

Agency Comment Summary Table

Agency	Submission Details	Response
<p>Hydro One Networks Inc.</p>	<p>Confirming receipt of COPA 2020-0004 (Brookhill Secondary Plan Update) dated Sept 8, 2020. Reviewed the documents concerning the noted Plan and have no comments or concerns at this time. Our preliminary review considers issues affecting Hydro One's 'High Voltage Facilities and Corridor Lands' only.</p> <p>For proposals affecting 'Low Voltage Distribution Facilities' please consult your local area Distribution Supplier.</p> <p>In our preliminary assessment, we confirm there are no existing Hydro One Transmission assets in the subject area. Please be advised that this is only a preliminary assessment based on current information.</p> <p>If plans for the undertaking change or the study area expands beyond that shown, please contact Hydro One to assess impacts of existing or future planned electricity infrastructure.</p> <p>Be advised that any changes to lot grading and/or drainage within proximity to Hydro One transmission corridor lands must be controlled and directed away from the transmission corridor.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Agency	Submission Details	Response
Conseil Scolaire Viamonde	The Conseil scolaire Viamonde has no comments regarding the Draft Secondary Plan for the Brookhill Secondary Plan. However, we would appreciate if you could keep us updated on the progress.	Acknowledged.
Metrolinx	No comments on behalf of Metrolinx at this time on the Draft Brookhill Secondary Plan or Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines.	Acknowledged.
Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries	Requests copy of the Draft Brookhill Secondary Plan - PIC slides, shown on September 28.	Acknowledged.
Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries	On May 28th MHSTCI provided initial comments on the above referenced project. For our records please provide us with a status update on all technical cultural heritage studies being undertaken for the Brookhill Secondary Plan project.	Acknowledged. Clarifications on project sent.
Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries	Thank you for the clarification. Please Keep MHSTCI informed of any technical cultural heritage studies undertaken for subsequent MCEAs within the planning area.	Acknowledged.
Alderville First Nation	Hasn't had a chance to go to the website yet to have a look at the studies completed for this project. Trusts the archaeological studies have been done and are in order. Please keep us posted as this project moves forward.	Archeological studies are required as part of development applications within in the Secondary Plan area.

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

Section	Comment	Response
1.1.e	The words "...the policies of..." are repeated	Section removed.
Principle 4	2nd objective. For consistency with other terminology in the Official Plan and throughout the secondary plan, consider using the term "Vegetation Protection Zone" as opposed to "appropriate separation distances".	Agree. Revised.
Principle 4	3rd objective. Is the intent to promote linkages between all of the listed features, for example, between heritage buildings and significant vegetation? Perhaps this could be separated into different objectives, or simply including at the end of the objective "...where appropriate."	That is not the intention. Substantial revisions to Section 1 have focused the Principles and removed this policy statement.
4.1. i) iii.	Suggest including <i>italicized text</i> "... stormwater runoff management <i>strategies for promoting groundwater infiltration and water quality treatment.</i>	Revised to include provided text. Now at 4.5.1 c.
4.1. i) iv	Suggest revise wording to "Low Impact Development Measures", as opposed to "Design Standards".	Revised to state "LID measures." Now at 4.5.1 d.
4.1.r)	It is recommended that this objective specify that the net loss of trees is approved through the policies of this plan and the Official Plan and do not form part of the Natural Heritage System. Additional study of the feature and function may be required in addition to the Tree Preservation Plan.	Section removed.
4.2.e)	Suggest deleting "...as the community evolves."	Revised. Now at 11.8.5
4.2.h)	CLOCA discourages off trail uses within the Natural Heritage System. This objective appears to encourage off trail uses.	Revised policy, now at 9.10.7

Section	Comment	Response
5.2.e)iii	Suggest including natural heritage features <i>and vegetation protection zones</i>	Section removed.
8.1.8.d & e)	<p>The trail network should be directed to areas outside of the Natural Heritage System (NHS) or limited to the outer edge of the vegetation protection zone.</p> <p>Trail connections bisecting the NHS should be limited in order to promote the preservation and protection to the ecological integrity and function of the features comprising the NHS.</p> <p>New pedestrian crossings of tributaries should be limited to ensure protection of the ecological integrity of the tributary and riparian corridor. Where feasible, road crossings over creeks should be utilized for trails crossings. Where creek crossings are unavoidable, existing crossing locations can be considered however, the new crossing should not use existing non-permitted culverts. Creek crossings will need to be designed to promote fish passage, passage of flows as well as minimize impacts to the riparian area. The location of pedestrian trails should be designed to avoid interfering with the meanderbelt of the creeks.</p>	New sections devoted to trails (9.10.6 to 9.10.14) incorporate comments.
8.1.8	In addition to the potential EIS requirements, studies to determine the hazard lands associated with the creek in the vicinity of the trail and crossing may be required in order to determine the most appropriate and suitable location for the trail and crossing.	The list of possible required studies is in the parent Official Plan.
9.1.1a) v.	CLOCA supports the Neighborhood Parks being connected to the NHS. However, the park proper must be located beyond the feature and the associated VPZ.	<p>Added suggested text. Now at 10.3.1 e.</p> <p>The NP will be located outside of the NHS.</p>
10.7.b)	Please clarify if the EPA includes the minimum vegetation protection zones (VPZ).	Yes, and to confirm, added "...and their associated VPZ's..." Now at 10.31 e.

