

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE  |
|--|--|-----------|---|
| <b>Planning and Development Department</b> |  |           |   |
| <b>September 18, 2024 – Tanjot Bal</b>     |  |           |   |
|  | <b>TOWN OF CALEDON, PLANNING &amp; DEVELOPMENT</b>   |           |   |
|  | Planning Justification Report  |           |   |
| 1.   | Please provide an addendum to the PJR that speaks to the new PPS.  | HPGI      | <b>Noted. Please find addendum letter, dated November 27, 2024 enclosed.</b>  |
| 2.   | Minimum density for MTSA served by GO Transit: The density calculated for this development is below 150 residents and jobs combined per hectare. The DSSP is to be revised to confirm that the density is met.   | HPGI      | <b>The overall plan area meets the minimum density of 150 people and jobs combined per hectare within the Bolton GO MTSA segment. The proposal ensures to achieve the minimum density requirements noted above. Refer to updated DSSP prepared by NAK and GSAI dated November 2024.</b> |
| 3.   | To support affordable housing, please confirm if any of the dwelling units will include additional residential units.  | HPGI      | <b>Affordable housing block proposed within the Secondary Plan Area, not within the subject draft plan. Refer to PJR Addendum letter dated November 27, 2024 and Caledon Station Affordable Housing Letter dated September 30, 2024.</b>  |
|  | <u>Phasing and Sequencing Plan</u>   |           |   |
| 4.   | The following comments were provided to Argo with respect to the surrounding subdivision application and are expected to be resolved through a revised submission.   | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| 5.   | Please combine the Phasing Plan with a figure that shows the proposed land use designation and road network.   | NAK       | <b>NAK to prepare a figure that combines the phasing plan with the proposed land use designation and road network.</b>  |
| 6.   | Include a table with a breakdown of what each phase consists of (e.g. land use designation, unit typologies, net area, number of units/jobs, estimated population/jobs).   | NAK       | <b>NAK to include a table in figures that breaks down the information. Humphries Planning Group to provide information.</b>   |
| 7.   | As a condition of draft plan approval, Planning staff will require the subdivision agreement to include the phasing plan and details.  | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |
|  | <u>Class 4 Noise</u>   |           |   |
| 8.   | Planning staff will connect under separate cover on the process for receiving Class 4 Noise classification.  |           | <b>Noted.</b>   |
|  | <u>Other</u>   |           |   |
| 9.   | Please note that staff have provided comments with respect to the other Caledon Station Wide documents to Argo. Staff are expecting the comments to be resolved through a revised submission.  | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| 10.  | Please update staff on efforts made toward Indigenous engagement/consultation and comments received.   | HPGI      | <b>Engagement and consultation with Indigenous groups is ongoing. Comments received from the Huron-Wendat Nation (HWN), dated September 24, 2024.</b>   |
| 11.  | Planning staff recommend that a revised submission follow receipt of comments from the public and Council following the Statutory Public Meeting scheduled for October 15th, 2024.   | HPGI      | <b>Acknowledged.</b>  |
|  | <b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>   |           |   |
| 12.  | Further detailed accessibility comments will be provided for the mixed-use block site plan application   | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| 13.  | 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.   | Owner     | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| 14.  | 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).   | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| 15.  | 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. | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| 16.  | If a community mail box 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 mail box landing area.   | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| 17.  | Where the neighbourhood park includes an outdoor play space, the design shall incorporate accessibility features such as sensory and active play components for children and caregivers with various disabilities. Such outdoor  | HPGI      | <b>Noted.</b>   |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY      | RESPONSE             |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
|--|---|----------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|---------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|--------------|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|--------------|--|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|--|-------------|-------------|------------|----------|-------------|--|----------|----------|---------|-----|----------|--|--|
|  | play space shall have a ground surface that is firm, stable and has impact attenuating properties for injury prevention and sufficient clearance to provide children and caregivers with various disabilities the ability to move through, in and around the outdoor play space.  |                |                      |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
|  | <b>FINANCE</b>  |                |                      |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| 18.  | If the proposed development were to proceed as planned, (includes residential and mixed use residential), the properties' taxable assessment values will change to reflect any developments that will take place.   |                | <b>Noted.</b>        |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| 19.  | Development Charges will be applicable at the Residential and Non-Residential (Other) rates that will be in effect on the dates of building permit issuance. If the zoning By-law amendment application is determined to be the first such application for the subject property, then Development Charges will be determined on the date when the zoning By-law amendment application is determined to be complete (the application completion date). Those determined rates will be applicable to building permits that will be issued within 18 months, starting on the application approval date.  | <b>Owner</b>   | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| 20.  | Interest on Development Charges will apply for the period commencing one day after the application completion date through to the date on which those charges are received by the Town.   | <b>Owner</b>   | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
|  | Development Charges would be applicable at the Residential and Non-Residential (Other) rates. Currently, those rates are:   |                | <b>Noted.</b>        |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| 21.  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Building Types</th> <th>Town of Caledon</th> <th>Region of Peel</th> <th>School Boards</th> <th>Transit</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Singles/ Semi-detached per unit</td> <td>\$59,199.60</td> <td>\$73,810.29</td> <td>\$5,076.00</td> <td>\$829.20</td> <td>\$138,915.09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Townhouse per unit, except stacked</td> <td>\$53,669.14</td> <td>\$58,458.07</td> <td>\$5,076.00</td> <td>\$829.20</td> <td>\$118,032.41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Large apartment per unit - apartment &gt; 70 m<sup>2</sup></td> <td>\$40,701.64</td> <td>\$53,539.73</td> <td>\$5,076.00</td> <td>\$592.33</td> <td>\$99,909.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small apartment per unit - apartment = &lt; 70 m<sup>2</sup></td> <td>\$23,887.18</td> <td>\$28,315.65</td> <td>\$5,076.00</td> <td>\$306.96</td> <td>\$57,585.79</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commercial space (per m<sup>2</sup>)</td> <td>\$112.91</td> <td>\$295.90</td> <td>\$11.84</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>\$420.65</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | Building Types | Town of Caledon      | Region of Peel | School Boards | Transit | Total | Singles/ Semi-detached per unit | \$59,199.60 | \$73,810.29 | \$5,076.00 | \$829.20 | \$138,915.09 | Townhouse per unit, except stacked | \$53,669.14 | \$58,458.07 | \$5,076.00 | \$829.20 | \$118,032.41 | Large apartment per unit - apartment > 70 m <sup>2</sup> | \$40,701.64 | \$53,539.73 | \$5,076.00 | \$592.33 | \$99,909.70 | Small apartment per unit - apartment = < 70 m <sup>2</sup> | \$23,887.18 | \$28,315.65 | \$5,076.00 | \$306.96 | \$57,585.79 | Commercial space (per m <sup>2</sup> ) | \$112.91 | \$295.90 | \$11.84 | n/a | \$420.65 |  |  |
| Building Types   | Town of Caledon   | Region of Peel | School Boards        | Transit        | Total         |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| Singles/ Semi-detached per unit                            | \$59,199.60   | \$73,810.29    | \$5,076.00           | \$829.20       | \$138,915.09  |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| Townhouse per unit, except stacked                         | \$53,669.14   | \$58,458.07    | \$5,076.00           | \$829.20       | \$118,032.41  |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| Large apartment per unit - apartment > 70 m <sup>2</sup>   | \$40,701.64   | \$53,539.73    | \$5,076.00           | \$592.33       | \$99,909.70   |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| Small apartment per unit - apartment = < 70 m <sup>2</sup> | \$23,887.18   | \$28,315.65    | \$5,076.00           | \$306.96       | \$57,585.79   |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| Commercial space (per m <sup>2</sup> )                     | \$112.91  | \$295.90       | \$11.84              | n/a            | \$420.65      |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| 22.  | Effective February 1, 2016, the Region began collecting directly for most hard service development charges (i.e. water, wastewater and roads) for most residential developments, at the time of subdivision agreement execution.  |                | <b>Noted.</b>        |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| 23.  | The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at September 10, 2024 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 (the application completion date); and are payable at the time of building permit issuance. That determination of rates is valid for 18 months after application approval date. 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. |                | <b>Noted.</b>        |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
|  | <b>URBAN DESIGN</b>   |                |                      |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |
| 24.  | Please note that all plans of subdivision are subject to Architectural Control Compliance Review Process for  | <b>NAK</b>     | <b>Noted.</b>        |                |               |         |       |                                 |             |             |            |          |              |                                    |             |             |            |          |              |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |             |             |            |          |             |  |          |          |         |     |          |  |  |

|     | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY        | RESPONSE   |
|-----|--|------------------|--|
|     | ground related residential developments. As the Town is updating the ACC Review Process, please confirm with UD Staff for current requirements.  |                  |  |
| 25. | UD recommends a mid block connection through a minimum 6m wide walkway block from Street 1-1 to Street 7, to break the long length of the Townhouse blocks and to provide better connectivity to the park (Block 48). Please see attached.   | NAK              | NAK recommends that mid-block connection aligns with Street '5'. Humphries Planning Group to update Draft Plan.  |
| 26. | We would recommended to provide demonstration plans for the Mixed Use Block 49 and the Medium Density Block 47 in the Community Design Guidelines provided for the Secondary Plan. Please note that an Urban Design Brief may be required for these blocks at the Site Plan stage.   | NAK              | The Town has confirmed that the demonstration plan for Medium Density Block 47 has been deferred to the site plan stage as part of the UDB (See email dated Nov 12, 2024).   |
|     | <b>ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT</b>  |                  |  |
| 27. | To comply with the Council-approved Green Development Standards, the applicant is required to complete the GDS Draft Plan of Subdivision checklist which can be found, along with other supporting documents, on the Town's website: <a href="http://www.caledon.ca/gds">www.caledon.ca/gds</a> .  | HPGI             | Noted. GDS Draft Plan of Subdivision checklist enclosed with submission.   |
|     | <b>DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING</b>   |                  |  |
|     | General:   |                  |  |
| 28. | All internal and external municipal servicing required to service the noted draft plan must be designed and constructed in accordance with the approved Caledon Station Secondary Plan Functional Servicing Report. Currently this document has not received formal approval from the Town, Region and Conservation Authorities and as a result all proposed servicing requirements for the noted draft plan will be subject to further review, once the above noted documents have been approved. |                  | Noted.   |
| 29. | A 0.3m reserve is to be provided along the back of the daylight triangles and road widening blocks.  | HPGI             | Noted. 0.3 m reserve along the back of the daylight triangle and road widening blocks shown on updated draft plan attached.  |
| 30. | All intersection angles shall be in the range of 85 degrees to 95 degrees.   | HPGI/BA          | The current alignment of the Regional Road system is at an angle of less than 85 degrees today (~83-84 degrees). A small number of intersections follow this same alignment, consistent with the approach adopted elsewhere across the Region and consistent with acceptable intersection angles as identified by the Transportation Association of Canada guidelines<br><br>All intersections exceed 80 degrees. Further refinements, if required, can be made as part of detailed design to bring intersection alignment to at least 85 degrees within the intersection design with negligible impact to lotting or rights-of-way. |
| 31. | A minimum 15 m tangent is required at all intersections.   | HPGI/BA          | Tangents have been identified on the attached materials that exceed 15 metres.   |
| 32. | It is unclear if Buildings 3 and 4 will have any underground structures. However, as per the recommendations of the Railway Vibration Study prepared by Valcoustics Canada Ltd., dated June 21, 2024, all underground structures must have a minimum setback distance of 40m from the east property line. At present, Buildings 3 and 4 have setbacks of 30m from the east property line.  | Valcoustics      | The railway vibration study does not recommend that all underground structures must have a minimum setback distance of 40 m from the east property line. Rather, the report recommends that vibration mitigation measures be implemented for all the underground structure portions within a setback distance of 40 m from the east property line.   |
| 33. | Due to the proximity to a main line railway, a 2.5m earthen berm with noise barriers on top is required along the east boundary line of Block 59.  | HPGI/Valcoustics | Acknowledged.  |
| 34. | There is a discrepancy between DWG 304 – Grading Plan 4 of 4 and other site plan drawings. The outdoor amenity space shown in the Noise Study and Landscape drawings is within the 4:1 slope area.   | Urbantech<br>NAK | Further coordination is required between civil grading and landscape design.   |
| 35. | The FSR proposes the realignment of Humber Station Road, starting just south of the intersection of Street '2' (McDougall Street) and Humber Station Road. However, the FSR and the Development Staging and Sequencing Plan, prepared by NAK and GSAI, do not specify the timing for this realignment. As this realignment would have a significant impact on properties fronting Humber Station Road, including non-participating properties, further detail on the realignment timeline.         | BA<br>Urbantech  | The realignment of Humber Station Road will be required in the initial phase given that Blocks 2/50/51 of the NHS corridor will need to be constructed for development purposes. Arrangements will be made to ensure that non participating parties would maintain vehicular access at all times.  |
| 36. | Adequate snow storage areas must be identified. These locations should consider traffic sight lines, both within the site and at site entrances, and should not be placed along any turnaround areas.  | HPGI             | Acknowledged. This matter will be deferred to the site plan stage through a detailed site plan (Block 61).   |
| 37. | Future submissions of the draft plan application must include a site servicing drawing that shows the proposed storm, sanitary, and watermain designs on a single drawing to confirm there are no conflicts with the proposed services.  | Urbantech        | There are no conflicts with the proposed services. Future submissions at detailed design will provide a combined site servicing drawing as requested.  |

|     | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY                         | RESPONSE  |
|-----|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| 38. | Provide a cross-sectional drawing of Block 56 and confirm that it is properly designed and sized to convey the proposed overland flow without flooding adjacent residential lots.  | Urbantech                         | Block 56 has been converted to a residential lot. It is not required for conveyance of overland flow. All overland flows will be conveyed by road rights-of-way to the sag point on Nattress Street adjacent to SWM Pond 1, where the inlet spillway is proposed. Refer to updated DWG 502 in the Final FSR package, dated October 2024.  |
| 39. | Ensure that all overland flow entering the pond is directed into the forebay, using adequately sized riprap to prevent erosion.  | Urbantech                         | All overland flow is conveyed to the inlet spillway off of Nattress Street. The inlet spillway directs overland flows into the forebay of SWM Pond 1. Refer to updated DWG 502 in the Final FSR package, dated October 2024. The inlet spillway riprap erosion protection will be provided at the detailed design stage.  |
| 40. | There are numerous infrastructure elements are planned to extend beyond the boundary lines of the subject subdivision. While Development Engineering acknowledges that the development application for the adjacent development (21T-22001C) is also under review with the intent to construct both developments concurrently, further clarification on the timing and staging is needed for realignment and construction of Humber Station Road and construction of clean water pipe.   | GSAI<br>Urbantech                 | Refer to the Interim Plan details in the Final FSR, dated October 2024. DWGs 104, 501A and 502A illustrate the Interim Plan and SWM servicing. The relevant portions of the adjacent development, referred to as Macville, will be constructed concurrently with the Humberking lands as shown in the Interim Plan. This includes the realignment and construction of Humber Station Road, the clean water pipe, and the Greenway Corridor required for implementation of the Humberking development and servicing plans.   |
| 41. | Stormwater Management Pond near Humber Station and King Street relies on external lands in another draft plan for construction of the pond and for the outlet. Prior to Draft Plan Approval the owner is to provide confirmation that the stormwater management facility and associate works can be constructed in its entirety as part of this draft plan. All lands associate with Stormwater management will need to be conveyed to Town ownership at the same time.  | Owner                             | Acknowledged.   |
| 42. | In accordance with the Town of Caledon Development Standards, SWM Pond 1 should include a bypass storm sewer system with a diversion structure to divert a 2-year storm event around the storm pond during cleanouts or maintenance.   | Urbantech                         | A bypass storm sewer system with diversion structure for the 2-year storm will be included for SWM Pond 1 in the detailed design stage. This system will not impact the proposed pond block or outlet inverts shown in the Final FSR, dated October 2024.   |
|     | <u>Street Lighting:</u>  |                                   |   |
| 43. | Street lighting will be required throughout the development. Street lighting design is to confirm to the Town of Caledon Outdoor Lighting Standard Manual dated September 19, 2019. Submission of detail design and photometric drawings for the street lighting system shall form a condition of draft approval of the subdivision.   | RTG                               | Noted. No further action required at this moment.   |
|     | <u>Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Investigation:</u>   |                                   |   |
| 44. | The report indicated that multiple groundwater and surface water samples exceeded the PWQQ criteria for various metal parameters and phosphorous. However, during the Without Prejudice meeting on August 22, 2024, DS Consultants Inc., indicated that additional sampling indicated that collected samples were within the limits of the PWQO standards and no further actions are required in order to remove contaminants. The Town requires a revised Hydrogeological Investigation report to be submitted for the Town's review. If dewatering into the sanitary sewer is necessary, written approval from the Region is required prior to commencing any dewatering activities.   | Soil Engineers/<br>DS Consultants | There are no exceedances against Peel sewer discharge criteria from the pumping well from the pond footprint (SWM Pond 1). Manganese and BOD exceeded storm sewer criteria from pumping well PW2A, and TSS and zinc exceeded storm sewer criteria from pumping well 2B.<br><br>Only copper and phosphorus exceedance was detected against PWQO from SWM Pond 1, no exceedance was detected from SWM Pond 2A, and multiple exceedances were detected from SWM Pond 2B. However, several parameters exceeded PWQO in surface water quality samples, some matching those detected in groundwater. Therefore, groundwater may be directly discharged to surface water without significant impacts on surface water quality. Minor metal exceedances can be dealt with settlement. The permanent dewatering system design with settlement treatment have been provided in the FSR drawings, dated October, 2024. |
|     | <u>Noise Feasibility Study:</u>  |                                   |   |
| 45. | Two Environmental Noise Feasibility Studies were submitted by Valcoustics, dated June 21, 2024, for the mixed-use development (East) and residential subdivisions (West). The proposed noise wall height along the east boundary of Block 59 is 4.3m, which exceeds the Town's Design Standard of 2.4m. However, if the noise wall is incorporated into a 2.5m crash berm, the height of the noise wall can be reduced to 1.8m. It should be further investigated whether increasing the height of the noise wall along the east boundary could eliminate other noise mitigation measures in Block 59. Please note that the "Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations" recommend noise wall heights of 5.5m above track elevation for Principal Main Lines and 4.5m for Secondary Main Lines. | Valcoustics                       | Noted.  |



