

COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX

Municipal Address Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (Option #6) **Date Prepared:** March 14, 2024
Client Humber Station Landowners Group
Application Secondary Plan Submission 2

PART 1 Transportation Engineering Public Works & Transportation Department

Reference #	Kavleen S. Younan	Commenting Agency	Heading	Comment	Responsibility	Action	Response
1	Transportation Engineering			Transportation Engineering Staff have reviewed the materials submitted for the Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (Option #6), 1st Submission and offer the following high-level comments. Please be aware that more detailed technical comments may be provided during subsequent application phases, as applicable to each specific phase:	-	-	Information only
2	Transportation Engineering			All collector and arterial roads should have on-boulevard cycling facilities. Preference for MUTs on both sides of collector and arterial roads to serve both pedestrians and cyclists.	LEA	N/A	The Town's preference for MUTs is noted. LEA will be developing and evaluating cross-sections as part of the EA for the George Bolton Parkway extension. The type of active transportation facility will be determined through this process and in consultation with any available standard cross-section for industrial collector roads.
3	Transportation Engineering			Caledon's Official Plan seeks complete communities with compact design, mixed uses, connected streets, and sustainable transportation.	SGL		This is an Employment Area. Development will help contribute to the creation of a complete community across Caledon's New Urban Area.
4	Transportation Engineering			The active transportation network within the study area and the future potential connections to the Town's active transportation network should be illustrated. They must be aligned with the active transportation network identified in the Town's Multi-Modal Transportation Master Plan.	LEA	-	Comment has been noted and a new figure has been prepared to illustrate the AT network within the study area. Please see Figure 4-4 which illustrates the proposed active transportation network and future potential connections to the Town's AT network.
5	Transportation Engineering			Please note that the Technical Studies, including the Traffic Impact Study, may not meet the Town's requirements for the SABE lands. The Town endorses a grid-style transportation network for better connectivity. The non-grid system leads to more driver turns and longer travel times. Direct north-south and east-west connections are recommended for improved connectivity. The current design isolates the community with few links to the south. Also, the non-grid transportation network is not transit-supportive for the coverage.	LEA	N/A	<p>The proposed road network follows a grid system. The extension of George Bolton Parkway provides a direct east-west connection through the block. North-south connections will be provided via a local road located approximately mid-block between Coleraine Drive and Humber Station Road, extending south, with its alignment following the natural features in the area.</p> <p>It is understood that the Town's MMTMP recommended a collector road network for the Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (SABE) areas which consists of a George Bolton extension, a northerly extension of Arterial A2 through the site to the rail corridor, and two (2) east-west collectors to connect the SABE employment and community areas. Based on a review of the conceptual collector network, several environmental and development constraints were identified limiting the feasibility of the proposed MMTMP collector road network (see Section 6.1). Furthermore, based on the feasibility memo prepared by LEA for the extension of Arterial A2 (see Appendix G), LEA recommends to cul-de-sac the future north-south collector road (A2) south of the George Bolton Parkway extension and north of the future Highway 413. Resultingly, the segment north of George Bolton Parkway would no longer effectively provide increased multi-modal connectivity for the site, and the continuation of the collector road north of the George Bolton Parkway extension would provide limited benefits to the overall road and active transportation network connectivity.</p> <p>It should be noted that the traffic study demonstrates the minimum road</p>

6	Transportation Engineering		Transportation Demand Management measures and initiatives and Parking policies need to be developed to achieve the Town's future non-auto modal split targets and reduce single-occupant vehicles.	LEA	-	Please see Section 9 of the traffic study outlining recommended high-level TDM mechanisms. Vehicular parking rates will be determined on a site-specific basis during subsequent applications.
7	Transportation Engineering		The secondary plan should suggest high-level policies for access management along Collector and Arterial roadways aligning with the Multimodal TMP and recommendation of TAC.	SGL		Caledon's new parent Official Plan contains high-level policies for access management, which development of the secondary plan will be subject to.
8	Transportation Engineering		Regarding the proposed land use plan, it is recommended that more than one option be developed and evaluated to select the one with the most negligible impact.	SGL		The land use concept proposes only Employment Area designations. Transportation options are being assessed for the George Bolton Parkway and A2 extension.
9	Transportation Engineering		It is noted that the plan proposes prestige employment along the future Highway 413. It is understood that this serves the visibility aspect; however, this area is landlocked and cannot be accessed from Humber Station Road since it is within the interchange functional area (see the image below). The Town understands that MTO does not typically allow access within this area. These lands can only be accessible from the George Bolton Parkway extension and the north-south access road through the General Employment Area. Also, the area south of 413 is currently earmarked for the Transitway station. Consideration should be given to relocating the prestige employment areas along Humber Station, George Bolton Parkway extension and the north-south access road. The north-south access road will potentially connect (subject to a feasibility study) to the A2 arterial south of Mayfield Road.	SGL		The location of Prestige Employment along the 413 is typical and warranted due to visibility and the level of built form standards for these buildings. Access to these sites will be provided via an internal local road network, which will expand the collector roads shown on the plan. Prestige Employment uses in proximity to the proposed Transitway station is a more compatible use than having the station adjacent to General Employment uses.
10	Transportation Engineering		Please ensure that the George Bolton Parkway (GBP) extension is included in the analysis. The full buildout is proposed for 2033, but the GBP is included in the 2043 horizon (10 years after the full buildout). In the MMTMP, the GBP Parkway is planned for 2031 and, as such, should be taken as a future planned network, and accordingly, traffic should be assigned for 2033 to build out future total conditions. Also, table 4-3 should be updated to align with the recommendations noted in the MMTMP and accordingly the analyses.	LEA	N/A	The planned timing from the Town's MMTMP for the extension of George Bolton Parkway and widening of Humber Station Road and Healey Road is noted. The traffic study has been updated to include the identified background road improvements and Table 4-3 has been updated to align with the recommendations noted in the MMTMP. Please see Section 7 for an updated analysis.
11	Transportation Engineering		As part of subsequent applications:	-	-	-
12	Transportation Engineering		Site access proposed unsignalized intersections; intersection operations are to be determined	LEA	To be addressed during subsequent applications	Noted. To be addressed during subsequent applications.
13	Transportation Engineering		Traffic management measures at intersections should be further reviewed and developed to ensure they operate at an acceptable LOS to the Town's satisfaction.	LEA	To be addressed during subsequent applications	Noted. To be addressed during subsequent applications.
14	Transportation Engineering		General bicycle parking rates should be proposed in line with nearby municipalities.	LEA	N/A	As part of the TDM mechanisms, bike parking for developments will be encouraged as a means to limit the use of automobile travel as a primary mode of transportation. Bicycle parking rates will be determined on a site-specific basis during subsequent applications.
15	Transportation Engineering		Further details on the internal road network will be required in subsequent applications.	LEA	To be addressed during subsequent applications	Noted. To be addressed during subsequent applications.

16	Transportation Engineering		Please note that a phasing plan for the Transportation Infrastructure could be requested to be reviewed by transportation after the OPA approval.	LEA	Phasing plan will be requested after OPA approval	Noted.
17	Transportation Engineering		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.	LEA	Requires response letter for re-submission package	Noted. A TIS Update and response letter have been provided.

COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX

Municipal Address Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (Option #6) Date Prepared: 1-Mar-24 27-Mar-24
 Client Humber Station Landowners Group
 Application Secondary Plan Submission 2