Section	Comment	Response
10.7	It is recommended that a policy be included referencing the minimum vegetation protection zones as required by the Clarington OP.	Agreed. Added, now at 11.8.3
10.7.c)	The OP uses the term "Low intensity recreation" whereas the Secondary plan is using "passive recreation" Please clarify the difference/provide definition of passive recreation.	To ensure consistency with the OP, "low intensity recreation" will be used. Now at 11.8.5
10.7c)	CLOCA does not support stormwater management facilities to be located within the Environmental Protection Area, except for stormfall outlets in accordance with CLOCA Stormwater Management policies, and LID's as permitted in the OP policy 3.4.9.	This is not suggested and the term "stormwater management facilities" is not used. Previously approved SWM facilities in EP/VPZ may continue, however Section 3.4.8 of the Official Plan prohibits new ones in EP (VPZ is part of EP). Now at 12.2.1
10.7c)	Please revise to include "...uses related to <i>conservation, flood or erosion control projects</i> .."	Revised. Now at 11.8.2
10.7d)	This policy needs to be clarified. A large section of the Brookhill Tributary that was historically tile drained, was naturalized several years ago as part of a development application that has since been built out. Much of the Brookhill Tributary remains in a natural state. CLOCA's preference is to maintain the tributary in an undisturbed manner. However, there is a section at the lower end of the tributary in proximity to the confluence with the Bowmanville Creek, referred to as the "nick point" that may require investigation for erosion control works. If this is what this policy is referring to, then it should be clarified.	Policy was from the previous Secondary Plan. The policy has been re-written to state the further naturalization of the Tributary may be required where supported by an agency approved EIS. New policy added at 11.8.7 relating to potential erosion concerns in the Brookhill tributary.
10.7.e)	In accordance with the Clarington Official Plan, an Environmental Impact Study is required for any development proposed with 120metres of a natural heritage feature,	Revised. Now at 11.8.8

Section	Comment	Response
	hydrologically sensitive feature, stable top of bank or meanderbelt.	
10.7.e)	An EIS is not necessarily required for development proposed on the Lake Iroquois Beach. A Hydrological Evaluation or other study such as a water balance may be required for development proposed on the Lake Iroquois Beach.	Deleted reference to Lake Iroquois Beach. Now at 11.8.8
10.8a)	It may be beneficial to include the underlying designation as well as the Environmental Overlay on the same figure.	Agree. Schedules A & B and Appendix C are now a single Schedule.
10.8b)	Please include "...delineation of these features <i>and areas...</i> ", to better reflect OP policy 3.4.3	Revised. Now at 11.9.2
10.8.b)	The EIS will determine the areas to be preserved and protected.	Acknowledged. Now at 11.9.2
10.8.c)	Recommend including a policy that elaborates on policy c. The new policy should acknowledge the possibility that following the EIS, it may be determined that only a portion of the lands within the Environmental overlay may be available for development.	Revised. Now at 11.9.3
11.2.e)	Please include "...flow moderation, <i>erosion control</i> and water quality."	Revised. Now at 12.2.5
11.2.i)	Please include Revised (as this would also include ensuring that flows are directed to appropriate areas to ensure changes to vegetation community types are not impacted).	Revised. Now at 12.2.7 Agreed. Reference to other NHS features such as wetlands and watercourses will be included.
12.3.1.a)	Please also include Hydrological Study, Water Balance, Geotechnical (Slope Stability) Study &/or Creek Erosion Assessment to determine hazard lands.	The list of possible required studies is in the parent Official Plan.

Section	Comment	Response
Schedule A	The future alignment of the Clarington Blvd (north) extension (currently Nash Road) will require further study and review to ensure minimal environmental impacts to features and functions as well as ensure that the road is constructed beyond the hazard lands associated with the Bowmanville Creek valley.	Acknowledged
Schedule A	In general, future road alignments will require further study and review to ensure minimal environmental impacts to features and functions as well as ensure no impacts to flood levels. Examples include Nash Road and Green Road future upgrades	Acknowledged
Schedule B	The trail network should be minimized within the Environmental Protection Areas. Trails should be directed outside of the Natural Heritage System (NHS) or limited to the outer edge of the vegetation protection zone.	Trail system revised, now shown on Schedule A. The location and alignment of the trails are conceptual. The precise alignment of trails will be confirmed through the development approvals process.
Schedule B	Connections bisecting the NHS should be limited in order to promote the preservation and protection to the ecological integrity and function of the features comprising the NHS.	Acknowledged
Schedule B	Many of the trails are shown bisecting Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW). Trails should avoid PSW's.	Acknowledged
Schedule B	New pedestrian crossings of tributaries should be limited to ensure protection of the ecological integrity of the tributary and riparian corridor.	Acknowledged
Schedule B	Where feasible, road crossings should be utilized as trails crossings.	Acknowledged

Section	Comment	Response
Schedule B	Where crossings are unavoidable, existing crossing locations can be considered however, the new crossing should not use existing non-permitted culverts. Crossings will need to be designed to promote fish passage and flows as well as minimize impacts to the riparian area.	Acknowledged
Schedule B	The location of pedestrian trails should be designed to avoid interfering with the meanderbelt of the creeks.	Acknowledged
Appendix C	The title requires editing	Acknowledged
Appendix C	Is it possible that Appendix C is redundant? It appears that the difference between Appendix C and Schedule B is the inclusion of the Environmental Constraints Overlay and associated note shown on Appendix C. Could the overlay be included on Schedule B?	Agree. Schedules A & B and Appendix C are now a single Schedule A.

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

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
General Comments Pertaining to all Secondary Plans in Process: <i>Consistency between Plans</i>	To assist with consistency, efficiency and to reduce review times, it is suggested that the Municipality create and utilize a standard Secondary Plan template and highlight policies that are common to each area. This will enable each Plan to be laid out similarly, allowing staff, agencies and the public to navigate each Secondary Plan, and allowing the reader to better identify elements that are common to each Plan, and those that are unique to each. Similarly, it is suggested that the municipality consider identifying common urban design guidelines and principles	Acknowledged. The Secondary Plan and SUDGs are restructured.

