

Agency Comment Summary Table

Agency	Submission Details	Response
Hydro One Networks Inc.	Preliminary review only considers issues affecting Hydro One's 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only - no comments or concerns at this time.	Acknowledged.
Canada Post	No objections.	Acknowledged.
Durham Regional Policy Services	Submitted map with red-line indicating microwave path. Although the microwave path from Oshawa City Hall to Darlington Hydro ONE does fly over the area, it is predominantly over existing structures AND is not the highest point in-between based on the path profile.	Acknowledged.

Agency	Submission Details	Response
<p>Simcoe County School Board</p>	<p>Very pleased with the revisions and additions to the Southwest Courtice Secondary Plan Update.</p> <p>Supportive of the proposed elementary school site location along Fenning Drive as it presents an opportunity to establish a neighbourhood facility that will foster a sense of community and serve as a walkable school for the coming years. Specifically supportive of the centralized location within the neighbourhood, opportunities for connectivity with other public amenities, and the possibility of passive education in the nearby ecological features such as Robinson Creek.</p> <p>Request for a park block be included in the plan adjacent to the proposed location for an elementary school site. Schools provide an important source of green space and programmed outdoor space for the community. Sharing large field activities such as ball diamonds, soccer pitches, and running tracks makes efficient use of available resources and public funds.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. There is a neighbourhood park proposed to the rear of the Elementary School site as well as directly across Fenning Drive.</p>
<p>Conseil Scolair Vimonde</p>	<p>The Conseil scolaire Vimonde has no comments to provide.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Agency	Submission Details	Response
Metrolinx	No comments on behalf of Metrolinx at this time on the Draft Brookhill Secondary Plan or Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines.	Acknowledged.

CLOCA's Comments on Secondary Plan, Schedule A, Schedule B, and Appendix C

Section	Comment	Response
New Section 3.2.6	Suggest minor revision to include "...demonstrate a net gain to the feature and function of the watercourse and riparian corridor, maintain..."	Revised as per comment.
Original Section 3.2.7	As noted above, where a tributary/feature exists on the landscape, it cannot be ignored during the development review process. Although the SWS is a comprehensive document, features are dynamic, and evidence of their presence on the landscape may vary from year to year. Therefore a particular feature may not be captured in all planning documents or in all mapping.	Revised as per comment.
New Section 3.2.16	Suggest revision to wording "...protecting and enhancing the natural features and functions of these lands, and may include..." As not all are considered "significant" and function should also be protected.	Policy reworded as per comment.

Durham Region's Comments on Secondary Plan, Schedule A, Schedule B, and Appendix C

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>General Suggest that a consistent name is created for this plan, as the Secondary Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines flip between Southwest Courtice and the Bayview Neighbourhood. This will reduce reader confusion.</p>	<p>Revised as per Region Comment.</p>
	<p>There are currently no policies to support the "Prominent Intersection" designation at Bloor Street and Townline. The Region suggests looking at the latest version of policies regarding the SECSP to include similar policies related to density and built form in this area.</p>	<p>Revised as per Region Comment.</p>
	<p>Section 1 - Introduction The Region will defer the population and unit count of this Secondary Plan, if at the time of Regional approval the Region's MCR is not completed. The current population and unit counts are subject to the employment lands in the south being converted to residential uses. Until a decision is made regarding employment area conversions it is premature for the Region to approve this portion of the Plan..</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
	<p>Section 2.3 Community Structure This section is intended to outline the vision of each community element, however, it jumps between describing where the features are located, and the function of other elements. It is suggested that this section is revised to include a vision</p>	<p>No Change Recommended. Consistent with the Structure Staff sent.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	statement detailing what each element will contribute to the Secondary Plan area.	
	<p>Section 3.2 Environmental Protection Areas and Natural Features</p> <p>In order to adequately protect the natural features within the Secondary Plan it is suggested that a policy similar to policy 9.5.4 of the Foster Northwest Secondary Plan is included in this Plan.</p> <p>Policy 9.5.4 states, " Where trees and shrubs are destroyed or harvested pre-maturely prior to proper study and approval, compensation will be based on the estimated tree value."</p>	Revised as per Region Comment.
	<p>Section 3.2 Environmental Protection Areas and Natural Features</p> <p>In order to adequately protect the natural features within the Secondary Plan it is suggested that a policy similar to policy 9.5.4 of the Foster Northwest Secondary Plan is included in this Plan.</p> <p>Policy 9.5.4 states, " Where trees and shrubs are destroyed or harvested pre-maturely prior to proper study and approval, compensation will be based on the estimated tree value."</p>	Revised as per Region Comment.
	<p>Policy 3.2.8 (Environmental Protection Areas and Natural Features)</p> <p>Suggest adding the word "feature" to the end of the policy, so it reads,</p> <p>"...A Vegetation Protection Zone of 15 metres as per Table 3-1 of the Clarington Official Plan is required from the valley feature."</p>	Revised as per Region Comment.