PART 2 TOWN - ENGINEERING SERVICES COMMENTS

Reference #	Commenting Agency	Heading	Comment	Responsibility	Action	Response
1.5	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Section 1.5 Previous Studies provides a list of studies, plans and guidelines that will provide input and guidance into the preparation of the CEISMP. The following should be included within the section and should be used to inform the CEISMP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Consolidated Linear Infrastructure Environmental Compliance Approval for the Corporation of the Town of Caledon (ECA No. 324-5701). All information related to this can be found on the Town's website: •Design Criteria for Sanitary Sewers, Storm Sewers and Forcemains for Alterations Authorized under and Environmental Compliance Approval (MECP, v.2.0, May 31, 2023) •Work undertaking to the south of Mayfield Road that can provide relevant context including Master Environmental Servicing Plan: Hwy 427 Industrial Secondary Plan Area (Area 47)(Aquafor Beech Ltd., 2016) •Scoped Subwatershed Study Settlement Area Boundary Expansion (Wood et al., January 2022) •Any available technical studies completed for the GTA West Corridor 	SCHAEFFERS		Noted, the report have been updated
2.1	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Section 2.1 includes a list and overview of the planning policy framework applicable to this study area. The following should be included as part of this list and addressed through the study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Federal Species at Risk Act (2002) •Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act (1997) •A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (and Amendment No. 1 2020) (The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019 was prepared and approved under the Places to Grow Act, 2005.) •Significant Wildlife Habitat Technical Guide (2000) •Redside Dace Development Guidance (2016) and Thermal Mitigation Checklist for Stormwater Management Ponds Discharging into Redside Dace Habitat (MNR, 2014) 	GEI / SCHAEFFERS		Noted, the report have been updated
	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	There appears to be inconsistency between the study findings and the classification of HDF-3. Throughout the Phase 1 report, HDF-3 is presented as an intermittent drainage feature; however, in 2017 HDF-3 was permanently flowing. In 2023 when the feature was observed dry, the observations also notes a beaver dam upstream. Further discussion with TRCA is required to determine whether this is a regulated feature.	GEI / SCHAEFFERS / ARCADIS		HDF-3 was observed to have perennial flow in 2017, however in subsequent years (2022 and 2023) HDF-3 was observed to be dry by late spring (ephemeral flow). Historical precipitation data using Environment Canada for Pearson suggests that 2017 had considerably above average precip, 2022 was below average, and 2023 was slightly above average. Due to the 2023 observations of ephemeral flow despite slightly above average precipitation, we conclude that HDF-3 is reasonably characterized as intermittent. We acknowledge the presence of a beaver dam in 2023, however the dam was located at the downstream end of HDF-3 (at the south end of the man-made pond) and is not expected to impact flow for the majority of the feature.
Page 18/19	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	On page 18, the report states 'Station SF6-17, which is located downstream of SF3-17 within the Clarkway Drive Tributary floodplain showed predominantly upward gradients in the spring. This suggests that this area may be receiving groundwater discharge during a portion of the year. This may represent an intermittent stream classification in these areas'. On page 19, the report states 'the Clarkway Drive Tributary is interpreted to have a permanent flow regime'. The report very clearly concludes that the Clarkway Drive Tributary as permanently flowing, so while the statement on page 18 is not carried through the conclusion is confusing. Can this be corrected or further explained.	GEI / SCHAEFFERS / ARCADIS		This was a typo and will be corrected. As noted on page 19, the Clarkway Drive Tributary is interpreted to have a permanent flow regime.
Page 17	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Page 17 of the report states 'Overall, downward hydraulic gradients were observed in most of the mini-piezometer nests, which suggests that the wetlands and drainage features on-site are not receiving groundwater discharge'. This statement is followed by additional study findings that indicate that there are features on the site that are groundwater fed throughout the year and some that are fed by groundwater for portions of the year. This statement oversimplifies the relationship between groundwater and surface features on the site. Further monitoring may be required to better understand this relationship. The Impact Assessment should further assess the impacts of the development on the groundwater system and the Management Plan should provide direction on how to maintain the interaction of the groundwater system with surface features.	SCHAEFFERS / ARCADIS		Downward hydraulic gradients in mini-piezometers are indicative of recharge conditions. However, the statement was deleted. A synthesis of groundwater recharge and discharge is provided in Section 3.2.4 and 3.2.5. Arcadis has also prepared depth to groundwater maps, which will be included in a revised report and help illustrate the groundwater-surface water relationships.
	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	To assist with characterizing the system effectively, the Town will provide the Stormwater Management Reports for the stormwater management facilities that also outlet to the Clarkway Road Tributary.	SCHAEFFERS		Noted. Thank you.
Page 15	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Page 15 states 'Silty sand to sand was noted in several borehole locations across the Study Area, underlying the upper till units. This unit was most noted in the boreholes advanced by DS Consultants in the southern portion of the Study Area. Where encountered, the unit was often several metres thick and extended to the bottom of the boreholes. This unit may represent the ORM aquifer deposit'. The report does suggest that this layer may result in artesian conditions when tapped into. The constraint and opportunity presented by the ORM aquifer unit should be further investigated as part of the Phase 1 study in order to inform the Impact Assessment and Management Plan. Better understanding of the ORM aquifer deposit should be able to address potential surface water infiltration opportunities based on soils information, depth to the water table, and aquifer vulnerability.	ARCADIS		Well nests MW2-17 s, d, MW4 s, d and MWS-17 were installed and monitored to assess groundwater conditions associated with the potential ORAC aquifer. A description of the water levels and vertical gradients was provided in the text. Based on this existing information, and surficial mapping, it is interpreted that there is a sufficient till cap in areas where spread footings are proposed. However, specific monitoring will be completed at the 60% design stage to confirm groundwater depths in areas proposed for SWM facilities, HD-3 realignment, HD-3 extended floodplain area and the tableland wetland compensation area.
Page 20	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Page 20 states the following 'It was noted that for all events considered to be representative of baseflow conditions, the baseflow estimated at the downstream station (SF5-17) was lower than the baseflow estimated at the upstream station (SF1-17) and midstream station (SF4-17), which suggests that the headwater drainage feature at SF4-17 and SF5-17 may be losing water through infiltration or discharge to other receivers (e.g., riparian wetlands) across the Site before reaching SF5-17. Some intermittent groundwater discharge may be occurring in the area of SF5-17 based on the upward gradients noted in the mini-piezometer during spring (see Section 3.1.10.2)'. The Impact Assessment and Management Plan should assess and address the impacts of the development on this interaction and provide strategies to ensuring no negative impact.	ARCADIS		This will be considered in the Impact Assessment and Management Plan.
Page 20	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Page 20 states the following: - 'HDF-3 (Centre Drainage Feature): One monitoring station (SF7-17) was installed adjacent to the mapped headwater drainage feature in 2017. Two additional observational stations (SF9-22 and SF11-22) were established in 2022 to record / observe flow conditions. No stream flow was observed at the monitoring station during any of the monitoring events, except for May 5, 2023, when minor to moderate flow was observed. - It should be noted that during the September 2023 monitoring event, stations SF1-17, SF4-17, SF5-17, and WL3-17 were observed dry. Based on recorded precipitation events with >5 mm/day on May 2, 2023, May 3, 2023, and minor precipitation on May 5, 2023, this flow is interpreted to represent runoff and not baseflow. - HDF-8 is interpreted to have an ephemeral flow regime.' - Its unclear whether the information in this section is related to HDF-8 or HDF-3.	GEI / SCHAEFFERS		The section refers to HDF-8 and will be updated. The reference to SF1-17, SF4-17, SF5-17, and WL3-17 referenced HDF-3 and will be moved to the appropriate section.

