SCOPED COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX - ALLOA SECONDARY PLAN
DRAFT FIRST SUBMISSION (JULY 2024) COMMENTS
Town of Caledon - POPA 2024-0004
May 2025

*Note: This document is submitted in support of the Partial Alloa Secondary Plan resubmission (**May 29, 2025**) and provides responses scoped to those items. A comprehensive resubmission package and comment matrix will follow - as discussed with Town staff.*

#	REVIEWER	COMMENTS/CONDITIONS	FORMAL RESPONSE
1	**Development Planning**	Comments to be provided within final comment letter	As discussed with staff, it is understood that further Development Planning comments will be provided after review of second submission.
1	**Policy**	Comments to be provided within final comment letter	As discussed with staff, it is understood that further Policy comments will be provided after review of second submission.
2	**Policy**	Comments are outstanding from the following agencies and departments and will be provided under separate cover. · OPP · Rogers	Per comment from Town staff, it is understood that outstanding OPP and Rogers comments are anticipated to be standard or non-significant at the Secondary Plan level and will not impede the processing of this application.
1	**Urban Design**	Clearly outline the opportunities and constraints within the site and what measures are taken to design around them	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
2	**Urban Design**	Identify the Special Character Areas within the community	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
3	**Urban Design**	Ensure the creation of significant views to help highlight local landmarks, scenic vistas, public art and open spaces. The identification of these views can help orient users within the area, create points of reference, and assist in wayfinding.	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.

TOWN OF CALEDON
PLANNING
RECEIVED
May 29, 2025

4	**Urban Design**	The neighbourhood centre was removed -from Chinguacousy Road & Tim Manley intersection. We would recommend to reintroduce the neighbourhood centre.	As the Neighbourhood Centre identified at Chinguacousy Road and Tim Manley Avenue includes the east side of the intersection, which is already built-out by the MW2 Secondary Plan, a complete Neighbourhood Centre as envisioned is unable to be achieved. However, as discussed with the Town/MHBC, there is significant overlap between the Neighbourhood Centre and Urban Corridor objectives of the Future Caledon Official Plan. In lieu of identifiying the Neighbourhood Centre designation in this area, the general Neighbourhood Centre objectives are achieved for the Chinguacousy Road and Tim Manley intersection by way of the proposed Urban Corridors along the Tim Manley Avenue extension and the north leg of Chinguacousy Road. Neighbourhood Centre designations are otherwise proposed in Phase 1 (northeast SP1 area), and Phase 2 (Tim Manley Avenue/Mississauga Road intersection).
5	**Urban Design**	The Future Official Plan 22.4 states: “Neighbourhood Centres are to be planned as vibrant focal points for the surrounding neighbourhood offering a range of goods and services to the neighbourhood for resident and worker daily needs within easy walking or cycling distance. Development within Neighbourhood Centres will take the form of mid-rise mixed-use buildings that can incorporate a mix of residential, commercial, office and service uses. They will be designed with an emphasis on quality pedestrian streetscapes and will be highly connected to transit and cycling infrastructure.”	Noted please see above.

6	**Urban Design**	a. Please incorporate additional mixed-use buildings surrounding the medium-high density block that will include commercial, office, and service uses	To address the Town's interest in mixed uses in this area, we propose integrating optional Live-Work units to facilitate the integration of ground-level retail at/near the intersection. Live-Work units must have lay-by parking in front of the units. Permitted Uses will include (in accordance with the approved zoning): - *Art Gallery* - *Artist Studio and Gallery* - *Business Office* - *Clinic* - *Day Care* - *Dry Cleaning or Laundry Outlet* - *Personal Service Shop* - *Restaurant* - *Retail Store* We further propose that non-residential uses should be optional to allow greater flexibility.
7	**Urban Design**	b. The ground floor of the medium-high density block at Tim Manley and Chinguacousy Rd should allow for commercial/retail opportunities	As discussed with the Town, live-work units have been proposed along the north side of the Tim Manley Avenue corridor to achieve optional ground level retail near the Chinguacousy Road intersection.
8	**Urban Design**	The Future Official Plan 22.4.3 states "The minimum permitted building height within the Neighbourhood Centre designation, excluding the Mayfield West Planned Major Transit Station area, is three storeys and the maximum permitted building height is 12 storeys". No one storey non residential building should be allowed	The revised Draft Secondary Plan has been revised to specify a proposed character for the Tim Manley Avenue Corridor, including minium building heights.
9	**Urban Design**	We do not recommended any single detached residential interface with general employment and would recommend at least town houses for the interface	General Employment designation is intended for the location of the existing Alloa Reservoir and Pump Station. The Reservoir is partly underground and sodded and appears as open space. No conflict is anticipated with adjacent residential uses and there are no noise impacts from the reservoir. We request maintaining the option for single detached dwellings at this location.

10	**Urban Design**	The blocks for major commercial and mixed use areas along Mayfield Drive should have adequate depth to accommodate the uses specified with an 'Urban Corridor.'. These corridors are anticipated to be approximately 100 metres in depth on either side of the road and will be characterized by a mixture of primarily high intensity forms of development, including retail and service commercial uses, offices and residential apartments, as well as community facilities. Check section 22.5 in new OP for Urban Corridors.	The proposed Major Commercial / Mixed Use Area blocks along Mayfield Road range between 60 and 100 metres in depth. These depths are sufficient to accommodate high density mixed use development. Deeper blocks are proposed at the arterial road intersections. The Draft Secondary Plan has also been revised to detail Urban Corridor policy and describe how the Major Commercial / Mixed Use Area along Mayfield Road may be developed for standalone commercial initially but planned to accommodate higher density mixed use development over time.
11	**Urban Design**	Ensure their commercial mixed-use areas are incorporating well designed outdoor public spaces and not just strip malls and parking lots.	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
12	**Urban Design**	Please specify the building typologies within 'Medium Density Residential' as indicated in the Design Guidelines	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
13	**Urban Design**	In looking at the street and block network in the Design guidelines, we'd recommend more openings on to the NHS.	As discussed with Town staff and illustrated through the demonstration plan, the current plan achieves 52% exposure to the NHS, which is a generally acceptable exposure rate to open spaces / NHS. Opportunity to break up large blocks (over 200 metres) will be explored.
14	**Urban Design**	The Special Policy Area-SP1 -shows medium density in the design guidelines but high density in PJR- Please clarify?	The SP1 area has been revised to a Neighbourhood Centre land use and the intent is to allow both medium and high density built forms within the Special Policy Area in accordance with the Draft Secondary Plan Policy document.
15	**Urban Design**	We'd also recommend the Special Policy area to be extended to the proposed collector Road to the south.	The Special Policy area has been extended per comment and discussion with staff.
16	**Urban Design**	The new secondary plan land use map has moved away from the comments we provided in the Parcs instead of incorporating them.	As discussed with Town staff, it was not clear why this comment was made.
17	**Urban Design**	There are some concerns in the location of the Community Park to the west of Creditview Road with no local street frontages	As discussed with Parks staff, a revised parks configuration has been prepared and confirmed. Parks staff confirmed local road access is not preferred for Community Park. Pedestrian safety can otherwise be addressed through traffic control features.
18	**Urban Design**	We'd like to see a mix of housing typologies and more than townhouses and single detached. Consideration for multiplexes, mid rise buildings and option for affordable housing and seniors housing should be explored	Several Medium-High Density Blocks are proposed throughout the Plan to accommodate a wide range of housing forms other than detached and townhouses, including opportunities for affordable housing. A mix of typologies are are also permitted anywhere within the proposed Neighbourhood Area designation of the Secondary Plan and within the Mixed Density Residential Zoning approved within the Phase 1 lands.