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>Policy 3.4.2 (Stormwater Management) Clarification is requested for this policy, as it indicates that stormwater management ponds cannot be located within the feature or its vegetation protection zone (VPZ). Should this more broadly include the entire EPA designation, as there are linkage areas included within this designation that may not be picked up by either a feature or its VPZ. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Revised as per Region Comment.</p>
	<p>Policy 3.4.3 (Stormwater Management) Clarification is requested for this policy, as it currently indicates that the temporary use of a stormwater management pond is permitted west of Prestonvale Road, but may ultimately be replaced with a planned facility to the east. If the municipality intends through this policy to require the pond be replaced with a pond to the east, it suggested that the word "may" be replaced with "shall" to require the movement of the facility. It is also may be appropriate to indicate that the facility movement be done at the sole cost of the developer.</p>	<p>Policy to remain as is. The specifics related to the relocation of the stormwater management pond will be determined at the appropriate Development Approvals stage.</p>
	<p>Policy 3.4.6 (Stormwater Management) Clarification is required for this policy, as there is currently no further guidance for the developer to reference when applying for development applications within "Conservation" Headwater Drainage Features. It is suggested that this policy be tied to consultation with the Conservation Authority or identify the guidance material the developer's must follow to prepare their applications.</p>	<p>Revised as per Region Comment and inclusion of additional policies to include policies related to the Implementation of the recommendations from the ongoing Subwatershed Study.</p>
	<p>Policies 3.4.6 & 3.4.11 (Stormwater Management) It is suggested that policies 3.4.6 and 3.4.11 are moved from Section 3.4 Stormwater Management into Section 3.2</p>	<p>Revised as per Regions Comment.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	Environmental Protection and Natural Features, as these policies deal more with the overall protection of natural features.	
	Section 5 - Street Network and Mobility The objectives of this section are a duplication of the vision and objectives for policy 2.2.5, to "connect the neighbourhood to the broader community and region by all modes of travel." It is suggested that they either be amalgamated in one area, or different objectives are identified for Section 2.2.5 or Section 5.	Revised the objectives to distinguish the Sections.
	Policy 5.3.1 (Arterial Roads) This policy currently identifies a ROW width range between 30-36 metres for Townline Road (Type B Arterial). This policy should be revised to include a ROW of 36 metres to further define the require of this road in the Secondary Plan.	Revised as per Regions Comments.
	Policy 5.3.4 (Arterial Roads) This policy currently states that the Region may close Prestonvale Road north of the railway to eliminate the at-grade crossing. This policy should be removed as the Region does not support Metrolinx plan to close Prestonvale Road and as it is not a Regional Road we do not have the authority to close it if it is recommended for closure.	Policy removed.
	Section 5.6 - Rear Laneways Clarification is required, as it appears as though only public laneways are permitted. Is the intent of this section to not allow private laneways?	Addressed through the addition of Laneway Policies into Section 5.6 of the Secondary Plan.
	Policy 6.2.5 - Land Use Built Form General Policies	Acknowledged.