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>across secondary plan areas, by land use type, and across arterial, collector, or local road classifications. This again will help reduce review times, and the potential for duplication while highlighting unique elements proposed for each community.</p>	
<p>General Comments Pertaining to all Secondary Plans in Process: <i>Regional Servicing</i></p>	<p>The Region’s services are planned sequentially, using approved growth forecasts, which in turn become the basis to inform capital priorities for the Region.</p> <p>It is critical that the growth forecasts in the Region’s Development Charges (DC) Background Study be used, with the knowledge that the timing of infrastructure is dependent on achieving the growth forecasts included in the DC study. The Region’s Budgets and Forecasts supersede the forecasts within the DC Study as they reflect, among other things, the actual growth to-date rather than the forecasted growth. Therefore, it is necessary to refer to the Region’s Budgets and Forecasts when reviewing current project status, rather than strictly relying on the estimated timeframes in the DC Study alone.</p> <p>Further, it is important to note that only the current year’s budget is approved in the Region’s Budgets and Forecast documents. The forecasts are estimates which are reviewed annually as demands and resources are required, and as such do not form firm commitments.</p>	<p>The Municipality and the Region have accepted a 2% growth rate.</p>
<p>Conformity to the Regional Official Plan</p>	<p>The Regional Official Plan (ROP) designates areas within the BSP study area as “Living Areas” and “Major Open Space Areas”. Living Areas are predominantly intended to be used for housing purposes and shall be developed in a compact form through higher densities and by intensifying and redeveloping existing areas, particularly along “Arterial Roads” (see Policy 8B.2). “Major Open Space Areas” in the BSP predominantly</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>include natural heritage and hydrological features associated with Bowmanville Creek.</p> <p>As noted earlier, the BSP provides various land use designations that will accommodate low and medium density residential; mixed-use development; parks and open space; environmental protection area; stormwater management ponds; and institutional uses. These land uses are intended to guide growth and development within the community, while recognizing the existing community within surrounding neighbourhoods and are consistent with the direction of the ROP.</p>	
<p>Conformity to the Regional Official Plan:</p> <p><i>Key Natural Heritage and Hydrologic Features</i></p>	<p>Schedule A – Open Space and Parks, identifies a large area for environmental protection surrounding the Bowmanville Creek valleylands.</p> <p>Appendix C – Potential Environmental Features of the BSP also identifies areas that have environmental constraints.</p> <p>This area is also regulated by the Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority (CLOCA). Accordingly, the Region and CLOCA must be satisfied with the approximate area designated “Environmental Protection” on Schedule A and “Environmental Constraints” on Appendix C to ensure that the key natural heritage and hydrologic features are protected and will not be adversely impacted by the proposed trail system that will connect the Living Areas within the BSP to the valleylands.</p> <p>It is also important to note that further refinements to the location of the “Environmental Protection” designation and “Environmental Constraints” overlays may occur through future plans of subdivision and/or zoning by-law amendment processes.</p>	<p>The NHS for the Brookhill SP is consistent with the previous version of the SP. The proposed trail system is "conceptual" and there has been no impact assessment. Future environmental studies are required to identify constraints and opportunities for a trail system within the Brookhill Neighborhood.</p> <p>The comment requiring that "further refinements to the location of the ‘Environmental Protection designation and ‘Environmental Constraints’ overlays may occur through future plans of subdivision and/or zoning by-law amendment processes" is addressed at 11.9.2.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
<p>Conformity to the Regional Official Plan:</p> <p><i>Bowmanville Avenue – Type A Arterial Road</i></p>	<p>Schedule 'C' – Map 'C3' to the ROP identifies Bowmanville Avenue as a Type 'A' Arterial Road. Policy 11.3.3 of the ROP specifies that Type A Arterial Roads shall be designed in accordance with Schedule 'E' -Table 'E7' Arterial Road Criteria and be subject to site-specific conditions and accepted planning, urban design and traffic engineering principles.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>Conformity to the Regional Official Plan:</p> <p><i>Secondary Plan Considerations</i></p>	<p>Policy 7.3.14 of the ROP requires municipalities to consider matters related to the following, when preparing a secondary plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sequential and orderly development; • an assessment of municipal services and facilities required to support the development of the area; • transportation needs for all modes; • key natural heritage features or hydrologic features (KNHHF) and their connections within the secondary plan area; • the provision of a range and mix of (affordable) housing; and • the provision of a diverse and compatible mix of land uses to support vibrant neighbourhoods. <p>The BSP and its related background studies have addressed the above noted matters in accordance with Policy 7.3.14 of the ROP. Further comments related to the proposed density requirements will be provided once further information is provided for our review and comment.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
<p>Provincial Policy:</p>	<p>The Planning Rationale Report and draft secondary plan were prepared prior to the recent release of updated provincial legislation, plans and policies. The Planning Rationale and</p>	<p>Agree, revised.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>Secondary Plan should be revised to reflect these recent changes to A Place to Grow – Office Consolidation (2020) (Growth Plan), the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020 (PPS) and Planning Act related to Bill 108, More Homes, More Choices Act.</p>	
<p>Provincial Policy: <i>Provincial Policy Statement</i></p>	<p>The PPS provides a comprehensive vision for growth and development for the province, and supports opportunities to provide a range of housing while encouraging growth within settlement areas, including intensification and redevelopment. The PPS also supports and promotes healthy and active communities by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity; • planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and, where practical, water-based resources; • providing opportunities for public access to shorelines; and • recognizing provincial parks, conservation reserves, and other protected areas, and minimizing negative impacts on these areas. <p>The Planning Rationale states that the Regional Official Plan requires a minimum of 10-year supply of residential growth. Recent changes to the PPS now require a 15-year supply, and the Region’s Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) will be implementing this change to conform with provincial policy.</p> <p>The BSP and its supporting documents will need to clarify that the Brookhill Neighbourhood will support and encourage</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>residential and non-residential economic growth at appropriate densities. The draft BSP supports infrastructure planning, active transportation, publicly accessible built and natural settings and minimizes the impact on environmentally sensitive features, consistent with the direction of the PPS.</p>	
<p>Provincial Policy: <i>A Place to Grow for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan)</i></p>	<p>The Growth Plan requires all new development taking place in designated greenfield areas to be planned and zoned to support the achievement of complete communities, support active transportation and encourage the integration and sustained viability of transit services.</p> <p>The Growth Plan density target for greenfield areas within the existing urban boundary is 50 residents and jobs per net hectare. 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.</p> <p>The Region also requests a copy of the breakdown of allocation of density targets for our review and future comment.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Minimum density targets are met. Breakdown of density allocation will be provided.</p>
<p>Specific Comments</p>	<p>The Region is generally supportive of the Draft Brookhill Neighbourhood Secondary Plan. Specific comments are provided in Attachment 1 ("Specific Comments on the Draft Brookhill Neighbourhood Secondary Plan") to this letter.</p> <p>The Draft Brookhill Neighbourhood Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines provide guidance on how to implement the Secondary Plan policies to achieve high-quality urban design and sustainability. The Region is generally supportive of the Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines. Our detailed comments suggested comments are intended to provide context or request</p>	<p>Revision of Secondary Plan policies and Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines to ensure consistency between the two documents.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>clarification. It is important to note that where certain guidelines are considered to be critical, they should be reflected through policy within the Secondary Plan to ensure they are implemented as intended. Specific comments on the Guidelines are provided in Attachment 2 ("Specific Comments on Appendix B – Draft Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines") to this letter.</p>	
<p>Delegated Provincial Plan Review Responsibilities</p>	<p>The BSP should ensure that all future development applications have regards for the Region’s delegated Provincial Plan review responsibilities. The Municipality should incorporate policies within the BSP that ensures proponents are made aware of the Region’s review responsibilities.</p> <p>As per Schedule E – Table ‘E8’ of the ROP’s Complete Application Requirements, conditions affecting new development proposals may include, but are not limited to the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Site Assessments and/or Records of Site Conditions; • Archaeological Assessments; • Environmental Impact Studies/Natural Heritage Evaluation; • Land Use Compatibility Studies; and • Noise and/or Vibration Studies <p>These requirements must be completed prior to the finalization of a planning application and/or as a condition of approval, where applicable.</p>	<p>Policy 13.2 outlines Complete Application Requirements.</p> <p>13.2.2 and 13.4.7 notes Region’s role.</p>
<p>Regional Finance, Servicing, Transportation</p>	<p>The following are specific comments from each internal Regional agency for review and consideration by the Municipality of Clarington.</p> <p>Specific financial comments have been included in Attachment</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact Analysis completed by Municipal Staff.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
Planning, Durham Regional Transit, and Regional Health: <i>Finance</i>	1 as generally summarized below: A fiscal impact analysis should be completed as part of the secondary plan to compare the estimated infrastructure servicing costs with the potential revenue (property taxes, user rates and development charges) resulting from the proposed development of these lands. All analysis of municipal operating and capital cost impacts should differentiate between Regional and local municipal costs.	
Regional Finance, Servicing, Transportation Planning, Durham Regional Transit, and Regional Health: <i>Servicing</i>	<p>The following are specific comments from each internal Regional agency for review and consideration by the Municipality of Clarington.</p> <p>Specific comments servicing and transportation planning have been included in Attachment 3 and 4 and the following comments below.</p> <p>The Region is concerned that the BSP is progressing in advance of detailed transportation work required to support the proposed road network. The Region also noted inconsistencies between the draft Secondary Plan and the Transportation Existing Conditions Report, prepared Burnside, dated September 2019 and Transportation Review Memo, prepared by Burnside, dated August 2020.</p>	<p>Both the Secondary Plan (the Plan) and the Transportation Study (the TS) have been updated to ensure there are no inconsistencies.</p> <p>The Region has since stated, via email, that this revised traffic analysis may be submitted after Council adoption of the Secondary Plan, but is required before Regional approval.</p>
Regional Finance, Servicing, Transportation Planning, Durham	1) Schedule A – Land Use and Transportation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designation of Longworth Avenue, west of Green Road, should be updated to a Type B Arterial, pending the resolution of Deferral 2 by the Region to the Clarington OP. • The designation of Nash Road ends at Clarington Boulevard, but the long-term extension to Bowmanville Avenue designated in the ROP and Clarington OP is not shown. 	<p>Longworth Avenue road designations updated.</p> <p>Nash Road extension is not part of the Secondary Plan, will not affect policies or</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
<p>Regional Transit, and Regional Health:</p> <p><i>Servicing</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new east-west street is identified in the supporting Brookhill Secondary Plan – Preferred Land Use Plan Transportation Review (August 2020), from the Clarrington Boulevard extension to Bowmanville Avenue and north of Longworth Avenue. This new street would appear to use a portion of the existing Nash Road alignment west of Bowmanville Avenue. If this road is being planned as a Collector as part of the secondary plan, it should be added to the schedule as such. • The North West quadrant of the proposed secondary plan south of Nash Road, north Longworth Avenue and east of Green Road contains an isolated development that is in proximity to natural heritage features. Isolated developments are not conducive to public transit as it generates longer walking distances to scheduled service routes. 	<p>land use designations, and is thus not shown on the Schedule.</p> <p>East-west street is a Local Road and not a Collector Road</p> <p>Acknowledge comment on isolated parcels.</p>
<p>Regional Finance, Servicing, Transportation Planning, Durham Regional Transit, and Regional Health:</p> <p><i>Servicing</i></p>	<p>2) Appendix A – Road Standards and Profiles, Brookhill Secondary Plan</p> <p>i) For the Type A Arterial (Regional Road 57):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ROW width column should be changed to 36 m. • Under the Bicycle Lanes column, the wording should add the term “multi-use” before path. • Under the Sidewalk column, the sidewalk should be listed as “1 Side”, as the 3.0 m multi-use path in boulevard is on the other side of the road. <p>ii) For the Type B Arterial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the Bicycle Lanes column, the term “path” should be removed, as a cycle track is being proposed as per the cross-sections in Appendix B – Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines. • Under Pavement Width, the need for four (4) continuous lanes works for Longworth Avenue, but based on our comments on the Appendix B – Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines below, 	<p>Appendix A – Road Standards and Profiles has been omitted from the Secondary Plan. Road classifications and standards will adhere to Appendix C of the Official Plan.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>there should be a 2/3 lane option noted for Green Road and Nash Road.</p> <p>iii) For the first Collector classification, under Bicycle Lanes, it states that the 1.5 m lanes are in the boulevard, whereas the cross-section in Appendix B – Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines shows on-road bicycle lanes. Based on Ontario Traffic Manual (Book 18) guideline for cycling facilities, on-road bike lanes on Collector roads sufficiently separate cyclists from the general purpose lane, based on speeds and volumes experienced for most Collector roads, and the need for separated cycle tracks in the boulevard is not necessary.</p>	
<p>Regional Finance, Servicing, Transportation Planning, Durham Regional Transit, and Regional Health: <i>Durham Regional Transit (DRT)</i></p>	<p>Durham Region Transit supports the secondary plan as it is consistent with transit supportive land use practices through the focus of higher density residential development along DRT's high frequency network. The following comments should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Durham Region Transit (DRT) and GO Transit routes have been since updated as per section 3.2 within the Planning Rationale Report. Route 501 (South Bowmanville) and Route 506 (Clarington Community Route); and the GO Bus Route 90 will no longer operate as part of the new network effective September 28, 2020. As part of the new network, Route 902 (King) will service the downtown Bowmanville area between Oshawa Station and Simpson Avenue. • DRT will review bus services as development occurs to support transit availability to residents. Future service will be located along arterial and collector roads as per Durham Region Transits' Five-Year Transit Strategy. 	<p>Acknowledged. The Secondary Plan will note that future transit routes will be located along arterial and collector roads.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
<p>Regional Finance, Servicing, Transportation Planning, Durham Regional Transit, and Regional Health:</p> <p><i>Regional Health</i></p>	<p>The overall health and wellbeing of the community are the main concern. To ensure that a community is healthy and sustainable, there are many different elements that must be achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following comments should be considered: All new construction to be conducted with good dust suppression plans prior to commencement of construction and during the construction phase to minimize impact to existing communities, utilizing Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change (MOEFCC) best practice document “Best Practices for the Reduction of Air Emissions From Construction and Demolition Activities”. (http://www.bv.transports.gouv.qc.ca/mono/1173259.pdf) • The community should be designed with water and landscaping features that are properly designed and graded to prevent pooling of water that may contribute to breeding grounds for vectors such as mosquitos. • It is recommended that all new rental units or housing used for priority populations have central air conditioning in the individual units and a cooling room in any multi-dwelling unit. • All community facilities such as community centres and schools have central air conditioning to minimize the impacts of extreme heat. 	<p>Agree, but some comments may be too detailed for inclusion in a secondary plan document. Will incorporate where appropriate.</p>
<p>Summary</p>	<p>The Region is generally supportive of the Draft Brookhill Neighbourhood Secondary Plan and Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines. However, there are a number of comments and concerns with the Secondary Plan progressing in advance of detailed transportation work required to support the proposed</p>	<p>The Region has since stated, via email, that this revised traffic analysis may be submitted after Council adoption of the Secondary Plan, but is required before Regional approval</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>road network. We recommend that detailed technical analysis be undertaken and reviewed before the Secondary Plan is endorsed by Council.</p> <p>The proposed Brookhill Secondary Plan update represents a major policy amendment and is of Regional Interest. Accordingly, the proposed amendment is not exempt from Regional approval. Please advise our Commissioner of Planning and Economic Development of your Council's decision. If your Council adopts the proposed Amendment, please forward a record to this Department within 15 days of the date of adoption. The record should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted Amendment (1 certified copy, 4 duplicates & 5 working copies) • Region's submission form (1 copy) • Letter requesting the Region's approval • Adopting by-law (2 certified copies) • Minutes of all public meetings • All written submissions and comments (originals or copies), showing the dates received • All planning reports considered by Council • Affidavit(s) of municipal employee(s) certifying that Notice of Public Meeting was given, a public meeting was held, and Notice of Adoption was given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act; and a • Mailing list of persons who spoke at the public meeting(s) <p>We would be pleased to discuss our comments on the suggested changes in this letter.</p>	
1.1 c)	The text should not refer to the previous Amendment No. 126 as a new Amendment to the Clarington Official Plan is required.	Section removed. However, original Brookhill Secondary Plan was Amendment

