developer shall made appropriate arrangements with the Region regarding financing and relocation of Regional services prior to registration of the Plan.</p>	Acknowledged.

189	Prior to registration of the Plan of subdivision, the Developer shall submit draft reference plan(s) for the Region's review and approval prior to such plans being deposited. All costs associated with preparation and depositing of the plans and transfer of lands shall be at the sole expense of the Developer.	Acknowledged.
190	The Developer agrees that prior to the Region granting clearance of the draft plan conditions of subdivision approval, the following shall require to be forwarded to the Region's Legal Services Division: a. A copy of the final signed M-Plan b. A copy of the final draft R-Plan(s); and c. Easement and conveyance documents required pursuant to this Agreement and the registration of this plan. A clause shall be included in the Subdivision Agreement in respect of same.	Acknowledged.
<p>Bell Canada Juan Corvalan planninganddevelopment@bell.ca Date: July 6 2023</p>		
191	We have reviewed the circulation regarding the above noted application. The following paragraphs are to be included as a condition of approval: "The Owner acknowledges and agrees to convey any easement(s) as deemed necessary by Bell Canada to service this new development. The Owner further agrees and acknowledges to convey such easements at no cost to Bell Canada. The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities where a current and valid easement exists within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost."	Acknowledged.
192	Upon receipt of this comment letter, the Owner is to provide Bell Canada with servicing plans/CUP at their earliest convenience to planninganddevelopment@bell.ca to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development.	Acknowledged.
193	It shall be noted that it is the responsibility of the Owner to provide entrance/service duct(s) from Bell Canada's existing network infrastructure to service this development. In the event that no such network infrastructure exists, in accordance with the Bell Canada Act, the Owner may be required to pay for the extension of such network infrastructure.	Acknowledged.
194	If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.	Acknowledged.
195	To ensure that we are able to continue to actively participate in the planning process and provide detailed provisioning comments, we note that we would be pleased to receive circulations on all applications received by the Municipality and/or recirculations.	Acknowledged.
196	We note that WSP operates Bell Canada's development tracking system, which includes the intake and processing of municipal circulations. However, all responses to circulations and requests for information, such as requests for clearance, will come directly from Bell Canada, and not from WSP. WSP is not responsible for the provision of comments or other responses.	Acknowledged.
<p>Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board Krystina Koops krystina.koops@dpcdsb.org Date: July 4, 2023</p>		
197	The Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board has reviewed the revised submission based on its School Accommodation Criteria and provides the following comments:	Acknowledged.

198	<p>The applicant proposes the development of 57 detached units which are anticipated to yield:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8 Students; and • 5 Grade 9 to Grade 12 Students <p>The proposed development is located within the following school catchment areas which currently operate under the following student accommodation conditions: (see chart in original comment)</p>	Acknowledged.
199	The Board requests that the following conditions be incorporated in the conditions of draft approval:	Acknowledged.
200	<p>That the applicant shall agree in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to include the following warning clauses in all offers of purchase and sale of residential lots.</p> <p>(a) "Whereas, despite the best efforts of the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students from the area, you are hereby notified that students may be accommodated in temporary facilities and/or bussed to a school outside of the neighbourhood, and further, that students may later be transferred to the neighbourhood school."</p> <p>(b) "That the purchasers agree that for the purpose of transportation to school, the residents of the subdivision shall agree that children will meet the bus on roads presently in existence or at another place designated by the Board."</p>	Acknowledged.