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1.0 OVERVIEW

1.1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this Planning Justification Report ('PJR') is to provide background information in support of an expansion to the Mayfield West ('MW') settlement area to implement the 2031 and 2041 Growth Plan (2017) population and employment forecasts, which is part of the 2017 Growth Plan conformity amendment process (Peel 2041 - Official Plan Review).

To support the proposed expansion, this PJR reviews all applicable and in-effect Provincial, Regional and local policies (including the 2017 Growth Plan) to determine whether the expansion would be in conformity with those policies. All of the technical work completed in support of the last MW settlement area expansion and all of the work recently completed and updated to support the current proposal has also been reviewed. In this regard, and as will be demonstrated in this report, it is my opinion that the proposed expansion will be in conformity with those policies, particularly as it relates to the location of a settlement area expansion in the Region of Peel context.

Below is a map that identifies in blue what lands are proposed to be added to the MW settlement area to implement the 2041 Growth Plan population and employment forecast. The lands to be added are known as the MW Phase 2 ('MW2') Stage 2 lands. The land area of MW2 Stage 2 is approximately 105 hectares, which does not include lands within the Greenbelt Plan area. Based on the Growth Plan (2017) requirement that these lands be planned to achieve a minimum density target that is not less than 80 residents and jobs per hectare, the MW2 Stage 2 lands could support about 8,500 residents and jobs combined.
As will be discussed later in this PJR, the current boundary of MW was established by Regional Official Plan Amendment 29 (‘ROPA 29’). This current boundary was based very precisely at the time on the amount of land that could be designated to implement the 2031A Growth Plan population and employment forecast.

It is for this reason that the current MW boundary follows straight lines through open fields, does not follow property boundaries and does not extend to logical boundaries that are established by Etobicoke Creek to the north and Chinguacousy Road to the west.

### 1.2 PLANNING OPINION

I am advised by Regional staff that Town of Caledon’s population could be planned to increase from 108,000 in 2031 (as per ROPA 24) to up to 160,000 by 2041 through the current 2017 Growth Plan conformity amendment process (Peel 2041: Official Plan Review). This represents a population increase of up to 52,000 people over current planned growth to 2031.

I am also advised by Regional staff that, with a population increase to 160,000 by 2041, a substantial portion of that increase could be accommodated on new Greenfield lands.

As such, the potential exists for the proposed expansion of MW2 Stage 2 lands in Caledon to accommodate that growth while still meeting 2017 Growth Plan intensification target for Peel Region as a whole (40% until the current municipal comprehensive review is approved and in effect, 50% to the year 2031, and 60% each year thereafter to 2041).

As a consequence of the above, the focus of my planning opinion is on whether the proposed location of the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion is appropriate and in conformity with Provincial and Regional policies that relate to the location of growth and development.

As will be demonstrated in this PJR, the MW2 Stage 2 lands have long been planned (for the most part) to be part of the MW settlement area.

On the basis of the work completed and recently updated, it is my opinion that inclusion of the MW2 Stage 2 lands will allow for the completion of the community, will provide for the efficient use of infrastructure and allow for the MW settlement area to extend to logical boundaries on the west (Chinguacousy Road) and to the north (Etobicoke Creek).

The expansion to MW will also support the establishment of a complete community, since it would facilitate the development of the necessary road and trail connections between McLaughlin Road and Chinguacousy Road and rectify a previous planning decision that led to the establishment of an arbitrary settlement area boundary that was simply based on a mathematical exercise.

In order to demonstrate how the MW2 Stage 2 lands would be integrated with the already approved MW2 Stage 1 lands, a number of examples of how this integration would occur are on the next two pages (as per a draft Development Staging and Sequencing Plan prepared by the landowners):
APPENDIX VI
PEEL 2041 GROWTH MANAGEMENT ROPA - REQUEST TO PROCEED WITH CONSULTATION ON DRAFT AMENDMENT

The red line on the map on the right is the boundary between the MW2 Stage 1 and MW2 Stage 2 lands. In this case, the inclusion of the MW2 Stage 2 lands in the settlement area will allow for the development of an additional elementary school and community park that, because of its location, will serve residents in both MW2 Stage 1 and Stage 2.

The inclusion of the MW2 Stage 2 lands in the settlement area will allow for the development of housing on both sides of the east-west spine road that is proposed to intersect with Chinguacousy Road as shown on the map on the right (it is noted that there are policies in OPA 222 that require the development of the east-west spine road to Chinguacousy Road when the MW2 Stage 1 lands are developed). The development of primarily medium density housing on both sides of this key east-west road will provide additional housing choices in MW, will further support transit along this key road and allow for the comprehensive planning of the spine road between Chinguacousy Road and Mayfield Road. There is also a second east-west collector road that will be extended to Chinguacousy Road as well as a result.

In addition to the above, the inclusion of the MW2 Stage 2 lands in the settlement area will allow for development to occur on both sides of the internal collector roads, as per the examples on the right. This will support the completion of the necessary road network much earlier and the development of fully developed streets that can be easily integrated with the remainder of the community. In addition, the creation of unfinished edges where development only occurs on one side of an internal street is avoided.

Lastly, the inclusion of the MW2 Stage 2 lands in the settlement area will allow for the...
development of an additional commercial area at the north east corner of Chinguacousy Road and Mayfield Road, with this commercial area serving both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands.

Based on the work completed to date, it is clear that the proposed settlement area expansion area will be planned to accommodate population growth in MW that is compact and transit-supportive, and will provide opportunities to plan and design a complete community with 'hard' boundaries with a diverse mix of land uses, a range and mix of employment and housing types and high quality public open spaces with easy access to local amenities and services. In preparing my land use planning opinion, I have reviewed the extensive documentation that was made available to me in support of the MW2 Secondary Plan and the work completed by consultants retained by the Town in 2017 to update this work.

In addition to the above, it is my opinion that, on the basis of my review of all available technical information that the proposed expansion of the MW settlement area to include the MW2 Stage 2 lands conforms to the Growth Plan (2017), is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement 2014 ('PPS') and conforms with the Region of Peel Official Plan ('ROP') and the Town of Caledon Official Plan ('OP') as it relates to the location of growth and development. Further details on consistency with and conformity with Provincial policy are found in Appendices 1 (PPS) and 2 (Growth Plan).

Given that the Ultimate Community Plan and Framework Plan that was developed for the MW2 Stage 1 and 2 lands in 2013 has a density that is less than the 80 residents and jobs combined than is now required by Section 2.2.7.2 of the Growth Plan, it is anticipated that the Framework Plan will be revised before it is implemented through an amendment to the Town of Caledon Official Plan.

However, it is not anticipated that significant changes will be necessary, given the proposed grid-like road pattern in the Framework Plan that provides for the development of low and medium density housing in interchangeable locations. It is recognized, however, that a review of parkland needs will need to be carried out given the increased density, along with a review of the need for additional schools. Both of these will be reviewed in the context of the local Official Plan Amendment process. It is noted as well that an opportunity exists on the part of the Region and Town to average the minimum density target over multiple Greenfield development areas in the Town of Caledon, which could result in a slight decrease in the density on the MW2 Stage 2 lands.

In any event, approximately 2,700 households are proposed on the MW2 Stage 2 lands based on the application of the minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined. Given
that between 45% and 50% of any new Greenfield development area is truly available for
development, the majority of these households (65% to 75%) will be in the form of
apartments, townhouses, stacked townhouses and back-to-back townhouses and the
remaining households will be in the form of single and semi-detached dwellings. This housing
mix will be required to support the minimum density requirement of 80 residents and jobs per
hectare combined. The population resulting from the development of this number of
households is about 7,800. The number of new jobs will be approximately 600, with these
jobs coming from the one new school proposed in MW2 Stage 2 and from the commercial
block at the northeast corner of Chinguacousy Road and Mayfield Road, with the remainder
being considered as work from home / no fixed location jobs.

As a result of the housing mix proposed, a significantly high proportion of the proposed
housing will be more accessible and affordable than other recently developed Greenfield
areas in Peel Region. Along with these new households will be other uses that provide
employment such as one additional elementary school and other commercial uses. In addition
to the above, the MW2 Stage 2 area is part of a larger MW2 Secondary Plan area that will
contain a wide range of uses and provide for a range of activities. The expansion of MW to
now include the MW2 Stage 2 lands will allow for the completion of this component of MW.

1.3 REPORT OUTLINE

Section 2.0 of this PJR provides a summary of the process followed in the development of the
MW2 Secondary Plan starting in 2006 and which is still ongoing. A more comprehensive
review of this process is contained in Appendix 3. As will be demonstrated in Section 2.0,
the MW2 Stage 2 lands were for the most part considered as part of the Ultimate Community
Plan throughout this process. However, the area of land selected at the time was the product
of a mathematical exercise that did not take into account the location of logical community
boundaries.

Section 3.0 of the PJR provides an overview of the technical studies that were either updated
or reviewed as it relates to MW2 Stage 2 to ensure that a sound technical foundation exists for
the expansion of the settlement area. Section 4.0 then reviews the MCR process in the
Town of Caledon and the process established by ROPA 24 that contemplated settlement area
expansions through the ROPA process.

Section 5.0 then reviews Provincial policy on settlement area expansions and provides an
opinion on whether the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion conforms to those policies,
as it relates to the location of growth and development. Section 6.0 contains a review of the
ROP policy framework and Section 7.0 contains a review of the Caledon OP framework and
criteria dealing with settlement area expansions. The report concludes with Section 8.0,
which is a review of the criteria established by the Region to consider settlement area
expansions in the Town of Caledon.

This PJR has been prepared for the Town of Caledon to implement the Council resolution on
the matter adopted on December 20, 2016. The Council resolution of December 20, 2016 is
reproduced in its entirety below for completeness, since it also in of itself provides some
context and history on the process to date:

- *Whereas the Town of Caledon Official Plan directs future growth to Bolton and*
MW with MW to grow faster than Bolton until they become similar in size; and,

- Whereas MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan General Terms of Reference was endorsed by Council on June 10, 2008 to strategically identify a location in MW for growth for the planning period from 2021 to 2031; and,

- Whereas a preferred scenario for the MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan was endorsed by Council on August 10, 2010 that includes lands south of the Etobicoke Creek, west of Highway 10, north of Mayfield Road, and east of Chinguacousy Road; and,

- Whereas the MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan has always targeted at building a compact and complete community that far exceeds the Greenfield density target set by the Province; and,

- Whereas the MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan was forced to split into two parts with only the east side, approximately 206 hectares of developable land, approved to proceed under ROPA 29 in order to achieve Region wide intensification and Greenfield density targets; and,

- Whereas the Province has since adjusted its 2031 growth forecasts with an increase of 130,000 persons and 10,000 jobs for Peel Region, and Peel Region has not made its adjustments accordingly; and,

- Whereas the subject land is entirely inside the area in Peel Region Official Plan (section 5.4.3.2.7 and Schedule D that is designated for future growth; and,

- Whereas most studies required to amend Peel Region’s Official Plan for a settlement area boundary expansions have been completed through MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan on the basis of compact and complete community building; and,

- Whereas all required Regional servicing capacities, including road, water and sewer, have been either in place or planned to be in place in the next two years to support a complete community building in MW Phase 2; and,

- Now therefore be it resolved that the Region of Peel be requested to amend its Official Plan to bring the remaining area of the Town of Caledon MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan into settlement area; and,

- Further that staff be directed to review, validate and update, where needed, all the studies that have been completed in the area to meet the requirements of Peel Region Official Plan for a settlement area boundary expansion; and,

- Further that staff be directed to prepare a new Planning Justification Study Report, as well as other studies that may be deemed necessary by Peel Region Official Plan, to support the Regional Official Plan Amendment; and,

- Further that staff be directed to continue to work with staff from the Region of Peel and the MW Phase 2 Landowners Group to expedite the planning process.

2.0 MW2 PLANNING PROCESS

The purpose of this section of the PJR is to provide a brief overview of the MW2 planning process since it also involved for the most part an analysis of the MW2 Stage 2 lands. The
intent of this overview is to demonstrate that the MW2 Stage 2 lands are a logical addition to the MW2 Stage 1 lands.

As set out in detail in Appendix 3, the MW2 planning process began in 2006 and was concluded with the approval of ROPA 29 in 2015. Throughout this lengthy process, multiple supporting studies were completed, many public meetings were held and many staff reports on the progress of the MW Secondary Plan process were completed, all as detailed in Appendix 3 to this report.

As set out in Schedule 3 of the June 2006 Growth Plan, Peel Region’s population and employment base was forecast to reach 1,640,000 and 870,000 respectively by 2031, which later came to be known as the 2031A forecast when the Growth Plan was amended in 2013. However, it was the 2031A population forecast that provided the basis for the last expansion to the MW settlement area through ROPA 29 and OPA 222 (which became known as MW2 Stage 1).

The Regional Land Budget (associated with ROPA 24) and the Caledon Land Budget (associated with OPA 226) established the population and employment numbers for settlement area boundary expansions in Caledon, and the maximum area that would result in the minimum Greenfield density target being met, in accordance with the 2031A forecast. As a consequence, three urban expansions in Caledon were undertaken in the Town through ROPA’s 28, 29 and 30. In this regard, these three ROPA’s included an additional 609 hectares of land within the Bolton and Mayfield West settlement areas. These additional lands were planned to accommodate about 21,500 residents and about 11,000 jobs at a combined density of 53 residents and jobs per hectare.

While ROPA 24 did not contemplate the 2031B and 2041 Growth Plan forecasts, it did establish a policy framework for the consideration of settlement area expansions in the future through a ROPA process. OPA 226 also did the same.

In addition, the ROP as amended later by ROPA 29 specifically anticipated a further expansion of the MW settlement area by stating the following:

*The boundary shown as a red dashed line on Schedule D and designated in the legend “Study Area Boundary” is the area within which additional growth for Mayfield West beyond the 2031 population target is anticipated to occur. Any settlement boundary expansion for the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre will be designated on the basis of a municipal comprehensive review and will require an amendment to this plan.*

On the basis of the above, the ROP has already predetermined that additional growth would be allocated to MW for the post-2031 time period, subject of course to the completion of a MCR.
In terms of the MW2 Stage 2 lands specifically, a Framework Plan endorsed by Council in 2013 clearly shows that the majority of the MW2 Stage 2 lands were considered as part of the planning process (Caledon Report DP-2013-092).

The intent at that time was to rely upon the Framework Plan (shown on the right) to prepare and submit an application to the Region of Peel to obtain an amendment to the Regional Official Plan to expand the MW settlement area boundary (which later became ROPA 30).

The Framework Plan prepared at the time was based on a draft Ultimate Community Plan that identified the potential full build-out of the lands bounded by Highway 410/10, Mayfield Road, Chinguacousy Road and the Etobicoke Creek.

In this regard, the following was further stated in Caledon Report DP-2013-092:

The Ultimate Community Plan enables both Caledon and Peel to plan for the appropriate municipal infrastructure (road, water and waste water services) and community facilities (i.e. schools and parks) to support possible future growth beyond the MW2 planning considerations.

The Framework Plan identified residential lands, employment lands, commercial lands and a transit hub. A natural heritage system was also identified.

The recommended Framework Plan involved the establishment of a spine road between Chinguacousy Road on the west and Hurontario Street on the east and the establishment of a second collector road between McLaughlin Road and Chinguacousy Road as well. Two north-south collector roads are also proposed between Chinguacousy Road and McLaughlin Road as well.

The boundary of MW2 then followed in all cases either the spine road or a collector road and in one case, an enhancement corridor (B3 as shown on the Framework Plan). However, the western boundary of the Framework Plan did not follow property boundaries, nor did it extend to Chinguacousy Road to the west or Etobicoke Creek to the north.

The Framework Plan boundary was the product of a mathematical exercise that was intended to ensure that exactly the amount of land required to meet expected population and employment growth was being planned for. In my opinion, the very precise nature of the calculations carried out to support Growth Plan implementation at the time resulted in the creation of a boundary that did not logically include all of the lands that should be planned for in MW.
A more detailed description of the planning process that led to the approval of ROPA 29 and then OPA 222 is contained within Appendix 3.
3.0 TECHNICAL STUDIES IN SUPPORT OF MW2 STAGE 2

3.1 LOCATION OF SETTLEMENT AREA EXPANSION

The map below shows in blue the lands that are to be added to the MW settlement area:

As noted in Section 2.0 of this PJR, the majority of the lands in MW2 Stage 2 were included in the Ultimate Community Plan that provided the basis for the endorsed Framework Plan.

However, it is now proposed to include an additional eight properties in the settlement area expansion as shown on the next page (with the properties outlined in blue).
Seven of the eight properties front on Chinguacousy Road. Six of these properties on Chinguacousy Road are small rural residential lots, of which four are currently developed with single detached dwellings. It is anticipated over time that these lots would be absorbed in the development area and redeveloped if they were included in the settlement area. Given their small size, and the desire to create hard community boundaries such as Chinguacousy Road, it is my opinion that they be included.

A small tributary to Etobicoke Creek bisects the most northern property. The development potential of this northern property has been reviewed and the southern portion can be easily integrated into the fabric of the development area. The northern portion is separated from the southern portion by the tributary; however, the northern portion has enough developable land to support development. The northern portion is also within the Focused Analysis Area (FAA) which is a zone surrounding the shortlist of route alternatives for the new highway corridor. These lands, if included as part of the MW2 Stage 2 expansion would be prevented from proceeding to development until the future route of the new highway corridor is known.

It is also my opinion that the eighth property, which is the site of the Brampton Christian School on Hurontario Street, be included as well. Although there are no immediate plans to close the school, not including these lands in the settlement area would mean that it would be the only parcel of land south of Etobicoke Creek and between Chinguacousy Road and Hurontario Street that is not in the MW settlement area. It is noted that the Brampton Christian School property was once considered as part of the Ultimate Community Plan but was removed for land budget reasons prior to the enactment of ROPA 29.

The total land area within the settlement area expansion is about 105 hectares (excluding lands subject to the Greenbelt Plan). Of this amount, about 88 hectares was included within
the Framework Plan, with the eight properties discussed above comprising approximately 17 hectares.

### 3.2 SUMMARY OF UPDATED TECHNICAL STUDIES

On December 13, 2016, Caledon Council passed a Motion that, among other things, directed staff to initiate a Regional Official Plan Amendment to expand the MW2 Secondary Plan boundary to include the remainder of the lands south of Etobicoke Creek (Stage Two lands). On December 20, 2016 Council adopted all of the recommendations from the December 13 Motion. One of the specific directions to staff involved the technical studies needed to justify the settlement area expansion:

- **Further that staff be directed to review, validate and update, where needed all the studies that have been completed in the area to meet the requirements of Peel Region Official Plan for a settlement area boundary expansion.**

- **Further that staff be directed to prepare a new Planning Justification Study Report, as well as other studies that may be deemed necessary by Peel Region Official Plan, to support the Regional Official Plan Amendment.**

Subsequently, the Town contacted those consultants that had completed reports for the MW2 Secondary Plan to assess and update their respective studies for the MW2 Stage Two lands. Below is review of each of the updated studies.

### 3.3 AGRICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

#### 3.3.1 Background

Colville Consulting was retained to complete the MW2 Stage 1 Agricultural Impact Assessment (2008 AIA) with the purpose of preparing ‘an Agricultural Impact Assessment to specifically address Policy 1.1.3.9 [of the 2005 PPS], as well as pertinent policies in the Region of Peel and in the Town of Caledon Official Plan relating to expansion of settlement boundaries’. It was also stated that the AIA was based on Caledon’s Draft Agricultural Impact Assessment Guidelines (2003) that had the effect of identifying basic steps for the AIA to follow.

The Town-prepared detailed terms required that the AIA be prepared in two parts. Part A was completed in January 2010. The purpose of Part A was to describe the existing agricultural conditions within the study area. The study area for the AIA consisted of a primary and secondary study area that is shown on the map to the right. It is noted that the study area included both the MW2 Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands.
Part A of the AIA identified the existing land use characteristics in the study area, provided a physical inventory of the primary study area and also provided the minimum distance separation (MDS) requirements for all livestock facilities in the primary and secondary study area. As indicated by Colville Consulting, the expectation of the AIA Part A was that the Town would use the information, in addition to other completed technical studies, to identify land use scenarios and eventually a preferred land use scenario.

Part B was completed in 2013. Part B included an assessment of three land use scenarios as well as the potential impacts on agriculture for each scenario. More specifically, Colville Consulting indicated that Part B also addressed the consumption of agricultural resources and farm related investments, the effect of the loss of resources/investments on agricultural operations and the potential negative impacts of new non-farm development abutting the agricultural area and farm operations.

The three land use scenarios included lands within the Part A study area and additional lands located to the east of Hurontario Street that were not assessed in the Part A report. As noted above, the study area in Part A (completed in 2010) and Part B (completed in 2013) included the MW2 Stage Two lands.

On the basis of the above, the AIA was updated on July 12, 2017 (2017 AIA) to assess the impact of the MW2 Stage Two lands on agricultural resources and farm operations in the area. This also involved the consideration of the PPS 2014 and the Growth Plan (2017). The 2017 AIA study area includes the MW2 Stage 2 well as an additional area of 1.5 kilometres surrounding the subject lands.

### 3.3.2 Policy Changes that Impact the 2017 AIA

**Provincial Policy Statement**

The current Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) came into effect on April 30, 2014. This version was updated from the time that the original AIA was completed. In the current PPS, Section 2.3 continues to deal with agricultural policy, however some of the policies that are applicable to the study area have been updated.

Section 2.3.5.1 of the PPS continues to allow for municipalities to exclude land from prime agricultural areas for the expansion of settlement areas. Section 2.3.5.1 states that:

*Planning authorities may only exclude land from prime agricultural areas for expansions of or identification of settlement areas in accordance with policy 1.1.3.8.*

While this section was not updated in the 2014 PPS version, the policy that it references in Section 1.1.3.8 has been updated. Section 1.1.3.8 of the PPS has been updated to require settlement expansions to evaluate alternative locations and to ensure that expansions comply with MDS requirements. Below is Section 1.1.3.8 of the PPS with the new policy language identified in red.

1.1.3.8 A planning authority may identify a settlement area or allow the expansion of a settlement area boundary only at the time of a comprehensive review and only where it has been demonstrated that:
a) Sufficient opportunities for growth are not available through intensification, redevelopment and designated growth areas to accommodate the projected needs over the identified planning horizon;

b) The infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available are suitable for the development over the long term, are financially viable over their life cycle, and protect public health and safety and the natural environment;

c) In prime agricultural areas:
   a. The lands do not comprise specialty crop areas;
   b. Alternative locations have been evaluated, and
      i. There are no reasonable alternatives which avoid prime agricultural areas; and
      ii. There are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas;

d) The new or expanding settlement area is in compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae; and

e) Impacts from new or expanding settlement areas on agricultural operations which are adjacent or close to the settlement area are mitigated to the extent feasible.

In determining the most appropriate direction for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas or the identification of a settlement area by a planning authority, a planning authority shall apply the policies of Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources and Section 3: Protecting Public Health and Safety.

Growth Plan

The Growth Plan (2017) includes updated policies on the agricultural system. Firstly, Section 4.2.6.1 indicates that the Province will identify an Agricultural System and in this regard, draft mapping has been prepared for public and stakeholder review. An updated Section 4.2.6 dealing with the interface between settlement areas and agricultural areas has also been included in the Growth Plan (2017) as per below:

Where agricultural uses and non-agricultural uses interface outside of settlement areas, land use compatibility will be achieved by avoiding or where avoidance is not possible, minimizing and mitigating adverse impacts on the Agricultural System. Where mitigation is required, measures should be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed.