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>Further to Comment # 3 above, the Region will determine through the Land Needs Assessment of the MCR, first, if the proposed employment area conversions are needed.</p> <p>Other components, including densities within the Designated Greenfield Area will also form part of this work. Further work may be required by Clarington staff to achieve conformity with the new ROP.</p>	
	<p>Policy 6.2.6 (General Land Use and Built Form Policies) As indicated in the Comment matrix the Municipality provided back regarding our previous comments, it is understood that a land budget will be provided to ensure this plan is meeting the required 50 people and jobs per hectare as set out in the terms of reference. how does the Municipality currently plan to achieve the required DGA densities for the entire secondary plan if all of the designated employment lands are not converted?</p> <p>Employment land conversions, such as the lands within the Southwest Courtice Secondary Plan require the completion of the Region's MCR to determine their appropriateness. The Municipality must be prepared to consider all aspects of the Region's new Plan, including density targets prior to requesting the Region to lift the deferred decision. This may require further study and refinement of the plan in the future.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Policies were included to acknowledge the Employment Land Conversions and potential impacts if the conversions were not deemed appropriate through the Regions Municipal Comprehensive Review (Section 6.7).</p>
	<p>Policy 6.2.7 (General Land Use and Built Form Policies) The following changes are suggested to this policy, so it reads,</p>	<p>Revised as per Regions comment.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>"...Window streets or flankage lots may also be considered. Reverse lot frontage development generally shall not should only be permitted within the Secondary Plan Area. if there are no other feasible options.</p>	
	<p>Policy 6.2.8 (General Land Use and Built Form Policies) The following changes are suggest to this policy, so it reads, "Buildings located adjacent to, or at the edge of parks and open spaces, shall provide include opportunities for pedestrian connections into and to overlook and provide pedestrian connections into the parks and open spaces. More specific policies related to park access can be found in Section 7 of this Plan."</p>	<p>Revised as per Regions comment.</p>
	<p>Section 6.3 Affordable Housing</p> <p>The Region requests staff to review the affordable housing policies included in the Southeast Courtice Secondary Plan related to a specified quantity of land required by development to be gifted to the Region of Durham and Habitat for Humanity, lower parking standards in areas with access to reliable transit, the reduction of development charges, application, grant and loan fees, and the permission of accessory units within townhouse units. Please also incorporate the Region's recent comments on the SECSP affordable housing policies to formulate similar policies for this Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing Policies updated to reflect the Regions recent comments on the Southeast Courtice Secondary Plan.</p>
	<p>Policy 6.5.2 (Neighbourhood Commercial) Suggest the following changes to this policy, so it reads,</p>	<p>Revised as per Regions comment.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>"The minimum height of any new buildings shall be two storeys, and these areas are encouraged to include mixed-use development, with residential units or office space integrated with retail uses, shall be encouraged. The design of buildings shall reflect and reinforce the character of the surrounding neighbourhoods."</p>	
	<p>Policy 6.8 (High Density Residential) The bullets are not chronologically ordered in this policy, please fix.</p>	<p>Revised as per Regions comment.</p>
	<p>Policy 6.5.3 (High Density Residential) Suggest the specific policy reference to "Policy 8A.2.9" of the Regional Official Plan (ROP) be deleted from this policy, as the new ROP will not maintain the same numbering, so it reads, "The minimum density of development shall be 85 units per net hectare to support an overall, long-term density for the Bloor Street Regional Corridor of 60 residential units per gross hectare and a floor space index of 2.5, in accordance with Policy 8A.2.9 of the Regional Official Plan."</p>	<p>Reference removed and minimum densities updated to 120 uph.</p>
	<p>Section 6.6 - Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential Question: Does the Municipality see the need for a minimum height for medium density residential dwelling types? If so, it should be inserted in this section.</p>	<p>Revised policies within the Low, Medium and High Density Designations to include minimum and maximum heights for all permitted built forms.</p>
	<p>Policy 6.6.6 (Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential)</p>	<p>Policy removed.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>The policy cross-references are incorrectly numbered in this policy, and the Region suggests the following wording changes, so it reads,</p> <p>"Where an application for the development of more than 100 units includes units in both Low Density and Medium Density Residential areas, the minimum densities set out in policies 6.65.4 and 6.65.5 shall apply, and the 20% requirement for townhouses, duplexes or triplexes shall apply to the low density portion of the overall development.</p>	
	<p>Policy 6.7 (Former Employment Lands (Employment Land Conversion Area)</p> <p>The Region requests the following wording change, so it reads, "In the event the Former Employment Lands are not converted to permit non-residential uses this Secondary Plan shall will be amended accordingly."</p>	Revised as per Regions comment.
	<p>Policy 7.2.6 (General Policies of Parks and Community Facilities)</p> <p>The Region suggests that this policy be moved under Section 7.3 - Neighbourhood Parks as this is a neighbourhood park specific policy.</p>	Section 7 updated to just "Parks" Section, with Neighbourhood parks and Parkette policies within it.
	<p>Policy 7.3.1 (Neighbourhood Parks)</p> <p>Suggest the following wording change, so it reads,</p> <p>"...Neighbourhood Parks shall be 0.6 to 2 hectares in size, depending on the area served and the activities to be provided.</p>	Section 7 updated to just "Parks" Section, with Neighbourhood parks and Parkette policies within it. Neighbourhood park size updated 1.5 and 3 hectares in size.

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
Schedule A	<p>Schedule 'A' - Land Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are currently no Neighbourhood Park symbols included in this schedule. Suggest that the same symbology from SECSP is used for consistency. - the lands south of the CP Rail line and south of Baseline Road West should also be included in the "Former Employment Lands" overlay as there is no Living Area designation in this area of the Regional Official Plan. Please adjust the boundary accordingly. - It is suggested that it may be clearer to the reader if there was a hatched line within the "Former Employment Lands" overlay boundary. - there are currently two greenspace areas which are meant to include stormwater management pond symbols, which do not have the black outside surrounding the blue dot. Please revise accordingly. 	Revised as per Regions comment.
Schedule 'C'	<p>Schedule 'C' - Open Space Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - there are currently two greenspace areas which are meant to include stormwater management pond symbols, which do not have the black outside surrounding the blue dot. Please revise accordingly. 	Revised as per Regions comment.
Appendix 'B'	<p>Appendix 'B' - Demonstration Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It may be appropriate to depict the employment land conversion area on this appendix as well. Although it does not form part of the formal requirements of the document, it can be misleading to readers who do not understand the planning process. 	Revised as per Regions comment.