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
		No. 60 (2008). This update is, in fact, Amendment No. 126.
1.1 f)	The text should refer to A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.	Section removed.
1.3 c) and e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.3 c) states that it is fundamental for the plan to achieve a minimum net density of 50 residents and/or jobs per hectare. However, section 1.3(e) states that the plan will provide approximately 6,400 to 6,600 people and 280 jobs with a gross density of 41 residents and jobs per hectare. • It is unclear whether a gross density of 41 residents and jobs per hectare is a direct equivalent to a net density of 50 residents and jobs per hectare as defined by the Growth Plan. Further information is required to determine whether the provincial density requirement will be met. 	Population, job, and units updated. A density assumption chart has been provided that illustrates the gross and net density for Brookhill. FBMP area to not be included.
Section 3.0 – Community Structure, Policy 4 (Residential Neighbourhoods)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the 1st paragraph, it is noted that the residential neighbourhoods be planned and designed to be within “an approximate 5-minute walk (400 metres) of local transit” and a 10-minute walk (800 metres) of “higher order transit and services.” The Region generally supports this goal. However, none of the secondary plan area is currently within a 5-minute walk of transit services, as DRT has replaced local bus routes serving the area with an Urban On-Demand service. However, the policy concept is still valid as the Urban On-Demand service uses a series of pick-up locations that should fulfill these walk distances. As the community develops, local routes could be reintroduced serving the secondary plan area. • The higher order transit part of the policy should be revised to read “within a 10-20-minute walk (800-1,600 metres) of higher order transit and services.” Please note, a 10-minute walk to the 	<p>Now at 3.4.1: Residential revised to include "...an approximate 5 minute walk (400 metres) of <i>existing and future local transit services</i>". Higher order transit has been revised to read "...within a 10 to 20 minute walk (800 to 1,600 metres)..."</p> <p>This leaves the option for potential future local transit to be delivered.</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<p>higher order transit bus stops is not possible for most of the secondary plan area, as well as the services within the Bowmanville West Town Centre. The nearby higher order transit/transit priority network is located along Regional Highway 2 and at the planned Bowmanville GO Station, as identified in the Regional Official Plan (Schedule 'C', Map 'C3') and Durham Transportation Master Plan (Maps 1A and 1B).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should also be clarified whether both local and higher order transit will be provided or whether the potential exists that, based on operational and financial criteria, only higher order transit will exist. • It is further recommended that a high level estimate of service level requirements and associated capital and operating costs be assessed as part of the review of the fiscal impact study. 	
Section 5.0 – Creating Vibrant Urban Places, Policy 5.3.1 v)	It should be clarified that traffic calming measures can be implemented on Collector and Local roads. In other words, the policy should not apply to Bowmanville Avenue, Green Road, Nash Road or Longworth Avenue (except for on-street parking potentially between Green Road and Bowmanville Avenue).	Policy revised to include "...on Collector and Local Roads... Now at 9.9.2 a
Section 6.0 - Encouragin g Housing Diversity Policy 6.1 h)	It should be clarified where noise attenuation fencing and reverse lot frontage conditions will be discouraged, including along Arterial Roads.	<p>Added to Policy "Noise attenuation fencing will be discouraged <i>along Arterial Roads.</i>" Now at 7.2.6</p> <p>Secondary Plan already includes policies to discourage back lotting or reverse lot frontage. See 6.7.13</p>
Section 6.0 -	Recent changes to the Planning Act (amended through Bill 108) allow an additional residential unit to be permitted in any single	New policy in conformity with Bill 108 at 7.2.21