The key component of the above is the requirement that mitigation is required to be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses. Section 2.2.8.3 j) also speaks to impacts on agricultural operations when an expansion to a settlement area is proposed:

Any adverse impacts on agricultural operations and on the agri-food network from expanding settlement areas would be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated as determined through an agricultural impact assessment;

Regional Official Plan
When the AIA was completed in 2013, the lands within the study area were all identified as Prime Agricultural Area in the ROP. Since that time, the ROP has been amended as a result of the approval of ROPA 29, which affected the MW2 Stage 1 lands only.

Schedule B of the ROP continues to identify the MW2 Stage 2 lands as Prime Agricultural Area. As with work completed in 2013, the ROP continues to require that an assessment of impacts on agriculture be completed. This requires demonstrating that there are no reasonable alternative locations that avoid prime agricultural areas and no reasonable alternative locations with lower priority lands. A proposal to expand a settlement area also has to demonstrate compliance with MDS formulae.

Town of Caledon Official Plan

The Town of Caledon OP includes the MW2 Stage 2 lands as Prime Agricultural Area on Schedule B and similar policies apply.

3.3.3 Other Changes in the 2017 AIA

This section provides an overview of the sections that have changed in the 2017 AIA.

Agricultural Investments

The 2017 AIA includes a new section called ‘Agricultural Investments’ that addresses drainage and infrastructure. It is noted that these topic areas were covered in the original AIA but not in its own section.

The 2017 AIA indicates that there are approximately 197.6 ha of tile-drained lands (157.8 ha of systematic and 39.8 random) in the study area. The majority of the tile drained lands lie outside of the MW2 Stage 1 and MW2 Stage 2 lands. According to the 2017 AIA, there are approximately 16.5 ha of land within MW2 Stage 1 (0.6 hectares) and MW2 Stage 2 (15.9 hectares) that will be directly impacted by future development.

The 2017 AIA acknowledges that the previous decision on the MW boundary as per ROPA 29 ‘did a good job of excluding farm operations from within its boundaries’. It is also noted that the infrastructure at other former farm operations within the subject lands has been removed entirely. However, the Cook Farm continues to be identified as a large dairy farm operation with farm infrastructure located within the MW2 Stage 2 lands. In addition to the above, the 2017 AIA also identifies several other farm operations that are located outside of the boundaries of the subject lands including livestock operations and cash crop operations with grain driers.

Minimum Distance Separation

The Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) formulae and guidelines were updated in 2016 and came into effect on March 1, 2017.

Since ROPA 29 and OPA 222 has been approved and is in effect, the MDS formulae focused on the MW2 Stage 2 lands. It is noted that OPA 222 did accommodate for MDS in the design of the land use plan and through policies. MDS I is applied to existing livestock operations, which include all of those in the study area.
The MDS Document, Publication 853 (2016) recognizes two types of land uses. The 2017 AIA indicates that the MW2 Stage Two lands are considered to be Type B land uses. According to the MDS Documents, Publication 853 (2016), Type B land uses ‘include applications to rezone or redesignate agricultural lands for residential, institutional, recreational use – high intensity, commercial or settlement area purposes’.

The 2017 AIA identified five operations of concern. The 2017 AIA indicates that the Cook Farm (Farm #2) is the most significant of the livestock operations, while the four other operations are ‘minor and unlikely to significantly affect the settlement area expansion in the long-term’. The figure below identifies the operations of concern (Farm #2, #20, #23, #24 and #27) and the MDS setback from each of them, except from the Cook property.
3.3.4 New Recommendations in the 2017 AIA

OPA 222 in policy 7.14.4.1.7 states ‘Development in the Plan Area shall be consistent, to the extent feasible, with the recommendations for mitigation measures contained in the Agricultural Impact Assessment’. In the 2017 AIA, Colville Consulting indicates its assumption that the policy above is in reference to the mitigation measures of the AIA dated January 2014. The 2017 AIA provides updated recommendations and mitigation measures that are discussed below. It is noted that the recommendations for ‘Phasing of Development’ and ‘Restrictions of Normal Farm Practices’ remain the same as in the AIA. It is also noted that the recommendations from the original AIA on Drainage Measures have been removed entirely in the 2017 AIA.

**Buffering Recommendations**

Below are the two new recommendations for buffering (Section 7.2) that replace recommendations in the original AIA. This recommendation takes into account Section 2.2.8.3 j) of the Growth Plan (2017):

*The establishment of a buffer of some form should be considered for lands on both sides of Chinguacousy Road.*

- Maintain the buffer along the northern boundary; and
- Consider implementing edge-planning concepts into the Stage 2 lands to minimize potential conflicts along Chinguacousy Road.

**Traffic Recommendations**

Below is a modified traffic recommendation from the original AIA (modified text in red).

- The transportation plans for new development should be internalized as much as possible and access to Chinguacousy minimized to the extent possible;

In addition to the above, the 2017 AIA includes two new recommendations that speak to traffic. These recommendations include:

- Ensure that access to farm fields is not restricted;
- Any upgrades to existing roadways used by farm machinery should include the construction of wide shoulders to allow for slow moving farm vehicles to travel safely;

**Vandalism, Theft and Trespass Recommendations**

The 2017 AIA also provides recommendations to limit the potential negative impacts of vandalism, theft and trespass with the recommendations below, which also takes into account Section 2.2.8.3 j) of the Growth Plan (2017):

- Delay development of the Stage 2 lands until development of the MW2 lands is nearly complete. The Stage 2 lands will act as a temporary buffer between urban and agricultural uses;
- Establish low density land uses along Chinguacousy Road;
Inform residents through public consultation/education to not trespass on agricultural lands;
Consider implementing edge planning concepts (e.g. buffering) into Stage 2 lands to minimize potential for new residents to easily access adjacent farm lands; and
Where necessary consider the erecting and maintaining suitable fencing along the property limits of sensitive farm operations adjacent to the settlement area boundary.

It is noted that the final recommendation above is similar to a recommendation made in the original AIA.

3.3.5 Conclusions

The 2017 AIA identifies the Cook dairy farm and other livestock operations along Chinguacousy Road as constraints to developing the MW2 Stage 2 lands. This is because the settlement expansion would encroach into the established MDS setbacks. Any new development needs to be compliant with MDS requirements. It is noted that MDS compliance is required as long as the livestock facilities are present, structurally sound and have the ability to house livestock. However, the 2017 AIA also indicates ‘that once the facilities are retired and the buildings removed, settlement boundary expansion can continue for the majority of the Subject Lands in compliance with MDS’.

It is also indicated in the 2017 AIA that there are four other farm operations that have MDS1 setbacks that extend onto the lands that are in the MW2 Stage 2 area. However, only three of these have an impact on lands within MW2 Stage 2 as set out below, and as shown on the right:

- Farm 20 – 0 hectares
- Farm 23 – 0.89 hectares
- Farm 24 – 4.6 hectares
- Farm 27 – 1.87 hectares

This means that there are 7.36 hectares within the MDS setbacks on the MW2 Stage 2 lands (not including the Cook property).

Given the small areas of land included within these MDS setbacks and their location on the western edge of MW2 Stage 2 along Chinguacousy Road, it is my opinion that their inclusion in the settlement area cannot be avoided, if the desire is to create a logical western boundary of the settlement area.
The amount of land affected is very minor and will not impact in a significant way the form of development. In addition, it is anticipated that a similar policy to Section 7.14.20 would be included in the Town of Caledon OP that would preclude development in these areas until the livestock facilities are altered or removed.

It is noted that the AIA as summarized above has been submitted to the Region for their review and will be further revised based on further consultation with the Region, the Town and the Province.

3.4 WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICING STUDY

3.4.1 Background

R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited (Burnside) was retained by the Town to conduct a Water and Wastewater Servicing Study (Servicing Study) for the MW2 Secondary Plan. Burnside also peer reviewed other studies completed by the Developers Group in 2012 and 2014.

Burnside’s work was divided into two parts. Part A was completed on May 26, 2009 and Part B was completed on October 8, 2010. The area subject to the servicing study is shown on the right.

The purpose of Part A (2009 Servicing Study) was ‘describe the existing or planned regional water and wastewater infrastructure in or adjacent to the Study area and identify the related wastewater drainage areas and water pressure zones’. The 2009 Servicing Study results formed the foundation for Part B. It was also indicated in the report that Part A would be used in the initial preparation of land use scenarios for the MW2 area.

The purpose of Part B (2010 Servicing Study) was to ‘identify potential internal servicing options including potential routing alignments for both wastewater and water services. Part B also identifies potential key external regional servicing improvements that would be required to service each of the three (3) land use scenarios’. The figure below shows the updated study area for the 2010 Servicing Study.

Recognizing that other studies have been completed since the 2010 Servicing Study, Burnside prepared a memo to the Town on March 9, 2017 (2017 Burnside Memo) that summarizes the servicing work completed by Burnside and other on-going engineering studies. In the 2017 Burnside Memo, Burnside also provides an opinion on whether these reports could be utilized in the expansion of the plan into the Stage Two lands. These reports are discussed below.
3.4.2 Other Completed Servicing Studies

**Water and Wastewater Servicing Study Report**

The Municipal Infrastructure Group Ltd. (TMIG) was retained by the Developer’s Group to prepare a Water and Wastewater Servicing Study Report (Developer’s Servicing Study). In January 2014, TMIG completed the Developer’s Servicing Study that documented engineering evaluations that were completed following Burnside’s Servicing Study. The Town retained Burnside to Peer Review the Developer’s Servicing Study.

The 2017 Burnside Memo indicates that the Developer’s Servicing Study was ‘undertaken to address revised servicing requirements as a result of changes to the MW2 Secondary Plan through OPA 226, dated September 11, 2012 and the Planning Report DP-2013-092, dated September 3, 2013’.

According to the 2017 Burnside Memo, the Developer’s Servicing Study was intended to:

- Identify existing and planned water and wastewater infrastructure;
- Provide a summary of proposed water and wastewater demands;
- Identify proposed water and wastewater infrastructure to support the study area;
- Identify possible interim servicing opportunities utilizing existing water and wastewater infrastructure; and,
- Identify potential development phasing limits based on planned and proposed infrastructure.

**Functional Servicing Report**

In May 2016, Urbantech Consulting prepared a Functional Servicing Report (2016 Urbantech FSR) and an EIR and Transportation Study to support individual Draft Plans of Subdivision in the MW2 lands. The 2017 Burnside Memo indicates that the 2016 Urbantech FSR ‘provided details to support the Future Development of the Stage 2 lands and demonstrated how those lands would be integrated with the approved MW2 lands’.

According to the 2017 Burnside Memo, the Urbantech FSR was intended to address the items below.

- Discussion on the existing drainage conditions and environmental constraints for Stage 1 and 2;
- Proposed grading, storm and stormwater management (SWM) design, and sanitary/water servicing; and,
- Proposed water and sanitary infrastructure has been designed to service MW2 lands (both Stages 1 and 2) as well as Future Developments lands beyond Stage 2.

**3.4.3 Conclusions**

The 2017 Burnside Memo acknowledges that the ‘more recent reports provide an indication that lands outside the Stage 1 area of MW2 have been considered in developing servicing concepts’.
In addition and in response to requests for additional information from the Region, Burnside has indicated that trunk sanitary sewers within MW2 have been sized to accommodate 80 residents and jobs per hectare within for the Stage 2 lands. As per the mapping included in Appendix 4, there are four different servicing outlets for MW2, but only the Edenbrook Drive outlet will accommodate the future MW2 Stage 2 development.

None of the MW2 Stage 2 development will be directed to the other three outlets (Van Kirk, Robertson Davies Drive and Highwood Road). It is also anticipated that any local stage 1 sanitary pipes, which will convey the future MW2 Stage 2 lands, will be sized through detail design for Stage 1 to accommodate future requirement for 80 residents and jobs per hectare.

With respect to water supply, the current FSR has only captured the trunk watermains along the major roads as shown in the mapping included in Appendix 4. The watermain sizes have been confirmed by Region, and they are properly sized for the increased MW2 Stage 2 population. The local watermains will be sized at detail design by individual developers as part of the subdivision applications, and it is anticipated that their water analysis will take into account higher densities within the MW2 Stage 2 lands.

### 3.5 CULTURAL HERITAGE SURVEY

#### 3.5.1 Background

The Town’s General Terms of Reference for the MW2 Secondary Plan divided the Cultural Heritage Survey into three component studies: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, a Built Heritage Resources Assessment and a Cultural Heritage Landscapes Assessment.

In December 2008, ASI, in collaboration with Envision, completed a Cultural Heritage Landscapes Assessment and Built Heritage Resources (2008 Cultural Heritage Survey) for the MW2 Secondary Plan area. The map on the next page shows the study area from the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey. It is noted that the archaeological assessment was completed as a separate study from the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey.

The 2008 Cultural Heritage Study identified the study area as a Peel Plain farmscape, however it was noted that the entire study area did not emerge as a cultural heritage landscape of significance. The 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey further identified fourteen properties and a railway that have cultural heritage resource significance. Below are the recommendations from the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey.

- The Town list eight properties on the Town’s Heritage Register. These properties include:
  - 12669 Chinguacousy Road
  - 12960 and 12900 McLaughlin Road
  - 12461 McLaughlin Road
The Town designate six properties under Section 29, Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. These properties include:
- 12529 Chinguacousy Road (considered a CHL)
- 12259 Chinguacousy Road
- 2939 Old School Road
- 12290 Hurontario Street
- 12700 McLaughlin Road
- 12891 McLaughlin Road

- The Town consider and designate the Former Credit Valley Railway as a cultural heritage landscape.

- The Town prepare a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement for the Designated and Listed properties in association with any proposed development of major site or building alteration, on or adjacent to the properties.

On August 10, 2010, through Report 2010-050, Council added all of the above-mentioned properties as listed properties in the Town of Caledon Heritage Register. According to the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey, the former Credit Valley River Railway was added to the Town’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory in 2009. The map below is a map of the properties with recommendations from above.

ASI indicates that the purpose of the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey is to update the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey to ‘assess any changes to the condition and status of properties containing cultural heritage resources within a portion of the original Secondary Plan study area, that may have transpired since 2008’. The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey includes the Stage Two lands only.

The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey documents four properties and the railway that were previously included in the 2008 Cultural Heritage Study. No additional properties were identified in the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey. Below is a list of the heritage resources that are included in the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey.
3.5.2 Policy Changes that Impact the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey

Provincial Policy Statement

The current PPS includes updates to heritage-related definitions that were in the previous PPS. The updated definitions were reviewed in detail.

Growth Plan

The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey also reviewed the policies of the 2006 Growth Plan, however it is noted that the 2017 Growth Plan is now in effect.

Some preamble text that addressed heritage-related matters has been reworded and/or removed in the 2017 Growth Plan. However, the policies that speak to heritage conservation in Section 4.2.7 of the 2017 Growth Plan have not been changed from the 2006 Growth Plan.

Region of Peel Official Plan

The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey identifies policies that recognize that address cultural heritage in Section 3.6 of the Region of Peel Official Plan. The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey does not identify changes to the Regional policies since the completion of the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey.
Town of Caledon Official Plan

The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey indicates that a number of heritage-related definitions have been updated since the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey was completed. It is noted that the Town’s Official Plan heritage-related definitions are different than those in the PPS and the Region of Peel Official Plan. Below are the definitions that have been updated in the Town’s OP since the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey was completed.

3.5.3 Other Changes in the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey

Since the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey, some changes have been made to properties on the Town’s Heritage Register. Some of these changes apply to heritage properties that are within the Stage Two lands. Below is a summary of these properties.

- **12259 Chinguacousy Road** (CHR 1) remains on the Town’s Heritage Register as a listed property. The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey indicates that of the remaining cultural heritage resources within the study area, this property is the most significant and intact.

- **12529 Chinguacousy Road** (CHR 2) was removed from the Town’s Heritage Register on September 29, 2015 (Report 2015-074). According to the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey, the majority of the property’s built heritage resources were removed without Council approval in 2013. The owner subsequently complied with the *Ontario Heritage Act* and received Council approval to demolish the remainder of the property’s built heritage resources.

- **12461 McLaughlin Road** (CHR 3) remains on the Town’s Heritage Register as a listed property. The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey states that this property has retained its significance, but that the removal of vegetation (which was previously identified as adding to its value) has impacted the property’s cultural heritage value.

- **12502 McLaughlin Road** (CHR 4) was removed from the Town’s Heritage Register on October 18, 2016 (Report 2016-130). Council approved the removal of this property following the completion of a Heritage Impact Statement by Wayne Morgan that determined that the property did not have sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to warrant retention and conservation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

- **Former Credit Valley River Railway** (CHR 5) remains on the Town’s Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory. It is noted that the railway is used regularly for freight traffic and continues to remain operational as part of the Credit Valley Explorer corridor (weekend public excursion train).

3.5.4 New Recommendations in the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey

The 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey recommended that a number of properties be listed and designated on the Town’s Heritage Register. The Town subsequently added all of the properties from the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey to the Town’s Heritage Register as listed properties. The Town also identified the Former Credit Valley River Railway as a Cultural Heritage Landscape on its Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory.
As identified above, some changes have occurred to the Town’s Heritage Register that included some properties within the Stage Two lands. Below are the recommendations identified in the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey:

1. The 2008 Scheinman Report [2008 Cultural Heritage Survey] recommends the designation of the property at 12259 Chinguacousy Road (CHR 1). The Town of Caledon should pursue designation to ensure the long-term survival of the property’s cultural heritage resources;

2. The MW2 Secondary Plan calls for the redevelopment of portions of properties containing cultural heritage resources. As such, a Heritage Impact Statement should be prepared to determine if the proposed development will have any impacts on the property’s heritage resources;

3. If a future application is made to incorporate the farmhouses at 12259 Chinguacousy Road or 12461 McLaughlin Road within a residential development, the farmhouses and significant landscape features should be conserved and a Conservation Plan should be prepared as a condition of approval of the planning application;

4. All significant heritage trees/vegetation identified within the 2008 Scheinman Report [2008 Cultural Heritage Survey] should be incorporated into the MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan where possible;

5. The 2008 Scheinman Report [2008 Cultural Heritage Survey] acknowledged the significance of the landscape at 12529 Chinguacousy Road. Despite the loss of the built heritage resources on site, this landscape should be considered as an asset to the area. Opportunities to preserve the landscape and potentially provide community access should be explored;

6. The condition of the cultural heritage resources in the study area should be monitored according to the Town of Caledon’s Property Standards By-law (98-155) to ensure that their condition does not deteriorate; and,

7. Town staff should promote the active use of the buildings to ensure that their condition is maintained.

3.5.5 Constraints to Developing the Stage Two Lands

Based on the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey and its proposed recommendations, below is a summary of the constraints to developing the Stage Two lands by the specific properties that were identified as having heritage significance.

12259 Chinguacousy Road (CHR 1)

- This property is listed on the Town’s Heritage Register.
- The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey recommends that the Town pursue designation to ensure the long-term survival of the property’s cultural heritage resources.
- The recommendations also propose that if future applications are made on this property to be included within a residential development that the farmhouses and significant landscape features be conserved. The recommendations further specify that a Conservation Plan should be prepared as a condition of approval with the planning application.
12529 McLaughlin Road (CHR 2)

- This property is no longer listed on the Town’s Heritage Register, however the 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey recommendations indicate that the landscape should be considered as an asset to the area and that opportunities to preserve the landscape and potentially provide community access should be explored. It is noted that the 2008 Cultural Heritage Survey acknowledged the significance of the landscape, in addition to the previous built resources that have since been demolished, on this property.

12461 McLaughlin Road (CHR 3)

- This property is listed on the Town’s Heritage Register.
- The recommendations propose that if future applications are made on this property to be included within a residential development that the farmhouses and significant landscape features be conserved. The recommendations further specify that a Conservation Plan should be prepared as a condition of approval with the planning application.

3.6 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT STUDY

3.6.1 Background

Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited (Paradigm) was retained by the Town to conduct a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for the MW2 Secondary Plan. The map below shows the study area for the TIS.
Paradigm’s work was divided into two parts. Part A was completed on January 26, 2009 and amended March 3, 2009. Part A assessed the existing and planned transportation. Paradigm indicated that the purpose of Part A was to ‘provide guidelines regarding roads and other transportation components as input to the development of land use plans for the Phase Two study area’. Paradigm also indicated that Part A utilized other transportation planning work that was being undertaken in the area.

Part B was completed on May 4, 2010. Part B identified the implications of land use scenarios on the broader transportation impact assessment area. Paradigm indicated that the purpose of Part B was to ‘provide a transportation master plan for improvements to the transportation system within the study area’.

In December 2015, Paradigm completed the MW2 Secondary Plan Transportation Master Plan (2015 TMP). This Transportation Master Plan was used to support OPA 222 that is now in effect. An addendum to the Master Transportation Plan was completed in November 2016. Paradigm indicated that the addendum was prepared to ‘identify potential changes to the approved MW2 Secondary Plan and discuss the implications to the approved TMP if the potential changes were adopted by the Town’.

In June 2017, Paradigm completed a second addendum to the Transportation Master Plan (2017 TMP) that seeks to ‘identify the nature of the proposed land use expansion [Stage Two lands] and to assess the implications for the approved Transportation Master Plan’. The 2017 TMP assessed the implications of additional lands on the network plan, transit plan and pedestrian and cycling plan.
3.6.2 Changes in the 2017 TMP

The 2017 TMP indicates that ‘the planned urban boundary expansion also includes two relatively small areas adjacent to Chinguacousy Road in which development was not previously anticipated’. It is noted that the existing Brampton Christian School (adjacent to Highway 10) is also outlined in blue. The 2015 TMP included this area in its analysis and assumed that the existing school use would continue. The map below outlines the two additional areas that were not previously considered in blue.

The 2017 TMP also states that the expected build-out of the area was included in the analysis of future transportation needs at the time that the 2015 TMP was completed. In this regard, the 2017 TMP assess the two additional areas outlined in blue in its update.

The 2017 TMP assumes that the two additional areas will be developed with low to medium density residential uses. In addition, the 2017 TMP expects that additional travel demand related to urban development on these lands will be relatively low compared to the overall urban development.

3.6.3 Constraints to Developing the Stage Two Lands

The 2017 TMP concluded that the existing plans (road network, public transit and pedestrian and cycling plan) are able to fully accommodate the expansion of the MW2 lands to include the Stage Two lands. The 2017 TMP does not recommend any changes to the existing plans. In response to a request for further information from the Region, Paradigm has indicated that while further transportation analysis is required, it is anticipated that the planned road network should be able to accommodate the expected population and jobs resulting from the application of the minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare on the MW2 Stage 2 lands.
3.7 NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.7.1 Background

Jade Acoustics Inc. (Jade Acoustics) was retained by the Town to conduct an Environmental Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (ENVIA) for the MW2 Secondary Plan. The map below shows the study area for the ENVIA.

Jade Acoustics’ work was divided into two parts. Part A was completed on December 22, 2008. The purpose of Part A (2008 ENVIA) was ‘to identify existing noise and vibration sources within, and in the vicinity of the study area and identify any possible constraints associated with the existing future noise and vibration study’. Part A concluded that there were several sources of noise and vibration within and around the study area that required assessment and evaluation but that ‘no source would severely constrain future uses’.

Part B was completed on May 13, 2010. The purpose of Part B (2010 ENVIA) was to ‘identify existing and future noise and/or vibration sources and evaluate their potential impact on the three proposed land-use options’. Part B provided an analysis of each of the land-use scenarios and concluded that all land-use scenarios would require acoustical abatement measures in order to comply with MOW/Peel Guidelines.