|     | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY                             | RESPONSE  |
|-----|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| 46. | The Noise Report identifies that Class 4 designation is required for areas near the medium density blocks. The Acoustical Consultant is to identify if the medium density blocks will provide the required noise mitigation when fully constructed. The Town's preference is not to designate the area Class 4.   | Valcoustics                           | The design of the medium density blocks has not been determined. The product (townhouses, mid-rises etc.) will depend on the market when the design is closer to completion. As such, the amount of acoustical screening that the medium density blocks will provide cannot be determined at this time. However, it appears that some of the industries, particularly Cavalier Transportation Services, may not benefit from the acoustical screening provided by the medium density blocks since the sound path is across the natural heritage system block and storm water pond and excesses above the Class 1 limits will likely still be predicted.<br><br>Designated as Class 4 but will try to achieve Class 1. Further review regarding detailed design will be provided at site plan stage. |
| 47. | Be advised that peer review of the Noise Feasibility Study may be required at the sole discretion of the Town. Costs for the peer review, should it be required, will be at the expense of the applicant.   | Valcoustics                           | Noted.  |
|     | <u>Environmental Site Assessment:</u>   |                                       |   |
| 48. | A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) - West, dated December 12, 2022, were prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd. and submitted in support of the application. The report identified multiple potential contributing activities on the property corresponding to seven areas of potential environmental concern at the site. Given the potential environmental concerns identified, a Phase 2 ESA was recommended.  | Soil Engineers                        | Phase 2 ESA report prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd., dated August 23, 2024 enclosed with resubmission.   |
| 49. | A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) - East, dated December 12, 2022, were prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd. and submitted in support of the application. The report identified multiple potential contributing activities on the property corresponding to three areas of potential environmental concern at the site. Given the potential environmental concerns identified, a Phase 2 ESA was recommended.  | Soil Engineers                        | Phase 2 ESA report prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd., dated November 8, 2024 enclosed with resubmission.  |
| 50. | A Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), dated August 23, 2022, were prepared by Soil Engineers Ltd. and submitted in support of the application. The Phase 1 and Phase 2 ESAs were prepared to the requirements of O.Reg. 153/04. The Phase 2 ESA included borehole drilling, installation of monitoring wells, testing of both soil and groundwater conditions and headspace vapour screening. Based on the results of the laboratory analyses the measured concentrations of the submitted soil and groundwater samples did not exceed the applicable MECP Standards. No further environmental investigation is recommended at this time.  | Soil Engineers                        | Acknowledged.   |
| 51. | The Town will require a Record of Site Condition be filed for the subject properties as a part of draft plan conditions.  | Soil Engineers                        | Noted. RSC work is completed and in the process of being filled.  |
|     | <b>STORMWATER</b>   |                                       |   |
|     | Engineering Services provides the following comments without prejudice on the Caledon Station Community-wide Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan Draft Plans of Subdivision:   |                                       | See responses below.  |
| 52. | Within Section 1.0 Introduction it is stated that a Final Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan was submitted as part of the Local Official Plan Amendment. This should be corrected to 'Initial Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan'. This is in alignment with the Secondary Plan policies for Caledon Station. It may be worth outlining the Policy requirement for this study as part of the introduction.  | Beacon                                | Noted. The CEISMP, dated October 11, 2024, has been corrected.  |
| 53. | The Introduction states that 'While some information gaps remained in the Final DEICMP, these gaps did not affect the proposed Land Use Plan or Framework Plan or the limits of the proposed Natural Heritage System.' The gaps in the Initial CEISMP were substantial enough that the width of buffers were not able to be set. This statement should be reviewed to accurately reflect that the Land Use Plan, Framework Plan and limits of the proposed Natural Heritage System were not finalized as part of the CEISMP that was submitted with the LOPA.   | Beacon                                | Study included in the 2023 CEISMP was sufficient to determine NHS limits on the Secondary Plan area. Subsequent study of other lands owned by the Argo Development Corporation, in accordance with the CEISMP TOR, are presented in the re-submission of the Community-Wide CEISMP, dated October 11, 2024.   |
| 54. | The CEISMP outlines both watershed scale and site specific scale groundwater chemistry results. The results align with the results presented in the Hydrogeological Investigation; however, the Hydrogeological Investigation indicates that pre-treatment of the pumped water will be required prior to discharging into a natural surface water feature and pre-treatment of the pumped water will be required to ensure compliance with the Peel Region sewer use bylaw/PWQO criteria prior to discharging into the sewer system or natural surface water features. The CEISMP needs to address the management strategy for treating pumped groundwater. The management strategy should be further addressed in the FSR. | Urbantech<br>Beacon<br>DS Consultants | The CEISMP, dated October 2024, has been revised to provide direction for treatment of groundwater and discharge, in accordance with the Hydrogeological Investigation. As per the Hydrogeological Investigation, dated October 2024, there were metal exceedances in groundwater quality when compared to Provincial Water Quality Objectives (PWQO) for surface discharge to nearby water features. However, the groundwater results were equivalent to or better than those of the baseline surface water quality. Therefore, the only pretreatment recommended for dewatered groundwater is a basic filtration device (e.g., OGS) to minimize   |

|     | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY        | RESPONSE  |
|-----|---|------------------|---|
|     |   |                  | suspended fines and associated metals. Refer to updated Section 6.3.7 and Drawing 601 in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024.  |
|     | Section 5.2 outlines the stormwater criteria for the site. The erosion criteria should be updated to reflect the findings of the erosion assessment or at minimum reflect the following:  | Urbantech Beacon | The erosion criteria as determined by the erosion assessment were reflective of the intermittent/ephemeral nature of the receiving channels. The updated erosion assessment in the CEISMP, dated October 11, 2024, confirms that the proposed stormwater management design can address erosion control requirements for these features.<br><br>The water balance target was updated to reflect the infiltration deficit determined by the hydrogeological investigation, dated October, 2024.   |
| 55. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWM facilities that outlet to a continuous flow creek: Design ponds to contain runoff from a 25mm storm for up to 48 hours. Additionally, ensure onsite retention of 5mm runoff volume generated from the total impervious area, which should be managed through infiltration, evapotranspiration, or reuse.</li> <li>• SWM facilities that outlet to Outlet to an intermittent or ephemeral flow channels: Conduct an erosion assessment of the channel according to TRCA Erosion Assessment Protocol, which includes analyzing soil composition, reviewing the erosion potential of native soils with a fluvial geomorphologist, monitoring predevelopment flows in the channel, establishing a continues hydrology model and determining an allowable release rate into the channel. This assessment will establish the extended detention requirement and runoff volume control requirements.</li> </ul> |                  | See response above.   |
|     | Further to this, given that the infiltration deficit has been determined as part of the Hydrogeological Investigation, the water balance target should be updated to reflect the specific criteria for the site.  |                  | See response above.   |
| 56. | The Block Plan Concept includes a Condo Block between W5 and W6. None of the supporting studies have addressed the feasibility or the impacts of the proposed stormwater infrastructure within the proposed location. The CEISMP and FSR should address that the proposed location has not been evaluated or supported by any of the work done to date and the feasibility will need to be fully addressed as an update to the Community-Wide CEISMP prior to future approval.  | Urbantech Beacon | The Framework Plan was submitted, in accordance with Secondary Plan policy 7.16.4.4.1, concurrent with the first plan of subdivision submission (another applicant). There is no block plan or change proposed to the Framework Plan. Along with the submission of the Framework Plan, the CEISMP was updated to reflect that the storm runoff is proposed to be discharged uncontrolled to wetlands W5 and W6 as part of the feature-based water balance. The adjacent SWM pond overcontrols to compensate and meet the site’s target release rates. The only proposed stormwater control for these wetlands is a Jellyfish filter to provide water quality treatment.<br><br>Please also note that this comment pertains to an adjacent property, not this application. |
| 57. | Section 5.2 provides a brief summary of the stormwater management strategy which includes three end-of-pipe stormwater management facilities which are identified as Pond 1, Pond 2A and Pond 2B. All three facilities are proposed to be wet ponds that provide post-development peak flows to pre-development levels for all storms up to and including the 100-year storm and Regional Storm. In Section 6.3.7 of the FSR it indicates that all three stormwater ponds will need liners. Engineering Services has the following concerns with the three proposed facilities that need to be addressed:   | Urbantech Beacon | See responses below.  |
| a.  | Pond 1: The Town is concerned with the amount of proposed permanent dewatering, the approach to dewatering the groundwater to support the pond in the proposed location, the pre-treatment requirement of the groundwater prior to dewatering, and the potential impact to a receiving system. These issues need to be mitigated.   |                  | Pond 1 is proposed at the natural drainage low point (moved north away from the King Street frontage as requested by the Town urban design staff). Permanent dewatering will be required at any viable location. The proposed dewatering system with pretreatment (filtration), as noted in response to comment 54, has been included in the FSR drawings, dated October, 2024, to meet Peel’s sewer discharge and PWQO criteria. No negative impacts are anticipated to the receiving system.  |
| b.  | Pond 2A: Given the location of Pond 2A and the potential impact of permanent groundwater dewatering on the adjacent natural features, the Town needs the CEISMP and the FSR to evaluate whether a more naturalized constructed wetland, with water quality pre-treatment (e.g. Manufactured Treatment Device) and no liner is a viable option as opposed to a traditional wet pond with a liner.  |                  | A naturalized constructed wetland with no liner is not a viable option due to the high groundwater table elevation (above permanent pool), underlying clay deposits (natural liners), and site constraints (wetland buffers). The pond permanent pool elevation is governed by the outlet elevation. Based on the revised hydrogeological and geotechnical studies, dated October, 2024, drawdown from construction dewatering is not anticipated within the adjacent wetlands, and permanent dewatering is not anticipated to be needed.   |

|     | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY                   | RESPONSE   |
|-----|--|-----------------------------|--|
|     |  |                             | Please also note that this comment does not pertain to the subject lands (Humberking Pond 1)   |
| c.  | Pond 2B: Engineering Services cannot support Pond 2B outside of the Secondary Plan and in the proposed locations south of King Street. The proposed location south of King Street presents a number of concerns that have yet to be addressed including the following:   |                             | See responses below.   |
|     | i. high groundwater resulting in significant permanent dewatering (45,000 L/day),  |                             | As per the revised hydrogeological and geotechnical studies, dated October, 2024, the subsurface deposits encountered at SWM Ponds 2A & 2B, mainly consist of clayey silt to silty clay till which will serve as an appropriate clay liner. A liner is not considered necessary for these ponds, and permanent drainage / dewatering is not anticipated. Further boreholes within the pond footprint will be undertaken during subsequent design stages to confirm these recommendations   |
|     | ii. insufficient evaluation of the natural features and the impact of the proposed pond location,  |                             | Additional environmental impact and stormwater management assessments have been undertaken at the proposed Pond 2B location, in accordance with the CEISMP TOR, that are equivalent to a scoped subwatershed study. The constraint mapping provided in the CEISMP did not require revisions as a result of these updated studies.  |
|     | iii. the impacts to the developability of the surrounding lands and the lands south of the pond,   |                             | Refer to the Pond 2B memo in Appendix 4 of the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. The memo evaluates four alternative locations of Pond 2B based on several factors as requested by the Town staff. The proposed Pond 2B location is the preferred alternative for all stakeholders due to its flexibility in grading and future development, reduced cut/fill volumes, improved urban design, and efficient / cost-effective stormwater management solutions. This option also optimizes land use, will cause no negative impact to natural heritage features provided that the recommended mitigation measures are implemented and provides a strategic advantage for timely development. |
|     | iv. the proposed approach of the major system and emergency spillway to directly cross King Street which has not been supported by the Region of Peel to date, and   |                             | The Region’s comments regarding major system and emergency spillway crossing King Street are addressed in this Matrix to obtain the Region’s support.  |
|     | v. the lack of wholistic evaluation of the area through a Local Subwatershed Study as per Future Caledon Official Plan.  |                             | Refer to responses to comment ii. and iii. above – a wholistic evaluation has been conducted in support of the proposed Pond 2B location.  |
| 58. | Section 5.2.1 provides an overview of water quality requirements for the subject lands. For the public lands within the Main Humber Watershed the stormwater management strategy appears to be proposing that water quality criteria be met through the use of CB Shields and OGS units. Please note that the combination of these two MTDs will not achieve 80% TSS removal. Furthermore, the stormwater management strategy should provide further details on the approximate number of MTDs that will be needed and their proposed potential location.  | Urbantech                   | Section 6.4.2 was updated in the Final FSR, dated October, 2024, to remove in series MTDs and propose Jellyfish Filters that provide 80% TSS removal instead.  |
| 59. | Section 5.2.2 does not address the erosion requirements for the catchments draining to the Main Humber River. This will need to be updated in the CEISMP. The erosion control criteria for this area was not addressed in the FSR. The CEISMP should outline the criteria and recommendations on strategies to achieve the criteria. The FSR should provide further details on the best options for implementing the management strategies.  | Urbantech<br>Beacon         | Refer to the updated Section 6.1 and 6.4.3 in the Final FSR, dated October 2024. The erosion control criteria for the Main Humber Catchment is retention of the first 5 mm of rainfall, as per TRCA criteria. The required retention volumes are achieved through a combination of on-site retention (infiltration/evapotranspiration LIDs) for site plan blocks, lot-level measures (downspout disconnection, additional topsoil), as well as ROW LIDs (tree pits and modular soil cells).  |
| 60. | Section 5.2.3 is titled Quality Control and should be labelled Quantity Control.   | Beacon                      | This was corrected in the CEISMP, dated October 2024.  |
| 61. | Section 5.3.1 of the CEISMP addresses the clean water pipe at a high level. Section 5.3 and Drawing 503 of the FSR provides more details on the design. The FSR indicates that temporary grade transition and stabilized interceptor swales are proposed along the north limit of the CSSP boundary to direct the external pre-development drainage to the clean water pipe via a headwall structure. The grade transition, interceptor swale and headwall structure will need to be placed within a service block. Neither the CEISMP, FSR nor the Draft Plan of Subdivision addresses this need. All three need to be updated to address this requirement. | Beacon<br>HPGI<br>Urbantech | The FSR, dated October 2024, has been updated to show the proposed interceptor swale placed within a service block. The CEISMP, dated October 2024, has also been updated to reflect the updated FSR. The area in question is part of a different Draft Plan of Subdivision by another proponent.  |
| 62. | The Exceedance Analysis presented in Section 5.2.2.1 does not align with regulatory requirements. The post-development exceedances must match pre-development exceedances. This must be addressed to TRCA's satisfaction. The approach for achieving the exceedances must be supported by the Town (ie. if LIDs are proposed, the Town needs to be in support of the proposed approach).   | Beacon                      | The continuous hydrology modelling was updated, in the October 2024 FSR, to reflect the following adjustments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporation of the updated LID measures, including infiltration tanks (along parks) and site plan block controls that provide 10 to 25 mm on-site retention based on feasibility. Refer to attached updated LID plan Drawing 703.</li> </ul>   |



|     | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY           | RESPONSE  |
|-----|---|---------------------|---|
|     |   |                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced orifice plates and extended pond detention times to reduce release rates.</li> </ul> <p>The above changes have resulted in the post-development exceedances meeting the pre-development erosion exceedance requirements to the TRCA's satisfaction as discussed in the September 6, 2024 meeting. See the accompanying updated erosion assessment result comparison tables for further detail</p>  |
| 63. | Table 24 outlines the proposed impacts of the development and recommended mitigation/management strategies. One of the potential impacts includes the need for permanent dewatering beneath the proposed stormwater pond due to high groundwater levels and the resulting hydrostatic pressure. The table indicates that the dewatering cannot be supported by conventional weeping tile drainage system. The table should be updated to reflect that this applies only to Pond 1. The proposed management strategy and FSR needs to provide further detail on the proposed dewatering management strategy to provide the Town with an understanding of the long-term operation and maintenance needs of the facility. Furthermore, as indicated as part of previously provided comments, the Town is concerned with the amount of required dewatering. All amendments that can be made to the design of the pond should be investigated and evaluated to reduce the dewatering requirements. | Beacon<br>Urbantech | <p>Table 24 in the CEISMP, dated October, 2024, was updated to distinguish the permanent dewatering requirements for Pond 1 from the construction-related dewatering at other ponds.</p> <p>All alternatives and amendments have been investigated to reduce dewatering requirements. Pond 1 is proposed at the natural drainage low point (moved slightly north away from the King Street frontage as requested by the Town urban design staff). Permanent dewatering will be required at any viable location. The proposed dewatering system with a pretreatment (filtration) design have been included in the updated FSR drawings to meet Peel's sewer discharge and PWQO criteria.</p> |
| 64. | Table 24 should provide an overview of the recommended mitigation/management strategies to support ease of review in future planning stages as opposed to referencing other reports. Update Table 24 to provide all of the recommended mitigation/management strategies.  | Beacon              | Noted. The CEISMP was updated accordingly in October, 2024  |
| 65. | Table 24 and Section 7.2.1 indicates that a best efforts approach will be implemented to meet the pre-development annual infiltration volume. While it appears that the full infiltration deficit is being managed, it should be noted that the infiltration deficit will need to be met across the site and a best efforts approach is not supported. To better assist with implementing the Groundwater Resource and Surface Water Resource Management Plan, the CEISMP and FSR should include a low impact development constraint and opportunities map. This would include where groundwater levels are high and where soils currently support infiltration. This should also provide information on groundwater flow direction.  | Urbantech           | Refer to the updated LID plan in the FSR, dated October, 2024, showing the new proposed infiltration measures (infiltration tanks along parks and site plan block controls) that would infiltrate 15 mm to 25 mm of runoff to the maximum extent possible. The updated water balance calculation tables shows the infiltration deficit is now completely met through infiltration measures only. An updated LID constraint map was also provided in the FSR, dated October, 2024, showing groundwater levels compared to proposed grades.   |
| 66. | Section 7.2.3 Construction and Permanent Dewatering does not provide any recommendations to address the findings in the Hydrogeological Investigation that indicates that permanent dewatering of groundwater will need to be treated before it is discharged. The Town requires an understanding of how this will impact the Town's responsibilities in managing the pond over the long-term.  | Urbantech           | Refer to updated Section 6.3.7 and Drawing 601 in the accompanying Final FSR and Hydrogeological report, dated October 2024. The groundwater results were equivalent or better than those of the baseline surface water quality. The proposed dewatering system is proposed to include a filtration device (e.g., OGS) to minimize suspended fines and associated metals. The discharge will meet PWQO criteria, and no potential impacts are anticipated to the receiving system.  |
| 67. | Section 7.2.4 indicates that the infiltration deficit can be achieved through filtration should groundwater levels impede the ability of the site block plans to infiltrate 1 mm. The infiltration deficit must be met through infiltration. Should it be determined that groundwater is too high in some areas where site block plans are proposed, the site block plans that do not have constraints will need to implement a greater amount. To determine the appropriate targets the Low Impact Development Plan should be supported by a constraint map as proposed in an earlier comment.   | Urbantech           | Refer to the updated LID plan, dated October, 2024, showing the proposed site plan block infiltration versus evapotranspiration / re-use targets based on groundwater constraints. The targets have been adjusted to overcompensate in areas where infiltration is feasible. In conjunction with the new infiltration tanks proposed along parks, the infiltration deficit is now completely met through infiltration only. Refer to the updated Section 8.1 and updated water balance tables in Appendix 4 of the Final FSR, dated October 2024.   |
| 68. | Table 25 should reference the Town's Stormwater Inspection, Maintenance and Monitoring Guide and that it will be followed for all stormwater facilities including ponds, low impact development practices and manufactured treatment devices.   | Beacon<br>Urbantech | It is understood that this document is in development, as it has not been shared with the Study Team. The CEISMP has been updated to reference this document, such that it be read in conjunction with the recommendations of the CEISMP.   |
| 69. | The CEISMP does not appear to address interim stormwater management strategies to support the Development Staging and Sequence Plan or the proposed draft plans of subdivisions. As indicated within the DSSP Plan, Caledon Station will be built in four phases with phase 3 currently representing the majority of the non-participating landowner properties and where Pond 2A is located and needed to manage Catchment 105. Furthermore, the FSR does not address the interim stormwater management approach required to support the draft plan of subdivisions. Both the CEISMP and the FSR must be updated to address the interim stormwater management requirements. Note that an interim stormwater management facility cannot outlet to private property.   | Beacon<br>Urbantech | <p>The interim stormwater management strategy has been included in the Final Community-Wide CEISMP and Final Community-Wide FSR, which were submitted in October 2024. Refer to interim SWM plan in the Final FSR for further detail as well. An interim pond will service Catchment 105 and outlet to the natural channel in the non-participating lands. Outlets to the Gore Road ditch have been assessed and determined to be not feasible due to invert elevations and grading constraints.</p> <p>Refer to new Section 11.2 in the accompanying Final FSR. An impact assessment was conducted for the downstream farmlands. The interim pond controls flow to mitigate</p>            |



