

Public Comments Summary Table

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| S001 Sept 8, 2020 | Mike Domovich, The Domos Group | Regarding property south of Longworth, west side of Bowmanville Ave. Indicated they would apply for high density. | Property outside update area, already draft approved for subdivision. No change to Secondary Plan. |
| S002 Sept 16, 2020 | Melissa Miceli, Canadian Tire Real Estate | Asked if 2000 Green Road (behind existing Canadian Tire) is part of Secondary Plan area. | Explained these lands are part of Bowmanville West Secondary Plan area. |
| S003 Sept 16, 2020 | Dave Simpson, Alderville First Nation | Enquired about archeological studies. | Archeological studies are required as part of development applications within in the Secondary Plan area. |
| S004 Sept 11, 2020 | Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting | Comments provided on behalf of Kaitlin regarding 46 Stevens Road, which suggests breaking up the Future Block Master Plan area into two or four distinct areas to be studied separately. Provided list of studies that would likely be required. Suggests that development in area that includes 46 Stevens can proceed independently of rest of Block Master Plan area. | No changes to Future Block Master Plan. A Block Master Plan is needed to address environmental, traffic, servicing, and neighbourhood compatibility concerns. |
| S005 | Jeff Goldman, | Overall, supportive of Secondary | High density area refined to match depth |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Sep 21, 2020 | Cameo Parent Corp | Plan. Notes that sanitary servicing may be provided along Bowmanville Ave earlier than in rest of Secondary Plan area. Regarding lands on the northeast corner of Bowmanville and Longworth: notes that previous discussions agreed there would be high density along Bowmanville Ave and Longworth, but now suggests high density be contained to neighbouring property. Also concerns with size of park. | on west side of Bowmanville Ave. Location of park adjusted to provide more low density. Further minor refinements to location of park and land use designation may be made through Draft Plan of Subdivision. |
| S006 Sept 23, 2020 Sept 28, 2020 March 10, 2021 March 16, 2021 March 17, 2021 March 22, 2021 March 29, 2021 April 1, 2021 April 6, 2021 | Steve Hennessey | Holds position that Linden Lane properties should not be part of Future Block Master Plan area as the properties are not as valuable as those to the south. Stated that 75% of Linden Lane landowners would like high density designation, that the properties are well-suited to provide municipal services to properties to the north, that new subdivisions may affect wells on Linden Lane, and that Longworth shouldn't be shifted south. Asked if Linden Lane would become a signalized intersection. Requested meeting | Mr. Hennessey was advised that Linden Lane is within the Future Block Master Plan area. When work begins on this Block Plan, requests for land use designations will be considered. After Council directed Staff to hold a pre-consultation meeting with Kaitlin about 46 Stevens, Mr. Hennessey requested a meeting with Planning Staff. On April 1, 2021, Planning Staff met with Mr. Hennessey and all property owners of Linden Lane. They were offered the same opportunity as Kaitlin: to submit an application for a pre-consultation meeting for a specific development proposal and |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | with Planning Staff and a Councillor. | Staff would hold the meeting. |
| S007 Sept 18, 2020 & Sept 30, 2020 | Libby Racansky | <p>Asked for clarification on platform used for Public Meeting (MS Teams). Asked if EA for road extensions were completed. Requests consultants review a report stating cancer rates in Bowmanville are higher than other regional neighbourhoods. States vehicles cause pollution and there shouldn't be more added. Comments about street designs that could reduce traffic. States that smaller stormwater ponds are better at reducing possibility of algae blooms</p> | <p>Public health is linked to how our built environments are designed. The Secondary Plan is based on compact neighbourhoods that encourage walkability and access to parks and open spaces.</p> <p>The size and location of SWM ponds will be determined at more detailed application process. Typically prefer smaller SWM ponds and low impact development measures to reduce large open water surfaces.</p> |
| S008 Sept 23, 2020 March 16, 2021 April 18, 2021 | Jim McEwen | <p>Requests that properties on Linden Lane be designated high density for apartments or seniors facility. Stated that the Linden Lane properties are not large enough for a subdivision. Pointed to need for affordable housing, the proximity of proposed GO station, and that Bowmanville Ave is a Local Corridor.</p> | <p>Mr. McEwan was advised that Linden Lane is within the Future Block Master Plan area. When work begins on this Block Plan, requests for land use designations will be considered.</p> <p>After Council directed Staff to hold a pre-consultation meeting with Kaitlin about 46 Stevens, Mr. Hennessey (a Linden Lane property owner) requested a meeting with Planning Staff. On April 1, 2021, Planning Staff met with all property owners of Linden Lane, including Mr. McEwan.</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | They were offered the same opportunity as Kaitlin: to submit an application for a pre-consultation meeting for a specific development proposal and Staff would hold the meeting. |