On June 28, 2017, Jade Acoustics completed a draft addendum to the 2010 ENVIA (2017 ENVIA). The purpose of the 2017 ENVIA is to assess the Stage Two lands to the MW2 Secondary Plan. The 2017 ENVIA used the same study area and map as provided in the 2017 TMP completed by Paradigm. It is noted that the 2017 ENVIA relied upon the 2017
3.7.2 Changes in the 2017 ENVIA

The 2017 ENVIA identifies three areas that will require particular attention. These include:

- The interface of the proposed commercial and employment lands west of Hurontario Street and the proposed residential lands and the existing Brampton Christian School;
- The interface of the proposed high density residential and the commercial land/transit hub at the intersection of The Spine Road and Collector Road F; and,
- The interface of the rail spur line and the proposed residential uses to the west.

3.7.3 New Recommendations in the 2017 ENVIA

Below are additional recommendations provided in the 2017 ENVIA.

- All residential dwellings will require warning clauses, implemented in the appropriate agreements, advising the homeowners of the noise situation and the existence of commercial, industrial developments and agricultural uses in the vicinity of the proposed development, which at times may be audible.
- Noise and vibration reports should be prepared for each use to determine the specific measures that will be needed to meet the applicable guidelines.

3.7.4 Constraints to Developing the Stage Two lands

The 2017 ENVIA did not identify constraints to developing the Stage Two lands, however the recommendations above could be applied during the planning process for the Stage Two lands.

3.8 FINANCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.8.1 Background

Watson and Associates Economists Ltd. (Watson) prepared the “Mayfield West Phase 2 Secondary Plan Fiscal and Economic Impact Assessment re the Region of Peel”, dated January 20, 2014 (“2014 Study”). The assessment within the 2014 Study focused primarily on the Mayfield West Phase 2 (MW2) Stage 1 lands to provide an indication of the anticipated long-range fiscal impacts of development on the Region of Peel.

The 2014 Study broadly assessed the development charge (D.C.) funding impact for Regional water, wastewater and roads needs attributable to MW2, including both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands. The analysis focused on the imminent Regional projects that were of a localized nature and significantly attributable to MW2. The 2014 study showed that while there would be front-end financing pressures for MW2 growth-related projects, at build-out of MW2 Stage 1 lands, there would be positive anticipated D.C. incremental capital cost and servicing differential revenues of $53.7 million. Moreover, MW2 Stage 2 lands were anticipated to
contribute an additional $62.8 million in D.C. revenue related to roads, water, and wastewater services.

Regional tax and utility rate supported impacts were also assessed as part of the 2014 Study. The tax supported assessment showed that the anticipated annual property tax revenues associated with the build-out of MW2 would exceed the anticipated increase in annual expenditures by $2.4 million annually ($1.7 million for Stage 1 land and $0.7 million for Stage 2 lands). The assessment also concluded that the Region’s water and wastewater rates would be sufficient to cover incremental operating and capital from current budget costs in MW2.

3.8.2 Updated Financial Impact Assessment

The 2014 Study was updated in August 2017 to consider the MW2 Stage 2 lands. The updated fiscal impact assessment includes a broad assessment of the development charge impacts of servicing MW2 Stage 2 lands for water, wastewater and roads services. The updated assessment also considers the Region’s operating budget implications for tax-supported services.

With respect to Regional roads, at current D.C. rates, the MW2 Stage 2 Lands are anticipated to produce $24.5 million of Regional Roads D.C. revenue by build-out. The one third cost share of the identified infrastructure needs is $14.2 million. This produces positive incremental capital cost and servicing differential revenues in the order of $10.3 million over the build-out of MW2 Stage 2 Lands.

With respect to water services, the MW2 Stage 2 lands are anticipated to produce approximately $54.8 million in water D.C. revenues at build-out. As a result, positive incremental capital cost and servicing differential revenues related to water services will be used to fund the balance of the Regions D.C. water program that provide border service benefits to the area and Regional water system in general. With respect to wastewater services, the development of the MW2 Stage 2 Lands is anticipated to produce $25.5 million in wastewater D.C. revenue at build-out. The result is an estimated positive incremental capital cost and servicing differential revenue of $5.7 million.

The above means that collectively between water, wastewater and Regional road infrastructure requirements, there will be positive incremental capital cost and servicing differential revenue of about $54 million. However, the analysis does indicate that there will be financing pressure in the near term based on the emplacement of infrastructure and timing of development for the MW2 Stage 2 lands.

However, the analysis does indicate that there will be financing pressure in the near term based on the emplacement of infrastructure and timing of development for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. This is typical, as the services are required to be built and paid for before build-out. It is noted however that expected revenue from MW2 Stage 1 lands will assist in financing these needs. To the extent that a cumulative short fall exists during the take up of MW2, this gap would be filled via Regional D.C. reserve funds, Regional external or internal debt, or potential upfront financing from the affected landowners.
3.9 **CIESMP**

The inventory and collection of background information related to the Mayfield West Phase 2 Secondary Plan commenced in 2008. The scope of the inventory and evaluation included identification of all natural heritage features (woodland, PSW, drainage features, vegetation, wildlife). The additional investigations included hydrological and hydrogeological testing and monitoring to determine and understand the water regime. Inventory of historical references to SAR and observations from the MW2 area (Stages 1 and 2) were recorded and considered during the confirmation of natural heritage constraints to development.

Consultants representing both the Town and landowners confirmed the natural heritage features extent by completing a field staking exercise with the TRCA, CVC and MNRF to locate woodland edges, PSW boundaries and to evaluate headwater drainage features and top-of-bank limits. Ultimately all natural heritage features were field confirmed with the agencies and surveyed by an Ontario Land Surveyor and used as parameters for future community design.

By 2011 all natural heritage constraints were identified and associated buffers/setbacks were applied and approved by all agencies. A monitoring program to collect data related to the surface and ground water regime was undertaken per the TRCA/CVC protocol in order to confirm the requirements for a features based water balance.

In 2014 the CEISMP completed by AMEC was approved by the Town and Region and included mapping depicting the natural heritage constraints (NHS), parameters to community design (performance measures) and stormwater management and servicing scenarios. Since the completion of the CEISMP was completed by AMEC, further ongoing analysis of the natural heritage features has occurred.

The work completed since the completion of the AMEC report has included further determinations of floodline mapping based upon an updated flood model (TRCA), meander belt calculation for Etobicoke Creek and a key headwater feature, stable slope analysis and erosion setback establishment. Also, given that the AMEC data collection occurred in 2008 – 2010, updates to the regional, provincial and federal status of plant and wildlife species were completed and further review of the water budget was completed using compiled data provided since the AMEC work was completed. Recent meetings with TRCA, CVC and MNRF have reconfirmed the acceptability of the characterization of natural heritage features and functions related to the MW2 lands. Proponents continue to liaise with MNRF regarding SAR and to date there have been no findings that would preclude development within the MW2 Stage 2 lands.

It is acknowledged that the work on the CEISMP is ongoing in accordance with updated terms of reference provided by the Region and will be subject to further review and revisions in consultation with the Region, Town of Caledon and relevant agencies to ensure terms of reference requirements are satisfied.
4.0 THE MCR PROCESS IN CALEDON

In September 2012, Peel Region retained the firm Malone Given Parsons (MGP) to review Caledon’s MCR process, and provide the Region with an assessment and planning opinion regarding the appropriateness of Caledon’s OPA 226 (Caledon’s Provincial Policy Conformity amendment) and associated settlement area boundary expansion applications in fulfilling the requirements of a MCR. It is noted that this assessment and planning opinion related to the implementation of the 2031 Growth Plan forecast through OPA 226.


In their Report, MGP provided the opinion that Caledon’s MCR process is appropriate and that Caledon can implement settlement area boundary expansions through separate amendments to the Region of Peel OP to conclude the conformity process. The following is stated in the report:

It is our opinion that the Town of Caledon’s MCR process is appropriate when considered within the Provincial policy definition of what constitutes a MCR process as an official plan review initiated by a municipality. OPA 226 is clearly the culmination of Caledon’s analytical and policy conformity work with provincial planning initiatives. However, full conformity to Provincial and Regional planning documents can only be achieved by delineating and designating the land required to accommodate growth through expansion of the Settlement Area Boundary (if necessary), i.e. by designating the land that will be required to meet growth forecasts for population and employment over the (2031) planning horizon. Hence, once approved, OPA 226 must be fully implemented through adoption of associated Settlement Area Boundary expansions.

By extension, Caledon’s Official Plan review is not complete until the Settlement Area Boundary expansions are finalized, and the expansions are demonstrated to conform to the policies of the Town, Region and Province. Additional Official Plan Amendments dealing with Settlement Area Boundaries must therefore be brought forward and adopted as part of the current Official Plan Review. Only then will the Official Plan Review process commenced by the Town in 2007 be concluded, and thereby conclude the MCR process. Completing the MCR through an Official Plan Review comprised of separate Official Plan Amendments is consistent with provincial policies and is similar in approach to that employed by other municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Caledon’s OPA 226 properly implements the Growth Plan Policy Areas in the Town in accordance with ROPA 24 and is good planning. It is appropriate to undertake the MCR process in stages, with the initial stages focused on Growth Plan Policy Area allocations and policies, followed by implementing Settlement Area Boundary Expansion OPAs as part of the same MCR.

MGP reviewed all the relevant Provincial, Regional and Caledon policy documents to identify all the policies relating to settlement area boundary expansions and MCRs. MGP then prepared a policy checklist that lists all the relevant policies that should be reviewed for
compliance to and conformity with settlement area boundary expansions in the context of the MCR process.

Using the policy checklist described above, MGP developed a list of 23 evaluation criteria that form the basis for evaluating whether individual settlement area boundary expansions meet the requirements of an MCR.

While the work completed by MGP related to the implementation of the 2031 Growth Plan forecast, it is my opinion that the work completed remains valuable and on this basis, this PJR addresses the policies contained in the policy checklist (see Sections 5, 6 & 7) and evaluation criteria (see Section 8) prepared by MGP.

In preparing the policy framework, MGP identified relevant policies from the following policy documents:

- Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 *(note: now PPS 2014)*
- Greenbelt Plan, 2005 *(note: now 2017)*.
- Region of Peel OP.
- Town of Caledon OP.

In some instances, the relevant policies contained in these policy documents are duplicative and therefore this PJR cross references responses to these policies where necessary.

It is recognized that the Region's land budget methodology is in the process of being updated. It is the intent of this PJR to also provide input into this updated methodology. Once finalized, it is anticipated that a more detailed analysis would be carried out in Caledon to ensure that the minimum density target established by the Growth Plan (2017) will be implemented.
5.0 PROVINCIAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

The Provincial planning system in Ontario is intended to guide growth and development across the Province and particularly the Greater Golden Horseshoe in a co-coordinated and comprehensive manner. As such, all OP’s and OPAs are required to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS) and conform to Places to Grow: The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and Greenbelt Plan, 2017.

The following sections provide an overview of the applicability of the PPS, Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan. A detailed response to the applicable Provincial policies and plans is provided in Appendices 1 and 2 of this PJR.

5.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT (2014)

5.1.1 Basis for Consideration of the PPS 2014

Section 3(5)(a) of the Planning Act states the following:

A decision of the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board, a minister of the Crown and a ministry, board, commission or agency of the government, including the Municipal Board, in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter, shall be consistent with the policy statements issued under subsection (1) that are in effect on the date of the decision.

The Policy Statement that is currently in effect is the PPS 2014, which came into effect on April 30, 2014. The overall context for municipal decision-making that is required to be consistent with the PPS 2014 is established in the first two paragraphs of the Part 1 Preamble to the PPS 2014:

The Provincial Policy Statement provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. As a key part of Ontario’s policy-led planning system, the Provincial Policy Statement sets the policy foundation for regulating the development and use of land. It also supports the provincial goal to enhance the quality of life for all Ontarians.

The Provincial Policy Statement provides for appropriate development while protecting resources of provincial interest, public health and safety, and the quality of the natural and built environment. The Provincial Policy Statement supports improved land use planning and management, which contributes to a more effective and efficient land use planning system.

5.1.2 Importance of Updated Official Plans

With respect to the implications of the PPS 2014 on the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion, Section 4.7 of the PPS 2014 states the following:

The official plan is the most important vehicle for implementation of this Provincial Policy Statement. Comprehensive, integrated and long-term planning is best achieved through official plans.
Official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. To determine the significance of some natural heritage features and other resources, evaluation may be required.

Official plans should also coordinate cross-boundary matters to complement the actions of other planning authorities and promote mutually beneficial solutions. Official plans shall provide clear, reasonable and attainable policies to protect provincial interests and direct development to suitable areas.

In order to protect provincial interests, planning authorities shall keep their official plans up-to-date with this Provincial Policy Statement. The policies of this Provincial Policy Statement continue to apply after adoption and approval of an official plan.

While the ROP has been amended to conform to the Growth Plan (pre the 2017 Growth Plan), it is recognized that the Region of Peel is currently updating the ROP to ensure that it conforms to the updated Provincial Plans.

5.1.3 The Use of Words in the PPS 2014

The PPS 2014 significantly expanded upon Part III (How to Read the Provincial Policy Statement) from the PPS 2005. There is now a discussion in Part III on the need to read the entire PPS, the need to consider specific policy language and the geographic scale of the policies. This section also confirms that the policies represent minimum standards and it also articulates the relationship of the PPS 2014 with Provincial plans. This new section also contains direction on defined terms and meanings and guidance material. There is one enhancement in Part III of interest that was made in 2014 and it deals with the language used in the PPS 2014. This enhancement is reproduced below:

When applying the Provincial Policy Statement it is important to consider the specific language of the policies. Each policy provides direction on how it is to be implemented, how it is situated within the broader Provincial Policy Statement, and how it relates to other policies.

Some policies set out positive directives, such as “settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development.” Other policies set out limitations and prohibitions, such as “development and site alteration shall not be permitted.” Other policies use enabling or supportive language, such as “should,” “promote” and “encourage.”

The choice of language is intended to distinguish between the types of policies and the nature of implementation. There is some discretion when applying a policy with enabling or supportive language in contrast to a policy with a directive, limitation or prohibition.

On the basis of the above, it is clear that the Province, in writing and updating the PPS 2014, was very cautious and deliberate with respect to the words used. Of particular interest to decision-makers is whether a particular policy incorporates the word “shall”, “should”, “promote” or “encourage”. The latter three are enabling or supportive, while the first (shall) when applied to a policy is a directive, limitation or prohibition.
The word 'shall' when used means that the policy requirement that follows is mandatory. This is supported by the statement in Part III of the PPS 2014, which indicates that there is some discretion when applying a policy with enabling or supportive language in contrast to a policy with a directive, limitation or prohibition. In this regard, wherever the word ‘shall’ is used, it is a directive, limitation or a prohibition.

With respect to the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion, below is a list of a few of the relevant directives, limitations and prohibitions (using the word 'shall') from the PPS 2014 that will need to be considered:

- **Section 1.1.2** - Sufficient land shall be made available to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 20 years.
- **Section 1.1.3.1** – Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development, and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.
- **Section 1.1.3.2** – Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses that support a number of objectives.
- **Section 1.2.4 e)** - Where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper-tier municipality in consultation with lower-tier municipalities shall identify and provide policy direction for the lower-tier municipalities on matters that cross municipal boundaries.
- **Section 1.6.1** - Infrastructure, electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems, and public service facilities shall be provided in a coordinated, efficient and cost-effective manner that considers impacts from climate change while accommodating projected needs.
- **Section 1.6.7.2** - Efficient use shall be made of existing and planned infrastructure, including through the use of transportation demand management strategies, where feasible.
- **Section 1.6.7.5** – Transportation and land use considerations shall be integrated at all stages of the planning process.
- **Section 2.1.1** - Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.
- **Section 4.4** - This Provincial Policy Statement shall be read in its entirety and all relevant policies are to be applied to each situation.

5.1.4 **The Role of Peel Region**

Section 1.2.4 of the PPS 2014 below indicates very clearly what is required, when an upper tier municipality (such as Peel Region) is responsible for planning:

1.2.4 Where planning is conducted by an upper-tier municipality, the upper-tier municipality in consultation with lower-tier municipalities shall:

a) Identify, coordinate and allocate population, housing and employment projections for lower-tier municipalities. Allocations and projections by upper-tier municipalities shall be based on and reflect provincial plans where these exist;
Peel Region has implemented Section 1.2.4 a) as a consequence of the approval of ROPA 24, which established the basis for the carrying out of settlement area expansions in the Town of Caledon. This role continues with the Peel 2041 process.

5.1.5 MW2 Stage 2 and the PPS 2014

Appendix 1 provides a review of the proposed MW2 Stage 2 for compliance with and conformity to relevant policies from the PPS 2014. All of the relevant and applicable policies in the PPS, related to the proposed settlement area boundary expansion, have been reviewed for compliance and conformity. Based on this review, the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion is consistent with the PPS 2014, as it relates to the location of growth and development.

5.2 GROWTH PLAN (2017)

The Provincial Government adopted the Places To Grow Act in June 2005. The Act provides a framework for the adoption of regional-scale Growth Plans. The first of these, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, was adopted by Regulation in June 2006. Since its adoption, the Growth Plan has been amended twice, as follows:

- The first amendment was released in January 2012 and contains new policies, schedules and definitions that apply in the Simcoe Sub-area; and,
- The second amendment was released in June 2013 to update and extend the Growth Plan’s population and employment forecasts.

The Growth Plan is a statement of Provincial policy directing growth-related planning decisions over the next 30 years. The intent of the Growth Plan is to significantly reduce urban sprawl and land consumption while making more efficient use of existing infrastructure. The Growth Plan requires that municipalities look to new ways to accommodate growth that breaks from the past, in terms of how communities are designed, and how land uses are mixed, all in an effort to improve our quality of life, our health and our general well-being.

The Growth Plan contains a vision for 2041 for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. This vision is described through a series of maps and text, and contains policies dealing with the essential aspects of the Plan. The Plan contains specifics on where and how the area will grow and the infrastructure that may be needed to support that growth. A section of the Plan also deals with the natural heritage system, agricultural system, rural areas and mineral aggregate resources.

The Growth Plan establishes specific policies dealing with forecasts, intensification, urban growth centres and intensification corridors, employment areas, urban boundaries, and small cities and towns. It also establishes minimum densities that new development must achieve, requires that urban growth centre and intensification corridor boundaries be delineated, creates strong policies dealing with the preservation of employment areas and lists the criteria to be met to justify urban boundary expansions.

A chapter on infrastructure deals with transportation and water/wastewater systems. A chapter entitled "Protecting What is Valuable" establishes policies related to the natural system, agricultural system, rural areas, mineral aggregate and cultural heritage resources.
There is also a chapter providing for implementation measures, including monitoring and review of the Plan’s policies and projections.

The Places to Grow Act, 2005 requires that the OP’s of all municipalities within the Growth Plan area be brought into conformity with the Growth Plan. In the Region of Peel, this resulted in a coordinated planning effort between the Region of Peel, Town of Caledon, City of Brampton, and City of Mississauga, and the adoption of required conformity amendments. The relevant conformity amendment applicable to this ROPA application is ROPA 24, which has been discussed throughout this report and particularly in Section 4.0.

The Government of Ontario introduced Amendment 2 to the Growth Plan in June 2013, which adjusted total population and employment for Peel Region by 2031 (referred to as 2031B), and set new population and employment targets for the Region by 2041. Growth Plan Amendment 2 came into effect on June 17, 2013 and required the affected municipal OP’s, including the Region of Peel and Caledon OP’s, be brought into conformity at the time of their next OP review.

The Growth Plan was recently updated in 2017 and it contains updated requirements for municipal comprehensive reviews and it increases the minimum intensification target and the minimum designated Greenfield area target. One of the key changes made is that the responsibility for identifying settlement area expansions now rests with the upper tier planning authority, which in this case is the Region of Peel. The role of the upper tier planning authority as it relates to the identification of targets is further spelled out in an updated Section 5.2.3.2:

**Upper-tier municipalities, in consultation with lower-tier municipalities, will, through a municipal comprehensive review, provide policy direction to implement this Plan, including:**

a) **Identifying minimum intensification targets for lower-tier municipalities based on the capacity of delineated built-up areas, including the applicable minimum density targets for strategic growth areas in this Plan, to achieve the minimum intensification target in this Plan;**

b) **Identifying minimum density targets for strategic growth areas, including any urban growth centres or major transit station areas, in accordance with this Plan;**

c) **Identifying minimum density targets for employment areas;**

d) **Identifying minimum density targets for the designated Greenfield areas of the lower-tier municipalities, to achieve the minimum density target for the upper- or single-tier municipality;**

e) **Allocating forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan to the lower-tier municipalities in a manner that would support the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan; and**

f) **Addressing matters that cross municipal boundaries.**

In addition to the above, and in accordance with Section 2.2.7.2 of the Growth Plan (2017), an average density of 80 people and jobs per hectare has been assumed for MW2 Stage 2. This generates a total yield of approximately 8,500 people and jobs by 2041 (105 ha x 80 people...
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MW PHASE 2 STAGE 2 SETTLEMENT AREA EXPANSION

PEEL 2041 GROWTH MANAGEMENT ROPA - REQUEST TO PROCEED WITH CONSULTATION ON DRAFT AMENDMENT

and jobs per ha). The new Growth Plan also contains new intensification targets and these will need to be implemented as well through the Peel 2041: Official Plan Review.

Appendix 2 of this PJR provides a review of the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion for compliance with and conformity to relevant policies of the Growth Plan 2017. All of the relevant and applicable policies in the Growth Plan related to the proposed settlement area boundary expansion, have been reviewed for compliance and conformity. Based on this review, the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion conforms to the Growth Plan as it relates to the location of growth and development.

5.3 GREENBELT PLAN, 2017

In 2005, the Province of Ontario created the Greenbelt Plan, to permanently protect about 728,000+ hectares (1.8 million acres) of agricultural lands and ecological features/systems, from urban development, within the Greater Golden Horseshoe and beyond. The Greenbelt Plan was established under Section 3 of the Greenbelt Act, 2005. The Greenbelt is the largest geographical area of its kind in the world, and includes the previously protected Oak Ridges Moraine and Niagara Escarpment. The main objectives of the Greenbelt Plan are to:

- Support agricultural land and promote agriculture production;
- Protect natural heritage features and systems;
- Advance opportunities for culture, recreation and tourism;
- Provide for viable rural settlements; and,
- Promote sustainable infrastructure and natural resource use.

The Greenbelt Plan establishes a policy framework that identifies where urbanization shall not occur to provide permanent protection to the agricultural land base and the ecological features and functions occurring on this landscape. The Greenbelt Plan generally identifies a ‘Protected Countryside’ that is made up of an Agricultural System and a Natural System, together with a series of settlement areas. The Agricultural System is made up of specialty crop, prime agricultural and rural areas. The Natural System identifies lands that support both natural heritage and hydrologic features and functions. Both systems maintain connections to the broader agricultural and natural systems of southern Ontario.

None of the lands within the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion are included in the Greenbelt Plan area, Niagara Escarpment Plan area, or Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan area. Notwithstanding the above, it is recognized that the northern limit of the MW2 Stage 2 lands abut lands that are within the Greenbelt Plan (Etobicoke Creek).