|          | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY                             | RESPONSE   |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------|---------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|          |   |                                       | floodplain and erosion impacts to pre-development levels. All prolonged flows are negligible and are contained within the existing channel. No impacts to the downstream farmland and HDF are anticipated.   |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70.      | Section 9 of the CEISMP should identify work that will also need to be completed by nonparticipating landowners once those properties proceed with development.   | Beacon                                | Noted. Section 10 of the Final CEISMP has been updated accordingly and was submitted to the Town in October, 2024.   |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | Engineering Services provides the following comments without prejudice on the Final Community-wide Functional Servicing Report Caledon Station Secondary Plan (Urbantech, June 2024):   |                                       | See responses below.   |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 71.      | On page 8 of the FSR it states that the Town is aware that infrastructure external to the CSSP is needed to service the plan. The Town is aware that the applicant has proposed Pond 2b as an option to service Catchment 106; however, Engineering Services is not in support of the proposed location of Pond 2B due to limited information. Engineering Services requires the pond to be within the Secondary Plan area. As indicated above, the Town is concerned with the placement of Pond 2B south of King Street for the following reasons:             | Urbantech<br>Beacon<br>DS Consultants | Note that Pond 2B is required for servicing of a different Draft Plan of Subdivision; however, this was evaluated as part of the Community-Wide studies (FSR, Hydrogeology, and CEISMP)  |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>high groundwater resulting in significant permanent dewatering (45,000 L/day),</li> </ul>  |                                       | Refer to the updated Hydrogeology investigation and Geotechnical investigation, dated October 2024. The subsurface deposits encountered at SWM Pond 2B (south of King St.), mainly consist of clayey silt to silty clay till which will serve as an appropriate clay liner. A liner is not considered necessary for Pond 2B, and permanent drainage / dewatering is not anticipated. Further boreholes within the pond footprint will be undertaken during subsequent design stages to confirm these recommendations.  |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>insufficient evaluation of the natural features and the impact of the proposed pond location,</li> </ul>   |                                       | Additional environmental and stormwater management assessments were undertaken, in accordance with the CEISMP TOR, that are equivalent to a scoped subwatershed study for the proposed pond location. These additional assessments are provided in the Final Community-Wide CEISMP and Final FSR. The constraint mapping provided in the CEISMP did not require revisions as a result of these updated studies. Constraint mapping is provided in Figure 10 of the CEISMP.   |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the impacts to the developability of the surrounding lands and the lands south of the pond,</li> </ul>   |                                       | Refer to the Pond 2B memo (Appendix 4 of the FSR), which evaluates four alternative locations of Pond 2B based on several factors as requested by the Town staff. The proposed Pond 2B location is the preferred alternative for all stakeholders due to its flexibility in grading and future development, reduced cut/fill volumes, improved urban design, and efficient / cost-effective stormwater management solutions. This option also optimizes land use, will cause no negative impact provided the recommended mitigation measures are implemented, and provides a strategic advantage for timely development. |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the feasibility of the major system and emergency spillway to directly cross King Street which has not been supported by the Region of Peel to date, and</li> </ul>  |                                       | The Region’s comments regarding major system and emergency spillway crossing King Street are addressed in this matrix to obtain the Region’s support.  |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the lack of wholistic evaluation of the area through a Local Subwatershed Study.</li> </ul>  |                                       | Refer to responses to the second and third bullet points above – a wholistic evaluation has been conducted in support of the proposed Pond 2B location and is provided in the Final CEISMP, dated October, 2024.   |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 72.      | Table 6-3 indicates that retaining walls will be considered above the high-water level if required. The provided drawings do not depict the proposed location of retaining walls. The Town of Caledon Development Standards do not allow for the use of retaining walls within the Stormwater Pond. The subsequent detailed design of the ponds should not include retaining walls within the pond design. Table 6-3 should be updated to remove this statement and it should be noted within the table that the Town’s Development Standards will be followed. | Urbantech                             | Retaining walls are not required for the proposed ponds. Table 6-3 has been updated in the Final FSR, dated October 2024, to remove this statement.  |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 73.      | The weighted calculations for imperviousness values for each pond catchment provided in Table 6-4 needs to be provided. Table 6-5 does not align with the Town’s standards and should be updated to align. The Town is not in support of the proposed SWM Pond Runoff Coefficient and Impervious Values (%) proposed in Table 6-5.  | Urbantech                             | Refer to the updated Table 6-5 (below) in the FSR, dated October 2024. The imperviousness values in Table 6-4 are more conservative than the Town’s standards, except for standard / shallow townhouses and road ROW. These values have been calculated based on the selected proposed product for each land use and would more accurately reflect the proposed design.  |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          |   |                                       | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Land Use</th> <th>Imperv.</th> <th>Runoff Coefficient</th> <th>Town Criteria</th> <th>Justification</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   | Land Use      | Imperv. | Runoff Coefficient | Town Criteria | Justification |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Imperv.   | Runoff Coefficient                    | Town Criteria  | Justification |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |
|          |   |                                       |  |               |         |                    |               |               |  |  |  |  |  |

| STAFF COMMENTS |   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE  |      |               |           |                                 |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|------|---------------|-----------|---------------------------------|
|                |   |           |   |      | (STD No. 103) |           |                                 |
|                |   |           | Medium Density Residential  | 80%  | 0.76          | 0.75      | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | Mixed-Use Residential   | 80%  | 0.76          | 0.75      | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | Go Transit Lands  | 100% | 0.90          | 0.90      | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | School  | 80%  | 0.76          | 0.75      | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | Park  | 10%  | 0.27          | 0.25      | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | Proposed EPA  | 10%  | 0.27          | 0.20-0.25 | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | Environ. Protection Area  | 10%  | 0.27          | 0.20-0.25 | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | SWM Pond  | 100% | 0.90          | 0.90      | Similar to Town Std             |
|                |   |           | Rear Lane Townhouses  | 76%  | 0.73          | 0.70      | Based on proposed product       |
|                |   |           | Dual Frontage Townhouse   | 75%  | 0.73          | 0.70      | Based on proposed product       |
|                |   |           | Back-to-back Townhouse  | 80%  | 0.76          | 0.70      | Based on proposed product       |
|                |   |           | Shallow Townhouse   | 66%  | 0.66          | 0.70      | Based on proposed product       |
|                |   |           | Standard Townhouses   | 66%  | 0.66          | 0.70      | Based on proposed product       |
|                |   |           | Shallow Single Detached   | 62%  | 0.63          | 0.40      | Based on proposed product       |
|                |   |           | Standard Single Detached  | 59%  | 0.61          | 0.40      | Based on proposed product       |
|                |   |           | External  | 80%  | 0.76          | N/A       | Assumed similar to SPA          |
|                |   |           | Roads   | 80%  | 0.76          | 0.90      | Based on proposed road sections |
| 74.            | Section 6.3.8 provides general information regarding the pond outfalls and indicates that the guidelines will be followed where possible. All of the pond outfalls need to be designed in alignment with TRCA's Stormwater Criteria Document in order for the Town to approve them as part of our CLI-ECA. Remove 'where possible' and ensure that the pond outfalls will be designed as per that guidance.   | Urbantech | <b>The outfalls will be designed as per the TRCA's criteria. Section 6.3.8 has been updated to remove "where possible" in the Final FSR, dated October 2024.</b>  |      |               |           |                                 |
| 75.            | As per Appendix A of the CLI-ECA, a best effort approach to the implementation of a treatment train is not permissible. The FSR needs to fully implement Appendix A which means that the 90% percentile rainfall event (27 mm) must be controlled in the following hierarchical order, with each step exhausted before proceeding to the next: 1) retention (infiltration, reuse, or evapotranspiration only to a maximum of the infiltration deficit), 2) LID filtration, and 3) conventional Stormwater management. Step 3, conventional Stormwater management, | Urbantech | <b>The 90% percentile rainfall event is controlled as per the CLI-ECA hierarchy. Refer to the updated Section 8.3 and 6.1 in the accompanying Final FSR , dated October 2024, that clarify the proposed LIDs and their intended function.</b> |      |               |           |                                 |

|     | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY      | RESPONSE   |
|-----|---|----------------|--|
|     | should proceed only once Maximum Extent Possible has been attained for Steps 1 and 2 for retention and filtration. Maximum Extent Possible means maximum achievable Stormwater volume control through retention and LID filtration engineered/landscaped/technical Stormwater practices, given the site constraints. Acceptable site constraints are listed in Table A2. High groundwater or areas where increased infiltration will result in elevated groundwater levels which can be shown through an appropriate area specific study to impact critical utilities or property (e.g., susceptible to flooding) is an acceptable reason for moving from Step 1 to Step 2. The Hydrogeological Investigation does depict areas of high groundwater but also includes areas where the groundwater is almost 5 metres below ground. Effort should be made to demonstrate a stormwater strategy that has implemented the CLI-ECA requirements and governed by the site constraints. |                | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to updated LID Plan in Drawing 703. Retention has been implemented to the maximum extent possible through proposed infiltration tanks (along parks) and site plan block on-site infiltration or evapotranspiration / re-use (as feasible). Feasible infiltration silva cells are also identified on the plan but are not required.</li> <li>2. LID filtration can be proposed through additional filtration silva cell in locations where groundwater tables are too high for infiltration. These filtration LIDs can be implemented if required by the Town.</li> </ol> <p>The remaining 90% percentile volume is controlled by the proposed end-of-pipe SWM ponds.</p> |
| 76. | The FSR is proposing the use of tree pits with a radius of 1 metre and a depth of 0.75 m which equates to a soil volume of 2.36 m3. The Town's Green Development Standards requires a soil volume of 30 m3. For tree pits that received drainage from impervious areas and that meet the Green Development Standard, credit will be given for water quality and water balance.  | Urbantech      | The proposed tree pits have been updated in the Final FSR, dated October 2024, to provide a soil volume of 30 m3 where possible, taking into consideration constraints such as driveways and ROW infrastructure (where soil volumes may be reduced to 10 to 15 m3).  |
| 77. | Section 6.4.2 appears to propose the use of sedimentation manufactured treatment devices in series. As per the Town's CLI-ECA agreement with the Province, when two or more sedimentation MTD are installed in series, no additional sediment removal credit shall be applied beyond the sediment removal credit of the largest device in the series.   | Urbantech      | Section 6.4.2 has been updated in the Final FSR, dated October 2024, to remove in series MTDs and propose Jellyfish Filters that provide 80% TSS removal instead.  |
| 78. | The FSR states that a portion of the infiltration deficit is being proposed to be met on the site plan blocks. The FSR needs to provide a target and demonstrate feasibility that this can be achieved.   | Urbantech      | Refer to the updated Water Balance LID Plan in Drawing 703, 704A and B of the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. The drawings identify site plan blocks that can achieve infiltration, and their targets based on groundwater levels compared to proposed grades. Section 8.1 and 8.3 in the FSR have also been updated to clarify this information.  |
| 79. | Section 8.2.1.3 appears to propose the use of a Third Pipe System to maintain feature based water balance. The use of a Third Pipe System is supported by the Town but will need to be located within the public realm to ensure its perpetual functionality.   | Urbantech      | The proposed third pipe system is located within public municipal property, as per Drawing 502 and 702 in the FSR, dated October 2024.   |
| 80. | The use of LID is discussed in multiple sections of the FSR and is proposed in order to maintain the infiltration deficit, meet water quality requirements and feature based water balance requirements. Further, Drawing 703 provides the water balance plan. Each section describes the LIDs somewhat differently. For example, are Tree Pits the same as LID Tree Pits. Due to the number of competing and overlapping requirements that require the implementation of LID it is difficult to clearly understand what the proposed plan is and whether it achieves the criteria. The Town requires a clearer depiction of the criteria for each catchment, the proposed locations of LIDs that have been informed by site constraints, and a succinct list of LIDs that will be used in the various land uses to achieve the criteria. In addition, here are a few additional items that have made it difficult to understand what the proposed LID approach includes:         | Urbantech      | Refer to the updated Section 8.1 and 8.3 in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024, that the proposed LIDs and their intended function to achieve the water balance, water quality, and erosion control criteria. The updated text has also been included in the Final FSR as well. Refer to the attached updated LID Plan.  |
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SWM Ponds are identified on the water balance plan and it is unclear how the ponds are supporting the water balance requirements.</li> </ul>   |                | SWM ponds do not support water balance requirements – they have been removed from the updated LID plan.  |
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear what LID filtration and infiltration practices are being proposed within the laneways.</li> </ul>  |                | Potential infiltration only silva cell locations in laneways are identified on the updated LID Plan in Drawing 703. Filtration silva cells can be implemented in areas with high groundwater tables (refer to attached LID Constraint Map in 704A and B). However, the recommended infiltration practice is the newly added infiltration tanks (along parks) in the updated LID Plan. Silva cells will only be implemented if required by the Town.  |
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is discussion of LIDs that are not considered on this plan including exfiltration systems.</li> </ul>  |                | Perforated pipes would have to be placed below the standard storm sewers to function as intended. Exfiltration pipes are not proposed due to the high groundwater table. The discussion has been removed from the Final FSR  |
|     | Engineering Services provides the following comments without prejudice on the Preliminary Hydrogeological Investigation Proposed Development Caledon Station & Argo King I & II Bolton, Ontario (DS Consulting Ltd., June 2024):  |                | See responses below.   |
| 81. | There is an infiltration factor of 0.15 for a tile drained moderately rooted crop land use in Table 11 of the 2024 Hydrogeological Report that wasn't in the 2022 report, and it is noted that areas with tile drainage are expected to have a significant reduction in infiltration. It is recommend that the area of tile drainage receives the same  | DS Consultants | The infiltration factor for tile drained moderately rooted crop land use has been increased to 0.45 to match the moderately rooted crop land use in the revised water balance in the updated hydrogeological investigation (October 2024)  |



|     | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY                   | RESPONSE   |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|--|
|     | infiltration factor as the moderately rooted crop land use with no tile drain of 0.35.  |                             |  |
| 82. | Section 4.1 of the Hydrogeological Report describes the slope of the development area as gentle. Please elaborate on and provide a rationale for selecting Hilly Land as the Topography infiltration factor in Table 11.  | DS Consultants              | The slope of the development area for pre and post-development conditions has been updated to moderately sloped land and the infiltration factor component for topography was increased 0.1 in the revised water balance in the updated hydrogeological investigation (October 2024) |
| 83. | Hydrogeological Report (Table K-5) indicates post development recharge volume with mitigation to be 109,611 m3. The FSR shows that post development recharge volumes with mitigation will range from 148,039 m3 to 202,043 m3 depending on the mitigation volume achieved by tree pits. Please address discrepancies between reports regarding volume provided by mitigation as well as discrepancies with the mitigation measures used.  | DS Consultants              | The revised water balance was completed with information provided by Urbantech. Discrepancies between the revised hydrogeological report and the FSR have been rectified.  |
| 84. | Connected Impervious and Pervious areas for water balance mitigation is 6,467 m3/year per in the Hydrogeological Report and 19,664 m3/year per the FSR. The Town does not credit pervious areas for mitigating the infiltration deficit unless additional storage is provided by LID.   | DS Consultants<br>Urbantech | Connected Impervious and Pervious areas for mitigation has been removed from the revised water balance.  |
| 85. | The CLIECA water balance criteria requires recharge to be controlled to meet predevelopment conditions on the property by infiltrating to pre-development conditions (i.e. infiltrate 144,413 m3 per year) or retain runoff from a 90th percentile rain event (27 mm in Caledon). On-site retention or re-use and filtration cannot be credited toward meeting pre-development recharge. On-site retention or reuse can be credited toward retaining the 90th percentile event. | DS Consultants              | The revised water balance and LID plan (Final FSR Drawing 703) achieves site balance with only infiltration mitigation.  |
| 86. | The Hydrogeological Report indicates high groundwater as a site constraint preventing infiltration deficit mitigation. The Monitoring Well results in Table 1 of the Hydrogeological Report show depth to groundwater that appear to be suitable for LIDs. As indicated in comments above, the applicant should develop an LID constraint map to better inform where LIDs are appropriate and where they are not.   | DS Consultants              | The revised water balance and LID plan (Drawing 703, 704A and B in the FSR) was achieved by comparing seasonally high water levels and adding infiltration LIDs as required.   |
|     | <b>LANDSCAPE</b>  |                             |  |
|     | <u>Secondary Plan (community design Guidelines):</u>  |                             |  |
| 87. | Update park facility plan as per comments   | NAK                         | Comments addressed, where appropriate. Updated park facility plan incorporated into the UDB.   |
| 88. | Include trail network map   | NAK                         | Please see trail network map in UDB – Figure 17 (page 38).   |
|     | <u>Draft Plan of Subdivision:</u>   |                             |  |
| 89. | Provide the following materials for Town's review and comments  | Owner                       | To be completed at detailed design stage.  |
|     | a. Conceptual fencing layout plan   |                             | See response above.  |
|     | b. Tree Compensation Planting Plan for proposed locations of compensation trees   |                             | See response above.  |
|     | c. Trail layout plan  |                             | See response above.  |
| 90. | Update park facility plan as per comments   | NAK                         | See response to Comment 87.  |
| 91. | Submit a separate Arborist Report for 21T-24006C. Update the Arborist Report as per latest Town's TOR for Arborist Reports, Tree Preservation Plans and Tableland Tree Removal Compensation requirements, which including but not limited   | Beacon                      | An updated Arborist Report has been prepared and is provided in support of Draft Plan of Subdivision application 21T-24006C. It can be found in Appendix E of the CEISMP, dated October 2024.  |
|     | a. Include General Notes (section 2.6) to the report  |                             | See response above.  |
|     | b. Add a column to the Tree Inventory Data table to indicate the number of required compensation trees, for each tree and the total quantity  |                             | See response above.  |
| 92. | CEISMP/ EIS report shall include the recommendation on planting density and species, for the Natural Heritage System blocks, for Town's review, comment and approval  | Beacon                      | Noted, refer to CEISMP addendum prepared by Beacon, dated December 17, 2024.   |
|     | <b>PARK</b>   |                             |  |
| 93. | A Financial Parkland Agreement will be prepared between the Town and Caledon Station Secondary Plan Landowner Group. The calculation and dedication of the parkland contribution requirements for the Caledon Station Secondary Plan pursuant to the requirements of the Planning Act have been and will be calculated on behalf of the Owners on a collective basis based on the Caledon Station Secondary Plan as a whole and not on the individual Owners' Lands.            | CSA                         | Noted.   |
|     | <b>MUNICIPAL NUMBERS</b>  |                             |  |
|     | <u>Municipal Numbers:</u>   |                             |  |
| 94. | Should the application be approved, the existing municipal address will cease to exist and new municipal numbers  | HPGI                        | Noted.   |