19	**Urban Design**	The gateways to the community should be indicated and their design should be highlighted in the guidelines.	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
20	**Urban Design**	Please note that the without the central east west corridor being shown as an urban corridor where the OP requires mixed uses, the northern half of the community does not met the HDA requirements for commercial/retail within 800m.	The propsoed Secondary Plan has been revised to identify the east-west corridor as an Urban Corridor. To address the HDA requirements, we propose integrating optional Live-Work units to facilitate the integration of ground-level retail near the Chinguacousy Road intersection. Permitted Uses will include (in accordance with the approved zoning): - *Art Gallery* - *Artist Studio and Gallery* - *Business Office* - *Clinic* - *Day Care* - *Dry Cleaning or Laundry Outlet* - *Personal Service Shop* - *Restaurant* - *Retail Store* At this time a Mixed Use Block is also proposed at the northeast corner of the east-west corridor and Creditview Road by way of the Phase 1 Tertiary Plan.
21	**Urban Design**	Residential located adjacent to Highway 413 corridor should have sufficient landscape buffer.	Note that a transitway will be located between the highway corridor and the Transitway which will act as a buffer to the highway. Developments will also accommodate any buffer/setback requirements of the MTO.
22	**Urban Design**	Detailed comments on the Community Design Guidelines will be provided once the Secondary Plan land use plan is finalized. It is our understanding that the Community Design Guidelines is only for phase 1 of the Secondary Plan	The Community Design Guidelines are intended to address the overall Secondary Plan but with greater detail of the Phase 1 Area to support Tertiary Plan level detail. We expect that an update to the CDG will be required at the time we process the Phase 2 Teritary Plan and language to this effect has been included in the Secondary Plan.
1	***Landscape***	*Landscape comments were received.*	*Landscape comments to be addressed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.*
1	**Parks**	Please see the marked-up comments on the Community Landscape and Open Spaces Plan section of the Community Design Plan.	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.

2	**Parks**	The park system for new communities should be designed as part of a comprehensive planning process with all landowners at the table so that parks can sized and located with consideration of the other future developable lands and to support the assembly of larger park blocks that support larger recreational amenities	As discussed with parks staff, a revised parks configuration has been prepared and generally confirmed. Revised parks configuration is reflected in revised submission materials.
3	**Parks**	Parks should be located centrally to the population they serve to maximize population catchment and minimize trip distances (please see markup).	As discussed with parks staff, a revised parks configuration has been prepared and generally confirmed. A parks radius plan has been prepared illustrating sufficient parks accessibility within plan. Plan has been reviewed and generally confirmed by staff.
4	**Parks**	Demonstrate parkland service radius buffers to all Neighbourood (400 metres) and Community Park (1000 metres) blocks in the secondary plan area (please see markup).	As discussed and reviewed with parks staff, a parks radius plan has been prepared illustrating sufficient parks accessibility within plan. Plan has been reviewed and generally confirmed by staff.
5	**Parks**	Parks should be placed in prominent locations to ensure high visibility from an adjacent streets. Parks should have frontage on a minimum of two streets and be located on major arterial or collector roads. This positioning will facilitate ease of access and increase the likelihood of frequent use.	As discussed with parks staff, a revised parks configuration has been prepared and generally confirmed. Revised parks configuration is reflected in revised submission materials.
6	**Parks**	Park blocks should be characterized by a broad and deep developable area, and having generally a regular rectangular square shape, as opposed to elongated, truncated, or complex parcel shapes, to maximize park design flexibility and programmability (please see markup).	As discussed with parks staff, a revised parks configuration has been prepared and generally confirmed. Revised parks configuration is reflected in revised submission materials.
7	**Parks**	Town is generally not supportive of locating parks within designated Natural Heritage areas and Greenbelt lands due to policies limiting the use of the lands for recreational uses.	Noted. No parks are proposed within the NES or Greenbelt.
8	**Parks**	Parkland dedication will be calculated from the total land area at 5% of the total area of the land (or 1 hectare per 600 residential units, whichever is higher. Town Staff will be calculating Parkland Dedication requirements for all of the land within a development application, without any exemptions for natural heritage lands, etc.	We continue to work with the Town on a Master Parks Agreement.
9	**Parks**	Neighbourhood Parks are to be sized between 1 ha and 2 ha (please see markup).	As discussed with parks staff, a revised parks configuration has been prepared and generally confirmed. Revised parks configuration is reflected in revised submission materials.
10	**Parks**	Neighbourhood Parks should be strategically separated from school blocks to prevent the overlap of amenities.	As discussed with parks staff, revised parks have been sized per Town comments and schools have been located to meet attributes preferable to school boards. It is noted that parks and schools co-location is promoted in Official Plan policy.

11	**Parks**	Potential Neighbourhood Park Facilities can include: a. Playground b. Seating Area with shade structure c. Courts (basketball, pickleball courts) d. Amenities (bike racks, benches, trees, signage, garbage receptacles) e. Outdoor fitness stations f. Free play areas	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
12	**Parks**	Increase proposed Community Park block to 6 ha and 7 ha in size and provide one fill-sized cricket field and associated park amenities (please see markup).	As discussed with parks staff, a revised parks configuration has been prepared and generally confirmed. Revised parks configuration is reflected in revised submission materials.
13	**Parks**	Provide an additional Community Park (6-7 ha in size) across the green corridor channel in Phase 2 of the Secondary Plan (please see markup).	An additional Community Park has been proposed on the west side of the Alloa Drain in the Phase 2 Area.
14	**Parks**	Community Parks may be located adjacent to Secondary School Blocks	Noted
15	**Parks**	Potential Facilities can include: a. Splash Pad/Misting Station b. Courts (basketball, pickleball, multi-use courts) c. Sport Fields (minimum two fields) d. Skatepark and BMX pump track e. Large playground f. Washroom Building g. Shade structure and seating area h. Amenities (parking lot, bike racks, water fountain, benches, trees, signage, interpretive signs, garbage receptacles) i. Community Gardens j. Off-Leash Dog Park k. Outdoor fitness stations l. Skateboard Park/Pump Track m. Ice rinks or skating loop n. Free play areas o. Picnic Areas	To be detailed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
1	**Finance**	If the proposed application were to proceed as planned (towards an Official Plan Amendment to facilitate the amending of text with the future Caledon Official Plan), the taxable assessment value of the properties may change, to reflect any development that would have taken place.	Acknowledged.

2	**Finance**	Any proposed new residential dwellings and non-residential buildings will attract Development Charges at the Residential and Non-Residential rates respectively. Those charges will be 'frozen' at the rates that will be in effect on the date when the first zoning amendment application is deemed complete (the application completion date), provided that the first zoning amendment took place after January 1, 2020. Otherwise, Development Charges will be determined on the date of building permit issuance.	Acknowledged.
3	**Finance**	If frozen rates apply, interest on Development Charges will accrue for the period starting one day after the application completion date, through to the date on which the charges are received by the Town	Acknowledged.
4	**Finance**	Additional information on Development Charges may be accessed on the Town's website at https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/development-charges.aspx	Acknowledged.
5	**Finance**	The Development Charges comments and estimates above are as at September 18, 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 applications other than site plan or rezoning applications; and 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.	Acknowledged.
1	***Capital Projects***	*Capital Projects comments were received.*	*Capital Projects comments to be addressed through TIS in comprehensive resubmission.*
1	**Minister of Energy and Electrification (MOE)**	The Ministry of Energy and Electrification has reviewed the 1st Submission for the proposed Official Plan Amendment for the Alloa Secondary Plan (POPA 2024-0004). A segment of the lands included in the planned community (the 'Subject Lands') falls within the Northwest Greater Toronto Area Transmission Corridor Identification Study's 2020 Narrowed Area of Interest. Current mapping for the Corridor Study can be found here: https://data.ontario.ca/dataset/northwest-greater-toronto-area-transmission-corridor-study-area.	Acknowledged