6.0 PEEL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The Region of Peel initiated its Growth Plan Conformity exercise in 2007 known as the Peel Region Official Plan Review (PROPR). The purpose of PROPR was to bring the ROP into conformity with the Provincial Policy Statement, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden
Horseshoe and the Greenbelt Plan. The PROPR process resulted in twelve ROPAs as follows:

1. ROPA 20 – Sustainability & Energy
2. ROPA 21A – Air Quality & Integrated Waste Management
3. ROPA 21B – Natural Heritage & Agriculture
4. ROPA 22 – Transportation
5. ROPA 23 – Housing
6. ROPA 24 – Growth Management, Employment Areas & Greenbelt Conformity
7. ROPA 25 – Monitoring & Planning and Conservation Land Amendment Act
8. ROPA 26 - Variety of matters including intensification incentives
9. ROPA 27 - Age-Friendly Planning and other matters
10. ROPA 28 - Expansion to Bolton Rural Service Centre (Employment)
11. ROPA 29 - Expansion to Mayfield West Rural Service Centre (Residential and Employment)
12. ROPA 30 - Expansion to Bolton Rural Service Centre (Residential)

In late 2014, Peel Region initiated a further review of its Official Plan (called Peel 2041: Official Plan Review). There are ten focus areas that are being dealt with as part of the Peel 2041 and they include housing, growth management, agriculture and transportation.

As mentioned previously, the purpose of this PJR is to provide background information in support of an expansion to the MW settlement area to implement the 2031 and 2041 Growth Plan population and employment forecasts, which is part of the 2017 Growth Plan conformity amendment process (Peel 2041). While it is recognized that the policies of the ROP will be updated to reflect the updated Growth Plan (2017), all of the current policies in the ROP and the Town OP have been reviewed, along with the updated policies in the PPS and Growth Plan (2017).

It is also recognized that the Region’s land budget methodology is in the process of being updated. It is the intent of this PJR to also provide input into this updated methodology. Once finalized, it is anticipated that a more detailed analysis would be carried out in Caledon to ensure that the minimum density target established by the Growth Plan (2017) will be implemented.

6.2 REGIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A SETTLEMENT AREA EXPANSION

Both the Growth Plan and ROP (as amended by ROPA 24), require that a settlement area boundary expansion only be undertaken as part of a MCR, which is a municipally initiated comprehensive study process.

The following chart reviews the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion for compliance with and conformity to the relevant policies in the ROP as part of the MCR.
## POLICY

| 5.5.4.2.1 | Plan to achieve a minimum greenfield density target of 50 people and jobs combined per hectare by 2031, to be measured over Peel’s designated greenfield area excluding major environmental features as defined by the Growth Plan. |

| RESPONSE | Given Section 2.2.7.4 of the Growth Plan, working in tandem with Section 2.2.7.2, the minimum density target for the MW2 Stage 2 lands is 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare. This exceeds the minimum density target in ROPA 24 and OPA 226. This minimum density will conform to the Growth Plan (2017). |

| 7.9.2.12 | Consider an expansion to the 2031 Urban Boundary, 2021 or 2031 Rural Service Centre boundary only through a Regional Official Plan Amendment which is based on a municipal comprehensive review which demonstrates the following (a) to p): |

| POLICY | RESPONSE |

| a) | That the proposed expansion is based on the population, household and employment growth forecasts contained in Table 3. |

| RESPONSE | The population, household and employment growth forecasts contained in Table 3 of the ROP implement the 2031A Growth Plan forecasts. As a result of the 2031B forecast (which is now the 2031 forecast in the current Growth Plan 2017), and the 2041 forecast, there is a need for the Region to update Table 3. |

I am advised by Regional staff that Town of Caledon's population could be planned to increase from 108,000 in 2031 (as per ROPA 24) to up to 160,000 by 2041 through the current 2017 Growth Plan conformity amendment process (Peel 2041: Official Plan Review). This represents a population increase of up to 52,000 people over current planned growth to 2031. |

I am also advised by Regional staff that, with a population increase to 160,000 by 2041, a substantial portion of that increase could be accommodated on new Greenfield lands. As such, the potential exists for the proposed expansion of MW2 Stage 2 lands in Caledon to accommodate that growth while still meeting 2017 Growth Plan intensification target for Peel Region as a whole (40% until the current municipal comprehensive review is approved and in effect, 50% to the year 2031, and 60% each year thereafter to 2041). |

| b) | That sufficient opportunities, as determined by the Region, are not available in the area |

| RESPONSE | In 2013, the Growth Plan was amended and Peel Region’s population and employment base was forecast to reach 1,770,000 and 880,000. |
### POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| municipality to accommodate forecasted growth for the area municipality contained in Table 3, through intensification and in designated greenfield areas. | respectively by 2031 and this came to be known as the 2031B forecast. 

This represents an increase of 130,000 persons and 10,000 employees in comparison to the original 2031 population forecast provided in Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan (2031A). 

The Growth Plan (2017) no longer has a 2031A and a 2031B forecast, and it now has one forecast for 2031, and it is the same as the previous 2031B forecast. 

The additional population and employment added to the 2031B forecast has not been implemented by Peel Region, meaning that a shortage of development land may currently exist in Peel Region to accommodate the 2031 forecast. 

As mentioned above, I am advised by Regional staff that, with a population increase to 160,000 by 2041, a substantial portion of that increase could be accommodated on new Greenfield lands. As such, the potential exists for the proposed expansion of MW2 Stage 2 lands in Caledon to accommodate that growth while still meeting 2017 Growth Plan intensification target for Peel Region as a whole (40% until the current municipal comprehensive review is approved and in effect, 50% to the year 2031, and 60% each year thereafter to 2041). |
<p>| c) The timing of the expansion and the phasing of development within the designated greenfield area will not adversely affect the achievement of the intensification and density targets of this Plan. | Given Section 2.2.7.4 of the Growth Plan, working in tandem with Section 2.2.7.2, the minimum density target for the MW2 Stage 2 lands is 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare. This exceeds the minimum density target in ROPA 24 and OPA 226. |
| d) That the proposed expansion makes available sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding 2031. | The MW2 Stage 2 expansion is required to partially implement the 2031B Growth Plan forecast, however, the result if implemented would be a further 'interim' boundary for MW. The purpose of the MW2 Stage 2 expansion is to ensure that land is made available for the 2041 planning horizon established by the Growth Plan (2017). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Conformity with the Regional Official Plan.</td>
<td>See Sections 6.3 and 6.4 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Environmental and resource protection and enhancement including the identification of a natural heritage system, in accordance with the policies of this Plan.</td>
<td>A comprehensive natural heritage features inventory has been completed for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. The identified features and their corresponding buffers have been approved by the TRCA. Consideration of SAR has also been on going with MNRF. The identification and evaluation of natural heritage components has led to the identification of the comprehensive natural heritage system. The to be completed CEISMP will provide final details on the enhancements to the NHS that will be included within buffers, Category A and B terrestrial and aquatic corridors, and within the Greenbelt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| g) That there are no reasonable alternative locations which avoid Prime Agricultural Areas. | The lands within the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion are considered to be within a prime agricultural area. However, these same lands are identified on Schedule D as being within a study area boundary subject to Policy 5.4.3.2.7 of the ROP. This section indicates that the lands within this study area boundary are expected to be the location within which additional growth for Mayfield West beyond the 2031 population target is anticipated to occur. This same policy also indicates that a MCR would be required to justify the expansion of the urban area into the study area and that an amendment to the ROP would be required. As a consequence of the above, the ROP has established the principle of potentially developing lands within the MW2 Stage 2 lands for future population and employment needs. In addition to the above, the MW2 Stage 2 lands are a logical choice for the expansion of MW and would serve to extend the MW settlement area boundary to a logical boundary on the west and to the north. In addition to the above, the policy indicates that there are no “reasonable” alternative locations that avoid prime agricultural areas. This means that alternative locations that may be considered should be “reasonable”.

In this particular case, the most logical location for expanding the MW settlement area boundary is to the west and given that residential development is proposed in the MW2 Stage 2 area, such development should be integrated with other existing and planned residential development in MW.

It is recognized that there are other locations within the ‘study area’ established by the ROP that could be considered.

These include the lands to the west of Hurontario Street and north of Etobicoke Creek. However, development in this area would be separated from the rest of MW by Etobicoke Creek and therefore would not be as well integrated as MW Stage 2. The same can be said for lands on the east side of Hurontario Street and also to the north of a tributary to Etobicoke Creek. In addition, these lands have long been considered as part of the GTA West EA and are now included within the FAA.

There is a small area of land on both sides of Kennedy Road that could be considered to the north of the existing MW boundary to Old School Road. This area would also be logical to consider, however, these lands are also in the FAA and are not as necessary to ‘complete’ the MW community as the MW Stage 2 lands because the lands to the south of Etobicoke Creek and between Hurontario Street and Chinguacousy Road have long been planned as an integrated complete community.

Lands on both sides of Heart Lake Road could also be considered, however, these lands are also within the FAA and given the location of Highway 410 to the south, these lands may lend themselves to employment uses. Lastly, there are additional lands within the ROP study area to the southwest of Dixie Road and Old School Road. These lands are also in the FAA. They are also separated from the current MW settlement area boundary by a watercourse and in my opinion would be a much lower priority for a small scale expansion involving 105 hectares than MW2 Stage 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this particular case, the most logical location for expanding the MW settlement area boundary is to the west and given that residential development is proposed in the MW2 Stage 2 area, such development should be integrated with other existing and planned residential development in MW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recognized that there are other locations within the ‘study area’ established by the ROP that could be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These include the lands to the west of Hurontario Street and north of Etobicoke Creek. However, development in this area would be separated from the rest of MW by Etobicoke Creek and therefore would not be as well integrated as MW Stage 2. The same can be said for lands on the east side of Hurontario Street and also to the north of a tributary to Etobicoke Creek. In addition, these lands have long been considered as part of the GTA West EA and are now included within the FAA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a small area of land on both sides of Kennedy Road that could be considered to the north of the existing MW boundary to Old School Road. This area would also be logical to consider, however, these lands are also in the FAA and are not as necessary to ‘complete’ the MW community as the MW Stage 2 lands because the lands to the south of Etobicoke Creek and between Hurontario Street and Chinguacousy Road have long been planned as an integrated complete community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands on both sides of Heart Lake Road could also be considered, however, these lands are also within the FAA and given the location of Highway 410 to the south, these lands may lend themselves to employment uses. Lastly, there are additional lands within the ROP study area to the southwest of Dixie Road and Old School Road. These lands are also in the FAA. They are also separated from the current MW settlement area boundary by a watercourse and in my opinion would be a much lower priority for a small scale expansion involving 105 hectares than MW2 Stage 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Within the Prime Agricultural Area there are no reasonable alternative locations on lower priority agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Refer to the response above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| i) Impacts from expanding settlement areas on agricultural operations are mitigated to the greatest extent feasible. | Colville Consulting makes a number of recommendations that are intended to mitigate the impact of development on the MW2 Stage 2 lands to the extent feasible.  
In this regard, buffering recommendations applying to Chinguacousy Road and along the northern boundary have been provided. In addition, it is recommended that the implementation of edge planning concepts be considered to minimize potential conflicts along Chinguacousy Road.  
It is also recommended that the transportation network on MW2 Stage 2 be internalized as much as possible and that access to Chinguacousy Road are minimized to the extent possible. It is also recommended that upgrades to existing roadways used by farm vehicles such as Chinguacousy Road should be wide enough to allow for slow moving farm vehicles to travel safely.  
It is also suggested that the MW2 Stage 2 lands be delayed from a development perspective until the MW2 lands are nearly completed such so that the Stage 2 lands will act as a temporary buffer between urban and agricultural uses. It is anticipated that these recommendation will be considered when the Caledon OP is amended to implement the ROPA for MW2 Stage 2. |
| j) Compliance with the minimum distance separation formula            | Colville Consulting reviewed the nature of the livestock facilities that exist on the MW2 Stage 2 lands and surrounding area.  
It was determined as part of this analysis that there are only five livestock operations of concern. In this regard, the Cook Dairy Farm (Farm #2) on Figure 8 of the Colville Report is the most significant of these livestock operations and has an MDS1 setback calculated to be 724 metres from the liquid manure storage area located to the east of the livestock barns. This setback also encroaches significantly into the MW2 lands and occupies much of the MW2 lands. |
POLICY | RESPONSE
---|---
Stage 2 lands. | It is noted that a portion of the Cook property was located within the MW2 lands subject to ROPA 29.

In recognition of the presence of this livestock facility, Section 7.14.20 of the Caledon OP prohibits development within the MDS1 setback area from the Cook Farm until the livestock facilities and the manure storage facilities are removed or altered to no longer be capable of housing livestock or storing manure. It is my understanding that a developer now owns the Cook farm, and that plans are in place to remove the livestock facility. As a consequence, it is very likely that the livestock facility will no longer exist in the short to medium term and when it ceases, there will no longer be an MDS1 setback issue to be concerned about.

It is also indicated in the 2017 AIA that there are four other farm operations that have MDS1 setbacks that extend onto the lands that are in the MW2 Stage 2 area. However, only three of these have an impact on lands within MW2 Stage 2 as set out below:

- Farm 20 – 0 hectares
- Farm 23 – 0.89 hectares
- Farm 24 – 4.6 hectares
- Farm 27 – 1.87 hectares

This means that there are 7.36 hectares within the MDS setbacks on the MW2 Stage 2 lands (not including the Cook property).

Given the small areas of land included within these MDS setbacks and their location on the western edge of MW2 Stage 2 along Chinguacousy Road, it is my opinion that their inclusion in the settlement area cannot be avoided, if the desire is to create a logical western boundary of the settlement area.

The amount of land affected is very minor and will not impact in a significant way the form of development. In addition, it is anticipated that a similar policy to Section 7.14.20 would be included in the Town of Caledon OP that would preclude development in these areas until the livestock
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k) Fiscal impact analysis</td>
<td>It has been demonstrated as part of the updated Fiscal Impact Analysis that there will be a positive incremental capital cost and servicing differential of about $54 million. However, the analysis does indicate that there will be financing pressure in the near term based on the emplacement of infrastructure and timing of development for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. This is typical, as the services are required to be built and paid for before build-out. It is noted however that expected revenue from MW2 Stage 1 lands will assist in financing these needs. To the extent that a cumulative short fall exists during the take up of MW2, this gap would be filled via Regional D.C. reserve funds, Regional external or internal debt, or potential upfront financing from the affected landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) The ability to provide the necessary Regional infrastructure and services, including Regional and local transportation infrastructure, water and wastewater servicing, in a financially and environmentally sustainable manner.</td>
<td>The Town retained R.J. Burnside and Associates Limited in early 2017 to review all previous reports prepared for MW2. It is noted that Chinguacousy Road has consistently been the boundary of the study area for the servicing work completed for MW2 to the west, Mayfield Road to the south and Old School Road to the north. This means that the MW2 Stage 2 lands were considered from the beginning. It is concluded by R.J. Burnside that the various reports prepared in support of MW2 illustrate that existing, planned and future infrastructure is/will be available and that the location and capacity of this infrastructure is appropriate to support MW2 Stage 2. It is also indicated that the more recent reports also provide an indication that lands outside the Stage 1 area of MW2 have been considered in developing servicing concepts. In addition and in response to requests for additional information from the Region, Burnside has indicated that trunk sanitary sewers within MW2 have been sized to accommodate 80 residents and jobs per hectare within for the Stage 2 lands. As per the mapping included in Appendix 4, there are four different servicing outlets for MW2, but only the Edenbrook Drive outlet will accommodate the future...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**POLICY** | **RESPONSE**
---|---
MW2 Stage 2 development. | None of the MW2 Stage 2 development will be directed to the other three outlets (Van Kirk, Robertson Davies Drive and Highwood Road). It is also anticipated that any local stage 1 sanitary pipes, which will convey the future MW2 Stage 2 lands, will be sized through detail design for Stage 1 to accommodate future requirement for 80 residents and jobs per hectare.

With respect to water supply, the current FSR has only captured the trunk watermains along the major roads as shown in the mapping included in Appendix 4. The watermain sizes have been confirmed by Region, and they are properly sized for the increased MW2 Stage 2 population. The local watermains will be sized at detail design by individual developers as part of the subdivision applications, and it is anticipated that their water analysis will take into account higher densities within the MW2 Stage 2 lands.

m) The sustainable development imperatives in Section 1.3.5 have been addressed. | Refer to Section 6.3 of this PJR.

n) Other relevant Regional interests as may be confirmed through pre-consultation. | The Town has consulted with the Region throughout the MW2 Stage 2 process.

o) Proposed expansion will meet the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan, Niagara Escarpment Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. | The proposed settlement area boundary expansion does not contain any lands that are part of the Niagara Escarpment Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Lands adjacent to the Greenbelt were reviewed in preparing the natural heritage system.

p) In determining the most appropriate location for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas the policies of Sections 2 and 3 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 are applied. (Note: now PPS 2014) | Refer to Section 5.0 of this PJR.
6.3 SECTION 1.3.5 (AS PER SECTION 7.9.2.12 M)

Section 1.3.5, Themes of the Plan, states in part the following: “The over-arching theme of this Plan is sustainability...” which is based on a framework consisting of the following sustainable development imperatives: (a) environmental; (b) social; (c) economic; and (d) cultural. The brief discussion below is intended to demonstrate how each of the imperatives was generally considered as part of the MW2 Stage 2 process to date.

6.3.1 Environmental Imperative

The following is indicated with respect to the environmental imperative in the ROP:

The environmental imperative is to protect, enhance and foster self-sustaining, Regional, Native biodiversity while reducing and measuring the impact of development on the ecosystem based on an integrated systems approach.

It is further indicated that the imperative seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants while promoting best practices in sustainable development including the use of green development standards, energy and water efficient systems and living within the carrying capacity of Peel’s supporting ecosystems.

To a very large extent, this imperative can be satisfied by directing new development to urban areas thereby minimizing the consumption of lands and impacts on the natural environment.

It is also noted that there are a number of policies in OPA 222 that will most likely be applied and included in the OPA for MW2 Stage 2. These policies require the preparation of a community-wide Environmental Implementation Report which is intended to ensure that the natural heritage goals and objectives, associated targets and management strategy identified in the supporting documentation will be implemented on a community-wide basis.

In addition, it is anticipated that the environmental policies dealing with the Environmental Policy Area and Greenway corridors as per Section 7.14.16.2 of the Caledon OP will also be applied to the MW2 Stage 2 area as well. In addition, there are a number of policies dealing with stormwater management facilities in Section 7.14.17.3 that also support the environmental imperative such as through the implementation of low impact development techniques.

Section 7.14.18 of the Caledon OP also deals specifically with the conservation of water and energy and it requires that all residential homes be designed and constructed with water and energy conservation, efficiency, and reuse systems and/or features that will reduce the rate of water and energy consumption and exceed energy efficiency standards in the Building Code Act.

It is noted as well that Caledon also has a Green Development Program, which is a voluntary program that provides development charge discounts for new green commercial and industrial buildings. Through this program, Caledon enables developers to create more sustainable projects in its communities.
The Town also has Corporate Green Building Standard that sets out Caledon’s commitment to incorporate sustainable building design principles into the planning, design, and construction of new municipal buildings and major renovations of existing buildings. Sustainable building design can lead to monetary savings, reduced environmental impact and a healthier and a more productive working environment.

In November 2013 Caledon Council adopted a new LED Outdoor Lighting Standard. Accordingly, new residential subdivisions, and industrial and commercial sites, including those within MW2 and MW2 Stage 2 will be required to use light emitting diode (LED) streetlights. Among the advantages of using LED streetlights over high-pressure sodium streetlights include a much lower power consumption ranging from 40-70% energy savings.

6.3.2 Social Imperative

The social imperative is to create conditions, in this case, communities and neighbourhoods that encourage healthy behaviours and lifestyles, and respect for one another.

The proposed MW2 Stage 2 expansion provides for the planning and design of a complete community with a diverse mix of land uses, a range and mix of housing and employment types, high quality public open space and easy access to local amenities and services such as schools, parks and recreation facilities. The addition of the MW2 Stage 2 lands to MW2 allows for the development of the necessary linkages between McLaughlin Road and Chinguacousy Road and the development of one additional school and the additional housing required to meet the 2031 and 2041 Growth Plan forecasts.

6.3.3 Economic Imperative

The intent of the economic imperative is to promote a strong, vibrant and prosperous economy that operates within the sustainability theme while encouraging environmentally friendly businesses and business practices, providing for an adequate supply of future employment lands, convenient, efficient and effective public transportation system, sustainable infrastructure and services to support a diverse and growing economy including local employment and financial sustainability.

In addition, one of the keys to a successful economy is ensuring that there is a sufficient supply of land for new housing and employment opportunities and in this particular case, it has been determined by the Province that Peel Region is required to accommodate a certain amount of population and employment by 2031 and 2041.

In order to meet this Provincial requirement, additional lands are required and the MW2 Stage 2 lands will fulfill part of that requirement. It is anticipated that the creation of new housing in MW will stimulate the local and regional economy by providing direct, indirect (i.e. employment multiplier or spin-off effects) and temporary (i.e. construction) employment growth to the broader area. The MW2 Stage 2 expansion will also generate induced employment impacts associated with increased labour income and wealth generated from local employment opportunities. In turn, this will stimulate growth in household savings, taxation, and the consumption of goods and services within the local and regional economy.
6.3.4 Cultural Imperative

As mentioned previously in this PJR, an updated Cultural Heritage Assessment was carried out in 2017. In this updated report, specific recommendations are made regarding 12259 Chinguacousy Road and 12461 McLaughlin Road. 12259 Chinguacousy Road (which is identified as CHR 1) is also known as the Cook Property. The 2017 Cultural Heritage Survey indicates that of the remaining cultural heritage resources within the general area, this property is the most significant and intact. 12461 McLaughlin Road (CHR 3) is also on the Town’s heritage register and it is recommended that it remain. Recommendations are made with respect to how these two properties and the important buildings contained on them can be retained.

The study area for the Stage 1 archaeological assessment completed in 2008 included all of the MW2 Stage 2 lands. It was recommended that all development be subject to a Stage 2 assessment prior to development, which is a standard recommendation.

6.4 OTHER REGIONAL POLICIES

Section 7.9.2.12 e) of the ROP requires that the settlement area expansion be in conformity with the ROP.

In this regard, the policies that are the most relevant to the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion are found in Section 5.5 (Growth Management) of the ROP. In this regard, there are a number of objectives in Section 5.5.1 that are directly relevant. These are below:

- Section 5.5.1.2 – to establish intensification and Greenfield density targets
- Section 5.5.1.3 – to manage growth based on the growth forecast and intensification targets and Greenfield density targets of this plan
- Section 5.5.1.5 – to optimize the use of the existing and planned infrastructure and services
- Section 5.5.1.6 – to support planning for complete communities in Peel that are compact, well designed, transit oriented, offer transportation choices, include a diverse mix of land uses, accommodate people at all stages of life and have an appropriate mix of housing, a good range of jobs, high quality open space and easy access to retail and services to meet daily needs
- Section 5.5.1.7 – to protect and promote human health

In addition, Section 5.5.2.3 indicates the following:

*It is the policy of Regional Council to develop compact, transit-supportive communities in designated Greenfield area.*

Section 5.5.4 then deals with Greenfield density. The objectives in Section 5.5.4.1 are as follows:

- To plan and designate Greenfields to contribute to complete communities;
To achieve compact urban forms within the designated Greenfield area that support walking, cycling and the early integration and sustained viability of transit services;

To achieve a compatible and diverse mix of land uses to support vibrant neighbourhoods;

To optimize the use of designated Greenfield areas;

To enhance the natural environment and resources; and,

The manage Greenfield growth to support Peel's economy.