|      | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY     | RESPONSE            |
|------|---|---------------|---------------------|
|      | 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 and a new street name.  |               |                     |
| 95.  | Municipal numbers will be issued at the earliest of grading approval, servicing approval or Final Site Plan Approval.   | HPGI          | Noted.              |
| 96.  | Upon issuance of Final Site Plan Approval, the Lead Planner will forward a copy of the approval package to municipal numbering staff to work with the owner to issue the required numbers and post any required signage of the numbers in accordance with the Town’s Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines.   | HPGI          | Noted.              |
| 97.  | In accordance the Municipal Numbering By-law and Guidelines, the municipal number must be posted on the exterior of the building that faces the road on which the building is numbered. The owner is advised to post the number (once issued) on the townhouses 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 x.7338. | Owner<br>HPGI | Noted.              |
| 98.  | There are no concerns with the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment   | HPGI          | Acknowledged.       |
|      | <u>Street Naming</u>  |               |                     |
| 99.  | Please be advised that on October 29, 2019, Town Council approved updates to the Town’s Corporate Policy on Street Naming. In accordance with these updates, this application will require:   | HPGI          | Noted.              |
|      | a. A minimum of one (1) street name of local historical significance is required and more are encouraged where possible   |               | See response above. |
|      | b. Please see the lists of available street names approved for use in Caledon (heritage names, veteran names and non-heritage names). The lists of available names can be found by visiting <a href="https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/street-naming.aspx">https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/street-naming.aspx</a>   |               |                     |
|      | c. Please be advised that the names on these lists are available on a “first come first serve basis” and are subject to change at any time based on qualifying development requests. Staff will do their best to keep the list as up to date as possible.   |               |                     |
|      | d. Due to local historical significance, some heritage names are intended for use in specific areas of the Town and are identified as such.   |               |                     |
|      | e. If the applicant wishes to submit alternate names for consideration as street names in Caledon, they may do so through the Town, for consideration by the Region of Peel Street Naming Committee. Only those names that adhere to the requirements of the Town of Caledon Corporate Policy on Street Naming and the Region of Peel Street Naming Guidelines will be considered.  |               |                     |
|      | f. The Region of Peel has a street naming webpage available for members of the public to search to see if a particular street name is presently in use or reserved for use Caledon, Brampton, Mississauga, or has otherwise been previously declined: <a href="https://www.peelregion.ca/planning/business/index.asp">https://www.peelregion.ca/planning/business/index.asp</a>   |               |                     |
|      | g. The new proposed street segments will also require suffixes in accordance with the Town of Caledon Corporate Policy on Street Naming.  |               |                     |
|      | <b>HERITAGE</b>   |               |                     |
|      | <u>Heritage Register:</u>   |               |                     |
| 100. | The subject lands do not contain any designated or listed, non-designated properties on the Town of Caledon’s Heritage Register. No Heritage Impact Assessment is required as part of this development application.   |               | Noted.              |
|      | <u>Archaeological Assessment:</u>   |               |                     |
| 101. | The proponent submitted the following archaeological assessments:   |               | Noted.              |
|      | a. “Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment Part of Lots 11 & 12, Concession 5, Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Historic Township of Albion, Historic County of Peel”, prepared by Irvin Heritage Inc., dated February 10, 2022.  |               |                     |
|      | i. Mary Site AIGw-204, no further cultural heritage value/interest  |               |                     |
|      | ii. No further assessment recommended.  |               |                     |
|      | b. “The Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment 14100, 14166 & 14196 Humber Station Road, Bolton, Town of Caledon Part of Lot 11, Concession 4, Regional Municipality of Peel, Historic Township of Albion, Historic County of Peel”, prepared by Irvin Heritage Inc., dated December 4, 2020.  |               |                     |

| STAFF COMMENTS  |   | ACTION BY       | RESPONSE  |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
|---|---|-----------------|---|--|--------------|--------------|---|-----|--------------|----------------|--|-------------|--|
|   | i. No further assessment recommended.   |                 |   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 102.  | Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism compliance letters were submitted for both assessments.  |                 | <b>Noted.</b>   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 103.  | There are no outstanding archaeological concerns with the subject lands.  |                 | <b>Noted.</b>   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 104.  | The following clauses are to be included as part of future agreements related to the development application:   |                 | <b>Noted.</b>   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
|   | a. The proponent shall avoid and/or mitigate, to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) and the Town, any archaeological resources that are identified through new information or documentation which may be received following the acceptance of archaeological assessment(s) by the MCM and clearance of archaeological concerns for the subject lands by the Town.   |                 | <b>See response above.</b>  |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
|   | b. The proponent shall immediately stop all work on the Subject Lands and notify the Town’s Heritage staff, Director of Planning, and the MCM in the event that deeply buried archaeological resources are found during the course of any grading or related works on the Subject Lands. Any and all work related to the discovery of deeply buried archaeological resources shall be carried out by the proponent, at their expense, to the satisfaction of the MCM and the Town’s Heritage staff. |                 | <b>See response above.</b>  |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| <b>ZONING</b>   |   |                 |   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| <u>Comments on Draft Plan of Subdivision</u>  |   |                 |   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 105.  | Review based on draft ZBL   |                 |   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 106.  | Review based on typologies provided in draft plan of subdivision dated and signed June 7, 2024  |                 |   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 107.  | Review of lot areas and frontages based on draft plan of subdivision. During draft approval, zoning staff will require a lot area and frontage certificate prepared and signed by an Ontario Land Surveyor to review lots and blocks for zoning compliance  | <b>Surveyor</b> | <b>Noted, this will be provided upon Draft Plan approval and prior to registration.</b> |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 108.  | Partial blocks/lots associated with adjacent subdivisions (“residential reserves/future development) not reviewed for zoning compliance   |                 |   |  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 109.  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Use</th> <th>Lot Area</th> <th colspan="2">Lot Frontage</th> <th>Review Notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>109. Dwelling, Townhouse</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>4.0 interior</td> <td>5.5 End/Corner</td> <td>Appears to comply</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | Use             | Lot Area  | Lot Frontage   |              | Review Notes | 109. Dwelling, Townhouse  | N/A | 4.0 interior | 5.5 End/Corner | Appears to comply  | <b>HPGI</b> | <b>Noted. No further action required.</b>                                    |
|   | Use   | Lot Area        | Lot Frontage  |  | Review Notes |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 109. Dwelling, Townhouse  | N/A   | 4.0 interior    | 5.5 End/Corner  | Appears to comply  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 110.  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Use</th> <th>Lot Area</th> <th colspan="2">Lot Frontage</th> <th>Review Notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>110. Dwelling, Townhouse, Rear-Lane</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>4.0 interior</td> <td>5.5 End/Corner</td> <td>Appears to comply</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   | Use             | Lot Area  | Lot Frontage   |              | Review Notes | 110. Dwelling, Townhouse, Rear-Lane   | N/A | 4.0 interior | 5.5 End/Corner | Appears to comply  |             |  |
| Use   | Lot Area  | Lot Frontage    |   | Review Notes   |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 110. Dwelling, Townhouse, Rear-Lane   | N/A   | 4.0 interior    | 5.5 End/Corner  | Appears to comply  |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 111.  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Use</th> <th>Lot Area</th> <th colspan="2">Lot Frontage</th> <th>Review Notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>111. Dwelling, Back-to-Back Townhouse</td> <td>N/A</td> <td>5.5 interior</td> <td>6.7 End/Corner</td> <td>BLOCK 33 – End unit fronting Street 7 shown as 6.33 (non-compliant), however scale indicates it may be a typo. Please confirm.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | Use             | Lot Area  | Lot Frontage   |              | Review Notes | 111. Dwelling, Back-to-Back Townhouse   | N/A | 5.5 interior | 6.7 End/Corner | BLOCK 33 – End unit fronting Street 7 shown as 6.33 (non-compliant), however scale indicates it may be a typo. Please confirm. | <b>HPGI</b> | <b>Noted. End unit shown as 6.33 is a typo, refer to updated draft plan.</b> |
| Use   | Lot Area  | Lot Frontage    |   | Review Notes   |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 111. Dwelling, Back-to-Back Townhouse   | N/A   | 5.5 interior    | 6.7 End/Corner  | BLOCK 33 – End unit fronting Street 7 shown as 6.33 (non-compliant), however scale indicates it may be a typo. Please confirm. |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 112.  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Use</th> <th>Lot Area</th> <th colspan="2">Lot Frontage</th> <th>Review Notes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>112. Building, Apartment, Building, Mixed Use, Building, Apartment - Senior Citizen, Seniors Retirement Facility, Long Term Care Facility</td> <td>N/A</td> <td colspan="2">N/A</td> <td>No requirement</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   | Use             | Lot Area  | Lot Frontage   |              | Review Notes | 112. Building, Apartment, Building, Mixed Use, Building, Apartment - Senior Citizen, Seniors Retirement Facility, Long Term Care Facility | N/A | N/A          |                | No requirement   | <b>HPGI</b> | <b>Noted. No further action required.</b>                                    |
| Use   | Lot Area  | Lot Frontage    |   | Review Notes   |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |
| 112. Building, Apartment, Building, Mixed Use, Building, Apartment - Senior Citizen, Seniors Retirement Facility, Long Term Care Facility | N/A   | N/A             |   | No requirement   |              |              |   |     |              |                |  |             |  |



| STAFF COMMENTS                            |   |   |     | ACTION BY   | RESPONSE   |                                    |
|---|---|---|-----|---|--|------------------------------------|
| 113.                                      | 113. Shopping Centre or non-residential use   | N/A   | 3.0 | No comment/no uses explicitly provided for review | HPGI   | Noted. No further action required. |
| Comments on Draft Zoning By-law Amendment |   |   |     |   |  |                                    |
| 114.                                      | <b>Issue</b>  | <b>Resolution</b>   |     | HPGI  | Noted, Draft By-law revised to include the current zones as passed by Council.   |                                    |
|   | 114. Schedule refers to existing zones prior to the passing of By-law 2024-055  | Revise Paragraph in the draft by-law, revise schedule   |     |   |  |                                    |
| 115.                                      | 115. PDF format not acceptable. Must be presented in Microsoft word format, NO PDF to DOC conversion.   | Appropriate template provided for the applicant to use.   |     | HPGI  | Noted.   |                                    |
| 116.                                      | 116. Redundant text found in Paragraph 1. Note that Section 13.1 sets out how exceptions are to be applied.   | Delete Paragraph 1: "By adding the following subsections to Section 13 – EXCEPTIONS.<br>1.1 Notwithstanding any other provisions of by-law 2006-50, the following   |     | HPGI  | Noted.   |                                    |
|   |   | provisions shall apply to the lands as shown on Schedule "A" of this By-law 2024-_____. All other provisions, unless specifically modified or amended by this section, continue to apply to the lands subject to this section." |     |   |  |                                    |
| 117.                                      |   | Town standard requires Paragraph 1 to be revised to:<br>117. The following is added to Table 13.1   |     | HPGI  | Noted.   |                                    |
| 118.                                      | 118. Infrastructure is already permitted in any zone as per Section 4.20 the of the by-law. Furthermore, this section requires that the infrastructure be approved by the Town of Caledon/Region. | Delete "essential infrastructure" definition and remove from permitted uses   |     | HPGI  | Noted. The proposed definition for essential infrastructure has been removed from the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment                 |                                    |
| 119.                                      | 119. Infrastructure is already permitted in any zone as per Section 4.20 the of the by-law. Furthermore, this section requires that the infrastructure be approved by the Town of Caledon/Region. | Delete "municipal drain" definition and remove from permitted uses  |     | HPGI  | The 'municipal drain" listing as a permitted use have been removed. Refer to the revised implementing Zoning By-law for further detail |                                    |

|      | STAFF COMMENTS   |   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE  |
|------|--|---|-----------|---|
| 120. | 120. Dwelling, Multiplex deleted and replaced with Multiplex. Dwelling, Multiplex is worded as such to be consistent with other zones that permit the use, and “Dwelling, Multiplex” vs Multiplex is preferred by the Town as it will be consistent with other dwelling type definitions ensuring its visibility in permitted uses list.   | Keep existing definition<br>See next comment  | HPGI      | The previously proposed site-specific term ‘Multiplex’ has been removed from site-specific draft implementing zoning by-law, and accordingly, the Town approved term “Dwelling, Multiplex” per By-Law 2024-055 has been reinstated.   |
| 121. | 121. Multiplex definition unacceptable. Proposed multiplex definition contains undefined terms “triplex and fourplex”.   | Preference is to retain existing definition or modify it if only ‘up to 4 units’ is preferred. Avoid using undefined terms as that will present problems in future interpretations. | HPGI      | As stated above, the Town’s approved term and definition for “Dwelling, Multiplex” has been reinstated.   |
| 122. | 122. A definition of “Rear-Lane” is required for the draft   | Insert into definitions section of draft by-law   | HPGI      | Town’s definition for ‘Rear-Lane’ has been added to Draft Zoning By-Law.  |
| 123. | zoning by-law as Rear-Lane dwellings are proposed and undefined in the parent zoning by-law. This was done in recent zoning by-laws.<br>123.   | <i>Rear-Lane: For the purposes of this zone, means a dwelling with a driveway access to a private or public street or lane adjacent to the rear lot line.</i>                       |           |   |
| 124. | 124. RMD zone stipulates that for Townhouses, minimum/maximum standards shall be in accordance with the RT zone (Section 6.3, Table 6.2, Footnote 12). As such, the maximum number of dwelling units per townhouse dwelling shall be 12.   | Zoning staff recommend that the footnote be adjusted or eliminated as this footnote could be incidentally interpreted to limit the use of ADUs/non-market housing.                  | HPGI      | Under Zone Standards for each of following Townhouse types: Townhouse, Townhouse, Rear-Lane, Townhouse Dual Frontage, Townhouse Back-to-Back and Townhouse Stacked, the following has been added to draft implementing Zoning By-Law:<br><br><i>Minimum / Maximum Standards<br/>Footnote 12 To Table 6.2 (Section 6.3) shall not apply.</i> |
| 126. | 125.<br>126. Based on the review of the draft plan, it appears that street townhouses will comply as the maximum appears to be 8 per block. Footnote 12 will apply to all townhouse types, so there are a few non-compliant back-to-back blocks (644, 645, 647, 646, 648, 649, and future 904). Please review all proposed blocks.<br>127. |   | HPGI      | Not applicable to subject lands. Street townhouse blocks on draft plan include blocks 39 to 43.   |
| 128. | 128. Public Uses are permitted under Section 4.33  | Remove Public Use from permitted uses   | HPGI      | Public Uses have been removed from the list of site-specific permitted uses.  |

|      | STAFF COMMENTS   |   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE  |
|------|--|---|-----------|---|
| 129. | 129. Schools are permitted uses under Section 4.33   | Remove Schools from permitted uses  | HPGI      | Schools have been removed from the list of site-specific permitted uses.  |
| 130. | 130. Parks are permitted under Section 4.33  | Remove Parks from permitted uses  | HPGI      | Parks have been removed from the list of site-specific permitted uses.  |
| 131. | 131. Environmental Management, Forest Management uses in the RMD zone  | Reconsider areas for Environmental Management, Forest Management to be zoned EPA  | HPGI      | Natural Heritage System zoned EPA1-405, refer to Schedule A.  |
| 132. | 132. Post-Secondary Education Facility is an undefined term. Colleges and universities are included under the term “schools” | Remove Post-Secondary Education Facility from permitted uses.   | HPGI      | Post-Secondary Education Facility has been removed from the list of site-specific permitted uses.   |
| 133. | 133. Accessory Uses are permitted uses under Section 4.2   | Remove accessory uses from permitted uses.<br><br>The uses would be reviewed under section 4.2 anyways. Recommend that the applicant review section 4.2 to ensure their intended accessory uses can comply with the provisions.   | HPGI      | Accessory Uses has been removed from the list of site-specific permitted uses.  |
| 134. | 134. Non-market Housing – removal of “for the purposes of this zone”   | Site specific terms or provisions are defined to be specific to the zone. Please retain, this is consistent with other terms.   | HPGI      | ‘For the purposes of this zone’ has been reinstated.  |
| 135. | 135. Non-market Housing – removal of the provisions  | It will be a permitted use but the provisions made it clear that it has to be in complaint building given that it had no specific development standards for the use, rather it would use the development standards for the type of structure it is (i.e. towns/detached/etc). This is significant for interpretation. | HPGI      | ‘Non-Market Housing’ is no longer proposed to be removed in site-specific implementing Zoning By-Law, it has been reinstated per By-Law 2024-055. |
| 136. | 136. Private Garage – “size” removed from provision  | Reinstate. The provision is regarding the size of the private garage.   | HPGI      | ‘Size’ has been reinstated.   |
| 137. | 137. Stormwater management ponds are permitted under Section 4.20 and 4.33.  | Remove Stormwater Management Pond from permitted uses<br><br>Also, of note—by-law does not define Stormwater Management Pond, but utilizes the term “Stormwater Management Facility”.   | HPGI      | Stormwater management ponds has been removed from the list of site-specific permitted uses.<br><br>Noted.   |



|      | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE  |
|------|--|-----------|---|
| 138. | <p>138. Definition of Lane has been restricted</p>                                       | HPGI      | Previously proposed site-specific definition for 'Lane' has been removed so Town definition for 'Lane' per By-Law 2024-055 has been reinstated.   |
| 139. | <p>139. Definition of Street has been restricted (proposes to use parent definition)</p> | HPGI      | Previously proposed site-specific definition for 'street' has been removed so Town definition for 'street' per By-Law 2024-055 has been reinstated.   |
| 140. | <p>140. Dwellings per Lot has been reinstated (therefore Section 4.11 applies)</p>       | HPGI      | A revised implementing Zoning By-law has been prepared to respond to Staff comments. Removal of "dwellings per lot" provision has been removed (so parent By-law as amended by By-law 2024-055 stands). |
| 141. | <p>141. Parking minimums for dwellings reduced within MTSA</p>                           | HPGI      | No change to Draft By-Law. No further action is required as Humberking Lands are located within the MTSA.   |
| 142. | <p>142. Use Restriction provision requires revision</p>                                  | HPGI      | The terms 'daycare' and 'private home' have been removed from the Use Restriction provision and have been replaced with 'day nursery' and 'dwelling unit.'  |

| STAFF COMMENTS  |   | ACTION BY        | RESPONSE   |
|---|---|------------------|--|
| 143.  | 143. Non-residential parking requirements waived for MTSA<br>Note to planner, confirm.<br>Tanjot Bal: Yes – no parking requirement within MTSAs   | HPGI             | Noted. No further action is required.  |
| 144.  | 144. Formatting notes<br>Arial, Size 11.<br>Defined terms (parent or excepted), listed as permitted uses or used within the special standards column must be <i>italicized</i><br>Left justification  | HPGI             | Noted. The Town’s Zoning By-law Amendment conventions have been adhered to. Refer to the accompanying implementing Zoning By-law for further detail. |
| <b>HYDROONE</b>   |   |                  |  |
| 145.  | We are in receipt of your Plan of Subdivision application, 21T-24006C dated September 3rd, 2024. We have reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One’s 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only.   | RTG              | Acknowledged.  |
| 146.  | For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities' the Owner/Applicant should consult their local area Distribution Supplier. Where Hydro One is the local supplier the Owner/Applicant must contact the Hydro subdivision group at subdivision@Hydroone.com or 1-866-272-3330.  | RTG              | Acknowledged.  |
| <b>BELL</b>   |   |                  |  |
| <u>Bell Canada Condition(s) of Approval:</u>  |   |                  |  |
| 147.  | 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.   | Owner            | Acknowledged.  |
| 148.  | 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.  | Owner            | Acknowledged.  |
| 149.  | 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.   | Urbantech<br>RTG | Noted, coordination with Bell Canada is ongoing.   |
| 150.  | 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.                | Owner            | Acknowledged.  |
| 151.  | If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.   | Owner            | Noted.   |
| <u>Concluding Remarks:</u>  |   |                  |  |
| 152.  | 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.   | RTG              | Noted.   |
| 153.  | If you believe that these comments have been sent to you in error or have questions regarding Bell’s protocols for responding to municipal circulations and enquiries, please contact planninganddevelopment@bell.ca directly.  | RTG              | Noted.   |
| 154.  | 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 Bell’s responses and for any of the content herein. | RTG              | Noted.   |
| <b>Comments from the following agencies and departments are attached:</b>   |   |                  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dufferin-Peel Catholic School Board, dated September 11, 2024</li> <li>Peel District School Board, dated September 16, 2024</li> </ul> |   |                  |  |