	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	As part of characterizing HDF-8 the report states that SF7-17, SF9-22 and SF11-22 were established in 2022 but no stream flow was observed at the monitoring station. Table C2-10: Stream Flow Measurements indicates that a staff gauge was installed at SF7-17 but no equipment was installed at SF9-22 or SF11-22. The table also indicates that for these locations stream flow observations were conducted twice, May 5 2023 and September 21 2023. On May 5 it is noted that no measurements were taken, only observations were made. On September 21st, a mixture of observation were made from NA, NM to dry. Can further information be provided to clarify the statement 'no stream flow was observed at the monitoring stations' as its unclear if enough information was collected to characterize the flow conditions of this HDF.	GEI / SCHAEFFERS / ARCADIS		SF7-17 was observed to be dry throughout the monitoring of 2017-2018. Table C-10 will be updated to reflect that. SF9-22 and SF11-22 stations were installed in 2022 and were intended to augment the earlier observations; however, the establishment of additional detailed surface water - groundwater stations along HDF-8 in 2022 was not part of the scope. Regardless, no stream flow was observed at the monitoring station during any of the monitoring events for any of the stations along HDF-8, except for May 5, 2023, following a precipitation event when flow was observed. These observations were corroborated by observations by GEI staff whose field surveys indicated that the majority of the feature is ploughed through and none of the feature has riparian habitat. GEI staff observed that HDF-8 had flow during the spring freshet of 2017 but had only isolated pools of standing water in the freshet of 2023. The reach was dry by May or June in both years. No fish were captured or observed in HDF-8. Based on the data collected and the observations of flow conditions, it is our opinion that this feature has been adequately characterized in terms of potential groundwater inputs to the headwater drainage feature.
	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	It appears that continuous stream flow measurements should be undertaken in line with the approved terms of reference at critical locations including at culverts. It doesn't appear that this has been done. Can further explanation be provided on the approach to capturing stream flows at these critical locations.	SCHAEFFERS		In a meeting with TRCA on January 26, 2024, it was agreed that continuous FBWB modelling is not required. As such, capturing of stream flows is not required. Please refer to Appendix B2 for the minutes of meeting provided with this submission and labelled "2024-01-26-Wetland Meeting Summary".
3.2.4.2	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Section 3.2.4.2 provides an overview of surface water quality results. Please note that temperature should be part of surface water quality monitoring as this site includes Redside dace contributing habitat. Continuous water temperature monitoring should be undertaken at critical locations.	GEI / SCHAEFFERS		The specific requirement to monitor surface water temperature was not included in the TOR and has not been included to date. We concur that since the site includes Redside dace contributing habitat, this should be completed as part of ongoing monitoring as part of Phase 2.
13	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory Terms of reference	As identified in the Terms of Reference, water quality is intended to be monitored over the long-term (pre-, during-, and post-development). To both inform the Management Plan and to adequately characterize baseline conditions, it is our expectation that continuous measurements of temperature, turbidity, and conductivity be taken at critical locations, in combination with grab samples throughout the year of the parameters that have been measured.	GEI / SCHAEFFERS		Continuous water quality monitoring is not considered necessary and was not included on the TOR. Continuous water quality was not required by the TRCA based on previous consultations with them. Additional discrete surface water samples can be collected if required.
	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	The use of Thornthwaite & Mathers method for site water balance is permissible for a site plan application but is not adequate at the scale of a Secondary Plan. To estimate the water balance across the site, as well as understand the impacts of the development and to inform appropriate management strategies, a surface water-groundwater numerical model is required. As we understand, this model can build off of TRCS's water budget model developed under the Clean Water Act, 2006.	SCHAEFFERS / ARCADIS		The water balance methodology was not specified in the TOR. The construction of a calibrated groundwater surface water model was not included in the TOR. The Thornthwaite and Mather methodology for completing water balance evaluations is considered acceptable per the CA guidelines for completing hydrogeological studies. However, as noted, water balance parameters that are available through the Oak Ridges Moraine Groundwater Program (ORMGP) and the TRCA (based on groundwater surface water models) will be reviewed and compared with the Thornthwaite and Mather results. In general, post development targets will be based on the most conservative (i.e., highest) values of pre-development recharge.
3.2.6	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Section 3.2.6 discusses impacts of development on infiltration but not an evapotranspiration. Please include discussion on the impacts to evapotranspiration to fully address to water balance.	ARCADIS		Evapotranspiration decreases from approximately 555 mm in the predevelopment scenario to 213 in the post development scenario due to an increase in impervious service, which represents an approximate 62 % reduction in ET.
Page 25	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Page 25 states 'As noted in the CVC and TRCA 2010 LID Guidance Manual, if the infiltration rate of soils less than 15 mm/hour (i.e., hydraulic conductivity less than 1x10-6 cm/s), the soil will need to be treated (e.g., tilled with organic matter) to increase the infiltration capacity of potential LID areas. As such, various LID measures can be contemplated to mitigate the reduction in recharge in the post-development scenario; however, soil amendments may be required'. Please note that the CVC and TRCA 2010 Guide has been superseded by the LID SWM Planning and Design Guide, Sustainable Technologies Evaluation Program (https://wiki.sustainabletechnologies.ca/index.php?title=Main_Page&oldid=15953). The guide indicates that when soils are of low infiltration rate, design modifications may be necessary which may include an underdrain, allowing for storage under an underdrain to draw down over a longer period of time and for more vertical orientated BMPs to provide greater hydraulic head are among design considerations that should be investigated. This section should be corrected to reflect existing practice and it is our expectation that the Management Plan will further recommend appropriate mitigation strategies that will be implemented at future stages of planning. LINK: https://wiki.sustainabletechnologies.ca/index.php?title=Main_Page&oldid=15953	SCHAEFFERS		Acknowledged. Report updated with current guidelines Further recommendations for mitigation strategies will be address in Phase 2
Page 25	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	On page 25 it states that LID measures will be proposed and designed at the detailed design stage. While it is appropriate to design them at detailed design, the CEISMP should generally guide the LID measures that should be implemented at detailed design as well as design considerations.	SCHAEFFERS		The Phase 2 CEISMP to include depth to groundwater maps across the site and including areas proposed for SWM / LID facilities. Additional field studies will be required to characterize depth to groundwater, hydraulic gradients, and infiltration rates in specific areas. This will be completed as part of the 60% design.
	Engineering Services	Phase 1/Existing Conditions and Baseline Inventory	Management Recommendations, of the Evaluation, Classification and Management Headwater Drainage Feature Guidelines (2014) developed by CVC and TRCA, identifies that where a lower level of protection is identified for a segment downstream of a segment with a higher level of protection, the more conservative approach shall be adopted for both segments and the downstream section should be reclassified to match the upstream section. This has not been applied to the HDF assessment and should be corrected.	GEI		The HDF Management Table (Table 1 in Appendix C1) notes the HDF management recommendations as per the strict Guidelines, as well as the Interpreted Management Recommendations from the Humber Station Consultant Team. The recommendations sometimes differ and rationale for the Interpreted Management Recommendations is provided in the footnotes of Table 1 (Appendix C1).
Table C2-3	Engineering Services		For Table C2-3 can you provide further explanation on why groundwater levels were not measured for some locations in 2022 and 2023.	ARCADIS		Water levels collected by Arcadis in 2022 could not be collected at MW3-17, MW9, MW14-17 because we did not have permission to access the respective parcels. A packer was observed in MW5-17d in 2022 and, as such, water levels were not obtained. Arcadis was retained in 2023 to collect water levels only in September, but this did not include BH1, BH9, BH12, BH13, BH15 and BH18, which were installed by others on a specific portion of the site. During the Sept. 2023 monitoring events, three wells were not monitored because either: they could not be located due to dense vegetation; were on parcel where we did not have permission to enter; or the well had a packer installed. Other reported water levels obtained in 2023 were obtained by other consulting companies working on specific parcels for individual land owners.

Water level readings on November 8, 21, 29 2022, May 12, 2023, and July 31, 2023, were provided by Palmers. Based on the data provided, they did not take measurements at MW1-17, MW2-17S/D, MW5-17S/D, and MW7 (BH3 RUB MW)

COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX						
Municipal Address		Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (Option #6)			Date Prepared: April 23, 2024	
Client		Humber Station Landowners Group			27-Mar-24	
Application		Secondary Plan Submission 2				
PART 5						
Reference #	Commenting Agency	Heading	Comment	Responsibility	Action	Response
General Comments	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	<p>- OPA 274 requires that the secondary plan be based on a subwatershed study prepared according to a Town-approved ToR and outlines minimum requirements for that study. The CEISMP was prepared according to ToR prepared prior to OPA 274. Therefore, a Town-approved SWS ToR has not been prepared. The submission cover letter indicates that the CEISMP is intended to encompass a Scoped Subwatershed Study. To ensure the OPA requirement for a SWS is met, the CEISMP shall outline how it meets typical/relevant SWS study requirements and all minimum requirements outlined in OPA 274.</p> <p>- One of the minimum requirements outlined in OPA 274 is for the SWS to establish environmental targets to maintain, restore and enhance existing conditions. The Phase 1 report identifies protected areas that may have considerable opportunity for improvements including buckthorn thickets and online ponds. Highly invasive species such as White Poplar that have been identified in the study area should also be considered for management. Ensure the report assess these opportunities, including those on non-participating lands, when establishing targets and the Phase 2/3 reports identify areas and BMPs for restoration/enhancement.</p> <p>- Clarify where the replacement habitat structures for Barn Swallow are located. If they are not located in the proposed NHS and the identified foraging habitat, re-locating them should be considered.</p> <p>- The figures display an outdated proposed route for Highway 413. The 2024 mapping includes a larger area to the south.</p>	GEI / SGL		<p>The report has been updated in Section 1.1 to outline how the CEISMP meets the requirements of OPA 274; Section 5.5.8.2 a.) in OPA 274 states " a subwatershed study or Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan (CEISMP) prepared in accordance with Town approved terms of reference..."</p> <p>Section 3.9.3 has been added to establish environmental targets to maintain, restore and enhance existing conditions.</p> <p>The Barn Swallow structures are shown on Figure 4a (Appendix A1). These structures are located inside the NHS.</p> <p>Figures have been updated with the current route for Highway 413.</p>
Section 1	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	<p>- It is indicated that Town policies require a CEISMP. Revise as per comment above.</p> <p>- The reference to Future Caledon designations and mapping for The study area is outdated. Revise to be consistent with The approved Future Caledon plan.</p> <p>- The Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment Guidelines are not considered 'interim'.</p>	GEI / SGL		<p>The report has been updated in Section 1.1 to outline how the CEISMP meets the Town Policies and the requirements of OPA 274.</p> <p>Per the Town's request, the Official Plan Amendment has been updated to amend the in-force Caledon OP and the secondary plan will be integrated into the existing Official Plan to align with OPA 278. Section 1.2.1 of the Future Caledon OP states that the 1978 Official Plan as per the last consolidation provides the policy framework for the Bolton Settlement Area including this Secondary Plan Area. All Future Caledon OP Schedules reference this section; and as such no land use designations will be referenced for the Study Area based on the Future Caledon OP. In addition, as the Future Caledon OP (2024) has not yet received regional approval at the time of this submission, this submission speaks to required amendments to the Caledon Official Plan (1978, 2024 consolidation) which is currently in force and effect.</p> <p>References to the Headwater Drainage Feature Assessment Guidelines have been revised accordingly.</p>
Section 2.0	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	<p>- Section 2.14 of the Regional Official Plan has been misinterpreted. The only development and site alteration permitted in Core Areas are those associated with the exceptions listed in 2.14.15. Revise to ensure clarity.</p> <p>- The land use designations outlined for the study area from Schedule C of the OP are incorrect. Revise to ensure clarity.</p>	GEI		<p>Acknowledged. Section 2.1 has been updated to say "Section 2.14 prohibits development and site alteration within the Core Areas of the Greenlands, except for permitted uses as outlined in 2.14.15." Section 2.14.10 provides policy language on how refinements to the Greenland System may be made through approved development plans.</p> <p>The Caledon OP review in Section 2.1 has been updated to note: The Study Area is located within the Bolton Settlement Area and is designated as New Employment Area, Highway 413 Transportation Corridor towards the southwest, and has Environmental Policy Area designation along the northwestern limits. The Study Area is adjacent to General and Prestige Industrial land use to the east, and Prime Agricultural Area to the west, as per Schedule C ("Bolton Land Use Plan").</p>
Section 3.1	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	<p>It is indicated that HDF8 was dry and HDF3 had intermittent flow on all monitoring events. However, elsewhere in the report HDF8 is identified as ephemeral and photographs in the appendices display water and refer to flows in that feature. Similarly, HDF3 was observed to have permanent flows in one monitoring year (Section 3.7.17 indicates HDF3 was permanently flowing in 2017). Clarify the flow regimes of these features and revise the report to ensure consistency.</p>	GEI / Arcadis		<p>Acknowledged. Section 3.1 has been revised to note that HDF-8 is ephemeral and HDF-3 had perennial flow in 2017, but displayed ephemeral flow in 2022 and 2023.</p>
Section 3.2	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	<p>It is indicated that the water balance was undertaken according to a conceptual site plan that outlines impervious surface coverage of rooftops, parking, walkways, roads, etc. but that wasn't provided in the submission. As such, the validity of the water balance is not clear.</p> <p>The role of infiltration relative to supporting the Clarkway tributary is discussed. However, the role of infiltration in supporting HDF3 and associated wetlands is not despite upward hydrogeological gradients being observed in proximity to these features and a permanent flow regime in 2017. The Phase 2 report must ensure no negative impact to all features and their functions including demonstrating the feasibility of matching post-development infiltration to pre-development levels.</p>	Arcadis / Schaeffers		<p>Please note that water balance made assumptions about the % impervious since the concept plan is still preliminary and these details haven't been determined. All proposed general industrial and prestige industrial land use, as well as proposed roadway was considered to be impervious in the post-development scenario.</p> <p>Text revised regarding the role of infiltration in supporting the headwater drainage features. Please note that infiltration can only occur in areas with downward gradients, regardless recharge important generally in the maintenance of headwater drainage features and other natural heritage areas and will be considered during Phase 2</p>