The Ultimate Community Plan developed for MW2 in 2013 and then refined in the years following is designed to implement the above objectives and the related policies since it will provide for the establishment of a complete community with a compatible and diverse mix of land uses to support vibrant neighbourhoods. The development form is compact and efficient at 80 persons and jobs per hectare which supports active transportation including walking and cycling. The plan supports diverse land uses such as medium density housing and employment in proximity to public open spaces.

The establishment of this complete community will also support Peel’s economy by providing the additional housing that is required to accommodate and implement the 2031 and 2041 Growth Plan forecasts. In any event, approximately 2,700 households are proposed on the MW2 Stage 2 lands based on the application of the minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined. Given that between 45% and 50% of any new Greenfield development area is truly available for development, the majority of these households (65% to 75%) will be in the form of apartments, townhouses, stacked townhouses and back-to-back townhouses and the remaining households will be in the form of single and semi-detached dwellings.

This housing mix will be required to support the minimum density requirement of 80 residents and jobs per hectare combined. The population resulting from the development of this number of households is about 7,800. As noted previously, it is expected that there will also be 600 new jobs on the MW2 Stage 2 lands as well.

As a result of the housing mix proposed, a significantly high proportion of the proposed housing will be more accessible and affordable than other recently developed Greenfield areas in Peel Region. Along with these new households will be other uses that provide employment such as one additional elementary school and other commercial uses. In addition to the above, the MW2 Stage 2 area is part of a larger MW2 Secondary Plan area that will contain a wide range of uses and provide for a range of activities. The expansion of MW to now include the MW2 Stage 2 lands will allow for the completion of this component of MW.

The higher minimum density will also support the development of affordable housing and it is anticipated that this issue will be explored further at the Secondary Plan stage, and be supported by an affordable housing assessment in consultation with the Region. In addition to the above, the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion supports Section 5.3.1.3 that states the following:

To establish healthy, complete urban communities that contain living, working and recreational opportunities, which respect the natural environment, resources and the characteristics of existing communities.
In addition, the proposed settlement area expansion supports another general objective as set out in Section 5.3.1.5 as follows:

**To achieve an urban structure, form and densities which are pedestrian-friendly and transit supportive.**

Given that the Ultimate Community Plan was developed in 2013 and has a density that is less than the 80 residents and jobs combined that is now required by Section 2.2.7.2 of the Growth Plan 2017, it is anticipated that the Concept Plan (as it applies to the MW2 Stage 2 lands only) will be revised before it is implemented through an amendment to the Town of Caledon OP.

However, it is not anticipated that significant changes will be necessary, given the proposed grid-like road pattern that provides for the development of low and medium density housing in interchangeable locations. It is recognized, however, that a review of parkland needs will need to be carried out given the increased density, along with a review of the need for additional schools. Both of these will be reviewed in the context of the local OPA process.

### 6.5 CONCLUSION

On the basis of the analysis contained in this section of the PJR, it is my opinion that the expansion of the MW settlement area as proposed will conform to the ROP, as it relates to the location of growth and development and the desire to establish and plan for complete communities.

### 7.0 CALEDON PLANNING FRAMEWORK

#### 7.1 INTRODUCTION

The Town of Caledon OP contains growth management policies that implement a tri-nodal growth concept based on focusing the majority of growth in the Rural Service Centres of Bolton, Caledon East and Mayfield West. ROPA 24 and OPA 226 were intended to implement the 2031A Growth Plan forecast. Both ROPA 24 and OPA 226 anticipated that expansions to settlement area boundaries would occur firstly through an Amendment to the ROP and then through an Amendment to the local OP.

Both ROPA 24 and OPA 226 included policies in their respective Official Plans on the process of expanding settlement area boundaries in Caledon. The relevant ROP policies were discussed in Section 6.0 of this PJR. The purpose of this section is to review the relevant policies in the Town’s OP as amended by OPA 226, as it relates to the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion.

#### 7.2 CALEDON’S PROVINCIAL POLICY CONFORMITY EXERCISE

The following section reviews the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion for compliance with and conformity to the relevant policies in Caledon’s OP, as amended by OPA 226, as part of its MCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PLANNING JUSTIFICATION REPORT - PREPARED FOR THE TOWN OF CALEDON**
September 22, 2017
### POLICY

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1.1</td>
<td>The Region will only consider approving settlement boundary expansions for Rural Service Centres if they contribute to the achievement of the Regional minimum intensification targets and the Regional Greenfield density target established for 2031.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3.1</td>
<td>An Official Plan Amendment and a municipal comprehensive review are required to expand the boundary of any settlement. As the boundaries of the Rural Service Centres in Caledon are designated in the Region of Peel Official Plan, a Regional Official Plan Amendment and a municipal comprehensive review are required to expand the boundary of a Rural Service Centre. A municipal comprehensive review is required to expand the boundary of a Village, Hamlet or Industrial Commercial Centre. The Region of Peel Official Plan lists the matters that must be addressed through the municipal comprehensive review in Section 7.9.2.12. The Region will determine if a municipal comprehensive review demonstrates that the requirements of section 7.9.2.12 of the Regional Official Plan are met. The Town of Caledon Official Plan lists the matters that the Town requires to be addressed in a municipal comprehensive review in Section 4.2.3.3.1, based on provincial and regional requirements and local considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESPONSE

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion will provide for Greenfield development that exceeds the minimum requirement set out in the Caledon OP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPA 226 was the culmination of Caledon’s Provincial Policy Conformity exercise, and forms the basis for settlement area boundary expansions in Caledon to 2031. While OPA 226 did not contemplate the 2031B and 2041 Growth Plan forecasts, it did establish a policy framework for the consideration of settlement area expansions in the future. ROPA 24 also did the same by establishing the policy framework that supported the implementation of the Growth Plan through a ROPA process. In addition, the ROP as amended by ROPA 29 specifically anticipated a further expansion of the Mayfield West settlement area by stating the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The boundary shown as a red dashed line on Schedule D and designated in the legend “Study Area Boundary” is the area within which additional growth for Mayfield West beyond the 2031 population target is anticipated to occur. Any settlement boundary expansion for the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre will be designated on the basis of a municipal comprehensive review and will require an amendment to this plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The MW2 Stage 2 settlement area boundary expansion will further advance Caledon’s MCR process at least as it relates to the 2031 forecast. Section 4.2.4.3.1 (reproduced below) also anticipates adjustments to Town-wide forecasts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjustments to Town-wide forecasts on Table 4.1 will generally be made as a result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POLICY

- Expansions to settlements will require an amendment to this Plan and shall be undertaken through a Municipal Comprehensive Review that will address the following:

  1. How the proposed expansion is based on the population and employment forecasts and population allocations in Tables 4.1 to 4.6 of this Plan.
  2. Protection and enhancement of natural environmental and cultural resources, including identification of a natural heritage system.
  3. The potential impact of the expansion on the function and character of the community including those lands in neighbouring municipalities.
  4. The expansion is a logical and

### RESPONSE

- The Town of Caledon OP does not anticipate growth beyond the 2031A Growth Plan projection because the ROP has not been updated in this regard. Once the ROPA for MW2 Stage 2 is implemented through a ROPA, the Town of Caledon OP will then also be updated.
- A comprehensive natural heritage features inventory has been completed for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. The identified features and their corresponding buffers have been approved by the TRCA. Consideration of SAR has also been on going with MNRF. The identification and evaluation of natural heritage components has led to the identification of the comprehensive natural heritage system. The to be completed CEISMP will provide final details on the enhancements to the NHS that will be included within buffers, Category A and B terrestrial and aquatic corridors, and within the Greenbelt.
- As has already been concluded with the MW2 Secondary Plan, which was implemented, by ROPA 29 and then OPA 222, new development in the MW settlement area will be closely integrated with development in the City of Brampton.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contiguous addition to the existing settlement.</td>
<td>Stage 2 lands have long been planned (for the most part) to be part of the MW settlement area. The inclusion of the MW2 Stage 2 lands will allow for the completion of the community and the establishment of logical western and northern boundaries. The proposed settlement expansion area will be planned to accommodate population growth in MW that is compact and transit-supportive, and will provide opportunities to plan and design a complete community with a diverse mix of land uses, a range and mix of employment and housing types, high quality public open space with easy access to local amenities and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) The ability to provide the necessary Regional infrastructure and services including Regional and local transportation infrastructure, water and wastewater servicing in a financially and environmentally sustainable manner.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (l) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Fiscal Impact.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (k) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Sufficient opportunities as determined by the Region to accommodate forecasted growth contained in Section 4.2.4 of this Plan through intensification and in designated Greenfield areas are not available in Caledon.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (b) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) An examination of reasonable alternative locations which avoid Prime Agricultural Areas, and reasonable alternative locations on lands with lower priority in the Prime Agricultural Area.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) The preparation and conclusions of watershed and sub-watershed studies that also address impacts in neighbouring municipalities</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (f) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the watershed or sub-watershed area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Compliance with minimum distance separation formulae.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) The provisions of the Niagara Escarpment Plan, the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, the Lake Simcoe Protection Plan and the Greenbelt Plan.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (o) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Conformity with the objectives and policies of the Region of Peel Official Plan; and, the principles, strategic direction, goals, objectives and policies of this Plan.</td>
<td>All relevant and applicable policies in the Regional OP, related to the proposed settlement area boundary expansion, have been reviewed for compliance and conformity in Section 6.0 of this PJR. The policies of Section 4.2.3 of the Caledon OP have been reviewed and the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion is supported, as it relates to the location of growth and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) The expansion makes available sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding the timeframe of this Plan.</td>
<td>The timeframe of Caledon’s OP is 2031, which will need to be updated when the ROP is updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) The timing of the expansion and the phasing of development within the designated greenfield area will not adversely affect the achievement of the Regional and municipal intensification and density targets.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (c) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) Mitigation of impacts of settlement area expansions on agricultural operations which are adjacent to or close to the settlement area to the greatest extent feasible.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) The sustainability objectives and policies of Section 3.1 of this Plan.</td>
<td>To a very large extent the completion of the Mayfield West community to Chinguacousy Road on the west and Etobicoke Creek to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy Justifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>north will provide for the development of a complete, integrated and transit-supportive community. It is anticipated that all of the relevant policies in Section 3.1 will be implemented through a future OPA, as was the case with OPA 222 for MW2.</td>
<td>(q) The proposed expansion will meet the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan, Niagara Escarpment Plan, Lake Simcoe Protection Plan, and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (o) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In determining the most appropriate location for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas, the policies of Section 2 and 3 of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 are applied. <em>Note: now PPS 2014</em></td>
<td>(r) Refer to Section 5.0 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expansion of existing settlement areas to include EPA will generally be discouraged unless it can be demonstrated that such an expansion would adhere to the Town's ecosystem principle, goal, objectives, policies and performance measures. No lands within the MW2 Stage 2 are included in the EPA.</td>
<td>5.7.3.1.7 The expansion of existing settlement areas to include EPA will generally be discouraged unless it can be demonstrated that such an expansion would adhere to the Town's ecosystem principle, goal, objectives, policies and performance measures. No lands within the MW2 Stage 2 are included in the EPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed large-scale development applications, proposed amendments to this plan or settlement area expansion proposals, which include, or are adjacent to EPA, and which may have a substantive impact on broader ecosystems, may be required to complete a comprehensive, broader scale environmental study, such as a Comprehensive EIS &amp; MP or a Sub-watershed Study, prior to any planning and development approvals. Such The AMEC November 2012 Mayfield West Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study And Management Plan Part C: Detailed Analysis and Implementation was approved by the Region and the Town. The AMEC report identified a Natural Heritage System that was endorsed by the TRCA, CVC and MNRF. All significant natural heritage features have been identified and confirmed jointly by MNRF, TRCA, CVC, Town of Caledon and development proponents. These features have thus been protected and associated buffers applied and similarly confirmed and approved by all parties. The</td>
<td>5.7.3.7.6 Proposed large-scale development applications, proposed amendments to this plan or settlement area expansion proposals, which include, or are adjacent to EPA, and which may have a substantive impact on broader ecosystems, may be required to complete a comprehensive, broader scale environmental study, such as a Comprehensive EIS &amp; MP or a Sub-watershed Study, prior to any planning and development approvals. Such The AMEC November 2012 Mayfield West Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study And Management Plan Part C: Detailed Analysis and Implementation was approved by the Region and the Town. The AMEC report identified a Natural Heritage System that was endorsed by the TRCA, CVC and MNRF. All significant natural heritage features have been identified and confirmed jointly by MNRF, TRCA, CVC, Town of Caledon and development proponents. These features have thus been protected and associated buffers applied and similarly confirmed and approved by all parties. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broader scale investigations may be necessary in order to assess the carrying capacity of the affected ecosystem and the potential cumulative environmental effects of the proposal, within an appropriate environmental framework. The need for and scope of such studies shall be determined jointly by the Town and other relevant agencies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **RESPONSE**

CEISMP has added large areas of wildlife habitat through restoration efforts and establishment of Greenway Corridors on agricultural lands where these features presently do not exist therefore resulting in a net gain in vegetative cover and associated habitat. Through restored buffers and created/enhanced greenway corridors the CEISMP will achieve a net gain in area extent and a net benefit to the habitat and functional aspects of the Natural Heritage System located within the expansion area and to the broader scale regional ecosystem.

### 5.10.3.18

The objectives and policies of the Greenbelt Plan, as generally incorporated into Section 7.13 of this Plan, shall apply to the growth and development of those portions of the Rural Service Centre of Caledon East, the Villages of Caledon and Alton, the Hamlets of Campbell’s Cross, Claude and Melville and the Industrial/Commercial Centre of Victoria that are within the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside, and shall apply to the consideration for expansion of any Settlement Area within or abutting the Greenbelt Plan Area.

Section 7.13 of the Town of Caledon OP contains policies related to the Greenbelt Plan. None of the lands within the MW2 Stage 2 settlement expansion area are included in the Greenbelt Plan area. Lands adjacent to the Greenbelt were reviewed in preparing the draft natural heritage system.

### 5.10.3.25

Expansions to settlements will require an amendment to this Plan and shall be reviewed on the following:

(a) Protection of environmental and cultural resources.
(b) The potential impact of the expansion on the function and character of the community.
(c) The expansion as a logical and contiguous addition to the existing settlement.
(d) The adequacy of municipal

Refer to the comments made on Section 4.2.3.3.1 of the Caledon OP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>services and related municipal financial costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) The need and demand for development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) An examination of reasonable alternative locations which avoid Prime Agricultural Areas, and considers lands with lower priority in the Prime Agricultural Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) The preparation and conclusions of watershed and sub-watershed studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Compliance with minimum distance separation formulae.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) The provisions of the Niagara Escarpment Plan and the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) The objectives and policies of Region of Peel Official Plan; and, the Principles, Strategic Direction, Goals, Objectives and Policies of this Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.4.1 Secondary Plans may be prepared for specific areas of the Town where it is considered necessary to provide more detailed planning objectives and policies for development activities. Secondary Plans may be prepared for established, partially developed or undeveloped areas within existing settlement areas within the Town in order to conform to an overall community development concept and approved planning policies. As well a Secondary Plan may be required as part of an expansion to the boundaries of an existing settlement or as a requirement of a Policy Area designation contained in this Plan.

In accordance with Section 5.10.4.3.2.1 of the Caledon OP, an overall secondary plan will be prepared for MW2 Stage 2 in the form of an OPA to address this policy.
7.3 CONCLUSION

OPA 226 was the culmination of Caledon’s Provincial Policy Conformity exercise, and forms the basis for settlement area boundary expansions in Caledon to 2031. While OPA 226 did not contemplate the Growth Plan 2031B forecast (which is the same as the current Growth Plan forecast for 2031), and the 2041 forecast, it did establish a policy framework for the consideration of settlement area expansions in the future. ROPA 24 also did the same by establishing the policy framework that supported the implementation of the Growth Plan through a ROPA process. In addition, the ROP as amended by ROPA 29 specifically anticipated a further expansion of the Mayfield West settlement area by stating the following:

The boundary shown as a red dashed line on Schedule D and designated in the legend “Study Area Boundary” is the area within which additional growth for Mayfield West beyond the 2031 population target is anticipated to occur. Any settlement boundary expansion for the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre will be designated on the basis of a municipal comprehensive review and will require an amendment to this plan.

The MW2 Stage 2 settlement area boundary expansion will further advance Caledon’s MCR process at least as it relates to the 2031 forecast. Section 4.2.4.3.1 (reproduced below) also anticipates adjustments to Town-wide forecasts:

Adjustments to Town-wide forecasts on Table 4.1 will generally be made as a result of a Provincial review of the forecasts in Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan and the associated review by the Region of Peel of the growth allocations to the area municipalities in Table 3 of the Region of Peel Official Plan. Adjustments to the population and employment allocations for specific communities will be considered by amendment to this Plan, when further detailed studies, such as the Village Studies, have determined specific population allocations for these settlements for the planning period.
8.0 REGIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following 23 evaluation criteria (first column in table) were developed for the Region of Peel by MGP and form the basis for evaluating whether individual settlement area boundary expansions meet the requirements of a MCR.

This section of the PJR reviews each of the evaluation criteria in the context of the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion and provides a response (second column in table) with respect to compliance with and conformity to the evaluation criteria. In some instances, the evaluation criteria duplicate policy contained in the ROP and, as such, a response has been provided in earlier sections of this PJR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Is the proposed settlement area boundary expansion being done at the time of a MCR?</td>
<td>Yes. The Region of Peel is considering the implementation of the 2031 and 2041 Growth Plan forecast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Is the proposed settlement area boundary expansion based on the population, household, and employment growth forecasts contained in Table 3 of ROPA 24?</td>
<td>Table 3 is in the process of being updated by the Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Is there insufficient opportunity to accommodate forecasted growth through:</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (b) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Intensification?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Redevelopment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. In Designated Growth Plan Policy Areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Does the expansion make available sufficient lands for a time horizon not exceeding 2031?</td>
<td>Yes, partially. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (d) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Will the timing of the settlement area boundary expansion and the phasing of development within the designated greenfield areas adversely affect the achievement of the intensification and density targets of ROPA 24?</td>
<td>No. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (c) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) If applicable, does the settlement area boundary expansion meet the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan; Niagara Escarpment Plan; Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan; and Lake Simcoe Protection Plan?</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Is the necessary infrastructure being provided is a financially and environmentally sustainable manner?</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (l) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Regarding expansions into Prime Agricultural Areas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Do the lands comprise specialty crop areas?</td>
<td>The MW2 Stage 2 lands are not within a specialty crop area. For the remainder of this policy, refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Are there reasonable alternative locations which avoid the Prime Agricultural Area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Within the Prime Agricultural Area, are there reasonable alternative locations on lower priority lands?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Have impacts from the proposed settlement area boundary expansion on agricultural operations been mitigated to the greatest extent feasible?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Have the policies within Section 2 and 3 of the PPS been applied in determining the most appropriate location for the settlement area boundary expansion?</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to Section 5.0 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Will the settlement area boundary expansion contribute to the overall achievement of the Regional minimum Greenfield density target of 50 people and jobs combined per hectare by 2031?</td>
<td>It will exceed this minimum. Refer to the response provided to Section 5.5.4.2.1 in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Is the settlement area boundary expansion in conformity to the Regional Official Plan?</td>
<td>Yes, as it relates to the location of growth and development. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (e) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Have other relevant Regional interests been confirmed through pre-consultation?</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (n) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Does the settlement area boundary expansion protect and enhance the environment and resources, including the identification of a natural heritage system (through an environmental study), in accordance with the policies of ROPA 24?</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (f) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Is the settlement area boundary expansion in compliance with the minimum</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance separation formula?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Has a fiscal impact analysis been</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (k) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Is the settlement area boundary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion outside of the Greenbelt Plan area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) In permitting expansions into rural areas within the Protected Countryside,</td>
<td>Not applicable. Does not include lands within the Greenbelt Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have the settlement area policies of the Greenbelt Plan and ROPA 24 been applied?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Does the settlement area boundary</td>
<td>Not applicable. Does not include lands within the Greenbelt Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion encompass areas within the Protected Countryside (as identified in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt Plan)?                      Have the policies within section 2.2.10.5 of ROPA 24, including the requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Is the settlement area boundary</td>
<td>Not applicable. Does not include lands within the Greenbelt Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion occurring within a Hamlet in the Protected Countryside (as identified in the Greenbelt Plan)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, does it fulfil the relevant requirements of ROPA 24?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Does the settlement area boundary</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion require the extension of municipal or private communal sewage or water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services outside of a settlement area boundary only in the case of health issues or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to service existing uses and the expansion thereof adjacent to the settlement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Have the sustainable development imperatives in ROPA 20 been considered</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (n) in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Is the settlement area boundary</td>
<td>Yes. Refer to the response provided to Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria vs. Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the settlement area boundary expansion within the Special Policy Area (the</td>
<td>No. The MW2 Stage 2 lands are not in the SISA as per Schedule D of the ROP. With respect to the GTA West Corridor, the Province established a Focussed Analysis Area (FAA) which is a zone surrounding the shortlist of route alternatives for the new highway corridor. The GTA west transportation corridor could directly impact properties that are located within the FAA. A small portion of the northern property fronting on Chinguacousy Road is within the FAA. When included in the MW settlement area, policies will preclude development as required. An area adjacent to the corridor has also been identified and it has been indicated by the Province that MTO has a reduced interest in properties located within the green area. In this regard, applications can proceed through municipal development processes. MTO will continue to review all development applications in the study area, but it is anticipated that the GTA west transportation corridor will not impact applications in green areas. The remainder of the MW2 Stage 2 lands are within this green area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 7.2 of this PJR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1 - PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

Below is a review of the relevant policies in the PPS 2014 and my planning opinion as it relates to the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Planning Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 a)</td>
<td>Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by: promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term.</td>
<td>The focusing of additional growth in an existing settlement area is consistent with this policy. The minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare will mean that land is used efficiently. Directing growth at the required minimum densities to settlement areas would conform to the Growth Plan, which encourages financially sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 b)</td>
<td>Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by: Accommodating an appropriate range and mix of residential (including second units, affordable housing and housing for older persons), employment (including industrial and commercial), institutional (including places of worship, cemeteries and long-term care homes), recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs.</td>
<td>Approximately 2,700 households are proposed on the MW2 Stage 2 lands based on the application of the minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined. Given that between 45% and 50% of any new Greenfield development area is truly available for development, the majority of these households (65% to 75%) will be in the form of apartments, townhouses, stacked townhouses and back-to-back townhouses and the remaining households will be in the form of single and semi-detached dwellings. This housing mix will be required to support the minimum density requirement of 80 residents and jobs per hectare combined. The population resulting from the development of this number of households is about 7,800. As a result of the housing mix proposed, a significantly high proportion of the proposed housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will be more accessible and affordable than other recently developed Greenfield areas in Peel Region. Along with these new households will be other uses that provide employment such as one additional elementary school and other commercial uses. In addition to the above, the MW2 Stage 2 area is part of a larger MW2 Secondary Plan area that will contain a wide range of uses and provide for a range of activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 c)</td>
<td>Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by: Avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns.</td>
<td>Directing growth to settlement areas is one way to avoid development and land use patterns that may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns. Once the Region approves a ROPA, the Town will prepare a detailed Secondary Plan that will balance all interests in ensuring that a complete community is developed in MW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 e)</td>
<td>Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by: Promoting cost-effective development patterns and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs.</td>
<td>Given that MW2 Stage 2 will be developed in accordance with the minimum density target requirement of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare, development in MW2 Stage 2 will be presumably more cost-effective than developments that are at a lower density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 g)</td>
<td>Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by: Ensuring that necessary infrastructure, electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems, and public service facilities are or will be available to meet current and projected needs.</td>
<td>It has been determined that water and sewer services are available for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. Other public service facilities will be assessed in more detail through the Secondary Plan process initiated by the Town of Caledon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 h)</td>
<td>Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by: Promoting development and land use patterns that conserve biodiversity and consider the impacts of a changing climate.</td>
<td>Directing growth to settlement areas at the densities proposed means that less land is being consumed for urban development. Lands that are the site of natural heritage features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Planning Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have also been avoided and a number of measures will be established and then implemented through the Secondary Plan and implementing Planning Act applications that will consider the impacts of a changing climate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.1.2

| Sufficient land shall be made available to accommodate an appropriate range and mix of land uses to meet projected needs for a time horizon of up to 20 years. However, where an alternate time period has been established for specific areas of the Province as a result of a provincial planning exercise or a provincial plan, that time frame may be used for municipalities within the area. Within settlement areas, sufficient land shall be made available through intensification and redevelopment and, if necessary, designated growth areas. Nothing in policy 1.1.2 limits the planning for infrastructure and public service facilities beyond a 20-year time horizon. |

| The Region is now planning to accommodate the 2031 and 2041 forecasts. |

### 1.1.3.1

| Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development, and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted. |

| MW is a settlement area and the additional development provided by the MW2 Stage 2 will further support the need for a range of population related employment and other services in the community. |