2	**Minister of Energy and Electrificatio n (MOE)**	At this time, the Ministry of Energy and Electrification is unable to allow any development to proceed within the Narrowed Area of Interest as it could be impacted by the future transmission corridor	It is our understanding that the Province encourages municipalities to accept and review planning applications within the Narrowed Area of Interest and the Highway 413 FAA - provided that servicing and/or development does not proceed before these overlays are removed. This Secondary Plan application does not impede the function of the overlay(s) to advance critical infrastructure and will support future growth and development in Caledon. The FAA overlay is also shown on the proposed Secondary Plan Land Use Schedule and appplicable policy is provided in the Secondary Plan regarding MOE comment and adjustment to final boundaries.
3	**Minister of Energy and Electrificatio n (MOE)**	The Ministry of Energy and Electrification and Independent Electricity System Operator continue to work with the Ministry of Transportation to co-locate the transmission corridor as refinements are being made to the Highway 413 transportation corridor	Acknowledged
1	**Ministry of Transportati on (MTO)**	The lands within the Alloa Secondary Plan are partially within the Focused Analysis Area (FAA 2020) land protection boundary for the Highway 413 project. The Highway 413 project team is currently unable to endorse changes in land use or the advancement of new developments within the FAA limits at this time. Lands within the FAA are being protected as they may be directly impacted by the Highway 413 transportation corridor, ancillary uses, or if refinements are made to the route during the preliminary design stage. The Highway 413 project is currently in the planning, environmental assessment and preliminary design phase. Property requirements and release of FAA lands for the project will be determined as the preliminary design advances.	It is our understanding that the Province encourages municipalities to accept and review planning applications within the Narrowed Area of Interest and the Highway 413 FAA - provided that development does not proceed before these overlays are removed. This Secondary Plan application does not impede the function of the overlay(s) to advance critical infrastructure and will support future growth and development in Caledon. The FAA overlay is also shown on the proposed Secondary Plan Land Use Schedule and appplicable policy is provided in the Secondary Plan regarding MTO comment and adjustment to final boundaries.
2	**Ministry of Transportati on (MTO)**	Policy 7.18.13.11.1 of the draft Secondary Plan directs that holding provisions be applied to zoning by-law amendments within the FAA, which is not supported. The Town should examine each proposed zoning by-law amendment on a case-by-case basis to ensure consistency and conformity with provincial policies and plans with respect to infrastructure corridor protection. Additionally, the draft Secondary Plan includes lands which are subject to appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal. As the Town and the Ministry are involved in the appeals, it would be prudent for the Town to refrain from advancing planning on these lands prior to a decision being rendered by the Ontario Land Tribunal.	In our view, it is appropriate to advance the planning of lands within the FAA but that the development of such lands could be withheld until such time that the FAA is lifted.
3	**Ministry of Transportati on (MTO)**	Regarding schedules, the Highway 413 FAA should be shown and any drawings referencing the preliminary design shall be labelled as Highway 413 Draft Preliminary Design and make reference that it is subject to change.	The secondary Plan Land Use Schedule has been revised to show the FAA.

1	**Bell Canada**	Bell Canada is most interested in changes to the transportation network and/or policies and regulations relating to the direction of growth and public infrastructure investments, heritage character, urban design, broadband and economic development related objectives. We have reviewed the Draft Official Plan, and would like to commend the community for their support as per Sections 7.18.14.4 and in particular 7.18.4.5.in achieving and upholding the community's vision of an intelligent and connected community, and Bell looks forward to a partnership and collaboration with Caledon to provide advanced telecommunications infrastructure to this new community.	Acknowledged.
2	**Bell Canada**	To facilitate the provisioning of this infrastructure, we appreciate the Town's continued support in ensuring that sufficient notice and time to comment on planning applications are provided, particularly for Draft Plan of Condominium, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan Control/Approval. This ensures an understanding by applicants of Bell's conditions and provisioning requirements.	Acknowledged.
3	**Bell Canada**	Bell would also emphasize that receiving engineering and servicing/utility plans/drawings, as soon as possible in the process, assists in the development and expedition of our provisioning plan. As a result, we would strongly recommend that this consideration be highlighted in any pre-circulation/consultation meetings with prospective applicants. This will assist Bell in providing comments and clearance letters in an efficient manner, assisting the Town of Caledon in meeting approval times. Such drawings should be submitted to: planninganddevelopment@bell.ca by the applicant/their agents.	Acknowledged.
4	**Bell Canada**	Moving forward, Bell Canada would like to continue to ensure that the landowners/developers are aware of and familiar with our conditions as they pertain to forthcoming Site Plans, Draft Plans of Subdivision and/or Draft Plans of Condominium as follows:	Acknowledged.

5	**Bell Canada**	Condition: "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. The Owner agrees that should any conflict arise with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements within the subject area, the Owner shall be responsible for the relocation of any such facilities or easements at their own cost." The Owner is advised to contact Bell Canada at planninganddevelopment@bell.ca during the detailed utility design stage to confirm the provision of communication/telecommunication infrastructure needed to service the development. 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 even 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. If the Owner elects not to pay for the above noted connection, Bell Canada may decide not to provide service to this development.	Acknowledged for future Site Plans, Draft Plans of Subdivision, and/or Draft Plans of Condominium.
1	**PDSB**	PDSB requires and requests a minimum of four (4) elementary school sites be provided within the development to accommodate the anticipated number of pupils. The Board requests each site to be 3.24 Ha (8 Acres) in size and be given 2 street frontages.	Per correspondence received from the PDSB on February 6, 2025, and following review of updated development statistics, we understand the PDSB will require 2 new Elementary schools in Phase 1 and 1 new Elementary school in Phase 2 (3 total), as well as 1 Secondary school site. The Secondary Plan proposes 3 new PDSB elementary schools (in addition to the existing Alloa Public School). The 3 proposed sites will be 3.24 hectares in size and be located on 2 street frontages, per comment.
2	**PDSB**	PDSB requires and requests one (1) secondary school site be provided within the development to accommodate the anticipated number of pupils. The Board requests each site to be 6.47 Ha (8 Acres) in size and be given 2 street frontages.	One secondary school is proposed in Phase 2 of the Secondary plan at 6.47 hectares in size. It will have 2 street frontages, including along the Mississauga Road and the East-West collector.
3	**PDSB**	PDSB requests a detailed unit breakdown in order for the PDSB to produce an accurate pupil yield from this development	Updated development statistics circulated and responded to per February 6, 2025 correspondence. Please also refer to same Development Statistics included with this submission.
4	**PDSB**	PDSB requests PDSB school sites be located away from the school site needed by Dufferin Peel Catholic District School Board	School spacing is accommodated, per comment.
5	**PDSB**	School site specific conditions of approval will be provided following formal submission of the application. The Board wishes to be notified of the decision of Council with respect to this proposed application.	Acknowledged.

1	**DPCDSB**	The applicant proposes the development of 3590 detached and semi-detached, 5855 townhouses and 2174 high density units, which are anticipated to yield: • 1480 Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8 Students; and • 715 Grade 9 to Grade 12 Students	Acknowledged.
2	**DPCDSB**	Based on the projected yields, 2 catholic elementary school sites will be required to service this plan. DPCDSB request a minimum site size of 2.4 (6 acres) on a 22 m right of way. Further, DPCDSB requests that the catholic elementary schools be distributed to have 1 school on each side of Creditview Road so they are centrally located and evenly spaced.	Two catholic elementary schools are proposed in the Secondary Plan at 2.4 hectares in size. One each is located in Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Secondary Plan.
3	**DPCDSB**	An update is required to Secondary Plan Section 7.18.11.2.1 to clarify that there are two (2) proposed catholic elementary schools within the Secondary Plan.	Noted - Secondary Plan revised per comment.
4	**DPCDSB**	The Student Accommodation and School Site Needs Analysis study does not address any phasing plans and when school sites will be made available. Further, the study does not clarify if schools are located on lands of participating landowners. DPCDSB will require clarification with respect to when each phase will be progressing to ensure that the elementary school sites will be available as development proceeds.	The proposed DPCDSB School site east of Creditview Road is located within the Phase 1 Development Area. The proposed DPCDSB School site west of Creditview Road is located within the Phase 2 Development Area. Phase 1 development is expected to advance generally between 2026 and 2032 at an average rate of up to 1,000 units per year. Phase 2 is anticipating to begin advancing as Phase 1 is nearing completion.
5	**DPCDSB**	The Student Accommodation and School Site Needs Analysis study correctly identifies the need for 2 elementary school sites, however it incorrectly reflects that only 100 secondary students will be generated from this development. Please see above anticipated student yields.	The DPCDSB secondary needs were recalculated as 622 pupils from the revised development stats in this submission. It is also noted that the Board's long term plan determines surplus permanent capacity of 682 spaces at St. Michael CSS.
1	**Accessibility**	No concerns	Received
1	**Municipal Numbers**	No concerns	Received
1	**Enbridge**	No concerns	Received
1	**Zoning**	No concerns	Received
1	**Economic Development**	No concerns	Received
1	**Canada Post**	Canada Post appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-noted application however, since the proposed classification change will have no direct impact on mail delivery, we do not wish to impose any conditions on the applicant at this time. As the subsequent subdivision, site plan or condominium applications are released, we will provide comments accordingly	Received