Section 3.4	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- It is indicated that the drainage model was revised to reflect the catchment boundary changes required for the post-development analysis. The Phase 2 report must demonstrate that the proposed drainage diversions will not impact protected features and their functions.	Schaeffers		Noted.
Section 3.75	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	<p>-HDF3 was assessed as a headwater drainage feature. However, it is understood that it is regulated as a watercourse by TRCA. Clarity is needed in this regard.</p> <p>- The rationale for HDF3 management recommendations that differ from the Headwater Drainage Feature Guidelines due to upstream reaches being wetlands is not understood. For three of the differing recommendations (HDF3a, 3d, 3g) it is the presence of fish in the reach itself that led to the protection recommendation in the guidelines. For HDF3i it is the presence of year-round water in the reach itself that led to the protection recommendation in the guidelines. It appears that the modified recommendations are being used to justify proposed reach realignments where agricultural straightening (note that siltation and fertilizer agricultural impacts are irrelevant in the post-development scenario) has occurred. While it is not clear that straightening has occurred on all of these reaches, subject to TRCA approval and the maintenance of groundwater contributions into the feature, the Town is supportive of rehabilitation in this case, including realignment of the reaches using natural channel design. As this is permitted by the guidelines which only state that realignment of reaches recommended for protection is "not generally permitted", the modified recommendations are not needed and should be revised.</p> <p>- The rationale for HDF management recommendations that differ from the Headwater Drainage Feature Guidelines due to Redside Dace contributing habitat is not understood. The Redside Dace habitat regulation indicates that HDFs must be permanent or intermittent to be considered contributing habitat. The HDF reaches with downgraded management recommendations (note that the approach for HDF4a was not consistent in the report), were all identified as ephemeral. Therefore, it appears that they would not be considered Redside Dace contributing habitat and no modified management recommendations are needed.</p> <p>- Clarify why interpreted management recommendations were provided for reaches that are not necessary to implement the proposed preliminary NHS (e.g., HDF3a).</p> <p>- The discussion regarding the mitigation management recommendation indicates that it was applied to ephemeral and intermittent swales. However, only ephemeral reaches have been given that recommendation. Revise for clarity.</p> <p>- The inclusion of traditional storm sewers in the mitigation management recommendation is not consistent with the guidelines which only include vegetated swales, bioswales, constructed wetlands, and LID BMPs. Revise and ensure that the Phase 2 report includes the correct</p>	GEI		<p>it provides some erosion and sediment transport function to the downstream system, this is limited. Further, the assessment noted that channel geometry varied over the assessed length of the feature, with the channel losing definition, particularly at the transition between wetlands. Given that the defined sections flow for short stretches between undefined or poorly defined sections, and that the feature provides limited sediment supply functions, it is recommended that this feature be evaluated as a headwater drainage feature (HDF).</p> <p>Under the HDF Guidelines, and as noted in Table 1 (Appendix C1), HDF3a, 3d, 3g, and 3i receive a management recommendation of Protection due to upstream wetlands which are automatically Protection and anything downstream of them are also afforded a management recommendation of Protection. Presence of fish/flows was restricted to spring for most years which is characterized as Valued Fish Habitat. The Interpreted Consultant Team Recommendations consider site-specific factors such as degradation of habitat due to agricultural impacts, as well as mitigation for Redside Dace, and provide rationale for alternative recommendations, including realignment using natural channel design. While we recognize that the HDF Guidelines for Protection reaches allow potential flexibility with realignment due to the wording 'not generally permitted', from a consistency perspective we prefer to include the Interpreted Consultant Team Recommendations for all HDFs that apply, to prevent misunderstanding from other agencies such as TRCA, MECP, DFO, etc. and because there are other reaches where we would continue to use the Interpreted Consultant Team Management Recommendations (i.e., those HDFs where we are interpreting the management recommendation to be Mitigation instead of Conservation, due to the proposed mitigation for removal of Redside Dace Contributing habitat). Maintenance of groundwater contributions for HDF-3 will be evaluated during phase 2 and 3.</p> <p>GEI engaged with MECP regarding the definition of Contributing Habitat for Redside Dace and understand that ephemeral headwater drainage features meet the definition. Therefore the modified management recommendations remain included in the report.</p> <p>Figure 6 has been revised to show HDF-3a as Conceptual Drainage Realignment.</p>
Section 3.7.8	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- It is indicated that L. palustris and E. palustris were found in an MAM2-11 wetland community, but that community is not present on Figure 4a. Clarify the management recommendation for all of the identified rare species.	GEI		The reference to MAM2-11 was a typo. The Phase 1 report has been revised to note L. palustris and E. palustris occurred in a MAM2-2 community. The Phase 2 Impact Analysis and Phase 3 Management Recommendations reports will finalize the NHS details including rare plant species relocation, as warranted.
Section 3.7.13	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- It is indicated that the FOD8-3 polygon was assessed for bat habitat and that acoustic monitoring confirmed that four bat species were present in that community. Clarify how this relates to Figure 5 and Table 15 in the appendices which include bat point count stations and bat transects elsewhere in the study area; some of which have identified bats.	GEI		Section 3.7.13 has been updated to differentiate between the bat habitat assessment and acoustic monitoring that occurred in the woodland (FOD8-3) and the bat transects and point station completed at structures and transects throughout the Study Area. The report notes that these transect and point surveys can only confirm bat presence and potential foraging within the Study Area. A habitat assessment and acoustic monitoring in woodlands and/or bat exit surveys for structures are required to confirm habitat use.
Section 3.7.14	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- The location of the road crossing transects and turtle basking stations are not evident on Figure 5. Tables 18 and 19 indicate that nine Midland Painted Turtles or unidentifiable turtles were found dead on the road at RT1 and one Midland Painted Turtle was found basking at TBS3. The presence of 5 or more nesting or overwintering Midland Painted Turtles is considered SWH. While it is acknowledged that the turtle nesting and basking surveys only revealed one Midland Painted Turtle, the surveys did not include non-participating lands where suitable habitat is present. Given the considerable presence of the species in the study area, it is reasonable to conclude that the species is breeding and overwintering somewhere in the study area. A discussion on candidate SWH should be provided. At minimum, it appears that all permanent ponds in the vicinity of where the species was found should be considered candidate overwintering SWH.	GEI		Figure 5 has been updated to show Turtle Basking (TB) stations and road mortality transects. As a result of the high density roadkill crossing location along Healey Road (RT1), it is acknowledged that turtles are crossing Healey Road between the woodlands on each side of the road which contain OA and wetland habitats as per MNFR LIO mapping and GEI's air photo interpretation. Therefore, candidate overwintering habitat may be present in the OA ponds associated with the northwest FOD community on non-participating lands (south of Healey Road). These OA ponds are identified as candidate over-wintering habitat on Figure 4a. The adjacent MAS2-1 community, identified as TB1 on the Study Area, did not identify any turtles during the turtle basking surveys and does not qualify as over-wintering habitat. While the pond at TB3 identified a Midland Painted turtle during basking surveys, abundances were not met (more than 5 individuals) and therefore it does not qualify as over-wintering habitat SWH.
Section 3.8.2	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	It is indicated that FOD7-6 does not meet the size criterion to be considered a woodland. Treed areas are present in close proximity on either side of this polygon and must be assessed for potential inclusion in the woodland polygon. Figures 4a and 4b suggest that these treed areas are an orchard and nursery. The report must demonstrate that these treed areas don't qualify for inclusion in the woodland.	GEI		The FOD7-6 in the south-central portion of the Study Area is located within non-participating lands, is < 0.5 ha in size and therefore does not meet the size criteria. While it is acknowledged that this FOD7-6 is adjacent to a nursery and orchard, these features are not considered woodlands as per 2.14.31 of the RPOP and cannot be included in the woodland polygon.
Section 3.8.4	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- The identified Bat SWH is not consistent with the bat survey locations and related discussion in Section 3.7.13 and Figure 5. This also applies to Figure 4a. Revise for clarity.	GEI		The text has been updated to identify the northwestern FOD and southern FOD6-7 (both on non-participating lands) as candidate bat maternity colony SWH. The FOD8-3 does not meet the criteria to be considered bat maternity colony SWH.
Section 3.8.8	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	The evaluation of significance must include Town Official Plan policy (e.g. Other woodlands).	GEI		A discussion of Other Woodlands as defined in either the Future Caledon OP Section 13.4.1 or current Caledon OP section 3.2.5.3 has been included in Section 3.8.2.