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
Encouraging Housing Diversity Policy 6.1 Garden Suites	detached house, semi-detached house, or row house and in an ancillary building. This would allow for a maximum of two additional residential units per property, for a total of three units on a property. This proposed policy be revised accordingly.	
Section 6.2 d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.2(d) states that “the Municipality will explore other potential incentives under a Community Improvement Plan or other legislated tool, such as reduced or deferred development charges, reduced application fees, grants and loans, to encourage the development of affordable housing units and purpose-built rental housing. The Municipality will also encourage Durham Region to consider financial incentives for these types of development.” • It should be noted that any financial incentives for this type of development are subject to the approval of Regional Council and are currently under consideration through the Regional review of a Regional Community Improvement Plan. 	Policy revised to add - "Financial incentives are subject to the approval of Regional Council." Now at 7.2.12
Section 8.0 – Mobility and Streets, Policy 8.1.1 a)	Longworth Avenue, west of Green Road, is part of Deferral 2 to the Clarington Official Plan (OP) but is currently designated as a Type B Arterial in the ROP. This deferral will soon be resolved through the Region’s further approval of the Clarington OP. As such, the secondary plan should update this policy.	Policy revised to read "Green Road, Nash Road, and Longworth Avenue west of Green Road are identified as Type B Arterial Roads and Longworth Avenue, east of Green Road is a Type C Arterial Road." Now at 9.3.1
Section 8.0 – Mobility and Streets,	• This policy needs to be revised, as there are no bike lanes proposed on Bowmanville Avenue through the Region’s Class EA study for Bowmanville Avenue (Baseline Road to Nash Road), completed in 2017. This policy is also inconsistent with the description used in Schedule A – Land Use and	Policy revised to read "It shall have a <i>boulevard Multi-Use Path (MUP) on the west side (for use by pedestrians and cyclists) and a sidewalk on the east side.</i> " Now at 9.3.3