1	***Operations***	*Operations comments were received.*	*Operations comments to be addressed through TIS in comprehensive resubmission.*
1	**Fire and Emergency Services**	The Community Risk Assessment indicates a significant gap in the delivery of an appropriate level of fire suppression services within Caledon's Rural Service Centers. This gap will only increase with housing growth if fire suppression services are not accounted for in the design and approval of new developments and the expansion of the Rural Service Centers. Fire Services does not recommend increasing this risk until significant improvements are made in fire suppression deployment benchmarks to a level where 10 firefighters can respond within a 10-minute response time (turnout time + travel time) to 80% of the fire related incidents within the rural service center boundaries. Any areas approved for growth that are underserved by fire suppression services shall have sprinklered residential (houses) and commercial-use buildings until the level of service reaches this benchmark.	Noted, per discussion with Town staff, it is understood that a new fire station will be located on Chinguacousy Road.
2	**Fire and Emergency Services**	Water supply and fire flow for firefighting must be adequate and satisfactory to the Region of Peel.	Noted
1	**Energy & Environment**	Table 1 - Page 2 – Just to clarify that the GDS does not require 3 season ASHP with natural gas backup, it is one option that builders can choose to meet the Operational Energy and Emissions metric. The minimum performance requirement is Tier 3 national code (or Energy Star) for energy performance plus a 20% reduction in GHG emissions from OBC. If a hybrid ASHP is installed it would of course produce much more significant emissions savings, but want to flag that this will not necessarily be the case depending on which pathway builders choose.	Page 2 -While the Tier 3 National Code or Energy Star allows for the use of either a gas-based systems or heat pumps, achieving the energy efficiency requirements of these standards using gas-based systems is extremely challenging and requires the prioritization of passive design measures, shifting the focus away from the HVAC. The level of passive upgrades required to facilitate compliance exceed the prescriptive code requirements set by the GDS which are already quite stringent. As a result, fuel swithcing i.e. the use of air source heat pumps was deemed the more practical and realistic design likelihood.
2	**Energy & Environment**	Page 3 - Please use the current in effect GDS for EV charging requirements as they were updated from the 2023 draft. The Option 2 scenario is fine as is. See the GDS Guidebook for details.	Page 3 - The report has been updated to incorporate the published GDS requirements.
3	**Energy & Environment**	Clarify whether cost estimates are just for EV-ready infrastructure (as is required in the GDS) or do they include the actual charging stations? Important to distinguish as only EV-ready infrastructure is required through the development process, whereas charging stations would be installed by owners over a number of years.	Rough-in costs for EV-ready infrastructure were not available from builders to inform the financial modeling, and it was assumed that these costs would be included in the baseline condition based on GDS requirements. Cost estimates therefore solely include EV charging station and installation costs. Costs for any electrical infrastructure upgrades (such as higher capacity transformers and sub-stations) were excluded.

4	**Energy & Environment**	Page 4 - Report indicates that Transportation Case 2 increases energy demand and carbon emissions by an estimated 25% from Transportation Case 1. It's unclear how carbon emissions would be increased under this scenario?	The carbon emissions described here correspond to the emissions associated with the electricity demand increase required to provide the additional chargers as part of Transportation Case 2. As the provincial electricity grid has relatively low-carbon energy generation, the overall relationship between increased demand vs. emissions is not linear. Tailpipe emissions were not assessed.
5	**Energy & Environment**	Page 5 - Why is onsite renewable energy not feasible in the proposed development? Under what conditions would it be feasible?	The statement indicates that any further reduction in emissions will require more on-site renewable energy, which is already at its maximum capacity. Essentially, this means there is no ability to generate additional renewable energy beyond what is currently accounted for under the proposed Net-Zero Scenario and Energy Conservation Measures (ECMs), such as geothermal heat pumps, solar PVs, and wastewater heat recovery. Text within the report was updated for better clarity.
6	**Energy & Environment**	Page 18 - I don't think it's fair to assess the viability of DE systems across the entire community area with 100% adoption. As you've rightly pointed out, DE is likely less feasible in lower density areas of the Secondary Plan, however part of the Plan area includes industrial, commercial, medium density and mixed use blocks which may be more suited to and benefit more from energy sharing between buildings. Have any conversations been held with DE providers to assess potential opportunities in the Plan area? See Vision Georgetown Energy Master Plan from Halton Hills which includes analysis of full, medium, and small-scale DE systems with different considerations for implementation and financial viability/payback timeline: https://www.haltonhills.ca/en/residents/resources/Documents/20180705_Vision-Georgetown-Energy-Masterplan-Revision.pdf. Similarly, the Heritage Heights Community Energy Plan from Brampton offers distinct recommendations for where DE systems may be most viable, and possible governance structures the City could consider: https://www.brampton.ca/EN/City-Hall/Documents/Heritage%20Heights%20Community%20Energy%20Study%20-%20FInal.pdf Would be helpful to understand to what extent district energy systems could reduce EUI across the plan area, even at a high level and in what areas would it be the most viable. This would help the Town to start understanding the	The approach was modified to reflect this statement. Sub-areas of the propsoed site were reevaluated to identify prospectively feasible areas for district energy systems based on proposed building density and archetypes. Additionally, the feasibility of each district energy system was explored in greater detail. District energy systems may not inherently improveme in energy efficiency (EUI); rather, it is dependent on the specific technologies integrated into these systems—such as geothermal energy, solar energy, and wastewater heat recovery—that drive energy savings. Some district systems may reduce consumption and emissions (e.g., if waste heat is used), whereas other systems will solely reduce emissions while providing the energy through low carbon/renewable sources. Consequently, the reduction in energy use intensity (EUI) from geothermal heat pumps at the building scale compared to a district scale may not be substantial. Any minor differences could stem from load balancing and other factors, but given the scale of these systems, the impact may not be significant.

		potential energy savings and costs/benefits if we want to invest in these systems down the road.	
7	**Energy & Environment**	Page 24 - Did the baseline cost estimate include the infrastructure costs of building out natural gas infrastructure that are borne by ratepayers? And are these costs included in the hybrid heat pump systems, where you'd have the cost of the heat pump in addition to all the gas infrastructure, as opposed to the ASHP which may avoid those infrastructure costs?	Infractructure costs were not explicitly captured in the costing analysis for any scenario for a number of reasons. The lack of detailed design information at this planning stage is the main reason as specific construction details needed to evaluate piping distribution networks (pip lengths and diameter), trenching methods and required materials are unavailable. Infrastructure costs were therefore removed from the analysis in order to reduce complexity with the understanding that this is a somewhat simplified approach and that trade offs (resulting from fuel switching technologies) will not be captured as it relates to thee removal of natural gas related infrastructure in the Near Net Zero scenario.
8	**Energy & Environment**	Page 26 - Are geothermal costs in the table only assessed assuming a DE system? My understanding was the analysis only looked at building scale systems, e.g. single borehole/borefield per building	The relative costs of district vs. building-scale systems were evaluated to be similar in terms of NPV. The primary difference is the payment structure where building level systems are shown as upfront costs as opposd to DES costs which are shown to be incurred incrementally