Section 3.9	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- The proposed NHS must be identified as preliminary as the Phase 2 Impact Analysis and Phase 3 Management Recommendations reports are needed to finalize aspects such as demonstrating the feasibility of meeting water balance targets (including restoration area hydrology), the identification of proposed uses in buffers such as trails, and appropriate buffer widths. While policy references were provided in relation to the proposed preliminary buffer widths, a robust rationalization will be required. Note that the Town's current OP does not provide buffer widths and the recently approved Future Caledon OP provides minimum buffer widths that differ from those that are proposed.	GEI		The proposed NHS has been identified as preliminary throughout the report and figures. As per Section 1.2.1 of the Future Caledon OP (2024): "The Future Caledon Official Plan applies a separate policy framework and land use pattern Town-wide, except where the 1978 Official Plan, as amended, remains in effect in accordance with Policy 1.2.1. As this applies to the Study Area, adherence to the new buffer policies in the Future Caledon OP (2024) are not required for Bolton Settlement Areas. However, as the Future Caledon OP (2024) has not yet received regional approval at the time of this submission, this submission speaks to required amendments to the Caledon Official Plan (1978, 2024 consolidation) which is currently in force and effect.
Section 3.9.4	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- It is indicated that the MAS2-1 wetland is being proposed for relocation to accommodate the proposed realignment of HDF3. However, the proposed realignment displayed on Figure 6 traverses both the existing and proposed wetland (i.e., there is no difference). Appropriate rationalization must be provided. While a wetland compensation area in the south is supported, clarify how/why 0.35ha was required by SCE's analysis. It must be demonstrated that the appropriate compensation/mitigation is being provided.	GEI / Schaeffers		It is anticipated that the natural corridor design for the proposed drainage realignment will require the relocation of MAS2-1 to the HDF3 realignment floodplain. A water availability assessment will be developed in Phase 2/3 to demonstrate that suitable hydrological conditions are provided within this realigned corridor to support a wetland community. A summary of wetland compensation calculations has been added to Section 3.9.5 to demonstrate how the 0.35ha area had been determined.
Section 3.9.5	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- Rationalize the basis for stating that ideally the post-development surface water balance will be within 10% of monthly pre-development inputs. Note that 5% has been used in other studies. Terms such as 'ideally' should not be used when setting targets. Minimum targets must be provided.	Arcadis		Text revised to meet the 5% criteria. The word ideally has been removed.
Figure 4a)	Town of Caledon	CEISMP - Phase 1	- HDF8a is displayed as a feature proposed for realignment but is displayed as protected within the proposed preliminary NHS on Figure 6. Revise to ensure consistency. - It is not clear if the full limit of the Clarkway wetland was staked. Provide clarity. Additionally, what is the difference between 'hydrologic edge of wetland' and 'wetland limit' staking? - Clarify why most of the FOD8-3 dripline was not staked even in areas of participating landowners. Staking is required in order to set feature limits.	GEI		HDF-8a is not identified as protected on Figure 6. Was this comment intended for another HDF? The riparian wetlands surrounding the Clarkway Drive Tributary were staked for all participating properties within the Study Area. Hydrologic edge of wetland was the high-water mark which was a temporarily flooded area that had been farmed. TRCA agreed that it was not a wetland, but wanted the high-water mark delineated to assist with any potential SWM outlet infrastructure in this general area. The FOD8-3 dripline along the north edge was shown incorrectly and has been updated for all relevant figures. For the southern edge of the FOD8-3, TRCA did not stake the CLT1-7 community since it was dominated by Buckthorn. Instead, TRCA requested we conduct a targeted Buckthorn survey to identify locations for Buckthorn control.
Table 21	Town of Caledon	Appendix C	- It is not appropriate to indicate that Myotis bats are confirmed to be absent from SA as acoustic monitoring only occurred in FOD 8-3. For instance they could be present in northern FOD woodland. - Table 21 indicates that American Bullfrog was found in the study area. As wetlands with breeding bullfrogs and associated amphibian movement corridors for the species are considered SWH, this must be assessed in the report.	GEI		Table 7 (SARA) was updated to indicate potential use by Myotis species in the northwestern and southern FOD communities on non-participating lands. The Bullfrog was heard during BBS in June at the pond near Humber Station Road (AMC15). No Bullfrogs were heard calling at this station during AMC surveys. Therefore, this pond is identified as candidate wetland amphibian breeding habitat SWH, which does not necessitate the need for identification of amphibian movement corridor SWH. In addition, the majority of HDF-3 does not have riparian vegetation as it is ploughed to the edge of the feature on both sides, and is not a suitable amphibian movement corridor.
8.2, 8.3, 8.5, 8.6	Town of Caledon	Draft Secondary Plan	The Draft Secondary Plan must be updated as necessary following approval of the Phase 2 and 3 CEISMP reports. - Section 5 indicates that the proposed land uses will respect the natural features and functions of the Clarkway Tributary corridor. Revise to include all protected features and functions in the Secondary Plan area. - Clarify why proposed policies 8.2, 8.3, 8.5, and 8.6 have been included when the Phase 1 CEISMP report indicates that the boundaries of the features have mostly been determined in the field and it is proposing buffers. Note that a policy addressing development limits in relation to non-participating lands is needed. - The Secondary Plan must implement the recommendations of the approved CEISMP. As such, proposed policy 8.3 is not appropriate except potentially in relation to non-participating lands in which case it is not appropriate to only refer to Provincial policies. Any refined development limits on non-participating properties must be consistent with Town and TRCA policies and the intent/recommendations of the approved CEISMP. - Clarify the intent of proposed policy 10.6. Other than watercourse crossings, all other encroachments must be avoided. Combine that policy and proposed policy 10.8 into one that only addresses watercourse crossings. - Proposed policy 10.11 addresses active transportation in the NHS. A conceptual active transportation/trails plan must be prepared for in relation to the Phase 2 CEISMP report in order to assess impacts and appropriate mitigation (e.g., buffer widths). See the related comment on proposed policy 8.6 above.	SGL		The Environmental Policy Area section of the policies has been revised to refer back to the CEISMP and follow the buffers and development limits, as well as the recommendations, set out in that document.
10.6						
10.11						
Phase 2 and 3 CEISMP Reports	Town of Caledon	Land Use Plan	- Must be updated as necessary following approval of the Phase 2 and 3 CEISMP reports	SGL		Noted.

COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX

Municipal Address Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (Option #6)
Client Humber Station Landowners Group
Application Secondary Plan Submission 2

Date Prepared: 27-Mar-24

PART 3		REGION					
Reference #	Jeff Hignet, Senior Planner	Commenting Agency	Heading	Comment	Responsibility	Action	Response
1	TRCA	Water Resources	The applicant has presented an outline detailing the approach and parameters employed in developing hydraulic models for watercourses that TRCA has not created. The outlined approaches are generally acceptable. However, to enable TRCA staff to verify the information provided in the report, the applicant is required to submit a digital copy of the HEC-RAS model.	SCHAEFFERS		Comment Noted. A digital copy of the HEC-RAS Model is submitted in Appendix F of the Humber Station CEISMP Phase 1 Report.	
2	TRCA	Water Resources	Please submit a plan that shows the existing condition floodplain mapping for all watercourses located in the subject property along with the HEC-RAS cross section.	SCHAEFFERS		The Floodplain Mapping is presented in the floodplain Report. Please refer to Appendix B of the Floodplain Report. Please note that Floodplain Report is included in Appendix D of the Humber Station CEISMP Phase 1 Report.	

COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX

Municipal Address Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (Option #6)
Client Humber Station Landowners Group
Application Secondary Plan Submission 2

Date Prepared:

27-Mar-24

PART 4 Planning						
Reference #	Commenting Agency	Heading	Comment	Responsibility	Action	Response
	SGL	General Comments	The new Official Plan is not in effect and may not be until after this Secondary Plan is complete. Follow existing OP and OPA 274, which was approved for this specific Secondary Plan, to prepare/revise these policies.	SGL		The format of the Secondary Plan/OPA has been revised to amend the current Caledon Official Plan. References to the Future Caledon Official Plan sections have been removed. References have been added to refer back to the current Caledon Official Plan and policies that were introduced from OPA 274.
	SGL	General Comments	Avoid referencing section and policy numbers as these are subject to change over time with future amendments to the Official Plan.	SGL		Noted.
	SGL	General Comments	Most language in this secondary plan that refers to the Caledon Official Plan calls it "this plan". This is confusing, as "this plan" is the secondary plan. We should call the new OP the new OP in the Secondary Plan	SGL		Revised to refer to current Caledon Official Plan.
	SGL	General Comments	Along the northwest section of the secondary plan area is the Knowledge and Innovation Employment Area designation. Refer to section 5.5.12 of OPA 274 to include policies in this secondary plan.	SGL		This has been discussed with the Town and wording has been added to the secondary plan policies to reflect the intent of the Knowledge and Innovation Corridor, while still allowing for both Prestie or General Employment uses.
	SGL	General Comments	The Secondary Plan Area is primarily designated New Employment Area, Environmental Policy Area, Planned Highway 413, and includes the Highway 413 Focused Analysis Area.	SGL		Noted.
	SGL	General Comments	The subject lands are within Official Plan Amendment 274 area, passed October 10th 2023, and have been designated New Employment Area, Environmental Policy Area, Planned Highway 413, and include the Highway 413 Focused Analysis Area	SGL		Noted.
	SGL	General Comments	The subject lands are within the new Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan currently being prepared in accordance with the policies and requirements of the FCOP.	SGL		Noted, although the policies will be in accordance with the current Official Plan as that is what is being amended and not the Future Caledon Official Plan.
	SGL	General Comments	Section 5.5.8 of OPA 274 states that secondary plans will be prepared and completed in accordance with the Town's approved Growth Management and Phasing Plan, this Plan and the Region of Peel Official Plan.	SGL		Noted.
	SGL	General Comments	An official plan amendment to implement a new secondary plan will be prepared in accordance with the policies and requirements of the Official Plan and/or OPA 274. Recommend including the direction provided in Chapter 22, Planning the Urban System, Chapter 24, Official Plan Amendments, and Chapter 27, Development Application Requirements (Section 24.3.1 of draft Future Caledon Official Plan)	SGL		Noted.
	SGL	General Comments	Need to include policies that provide for the orderly transition from agriculture and related uses that enable agricultural uses to continue for as long as practical and mitigate and/or minimize adverse effects. Also add policies providing guidance on continuation/integration/transitional of existing land uses.	SGL		To be added to the secondary plan policies or reflected through the parent Official Plan policies.
	SGL	General Comments	Add a section to include Energy and Climate Change mitigation and include policies that identify how low carbon and alternative and renewable energy systems should be incorporated	SGL		Policies added to vision and design sections.
	SGL	General Comments	Include identification of areas where tertiary plans may be required. If not required, include level of detail that would be provided in a tertiary plan.G22	SGL		Tertiary plans will not be required.
	SGL	General Comments	Include policies providing for appropriate urban agricultural uses in suitable locations.	SGL		To be added to the secondary plan policies or reflected through the parent Official Plan policies.

	SGL	General Comments	Some of the conceptual collector roads are missing on the Land Use schedule. See schedule F1 of new Future Caledon Official Plan to revise showing conceptual road connections to adjacent areas.	SGL		This has been discussed with the Town. The George Bolton Parkway extension and new north-south Industrial Road are being studied through the EA process and any further refinements will be dealt with as part of that process. The OPA is an amendment to the in-effect Official Plan, and not the Future Caledon Official Plan.
1	SGL	Purpose	<p>This secondary plan should begin with the long-term vision followed by a series of guiding principles intended to achieve the vision. Ex's: What is the vision? Why is it important to Bolton + Caledon + the GTA? What is important about the vision/future for this Secondary Plan area? What is important about this location? How will this secondary plan provide for residents, employees, cyclists, future transit, contribute to complete communities, etc?</p> <p>Need further details on the land use designations to be applied, including the mentioned vision plus the goals and objectives, permitted uses and development policies that apply to each. See OPA 274 for structure.</p> <p>"The purpose of this Secondary Plan is to establish detailed land use policies <i>and designations</i> for the Humber Station Employment Area."</p>	SGL		Vision and Guiding Principles section added.
1	SGL	Purpose	<p>"In addition, the policies cover transportation, servicing, cost sharing, phasing, environmental, urban design, eco-business, cultural and built heritage, archaeology and implementation."</p> <p>Needs to be re-written to include a description of the main structural elements of the secondary plan area and how those structural elements area based on the guiding principles. Also include a description of how much growth is planned in the secondary plan area.</p>	SGL		Planning Designations section added and revised.
2	SGL	Location	<p>"The Secondary Plan Area is bounded by Humber Station Road to the west, Mayfield Road to the south, Healy Road to the north and the Coleraine West Employment Area Secondary Plan Area boundary to the east as shown on Schedule XX."</p> <p>Change to the "mid-concession between Humber Station Road and Coleraine Drive".</p>	SGL		Revised.
3	SGL	Basis	Update section with info from the existing OP and OPA 274. These lands have been re-designated in advance of this Secondary Plan to "New Employment Area" and "Highway 413 Transportation Corridor", but there is no mention of this in basis section.	SGL		Revised.
3	SGL	Basis	Technical studies to be listed to demonstrate feasibility of development for employment uses to inform secondary plan.	SGL		List of technical studies has been added.
3	SGL	Basis	<p>"Section 23.6 of the Official Plan"</p> <p>This is referring to the new OP, which is not yet in force. This Secondary Plan should be based on existing OP and OPA 274. Also, don't list policy/section numbers as these are subject to change through future amendments.</p>	SGL		Addressed.
4	SGL	Goals	<p>"Humber Station employment area secondary plan promotes high quality industrial development in a comprehensive manner consistent with the Official Plan."</p> <p>This could use some elaboration: how will this contribute/create the community we want? What about mobility/walkability? How will this connect to adjacent areas? Leveraging future transit opportunities should also be a goal and/or objective. Most of these 4 goals listed are more objectives than goals – consider an overall "Goal" statement, followed by an Objectives section listing the objectives for this Secondary Plan area. I think we should have more objectives here. Need something referencing low-impact sustainable planning & design. Also should comment on OPA 274.</p>	SGL		Addressed and revised under the new Vision and Guiding Principles section.