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
Policy 8.1.1 c)	<p>Transportation, and the cross-section shown in Appendix B – Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines. A boulevard Multi-Use Path (MUP) is planned on the west side (for use by pedestrians and cyclists), and a sidewalk is planned on the east side of Bowmanville Avenue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further, it should be clarified whether any signalized intersections will be required on Regional roads and in accordance with Regional cost sharing policy for traffic signalization. It should also be clarified if there will be any direct cost to the Region for this service. 	<p>The locations of signalized intersections are not determined at the time of a Secondary Plan.</p>
Section 8.0 – Mobility and Streets, Policy 8.1.1 g)	<p>The description of the alignment for Longworth Avenue should be clarified. The alignment of Longworth Avenue shown in the secondary plan is approximate, and the section from the existing Bowmanville Creek bridge westerly to Green Road (including the shift in alignment to the south from the existing bridge to Bowmanville Avenue), will be determined through detailed design. The section from Green Road westerly to Holt Road is currently being determined through the Longworth Avenue Extension Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study.</p>	<p>Policy revised to read "The alignment of Longworth Avenue as shown on Schedule A is approximate and the section from the existing Bowmanville Creek bridge westerly to Green Road (including the shift in alignment to the south from the existing bridge to Bowmanville Avenue), will be determined through detailed design. The section from Green Road westerly to Holt Road is currently being determined through the Longworth Avenue Extension Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study." Now at 9.3.8</p>
Section 8.1.6(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3(4) refers to the Brookhill Neighbourhoods being within a 5 minute walk (400 meters) of local transit service and a 10 minute walk (800 meters) of higher order transit. Section 8.1.6(b) goes on to state that transit service will be implemented on a phased basis and based on acceptable operational and financial criteria. 	<p>8.1.6 b) removed. See response below regarding the removal and replacement of 8.1.6 a)</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted above, it should be clarified whether both local and higher order transit will be provided or whether the potential exists that, based on operational and financial criteria, only higher order transit will exist. • It is further recommended that a high level estimate of service level requirements and associated capital and operating costs be provided as part of the fiscal impact study. 	
Section 8.1.6 c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A provision for transit stops and incorporation of bus-bays, where appropriate, will be incorporated into road design requirements. An estimate of the magnitude and cost of this infrastructure should be included in the Regional servicing estimates. • Under the Region's current approach, developers do not fund or install transit stops as the Regional transit development charge provides the funding for the Region to construct this type of transit infrastructure. 	<p>Policy 8.1.6 revised. Now at 9.8.1: "Transit facilities should be integrated early and appropriately throughout the Brookhill Neighbourhood. Durham Region Transit shall be invited to all development pre-consultation meetings to advise on transit requirements."</p> <p>Now policy, at 9.8.2: "To facilitate the creation of a transit supportive urban structure, the following measures shall be reflected in development proposals, including the subdivision of land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Transit-supportive densities provided on lands within the Local Corridor in keeping with municipal density targets; b. Provision of a local road pattern and active transportation network that provides for direct pedestrian access to transit routes and stops; c. Transit stops located in close proximity to activity nodes and building entrances; and d. Provision for transit stops and