|   | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY | RESPONSE   |
|---|---|-----------|--|
|   | <b>The following agencies and departments have no concerns:</b>   |           |  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rogers, dated September 3, 2024</li> </ul>   |           |  |
|   | <b>The following agencies and departments have not provided comments and will be provided following receipt:</b>  |           |  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Region of Peel</li> <li>Metrolinx</li> <li>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Transportation</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Legal</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Fire</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Operations</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Community Facilities</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Capital Projects</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Policy</li> <li>Town of Caledon, Natural Heritage</li> </ul>   |           |  |
|   | <b>NEXT STEPS</b>   |           |  |
|   | 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.   |           |  |
|   | Partial resubmissions, which do not address all deficiencies listed in the letter, will not be accepted for processing.   |           |  |
|   | Please ensure that the revised submission includes a cover letter and a comment response matrix. Please see all comments for details on other submission requirements.  |           |  |
|   | 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 <a href="http://www.caledon.ca/development">www.caledon.ca/development</a> , 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. |           |  |
|   | Please note:  |           |  |
| 1.  | The latest Town of Caledon’s Development Standard Policies and Guidelines (Version 5) have been released. An electronic copy is available on the Town of Caledon website for viewing as per the following link: <a href="https://www.caledon.ca/en/townhall/development-standards-policiesguidelines.asp">https://www.caledon.ca/en/townhall/development-standards-policiesguidelines.asp</a> . Please ensure all future engineering drawings are designed in accordance with the latest Town’s engineering standard.   |           | <b>Noted.</b>  |
| 2.  | The Town’s Fees By-law requires recirculation fees for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment (fees subject to change) for any resubmission after the 3rd submission.  |           | <b>Noted.</b>  |
|   | <b>REDLINE COMMENTS:</b>  |           |  |
|   | <b>***PLEASE SEE REDLINE COMMENTS ATTACHED***</b>   |           |  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>A1: Draft Plan of Subdivision</b></li> <li><b>FF1-FF8: Park Facility Fit Key Plan</b></li> </ul>  | HPGI/NAK  | Noted, refer to Draft Plan dated November 14, 2024 and Park Facility Fit Key Plan dated October 3, 2024. |
| <b>Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board</b> |   |           |  |
| <b>September 11, 2024 – Krystina Koops</b>          |   |           |  |
|   | The Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board (DPCDSB) has reviewed the above noted application based on its School Accommodation Criteria and provides the following comments:  |           |  |
|   | The applicant proposes the development of 456 townhouse/medium density units and 575 mixed use units, which are anticipated to yield:   |           |  |

| STAFF COMMENTS   |   | ACTION BY                      | RESPONSE             |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
|--|---|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|-----|-----|---|------------------|----------------|------|------|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 93 Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8 Students; and</li> <li>- 38 Grade 9 to Grade 12 Students</li> </ul>   |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| The proposed development is located within the following school catchment areas which currently operate under the following student accommodation conditions:  |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">Catchment Area</th> <th style="width: 20%;">School</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Enrolment</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Capacity</th> <th style="width: 30%;"># of Portables / Temporary Classrooms</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Elementary School</td> <td>St. Cornelius</td> <td>535</td> <td>741</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Secondary School</td> <td>Robert F. Hall</td> <td>1434</td> <td>1314</td> <td>4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   | Catchment Area                 | School               | Enrolment                             | Capacity | # of Portables / Temporary Classrooms | Elementary School | St. Cornelius | 535 | 741 | 0 | Secondary School | Robert F. Hall | 1434 | 1314 | 4 |  |  |
| Catchment Area   | School  | Enrolment                      | Capacity             | # of Portables / Temporary Classrooms |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| Elementary School  | St. Cornelius   | 535                            | 741                  | 0                                     |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| Secondary School   | Robert F. Hall  | 1434                           | 1314                 | 4                                     |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| <b>The Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board is committed to the phasing of residential development coincidental with the adequate provision and distribution of educational facilities. Therefore, the Board requests that the Town of Caledon include the following school accommodation condition:</b>   |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| <b>"Prior to final approval, the Town of Caledon shall be advised by the School Board(s) that satisfactory arrangements regarding the adequate provision and distribution of educational facilities have been made between the developer/applicant and the School Boards for this plan."</b>   |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| DPCDSB requests that the following conditions be incorporated in the conditions of draft approval:   |   | <b>HPGI</b>                    | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| 1.   | That the applicant shall agree in the Servicing and/or Subdivision Agreement to erect and maintain information signs at all major entrances to the proposed development advising the following:<br>"Please be advised that students may be accommodated elsewhere on a temporary basis until suitable permanent pupil places, funded by the Government of Ontario, are available." These signs shall be to the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board's specifications, at locations determined by the Board and erected prior to registration. |                                | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| 2.   | 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 until the permanent school for the area has been completed.  |                                | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
|  | 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."  |                                | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
|  | 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."  |                                | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
|  | DPCDSB will be reviewing the accommodation conditions in each elementary and secondary planning area on a regular basis and will provide updated comments if necessary.   |                                | <b>Acknowledged.</b> |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| <b>Peel District School Board</b>  |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| <b>September 16, 2024 – Zach Tessaro</b>   |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| The Peel District School Board (PDSB) has reviewed the above-noted application for the proposed development consisting of a mix of townhomes, mixed use and mid-rise buildings with 1,058 residential units located at the above-noted address. PDSB has the following comments based on its School Accommodation Criteria:  |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| The anticipated student yield from this plan is as follows:  |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><b>Kindergarten to Grade 5</b></th> <th style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"><b>Grade 9 to 12</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">171</td> <td style="text-align: center;">66</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>   |   | <b>Kindergarten to Grade 5</b> | <b>Grade 9 to 12</b> | 171                                   | 66       |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| <b>Kindergarten to Grade 5</b>   | <b>Grade 9 to 12</b>  |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| 171  | 66  |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |
| The students generated from this development would reside within the boundaries of the following schools:  |   |                                |                      |                                       |          |                                       |                   |               |     |     |   |                  |                |      |      |   |  |  |



| STAFF COMMENTS                        |   |                  |                 | ACTION BY                    | RESPONSE |               |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------|---------------|
|                                       | Public School   | School Enrolment | School Capacity | Number of Occupied Portables |          |               |
|                                       | Palgrave P.S.   | 560              | 581             | 2                            |          |               |
|                                       | Humberview S.S.   | 1,094            | 1,437           | 2                            |          |               |
|                                       | Please provide a more detailed unit breakdown for the medium density units (number of bedrooms) in order for us to provide a better student yield from this development.  |                  |                 |                              |          |               |
|                                       | PDSB requires the following conditions be placed in the Subdivision Agreement:  |                  |                 |                              | HPGI     | Acknowledged. |
| 1.                                    | Prior to final approval, the Town of Caledon shall be advised by the School Board(s) that satisfactory arrangements regarding the provision and distribution of educational facilities have been made between the developer/applicant and the School Board(s) for this plan.  |                  |                 |                              |          | Acknowledged. |
| 2.                                    | The Peel District School Board requires the following clause be placed in any agreement of purchase and sale entered into with respect to any units on this plan, from the date of registration of the development agreement:   |                  |                 |                              |          | Acknowledged. |
|                                       | a. "Whereas, despite the efforts of the Peel District School Board, sufficient accommodation may not be available for all anticipated students in the neighbourhood schools, you are hereby notified that some students may be accommodated in temporary facilities or bused to schools outside of the area, according to the Board's Transportation Policy #39. You are advised to contact the School Accommodation department of the Peel District School Board to determine the exact schools."  |                  |                 |                              |          | Acknowledged. |
|                                       | b. "The purchaser agrees that for the purposes of transportation to school the residents of the development shall agree that the children will meet the school bus on roads presently in existence or at another designated place convenient to the Peel District School Board. Bus stop locations will be assessed and selected by the Student Transportation of Peel Region's Bus Stop Assessment procedure and process (STOPR012)."  |                  |                 |                              |          | Acknowledged. |
| 3.                                    | PDSB requests that the developer agree to erect and maintain signs at the entrances to the development which shall advise prospective purchasers that due to present school accommodation pressures, some of the children from the development may have to be accommodated in temporary facilities or bused to schools, according to the Peel District Board's Transportation Policy. These signs shall be to the School Board's specifications and at locations determined by the Board.   |                  |                 |                              |          | Acknowledged. |
|                                       | The Board wishes to be notified of the decision of Council with respect to this proposed application.   |                  |                 |                              |          | Noted.        |
|                                       | If you require any further information, please contact me at zach.tessaro@peelsb.com or 905-890-1010, ext. 2217.  |                  |                 |                              |          | Noted.        |
| <b>Enbridge Gas</b>                   |   |                  |                 |                              |          |               |
| <b>August 20, 2024 – Casey O'Neil</b> |   |                  |                 |                              |          |               |
|                                       | Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.   |                  |                 |                              | Owner    | Noted.        |
|                                       | Please always call before you dig, see web link for additional details:<br><a href="https://www.enbridgegas.com/safety/digging-safety-for-contractors">https://www.enbridgegas.com/safety/digging-safety-for-contractors</a>  |                  |                 |                              | Owner    | Noted.        |
|                                       | This response does not constitute a pipe locate, clearance for construction or availability of gas.   |                  |                 |                              |          |               |
|                                       | The applicant shall use the Enbridge Gas Get Connected tool to determine gas availability, service and meter installation details and to ensure all gas piping is installed prior to the commencement of site landscaping and/or asphalt paving.<br>( <a href="https://enbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com/GetConnected_Th/Login2?OriginalURL=https%3A%2F%2Fenbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com%2FGetConnectedApp_UI%2F">https://enbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com/GetConnected_Th/Login2?OriginalURL=https%3A%2F%2Fenbridge.outsystemsenterprise.com%2FGetConnectedApp_UI%2F</a> ) |                  |                 |                              | Owner    | Noted.        |
|                                       | If the gas main(s) needs to be relocated as a result of changes in the alignment or grade of the future road allowances or for temporary gas pipe installations pertaining to phased construction, all costs are the responsibility of the applicant.   |                  |                 |                              | Owner    | Noted.        |
|                                       | In the event that easement(s) are required to service this development, and any future adjacent developments, the applicant will provide the easement(s) to Enbridge Gas at no cost.  |                  |                 |                              | Owner    | Noted.        |

|   | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY    | RESPONSE  |
|---|---|--------------|---|
| <b>Rogers</b>   |   |              |   |
| <b>September 3, 2024</b>  |   |              |   |
|   | Thank you for your letter. Rogers Communications appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on future development within the Town of Caledon.  |              | <b>Noted.</b>   |
|   | We have reviewed the proposed area and do not have any comments or concerns at this time. Rogers currently has existing communications within this area. Please contact Rogers at <a href="mailto:yorkcirculations@rci.rogers.com">yorkcirculations@rci.rogers.com</a> prior to the commencement of construction.   | <b>Owner</b> | <b>Noted.</b>   |
|   | Should you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact York Outside Plant Engineering.   |              | <b>Noted.</b>   |
| <b>Strategic Initiatives</b>                                      |   |              |   |
| <b>September 19, 2024 – Sherry Brake email sent to Tanjot Bal</b> |   |              |   |
|   | Fire:   |              |   |
|   | There is a need for a fire station within Caledon Station Secondary Plan  |              |   |
|   | As per comments provided to 21T-22001C and 21T-22002C, Block 838 is deemed to be suitable for this location as long as all other requirements are met.  | <b>HPGI</b>  | <b>Noted, Fire Station is being provided on adjacent lands. Not applicable to Humberking lands.</b> |
|   | Community Centre:   |              |   |
|   | As per comments provided to 21T-22001C and 21T-22002C, a Community Centre is required to serve the proposed new community. The Community Centre must be in close proximity to the residential neighbourhoods in which it serves and be safely accessible to and from parks and schools. The minimum lot size shall be 10 acres or 4.046 ha of fully developable land and other requirements within the attachment are met.  | <b>HPGI</b>  | <b>Noted, Community Centre is proposed on adjacent lands. Not applicable to Humberking Lands.</b>   |
| <b>Region of Peel</b>   |   |              |   |
| <b>October 8, 2024 – Patrick Amaral</b>                           |   |              |   |
|   | The Region has received a submission for the above-noted application that proposes a Draft Plan of Subdivision and Zoning By-law Amendment application within lands identified as Caledon Station Secondary Plan generally located on the west and east side of Humber Station Road, North of King Street and west of the CP Railway lands.   |              |   |
|   | The application proposes to implement the vision of the Caledon Station Secondary Plan and specifically proposes an estimated 1,058 residential dwelling units in various typologies including mixed use and mid-rise buildings. The proposal also includes a park, stormwater management pond, Natural Heritage system and various blocks for walkways, road widenings, and reserves.  |              |   |
|   | Regional staff note that the related Official Plan Application for the Secondary Plan Area which these lands are located in has been appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) and work is ongoing to resolve remaining issues. Regional staff continue to look forward to working collaboratively with the Town and applicant to address any outstanding items and towards agreeable and satisfactory outcomes.  |              |   |
|   | <b>Planning and Development</b>   |              |   |
|   | As of July 1, 2024, the Region’s status as an upper-tier municipality with planning responsibilities under the Planning Act will be removed. Once in effect, lower-tier municipalities will assume planning policy and approval responsibilities of the regional municipality, including primary responsibility for all planning in their geographies, except for matters requiring provincial approval. Per section 70.13(2), the Region's official plan will be deemed to constitute the official plan of the Town of Caledon, and conformity will still be required until such time as Caledon amends Peel’s Official Plan and approval is provided by the Province. Therefore, as of July 1, 2024, the current Region of Peel Official Plan has become the Town of Caledon’s Official Plan and shall be implemented by the Town of Caledon. |              |   |
|   | Beyond July 1 2024, the Region’s mandate will continue to include the provision of hard and soft services to the community, including but not limited to water and wastewater servicing, transportation, waste management, affordable housing, health services, emergency services, etc. To this end the Region will continue to have an interest in community building to ensure the efficient, financially sustainable and effective delivery of infrastructure and services. Should the Minister decide that water wastewater, roads or waste are to be delivered by other entities outside of Peel, the Regional role will be reexamined at that time.  |              |   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The associated Official Plan Amendment (OPA) application POPA 2021-0002, is still under review and</li> </ul>  | <b>HPGI</b>  | <b>Noted.</b>   |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE  |
|--|--|-----------|---|
|  | currently under appeal to the OLT.   |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At this time, the Region is not in a position to provide conditions of Draft Plan Approval. Revisions to received submission material is required as noted in the comments detailed in this letter.</li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Noted.  |
|  | <b>Community-Wide Development Staging and Sequencing Plan</b>  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please Include a table with a breakdown of what each phase consists of (e.g. land use designation, net area, number of units/jobs, estimated population/jobs).</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Humberking lands fully located within Phase 1. Refer to Interim Plan (Drawing 104) enclosed with Functional Servicing Report and Phasing Plan prepared by HPGI dated Nov 14, 2024.  |
|  | <b>Housing Assessment</b>  |           |   |
|  | Regional staff acknowledge that the Secondary Plan includes provision to dedicate lands to the Region for purpose-built affordable housing. The applicant has noted these lands to be in the northeastern quadrant of the Caledon Station community. Further discussion is required with the applicants of the Secondary Plan in determining the location of these lands as Town staff have requested these lands to be in a more central location and in an earlier phase to meet housing needs of Caledon earlier. Regional staff are available to support these discussions. Generally, the Region would require a site that is fully serviced with appropriate future access to transit and general amenities (i.e. commercial sites and schools/community centres), and unencumbered lands (i.e. one complete block). | HPGI      | The Secondary Plan proposes to dedicate a total land area of 0.91 hectares (2.25 acres) to the Region for purpose-built affordable housing. Following further review, Regional staff have confirmed that they are satisfied with the total land area and location identified in the Secondary Plan and Development Staging and Sequencing Plan (DSSP) dated November 2024.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once a suitable location is determined and noted on the Development Staging and Sequencing Plan (DSSP), the Region will work with the applicant through the draft plan of subdivision to convey the land through registration of the plan.</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Refer to response above.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the currently proposed location, the Region would require one complete block. It is unknown at the moment if these lands would be conveyed through one or multiple draft plan of subdivisions.</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Refer to response above.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Region requests a demonstration plan to indicate the layout of the future mid-rise built form.</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Refer to response above.  |
|  | <i>Additional Housing comments</i>   |           |   |
|  | This application is located within an area that is a priority community for child care expansion. The applicant is encouraged to explore the opportunity of co-locating a licensed childcare centre within the proposed development, such as in ground floor mixed-use or indoor amenity spaces, where feasible. Please contact Paul Lewkowicz at paul.lewkowicz@peelregion.ca who can connect the applicant with staff in the Region of Peel’s Human Services Early Years and Child Care Services Division.   | Owner     | Acknowledged.   |
|  | <b>Development Engineering</b>   |           |   |
|  | The Draft Caledon Station Secondary Plan area includes lands within the boundary of the ROPA 30 and the 2051 New Urban Area. The Region has identified servicing strategies and projects to service the areas within ROPA 30 and some of the strategies outlined and proposed projects may support servicing Secondary Plan lands within the 2051 New Urban Area. However, these strategies require further analysis and refinements, and could also include the advancement of certain key downstream projects. Development in the area must also comply with all relevant Region and Town requirements, including those outlined in the Town of Caledon and Regional Official Plans for ROPA 30 and the 2051 New Urban Area.   | Urbantech | Noted. No further action is required at this time.  |
|  | The Region is currently developing a detailed servicing strategy for this Secondary Plan area (including ROPA 30 lands) as part of the 2025 Water and Wastewater Master Plan. The Region and applicant will continue to work closely together and coordinate as servicing strategies and arrangements for these lands are finalized.   | Urbantech | Noted. No further action is required at this time.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once the details of the servicing strategy have been finalized and agreed upon, a revised Functional Servicing Report (FSR) showing proposed water and wastewater servicing plans for the subdivision lands and provision for the adjacent lands is required for review and approval by the Region.</li> </ul>  |           | See response above.   |
|  | <b>Sanitary Sewer Facilities</b>   |           |   |
|  | Municipal sanitary sewer facilities consist of:  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 300-mm PVC local sewer (circa 2010) on King St, east of CN rail. This sewer conveys sanitary flows through the local collection system to the 525-mm sanitary trunk sewer on Coleraine Drive</li> </ul>   |           | The sanitary trunk sewer from Countryside Drive to Healy Road is now proposed as a 1200 mm diameter sewer due to the suitability for a micro tunnelling operation. This sewer is at 90% design and construction has not commenced yet. The subject development is proposed to ultimately outlet to this sewer via a new 1200 mm sanitary trunk extending south from King Street to Healy Road which will be front ended by the developer and constructed ahead of the |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A new 750-mm sanitary trunk sewer on Humber Station Road, from Countryside Drive to Healey Rd, constructed this year. This was extended from the 750-mm sanitary trunk sewer on Clarkway Drive.</li> </ul>  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both the new 750-mm sanitary trunk sewer on Humber Station Rd and the 525-mm sanitary trunk sewer</li> </ul>  |           |   |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY               | RESPONSE  |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|
|  | <p>on Coleraine Drive convey flows to the Brampton-Bolton Trunk Sewer, which eventually conveys flows to the G.E. Booth WWTP</p>  |                         | <p><b>subject development. This sewer is currently in the design stage and a 50% design submission will be filed with the Region.</b></p> <p>Internal and External Sanitary Servicing Plans are included in Drawing 801 and 802 of the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. The Internal Sanitary Servicing Plan shows the proposed servicing of the subdivision lands, and the External Servicing Plan shows how the adjacent lands will be serviced. These plans include the latest information available to date.</p> |
|  | <p>There are several DC projects planned in this area to service future growth in the West Bolton and SP47 area. Based off the 2024 DC map, these are:</p>  |                         | <p><b>As noted in the response above, the sanitary sewer on Humber Station Road is being constructed as a 1200 mm diameter sewer. This sewer is proposed as the outlet for the subject draft plan lands (BRES-3) as well as the future growth lands identified on drawing 801. The estimated population densities for the external future growth lands and existing sewers capacity downstream are to be confirmed by the Region.</b></p>   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a 600-mm sanitary sewer on King Street, Emil Kolb Parkway and Coleraine Drive from Humber Station Road to the existing 750-mm sanitary trunk sewer on Coleraine Drive north of George Bolton Parkway. Scheduled for construction in 2026 under project number # 24-2196.</li> </ul>  |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a 525-mm sanitary sewer on King Street from Humber Station Road to The Gore Road. Scheduled for construction in 2032 under project number #29-2199;</li> </ul>   |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a 675-mm sanitary sewer on Humber Station Road from the new 750-mm sanitary sewer at Healey Road to the future 525-mm sanitary sewer at King Street. Scheduled for construction in 2026 under project number # 24-2194.</li> </ul>   |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External easements and construction will be required.</li> </ul>   |                         |   |
|  | <p><b>Water Facilities</b></p>  |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lands are located within Water Pressure Zone 7 supply system.</li> </ul>   |                         | <p><b>A Water Distribution Plan showing the proposed watermain servicing for the subject lands is included in Drawing 901 of the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024.</b></p>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing infrastructure consist of:</li> </ul>   |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A 300-mm PVC distribution main (circa 2003) on King St, east of CN rail (PZ-6)</li> </ul>  |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A 150-mm PVC distribution main (circa 1979) on Humber Station Road, and a 150-mm PVC distribution main (circa 1985) on the Gore Road (PZ-6). These pipelines terminate about 2km south of King St which is the southern edge of the subject site</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Urbantech</b></p> |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A 200-mm PVC distribution main (circa 1986) that runs along Mayfield Road connecting to the two 150-mm distribution mains described above (PZ-6)</li> </ul>  |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A 750mm CPP transmission main (circa 2002) that runs along Mayfield Road and continuing up Coleraine Drive which transfers water to the Bolton Elevated Tanks (PZ-6).</li> </ul>   |                         |   |
|  | <p>There are several DC projects planned in this area to service future growth in the West Bolton area. Based off the 2024 DC map, the DC projects are:</p>   |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Macville Elevated tank (ET) (PZ-7), located near the north-east corner of the subject area, is scheduled for construction in 2032 under project #29-1999. There is currently an EA in progress for this ET. The ET will be supplied by a 900mm transfer main, scheduled for construction in 2032 under project # 29- 1299, from the proposed new Sandhill Pumping Station, schedule for construction in 2031 under project number #29-1999. The proposed Macville ET will create a new pressure zone (PZ-7) that will cover the subject area.</li> </ul> |                         | <p><b>Noted. No further action is required.</b></p>   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A North Bolton Booster Pumping Station located at the intersection of King St West and Coleraine Dr, scheduled for construction in 2026 under project #24-1969. Note this is shown in the DC map as located near the intersection with King St, however current plans are to move it further south. This will provide pressure to the West Bolton areas while the new Macville ET is constructed.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Urbantech</b></p> |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a 1500-mm PZ-6B transmission main from the existing 1050-mm stub at the north side of King Street to the North Bolton Booster PS, scheduled for construction in 2026 under project number #24-1266.</li> </ul>   |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a 600mm PZ-7B watermain, supplied from the North Bolton Booster PS, on King St from Emil Kolb Pkwy to Humber Station Rd, on the southern edge of the subject area, scheduled for construction in 2026 under project number #24-1190.</li> </ul>  |                         |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• External easements and construction will be required.</li> </ul>   |                         |   |
|  | <p>The scope of planned water capital projects within and around the subdivision area requires further refinement</p>   | <p><b>Urbantech</b></p> | <p><b>Noted. No further action is required.</b></p>   |