| S009 Sept 25, 2020 | Mark Jacobs, The Biglieri Group | Regarding 2492 and 2538 Bowmanville Ave and 2499 Nash Road on behalf of property owners Brookhill Durham Holdings Inc. Supports the mix of Low and Medium Density Residential on the properties. Requested that the lands adjacent to Bowmanville Ave be Medium rather than High Density to provide a transition to the adjacent Low Density. Requests that the proposed elementary school be moved further south. States support of for the removal of Nash Road between Clarington Blvd. extension and Bowmanville Ave. and replaced with local roads. Also feels that measurement in metres for building heights is too restrictive for a Secondary Plan and should be captured in zoning. | Bowmanville Avenue is a Local Corridor where higher densities are to be directed. The designation allows for uses that are appropriate along this arterial. It also mirrors what is occurring across the street. Transition policies are included in the Secondary Plan. Reference to metres has been removed from building heights. |
| S010 Sept 25, 2020 | Paul Tobia, Weston | Regarding 46 Stevens on behalf of Kaitlin Corp. Stated he will | No changes to Secondary Plan needed. |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| | Consulting | review the materials released on Sept 8, 2020 and provide further comments. | |
| S011 Sept 25, 2020 March 4, 2021 | Doug Allingham | <p>Resident of Luverme Court which is within Future Block Master Plan area. Concerned about high densities in the area and believes the entire south of Longworth should be low density with single detached dwellings and the Future Block Master Plan should be removed from the Secondary Plan. Stated he understands need to increase densities but area has limited infrastructure and constrained by natural features. Would like land uses within Future Block Master Plan area to remain the same as they are now.</p> <p>Enquiry about why Council directed staff to hold a pre-consultation meeting with Kaitlin and why it was not public.</p> | <p>No changes to Future Block Master Plan.</p> <p>Explained that Council directed Staff to hold a pre-consultation meeting with Kaitlin. Also explained why pre-consultation meetings are private, and that any subsequent application would be a public process.</p> |
| S012 Sept 28, 2020 | Eudore Chand, Durham Post | Clarifying date of Public Meeting and deadline for comments. | No changes to Secondary Plan. |
| S013 Sept 28, 2020 Sept 30, 2020 | Andrea Jackson | Lives in Brookhill neighbourhood and hopes for enhancements, not overcrowding. Likes the idea of | Acknowledged. Parks central to each neighbourhood and schools are proposed for the secondary plan to provide |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Oct 6, 2020 Oct 19, 2020 | | <p>trails and neighbourhood parks and requested details of trails, size of parks, and who's responsible for maintenance. Asked for clarification on the map.</p> <p>Stated the projected growth to 2031 (140,340) does not sound like healthy growth. Other concerns with density.</p> <p>Stated that no green spaces are proposed in the new neighbourhood block. Concerns with social distancing, access to outdoor spaces, and child's play.</p> <p>Feels the only green space in Clarington is the protected Natural Heritage areas. Wants to see short distance, walkable trails and community facilities nearby. There's no proposed or guaranteed transit to support the new housing and community to be "healthy and vibrant".</p> <p>Asked question about format of Public Meeting and states appreciation for work gone into Secondary Plan and Staff's</p> | <p>amenities for residents.</p> <p>A large portion of the secondary plan is proposed for single detached, semi detached and townhouse development. The southeast corner of Green Road and Longworth extension is outside the update area. An application for a subdivision and re-zoning has been submitted, which is a public process outside the Secondary Plan update.</p> <p>Other higher density forms of housing such as low and midrise apartments are to be located along Bowmanville Avenue and the intersection of Bowmanville Avenue and Longworth Avenue. The timing of development has not been determined but will be phased to allow for servicing infrastructure.</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>availability to discuss her concerns.</p> <p>Suggests apartment buildings should not back onto or even be on the same street as single detached dwellings.</p> <p>Requested the entire Secondary Plan area be only single and semi detached dwellings. Expressed concern about parking. Requested that apartments be replaced with townhouses. Opposes any future building proposal. Stated that townhouses do not need sidewalks.</p> <p>States that residents will continue to voice opposition to Council about apartment buildings.</p> | |