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
		incorporation of bus-bays where appropriate into road design requirements"
Pedestrian and Bicycle Path System f)	The trail system should also include connections to Institutional uses, such as schools, in addition to the Neighbourhood Centre, the road network and the existing trail system.	Policy revised to read "Accordingly, connections will be made to the road network, the Neighbourhood Centre, <i>institutional uses including schools, Neighbourhood Parks</i> , and the existing trail system." Now at 9.10.6
Pedestrian and Bicycle Path System k) v.	The active transportation network should include connections to all major destinations such as the Village Corridor, the Neighbourhood Centre, and Institutional uses including schools, in addition to neighbourhood parks and community gardens.	Policy revised to read "The active transportation network will connect to <i>all</i> major destinations, such as <i>the Village Corridor, the Neighbourhood Centre, Institutional uses including schools</i> , neighbourhood parks and community gardens, in order to provide convenient and safe access to facilitate travel by alternate modes of transportation;" now at 9.10.4
9.2.1 Schools – e) iii.	It is suggested that the medium density or higher type of residential uses be specified in policy in the event that a school site shall not be required by the School Board.	Schools now shown as a symbol, not a block, on top of Low Density Residential.
9.2.1 Schools – f) iii.	It is suggested the following wording be added "Parking and loading areas will be provided and access points designed in a manner that will promote active transportation and, minimize conflicts..."	Numerous policies under Section 10.6 promote walking and cycling to school. See also 9.10 for Active Transportation
9.2.2 Places of Worship b)	Appropriate alternative uses should be detailed in this policy such as medium or high-density residential uses if it is determined that a Place of Worship is deemed not to be needed in the community.	A Place of Worship site has not been determined and is not identified on Schedule A. Place of Worship section