9	**Energy & Environment**	Page 36 - Would like to see more detail in the implementation plan, including policy recommendations to enable the near net zero scenario outlined in the report, and specific considerations for how the technologies referenced can be deployed through the planning process, what additional study/action may be required and by whom, etc. See Heritage Heights CEP, page 26 and 32 for examples. Also refer to TOR for what should be included in the Implementation Plan. Ideally this should provide enough detail to help provide a roadmap for both the Town and developers wrt options, potential ownership or financing models, and next steps.	The reference documentation was reviewed and updates were made based on feedback provided and referencing the TOR. Note that much of the policy guidance in the reference document is now incorporated within the Green Development Standard requirements. The Landowners are committed to conducting regular engagement with utility and energy providers throughout the planning process, and additional engagement points have been identified for future phases prior to site plan. The Implementation Plan defines the process and timeline for when engagement should occur, referencing the Town's Green Development Standard which provides the detailed guidance and requirements for energy performance.
10	**Energy & Environment**	Page 37 - Note that Caledon's interim emissions reduction target of 36% by 2030 is a Town-wide target encompassing both existing and new communities. The target specific to new development is that all new buildings are built to net zero emissions standards by 2030.	Noted, and the report has been revised to provide clearer clarification of the targets based on this feedback.
1	***Region of Peel***	*Region of Peel comments were received regarding the Alloa Subwatershed Study, Scoped Servicing Study, TIS, EIR, Healthy Development Assessment, and Phase 1 FSR.*	*Region of Peel comments to generally be addressed in respective studies through comprehensive resubmission.*
2	**Region of Peel**	A Staging and Sequencing Plan for the entire secondary plan area (Phases 1 and 2) is required detailing proposed timing and delivery of key infrastructure and phasing and sequencing of development to coordinate with infrastructure delivery.	A Phase 1 Development Staging and Sequencing Plan has been prepared in support of the resubmission and was submitted to Town and Region on January 22, 2025. Phase 2 will be provided in conjunction with the Phase 2 Tertiary Plan phase.
3	**Region of Peel**	**Property Requirements** The Region requires the gratuitous dedication of lands to meet the Region of Peel Official Plan requirement for Regional Road 1 (Mississauga Rd). • The Region's road widening requirement for mid-block along Mississauga Rd is 45 m right-of-way (22.5 m from the centerline). Additional property may be required within 245 m 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: - 50.5 m for a single left turn lane intersection configuration (25.25 m from the centerline of Mississauga Rd). - 54.0 m for a double left turn lane intersection configuration (27.0 m from the centerline of Mississauga Rd). • 15 x 15 m daylight triangles and/or signals easements at any approved full moves intersections or full moves accesses along;	Noted. The required land dedications are to be shown on the future Phase 2 Tertiary Plan and future Draft Plan Drawings.

		• 0.3 m reserve along the frontage of Mississauga Rd behind the property line and daylight triangles, except at any approved access points;	
4	**Region of Peel**	The Region requires the gratuitous dedication of lands to meet the Region of Peel Official Plan requirement for Regional Road 14 (Mayfield Rd). • The Region's road widening requirement for mid-block along Mayfield Rd is 50 m right-of-way (25.0 m from the centerline). Additional property may be required within 245 m 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 m for a single left turn lane intersection configuration (27.75 m from the centerline of Mayfield Rd). - 59.0 m for a double left turn lane intersection configuration (29.5 m from the centerline of Mayfield Rd). • 15 x 15 m daylight triangles and/or signals easements at any approved full moves intersections or full moves accesses along Mayfield Rd; • 0.3 m reserve along the frontage of Mayfield Rd behind the property line and daylight triangles, except at any approved access points;	Noted. The required land dedications are to be shown on the applicable Tertiary Plan and future Draft Plan Drawings.
5	**Region of Peel**	• Through the future Draft Plans of Subdivision and Site Plan applications, the applicant is required to gratuitously dedicate these lands to the Region, free and clear of all encumbrances. All costs associated with the transfer, including preparation of plans and title documents, will be solely at the expense and responsibility of the applicant. Prior to depositing plans, the applicant must provide for the Region's approval the necessary title documents and reference plan(s).	Acknowledged.
6	**Region of Peel**	• At this time, we request that these property requirements are reflected on the Secondary Plan and Tertiary Plan land use plans.	The property requirements are shown on the Tertiary Plan but the Secondary Plan Land Use Schedule is too conceptual to show proper right-of-way widths and dimensions.

1	***CVC***	*CVC comments were received regarding the Local Subwatershed Study, Scoped Servicing Study, and Phase 1 FSR.*	*CVC comments to be addressed in respective studies through comprehensive resubmission.*
1	***City of Brampton***	*City of Brampton comments were received regarding the Local Subwatershed Study and Scoped Servicing Study.*	*City of Brampton comments to be addressed in respective studies through comprehensive resubmission.*
1	***TRCA***	*TRCA comments were received regarding the Local Subwatershed Study, Scoped Servicing Study, and Phase 1 FSR.*	*TRCA comments to be addressed in respective studies through comprehensive resubmission.*
1	**Hydro One**	Hydro One doesn't have any conflicts or comments regarding this application.	Received
1	**MHBC (AIA)**	1. Introduction & Background MacNaughton Hermson Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) was retained by the Town of Caledon to review and Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) prepared by Colville Consulting Inc. (Colville) in support of a proposed settlement area boundary expansion (SABE) and planning approvals to facilitate a Secondary Plan for the Alloa Planning Area in the Town of Caledon. The subject lands consist of the portion of the lands included within the proposed secondary plan boundary.	Noted
2	**MHBC (AIA)**	Location & Planning Context The Alloa Planning Area is comprised of multiple parcels encompassing approximately 724 hectares, with surrounding uses consisting primarily of existing agricultural uses (agricultural fields and livestock facilities) and rural residential dwellings. The lands are bound by Chinguacousy Road to the east, Mayfield Road to the south, and the proposed Highway 413 Corridor to the north and west.	Noted
3	**MHBC (AIA)**	The subject lands have been included as part of the 2051 New Urban Area within the Region of Peel Official Plan (Schedule E-1) and identified as 'Designated Greenfield Area' (Schedule E-3). The subject lands are designated 'Prime Agricultural Area' in the current in-effect Town of Caledon Official Plan (Schedule A). The Future Caledon Official Plan was adopted by Council on March 26th, 2024; the new Official Plan has not yet been approved by the Province and, as such, is not yet in effect. The Future Caledon Official Plan includes the subject lands within Caledon's Urban Area and designates it 'New Community Area', 'New Employment Area', and 'Natural Features and Areas' (Future Caledon Official Plan Schedule B4).	Noted

4	**MHBC (AIA)**	Proposed Development The proposed Secondary Plan contemplates a comprehensive range of uses (residential, mixed-use, employment, commercial, community amenities, and natural environment) to create a new community in the Town of Caledon. Based on our review of the Planning Justification Report prepared by Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. (July 2024) and Secondary Plan Concept prepared in support of the settlement area boundary expansion, the area is planned to consist of a Community Area and an Employment Area. The Community Area will include Neighbourhood Area and Major Commercial/Mixed-Use Area designations while the Employment Area will consist of the General Employment Area and Prestige Employment Area designations. The Secondary Plan also identifies locations for community amenities, including schools and parks, and the proposed transportation network. The Secondary Plan is proposed to be implemented in two phases: the first phase consists of the subject lands from Creditview Rd. to Chinguacousy Rd. with a small portion southwest of Creditview Rd.; and the second phase consists of the subject lands from Creditview Rd. (excluding the above noted south-west portion) to the western boundary of the subject lands.	Noted
5	**MHBC (AIA)**	Purpose of AIA Peer Review The purpose of the Peer Review is to ensure that the AIA is consistent with the requirements of the applicable planning documents. Consistent with Section 1.7 of the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Agri-business (OMAFA) Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Guidance Document, the authors confirm that they have the requisite qualifications to complete the review (see Appendix A – CVs) and have no perceived or actual conflicts of interest in association with the AIA.	Noted