### 1.1.3.2 a)

| Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on densities and a mix of land uses which: 1. Efficiently use land and resources; 2. Are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion; 3. Minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change, and promote energy efficiency; 4. Support active transportation; 5. Are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed; and 6. Are freight-supportive. |

<p>| The MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion will entail the efficient use of land, given the minimum density proposed. The planned density will also support active transportation and will be transit-supportive, both of which were key elements in the development of the Community Framework Plan for MW2. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Planning Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.6</td>
<td>New development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and shall have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities.</td>
<td>The MW2 Stage 2 lands are located adjacent to the settlement area boundary, have been for the most part planned for development since 2008 and will support compact development at higher densities than planned for in MW2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.7</td>
<td>b) The orderly progression of development within designated growth areas and the timely provision of the infrastructure and public service facilities required to meet current and projected needs.</td>
<td>It is anticipated that phasing plans for MW2 Stage 2 will be developed as part of the Caledon OPA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.8</td>
<td>a) A planning authority may identify a settlement area or allow the expansion of a settlement area boundary only at the time of a comprehensive review and only where it has been demonstrated that sufficient opportunities for growth are not available through intensification, redevelopment and designated growth areas to accommodate the projected needs over the identified planning horizon.</td>
<td>In 2013, the Growth Plan was amended and Peel Region’s population and employment base was forecast to reach 1,770,000 and 880,000 respectively by 2031 and this came to be known as the 2031B forecast. This represents an increase of 130,000 persons and 10,000 employees in comparison to the original 2031 population forecast provided in Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan (2031A). The Growth Plan (2017) no longer has a 2031A and a 2031B forecast, and it now has one forecast for 2031, and it is the same as the previous 2031B forecast. The additional population and employment added to the 2031B forecast has not been implemented by Peel Region, meaning that a shortage of development land may currently exist in Peel Region to accommodate the 2031 forecast. As mentioned above, I am advised by Regional staff that, with a population increase to 160,000 by 2041, a substantial portion of that increase could be accommodated on new Greenfield lands. As such, the potential exists for the proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expansion of MW2 Stage 2 lands in Caledon to accommodate that growth</td>
<td>It has been demonstrated as part of the updated Fiscal Impact Analysis that collectively, there will be a positive incremental capital cost and revenue differential of about $54 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>while still meeting 2017 Growth Plan intensification target for Peel</td>
<td>However, the analysis does indicate that there will be financing pressure in the near term based on the emplacement of infrastructure and timing of development for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. This is typical, as the services are required to be built and paid for before build-out. It is noted however that expected revenue from MW2 Stage 1 lands will assist in financing these needs. To the extent that a cumulative short fall exists during the take up of MW2, this gap would be filled via Regional D.C. reserve funds, Regional external or internal debt, or potential upfront financing from the affected landowners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region as a whole (40% until the current municipal comprehensive review is approved and in effect, 50% to the year 2031, and 60% each year thereafter to 2041).</td>
<td>With respect to other public service facilities such as schools and parks, there are well-established funding mechanisms in place to ensure their delivery and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.8 b)</td>
<td>The infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available are suitable for the development over the long term, are financially viable over their life cycle, and protect public health and safety and the natural environment.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) of the ROP in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.8 c)</td>
<td>In prime agricultural areas: 1. The lands do not comprise specialty crop areas; 2. Alternative locations have been evaluated; and i. There are no reasonable alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which avoid prime agricultural areas; and ii. There are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) of the ROP in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.8 d)</td>
<td>The new or expanding settlement area is in compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae.</td>
<td>Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) of the ROP in Section 6.2 of this PJR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.8 e)</td>
<td>Impacts from new or expanding settlement areas on agricultural operations which are adjacent or close to the settlement area are mitigated to the extent feasible.</td>
<td>Section 2.0 of the PPS 2014 is entitled “Wise Use and Management of Resources”. This section contains policies on natural heritage (Section 2.1), water (Section 2.2), agriculture (Section 2.3), minerals and petroleum (Section 2.4), mineral aggregate resources (Section 2.5) and cultural heritage and archaeology (Section 2.6). With respect to Section 2.1 dealing with natural heritage, a considerable amount of work has been completed in support of the MW2 Secondary Plan exercise, which included consideration of the lands within MW2 Stage 2 as well. Issues relating to Section 2.2 (Water) have also been assessed in the work completed to date and it is anticipated that more detailed studies will be prepared to implement the ROPA for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. The above work would be completed to support a Secondary Plan and a local OPA. Many of the policies currently within the Caledon OP that apply to MW2 will also apply in MW2 Stage 2 as well. These include Section 7.14.4.3, which provides for the development of a community-wide Development Staging and Sequence Plan, Section 7.14.4.5 that provides for a community-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3.8</td>
<td>In determining the most appropriate direction for expansions to the boundaries of settlement areas or the identification of a settlement area by a planning authority, a planning authority shall apply the policies of Section 2: Wise Use and Management of Resources and Section 3: Protecting Public Health and Safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# | Policy | Planning Opinion
--- | --- | ---
1 | Functional Servicing Report, Section 7.14.4.6 that provides for a community-wide Environmental Implementation Report and Section 7.14.18 that contains policies on the conservation of water and energy. Section 2.3 deals with agriculture and this policy area has already been dealt with in previous responses. It is noted that Section 2.3.5.1 indicates that planning authorities may only exclude land from prime agricultural areas for expansions of or identification of settlement areas in accordance with Policy 1.1.3.8. Sections 2.4 (Minerals and Petroleum) and 2.5 (Mineral Aggregate Resources) do not directly apply to MW2 Stage 2. Section 2.6 which deals with cultural heritage and archaeology does apply and in this regard a Cultural Heritage Assessment was carried out in 2008/2009 and updated in 2017. Within this update are recommendations on the cultural heritage resources in the area and on how they should be conserved. With respect to archaeology, the MW2 Stage 2 lands were assessed at the same time as the MW2 lands and recommendations have been made to conduct Stage 2 assessments in support of future development applications. | 1.2.1 a) A coordinated, integrated and comprehensive approach should be used when dealing with planning matters within municipalities, across lower, single and/or upper-tier municipal boundaries, and with other orders of government, agencies and boards including managing and/or promoting growth and development. The request for a ROPA is being coordinated with Peel Region. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Planning Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 g)</td>
<td>Population, housing and employment projections, based on regional market areas.</td>
<td>The Region is now planning on implementing the 2031 and 2041 forecasts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3 c)</td>
<td>Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area by directing the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs.</td>
<td>MW is an excellent example of where new housing should be directed, given that it is a growing settlement area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3. d)</td>
<td>Promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed.</td>
<td>The MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion will entail the efficient use of land, given the minimum density proposed. The planned density will also support active transportation and will be transit-supportive, both of which were key elements in the development of the Community Framework Plan for MW2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.1</td>
<td>Infrastructure, electricity generation facilities and transmission and distribution systems, and public service facilities shall be provided in a coordinated, efficient and cost-effective manner that considers impacts from climate change while accommodating projected needs.</td>
<td>See response below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6.1 a)</td>
<td>Planning for sewage and water services shall direct and accommodate expected growth or development in a manner that promotes the efficient use and optimization of existing: 1. Municipal sewage services and municipal water services; and 2. Private communal sewage services and private communal water services, where municipal sewage services and municipal water services are not available.</td>
<td>Existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services will be extended to the MW2 Stage 2 lands in an economical manner in accordance with the work completed to date. No issues have been identified with respect to the provision of these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6.1 b)</td>
<td>Ensure that these systems are provided in a manner that: 1. Can be sustained by the water</td>
<td>See response above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6.1</td>
<td>c) Promote water conservation and water use efficiency.</td>
<td>See response above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6.1</td>
<td>d) Integrate servicing and land use considerations at all stages of the planning process.</td>
<td>The MW2 Secondary Plan process has involved consideration of servicing, environmental matters and transportation in a coordinated manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.6.7</td>
<td>Planning for stormwater management shall: a. Minimize, or, where possible, prevent increases in contaminant loads; b. Minimize changes in water balance and erosion; c. Not increase risks to human health and safety and property damage; d. Maximize the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces; and e. Promote stormwater management best practices, including stormwater attenuation and re-use, and low impact development.</td>
<td>This will be implemented at the Secondary Plan stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.7.1</td>
<td>Transportation systems should be provided which are safe, energy efficient, facilitate the movement of people and goods, and are appropriate to address projected needs.</td>
<td>A comprehensive Transportation Master Plan has been prepared to address this policy. In response to a request for further information from the Region, Paradigm has indicated that while further transportation analysis is required, it is anticipated that the planned road network should be able to accommodate the expected population and jobs resulting from the application of the minimum density target of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare on the MW2 Stage 2 lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.7.2</td>
<td>Efficient use shall be made of existing and planned infrastructure, including through Existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the use of transportation demand management strategies, where feasible.</td>
<td>extended to the MW2 Stage 2 lands in an economical manner in accordance with the work completed to date. No issues have been identified with respect to the provision of these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.7.4</td>
<td>A land use pattern, density and mix of uses should be promoted that minimize the length and number of vehicle trips and support current and future use of transit and active transportation.</td>
<td>The minimum required density of 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare would support the development of an efficient transportation system in MW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.7.5</td>
<td>Transportation and land use considerations shall be integrated at all stages of the planning process.</td>
<td>The MW2 Secondary Plan process has involved consideration of servicing, environmental matters and transportation in a coordinated manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6.8.3</td>
<td>Planning authorities shall not permit development in planned corridors that could preclude or negatively affect the use of the corridor for the purpose(s) for which it was identified.</td>
<td>With respect to the GTA West Corridor, the Province established a Focussed Analysis Area (FAA) which is a zone surrounding the shortlist of route alternatives for the new highway corridor. The GTA west transportation corridor could directly impact properties that are located within the FAA. A small portion of the northern property fronting on Chinguacousy Road is within the FAA, and these lands when included in the settlement area, will be precluded from development until appropriate. An area adjacent to the corridor has also been identified and it has been indicated by the Province that MTO has a reduced interest in properties located within the green area. In this regard, applications can proceed through municipal development processes. MTO will continue to review all development applications in the study area, but it is anticipated that the GTA west transportation corridor will not impact applications in green areas. The remainder of the area adjacent to the corridor has also been identified and it has been indicated by the Province that MTO has a reduced interest in properties located within the green area. In this regard, applications can proceed through municipal development processes. MTO will continue to review all development applications in the study area, but it is anticipated that the GTA west transportation corridor will not impact applications in green areas. The remainder of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.</td>
<td>A comprehensive natural heritage features inventory has been prepared in support of the MW2 Stage 2 expansion. In addition, the delineation of meander belt widths and geotechnically stable top of slope has been completed for Etobicoke Creek and significant headwater features. The identified features and their corresponding buffers have been approved by the TRCA. Consideration of SAR has also been on-going with MNRF. The identification and evaluation of natural heritage components has led to the identification of the comprehensive natural heritage system. The CEISMP will provide final details on the enhancements to the NHS that will be included within buffers, Category A and B terrestrial and aquatic corridors, and within the Greenbelt. The confirmation of natural heritage constraints to development and the associated buffers and linkages between features where development will not occur, ensures the long-term viability of the NHS within the expansion area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>The diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and groundwater features.</td>
<td>The CEISMP has identified an NHS that incorporates and preserves all existing natural heritage features located within the expansion area. In addition, corridors are proposed which will link natural heritage features located within the Stage 1 lands to the Etobicoke Creek valley. The CEISMP has added large areas of wildlife habitat through restoration efforts and establishment of Greenway Corridors on agricultural lands where these features presently do not exist therefore resulting in a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
net gain in vegetative cover and associated habitat. Through restored buffers and created/enhanced greenway corridors the CEISMP will achieve a net gain in area extent and a net benefit to the habitat, diversity and functional aspects of the Natural Heritage System located within the expansion area and to the broader scale regional ecosystem. Proposed SWM facilities to be located along the Etobicoke Creek/Greenbelt corridor will consider the maintenance of water budget targets to ensure no impacts to PSW and fish habitat. Erosion thresholds to guide SWMP design will be quantified in the CEISMP to mitigate exacerbated rates of erosion. As a consequence of the above, this policy is satisfied.

This policy permits the consideration of a settlement area expansion.

A detailed Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Review has been carried out and recommendations have been made on how the cultural heritage resources in the MW2 Stage 2 area can be conserved.

APPENDIX 2 - GROWTH PLAN 2017

Below is a review of the relevant policies in the Growth Plan 2017 and my planning opinion as it relates to the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Planning Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.2 a)</td>
<td>The vast majority of growth will be directed to settlement areas that:</td>
<td>Mayfield West has a built boundary that reflects the development that has occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.  Have a delineated built boundary;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.3.5.1 | Planning authorities may only exclude land from prime agricultural areas for expansions of or identification of settlement areas in accordance with policy 1.1.3.8. | This policy permits the consideration of a settlement area expansion. |

| 2.6.1 | Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved. | A detailed Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Review has been carried out and recommendations have been made on how the cultural heritage resources in the MW2 Stage 2 area can be conserved. |
### Policy | Planning Opinion
--- | ---
<p>| ii. Have existing or planned municipal water and wastewater systems; iii. Can support the achievement of complete communities. | before 2006. The settlement area is fully serviced and is being planned to be a complete community through the establishment of a mix of uses, a range of housing options and an integrated transportation network. |
| 2.2.1.2 c) Within settlement areas, growth will be focused in: i. Delineated built-up areas; ii. Strategic growth areas; iii. Locations with existing or planned transit, with a priority on higher order transit where it exists or is planned; iv. Areas with existing or planned public service facilities. | As a small settlement area in a primarily rural community, MW is not served by higher order transit. However, a transit hub is planned in MW2 and the addition of more people on the MW2 Stage 2 lands will support the development of transit over the long term. |
| 2.2.1.4 a) Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of complete communities that: Feature a diverse mix of land uses, including residential and employment uses, and convenient access to local stores, services, and public service facilities; | The MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion will entail the efficient use of land, given the minimum density proposed. The planned density will also support active transportation and will be transit-supportive, both of which were key elements in the development of the Community Framework Plan for MW2. |
| 2.2.1.4 b) Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of complete communities that: Improve social equity and overall quality of life, including human health, for people of all ages, abilities, and incomes; | The higher proportions of medium and high-density housing that would be developed on the MW2 Stage 2 lands, will support increased social equity, would provide choice in the market and appeal to a larger market. The minimum density of 80 residents and jobs combined will support the establishment of an integrated transportation network, including an active transportation network that supports healthy lifestyles. |
| 2.2.1.4 c) Applying the policies of this Plan will support | Considerable housing choice |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Planning Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the achievement of complete communities that: Provide a diverse range and mix of housing options, including second units and affordable housing, to accommodate people at all stages of life, and to accommodate the needs of all household sizes and incomes.</td>
<td>will be provided on the MW2 Stage 2 lands as a consequence of the minimum densities required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4 d)</td>
<td>Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of complete communities that: Expand convenient access to: i. A range of transportation options, including options for the safe, comfortable and convenient use of active transportation; ii. Public service facilities, co-located and integrated in community hubs; iii. An appropriate supply of safe, publicly-accessible open spaces, parks, trails, and other recreational facilities; iv. Healthy, local, and affordable food options, including through urban agriculture.</td>
<td>A comprehensive and integrated planning process has been undertaken in support of the MW2 Secondary Plan and it involved, for the most part the MW2 Stage 2 lands. The issues identified in sub-sections i), ii) and iii) were considered as part of that process and will be implemented through a future OPA. Opportunities with respect to urban agriculture will be reviewed as part of that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4 e)</td>
<td>Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of complete communities that: Ensure the development of high quality compact built form, an attractive and vibrant public realm, including public open spaces, through site design and urban design standards.</td>
<td>A comprehensive and integrated planning process has been undertaken in support of the MW2 Secondary Plan and it involved, for the most part the MW2 Stage 2 lands. The product of this work is a well-designed and efficient new community area that will require the preparation of detailed implementation strategies to implement this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4 f)</td>
<td>Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of complete communities that: Mitigate and adapt to climate change impacts, build resilience, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and contribute towards the achievement of low-carbon communities.</td>
<td>To be implemented by the Town through the required Secondary Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.4 g)</td>
<td>Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of complete communities that: Integrate green infrastructure and low impact development.</td>
<td>To be implemented by the Town through the required Secondary Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6.2</td>
<td>Notwithstanding policy 1.4.1 of the PPS, 2014, in preparing a housing strategy in accordance with policy 2.2.6.1, municipalities will support the achievement of complete communities by: a) Planning to accommodate forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan. b) Planning to achieve the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan. c) Considering the range and mix of housing options and densities of the existing housing stock. d) Planning to diversify their overall housing stock across the municipality.</td>
<td>Even though this policy supports the development of a housing strategy, implementing the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion will support these objectives since it will accommodate growth to 2031 and 2041, exceed the minimum density target that currently exists in the ROP and provided for a significant percentage of medium and high density housing on the lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6.5</td>
<td>When a settlement area boundary has been expanded through a municipal comprehensive review in accordance with the policies in subsection 2.2.8, the new designated greenfield area will be planned based on the housing strategy developed in accordance with policies 2.2.6.1 and 2.2.6.2.</td>
<td>This section references Section 2.2.6.2 above and the comments made above apply here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7.1</td>
<td>New development taking place in designated greenfield areas will be planned, designated, zoned and designed in a manner that: a) Supports the achievement of complete communities; b) Supports active transportation; and c) Encourages the integration and sustained viability of transit services.</td>
<td>This will be the case with MW2 Stage 2 as has already been demonstrated in responses to other policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7.2</td>
<td>The designated greenfield area of each upper- or single-tier municipality will be planned to achieve within the horizon of this Plan a minimum density target that is not less than 80 residents and jobs combined per hectare.</td>
<td>This will be achieved on the MW2 Stage 2 lands, with the density measured as per Section 2.2.7.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.8.1</td>
<td>Settlement area boundaries will be delineated in official plans.</td>
<td>The ROPA requested would result in an expanded settlement area that will be delineated in the ROP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.8.2 a)</td>
<td>A settlement area boundary expansion may only occur through a municipal comprehensive review where it is demonstrated that: based on the minimum intensification and density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Planning Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planning Opinion</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | targets in this Plan and a land needs assessment undertaken in accordance with policy 2.2.1.5, sufficient opportunities to accommodate forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan are not available through intensification and in the designated greenfield area:  
   i. Within the upper- or single-tier municipality; and  
   ii. Within the applicable lower-tier municipality. |  |
| 2.2.8.2 b) | A settlement area boundary expansion may only occur through a municipal comprehensive review where it is demonstrated that: the proposed expansion will make available sufficient lands not exceeding the horizon of this Plan, based on the analysis provided for in policy 2.2.8.2 a), while minimizing land consumption. | See response above regarding planning horizon. The consumption of land is minimized and given that the minimum density is 80 residents and jobs per hectare combined, the land will be used efficiently. |
| 2.2.8.2 c) | A settlement area boundary expansion may only occur through a municipal comprehensive review where it is demonstrated that: the timing of the proposed expansion and the phasing of development within the designated greenfield area will not adversely affect the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan, as well as the other policies of this Plan. | In 2013, the Growth Plan was amended and Peel Region’s population and employment base was forecast to reach 1,770,000 and 880,000 respectively by 2031 and this came to be known as the 2031B forecast. This represents an increase of 130,000 persons and 10,000 employees in comparison to the original 2031 population forecast provided in Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan (2031A). The Growth Plan (2017) no longer has a 2031A and a 2031B forecast, and it now has one forecast for 2031, and it is the same as the previous 2031B forecast. The additional population and employment added to the 2031B forecast has not been implemented by Peel Region, |
meaning that a shortage of development land may currently exist in Peel Region to accommodate the 2031 forecast.

As mentioned above, I am advised by Regional staff that, with a population increase to 160,000 by 2041, a substantial portion of that increase could be accommodated on new Greenfield lands. As such, the potential exists for the proposed expansion of MW2 Stage 2 lands in Caledon to accommodate that growth while still meeting 2017 Growth Plan intensification target for Peel Region as a whole (40% until the current municipal comprehensive review is approved and in effect, 50% to the year 2031, and 60% each year thereafter to 2041).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Planning Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2.8.3

Where the need for a settlement area boundary expansion has been justified in accordance with policy 2.2.8.2, the feasibility of the proposed expansion will be determined and the most appropriate location for the proposed expansion will be identified based on the following:

a) There are existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities to support the achievement of complete communities;

Existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services will be extended to the MW2 Stage 2 lands in an economical manner in accordance with the work completed to date. No issues have been identified with respect to the provision of these services.

In addition and in response to requests for additional information from the Region, Burnside has indicated that trunk sanitary sewers within MW2 have been sized to accommodate 80 residents and jobs per hectare within for the Stage 2 lands. As per the mapping included in Appendix 4, there are four different servicing outlets for MW2, but only the Edenbrook Drive outlet will accommodate the future MW2 Stage 2 development.

None of the MW2 Stage 2 development will be directed to the other three outlets (Van Kirk, Robertson Davies Drive and Highwood Road). It is also anticipated that any local stage 1 sanitary pipes, which will convey the future MW2 Stage 2 lands, will be sized through detail design for Stage 1 to accommodate future requirement for 80 residents and jobs per hectare.

With respect to water supply,
b) The infrastructure and public service facilities needed would be financially viable over the full life cycle of these assets, based on mechanisms such as asset management planning and revenue generation analyses;

the current FSR has only captured the trunk watermains along the major roads as shown in the mapping included in Appendix 4. The watermain sizes have been confirmed by Region, and they are properly sized for the increased MW2 Stage 2 population. The local watermains will be sized at detail design by individual developers as part of the subdivision applications, and it is anticipated that their water analysis will take into account higher densities within the MW2 Stage 2 lands.

The capital costs of the proposed infrastructure / public facilities such as sewer infrastructure, roads, and stormwater management ponds within the MW2 Stage 2 lands will be funded entirely by development, with the exception of Development Charge (DC) infrastructure. DC infrastructure will be initially funded by development, but a portion of the costs will be credited to the developers. DC infrastructure in the subject lands includes the external roads, sanitary trunk (375mm and larger) and watermains (400mm and larger).