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
		replaced with broader Community Facilities section.
10.2 Low Density Residential Designation b)	"Limited" street townhouse dwellings is subjective and requires clarification. Is the number proposed to be limited based on the overall Secondary Plan area, by each subdivision, by each street or some other measure?	Municipality has revised the definition for 'Low Density' to include townhouses. Policy at 11.3.6 that requires a minimum of 80% of the Low Density Residential be singles and semis, the remaining 20% (max) may be townhouses.
10.3 Medium Density Residential Designation d)-g)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a suggestion, professional office, and service commercial uses (i.e. travel agent, and hair salon) may be appropriate to be added to the list of allowable retail uses, as these types of uses provide a local service, and would help bring clientele to the area and support an active streetscape. • It is also recommended in policy 10.3 d) specify that such uses are only permitted in mixed use buildings and in strategic locations be qualified by stating they are only permitted on arterial roads and at intersections such as Longworth Avenue, Clarington Boulevard and Green Road. 	Suggestion conflicts with parent Official Plan policies for "Urban Residential." Mixed-use buildings not permitted. Only limited small-scale commercial uses permitted. See 11.4.2
10.4 High Density Residential Designation b)	<p>It is recommended that the types of uses permitted in mixed use buildings be specified and include professional office, and service commercial uses in addition to retail uses.</p> <p>It is also recommended that Policy 10.3 d)-g) also be included in Policy 10.4.</p>	<p>Revised. The Municipality has prepared working definitions for the land use designations across all secondary plans. The High Density Residential designation is now referred to as "Medium Density Local Corridor" since max height is 6 storeys.</p> <p>New policy at 11.5.1: "The Medium Density Local Corridor designation allows for a concentration of density and mix of</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
		<p>uses. The predominant use of lands with the Medium Density Local Corridor designation is housing in mid-rise building forms combined with cultural, entertainment, recreational, offices, restaurants, retail, and/or service commercial uses within mixed-use buildings”.</p> <p>Permitted building types limited to: Street townhouses; Block townhouses; Stacked townhouses; Back-to-back townhouses; Apartment buildings; Mixed-use buildings; and Accessory apartments.</p>
10.4 High Density Residential Designation f)	<p>It is recommended that transition policies to lower density designations be incorporated into this policy for all uses including mixed use buildings.</p> <p>The policy should read “All buildings Apartment dwellings should be located...Lower density housing forms, such as townhouses and stacked townhouses, may be utilized with apartment and mixed use buildings to transition to lower density areas.”</p>	Policy removed. Medium Density Local Corridor permits apartments and mixed use buildings.
10.4 High Density Residential Designation g)	<p>Due to the proximity of mixed use high density residential uses to low density residential land uses, consider adding a new policy to consider sensitively integrating new buildings in accordance with Policy 5.2e).</p> <p>Add a new Policy g) that reads:</p> <p>“Development of uses will be sensitively integrated with Policy</p>	<p>Revised.</p> <p>New policy at 11.5.5 "The highest and most dense forms of development shall be located fronting the Local Corridor. Development shall provide a transition, locating less dense and lower scale buildings in locations adjacent to lower</p>

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
	5.2e) of this Plan. The scale of buildings in a High Density Residential designation shall be compatible and sensitively integrated with surrounding residential uses in terms of building mass, height, setbacks, orientation, privacy, landscaping, shadow casting, accessibility and visual impact.”	density designations." Proposed policy added with reference to new Transition Policies.
10.5 Village Corridor Designatio n a) and d)	It is suggested that office uses also be permitted within this designation. It is a use that would be complementary to the retail and commercial uses permitted within this designation.	Updated to include "offices". See 11.6.1
Neighbour hood Centre Designatio n b) and g)	To be consistent with the other designations in the Secondary Plan, service commercial uses including office should be permitted in this designation.	Aside from “grocery stores/supermarkets” at 11.7.2, other commercial uses are permitted in mixed-use buildings.
10.8 Environme ntal Constraints Overlay	It is recommended that a Policy d) be added to specify a Special Policy for the low density residential lands proposed northwest of Longworth Avenue and Green Road. These lands are constrained with limited road access, the ability to be serviced by infrastructure and transportation.	To be determined at the time of a more detailed application for the property. The underlying designation cannot be achieved until an Environmental Impact Study has been prepared and the limits of the natural heritage system confirmed by the Municipality and CLOCA. The Environmental Constraints Overlay policies state that "the underlying designation cannot be achieved until an Environmental Impact Study has been prepared and the limits of the natural heritage system confirmed." Not certain we need to add any additional policies.

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
11.1b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 11 deals with servicing requirements for the Secondary Plan Area. Section 11.1b states that “the Municipality will work with the landowners and the Regional Municipality of Durham to develop a plan for the phasing of extensions to the existing services within the Brookhill Secondary Plan Area.” However, the plan does not provide any detail with respect to water, sewer, or road servicing requirements. • Section 11.1b also states that “a phasing plan shall be prepared as part of the Functional Servicing Plan by development proponents at the time an application for draft plan of subdivision is submitted.” It is recommended that an overview of the specific servicing extensions be provided prior to the submission of future draft plans of subdivision to ensure an informed and timely review by Regional staff. • It should also be stated that any Regional infrastructure required to support the development of this area is subject to the annual Budget and Business Planning Process. The timing of capital works in the Region’s Development Charge Study is an estimate only and is subject to rate of residential / non-residential growth, available financing and competing priorities of Regional Council. 	New policy at 12.1.2: "Any Regional infrastructure required to support the development of the Brookhill Neighbourhood is subject to the annual budget and Business Planning Process."
12.2 Capital Works c) ii. and d)	The Region of Durham will also need to be satisfied that the owner enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the Region of Durham and that the assessment of infrastructure cost requirements and development phasing be undertaken to the satisfaction of the Municipality of Clarington and the Region of Durham.	Acknowledged

Topic/ Section	Comment	Response
Section 12.0 – Implementation, Policy 12.3.1 a)	Under viii, an Internal Traffic Impact Study is listed while under ix, a Traffic Impact Study is listed as study requirements that may be required for development applications in the secondary plan area. The sub-policy should simply refer to Transportation Impact Study (as Traffic Impact Study is an older term focused on auto travel).	At subdivision stage we require a Transportation Impact Study
12.4 Pre-submission Consultation f)	Peer review studies and retention is also at the discretion of the Region of Durham in addition to the Municipality of Clarington.	Acknowledged