| <p>S014 Oct 7, 2020 April 1, 2021</p> | <p>Mark and Susan Ashworth</p> | <p>As owners of 2285 Linden Lane, they do not want high density nearby as they chose to live on the property to be far away from medium and high density.</p> <p>Reiterated above point at meeting on April 1.</p> | <p>Linden Lane is within the Future Block Master Plan area. When work begins on this Block Plan, requests for land use designations will be considered.</p> <p>After Council directed Staff to hold a pre-consultation meeting with Kaitlin about 46 Stevens, Mr. Hennessey (a Linden Lane property owner) requested a meeting with</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>Planning Staff. On April 1, 2021, Planning Staff met with all property owners of Linden Lane, including Mr. Ashworth. They were offered the same opportunity as Kaitlin: to submit an application for a pre-consultation meeting for a specific development proposal and Staff would hold the meeting.</p> |
| <p>S015 Oct 15, 2020</p> | <p>Filip Aleksanderek</p> | <p>Requested a copy of the Public Meeting staff report (PSD-032-20).</p> | <p>Copy of report provided.</p> |
| <p>S016 Oct 16, 2020</p> | <p>Michael Fry, D.G. Biddle and Associates, retained to provide comments on 'Tonno Lands'</p> | <p>Restates the importance of preserving the current land use permissions on the lands from the existing Brookhill Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Concern with implementing the urban design guidelines as they may affect their plans. To conform to these guidelines for a project nearing conditional draft plan approval would be very costly and timely. Requests that the subject property be exempt from the proposed Urban Design Guidelines to avoid potential conflict.</p> | <p>Property is outside of study area so no changes to land use permissions. Updated Secondary Plan and Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines replace the previous versions, which will apply to subject property.</p> |
| <p>S018 Oct 19, 2020</p> | <p>Bryce Jordan, GHD Group,</p> | <p>A concept plan was prepared for the client's property, which is</p> | <p>Due to policy added prohibiting private roads or lanes within Low Density</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| | retained to provide comments on behalf of owners of 2405 & 2421 Nash Road. | <p>similar to the demonstration plan prepared by the consultant. The north end of the subject property is shown in both plans as being a block of land with public road frontage only onto the collector roads (Nash Rd and Clarington Blvd). This block would be most efficiently developed as townhouses.</p> <p>Notes that Table 4-3 in Clarington's OP will permit "limited townhouse" development internal to the neighbourhood. However, the Secondary Plan would restrict townhouses to street townhouses.</p> <p>Suggests any form of townhouse in the Low Density Residential area on a limited basis. This change would more accurately reflect the policy set out in the parent OP and allow flexibility for the efficient development of the neighbourhood.</p> | Residential, and the subject property's unique configuration, the lands have been designated Medium Density Residential. This designation permits different forms of townhouses. |
| S019 Oct 19, 2020 | Ryan Guetter, Weston Consulting, retained by | Reiterated request for higher density at 46 Stevens through a Block Precinct Plan, or Block Master Plan process and should | Planning Staff worked with Kaitlin's representatives to develop a terms of reference for the Block Master Plan. However, as Mr. Guetter noted, Kaitlin |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| | VAD Retail Limited, the registered owner of 46 Stevens Rd., which is under the control of Kaitlin Corporation. | <p>include specific building typologies, heights, and densities.</p> <p>If the Block Master plan approach is found not to be appropriate, they wish to proceed with the site-specific applications for the subject lands, and requests the pre-application checklist be provided.</p> <p>Discussed a September 16, 2020 application for a pre-consultation, including a proposed terms of reference for studies for the area to proceed concurrent with the Secondary Plan process.</p> <p>Requests the Design Guidelines not to be prescriptive and not applied as policy.</p> | <p>instead submitted a pre-consultation request for one property (46 Stevens) within the Future Block Master Plan area. Staff advised that the pre-consultation was pre-mature as a Block Master Plan was required prior to any specific development application.</p> <p>As explained in the Staff Report at the Sept 28, 2020 Statutory Public Meeting for the Brookhill Neighbourhood Secondary Plan a Block Master Plan is required to address infrastructure for servicing, vehicular access, environmental constraints, and neighbourhood opposition to higher densities.</p> <p>On March 1, Council approved a resolution (#C-088-21), which directs staff to accept Kaitlin's pre-consultation application and "process the applications in the normal course." In response, Staff scheduled a pre-consultation meeting for April 29.</p> |
| S020 Oct 20, 2020 | Nandish Kanesh | Enquiring about the timing of construction and when detailed housing plans will be available. | Explained development process and added to Interested Parties List to be informed of project progress. |