6	**MHBC (AIA)**	This peer review included a review of the following document: • Provincial Planning Statement, 2024; • Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Agri-business (OMAFA) Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Guidance Document; • Region of Peel Official Plan; • Region of Peel Agricultural Impact Assessment (Phases 1 & 2) to inform Settlement Area Boundary Expansions; • Town of Caledon Official Plan (2024 Consolidation); • Future Caledon Official Plan (2024); • Planning Justification Report for Alloa Secondary Plan (Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., July 2024); • Agricultural Impact Assessment for Alloa Planning Area (Colville Consulting Inc., May 2024); • Terms of Reference: Alloa Secondary Plan (GSAI, May 2024); • Agricultural Resource Information sources, including: o AgMaps – Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Agribusiness (OMAFA) https://www.lioapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/AgMaps/Index.html?viewer=AgMaps.AgMaps &locale=en-CA o Agricultural Systems Portal – OMAFA https://agriculture-systems-portalontarioca11. hub.arcgis.com/	Noted
7	**MHBC (AIA)**	A site visit of the area, including a roadside survey of land uses, including possible livestock facilities, within 1.5 kilometres of the subject lands was completed on November 14th, 2024 and confirmed the findings of Colville's land use survey.	Noted
8	**MHBC (AIA)**	2. Peer Review of Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) To begin, we would like to recognize the high-quality and detailed work evident in the Agricultural Impact Assessment for Alloa Planning Area prepared by Colville Consulting Inc. (May 2024). The following peer review is organized reflecting the AIA report sections and provides recommendation for areas where further detail or clarity would be beneficial.	Noted
9	**MHBC (AIA)**	Introduction The introduction adheres to the requirements of the Province's Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment Guidance Document ('AIA Guidance Document') and describes the proposal, the site location, why the AIA is required, and the scope of the retainer. Recommendations are provided below to strengthen \the underlined subsection.	Noted

10	**MHBC (AIA)**	Retainer – the description of the Alloa Planning Area provided in this section states that a portion of the subject lands is located within the Greenbelt Plan. The Planning Justification Report prepared for the Alloa Secondary Plan Official Plan Amendment application specifically states that "the Subject Lands are not within the jurisdiction of the Greenbelt Plan, Niagara Escarpment Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, or the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan". Can you clarify why the subject lands described in the Agricultural Impact Assessment differ from those described in the Planning Justification Report?	The size/boundaries of the Subject Lands has been updated in the redline revision copy of the AIA to reflect the boundaries of the Secondary Plan using the latest shapefiles provided. The updated boundaries show that no portion of the Subject Lands are located within the Greenbelt Plan area, nor Oak Ridge Moraine Conservation Plan area.
11	**MHBC (AIA)**	Study Areas – When identifying the primary and secondary study areas, it would be beneficial to reference the AIA Guidance Document to back up why the size of each study area was selected.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA
12	**MHBC (AIA)**	Methodology Overall, it is our opinion that the methodology undertaken for this Agricultural Impact Assessment i appropriate and meets the requirements of the AIA Guidance Document. Below we provide a few recommendations that could further strengthen this section.	Noted
13	**MHBC (AIA)**	Background Data Collection – We recognize that the list of background data reviewed is extensive and relatively comprehensive. We note that review of the Region's Agricultural Impact Assessment (Phase 1 & 2) undertaken to inform the Region's Settlement Area Boundary Expansion would be beneficial to back up the assertion that an additional assessment of alternative locations would be redundant.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA
14	**MHBC (AIA)**	Evaluation of Alternative Locations – As stated above, a review and summary of the Region's Agricultural Impact Assessment would help support that an assessment of alternative locations is not required.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA
15	**MHBC (AIA)**	Agricultural Policies We are aware that this AIA was submitted in May 2024, prior to the changes to provincial planning policy. The Provincial Planning Statement, 2024 (PPS 2024) came into effect on October 20th, 2024. The PPS 2024 integrates the 2020 Growth Plan and PPS into a single planning document that is applies province wide. We recommend updating this section to include reference to the PPS 2024. Additionally, the Growth Plan is no longer relevant to this AIA (given that the portion of the site within the Greenbelt Plan is not proposed for inclusion in the settlement area). Further, given that Council has adopted the Future Caledon Official Plan (though it is not yet in-effect), it would be beneficial to include a brief review of the proposed inclusion of the lands in the Urban Area in the context of the new Official Plan. Below are our recommendations for this section of the AIA.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA

16	**MHBC (AIA)**	Provincial Planning Statement – We note that the title for subsection 4.1 appears to be missing. We propose that this section be updated to reference the PPS 2024. Additionally, the policy sections referenced should be updated to reflect the policy references of the PPS 2024, as well as any changes to policy (particularly those regarding new settlement area boundary expansion policies).	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA
17	**MHBC (AIA)**	Growth Plan & Greenbelt Plan – It is our understanding that the settlement area boundary expansion does not include any lands within the Greenbelt Plan. If this is the case we recommend removing the policy sections on the Growth Plan & Greenbelt Plan as these policies would then not be relevant to the Agricultural Impact Assessment as it relates to the proposed settlement area boundary expansion.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA
18	**MHBC (AIA)**	Town of Caledon Official Plan – Please include a brief subsection on the Future Caledon Official Plan (adopted by Council but not yet in-effect) which proposes to include the lands in the Urban Area. This would help lend even greater legitimacy to the argument that no alternative analysis is required and for the inclusion of the lands in the settlement area.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA
19	**MHBC (AIA)**	Study Findings Agricultural Crop Statistics – This subsection could benefit from the inclusion of more Census data than what is provided for in the report. Specifically, data showing trends of average farm size and most common field crops in 2011, 2016, and 2021 could be included to more conclusively demonstrate whether agricultural activity in the study area is representative of the broader Township/Region.	Additional agricultural statistics have been provided within the redline revision copy of the AIA
20	**MHBC (AIA)**	Agricultural Uses – While we agree that there may be less of an incentive to invest in agricultural improvements on leased agricultural lands, this does not necessarily mean that the lands have lower agricultural priority. Agricultural landowners may lease their lands to local farm operations for a variety of reasons unrelated to the quality of the agricultural land. We caution against conclusions equating land tenure to agricultural priority and recommend removing this wording from the report.	Wording has been adjusted. Lands which are tenant farmed typically have fewer investments in agricultural land improvements and infrastructure. However, this does not inherently reduce the quality of the lands themselves.
21	**MHBC (AIA)**	Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) – Based on our roadside investigations, we confirm the findings of Colville's MDS analysis. The proposed settlement area expansion complies with the MDS I formula.	Noted

22	**MHBC (AIA)**	Economic and Community Benefits of Agriculture – We would like to better understand where your assertion that "the influence of agriculture in the study area is waning". Much of the statistics mentioned in this subsection reference Town and Region level census data. This analysis would benefit from more detail on trends within the study area that appear to reflect broader Town/Regional trends. Additionally, we question how the reduction of approximately 556.92 hectares of prime agricultural land within an area (Town/Region) where statistics already show a decline in the total number of farms and agricultural employment can be considered negligible, even with the implementation of mitigation measures.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of AIA. The longer term impacts associated with this loss will be difficult to mitigate as the lands are designated for non-agricultural uses. Mitigation measures (i.e., phasing) will allow for the short-term impacts of this loss to be mitigated to the extent feasible.
23	**MHBC (AIA)**	Assessment of Agricultural Priority Point 1 - We recommend referencing the Region's Agricultural Impact Assessment and the Future Caledon Official Plan in this section.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA
24	**MHBC (AIA)**	Points 3 and 5 - Referencing the location of future Highway 413 at the boundaries of the subject lands would be beneficial to the AIA's arguments around existing and future fragmentation and disturbances to agriculture.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA
25	**MHBC (AIA)**	Point 7 – The AIA states "the close proximity of the City of Brampton and Town of Caledon settlement area boundaries and non-agricultural land uses creates potential MDS II setback constraints that would limit the opportunity for new or expanding livestock operations within the subject lands ". We understand that the location of the existing settlement areas constrains the expansion of livestock operations within the subject area, but does this logic not extend to say that the proposed boundary expansion will constrain the ability of existing livestock operations outside of the subject lands that were previously unconstrained by nearby settlement area boundaries? Is this impact evaluated elsewhere in the AIA?	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA. MDS I setbacks are typically larger than MDS II setbacks. By demonstrating compliance with the MDS I formula, it can be reasonably assumed that MDS II setbacks can be met for expanding livestock operations. However, MDS II setbacks cannot be determined without knowing the size of the expansion (i.e., increase in livestock) and the type of livestock that will be housed. Additionally, the location of a new or existing livestock facility or manure storage system would need to be known to determine whether a given operation would comply with the MDS II formula. It is not anticipated that the proposed settlement area boundary expansion will create development constraints related to MDS II setback requirements for livestock operations in the Study Area.
26	**MHBC (AIA)**	Assessment of Alternative Locations Provincial Policy – The policy sections referenced should be updated to reflect the Provincial Planning Statement 2024 (PPS, 2024). Again, we suggest that a brief review and summary of the Region's Agricultural Impact Assessment as this study relates to the subject lands would provide beneficial background to strengthen your argument	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA

27	**MHBC (AIA)**	Evaluation of Alternative Locations – The AIA states "given the Subject Lands' approved designation in the Region of Peel Official Plan, the level of non-agricultural development in the Study Area, and the close proximity to the City of Brampton and Town of Caledon settlement areas, the Subject Lands are a logical location for the proposed development" (underline added for emphasis). Presuming that the underlined portion of this statement indicates that the level of non-agricultural development in the Study Area is higher than other agricultural areas in the Region and Town, is there anything specific that can be drawn on in this section to back this up? Can Table 2 (in subsection 5.6.5 of the AIA) be compared to existing data or observations from other areas of the Region to demonstrate that non-agricultural uses in the study area are higher than average? It is our opinion that this subsection could benefit from additional analysis to back up this assertion.	Given the Subject Lands' inclusion within the 2051 New Urban Area of the Region of Peel Official Plan, the Subject Lands are no longer part of a provincially or regionally recognized prime agricultural area (as further explained below). As such, in our opinion, an evaluation of alternative locations is not required for the proposed settlement area boundary expansion. The redline revision copy of the AIA reflects this. The information collected for the AIA did not include significant areas outside of the required 1.5 km Study Area. We also believe that the comparison of other lands beyond the 1.5 km and outside of the Region's settlement area boundary is not a fair comparision as those lands are not within a proposed settlement area boundary.
28	**MHBC (AIA)**	Avoidance of Prime Agricultural Areas – This subsection could benefit from stronger conclusions. For example, the AIA states that "nearly all lands surrounding the Town of Caledon and City of Brampton settlement areas are located within the Greater Golden Horseshoe's Prime Agricultural Area" (underline added for emphasis). Could you provide additional detail on the lands that are not 6 considered prime agricultural area and why they do not constitute a suitable location. Referencing that outside of the Greenbelt area, the GGH Prime Agricultural Area mapping does not apply until it has been implemented in an upper-tier Official Plan and that the Region Official Plan does not include the lands in the prime agricultural area would help tie these two assertions together. Again, reference to the Region's Agricultural Impact Assessment and the Future Caledon Official Plan would be beneficial to this analysis.	See above comment
29	**MHBC (AIA)**	Assessment of Impacts to Agriculture Disruption to Farm Operations and Minimum Distance Separation – These two subsections could benefit from a discussion on how new non-agricultural development might have an impact on the ability of livestock operations within the study area to expand in the future and how these impacts can be minimized and/ or mitigated.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA
30	**MHBC (AIA)**	Trespass and Vandalism – We recommend the addition of the following recommendation in the AIA to help avoid trespassing, vandalism, and other concerns: consideration should be given to distributing education and awareness brochures to landowners, developers, and construction company about normal farm practices and the potential financial, resource and biosecurity impacts that could result from trespassing and vandalism.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA

31	**MHBC (AIA)**	Transportation Impacts – We suggest adding a recommendation that future development implement 'Share the Road' signage at key interfaces between agricultural and urban area transitions during phased build out (ex. where road accesses associated with the future development terminate at a road used by agricultural machinery). We agree strongly with the AIAs recommendation that a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) in support of the proposed settlement area boundary expansion be required, and that the TIS consider impacts to agricultural traffic.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA
32	**MHBC (AIA)**	Economic and Community Impacts – We recommend adding more detail to back up the claims that "agriculture is waning in the study area" and that "the loss of input to the agricultural economy is likely to be offset by the additional inputs to the economies associated with the proposed new community development ". We caution that the language currently used is a bit strong given limited data provided to back up these findings. We agree that phasing is a good approach to mitigate the loss of agricultural impacts to the economy.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA
33	**MHBC (AIA)**	Summary of Impacts Given that the AIA identifies impacts to agriculture that require mitigation, we strongly suggest that the report include firm recommendations that implement key mitigation measures throughout the development of the Secondary Area. For example, Table 5 provides the following mitigation measure: "consider phasing development to allow for continued cultivation until lands are required for development". This recommendation should use stronger language, for example "development should/shall be phased to allow for continued cultivation until lands are required for development". We recommend revising the language used in Table 5. Additionally, we recommend the addition of a 'Recommendations' section to the AIA where clear recommendations are provided that can be implemented in the future development and build out of the subject lands.	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA

34	**MHBC (AIA)**	Conformity with Agricultural Policies Provincial Policy Statement – Please revise the title to Provincial Planning Statement. The subject lands are still considered a part of the prime agricultural area per the in-effect Caledon Official Plan (Schedule A) and, as such, the agricultural policies of the PPS do apply, contrary to what is stated in the AIA. Please correct this wording. Despite the claim that PPS agricultural policies do not apply, it is our opinion that the AIA demonstrates that the proposed settlement area boundary expansion is consistent with the agricultural policies of the PPS (once the referenced subsections are updated to reflect those of the PPS 2024). We agree that Regional and Township policy direction clearly intends for the lands to be removed from the prime agricultural area [per the Region's 2051 New Urban Area (as approved in 2022) and the Future Caledon Official Plan (not yet in-effect)].	We acknowledge that the Subject Lands remain designated as part of the prime agricultural area in the in-effect Town of Caledon Official Plan. However, through the Region of Peel's municipal comprehensive review (MCR), the lands were removed from the prime agricultural area and included within the 2051 New Urban Area. The Province serves as the review and approval authority for the MCR, and accordingly, the Region's mapping represents a refinement of the Province's mapping, which takes precedence in this context. As a result, the Subject Lands have been removed from the provincially recognized prime agricultural area, and the proposal is not required to be consistent with the agricultural policies of the Provincial Planning Statement. Regardless of whether the agricultural policies of the Provincial Planning Statement apply, we agree that the proposed settlement area boundary expansion is consistent with the applicable policies. Additionally, it is our understanding, based on discussions with Town staff, that the Secondary Plan will not be approved until after the Future Caledon Official Plan receives Provincial approval. Given this, the proposal should be evaluated in the context of the Subject Lands being designated as a New Community Area, meaning they are no longer part of a prime agricultural area.
35	**MHBC (AIA)**	Growth Plan & Greenbelt Plan –It is our understanding that the settlement area boundary expansion does not include any lands within the Greenbelt Plan. If this is the case, we recommend removing statements on the Growth Plan & Greenbelt Plan	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA
36	**MHBC (AIA)**	Conclusion Point 4 – Change PPS reference to reflect PPS 2024	Noted and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA
37	**MHBC (AIA)**	Point 5 – Based on our review of the Planning Justification Report, it is our understanding that the entirety of the subject lands are within the Region of Peel's 2051 New Urban Area, not the majority as stated in this conclusion. Please confirm and update.	Confirmed and incorporated into redline revision copy of the AIA. The redline revision copy was updated using the most recent shapefiles provided to us, which shows that no portion of the Subject Lands are within the Greenbelt Plan area.