|  | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY | RESPONSE   |
|--|---|-----------|--|
|  | and updates to be finalized. The ROPA 30 Class EA process (which is currently underway) will determine the water servicing strategy.  |           |  |
|  | <b>General comments</b>   |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All costs associated with servicing of the proposed development will be at the applicant's expense.</li> </ul>   | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Servicing of the subdivision Plan will require construction of oversized watermains and sanitary sewers which are the financial responsibility of the Region as per Development Charges By-law and Policy F40-06. Should the Developer wish to proceed with the works in order to obtain clearance of the Draft Plan conditions at a time when the Region is not prepared to fund the works, then the Developer will be required to enter into a Front-Ending Agreement prior to the construction of the works. This Agreement will be subject to the Region's determination that it has or will have sufficient funds to justify entering into the Front-Ending Agreement, Regional Council approval and according to Policy F40-06. Otherwise, the servicing of the subject Plan will need to wait until the Region constructs the required DC infrastructure as described above.</li> </ul> | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Developer is advised that the Region has undertaken design and construction of the following DC works:</li> </ul>  | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. a 600mm (Pressure Zone 5) watermain on Clarkway Drive from Countryside Drive to Mayfield Road;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. a 400mm (Pressure Zone 6) watermain on Humber Station Road from Mayfield Road to Healey Road;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. a 1200mm sanitary trunk sewer on Clarkway Drive/Humber Station Road from Countryside Drive to Healey Road.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The Region anticipates a year and a half construction period with a completion date of Spring 2026. It is recommended that the Developer or its consultant contacts the Region to clarify specific watermain and sanitary sewer requirements prior to preparation of detailed engineering plans and/or reports.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restriction on transfer or charge for all lots and blocks within the subdivision Plan will be registered on title until the external sanitary sewers and watermains to service the subdivision Plan have been completed to the Region's satisfaction. The Developer will be responsible for all costs in respect of said restriction on title.</li> </ul>  | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Servicing Lots and Blocks fronting Laneways must be from the approved public R.O.W. in accordance with the Town's standard drawings where Regional underground services are permitted. The proposed Lots fronting Frizzle Lane cannot be serviced by municipal water and wastewater services in accordance with the Town's current approved standard drawings where Region's underground services are not permitted.</li> </ul>  | Urbantech | Sanitary and water servicing of the proposed lots fronting Frizzle Lane will be provided from the Newlove Avenue and Pastoral Street ROW's with the exception of the last 4 units at the east end which will require a servicing easement adjacent to the park block to provide sanitary and watermain servicing.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The developer will be required to obtain and dedicate easements (if any) as required by the Region for Regional infrastructure, at no cost to the Region.</li> </ul>   | Owner     | Noted.   |
|  | <b>Regional Roads</b>   |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed subdivision Plan abuts King Street (Regional Road #9).</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Noted.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Region of Peel will not permit any changes to grading within King Street's ROW along the frontage of the limits of the subdivision Plan.</li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Noted.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No lots or blocks shall have direct access to the Regional roads. Any future access shall be in accordance with The Region Access Control By-law.</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Noted. Access provided along Humber Station Road.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under no circumstances should the flow of storm water from the subdivision Plan be diverted into the Regional right-of-ways (by pipe or channel).</li> </ul>   | Urbantech | Noted. The storm servicing design has been revised to redirect the ROW area at the south end of Nattress Street to SWM Pond 1 by introducing a major system capture point at the intersection with King Street. This will ensure that no storm drainage from the subdivision will be directed to the Regional ROW. Refer to the updated Drawing 501 in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Developer shall submit to the satisfaction of the Region:</li> </ul>   |           |  |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY      | RESPONSE  |
|--|--|----------------|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Storm Water Management Report to determine and demonstrate, that there is no adverse effect from the subdivision Plan area on the existing structures and drainage along Regional roads;</li> </ul>   | Urbantech      | A Storm Drainage Study Report is not warranted in our opinion. The requested detail is provided in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. Refer to updated SWM plan in Drawing 501. No drainage flows are directed to the Regional Road (King Street).   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic Impact Study (TIS) detailing the impact of the subdivision plan area on the Regional road network and identifying any mitigation measures.</li> </ul>   | BA Group       | A Traffic Impact Study (July 2024) detailing the impact of the Draft Plan of Subdivision on the Regional Road network has been prepared. Refer to the Caledon Station Transportation Study for further detail.  |
|  | <b>Stormwater Management</b>   |                |   |
|  | The stormwater management of the development sites must adhere to and comply with the Region of Peel’s stormwater management policies in the Region’s Official Plan (Stormwater 2.6.20), Storm Design Criteria and other requirements Design, standards specification and procedures.  | Urbantech      | The proposed SWM strategy complies with the Region of Peel’s stormwater management policies, criteria and design standards. A Storm Drainage Study Report is not warranted in our opinion as the requested details are provided in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. Refer to the updated SWM plan in Drawing 501 for further detail. No drainage flows are directed to the Regional Road (King Street).  |
|  | A Storm Drainage Study Report to the satisfaction of the Region is required to determine and demonstrate, that there is no adverse effect from the subdivision Plan area on the existing structures and drainage along Regional roads. We note further comments below based on our review of the stormwater management report.   | Urbantech      |   |
|  | We acknowledge these comments are related to the overall secondary plan area, however the following comments will need to be resolved before the subdivision advances:   |                | See responses below.  |
|  | <i>Dwg. No. 502 – Minor &amp; Major System Storm Servicing Plan</i>  |                |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is acknowledged that Pond 2A will outlet to a roadside ditch which ultimately crosses the Region’s ROW (King Street). Please note that the outlet headwall should not be located within the Region’s ROW. Culvert capacity analysis should be conducted to meet Pipe Crossing Design Flood Frequency Requirements as per section 5.17 – Culverts and Crossings of the Stormwater Design Criteria. Refer to the Region’s stormwater design criteria here: <a href="https://www.peelregion.ca/public-works/designstandards/pdf/stormwater-design-criteria-201906.pdf">https://www.peelregion.ca/public-works/designstandards/pdf/stormwater-design-criteria-201906.pdf</a></li> </ul>  | Urbantech      | The Pond 2A outlet headwall is not located within the Region’s ROW. Culvert capacity analysis has been undertaken as per the Region’s criteria and the proposed culvert upgrades and have been included in the updated Section 6.3.8 in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further discussion will be required regarding runoff from street next to Pond 1 discharging into the Region’s storm sewer on King Street. Please note that the Region of Peel has a Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approval (CLI ECA # 009-S701), for the Regional Municipality of Peel Stormwater Management System. Therefore, it is the Region’s mandate that no external flows are permitted, that outflow is discouraged during development or redevelopment of lands with existing drainage towards Region’s Right-of-way, and that no new connections are made to regional roads. To view the Region’s CLI ECA stormwater requirements for storm connections, please go to this link: <a href="https://peelregion.ca/publicworks/design-standards/pdf/cliECA-swm-criteria.pdf">https://peelregion.ca/publicworks/design-standards/pdf/cliECA-swm-criteria.pdf</a>.</li> </ul> | Urbantech      | Refer to the updated SWM Plan in Drawing 501 of the FSR, which has been revised to ensure no external flows to the Regional ROW as per CLI ECA requirements. The entire ROW of Nattress Street is now captured by a major capture point and conveyed to Pond 1. This has also been reflected in the Final FSR, dated October 2024.  |
|  | <b>Hydrogeological Review</b>  |                |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional staff have reviewed the Preliminary Hydrological investigation prepared by DS Consultants dated June 11, 2024, and offer the following comments to be included within a revised report:</li> </ul>   |                | See responses.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The report is to include a well survey and contingency plan for potential impacts to private wells.</li> </ul>  | DS Consultants | The revised hydrogeological investigation (October 2024) includes a well survey and contingency plan for impact to private wells. Permanent drainage values have been revised in the updated hydrogeological investigation.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The report is to include permanent dewatering estimates for Medium Density Residential Blocks, Townhouse &amp; Single Detached Units and SWM Pond 2A.</li> </ul>  | DS Consultants | Permanent dewatering estimates for SWM Pond 2A has been revised in the updated hydrogeological investigation (October 2024). Permanent drainage for medium density residential blocks, townhouses and single detached units are addressed in section 7.5 of the hydrogeological investigation (October 2024). The basements of the residential blocks will likely be constructed above the water table and with a water-proofing membrane. A perimeter drainage system will be installed, however all collected percolating stormwater will be discharged to landscaped/vegetated areas of individual residential lots. |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition, the following information must be submitted once available by the applicant:</li> </ul>  |                |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copy of the EASR/PTTW from MECP</li> </ul>  | DS Consultants | Acknowledged  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copy of permit to discharge from utility authority (if applicable, i.e. discharge directed towards municipal sewer)</li> </ul>  | DS Consultants | Acknowledged  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copy of the dewatering discharge plan submitted to conservation authority (i.e. discharge directed towards NHS)</li> </ul>  | DS Consultants | Acknowledged  |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE  |
|--|--|-----------|---|
|  | <b>Transportation and Traffic Development</b>  |           |   |
|  | The Region is currently updating our Transportation Master Plan and additional study elements including the Road Characterization Study (RCS).   |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff note that there are future works currently programmed as part of Peel's 10 Year Capital Budget and Plan in the vicinity of the application:</li> </ul>  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>King Street Grade Separated Crossing: King Street Over the CP Rails (2030)</li> </ul>   |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An Environmental Assessment (EA) is planned to commence in approximately 2027 for a grade separation on King St at the CP Railway east of Humber Station Road (the crossing is currently at-grade). EA commencement is subject to annual Council approval of the Capital Program.</li> </ul>  |           |   |
|  | <i>Requested Site-Specific Traffic Impact Study</i>  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A site-specific Traffic Impact Study is requested to be undertaken;</li> </ul>  | BA Group  | <p>Peel Region was contacted for growth and signal timing information in the preparation of the July 2024 TIS. Further to this, BA Group has followed up through the Town for confirmation on the latest TMC, AADT, collision data and TMP modelling outputs (EMME) to compare with the Secondary Plan Transportation Study. EMME modelling outputs remain outstanding. Regardless, auxiliary lanes are proposed on Regional Road intersections, as shown in Figure 11, 12, and 13 of the July 2024 Transportation Study and functional road design and detailed design can confirm the arrangement of auxiliary turning lanes within the Region's right-of-way.</p> <p>Updates to Functional Road Design are awaiting comments and consensus with the Town on cross-section design across the community.</p> |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please visit the link here for the detailed Region of Peel TIS formatting and contact information for background traffic (growth rate, AADT, signal timing, etc.).</li> </ul>   | BA Group  | See response above.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please note that auxiliary turn lanes are required at the existing intersection of Humber Station Road and King Street. Storage and tapers to TAC standards are required;</li> </ul>  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Region acknowledges that no access is being proposed off of King Street for Phase 1B – Access to be from Humber Station Road.</li> </ul>  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Region will require 2.0m paved shoulders along the frontage of King Street.</li> </ul>  |           |   |
|  | <b>Land Dedication</b>   |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Region requests the gratuitous dedication of lands to meet the Town of Caledon's Official Plan requirement for Regional Road 9 (King Street) which has a right of way of 35.5 metres, 17.75 metres from the centreline of the road allowance, within 245 metres of an intersection to protect for the provision of but not limited to: utilities, sidewalks, multiuse pathways and transit bay/shelters;</li> </ul> | HPGI      | Acknowledged. Right of way width shown on draft plan dated Nov 14, 2024.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Region will require the gratuitous dedication of a 15 x 15 m daylight triangle at the intersection of King Street and Humber Station Road.</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Noted, 15 x 15 m daylight triangle provided at the intersection of King Street and Humber Station Road. Refer to draft plan of subdivision.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Region will require the gratuitous dedication of a 0.3 metre reserve along the frontage Regional Road 9 (King Street) behind the property line and daylight triangle;</li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Noted, 0.3 m reserve provided along the back of King Street and daylight triangle. Refer to draft plan of subdivision   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant is required to gratuitously dedicate these lands to the Region, free and clear of all encumbrances. All costs associated with the transfer are the responsibility of the applicant. The applicant must provide the Region with the necessary title documents and reference plan(s) to confirm the Regions right-of-way;</li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Noted.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscaping, signs, fences, cranes, gateway features or any other encroachments are not permitted within the Region's easements and/or Right of Way limits.</li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Acknowledged.   |
|  | <b>Engineering Requirements</b>  |           |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian infrastructure may be required across the frontage of this site; confirmation will be provided after consultation with the Project Manager of any future road widening projects.</li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Noted.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A detailed engineering submission of road and access works will be required for our review and comment, designed, stamped and signed by a Licensed Ontario Professional Engineer. The engineering submission must include the removals, new construction and grading, typical sections and pavement</li> </ul>  | Urbantech | Noted. No further action is required.   |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY | RESPONSE   |
|--|---|-----------|--|
|  | markings and signing drawings. All works within Region of Peel’s right of way must be designed in accordance to the Public Works, “Design Criteria and Development Procedures Manual” and “Material Specifications and Standard Drawings Manual”;   |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Owner shall submit to the Region a detailed cost estimate, stamped and signed by a Licensed Ontario Professional Engineer, of the proposed road and access works within the Regional right of way;</li> </ul>  | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Securities shall be submitted in the form of either a letter of credit or certified cheque, in the amount of 100% of the approved estimated cost of road and access works along Regional Road 9 (King Street);</li> </ul>  | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 10.8% engineering and inspection fee shall be paid to the Region based on the approved estimated cost of road and access works (minimum \$1,724.41);</li> </ul>  | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Owner will be required to submit the following prior to commencement of works within the Region’s right-of-way:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed Road Occupancy Permit and a permit fee as per the Region’s user fees and charges By-law;</li> <li>Completed Notice to Commence Work ;</li> <li>Provide proof of insurance with the Region of Peel added to the certificate as an additional insured with \$5 million minimum from the Contractor;</li> <li>Please note that any proposed construction within the Region of Peel’s right of way is pending PUC approval (minimum six week process). Please note that PUC circulation requirements have recently changed. We require PDF version of the full drawing set it is to be sent via email, and cannot exceed 10MB per email.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All costs associated with the design and construction of road and access works will be 100% paid by the Owner;</li> </ul>  | Owner     | Acknowledged.  |
|  | <b>Healthy Communities</b>  |           |  |
|  | <b>Green Development Standard</b>   |           |  |
|  | Regional staff did not receive a Green Development Standard submission within the materials received, notwithstanding this, should this be an item required by Town staff the following comments are provided.  |           | <b>Noted. Green Development Standard checklist provided.</b> |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.4 – The tool has reached a Gold threshold on the Street Connectivity, Streetscape Characteristics and Efficient Parking metrics. Therefore, it satisfies this GDS requirement.</li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Noted.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.6-Many of the proposed residential dwellings are within close proximity to a park and it appears that just over 75% of the dwellings are in proximity to other neighbourhood amenities. We look forward to further clarification on fulfillment of the metric, based on what will be provided in the mixed use blocks and other commercial areas.</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Noted.   |
|  | <b>Healthy Development Framework</b>  |           |  |
|  | After review of the completed Healthy Development Assessment, we are pleased to see the efforts made to create a healthy built environment through the design of the street network, land use mix and density. The role of the built environment can have a significant impact on human health and sustainability. Creating dense, compact neighbourhoods can encourage being physically active in our daily lives and promote using active transportation over private automobiles. In designing the subdivision plan there is an opportunity to establish a well connected and serviced neighbourhood. Some additional considerations are below:  |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We look forward to seeing the sidewalks labelled on the street in the future detailed design.</li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Noted.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blocks 47 and 59 will require a small scale HDA submitted at the time of development. Additional comments may be forthcoming. Small-scale: <a href="https://peelregion.ca/healthy-communities/pdf/HDA-small-scale-toolfillable.pdf">https://peelregion.ca/healthy-communities/pdf/HDA-small-scale-toolfillable.pdf</a></li> </ul>  | HPGI      | Noted.   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exposure to natural environments can have a positive impact on the overall mental health and wellbeing of residents.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include green infrastructure in non-traditional spaces.</li> <li>Include visible green areas in that allow for public access.</li> <li>Please also ensure that amenity, outdoor spaces and parks are designed to support multi-</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   | HPGI      | Noted.   |