| S021 Oct 21, 2020 | Andrew Vandorsselaer | Concerned that their property might be affected directly. States | Staff telephoned resident and explained the existing uses on the property could |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|
| Oct 30, 2020 | and Lindsay Barakett | they are OK with housing development, but not apartment buildings or plaza directly across from their property. Question about reconstruction of Nash and utilities. | continue and no significant new development would be permitted as the property is designated Environmental Protection Area. Area across from their property is recommended to be Environmental Protection and Low Density Residential. |
| S017 Oct 19, 2020 | Bryce Jordan, GHD Group, retained as representative of the Brookhill North Landowners Group | States that certain areas, particularly near the confluence of Longworth Avenue, Bowmanville Boulevard and Clarington Boulevard require the use of rear lanes as shown on the demonstration plan. The BNLG requests that the use of public rear lanes will be permitted. | Public rear lanes are permitted along arterial and collector roads. Private streets and lanes are not permitted within the Low Density Residential designation. Lane policies revised to reflect the policies prepared and approved for Southeast Courtice Secondary Plan. |
| | | States it needs to be made clear that the unit mix and density target need not be met by each application but by the Secondary Plan area as a whole. | The Secondary Plan has been revised to state the "minimum density target will be measured over the entire designated greenfield area, excluding natural heritage features and areas, natural heritage systems and floodplains, provided development is prohibited in these areas." |
| | | Concern with policy that states "all residential development shall be consistent with the Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines". States | Borrowing language from Southeast Courtice Secondary Plan, the Brookhill Secondary Plan states "New development shall be consistent with the |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>this should be changed to “have regard for” and that it is not appropriate for Official Plan policy to require compliance with a free-standing document which, itself, is not subject to appeal.</p> | <p>urban design policies contained in Section 5 of the Official Plan, the policies of this Secondary Plan, and shall be in accordance with the Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines.”</p> <p>For clarity, the following policy statement has been added: “The Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines shall accompany this Plan and be used as guidance in the interpretation and implementation of the Secondary Plan’s policies.”</p> |
| | | <p>Regarding policy for parkettes to have “100% public frontage” though the Official Plan calls for a minimum 30% road frontage for Parkettes. The existing Parkettes in Brookhill have about 50% to 60% public frontage. If a number is to be specified in the revised Secondary Plan, than a range of about 50% would be more appropriate.</p> | <p>Policy revised to be consistent with Official Plan: to require "50 percent" public frontage.</p> |
| | | <p>Regarding policy that states Public Squares “shall be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Centre, Village Corridor or other high traffic areas”. Points to background work that indicates that Public Squares</p> | <p>Policy revised to state “The Neighbourhood Centre designation at this intersection shall provide a privately owned publicly-accessible plaza at the Prominent Intersection to contribute to its visual prominence, reinforce its role as a gateway, improve the relationship of built</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>are required only in Neighbourhood Centres. The policy needs to be revised to indicate that Public Squares may be incorporated into other areas. If they are provided, one hectare is excessive for such a facility.</p> | <p>form to the public right-of-way, and contribute to the area's identity."</p> <p>Privately owned publicly-accessible spaces are permitted but not required in other designations.</p> |
| | | <p>Regarding policy that states Low Density shall be developed in accordance with Section 9 of the Official Plan. However, there are no specific policies for Low Density Residential in Section 9.</p> | <p>Policy replaced with: "Other uses, including small scale service and neighbourhood retail commercial uses, which are supportive of and compatible with residential uses, are also permitted in accordance with the Clarington Official Plan."</p> |
| | | <p>Requests that block townhouses be permitted in Low Density Residential. States that the demonstration plan shows a number of blocks of land designated Low Density that would be appropriate for a block townhouse design solution.</p> | <p>New policy added: "Detached and semi-detached dwelling units shall account for minimum 80 percent of the total number of units in Low Density Residential designation, with units in other building types accounting for the remaining 20 percent. Generally, this ratio should be applied for each plan of subdivision to encourage an even distribution of townhouse units."</p> <p>In Low Density Residential, only "street townhouses" are permitted as private roads or lanes are not permitted in Low Density Residential.</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | Block, stacked and back-to-back townhouses are permitted in other designations. |