38	**MHBC (AIA)**	Point 6 – The agricultural policies of the current Caledon Official Plan do apply to the subject lands (as they are designated as prime agricultural area in the Town Official Plan) and it is our opinion that the AIA confirms that the proposed settlement area boundary expansion conforms to the Official Plan policies. Please update the conclusions to reflect that the proposed settlement area boundary expansion was assessed against Section 4.2.3.3.1 of the Official Plan and found to be in conformity. Please clarify also that the Future Caledon Official Plan (adopted by Council but not yet in-effect) removes the subject lands from the prime agricultural area and that, as such, the agricultural policies of the new Official Plan will not apply to the proposed development.	The Town of Caledon Official Plan requires that settlement area boundary expansion be undertaken through an MCR and an Official Plan Amendment (OPA). While an OPA will be required for this expansion, the AIA has addressed key agricultural policy considerations, including demonstrating compliance with the MDS formulae and providing mitigation measures to minimize impacts on existing agricultural resources. As such, we agree that the proposal is consistent with the *intent* of Section 4.2.3.3.1 of the Town of Caledon Official Plan, however, it does not fully conform to this policy as SABE is being pursued outside of an MCR. The redline revision copy of the AIA clarifies that the agricultural policies of the Future Caledon Official Plan will not apply to the proposed development once the Official Plan receives Provincial approval.
1	***RJ Burnside (TIS)***	*Peer Review comments (RJ Burnside) were received regarding the TIS.*	*Peer Review comments to be addressed in TIS through comprehensive resubmission.*
1	**Public Comment: Brookvalley Project Management (Frank Filippo)**	We have reviewed the application. While the FSR Letter of Compliance confirms the lands will be accommodated in the 750mm Brisdale Drive wastewater trunk outlet to the south of Mayfield, there are references throughout the documents (and the related OPA / Secondary and Tertiary application documents) that suggest a portion of the sanitary flows may be directed to the existing sanitary trunk located on the east side of Chinguacousy at Tim Manley / Neil Promenade, out letting to the existing 750 mm Edenbrook Drive sanitary trunk, south of Mayfield. Please note that the existing Edenbrook Drive sanitary trunk outlet is reserved for the future Mayfield West Phase 2, Stages 1 - 3 (MW2-1, MW2-2, MW2-3) lands located between Chinguacousy and Hurontario. This consistent with the current MW2-3 (Draft Plan approved January 28, 2025) and past MW2 FSR reports and has been further confirmed with the Region of Peel. No sanitary flows from the Alloa lands should therefore be directed to the existing Edenbrook trunk. The references noted above and in the Subdivision FSR Letter of Compliance drawing 5.1 (Alloa Phase 1 Wastewater Servicing Notes, Clause 4) should be removed. Kindly confirm receipt of this email and further that the aforementioned	*Public comment to be addressed in Scoped Servicing Study through comprehensive resubmission.*

		sanitary outlet regimes are confirmed and will be maintained so as to allow for MW2 to be completed as intended.	
1	**Public Comment: Arcadis/ Corteva Agriscience**	Arcadis is supportive of the Prestige Employment designation within the proposed Alloa Secondary Plan: Land Use Schedule and believe that generally, the policies within the Secondary Plan and Future Caledon Official Plan are supportive for employment uses. However, it is noted that the Existing Use of the subject site (12111 Mississauga Road) as a research and development facility (Corteva Agriscience) is not captured within the permitted uses of the designation. Arcadis requests that this use be included in the permitted uses of the Prestige Employment Area designation or specifically to this property.	The Draft Secondary Plan has been revised to state that the existing Agriscience facilty is permitted to remain.
2	**Public Comment: Arcadis/ Corteva Agriscience**	It is also noted that there is a Natural Environment System Area linkage running through the subject site. It is understood that the purpose of the Natural Environment System Area designation as a whole is to provide linkages between the Natural Environment System and Public Service Facilities, however, Arcadis is requesting that further clarity be provided on the specific positioning and structure of this north-south connection that runs through the subject site, prior to approval of the proposed Secondary Plan.	At this time, the linkage is shown at a conceptual location in accordance with the Region of Peel Scoped Subwatershed Study. The Secondary Plan provides flexibility to adjust the location / limits of the NHS system provided the intent of the plan is maintained. Further refinements to the linkage can be made through the future Phase 2 Tertiary Plan and/or site-specific development application.

3	**Public Comment: Arcadis/ Corteva Agriscience**	It is Arcadis' opinion that the subject site should be included as part of Phase 1 due to its direct adjacency to existing water and wastewater servicing. It is noted that in order to advance and extend servicing to Phase 1 lands, the services would extend directly past this site, positioning this site to be developed earlier in the planning approval process. Therefore, establishing this Employment Area in conjunction with Phase 1 development will ensure that residents will have access to well-established employment and support it as a complete community.	The proposed Phase 1 boundary has been identified based on location and availability of water and wastewater services; the status and advancement of road infrasrtructure improvements and widenings on Mayfield and Chinguacousy Road, proximity to existing built out areas, and greater landowner participation compared to areas within the western part of the Secondary Plan. At this juncture, no changes are proposed to the configuration of the Phase 1 boundary, however, there are no policies that preclude the advancement of Phase 2 development provided a proponent can demonstrate the availability and/or provision of adequate services and infrastructure to support development/re-development.
4	***Public Comment: Arcadis/ Corteva Agriscience***	The site currently serves as the Global Technology Hub for canola breeding at Corteva Agriscience. The 94 acre land parcel includes approximately 95,000 square feet of agriscience research and development facilities and over 50 full-time and seasonal employees, contributing to Caledon's established employment sector and Alloa Secondary Plan Employment Forecasts. Arcadis and Corteva Agriscience are mindful that it is vital to protect the existing employment use from incompatible sensitive land uses that could be associated with the surrounding development, in accordance with the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement. In summary, Arcadis supports the intent and objectives of the Alloa Secondary Plan including the Prestige Employment Area designation for the subject site. However, Arcadis requests that the proposed Secondary Plan be revised to introduce the existing use of the subject site to be permitted, as well as provide further clarification and justification for the Natural Environment System Area to be located as a north-south connection bisecting the subject site.	*Public comment to be addressed in Scoped Servicing Study through comprehensive resubmission.*
1	***Water Resources (Cassie Schembri) and Peer Review (Montrose Environmental)***	*Town and Peer Review (Montrose Environmental) comments were received on the Local Subwatershed Study and Phase 1 FSR.*	*Town and Peer Review comments to be addressed in respective studies through comprehensive resubmission.*
1	***Development Engineering***	*Town comments were received on the Local Subwatershed Study, TIS, and Phase 1 FSR.*	*To be addressed in respective studies through comprehensive resubmission.*

1	**Heritage**	Official Plan Amendment • See tracked changes document for requested revisions to the proposed Cultural Heritage Conservation Policies.	Draft revisions have been made to the proposed Cultural Heritage Conservation policies as noted. Regarding Stage 3/4 Archaeology policy 7.7.18.12.2.2 (on red-lined document), we suggest that future Stage 3/4 Assessments be required as a **condition** of development approval. In review with consultant, this is understood as the typical process.
2	**Heritage**	Land Use Plan • Remove heritage symbol for 12540 Chinguacousy Road, as it has since been removed from the Heritage Register.	Land Use Plan has been updated per comment
3	**Heritage**	Community Design Plan • The Community Design Plan needs to be revised to include a second on cultural heritage resources. See other previously completed Secondary Plan materials for examples (Macville, Argo Kennedy).	To be addressed through CDG in comprehensive resubmission.
4	**Heritage**	Cultural Heritage Assessment Report Comments • Comments on the CHAR are included in the red-lined document, provided separately.	Revised CHAR included in resubmission per redlined comments.
5	**Heritage**	• A revised CHAR addressing Heritage staff's comments is expected as part of the second submission.	Revised CHAR included in resubmission per redlined comments.
6	**Heritage**	• Heritage staff are agreeable to reviewing the revised CHAR, and meeting with the heritage consultant if needed, ahead of circulation to ensure all comments have been addressed appropriately.	Acknowledged
7	**Heritage**	Cultural Heritage Assessment Report – Site Visits for Properties with Participating Landowners • Heritage staff acknowledge that several heritage properties within the subject lands are owned by non-participating landowners. However, it is inherently difficult to assess the cultural heritage value/interest from the public right of way.	Acknowledged
8	**Heritage**	• The report should be revised to include on-site imagery for heritage properties owned by participating landowners to confirm structures and preliminary heritage attributes. Imagery could be taken from related heritage reports for draft plan of subdivision applications, where available.	Additional imagery incorporated where possible.
9	**Heritage**	Archaeological Assessment • The proponent submitted the "Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment: Alloa Landowners Group, Part Lots 18-21, Concession 3-5 WHS, Former Geographical Township of Chinguacousy, Peel County, now Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario", prepared by Parslow Heritage Consultancy Inc., dated January 17, 2024, as well as the related Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) compliance letter.	Acknowledged

10	**Heritage**	• Heritage staff are agreeable to Stage 2 (and further) assessments being submitted as part of future draft plan of subdivision and/or site plan applications.	Acknowledged
11	**Heritage**	• No further archaeology work is required at this stage.	Acknowledged
1	***Watson (FIS)***	*Peer Review comments (Watson) were received regarding the FIS.*	*Peer Review comments to be addressed through FIS comment memo in comprehensive resubmission.*