In terms of financial viability, the majority of the infrastructure will be constructed by the developers and will not constitute any capital expenditure by the Town of Caledon or Region of Peel. In terms of asset management, it is assumed that, upon assumption of Town-owned or Region-owned
infrastructure, the future tax revenues from the residents and businesses in the subject lands will support the on-going maintenance and management of the proposed infrastructure. The infrastructure in the MW2 Stage 2 lands has also been designed to service future communities north of the subject lands.

It should be noted that the majority of the trunk sewer and stormwater management infrastructure in Stage 2 is required to service the Stage 1 lands, for which the Secondary Plan has already been approved.

Existing municipal sewage services and municipal water services will be extended to the MW2 Stage 2 lands in an economical manner in accordance with the work completed to date. No issues have been identified with respect to the provision of these services.

It has been demonstrated as part of the updated Fiscal Impact Analysis that collectively, there will be a positive incremental capital cost and revenue differential of about $54 million.

However, the analysis does indicate that there will be financing pressure in the near term based on the emplacement of infrastructure and timing of development for the MW2 Stage 2 lands. This is typical, as the services are required to be built and paid for
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed expansion would align with a water and wastewater master plan or equivalent that has been completed in accordance with the policies in subsection 3.2.6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed expansion would align with a stormwater master plan or equivalent that has been completed in accordance with the policies in subsection 3.2.7;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Region of Peel commissioned the Water and Wastewater (2014) Master Plan that outlined the future infrastructure requirements / expansions in the Town of Caledon. Through preparation of the Functional Servicing Report (FSR) for the MW2 lands, the Region of Peel was consulted and the proposed water and sanitary servicing strategy was coordinated such that the design of the Stage 2 lands meets the intent of the Master Plans and anticipated future populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These studies characterized the existing conditions in the study area, developed the stormwater management criteria and targets for control as well as mitigation of impacts to natural features, and “tested” the Secondary Plan land use before build-out. It is noted however that expected revenue from MW2 Stage 1 lands will assist in financing these needs. To the extent that a cumulative short fall exists during the take up of MW2, this gap would be filled via Regional D.C. reserve funds, Regional external or internal debt, or potential upfront financing from the affected landowners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Watershed planning or equivalent has demonstrated that the proposed expansion, including the associated servicing, would not negatively impact the water resource system, including the quality and quantity of water for compliance with the established targets.

The TRCA also identified specific targets with respect to flood mapping and SWM facility locations that are relevant to the Stage 2 lands. The Stage 2 SWM strategy will generally conform to the Endorsed Framework Plans with respect to the recommended locations of the SWM facilities.

As noted in the response above, AMEC Foster Wheeler completed a subwatershed study / environmental impact study to characterize and determine the mitigation requirements for perceived impacts to the water resource system including water quality and quantity for the Stage 2 lands.

f) Key hydrologic areas and the Natural Heritage System should be avoided where possible.

The MW2 Stage 2 expansion area plan will maintain appropriate buffers from the Natural Heritage System features and hazards as coordinated with TRCA. There are no hydrologic features directly impacted by the Stage 2 lands, other than the overall drainage to Etobicoke Creek and the embedded PSW. The design of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 lands will match as closely as possible the existing drainage patterns to ensure that the flow regime of the Etobicoke Creek system is unaltered. Where required and as identified in the CEISMP, SWM facilities are proposed to control post-development flows to the targets established by the TRCA in the Etobicoke.
| 2.2.8.3 h) | Prime agricultural areas should be avoided where possible. An agricultural impact assessment will be used to determine the location of the expansion based on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the impact on the Agricultural System and evaluating and prioritizing alternative locations across the upper- or single-tier municipality in accordance with the following:
   i. Expansion into specialty crop areas is prohibited;
   ii. Reasonable alternatives that avoid prime agricultural areas are evaluated; and
   iii. Where prime agricultural areas cannot be avoided, lower priority agricultural lands are used. | Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) of the ROP in Section 6.2 of this PJR. |
| 2.2.8.3 i) | The settlement area to be expanded is in compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae. | Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) of the ROP in Section 6.2 of this PJR. |
| 2.2.8.3 j) | Any adverse impacts on agricultural operations and on the agri-food network from expanding settlement areas would be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated as determined through an agricultural impact assessment. | Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) of the ROP in Section 6.2 of this PJR. |
| 2.2.8.3 k) | The policies of Sections 2 (Wise Use and Management of Resources) and 3 (Protecting Public Health and Safety) of the PPS are applied. | Refer to the response provided to a similar section in the PPS 2014 in Appendix 1. |
| 3.2.5.1 b) | In planning for the development, optimization, or expansion of existing and planned corridors and supporting facilities, the Province, other public agencies and upper- and single-tier municipalities will ensure that existing and planned corridors are protected to meet current and projected needs in accordance with the transportation and infrastructure | Refer to the response provided to Section 1.6.8.3 of the PPS 2014 in Appendix 1. |
corridor protection policies in the PPS.

| 4.2.6.3 | Where agricultural uses and non-agricultural uses interface outside of settlement areas, land use compatibility will be achieved by avoiding or where avoidance is not possible, minimizing and mitigating adverse impacts on the Agricultural System. Where mitigation is required, measures should be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed. | Refer to the response provided to Section 7.9.2.12 (g) through (j) of the ROP in Section 6.2 of this PJR. |
| 4.2.7.1 | Cultural heritage resources will be conserved in order to foster a sense of place and benefit communities, particularly in strategic growth areas. | A detailed Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Review has been carried out and recommendations have been made on how the cultural heritage resources in the MW2 Stage 2 area can be conserved. |

**Appendix 2** above of this PJR provides a review of the MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion for compliance with and conformity to relevant policies of the Growth Plan 2017. All of the relevant and applicable policies in the Growth Plan related to the proposed settlement area boundary expansion, have been reviewed for compliance and conformity. Based on this review, it is my opinion that the proposed MW2 Stage 2 settlement area expansion conforms to the Growth Plan as it relates to the location of growth and development.
APPENDIX 3 - DETAILS OF THE MW2 PLANNING PROCESS

On August 1, 2006, Council endorsed the recommendations made in Report 2006-49 that dealt with the Town of Caledon population and employment forecast and allocations. Within this report, staff requested that Council endorse the population and employment forecast and allocations for the 2011, 2021 and 2031 planning horizons contained in Official Plan Amendment 203. In addition, Council was asked to direct staff to commence work on the terms of reference for an expansion to the MW Rural Service Centre west of Highway 10 in late 2006.

It was indicated in this report that there would be no change to the 2021 Town-wide population forecast was then included in the Official Plan, so that the 2021 Town-wide population would remain at 84,444. However, it was also recommended that there should be a reallocation of approximately 5,400 people from the Villages and the Palgrave Estate Residential Area to the Rural Service Centres. It was the intent at the time that the 5,400-person reallocation be divided between MW (3,900) and Bolton (1,500). With respect to MW, it was indicated that the 3,900 people reallocated to MW would be subject to the policies of ROPA 17, which directs additional growth to the west of Highway 10. In my opinion, this 2006 report made it clear that the Town was actively considering the expansion of the MW settlement area to the west of Highway 10.

With respect to the 2031 planning horizon, Report 2006-49 indicated that the Town-wide population forecast for 2031 would be 108,000 and the employment forecast would be 48,622. It was further indicated that the Town-wide population increase of 23,556 between 2021 and 2031 would be distributed as follows: 19,676 distributed equally between MW and South Albion-Bolton; 2,462 allocated to the Villages to restore their previous forecast in the then current Official Plan and the remainder allocated to the rural category, which includes lands within the Agricultural Area, Rural Area and the Palgrave Estates Community. The above meant that the population of MW was planned to increase by 9,838 people between 2021 and 2031.

There is reference in Report 2006-49 to ROPA 17, which was the Regional Official Plan Amendment for MW that expanded the MW Rural Service Centre boundary to include lands on the east side of Highway 10 for the development of a new community. It was indicated that Section 5.4.3.2.9 of ROPA 17 specified that any additional growth in MW would be located on the west side of Highway 10. This section of ROPA 17 also directed that studies be completed to determine the exact land requirements and to fulfill the Provincial and Regional study requirements that existed at the time for settlement area boundary expansions.

On September 25, 2007, Council endorsed the recommendations made in Report 2007-52 with respect to the Employment Land Needs Study. While this study was primarily focused on the South Albion-Bolton Community planning process that was initiated in May 2004, there was some reference to MW in the report. In particular, it was indicated that the employment lands supply of 181.2 hectares (448 gross acres) that were designated in the MW Secondary Plan at the time could accommodate future demand beyond 2021 but it was recommended that an additional 20.2 hectares (50 gross acres) be designated post-2021.
On June 10, 2008, Council endorsed the recommendations made in Report PD 2008-040 that dealt with the MW2 Secondary Plan General Terms of Reference. It was indicated in this report that the MW Community Development Plan study area was established on Schedule B (MW Land Use Plan) in Caledon’s Official Plan. The lands within the Community Development Plan study area are shown on the map below, which shows the 2021 MW settlement area boundary in blue, with all other lands being within the ‘Community Development Plan Study Area’. It is noted that the boundary of the ‘Community Development Plan Study Area’ extended from Chinguacousy Road on the west to Dixie Road on the east.

It was indicated in Report PD 2008-040 that within the ‘Community Development Plan Study Area’, a compact and well-integrated community is to be developed in the long-term through a series of phased expansions. These phased expansions would be based on the long-term population and employment forecast contained in Caledon’s Official Plan as may be updated from time to time. In my opinion, this means that it had long been contemplated that MW would expand in a phased manner over time.

The following was further indicated in Report PD 2008-040 with respect to population:

Under Caledon’s Population and Employment Study, the 2021 Caledon-wide population forecast will remain at 84,444 and the 2031 Caledon-wide population forecast is
108,000. For Mayfield West, the 2021 population forecast has been revised from 13,100 to 17,000 representing a 3,900 population increase (reallocated from elsewhere in Caledon) and a 2031 population forecast of 26,838 has been established representing an additional 9,838 population between 2021 and 2031.

It was then indicated that one of the purposes of Report PD 2008-040 was to recommend that the Phase 2 Secondary Plan be undertaken in accordance with the General Terms of Reference ('GTR') attached to the report as Schedule B to the staff report. It was the intent of the GTR to set out a road map for the completion of a comprehensive secondary planning exercise and describe the objectives, scope and deliverables, resources and work program, stakeholders, roles and responsibilities and schedule. It was then indicated that the secondary planning exercise would take approximately 27 months to complete.

It was further recognized in Report PD 2008-040 that the Growth Plan indicated that settlement area boundary expansions could only occur as part of a MCR. It was further indicated that an expansion to a settlement area boundary would require an amendment to the Peel Official Plan to amend Schedule D (Regional Structure) and Schedule B (Prime Agricultural Areas). The following was further indicated:

The Work Program associated with the secondary planning exercise has been designed to fulfill the Provincial policy requirements in respect of a Municipal Comprehensive Review and the requirements of the Peel and Caledon Official Plan. Accordingly, a set of technical studies and implementation documents will be completed in support of the Phase 2 Secondary Plan.

The MW2 Secondary Plan study was then initiated by Caledon in 2008 to identify a location for the population and employment increase anticipated for the planning period from 2021 to 2031. Following the release of the GTR discussed above, Caledon retained a team of external consultants to carry out the necessary background technical studies to both inform and support MW2. In this regard, nine consultant firms were retained to complete the following background technical studies:

1. Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan ('CEISMP');
2. Water & Wastewater Servicing Study;
3. Transportation Impact Study;
4. Agricultural Impact Assessment;
5. Noise & Vibration Impact Assessment;
6. Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment;
7. Cultural Heritage Landscapes Assessment & Built Heritage Resources Assessment;
8. Commercial Needs Assessment; and,

On April 7, 2009, Council enforced the recommendation made in Report PD 2009-021 that authorized revisions to key milestone events in the MW2 Work Program. In the report, it was indicated that the technical studies would be completed by May 2009, the guiding principles would be endorsed in April 2009 and that a preferred Land Use Plan would be selected in
October 2009.

It was then proposed in this report that the application to expand the settlement area boundary would be submitted by December 2009 and that a Council information workshop would be held in February 2010. The revisions to the timing of the completion of the reports and the submission of the application needed to be revised at the time to reflect the external factors that existed at the time, such as the extended timetable for Peel’s Provincial Policy Conformity Exercise and internal factors such as the extended timetable for Caledon’s own Provincial Policy Conformity Exercise.

On May 5, 2009 Council endorsed a set of Principles for the MW2 Secondary Planning process as per Report PD-2009-029. The Principles were as follows:

1. Achieve a net ecological gain;
2. Adopt an integrated design process;
3. Foster a local identity rooted in the spirit of the Town of Caledon;
4. Establish the structure for a close knit small town that fosters self-sufficiency;
5. Achieve a range and mix of housing;
6. Promote walking, cycling and transit opportunities;
7. Ensure community connectivity and integration at all scales; and,
8. Support adaptive change.

On June 23, 2009, Peel Region released a draft of ROPA 24 as per a report to Regional Council on that date.

The purpose of the draft ROPA 24 was to update the ROP to bring it into conformity with the Growth Plan (2006) and the Greenbelt Plan and to ensure that it was consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2005). It was indicated in this report that on June 18, 2005, Regional Council adopted ROPA 15 that updated the population, household and employment forecasts and which extended the planning horizon for the urban system to 2031.

The Ontario Municipal Board approved ROPA 15 on December 8, 2006. With the release of the Growth Plan on June 16, 2006, new upper-tier forecasts and a number of other policies then had to be considered by Peel Region. It was further indicated in the report that the three local municipalities in Peel Region had undertaken a review of their population and employment forecasts as part of the implementation of the Growth Plan. However, the totals of the three municipal population and employment figures for 2031 were higher than the 2031 Growth Plan forecasts by 23,000 people and 17,000 jobs.

On this basis, a number of discussions were held with the local municipalities and options were developed. In addition to the many changes proposed to the ROP at the time to implement the Greenbelt Plan, a new Section 4.1.1 was proposed.

This section established the population and employment forecasts for the Region of Peel to the year 2031. With respect to Caledon, it was proposed in the draft of ROPA 24 that the population of the Town would increase from 75,000 people in 2011 to 111,000 in 2031.
It was acknowledged in a footnote to the Table 3 that the Province was at the time reviewing the forecasts included within Schedule 3 of the Growth Plan and that as soon as the schedule was amended, Table 3 would also need to be amended. This reference to changes had to do with the 2031B and 2041 forecasts that were then in development.

It was also proposed at the time to delete two paragraphs in Section 5.4.3 in the ROP and replace them with the following:

The only rural service centres in the rural system designated in this plan are Mayfield West, Bolton and Caledon East in the Town of Caledon. These three rural service centres serve as the primary foci for growth within the rural system. The 2031 boundary for the Caledon East rural service centre and the 2021 boundaries for the Mayfield West and Bolton rural service centres are designated in this plan, which indicate where growth is planned to occur in a phased manner subject to the financial capabilities of the Region. The 2031 boundaries for the Mayfield West and Bolton Rural Service Centres will be designated on the basis of a Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review and will require an amendment to this plan. Growth within these three rural service centres will take place in a timely and orderly manner, making the most effective and efficient use of available services.

The Mayfield West, Bolton and Caledon East communities will be developed on full municipal water and sewer services. Opportunities for a wide range and mix of land uses and activities will be provided within the three rural service centres. Caledon East falls partially within the ORMCPA and the protected countryside of the Greenbelt Plan and is subject to the Town/Village policies of the Greenbelt Plan.

It was also proposed at the time to include a new Section 5.4.3.2.2 as per below:

Show on Schedule D the 2031 boundary for the Caledon East rural service centre and the 2021 boundaries for the Mayfield West and Bolton rural service centres. The 2031 boundaries for the Mayfield West and Bolton rural service centres will be designated on the basis of a Regional Municipal Comprehensive Review and be consistent with Sections 5.4.7, 5.5 and 7.9 of this plan and will require an amendment to this plan. Accordingly, the Town of Caledon will determine and designate the 2031 boundaries of the Mayfield West and Bolton rural service centres.

It was clear at the time that the Peel Region process relating to the implementation of the Growth Plan forecast to 2031 relied upon the determination of settlement area boundaries by the Town of Caledon. Item 63 in ROPA 24 also included a renumbered Section 5.4.3.2.7 as per below:

The study area shown on Schedule D around Mayfield West rural service centre and designated in the legend ‘settlement study area’ is the area within which additional growth for Mayfield West beyond the 2021 population target is anticipated to occur.

An extract from draft Schedule D below shows the proposed settlement study areas.
It is noted that the final version of ROPA 24 approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on November 30, 2012 continued to identify a 'study area boundary' around MW, but did not include such boundaries in the vicinity of Tullamore and Bolton as originally proposed, as shown below.

Item 69 in the draft of ROPA 24 established a new Section 5.4.7 that dealt with settlement study areas. The first few sentences of this policy are below:

To provide a framework to manage growth in the rural systems, three settlement study areas (study areas) which have been identified on Schedule D. The three study areas are broadly defined around Mayfield West, Tullamore and Bolton. Bolton and Mayfield West are established rural service centres that are planned to accommodate steady managed growth and are currently identified in this plan.
The following was further indicated in the proposed Section 5.4.7.2.3:

*Proceed with the planning process for the study area around Mayfield West rural centre in accordance with Policy 5.4.3.8 and all other applicable policies of this plan and the Area Municipal Official Plan.*

On October 20, 2009, Council authorized the release of a draft of OPA 226 in accordance with Report PD 2009-74.

On June 8, 2010, Council endorsed the recommendations made in Report PD 2010-036 that recommended that Council adopt Official Plan Amendment 226. Prior to the writing of that report, the population forecast and allocation tables had been updated to conform to an updated ROPA 24 and the Greenfield density policies were modified to reflect other changes made to ROPA 24 as well. The policies were also revised to reflect ROPA 24 wording with respect to MCR requirements as well.

It was also indicated in this report that the version of OPA 226 that was released for public comment on October 20, 2009 showed the total population and employment forecast for Caledon for 2011, 2021 and 2031 in conformity with the then current version of ROPA 24. The forecasts at the time reflected the proportional reductions that the Region made to the area municipal forecast to bring the Region of Peel total forecast to within 5,000 people of the Provincial forecast in the Growth Plan.

However, the Province subsequently indicated that the Regional forecast must match the Provincial forecast exactly. In response to this comment, the Region applied further proportional reductions in the area municipal forecast in order to conform to the Growth Plan.

On August 10, 2010, Council endorsed a preferred scenario for MW2, which identified the location for the next phase of growth for MW and the land uses intended for the area (PD 2010-050). Below is a map showing the preferred scenario at the time.
The preferred scenario included approximately 350 hectares of land. With respect to the residential lands, a total of 183 hectares of new residential lands were proposed on lands west of Highway 10. These lands would accommodate 11,638 new residents and complementary new schools and community parks, and achieve an average overall density of 64 residents per hectare.

Also included on the preferred scenario were 92 hectares of new employment lands and 35 hectares of commercial lands. A Transit Hub/Centre was also identified along with lands that would be included within the Natural Heritage System.

According to the preferred scenario, the northern boundary of the preferred scenario dated August 10, 2010 extended to the Greenbelt Plan boundary associated with Etobicoke Creek until a midpoint between McLaughlin Road and Chinguacousy Road. In this regard, one parcel of land extending to Chinguacousy Road and located immediately to the north of Mayfield Road was included, and the parcel of land to north known as the 'Cook property' was also included, however, a note was added to the legend indicated that the lands are considered to be 'Priority Future Phase Lands.' In addition, and according to the map prepared at the time, the parcel to the north of the 'Cook Property'; a portion of which is south of Etobicoke Creek, was identified as a “cultural heritage landscape” in the legend.

A key component of the preferred scenario involved the development of a new east-west road between Highway 410/Hurontario Street and Chinguacousy Road that would run parallel to Mayfield Road and be located between Etobicoke Creek and Mayfield Road in a central location. It was on the basis of this preferred scenario that staff recommended to Council that Phase 3 of the MW2 Secondary Plan be initiated with the preferred scenario boundary.
The following is further indicated in this report with respect to population:

*The recommended population and employment forecast and allocations were originally contained in the Town Official Plan Amendment #203 (OPA 203), which Town Council endorsed on August 1, 2006 and November 6, 2007. Furthermore, Town Council directed that the forecast and allocations contained in OPA 203 be used in all population related planning matters. Population allocations for Mayfield West which are contained in the existing Official Plan and OPA 203 are shown in Table 1.*

Table 1 included in the report indicated that the existing Official Plan population for MW was at that time 13,100 and that the revised population as per OPA 203 was 17,000 in 2021 and 26,838 in 2031. This translated into an increase of 3,900 people before 2021 and 9,838 people between 2021 and 2031.

It was further indicated in this report that on June 8, 2010 Council adopted *OPA 226*. The original OPA 203 population and employment forecasts, outlined within the report, were incorporated into OPA 226 with minor proportional reductions and the addition of the 2001 census undercount of 4.3% to match the forecast for the Town contained in ROPA 24. This meant that the population allocation for MW as per OPA 226 as adopted was 17,515 in 2021 and 27,584 on 2031. The increase in the amount of population allocated between 2021 and 2031 was 746.

A detailed description of the *three alternative scenarios* that were prepared at the time was included within the report. In this regard, 28 formal submissions and 144 comments in total were provided on the three scenarios and as a consequence of an analysis of the comments, a preferred scenario was developed in February 2010. It was indicated that one of the underlying principles of the February 2010 preferred scenario was that the lands south of Etobicoke Creek and adjacent to Chinguacousy Road be included within an expanded settlement area boundary. The preferred scenario was further refined in June 2010 where it was indicated the following:

*Council reiterated its desire to see the land south of the Etobicoke Creek and adjacent to Chinguacousy Road included with an expanded settlement boundary and to see the proposed east-west Transit Spine Road extend to Chinguacousy Road.*

It was for this reason that the boundaries of MW2 along Mayfield Road extended westerly to Chinguacousy Road at that time (this was later changed when the boundaries were modified in 2013).

With respect to the Greenfield density target, the preferred scenario would accommodate 11,638 new residents and 5,895 new jobs for a combined total of 17,533 new residents and jobs. It was further indicated that the balance of the expected population growth (which is 2,100 and the difference between 13,738 and 11,638) was proposed to be allocated to the existing residential lands within MW1 to increase the existing density of 41 residents and jobs combined per hectare to 50 residents and jobs combined per hectare with this population growth occurring post-2021.
With respect to the Cook property, which is located at 12259 Chinguacousy Road, it is indicated in the report that it was proposed to include the Cook property in the proposed expansion area. The following was then indicated:

**Excluding the Cook property from the settlement boundary would result in approximately 54 hectares of land adjacent to, east and south of the Cook property being precluded from designation for growth due to the application of the Provincial minimum distance separation formula to these lands; at a density of 50 persons and jobs per hectare, this exclusion represents approximately 2,700 population. By including the Cook property in the settlement boundary, the Town is able to designate sufficient lands to fully accommodate the population growth forecast contained in both ROPA 24 and OPA 226.**

It was further indicated that although the Cook property was being included in the settlement area, it was intended that it would be subject to policies which would not allow for it to be designated for development until after 2031 or until such time that MW is assigned additional population. This means that while the Cook property was included, development on the Cook property would not have contributed to the population growth of 11,838 expected in MW.

It was later recommended that the Cook property be included on the Town’s heritage register, as a non-designated property. It was also recommended that the property to the north known as 12669 Chinguacousy Road also be included on the Town’s heritage register, again as a non-designated property.