| | | Request heights be expressed in storeys, not metres. | All references to metres removed. |
| | | Regarding policy that states Medium Density shall be developed in accordance with Section 9 of the Official Plan. However, there are no specific policies for Medium Density Residential in Section 9. | Policy replaced with: "The predominant use of lands within the Medium Density Residential designation are a mix of housing types and tenures in mid- and low-rise building forms." |
| | | Requests that the permitted heights in High Density Residential be changed from 4 to 6 storeys to 2 to 6 storeys to allow for townhouses. | The High Density Residential designation is now "Medium Density Local Corridor" which permits townhouses and other built forms with heights between 3 and 6 storeys. |
| | | Requests that the stand-alone commercial building (a grocery store/supermarket) in the Neighbourhood Centre be permitted to be a single storey. | <p>The Official Plan states the minimum height for Local Corridors is 2 storeys. The grocery store/supermarket is permitted to have other ancillary uses on upper floors.</p> <p>Policies for the Neighbourhood Centre have been revised to allow a stand-alone commercial building, so long as residential or mixed use building is also on the site.</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Regarding policy that requires the naturalization of the Brookhill Tributary from the original Brookhill Secondary Plan. Points out the section of the Brookhill Tributary that required naturalization was south of Longworth Avenue. Therefore, this policy is no longer required or, at least, does not apply to the lands owned by members of the BNLG. If this policy is not to be deleted, we request written confirmation of our understanding as set out above.</p> | <p>Following CLOCA's comments on the same section, the policy has been re-written to state the further naturalization of the Tributary may be required where supported by an agency approved EIS. Additional policy added relating to potential erosion concerns in the Brookhill tributary.</p> |
| | | <p>Regarding policies that speak to the "level of development acceptable" where environmental features and functions are found in this area will be based on "whether the proposed development will have a significant negative impact on the identified features/functions". States this is taking a site-specific view of significance rather than a systems view. Argues the policy should concern "whether the proposed development will have a significant negative impact on the</p> | <p>The assessment of potential development related impacts to the NHS must take into account the PPS (and NHRM), the Region OP, the local OP, Brookhill SP policies, and CLOCA regulations/policies.</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | overall natural heritage function within the neighbourhood”. | |
| | | Regarding the draft Master Servicing and Stormwater Management report in which a number of possible stormwater management facility locations have been identified by symbols on the land use map. It is noted that there is the potential to reduce the number of facilities and to avoid possible diversions of drainage areas. However, this can only be finally determined with more detailed information that is not available at the Secondary Plan stage. | Reducing the number of storm pond outfalls to Bowmanville Creek is a preferred option. Diversion of flows from the Brookhill Tributary to Bowmanville Creek should be avoided, where feasible. |
| | | Consequently, the BNLG endorses the intent of the policy that provides flexibility in location and size of stormwater management facilities. It should also state the “number of facilities be changed without amendment to the Secondary Plan”. | See next response below. |
| | | The policy about conveying lands in accordance with a Stormwater Management Report should be deleted for the following reasons: | Policy updated: “The number and location of the stormwater management facility symbols may be changed without an amendment to this Plan. The exact |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>1) By requiring compliance with a freestanding document, it is negating the flexibility of the policies which precede it.</p> <p>2) The document referred to does not exist.</p> <p>3) If it is meant to refer to the Master Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, this report is not detailed enough or rigorous enough upon which to enforce compliance.</p> <p>4) It is never appropriate to use Secondary Plan policy to enforce compliance with a document which, in itself, is not subject to the same appeal rights as the policy document.</p> | <p>location, number, and size of the facilities will be determined through the Functional Servicing Report and in accordance with Section 20 of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Stormwater management facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of the Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines attached as Appendix A to this Secondary Plan.”</p> <p>Policy added: “Storm drainage for the secondary plan lands will be conveyed to the Bowmanville Creek and the Brookhill Tributary in accordance with the provisions of the Functional Servicing Report.”</p> <p>(Note that a Functional Servicing Plan is contained within a Functional Servicing Report.)</p> |