4	SGL	Goals	<p>"To provide for logical and orderly development on full municipal services" It should be stated that this should happen early in the planning approval process, and include, where applicable, lands for stormwater management, public health, education, recreation, parks and open space, cultural and community facilities, public safety and affordable housing.</p> <p>"To ensure a high standard of community design is provided along all arterial roads" What does this mean? Is built form and character/architectural design included in this?</p>	SGL		Revised.
5	SGL	General Policies	<p>I don't see any General Policies here? List them as numbered policies, add them if this is just an intro. Include employment numbers and minimum employment densities.</p> <p>General employment should be a separate paragraph.</p>	SGL		Revised structure of this section.
5	SGL	General Policies	<p>"The General Employment designation is more suitable for manufacturing, processing, distribution and outdoor storage uses and will be characterized by large properties developed with single and multiple unit buildings accommodating the industrial uses that are primary to the designation."</p> <p>This should read accessory outdoor storage, rather than outdoor storage.</p>	SGL		Revised to refer back to OPA 274 policies in Official Plan.
6.1	SGL	Community Design	6.1 "All development policies shall conform to Section 7 as well as the following specific policies"; this needs to speak to achieving high standards of the physical design of the built and natural environment.	SGL		Section revised and additional guidance included from Town-wide Urban Design Guidelines.
6.2	SGL	Community Design	Section 6.2 of community design list section numbers; don't list section numbers, just say the OP and OPA 274 if needed.	SGL		Revised.
6.2	SGL	Community Design	<p>6.2 "To ensure high-quality design within the Secondary Plan Area, an Urban Design Assessment to the satisfaction of the Town will be required to show the site layout, design, elevations, signage, landscaping and pedestrian movement at the Site Plan Approval stage."</p> <p>This should be followed by an urban design section in the secondary plan – urban design principles should be embedded in the secondary plan policies.</p>	SGL		Section revised and additional guidance included from Town-wide Urban Design Guidelines.
6.3	SGL	Community Design	6.3 "All development shall conform to the design policies of Section 7 as well as the following specific policies." repeats 6.1 - refer to 6.1 comment	SGL		
6.4	SGL	Community Design	<p>"Buildings placed within the Prestige Employment designation shall generally front and provide their primary building entrance on Mayfield Road, George Bolton Parkway or Healey Road."</p> <p>Buildings will be located close to street edge, as per 5.5.10.4.b in OPA 274</p>	SGL		Added.
7.1	SGL	Prestige and General Employment Land Use Designations	Refer to policies as existing OP and OPA 274, avoid using section (as mentioned here) and policy numbers.	SGL		Revised to refer back to OPA 274 policies in Official Plan.
7.2	SGL	Prestige and General Employment Land Use Designations	<p>"The Prestige Employment designation shall apply to lands adjacent to Mayfield Road and the GTA West Transportation Corridor, with the intent that the development adjacent to these major roads will be attractive and developed to a high standard of community design with buildings that appear to front onto major roads."</p> <p>Consider listing these as 2 policies.</p>	SGL		Revised to refer back to OPA 274 policies in Official Plan.
7.3	SGL	Prestige and General Employment Land Use Designations	Avoid using section numbers as mentioned here (Section 23.8 and 23.8.2) and list uses.	SGL		Revised to refer back to OPA 274 policies in Official Plan.
8	SGL	Natural Environment System	Main header change from Natural Heritage System to Natural Environment System.	SGL		Revised to Environmental Policy Area to follow designation name.
8.1	SGL	Natural Environment System	Start this section by including language on how policies within the Natural Environment System within the secondary plan area are to be protected and potentially enhanced.	SGL		Language added.

8.2	SGL	Natural Environment System	<p>"8.2The refined development limit will be set through the completion of an EIS to the satisfaction of the Town of Caledon and based on the current planning policies of this Plan, relevant Region of Peel, Provincial and Conservation Authority policies."</p> <p>Start this section by including language on how policies within the Natural Environment System within the secondary plan area are to be protected and potentially enhanced.</p> <p>Write out EIS - do not use acronym going forward. In document "this plan" is written - is it the official plan or secondary plan - please specify.</p>	SGL		Language added.
9.1	SGL	Cultural Heritage Resources	<p>"Conservation of heritage resources shall be consistent with the provisions of Section 6 of this Plan."</p> <p>Specify if this is the OP.</p>	SGL		Revised.
10.1	SGL	Transportation	This plan to be removed and corrected to The Official Plan.	SGL		Revised.
10.2	SGL	Transportation	<p>"Any roads within the Secondary Plan Area shown on Schedule XX may be adjusted in the subdivision or site plan approval processes taking into account such matters as the preservation of environmental features, stormwater management requirements, heritage resources, the provision of full urban services, emergency services, detailed land use relationships and street pattern."</p> <p>Some of the conceptual roads already shown need to be adjusted, others added. See schedule F1 of new OP. Connections to adjacent areas</p>	SGL		This has been discussed with the Town. The George Bolton Parkway extension and new north-south Industrial Road are being studied through the EA process and any further refinements will be dealt with as part of that process. The OPA is an amendment to the in-effect Official Plan, and not the Future Caledon Official Plan.
10.5	SGL	Transportation	Document says right of way width of 22.5m - as per the Official Plan, Local Road allowance is to be between 17 and 20 metres (OP 5.9.5.2.9.f.iv)	SGL		Revised right-of-way width has been accommodated through the secondary plan.
10.7	SGL	Transportation	Removal of Section 11.4 of this Plan - add the Official Plan instead.	SGL		Revised.
10.8	SGL	Transportation	<p>"The roads within the Secondary Plan Area shall be designed to support and accommodate active transportation (walking, bicycling) and public transit to the greatest extent practical, to be determined through the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process, as required."</p> <p>Make all "shall's" be "will's". I know it sounds semantic, but it's to be consistent with OP.</p>	SGL		Revised.
10.9	SGL	Transportation	<p>"Shared parking, bicycle parking, carpool parking, and end-of-trip facilities, such as bike racks, showers and bicycle storage, to further promote modes of transportation other than the single-occupant vehicle will be encouraged."</p> <p>Some of this will be required by the new OP, need to strengthen the language. Suggest starting this policy with "Require minimum provisions for..." and delete "...will be encouraged."</p>	SGL		Revised.
12.1	SGL	Phasing	A phasing plan needs to be included and section 4.4 has been deleted; replace with the Official Plan	SGL		Phasing policies have been added.
14.1	SGL	Developer's Group Policy	Should add/revise policy where benefitting landowners who are not participating in preparation of this secondary plan but later decide to develop their lands will be required to contribute to the costs of preparing this secondary plan, based on their proportional share.	SGL		Revised, policy from Future Caledon Official Plan incorporated.

COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX						
Municipal Address Humber Station Employment Area Secondary Plan (Option #6) Client Humber Station Landowners Group Application Secondary Plan Submission 2			Date Prepared: March 27, 2024			
PART 5						
Reference #	Jeff Hignett, Senior Planner, Policy					
	Commenting Agency	Heading	Comment	Responsibility	Action	Response
1	Region of Peel	Planning and Development Services Comments	<p>With respect to the Humber Station Employment Secondary Plan, we have undertaken a review of the information provided specifically the Phase 1 Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Master Plan (CEISMP) which includes the following components:</p> <p><u>Phase 1:</u> The characterization of existing conditions, including the natural heritage features, hydrologic features, and surface and groundwater systems. Specifically:</p> <p><u>Background:</u> The Town of Caledon policies require that a CEISMP be prepared in support of applications for development that are adjacent to EPAs. The CEISMP addresses a range of environmental and servicing issues, including the protection and management of surface water, groundwater, fluvial geomorphology, terrestrial and aquatic resources, and the identification of the Natural Heritage System (NHS) and municipal servicing needs, including stormwater management, sanitary and water servicing and site grading requirements. There is an expectation that the CEISMP will be guided by the Terms of Reference (TOR) which was outlined by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) in Appendix 1 of the Bolton Residential Expansion Study Background Environmental Study (2014). The TRCA's Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines (dated October 2014), presented in Appendix A, and the TRCA's Master Environmental Servicing Plan Guideline (dated March 2015), presented in Appendix B. The consultants have confirmed that a Terms of Reference (TOR) for the CEISMP was submitted to the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and the Town of Caledon on January 28, 2022. The TOR was revised to address comments from the TRCA and re-submitted on July 6, 2022.</p> <p>The TOR guidelines, suggest that the CEISMP is to include three phases of reporting. As practical, the CEISMP components may be submitted in phases before proceeding to the next phase. The individual study components will be integrated across the various disciplines in the characterization, impact assessment, and implementation phases of the CEISMP.</p> <p><u>Future subsequent phases will include the following:</u> Phase 2 - includes the analysis, impact assessment, mitigation, and recommendations. Phase 3 - consists of a comprehensive implementation plan, monitoring plan, and adaptive management plan.</p> <p><u>Primary Observations:</u> The CEISMP Phase 1 from all indications have seemingly followed all requirements of the Region of Peel Official Plan, Town of Caledon Official Plan, and the TRCA. The CEISMP Phase 1 has reviewed and confirmed the extent of the Natural Heritage System (NHS) for the Study Area. A series of analyses were completed to identify natural hazards, natural features and functions that meet the definition of NHS components as described in the Town of Caledon Official Plan and Region of Peel Official Plan. The proposed NHS includes valley and stream corridors, wetlands, woodlands, significant wildlife habitat, habitat of endangered and threatened species, fish habitat, and their Vegetation Protection Zones/buffers. The NHS also includes a conceptual drainage realignment for Headwater Drainage Feature (HDF-3), and wetland relocation and/or compensation, which is anticipated to achieve a net ecological gain compared to existing conditions. This information is well supported by included mapping, figures and tables.</p> <p><u>Other Observation:</u> Reference was made on pg. 50 to the Peel-Caledon Significant Woodlands and Significant Wildlife Habitat Study (NSEI et al. 2009), but it was not included in the list of References and background Materials pgs. 60 - 64</p>			Noted. The citation for the Peel-Caledon Significant Woodlands and Significant Wildlife Habitat Study (NSEI et al. 2009) has been added to the References and Background Materials section.
2	Region of Peel	Program Planning Comments	<p>No population or water/wastewater demand estimates were given in the provided documents. Functional Servicing Report (FSR) is required, which provides these estimates calculated using design criteria from Peel Region's current water standard.</p> <p>No water or wastewater service plan was given the provided documents. This should be provided in the Functional Servicing Report as part of a future submission of this application.</p>			Noted. Servicing plans and population estimates will be provided as part of future submissions.
3	Region of Peel	Existing Water Infrastructure	<p>GIS and servicing drawings illustrate the following existing infrastructure in the vicinity of this development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A 200mm PVC distribution main on Humber Station Road, on the western edge of the site (PZ-6) - A 200mm PVC distribution main on Healey Road, on the northern edge of the site (PZ-6) - A 200mm PVC distribution main on Mayfield Road, on the southern edge of the site (PZ-6) - A 300mm PVC distribution main on Coleraine Drive, on the eastern edge of the site (PZ-6) - A 750mm CPP transmission main that runs along Mayfield Road and continuing up Coleraine Drive (PZ-7) which transfers water to the Bolton Elevated Tanks 			Noted.
4	Region of Peel	Planned Water Infrastructure	<p>GIS and servicing drawings illustrate the following existing infrastructure in the vicinity of this development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A concrete sanitary trunk sewer (circa 1982) on Coleraine Drive on the eastern edge of the site. The first 1km of the pipe section along this edge is 525/600mm, the remaining 2km is 750mm diameter. - The 750-mm sanitary trunk sewer conveys flows to the Brampton-Bolton Trunk Sewer, which eventually conveys flows to the G.E. Booth WWTP. 			Noted.
5	Region of Peel	Planned Waste Wastewater Infrastructure	<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A 600mm sanitary sewer on Healey Road, scheduled for construction in 2024 (24-2193) - A 750mm sanitary trunk sewer on Humber Station Road, scheduled for construction in 2024 (23-2271 and 23-2270) - A 450-mm sanitary sewer on the future extension of George Bolton Parkway from the above Humber Station Road trunk sewer to 700 metres easterly, scheduled for construction in 2026 (26-2190). And 450-mm sanitary sewer on a future street from that sewer to 500 metres northerly within the subject site, scheduled for construction in 2027 (27-2191) 			Noted.

6	Region of Peel	Future Highway 413 and Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Protection Area	<p>The subject lands – formerly known as the BRES Option 6 Employment Lands - were brought into the local urban boundary through the passing of OPA 274. OPA 274 included modification of the Bolton Land Use Plan to include a “Future Highway 413 and Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Protection Area” overlay over the portion of the subject lands within the FAA for these ongoing projects. With respect to the Humber Station Employment Secondary Plan, the following must be reflected in a future submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please revised the Draft Land Use Plan to show the “Future Highway 413 and Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Protection Area” as approved through OPA 274; and - To support the above overlay, please include the following language to within the draft secondary plan policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Future Highway 413 Corridor and Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Protection Areas are an overlay designation within New Employment Area consisting of a corridor protection area that reflects the Highway 413 Focused Analysis Area (2020) and the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor Narrowed Area of Interest (2020) and that is intended to be protected and refined until such time as the final locations of the Highway 413 Corridor and the Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor are confirmed. The final confirmed rights-of-way for the Highway 413 and Northwest GTA Transmission Corridor will be protected indefinitely with the highway lands designated under the PTHIA. Development within this area will not preclude or negatively affect the planning and/or implementation of the planned corridors for the purpose(s) for which they are identified. 			
7	Region of Peel	Stormwater Management Comments	<p>The Draft OP policies related to stormwater are satisfactory at this time however we do not have enough information to assess any stormwater impacts. The Phase 1 study outlines existing drainage conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase 2 of the study will outline the requirements for the area, review of the Phase 2 study will be required prior to approval. - The following materials and information is required for the Regional SWM review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SWM report – address the relevant sections of the Region’s SWM report submission requirements and SWM Criteria: https://www.peelregion.ca/public-works/designstandards/pdf/stormwater-management-report-requirements-december2022.pdf, https://www.peelregion.ca/public-works/designstandards/pdf/stormwater-design-criteria-201906.pdf - Grading and servicing plan with location of SWM facilities and their outlet clearly identified, with flow rate. - ESC plan with location of temporary sediment basins and their outlet clearly identified, with flow rate - Drainage area plan, outlining internal and external catchment area (ha) and runoff coefficient, with flow direction for minor and major flows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Hydraulic/floodplain analysis report, if impacts Regional roads and crossings. - Flows from external lands (including lands not participating in application) shall not be rerouted to regional roads. - No grading will be permitted within any Region of Peel ROW to support adjacent developments - For SWM facilities adjacent to a regional road, emergency overland flows shall not cause flooding of regional roads. Regional road drainage should be managed by any SWM facilities, as needed. 			Noted. Requested documents will be provided as part of future submission.
8	Region of Peel	Transportation Planning Comments	<p>Any proposed connection to Mayfield Road must adhere to the spacing requirements set out within the Region’s Road Characterization study. This portion of Mayfield Road is designated as an Industrial Connector, which outlines a spacing requirement of 450 metres between any full movement access.</p> <p>Property dedication will be required as per Section 7.7 of the Region of Peel Official Plan. along Regional Road 14 (“Mayfield Road”). The Region’s Official Plan road widening requirement for mid-block along Mayfield Road is 50 metres right-of-way (25.0 metres from the centerline). Additional property pursuant to the Region’s Official Plan will be required within 245 metres of intersections as a result of design necessities to protect for the provision of but not limited to; utilities, sidewalks, multiuse pathways and transit bay/shelters: 55.5 metres for a single left turn lane intersection configuration (27.75 metres from the centerline of Mayfield Road).</p> <p>Please be advised that there is an on-going Capital Project #18-4860 (currently in detailed design), taking place for the storm improvement of Highway 50 from Mayfield Road to Healey Road. The Project Manager for this project is Olek Garbos (olek.garbos@peelregion.ca) Please reach out to the project manager to obtain additional information on the capital project and detailed design.</p> <p>Please be advised that there is an on-going Capital Project #21-4040 (currently in detailed design), taking place for the construction of the future A2 Regional roadway, which will intersect with Mayfield Road along the south side. The Project Manager for this project is Scott Durdle (scott.durdle@peelregion.ca). Please reach out to the project manager to obtain additional information on the capital project and detailed designs.</p> <p>Please be advised that there is an on-going Capital Project #13-4065 is taking place along Mayfield Road for road widening from The Gore Road to Coleraine Drive. The Project Manager for this project is Serguei Kabanov (serguei.kabanov@peelregion.ca). Please reach out to the project manager to obtain additional information on the capital project and detailed design.</p> <p>We are supportive as noted within the draft report that any proposed new roadways will be reviewed/adjusted through any subsequent subdivision or site plan applications. We request a concept plan that clearly indicates the spacing distances being proposed for the new roadways for our review and comment.</p> <p>It is to be noted that the proposed intersection of Mayfield Road and Triangle Lands Access, which falls within the study area but not the lands of development will only be supported as a restricted access and not a full movement signalized access as depicted on Figure 4-2: 2043 Future Background Road Network</p> <p>The conceptual road network indicated on Humber Station Employment Area Land Use Plan – Option 3 as an interim scenario which includes the extension of George Bolton Parkway as well as a new cul-de-sac roadway.</p> <p>MTO must be circulated for comment and approval as a significant portion of the subject lands fall within the Route Planning Study Area boundaries. As such, the Region has concerns of the proposed municipal extension of A2 north of Mayfield Road as it is bisected by the proposed 413 Highway. Should this</p>			