On September 11, 2012, Council dealt with a report on the modifications to OPA 226 (DP-2012-085). It was indicated in this report that on October 27, 2010, the Province issued a draft decision on ROPA 24 that had been adopted by Regional Council on April 22, 2010. This decision was appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board.

A series of discussions involving staff at the Province, the Region and the area municipalities took place in late 2010 and early 2011 which resulted in minutes of settlement signed by the Region, the Cities of Mississauga and Brampton, the Town of Caledon and by the Province on October 7, 2011. This settlement proposed changes to ROPA 24 and included a land budget agreed to by all five government parties. The revised land budget indicated how the Region would meet the Growth Plan forecasts and targets, including the Greenfield density target of 50 persons and jobs combined per hectare within the existing future and existing Greenfield area, which encompassed the future settlement expansions in Caledon.

Through the settlement, the population forecast for the Region of Peel for 2031 was reduced from 1,641,000 to 1,640,000 to conform to the Growth Plan forecast for the Region. The population forecast for Caledon was then reduced from 111,000 to 108,000. Part of the reduction (1,000) was the result of a proportional reduction to allow the Region to meet the Growth Plan forecast and rounding.

The above changes meant that a maximum of 21,500 and 11,000 jobs could be located in future settlement expansions in Caledon which meant that the area of such expansions could not exceed a total of 609 hectares. In addition, the minimum density would be required to be set at 53.4 persons and jobs combined per hectare.
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The above changes were then reviewed against the proposed settlement area expansions that were being considered at the time, including the South Albion-Bolton employment land expansion (including the North Hills supermarket), MW2, Bolton Residential Expansion and Alton Village.

The second part of the review consisted of an assessment of the distribution of growth among the proposed settlement expansions and the densities that would be required for them to collectively conform to the land budget minimum density requirement of 53.4 persons and jobs combined per hectare. It was then determined that if all the expansions were to proceed at their desired sizes and densities, the Town would not be able to meet the land budget minimum density/maximum land area requirements and achieve conformity with ROPA 24.

A number of scenarios were reviewed at that time as set out below:

- **Scenario 1** – equally dividing new residential growth between Bolton and MW such that the density is 71 persons and jobs combined per hectare. Alton would expand as was proposed at the time at a density of 25 persons and jobs per hectare.

- **Scenario 2** – expand Bolton and MW equally but assume a higher density of 50 persons and jobs combined per hectare for the Alton settlement area expansion. If this option is selected, less land would be required in Alton and the additional land (16 hectares) is then divided between MW and Bolton resulting in a density of 68.3 people and jobs combined per hectare for Bolton and MW.

- **Scenario 3** – equally divide the residential growth between Bolton and MW with no settlement area expansion for Alton.

It was recommended in Report 2012-085 that the second scenario above be selected, which would result in a reduction of approximately 1,800 people, 273 jobs and 69 hectares of associated expansion land from the ongoing MW Phase 2 Secondary Plan process. This recommendation meant that the boundary of the preferred scenario dated August 10, 2010 had to be modified.

It was also agreed at the time that Section 4.1.7 of OPA 226 could be modified in response to the changes made to Section 5.4.7 of ROPA 24 with Section 4.1.7 stating the following:

*The Town of Caledon will study areas around Bolton, Mayfield West and Tullamore as shown on Schedule A1 for possible settlement expansions to accommodate the population and employment forecasts shown in Table 4.1 recognizing a settlement area boundary expansion may only occur as part of a Municipal Comprehensive Review.*

On September 3, 2013, Council considered Report DP-2013-092 that recommended the endorsement of a recommended Framework Plan for the MW2 Secondary Plan. The intent at that time was to rely upon the Framework Plan to prepare and submit an application to the Region of Peel to obtain an amendment to the Regional Official Plan to expand the MW settlement area boundary. It is indicated in the report that changes to ROPA 24 and the corresponding changes to OPA 226 with respect to population have had an impact on the MW Secondary Plan process.
It was further indicated in this report that two Framework Plans were reviewed with Council at a workshop in February 2012 and a number of options with respect to future development were reviewed. A draft Framework Plan was then reviewed with Council at a workshop in February 2013.

It was also indicated in this report that a draft Ultimate Community Plan that identified the potential full build-out of the lands bounded by Highway 410/10, Mayfield Road, Chinguacousy Road and the Etobicoke Creek was reviewed with Council. The following was further indicated:

*The Ultimate Community Plan enables both Caledon and Peel to plan for the appropriate municipal infrastructure (road, water and waste water services) and community facilities (i.e. schools and parks) to support possible future growth beyond the MW2 planning considerations.*

It is noted that the Ultimate Community Plan did not include six small residential lots fronting on Chinguacousy Road and the larger parcel bounded by the Greenbelt Plan on the east and Chinguacousy Road on the west in the northwest corner of the Secondary Plan area.

The recommended Framework Plan (which also shows the Ultimate Community Plan) from this report is shown below.

The Framework Plan identified residential lands, employment lands, commercial lands and a transit hub. A natural heritage system was also identified.

The recommended Framework Plan involved the establishment of a spine road between Chinguacousy Road on the west and Hurontario Street on the east and the establishment of a second collector road between McLaughlin Road and Chinguacousy Road as well. Two north-
south collector roads are also proposed between Chinguacousy Road and McLaughlin Road as well.

The boundary of MW2 then followed in all cases either the spine road or a collector road and in one case, an enhancement corridor (B3 as shown on the Framework Plan).

A number of changes were made to the boundary of MW2 from the boundary in the framework plan that was recommended in August 2010. These changes included:

- The removal of the Brampton Christian School from the MW2 Secondary Plan;
- The inclusion of the eastern 8.5 hectares of the ‘Cook Property’; and,
- The removal of the property at the northeastern corner of Chinguacousy Road and Mayfield Road.

In addition, the inclusion of the eastern portion of the ‘Cook Property’ allowed for the inclusion of the entirety of the central woodlot in the MW2 Secondary Plan and the establishment of collector roads that would serve as the interim edge of development until the rest of the lands could be brought into the settlement area.

The changes made to the August 2010 boundary were made to ensure that exactly the amount of land required to meet expected population and employment growth was being planned for. In my opinion, the very precise nature of the calculations carried out to support Growth Plan implementation at the time resulted in the creation of a boundary that did not logically include all of the lands that should be planned for in MW.

Following the Council acceptance of the Report DP-2013-092, the Town of Caledon applied to amend the Region of Peel Official Plan with the application being received on January 23, 2014.

The purpose of the application was as follows:

**To establish the Mayfield West Phase 2 Secondary Plan Settlement Boundary Expansion, and provide an updated policy framework to guide planning applications and development approvals in the Mayfield West Phase 2 Secondary Plan planning area.**

To support the proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment, the Town also prepared a Planning Justification Report dated January 2014. The following was also indicated with respect to the population forecast in the Growth Plan that was relied upon in making the application to the Region:

**The proposed settlement area boundary expansion is being undertaken to implement the original Growth Plan population and employment forecast for 2031 (referred to as 2031A) and the Regional and Caledon Official Plans which have incorporated the 2031A forecast.**
It is also noted in the Town's Planning Justification Report that the Region retained the firm Malone Givens Parson (MGP) in September 2012 to review Caledon’s MCR and provide the Region with the following:

*An assessment and planning opinion regarding the appropriateness of Caledon’s Official Plan Amendment 226 and the associated Settlement Area Boundary Expansion applications in fulfilling the requirements of an MCR.*

It is further indicated that 23 evaluation criteria were established by MGP to assist in evaluating whether individual settlement area boundary expansions in Caledon met the requirements of an MCR. The intent of the Town’s Planning Justification Report was to address those criteria.

The application for Regional Official Plan Amendment was also supported by the following studies:

2. The Employment Lands Needs Study prepared by Watson and Associates;
3. Comprehensive Environmental Impact Study and Management Plan prepared by AMEC Environment and Infrastructure;
4. Agricultural Impact Assessment prepared by Colville Consulting Inc.;
5. Water and Waste Water Servicing Study prepared by R.J. Burnside and Associates;
6. Cultural Heritage Landscapes Assessment and Built Heritage Resources Assessment prepared by Andre Schenman and Envision, the Hough Group;
7. Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment prepared by Historical Horizon;
8. Transportation Impact Study prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited;
10. Commercial Needs Assessment prepared by Scott Morgan; and,

It was also indicated in the Town’s Planning Justification Report that a number of additional studies would be prepared in support of the Caledon Official Plan Amendment and they include the following:

1. Community Design Plan;
2. Comprehensive EIS and MP;
3. Transportation Master Plan;
4. Water and Wastewater Servicing Plan; and,
5. Fiscal and Economic Impact Assessment.
It was noted in the Town’s Planning Justification Report that the Caledon MCR process was appropriate and that Caledon was able to implement settlement area boundary expansions through separate amendments to the ROP to conclude the conformity process.

In this regard, below is the conclusion reached by MGP in their report dated April 13, 2013 and endorsed by Regional Council on May 23, 2013, as reported in the Town’s Planning Justification Report:

"It is our opinion that the Town of Caledon’s MCR process is appropriate when considered within the Provincial policy definition of what constitutes a MCR process as an Official Plan Review initiated by a municipality. OPA 226 is clearly the culmination of Caledon’s analytical and policy conformity work with Provincial planning initiatives. However, full conformity to Provincial and Regional planning documents can only be achieved by delineating and designating the land required to accommodate growth through expansion of the Settlement Area Boundary (if necessary), i.e. by designating the land that will be required to meet growth forecasts for population and employment over the (2031) planning horizon. Hence, once approved, OPA 226 must be fully implemented through adoption of associated Settlement Area Boundary expansions.

By extension, Caledon’s Official Plan review is not complete until the Settlement Area Boundary expansions are finalized, and the expansions are demonstrated to conform to the policies of the Town, Region and Province. Additional Official Plan Amendments dealing with Settlement Area Boundaries must therefore be brought forward and adopted as part of the current Official Plan Review. Only then will be Official Plan Review process commenced for the Town in 2007 be concluded, and thereby conclude the MCR process. Completing the MCR through an Official Plan Review comprised of separate Official Plan Amendments is consistent with Provincial policies and is similar in approach to that employed by other municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Caledon’s OPA 226 properly implements the Growth Plan Policy Areas in the Town in accordance with ROPA 24 and is good planning. It is appropriate to undertake the MCR process in stages, with the initial stages focused on Growth Plan Policy Area allocations and policies, followed by implementing Settlement Area Boundary Expansion OPAs as part of the same MCR.

On the basis of the above, the requested application to amend the ROP was determined to be in conformity with the Growth Plan. The application was deemed to be complete by the Region in January 2014 and the formal public meeting was held on May 22, 2014. By way of resolution at Regional Council on September 11, 2014, ROPA 29 was adopted by Bylaw 72-2014. There was one appeal to ROPA 29, however it was withdrawn and ROPA 29 came into effect on May 8, 2015.

As noted in the Regional Council Report dated September 11, 2014, the purpose of ROPA 29 was to expand the Rural Service Centre boundary for Mayfield West by adding a total of 207.5 hectares of net developable land to the Rural Service Centre boundary in the Region’s Official Plan as identified on Schedule D, Regional Structure. It was further indicated that the proposed expansion was to include approximately 10,000 people, 2,600 population related jobs from commercial uses and 1,100 employment related jobs from higher density employment uses such as office/business parks. It was also clearly indicated in this report the following:
The MW2 ROPA Application submitted by the Town of Caledon intends to implement the P2G 2031A population and employment forecasts.

The following was also indicated in the report with respect to the boundary of MW2:

The MW2 land area that is part of this proposed ROPA is smaller than the land area that Caledon Council was previously considering for expansion. This reduced size is a result of adjustments made in response to the population and employment numbers in P2G 2031A as reflected in ROPA 24 and Caledon OPA 226. If additional population and employment becomes available for Caledon through a future Regional Official Plan Amendment that will bring the Regional Plan into conformity with Amendment 2 of the Places to Grow Plan, a subsequent ROPA application by the Town of Caledon could add more land into Mayfield West’s Rural Service Centre boundary or other Rural Service Areas to accommodate that additional population and employment growth.

On the basis of the above, there clearly was an anticipation on the part of Regional staff that the possibility existed for Mayfield West to be expanded further to fully bring the Regional Official Plan into conformity with Amendment 2 of the Growth Plan.

The following was also indicated with respect to the conformity of ROPA 29 to the Region of Peel Official Plan:

The MW2 ROPA application conforms to the Region’s Official Plan. The MW2 area is one of several expansion areas currently in process in Caledon. Taken together, the expansion areas allow Caledon to meet its population and employment growth targets as approved by the Places to Grow Plan, Regional Official Plan and Caledon Official Plan. The review by Regional, Town and Conservation Authority staff found that the MW2 ROPA met our OP requirements for Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) as listed in ROP Section 7.9.2.12 (see Appendix IV).

The reference to Appendix IV relates to a letter from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to the Region of Peel dated August 18, 2014. The purpose of the letter was to provide comments on ROPA 29 as then proposed. The Province with respect to Provincial Policy and Provincial Plans then indicated the following:

While it is recognized that the ROPA and its supporting documentation have been prepared by the Town, the Region will need to ensure that this amendment is consistent with the new policy direction contained in the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Based on the above, our comments focus on matters related to growth management, the proposed GTA West transportation corridor and protection of agricultural resources.

In considering the Staff Report, Regional Council then decided to support the amendment as proposed within Appendix I to the Staff Report. It was indicated within the basis section of ROPA 29 the following with respect to the Growth Plan population and employment forecasts:

The proposed settlement area boundary expansion is being undertaken to implement the original Growth Plan population and employment forecasts for 2031 (referred to as...
2031A) and the Regional and Caledon Official Plans which have incorporated the 2031A forecast.

The following was further indicated regarding the suitability of the proposed MW settlement area boundary expansion:

- It implements the planning considerations in a manner that is consistent with ROPA 24 and OPA 226 and their associated land budget.
- It provides for the planning and design of a complete community with a diverse mix of land uses, a range and mix of housing and employment types, high quality public open space and easy access to local amenities and services.
- It accommodates population and employment growth in Caledon’s designated Greenfield area that is compact and transit supportive.
- It represents a logical and contiguous expansion to the Mayfield West settlement area boundary.

A revised Section 5.4.3.2.2 was also included in the ROP by ROPA 29 as follows:

*Show on Schedule D the 2031 settlement boundaries for the Caledon East and Mayfield West Rural Service Centres and the 2021 settlement boundary for the Bolton Rural Service Centre. The 2031 settlement boundary for the Bolton Rural Service Centre will be designated on the basis of a municipal comprehensive review and will be consistent with Sections 5.4.7, 5.5 and 7.9 of this Plan and will require an amendment to this Plan. Accordingly, the Region, working with the Town of Caledon, will designate the 2031 settlement boundary of the Bolton Rural Service Centre.*

A revised Section 5.4.3.2.7 was also included in the ROP by ROPA 29 as follows:

*The boundary shown as a red dashed line on Schedule D and designated in the legend "Study Area Boundary" is the area within which additional growth for Mayfield West beyond the 2031 population target is anticipated to occur. Any settlement boundary expansion for the Mayfield West Rural Service Centre will be designated on the basis of a municipal comprehensive review and will require an amendment to this plan.*

A number of other policies on healthy communities and the built environment, the GTA West Preliminary Route Planning Study and the Provincial Minimum Distance Separation were also included within ROPA 29. With respect to the latter, Section 5.4.3.2.8.3 indicates the following:

*Regional Council directs the Town of Caledon, in consultation with and to the satisfaction of the Province and the Region, to include in its official plan and in the Mayfield West Phase 2 Secondary Plan, policies that will:*

(a) *Identify through mapping any Provincial Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) I calculated setback (the Setback Area) that extends into the Mayfield West Phase 2 Settlement Area.*

(b) *Prohibit development in the Setback Area. If and when the livestock and manure storage facilities that are creating the Setback Area are removed, thus eliminating*
the Setback Area, development can proceed in accordance with the Mayfield West Phase 2 Secondary Plan.

(c) Recognize that lands within the Setback Area will be considered a Type A Land Use for the purpose of applying Provincial MDS II Formula.

As noted above, ROPA 29 came into effect on May 8, 2015.

While long term growth planning was occurring at the Regional and local levels, the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO) was undertaking Stage 2 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) Study for the GTA West transportation corridor. Building on the recommendations from Stage 1, the EA Study was supposed to identify the route, determine interchange locations and complete the preliminary design for a new transportation corridor within the Route Planning Study Area. The new transportation corridor was planned to include: a 400-series highway, transitway and potential goods movement priority features. In late 2015, work on the EA was suspended. A panel appointed by the Province is currently carrying out a strategic assessment of the alternatives to meeting future transportation demand and other transportation infrastructure needs.

As part of the background work for the EA, a review of land use was carried out. On the next page is a map produced in a working paper update entitled 'Draft Overview of Environmental Conditions and Constraints' dated June 2015 that identifies lands within the MW settlement area as per ROPA 29 and OPA 222 and the remaining lands that are located within the 'Special Study Area' identified on Schedule D to the ROP as a 'Future Urban Area'.

On October 10, 2015, Council considered Report DP-2015-090. The purpose of this report was to recommend that Council adopt OPA 222. This OPA established goals, objectives and policies to govern the redevelopment of land within the MW2 area. Council then adopted OPA 222 on November 10, 2015. It is noted that OPA 222 provided for an overall Greenfield density of 68.2 people and jobs combined per hectare.

While OPA 222 dealt with the same area as identified in ROPA 29, there were a number of references to the broader community and its logical western extent, which is Chinguacousy Road. In this regard, Section 7.14.4.3 deals with the need to prepare a Community-Wide Development Staging and Sequencing Plan.
Section 7.14.4.3.3 below then discusses the broader area that extends beyond the limits of the lands subject to ROPA 29 and OPA 222:

The community-wide DSSP shall recognize that the following arterial roads and their associated transportation-related infrastructure, as suggested in Schedule B-2 of this Plan, are required for the development of the entire Plan Area:

a) Spine Road from Hurontario Street / Highway 410 west to Chinguacousy Road;

b) McLaughlin Road from Mayfield Road north to the south limit of the Greenbelt Plan Area associated with the Etobicoke Creek; and

c) Chinguacousy Road from Mayfield Road north to the spine road.

On March 8, 2016, Council considered Report DP-2016-10, which recommended that the MW2 Community Design Plan be approved. The following extract from the Staff Report provides an overview of how the Community Design Plan is to be utilized going forward.

The proposed MW2 CDP provides Council, residents, landowners and stakeholders with a clear idea regarding the intended design of the overall community (e.g. road network, location of schools and parks, trails and cycling routes) as well as key components of the community (e.g. distribution of housing types, architecture, and streetscape design). The CDP states that it “provides guidance to all parties involved in delivering a pedestrian friendly, transit-oriented community with mixed uses, a diversity of housing types and densities, a variety of commercial, employment and institutional uses and an emphasis on creating, preserving and enhancing the Natural Heritage System (NHS).” The CDP covers two areas: one is the area that was originally envisioned for the community, and the other is the area approved by ROPA 29 and OPA 222. It is important to note that any further settlement area boundary expansion beyond what is currently approved will require a municipal comprehensive review to determine.

On March 8, 2016, Council considered recommendations made in Report DP-2016-12, which dealt with a Transportation Master Plan for MW2. The study area for the master plan included
the lands north of Mayfield Road, east of Chinguacousy Road, south of the Etobicoke Creek and west of Hurontario Street to guide the provision of fully integrated transportation infrastructure and services. The following was also indicated in the report on the needed arterial roads, with one of these roads extending from the Secondary Plan area to Chinguacousy Road:

**The proposed arterial roads provide mobility within MW2 as well as connections to the surrounding Municipal arterial roads, Regional roads and Provincial highways, as follows:**

- **An east – west Spine Road that will connect Chinguacousy Road and McLaughlin Road along with a connection to the Highway 410 interchange with Valleywood Boulevard and Hurontario Street.** The details of this roadway connection will require further investigation in partnership with the MTO. The Spine Road provides important connectivity between the primary activity areas within MW2.
- **McLaughlin Road extending north from Mayfield Road, generally along the current alignment.**
- **Chinguacousy Road extending north from Mayfield Road, generally along the current alignment.**

The above roads are shown on the figure below.

In mid-2016, the Province established a Focussed Analysis Area (FAA) which is a zone surrounding the shortlist of route alternatives for the new highway corridor. The GTA west transportation corridor could directly impact properties that are located within the FAA. This area is identified on red in the map below. A small portion of the northern property fronting on Chinguacousy Road in MW2 Stage 2 is within the FAA.
An additional area adjacent to the corridor has also been identified and it has been indicated by the Province that MTO has a reduced interest in properties located within the green area.

In this regard, applications can proceed through municipal development processes. MTO will continue to review all development applications in the study area, but it is anticipated that the GTA west transportation corridor will not impact applications in green areas. The remainder of the MW2 Stage 2 lands are within this green area.

On May 25, 2017, the Ontario Municipal Board issued a decision on OPA 222, with the decision reflecting a settlement that was reached amongst the parties. A few minor changes to the framework plan were made to reflect the concerns of one of the appellants. In particular, the northerly rail crossing was eliminated and additional roadways on either side of the railway were incorporated into the conceptual road network on the revised Schedule D. The boundaries of MW2 remained as is.
APPENDIX 4 - WASTEWATER AND WATER SERVICING

NOTES:
1. OPEN SPACES AND SWM BLOCKS ARE EXCLUDED FROM DRAINAGE AREAS CONTRIBUTING TO THE SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM.
2. REFER TO DRAWINGS 802 AND 803 FOR DETAIL SANITARY DRAINAGE AREA PLANS.
3. REFER TO DRAWINGS 321-326 FOR PRELIMINARY TRUNK SEWER PROFILES.
4. DUE TO THE GRADING AND SERVICING CONSTRAINTS WITHIN THE CALEDON 410 DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED LANDS, A LARGER DIAMETER PIPE (375∅ @ 0.30%) HAS BEEN PROPOSED WITHIN THE FUTURE PEEL POLICE FACILITY EASEMENT FOR CONNECTION TO THE EXISTING 300∅ SANITARY OUTFALL AT HIGHWOOD ROAD. PROPOSED SUBDIVISION SANITARY OUTFALL CANNOT BE MAINTAINED AS A 300∅ PIPE AT 0.50% TO ACHIEVE REQUIRED CONVEYANCE CAPACITY WHILE MEETING THE EXISTING HIGHWOOD ROAD OUTFALL INVERT ELEVATION.

DEVELOPMENT CHARGE INFRASTRUCTURE NOTES:
*AS CONFIRMED BY REGION OF PEEL, THE TRUNK SEWERS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 375mm DIA. ARE CONSIDERED AS DEVELOPMENT CHARGE INFRASTRUCTURE (WITH EXCEPTION OF SANITARY SEWER DESCRIBED IN NOTE 4 ABOVE).

* FOLLOWING TRUNK SEWERS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED IN THE REGION DC BACKGROUND STUDY:
STAGE 1:
- SPINE ROAD (CHINGUACOUSY TO McLAUGHLIN)
- COLLECTOR ROAD C (MAYFIELD TO SPINE)
- McLAUGHLIN ROAD (SPINE TO COLLECTOR A)
- McLAUGHLIN ROAD (COLLECTOR B TO MAYFIELD)
- MAYFIELD ROAD (McLAUGHLIN TO VAN KIRK)
STAGE 2:
- McLAUGHLIN ROAD (COLLECTOR A TO MW2 NORTH LIMIT)
- CHINGUACOUSY ROAD (SPINE ROAD TO MW2 NORTH LIMIT)