| | | <p>The Clarington Official Plan policy 23.17.8 sets out the basis for requiring Landowner Group cost sharing. The BNLG was formed in recognition of that policy to share in the cost of the Secondary Plan Update. The BNLG wishes to carry forward with the sharing of costs throughout the remainder of the development process.</p> | <p>A Cost Sharing Policy has been added to the Secondary Plan.</p> |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | Requests that a cost sharing policy be added to the Secondary Plan. Provided suggested wording. | |
| | | | |
| S007 April 8, 2021 | Bryce Jordan, GHD Group | The following comments were provided on behalf of the Brookhill Neighbourhood Landowners Group (BNLG) based on an April 2021 draft of the Secondary Plan made available to the BNLG. | |
| | | Requests that development adjacent to “parks and Environmental Protection Areas” not be subject to development transition policies, and that, if anything, the density should increase towards Parks and Open Spaces | Agreed. Revised as requested. Parks and EP areas are not subject to the same transition policies as those for development between low and higher densities. |
| | | Regarding the commercial building permitted in the Neighbourhood Centre, requests that it be a minimum 2 storey building or a building of similar massing such as a supermarket with minimum 2 storey profile. | Section 10.3.5 of the Official Plan states “All new Commercial Development within Urban and Village Centres, Regional and Local Corridors and Waterfront Places shall be a minimum height of two storeys.” This was approved by LPAT. The two storeys must be full storeys, not |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | a mezzanine, and not just profile or appearance. It's a policy about density, not just design. |
| | | Suggests the following policy: "The Neighbourhood Centre designation at this intersection shall provide a privately owned publicly-accessible plaza at the Prominent Intersection to contribute to its visual prominence, reinforce its role as a gateway, improve the relationship of built form to the public right-of-way and contribute to the area's identity." | Agreed. Revised as suggested for clarity. |
| | | Requests policy about block lengths being to no more than 200 metres to say 'generally' no more than 200 metres. | Agreed. Revised to include 'generally.' |
| | | The Urban Design Guidelines indicates no more than 8 townhouse units attached with no more than 6 preferred. This should be reflected in the Secondary Plan | The Secondary Plan states "The maximum number of contiguously attached townhouses shall be six." The Design Guidelines have been changed to reflect this policy. |
| | | Requests that the policy requiring mid-block pedestrian connections be revised to apply only when the | The policy is not revised and consistent with the Southeast Courtyce Secondary Plan. |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | maximum block length is exceeded. | |
| | | Requests that policy be revised to not preclude a possible right-in / right-out access to the Neighbourhood Centre from Bowmanville Avenue. | Revised to include “Where feasible, right-in/right-out access is permitted.” |
| | | Requests that policy encouraging sidewalks on both sides of Local Roads be revised to apply only to “main” Local Roads. | This section will remain as written (without ‘main’). It does have the caveat ‘encouraged.’ |
| | | Requests adding the follow policy: “On-street parking will be provided on Longworth Avenue in the Village Corridor designation.” | Policy added as it supports the overall vision of the Secondary Plan. |
| | | Requests that privately-owned publicly accessible spaces (POPS) be considered for partial parkland dedication credit | Parkland dedication is about conveying lands to the Municipality and POPS are privately owned, not conveyed to the Municipality. Thus POPS cannot be counted toward parkland dedication. |
| | | Requests that policy requiring a minimum of 80% of the Low Density be single or semi-detached dwelling units be revised to say ‘approximately’ 80%. | This section will remain as written (without ‘approximately’). 80% is the minimum. |
| | | States that the BNLG does not | Maximum densities are not included in |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | support the introduction of a maximum net density in any land use designation. But, if maximums are introduced, they have to be large enough to permit the most dense built form permitted on a net site basis in that land use designation. | the Secondary Plan. A number of policies and other mechanisms (such as zoning and site plan control) are in place to help ensure sites are not overbuilt. |
| | | Due to new policy prohibiting private lanes in Low Density, requests that two specific sites have their designation changed from Low Density to Medium Density Residential. | Agreed. Schedule A has been revised to designate these two areas as Medium Density Residential. |