|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY | RESPONSE   |
|--|--|-----------|--|
|  | generational use. Considerations can include design elements which support physical activity, such as an array of visual and sensory experiences and landscaping along the sidewalks and or walking paths.   |           |  |
|  | <b>Waste Development</b>   |           |  |
|  | Prior to Draft Plan Approval of the subdivision, the applicant must submit a Waste Management Plan that demonstrates that conditions of Section 2.0 and 3.0 of the Waste Collection Standards Manual (WCDSM) have been met to the satisfaction of the Region of Peel.  | Owner     | <b>Noted. A Waste Management Plan for ground-oriented housing components will be prepared and provided in support of the future detailed design stage.</b>   |
|  | 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) conditions being met and labelled on a drawing:   | Owner     | <b>Noted.</b>  |
|  | <b>The Waste Management Plan Must Demonstrate the Following:</b>   |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection vehicle access route must be shown on the drawing. See section 2.0 of the WCDSM for requirements.</li> </ul>   | Owner     | <b>Noted, see response above.</b>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>  | Owner     | <b>Noted, see response above.</b>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A minimum of 3.75 square meters (2.5 meters by 1.5 meters) must be provided in the garage,</li> </ul>   | Owner     | <b>Noted, see response above.</b>  |
|  | <b>Medium Density and Mixed-use Blocks</b>   |           |  |
|  | Prior to Site Plan Approval, the Region of Peel will provide Front-End Collection of garbage and recyclable materials for the residential units within the development. The developer is required to submit a Waste Management Plan that complies with the specifications detailed in Section 2.0 and 4.0 of the Waste Collection Design Standards Manual (WCDSM).   | Owner     | <b>Noted. No further action is required at this time.</b>  |
|  | Through proceeding development stages for the Medium Density and Mixed-Use blocks a Waste Management Plan will be required to demonstrate how the WCDSM will be met. As an Example, the Waste Management Plan for Development must meet and illustrate the WCDSM Requirements listed below:  | Owner     | <b>Noted. A Waste Management Plan for the Medium Density and Stacked Townhouse development components will be prepared and provided in support of the future detailed design stage. No further action is required.</b> |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collection vehicle access route throughout the sites must be shown on a Waste Management Plan. See section 2: of the WCDSM for access route requirements.</li> </ul>  |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All bins of a single stream, whichever is larger, must be shown in the collection point areas. The collection point areas must also show 10 square meters for the set-out of Bulky Items. See Appendix 9: of the WCDSM for collection point requirements.</li> </ul>  |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The internal waste storage rooms must be large enough to contain all the required number of front-end bins and allow for easy movement of the bins. It must also show 10 square meters for the set-out of Bulky Items. See Appendix 6: and 7: for Cart and Front-End Bin dimensions and calculations, (Note, developments calculations must be shown on Waste Management Plan). See Appendix 13 &amp; 14: for a sample drawing of a Waste Storage Room that illustrates these requirements.</li> </ul>  |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please Note: Under the Food and Organic Waste Framework in Ontario statement and the potential that the Region of Peel may have an organics collection program for residential buildings in the future, the Region of Peel is recommending residential buildings install a dedicated chute for organic material. In addition, the Region is recommending the waste storage area rooms will need to be larger to accommodate future organics bins. The rooms will also need to be well ventilated, equipped with running water and sewer drain for washdown, be well lit, located away from fresh air intakes and have measures for pest control.</li> </ul> |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private waste collection is required for non-residential waste within mixeduse residential buildings. Garbage Rooms that is intended for non-residential waste storage must be shown on the Waste Management Plan, kept, and arranged separately from residential waste.</li> </ul>   |           |  |
|  | <b>Additional comments:</b>  |           |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For more information, please consult the following:</li> </ul>  |           |  |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY      | RESPONSE   |
|--|--|----------------|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Waste Collection Design Standards Manual available at: <a href="https://peelregion.ca/public-works/design-standards/pdf/wastecollection-design-standards-manual.pdf">https://peelregion.ca/public-works/design-standards/pdf/wastecollection-design-standards-manual.pdf</a></li> </ul>   |                |  |
|  | If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the undersigned at 905-791-7800 ext. 4093, or by email at: <a href="mailto:patrick.amaral@peelregion.ca">patrick.amaral@peelregion.ca</a>  |                |  |
| <b>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)</b><br><b>October 16, 2024 – Michael Hynes</b> |  |                |  |
|  | Further to your circulation letter dated August 15, 2024 this letter acknowledges receipt of the 1st submission circulation for the above noted applications. TRCA staff have reviewed the materials identified in Appendix ‘A’ circulated by the Town of Caledon and offer the following comments. Detailed comments have been provided in Appendix ‘B’.  |                |  |
|  | <b>TRCA Role</b>   |                |  |
|  | TRCA have reviewed the application in accordance with the Conservation Authorities Act and its associated regulations, which require TRCA to provide programs and services related to the risk of natural hazards within this jurisdiction. Whether acting on behalf of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) or as a public body under the Planning Act, Conservation Authorities (CA’s) must help to ensure that decisions under the Planning Act are consistent with the natural hazards policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and conform to any natural hazard policies in a provincial plan. |                |  |
|  | <b>Recommendation</b>  |                |  |
|  | Based on the comments provided in Appendix B, TRCA staff have several issues that will require resolution before providing the Town of Caledon the Conditions of Draft Approval. Specific comments that need to be addressed include the following:  |                |  |
|  | Geotechnical   |                |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The grading for the Greenway Corridor should be reviewed by a geotechnical engineer to ensure that the proposed side slopes are stable in the long term.</li> </ul>   | Urbantech      | Noted, see response to comment 1 (Appendix ‘B’) below.   |
|  | Hydrogeology   |                |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please clarify why the post-development deficit increased from 21,852 m<sup>3</sup> to 34,803 m<sup>3</sup> when the pre-development infiltration estimate increased from 138,717 m<sup>3</sup> to 144,413 m<sup>3</sup>.</li> </ul>  | DS Consultants | See response to comment 3 (Appendix ‘B’) below.  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TRCA hydrogeology staff do not support permanent dewatering. It is recommended that a design be considered that does not necessitate permanent dewatering.</li> </ul>   | DS Consultants | See response to comment 4 (Appendix ‘B’) below.  |
|  | Water Resources  |                |  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide erosion control measures to achieve the onsite retention of 5mm of runoff from all impervious areas using low impact development techniques.</li> </ul>  | Urbantech      | Refer to the updated Section 6.1 and 6.4.3 in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. The erosion control criteria for the Main Humber Catchments is retention of the first 5 mm of rainfall as per TRCA criteria. The required retention volumes are achieved through a combination of on-site retention (infiltration/evapotranspiration LIDs) for site plan blocks, lot-level measures (downspout disconnection, additional topsoil), as well as ROW LIDs (tree pits and modular soil cells). |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please demonstrate how the site (Catchments 101, 102, and 103) will meet TRCA's erosion control criteria, specifically through the detention of runoff from a 25mm storm event over 24 to 48 hours and onsite retention of 5mm of runoff from all impervious areas, to prevent instream erosion.</li> </ul>   | Urbantech      | See above response for 5 mm retention. The detention of the 25 mm storm event is not required as no ponds are proposed for these catchments (101 to 103).  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TRCA requires applicants to provide an adaptive management plan along with a post-implementation monitoring strategy. Please submit an adaptive management plan, outlining how it will be implemented if post-implementation monitoring indicates the need to either increase water flow to the feature or divert runoff away from the wetland.</li> </ul>  | Urbantech      | The adaptive management plan can be provided at detailed design stage. This does not impact the current proposed design for feature-based water balance in the accompanying FSR, dated October 2024.   |
|  | TRCA looks forward to working with the applicant to resolve the outstanding issues noted above and in Appendix ‘B’. At this time, the Conditions of Draft Approval will not be provided until the applicant resolves these outstanding issues.   |                |  |
|  | We trust these comments are of assistance. Should you have any questions, please contact me at <a href="mailto:michael.hynes@trca.ca">michael.hynes@trca.ca</a> .  |                |  |

|    | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY      | RESPONSE  |
|----|--|----------------|---|
|    | <b>Appendix 'A': Materials Reviewed by TRCA</b>  |                |   |
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subdivision Cover Letter , Humphries Planning Group Inc. August 1, 2024</li> <li>Cover Letter ZBA, Humphries Planning Group, August 12, 2024</li> <li>Revised Draft Plan of Subdivision, Humphries Planning Group, June 5, 2024</li> <li>Caledon Station Community Wide Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan Draft Plans of Subdivisions, Beacon Environmental Limited, July 3, 2024</li> <li>Caledon Station Community Design Plan, Humphries Planning Group</li> <li>TRCA Regulated Map</li> <li>Environmental Site Assessment (West), Soil Engineers Ltd, December 12, 2022</li> <li>Environmental Site Assessment (East), Soil Engineers Ltd, December 12, 2022</li> <li>Caledon Station Functional Servicing Report, Urbantech, 3rd submission, June 2024</li> <li>Revised Community Wide Geotechnical Report, DS Consultants Ltd., June 25, 2024</li> <li>Geotechnical Report, Soil Engineers Ltd, December 2021</li> <li>Hydrogeological Investigation, DS Consultants, June 11, 2024</li> <li>Landscape Plan (East), NAK Design, December 21, 2023</li> <li>Landscape Plan (West), NAK Design, December 21, 2023</li> <li>Staging and Sequencing Plan, NAK Design and GSAI, May 2024</li> <li>Planning Justification Report, Humphries Planning Group Inc., July 2024</li> <li>Zoning By-law Amendment, Humphries Planning Group Inc., August 12, 2024</li> <li>Zoning By-law Matrix, GSAI, July 23, 2024</li> <li>Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment, Soil Engineers Ltd., August 23, 2024</li> </ul> |                | <p>Please note that the following materials were revised per comments and resubmitted as part of 21T-22001C in October, 2024:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Caledon Station Community-Wide Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan: Draft Plans of Subdivision, Beacon Environmental Limited</li> <li>Community-Wide Functional Servicing Report — Caledon Station Secondary Plan, 4th submission, Urbantech</li> <li>Hydrogeological Investigation: Caledon Station, DS Consultants</li> </ul> |
|    | <b>Appendix 'B' – TRCA's Technical Comments</b>  |                |   |
|    | Geotechnical   |                |   |
| 1. | As per the CEISMP, the proposed Greenway Corridor along the west side of Humber Station Road will include side slopes having gradients of 2.5 to 3H:1V. The grading for the Greenway Corridor should be reviewed by a geotechnical engineer to ensure that the proposed side slopes are stable in the long-term.   | DS Consultants | The grading for the Greenway Corridor is under review by the geotechnical engineer  |
|    | Hydrogeology   |                |   |
| 2. | There are no hydrogeology-related issues with the Draft Plan of Subdivision file (21T-24006C provided comments below are addressed.  | DS Consultants | Acknowledged  |
|    | Hydrology - Humber Station Secondary Plan  |                |   |
| 3. | The 2023 hydrogeology report estimated pre-development total infiltration at 138,717 m <sup>3</sup> and projected a post-development infiltration deficit of 21,852 m <sup>3</sup> , even with proposed mitigation measures. In the June 11, 2024 report, pre-development total infiltration was revised to 144,413 m <sup>3</sup> , but the projected post-development infiltration deficit increased to 34,803 m <sup>3</sup> , despite the proposed mitigation measures. <b>Please clarify why the post-development deficit increased from 21,852 m<sup>3</sup> to 34,803 m<sup>3</sup> when the pre-development infiltration estimate increased from 138,717 m<sup>3</sup> to 144,413 m<sup>3</sup>.</b>   | DS Consultants | The water balance has been revised in the updated hydrogeological investigation (October 2024)  |
| 4. | Section 8 of the June 2024 hydrogeology report discusses the potential impacts of dewatering requirements. The report estimates that SWM Pond 1 may require permanent dewatering of approximately 565,920 m <sup>3</sup> . However, the report does not address the potential impacts of long-term dewatering. The TRCA hydrogeology staff do not support permanent dewatering. <b>Please provide an assessment of impacts to regulated features.</b>  | DS Consultants | As per the geotechnical comments and recommendations, SWM Pond 1 will require an under-line drainage system to reduce the uplift hydrostatic pressure at the base of the liner. The zone of influence was estimated to be 98 m. As per section 8.2 of the hydrogeological investigation (October 2024), wetlands 7 and 8 are being relocated offsite. Therefore, they are not anticipated to fall within the estimated zone of influence of SWM Pond 1 (98m) and are not anticipated to be impacted from permanent drainage.      |
|    | Water Resources  |                |   |
| 5. | <b>Section 6.1 Overall SWM Strategy:</b> -The applicant has outlined the erosion control measures as follows: "Detain, at a minimum, the runoff volume generated from a 25mm storm event over 24 to 48 hours." However, TRCA's erosion control criteria consist of two key components: extended detention and runoff volume control. Extended detention is designed to slow the release of stormwater into streams and rivers, reducing peak flow rates that may cause erosion during and after storm events. Runoff volume control aims to minimize the total runoff  | Urbantech      | Refer to the updated LID plan in Drawing 703 of the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024, showing the new proposed infiltration measures (infiltration tanks along parks and site plan block controls) that would infiltrate 15 mm to 25 mm of runoff to the maximum extent possible in the West Humber Catchments (104 and 105), as well as the 5 mm of runoff in the Main Humber Catchments (101 to 103) through a combination of on-site retention   |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY | RESPONSE   |
|--|---|-----------|--|
|  | <p>entering streams and rivers, reducing the stress on these water bodies and preventing erosion. While the applicant has demonstrated that runoff from a 25mm storm event will be detained for 48 hours, the applicant has not demonstrated onsite retention of 5mm of runoff from all impervious areas to prevent instream erosion. <b>Please provide erosion control measures to achieve the onsite retention of 5mm of runoff from all impervious areas using low impact development techniques.</b></p>  |           | <p>(infiltration/evapotranspiration LIDs) for site plan blocks, lot-level measures (downspout disconnection, additional topsoil), as well as ROW LIDs (tree pits and modular soil cells).</p>  |
| 6.   | <p><b>Section 6.4: Main Humber River SWM:</b>-Quantity control is not required for the site (Catchments 101, 102, and 103) draining to the main Humber River. However, the proposed development is expected to modify the flow regime, which could result in instream erosion. Consequently, TRCA requires erosion control measures to address this potential impact. Instream erosion control typically involves two key components: extended detention and runoff volume control. Extended detention is intended to slow the release of stormwater into streams and rivers, reducing peak flow rates that may contribute to erosion during and after storm events. Runoff volume control focuses on minimizing the total runoff entering streams and rivers, thereby lessening the stress on these water bodies and preventing erosion. <b>Please demonstrate how the site (Catchments 101, 102, and 103) will meet TRCA's erosion control criteria, specifically through the detention of runoff from a 25mm storm event over 24 to 48 hours and onsite retention of 5mm of runoff from all impervious areas, to prevent instream erosion.</b></p>   | Urbantech | <p>Refer to the updated Section 6.1 and 6.4.3 in the accompanying Final FSR, dated October 2024. The erosion control criteria for the Main Humber Catchments is retention of the first 5 mm of rainfall as per TRCA criteria. The required retention volumes are achieved through a combination of on-site retention (infiltration/evapotranspiration LIDs) for site plan blocks, lot-level measures (downspout disconnection, additional topsoil), as well as ROW LIDs (tree pits and modular soil cells). The detention of the 25 mm storm event is not required as no ponds are proposed for these catchments (101 to 103).</p> |
|  | <p><b>Section 8.2.1.3 Proposed Model &amp; Mitigation Measures:</b>-The applicant conducted a comprehensive feature-based water balance analysis and concluded that the amount of runoff required to sustain the wetland's hydrologic and ecological function is significantly lower than the runoff volumes it currently receives. However, given the inherent uncertainties in modeling, <b>TRCA requires applicants to provide an adaptive management plan along with a post-implementation monitoring strategy. Please submit an adaptive management plan, outlining how it will be implemented if post-implementation monitoring indicates the need to either increase water flow to the feature or divert runoff away from the wetland.</b> To better understand this comment, please refer to the following excerpt from page 40 of the Wetland Water Balance Modelling Guidance Document, TRCA, 2020:</p> <p><i>“For development scenarios in which it is necessary to supply additional water to the wetland to maintain the water balance, the mitigation measures should be designed to collect runoff from an area that is 30 percent larger than the calculated area required wherever possible. For example, if a roof drain collector system is being used to supply additional runoff volume to the wetland, and calculations suggest that a total of 1 ha of roof runoff is necessary to replace the volume of water lost, the system should be designed to collect runoff from 1.3 ha of roof area. Additionally, adjustable orifices should be incorporated into the conveyance system, such that the orifice can be reduced or enlarged if monitoring and adaptive management identifies a surplus or a deficit of runoff reaching the wetland, and any excess runoff volume is conveyed via an overflow to the main storm sewer system. The requirement of 30 percent additional contributing area is meant to address the fact that it is much more difficult to add extra contributing roof area to a drain collector system than it is to re-route already connected contributing roof area to a different outlet (e.g. a stormwater management pond). The 30 percent additional contributing area recognizes the inherent uncertainty of modelling input data, output data, and mitigation system performance. The use of an adjustable orifice and overflow system allows for a mitigation system that is both adaptive and that functions in a completely passive manner, once it has been demonstrated to successfully maintain the wetland water balance.”</i></p> | Urbantech | <p>The adaptive management plan can be provided at detailed design stage. This does not impact the current proposed design for feature-based water balance in the accompanying FSR, dated October 2024.</p>  |
| <p><b>Town of Caledon, Transportation Engineering<br/>October 31, 2024 – Kavleen S. Younan</b></p> |   |           |  |
|  | <p><b>General</b></p>   |           |  |
|  | <p>Traffic controls at all internal intersections should be covered at this level (based on an updated transportation study).</p>   | BA Group  | <p>The following traffic controls are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Signalization at all collector/arterial intersections and at collector/collector intersections along Humber Station Road (unless indicated to be right turns only)</li> <li>- All-way stop control at all other collector/collector intersections (with protection for signals).</li> </ul>   |