| | | Requests that back-to-back townhouses be a permitted use in Medium Density Residential, Medium Density Local Corridor, and Village Corridor | Agreed. Back-to-back townhouses are permitted in these designations, and are now addressed in the Design Guidelines. |
| | | Suggests that policy encouraging townhouses be located in proximity to open spaces and commercial uses is better suited for Low Density rather than Medium Density Residential. | Agreed. This policy moved to the Low Density section. |
| | | States it is not reasonable to expect that every site | Agree that not all sites will have a mixed-use building. Policy has been |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | contain a mixed use building. Suggests policy be rewritten to say "A mixture of uses is required within each quadrant of the designation that fronts onto Longworth Avenue or Clarington Boulevard". | revised, but does not include the suggested 'quadrant' breakdown. |
| | | Requests removing policy that requires all buildings in the Village Corridor within 50 metres of the Prominent Intersection be 4 storeys and only 4 storeys. | Agreed. Buildings may be between 3-4 storeys. Prominent Intersection policies are in place to ensure good design at the intersection. |
| | | Requests adding to the permitted uses in the Neighbourhood Centre "small free standing commercial buildings." | Permissions not added. The Grocery store/supermarket will remain as the only permitted stand-alone commercial use in the neighbourhood Centre. Other commercial uses are permitted in mixed-use buildings. |
| | | Requests adding the following policy for the Neighbourhood Centre: "A grocery store/supermarket with a 2 storey profile is permitted without having a functional second floor." | As noted above, the Official Plan is clear that commercial buildings must be at least 2 storeys in the Local Corridor. The upper floor or floors of the grocery store/supermarket may contain ancillary uses. |
| | | Requests adding policy that states | Policy not added. Section 3.4.8 of the |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | "Stormwater Management Ponds are permitted in the VPZ portion of the Environmental Protection designation." | Official Plan prohibits new ones in EP (VPZ is part of EP). Previously approved SWM facilities in EP/VPZ may continue, however |
| | | Notes inconsistent terminology for stormwater plans and reports. | Revised. Where appropriate, reference to "study" so an older report doesn't override a future study. |
| | | Suggests policy regarding conveyance of lands for stormwater does not provide any real guidance and may actually create confusion. | Policy revised to state: "Storm drainage for the secondary plan lands will be conveyed to the Bowmanville Creek and the Brookhill Tributary in accordance with the provisions of the Functional Servicing Report." |
| | | States that the Design Guidelines need to be revised to reflect revised policies in Secondary Plan. | Agreed. Revised to match Secondary Plan policy. |
| | | Requests that the cost sharing policy that is being revised for South West Courtice Secondary Plan be used in the Brookhill Secondary Plan. | When the revised cost sharing policy is available, it will replace the current cost sharing policy at section 13.1.7 prior to Regional approval of the Brookhill Secondary Plan |
| | | Suggests the requirement that back-to-back townhouses in the Medium Density Local Corridor be located next to lower density is not an appropriate development | Agreed. Policy altered to reference general development transition policies. |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | transition. | |
| S009 April 20, 2021 | Mark Jacobs, The Biglieri Group, retained by Delpark Homes, owners of 2600 & 2798 Green Road and the southeast corner of Bowmanville Avenue and Longworth Avenue. | The following comments are based on an April 2021 draft of the Secondary Plan made available to the Landowners Group. | |
| | | Requests the grocery store/supermarket in the Neighbourhood Centre only have a façade of 2 storeys as well as changes to phrasing of density requirements in Neighbourhood Centre. | <p>The section is not revised.</p> <p>Section 10.3.5 of the Official Plan states “All new Commercial Development within Urban and Village Centres, Regional and Local Corridors and Waterfront Places shall be a minimum height of two storeys.” This was approved by LPAT.</p> <p>Development in the Neighbourhood Centre will have a minimum net density of 40 units per net hectare.</p> |
| | | Requests specific development transition polices be added to the Medium Density Residential section | Policies not added to Medium Density Residential section as development transition are contained in their own section. |

| Submission Number Date | Name, group (if applicable) | Summary of Comments | Response |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | In summary, a series of comments about consistency between Secondary Plan policies and the relevant sections within the Design Guidelines. | The Design Guidelines have been revised and are consistent with the Secondary Plan policies. |