|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY       | RESPONSE   |
|--|--|-----------------|--|
|  |  |                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All-way stop control at local/local and local/collector intersections along the central park blocks to facilitate pedestrian crossings along the central park feature.</li> <li>- Side-street stop control at local roads that intersect collector roads.</li> <li>- Side-street stop control at laneways that intersect local or collector roads.</li> </ul> <p>Early implementation of signals can be further reviewed with the Town as part of detailed design and phasing considerations in the DSSP.</p> <p>Phase 1, in particular, does not warrant early signalization on Street Y (MacDougall Street) given there will be minimal traffic and no destination to the north or east prior Phase 2. The Town has protected for signalization in its Development Charges Background Study and staged implementation can continue to be reassessed with phased buildout of the Caledon Station Secondary Plan lands.</p> <p>See the following Caledon Station Secondary Plan Transportation figures for lane configuration and traffic volume for collector and arterial roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Figures 10 to 13: Lane Configuration and Traffic Control, by Phase</li> <li>- Figures 31 to 32: Future Total Traffic Volumes, by Phase</li> </ul> |
|  | <p>Demonstrate that the proposed right of ways can support above-ground infrastructure, including but not limited to travel lanes, parking, active transportation facilities (including but not limited to a Pedestrian Plan), etc. Provide AutoTURN maneuverability to confirm the proposed reduced roadway geometry can support critical anticipated design vehicles along their anticipated travel paths.</p> | <p>BA Group</p> | <p>Updates to Functional Road Design are awaiting comments and consensus with the Town on cross-section design across the community. The following figures demonstrate the measures that are recommended to be accommodated in the functional road design and detailed design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of travel lanes: Caledon Station Secondary Plan Transportation Study: Figure 13 – Lane Configurations</li> <li>- Parking: to be accommodated on one-side of local and collector roads, demonstrated in context on future Parking Plans as part of detailed design.</li> <li>- Active Transportation: Multi-Use Path and cycling infrastructure as demonstrated on Appendix B and C of the accompanying Traffic Compliance Letter.</li> <li>- Pedestrian Plan: Arterial, Collector and Local roads have extensive sidewalk facilities as demonstrated on the proposed cross-sections. See Active Transportation and Open Space Figures for the Mobility Plan in context with trails, MUPs, and the overall framework plan.</li> </ul>  |
|  | <p>The traffic compliance letter is inconsistent regarding the type of units compared to the proposed parking reductions in the Zoning By-Law Amendment (ZBA).</p>   | <p>BA Group</p> | <p>The Traffic Compliance Letter refers to a review and demonstration of on-street parking. Updates to Parking Plans and Functional Road Design are awaiting comments and consensus with the Town on cross-section design across the community.</p> <p>All Subject Lands are located within MTSA, thus comments regarding parking outside MTSA are not relevant to this application. Please note, parking outlined in the Zoning By-Law Amendment (ZBA) and Planning Justification Report (PJR) demonstrates conformance with Zoning By-Law No. 2024-055, with the exception of back-to-back townhouses. The Draft implementing Zoning By-Law continues to seek 1.0 space/unit for back-to-back townhouses outside the MTSA. Given that other townhouse product (rear lane and stacked townhouses) require only 1 space/unit as approved through Zoning By-Law No. 2024-055, this is appropriate and consistent with the intent of Zoning By-Law No. 2024-055.</p>   |
|  | <p>Town Transportation Staff differ to Metrolinx on if the proposal is sufficient to support the proposed Go Station site requirements.</p>  | <p>BA Group</p> | <p>Noted. No further action is required.</p>   |
|  | <p>Town Transportation staff defers to the Region regarding capacity analysis and mitigation measures for existing and proposed intersections under their jurisdiction.</p>  | <p>BA Group</p> | <p>Noted. No further action is required.</p>   |
|  | <p><b>Draft Plan</b></p>   |                 |  |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY                | RESPONSE  |
|--|--|--------------------------|---|
|  | <p>Identify how each block will be accessed under interim and ultimate conditions. Accesses to be aligned with TAC recommendations. When considering interim conditions, please note the Town of Caledon Development Standards requires dead-end roadways to terminate in a temporary cul-de-sac. Interim Conditions require the approval of Development Engineering.</p>  | <p>BA Group</p>          | <p>Notation of recommended access arrangement restrictions for medium density blocks is provided in Appendix C of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter.</p> <p>A revised Draft Plan of Subdivision has been prepared and is provided in support of the application.</p> <p>Temporary culdesacs have been demonstrated where dead-end roads abut non-participating lands. Where short segments of road (1-2 driveways) exist, roads have been shown with a temporary dead-end. Further detail regarding temporary turnarounds or temporary dead-ends (if required) will be provided during the future detailed design. Refer to Appendix A of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter.</p> <p>The lands immediately west of the Draft Plan are proposed to be built as part of Phase 1 (see DSSP). Culdesacs have not been shown along the west limits of the Draft Plan since these lands are being considered concurrent.</p> |
|  | <p>It is noted that Street A is missing a daylighting Triangle.</p>  |                          |   |
|  | <p>The submitted Draft Plan of Subdivision covers areas that differ from those analyzed in the Transportation Study for Phases 1 and 2. Specifically, Phase 1A is not included. The traffic analysis assumes that Phases 1A and 1B will proceed concurrently, as is the case with Phase 2. This assumption needs to be clearly documented in the reports, and the proposed roadway geometry should reflect this assumption.</p>                        | <p>BA Group<br/>HPGI</p> | <p>A revised Caledon Station Development Staging and Sequencing Plan (DSSP) has been prepared and confirms integration of Phase 1a and 1b.</p>  |
|  | <p>Please note that conditions will be required at draft plan approval to ensuring that roadways are constructed according to the assumptions in the transportation study and aligned to phasing.</p>  | <p>BA Group</p>          | <p>Noted.</p>   |
|  | <p><b>Pedestrian and Cyclist Circulation Plan</b></p>  |                          |   |
|  | <p>Please provide a single drawing with all proposed AT facilities, to the level of detail provided in the Draft Plan of Subdivision (local roads, street name, proposed facility on which side of road, etc.). Ensure this drawing is consistent with latest proposal for walking and cycling facilities. Include the proposed trail network, with indication whether proposed trails are multi-use or walking-only.</p>                              | <p>BA Group<br/>NAK</p>  | <p>An updated pedestrian plan (Active Transportation Plan and Open Spaces Plan) is provided by NAK and also provided in Appendix B of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter.</p>  |
|  | <p>Identify proposed trail connections to the existing and proposed AT facilities beyond the limits of the subject lands, including but not limited to the Humber Valley Heritage Trail, and proposed trails within the TRCA Trail Strategy.</p>   | <p>BA Group<br/>NAK</p>  | <p>An updated pedestrian plan (Active Transportation Plan and Open Spaces Plan) is provided by NAK and also provided in Appendix B of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter.</p>  |
|  | <p>All collector and arterial roads must have in-boulevard cycling facilities. In accordance with, the ATMP, multi-use paths should be used on both sides of collector and arterial roads to serve both pedestrians and cyclists.</p>  | <p>BA Group</p>          | <p>Notation on proposed active transportation facilities has been provided in Appendix C of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter.</p> <p>All collector and arterial roads are proposed to have in-boulevard cycling facilities.</p>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In cases where expected AT volumes are high (within vicinity of Transit Hub), in-boulevard cycle tracks, directly in addition to sidewalk facilities, are necessary to separate cyclists and pedestrians.</li> </ul>  |                          |   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where a significant number of single-family driveways exist along a collector road, context-appropriate design considerations should be made, beyond the typical ROW. Justification should be provided in these cases. With that said, in-boulevard cycling facilities must be provided on both sides of collector roads in the vicinity of schools, parks, community centres, and commercial areas.</li> </ul> |                          |   |
|  | <p>Locate mid-block AT connections/mews centrally in blocks that are longer than 200 metres in length and connect to sidewalks, trails, or pathways on either end, as needed. Please also include AT linkages/mews between communities and as strategic connections to the AT network or key destinations.</p>   | <p>BA Group<br/>NAK</p>  | <p>The Draft Plan reflects a street fabric and Active Transportation network that is significantly porous and appropriately aligned to direct pedestrians towards park features, the GO Station, and/or collector road connections that lead to broader regional facilities. There are very few blocks that exceed 200m on the Draft Plan, and none exceed 260 metres (south side of Richard Orr Ave). Long medium density blocks are expected to provide pedestrian porosity within their future Site Plan applications.</p> <p>An updated pedestrian plan (Active Transportation Plan and Open Spaces Plan) is provided by NAK and also provided in Appendix B of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter.</p>  |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY         | RESPONSE   |
|--|--|-------------------|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note this could be achieved by redesigning the proposed block 56 to include a MUP connection to the SWM pond.</li> </ul>  |                   |  |
|  | As the park will generally be designed to limit cyclists, please ensure there is an MUP encircling the Park Block 910.   | NAK               | There will be a multi-use trail along the northern side of the park as part of the multi-modal loop. The park interfaces with local streets along the southern and western sides, which are designed to have compact roads, allowing cyclists the opportunity to circle the park block.  |
|  | Review potential vehicular, pedestrian, and cyclist conflict locations based on anticipated paths of desire, volumes, and user types. Protected intersections should be considered at collector and arterial roads intersections. Justification should be provided where protected intersections are not recommended.  | BA Group          | Updates to Functional Road Design are awaiting comments and consensus with the Town on cross-section design across the community. Protected intersection design is supported, where applicable, and detailed design can point to justification where not provided. Collector and Arterial Roads are the primary candidates for protected intersection design.  |
|  | <b>Parking</b>   |                   |  |
|  | Provide a proposed-on Street parking plan. Please note previous proposals have suggested reducing the length and number of on-street parking spaces without providing any reasoning or data regarding the accommodation of shorter vehicles. Note that on-street parking spaces need to be longer than typical off-street spaces as they require sufficient space to accommodate vehicles entering and exiting. Although the Town currently doesn't have guidance for on-street parking dimensions, typical standards range from lengths of 6.7m to 7.0m   | BA Group          | <p>A former review of on-street parking supply in 2023 indicated an on-street parking supply of 0.72 per unit. Rates are subject to change with an update to the Parking Plan. However, 2023 estimates indicate a high supply of visitor parking on-street across the Draft Plan can be achieved.</p> <p>Updates to Parking Plans and Functional Road Design are awaiting comments and consensus with the Town on cross-section design across the community.</p> |
|  | Confirmation regarding the provision of bike parking to support active transportation is necessary.  | BA Group          | Recent updates to the Town's Zoning By-law do not identify bike parking requirements. However, bike parking is recommended to be implemented as an effective TDM measure on medium density and mixed use blocks. The Green Development Standards Guidelines address the requirement for bike parking and can be applied to future site plan applications.  |
|  | <b>DSSP</b>  |                   |  |
|  | Please provide the assumed number of units for each phase to allow transportation staff to compare them with the assumptions outlined in the Transportation Study.   | Owner<br>BA Group | A revised Phasing Plan (September 2023) has been prepared with a detailed breakdown of units that matches units considered in the July 2024 Transportation Study.  |
|  | <b>Transit</b>   |                   |  |
|  | Please be advised that the proposed interim transit routes are subject to review and approval by Brampton Transit. To ensure alignment with the city's transit planning, it is recommended that you reach out to Andrew Charles at Brampton Transit via email at andrew.charles@brampton.ca. This consultation is essential to confirm that the proposed routes are feasible and meet the city's requirements.   | Owner<br>BA Group | <p>Potential interim transit routes are outlined on Figure 3 of the July 2024 Transportation Study for Phases 1 and 2.</p> <p>Brampton Transit is circulated on the current draft Draft Plan resubmission.</p>   |
|  | Furthermore, as part of future applications, the applicant should take the initiative to propose potential bus stop locations along these transit routes. This will help ensure that the transportation plan is comprehensive and fully integrated with the city's existing and future transit infrastructure. In addition to identifying these bus stop locations, it is also important to clarify how the construction and funding of the proposed transit facilities will be managed. This information is crucial for a complete understanding of the project's impact on the local transit network and for ensuring that all necessary infrastructure is in place to support the proposed development. | Owner<br>BA Group | Noted. The potential location of bus transit stops will be indicated on supporting materials prepared in support of the future detailed design (Site Plan Approval) stage. No further action is required at this time.   |
|  | <b>Transportation Study</b>  |                   |  |
|  | All external roadways indicated in the draft plan must be constructed in accordance with the approved Caledon Station Secondary Plan Transportation Study Report. Currently, the phasing of improvements (among other matters discussed in previous comments, dated July 16th, provided for this study) has not received formal approval from the Town; therefore, all proposed requirements for the draft plan will be subject to further review once the aforementioned document is approved.  | BA Group          | Noted. No further action is required.  |
|  | Please note the provided community road (ROW) cross section elements are subject to a multidisciplinary review, therefore should obtain approval of all relevant disciplines. Please refer to the Email from Kavleen Younan September 16th, 2024.  | BA Group          | Further to workshop meetings with Staff, cross-sections details have also been emailed to for comment to multiple disciplines for comment. Updates to Parking Plans and Functional Road Design are awaiting comments and consensus with the Town on cross-section design across the community.   |
|  | Trips should be assigned to all collector roads, and major local roads. Capacity analysis of internal intersections should be completed as required with the addition of local to collector intersections at this stage (focus on critical locations). Review of queuing should be completed (as required) to ensure forecasted queues will not impact pedestrian and vehicular conflict locations.  | BA Group          | Additional internal intersections were identified in discussion with Town staff. These locations are circled in Appendix I of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter. BA Group has reviewed the upstream/downstream intersection volumes at these locations. Figure 32 – Future Total   |

|  | STAFF COMMENTS   | ACTION BY              | RESPONSE  |
|--|--|------------------------|---|
|  |  |                        | <p>Traffic Volumes have also been provided in Appendix I for direct reference to overall traffic volumes. We have specifically addressed each circled item below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Street VV and Street JJ</b> (west of central park) are estimated to have local road or minor collector levels of traffic volumes between Street A and Street Y. Side street traffic volumes are estimated to be low and side street stop control is considered adequate at these locations. All-way stop control will be considered along the central park spine as part of detailed design to allow for control crossings for key trails, sidewalks, and MUPs.</li> <li>- <b>Street I</b> is estimated to have minor collector levels of traffic between Street A and Street Y. Side street traffic volumes are estimated to be low and side street stop control is considered adequate at these locations. All-way stop control will be considered along the central park spine as part of detailed design to allow for control crossings for key trails, sidewalks, and MUPs.</li> <li>- <b>North-South Midblock Local</b> between Street I and Humber Station is anticipated to have local traffic volumes (low relative to Street Y). This mid-block local is proposed to operate under side street stop control at Street Y. Given the mid-block location between Street I and Humber Station Road (that are ~400 metres apart), this midblock Local Road would be a good candidate for an APS activated pedestrian crossing and traffic calming measures (curb extensions, for example) that can be identified in detailed design.</li> <li>- <b>Street C / Humber Station:</b> The final local street traffic volumes and related traffic control measures will be most closely interrelated to the GO Station detailed design and permitted access routing for buses and passenger drop-off determine for that plan. Street A and Street E (instead of Street C) are proposed at a Secondary Plan level to serve the primary purpose of transit routing and drop-off vehicles entering/exiting the GO Station. The Street C / Humber Station intersection falls within the proposed Main Street District that could be closed for events. As such, Street C is not relied upon within the overall network to have full-moves access. Final intersection control and design can be further advanced with the Town as part of detailed design and Phase 2 when: a) more detail about the GO Station design is known and b) when the unique character district of Humber Stations Road in the Main District is further advanced. The intersection is proposed to operate under side street or all-way stop-control and could be considered for turning movement vehicle restrictions as part of detailed design.</li> </ul> |
|  | <p>The study suggests preserving the option for future signalization at collector-to-collector intersections, with signals to be installed only when warranted by traffic conditions. However, the Town’s preference is that these intersections be signalized during the initial construction phase of the roads, rather than constructing the intersections as all-way stop controls and later converting them to signalized intersections. Given the anticipated density in this area and the expected high volume of active transportation, Town staff strongly recommend that these intersections be signalized from the outset. This approach will better accommodate the traffic and pedestrian flow and enhance safety for all road users.</p> | <p><b>BA Group</b></p> | <p><b>Early implementation of signals can be further reviewed with the Town as part of detailed design and phasing considerations in the DSSP to determine where signals are most appropriate to enhance experience for all road users.</b></p> <p><b>Phase 1, in particular, does not warrant early signalization on Street Y (MacDougall Street) given there will be minimal traffic and no destination to the north or east prior Phase 2. The Town has protected for signalization in its Development Charges Background Study and staged implementation can continue to be reassessed with phased buildout of the Caledon Station Secondary Plan area.</b></p>   |
|  | <p>Please provide an AutoTurn analysis for the proposed site, particularly focusing on roadways that deviate from the standard Town cross-sections. This analysis should demonstrate that the site can adequately accommodate all necessary vehicles, including, but not limited to, snowplows, and trucks. Propose interim measures as required.</p>  | <p><b>BA Group</b></p> | <p><b>Updates to Functional Road Design are awaiting comments and consensus with the Town on cross-section design across the community. Functional design of intersections that vary from Town standards are expected to demonstrate anticipated design vehicles (snow plows, trucks, buses) where applicable.</b></p>  |
|  | <p>Provide recommendations (including but limited to temporary cul-de-sacs, conditions, and holdings) to ensure the concurrent development of roadways (as required) and limit the required interim analysis (as is reasonable).</p>   | <p><b>BA Group</b></p> | <p><b>Temporary culdesacs have been demonstrated where dead-end roads abut non-participating lands. Where short segments of road (1-2 driveways) exist, roads have been shown with a temporary dead-end. Further detail regarding temporary turnarounds or temporary dead-ends (if required) will be provided during the future detailed design. Refer to Appendix A of the December 2024 Traffic Compliance Letter.</b></p>  |



|  | STAFF COMMENTS  | ACTION BY       | RESPONSE   |
|--|---|-----------------|--|
|  | <p>Please note that Transportation Engineering reserves the right for additional comments based on a revised submission. Transportation Engineering requests that the Traffic Consultant provide a response letter with the re-submission package clearly reiterating the Town’s comments in order and including details for how each comment has been addressed. Please let me know if you have any questions or require any additional information.</p> | <p>BA Group</p> | <p><b>This Matrix has been prepared to demonstrate how all Transportation Engineering comments have been addressed and is to be read in conjunction with the December 2023 Transporattion Conformance Letter and related appendices. Refer to the responses provided above for further detail.</b></p> |