

CLOCA's Comments on Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines

Section No.	Comment	Consultant's Response
2.2.2 Type C Arterial - Longworth	It may be beneficial to specifically include in this section wording from 2.2.1 points 7 & 8 which speak to including within the right of way green intrastate to improve groundwater infiltration and water quality treatment as well as incorporating curb cuts where feasible as there may be opportunity in the wider right of way widths of Longworth Ave.	Green infrastructure guideline added to Type C Arterial
2.4.1	Valleylands #1 - It is unclear what lands are being referred to as the 'Bowmanville Valley Conservation Area'. The lands owned by CLOCA in the Bowmanville valley north of Longworth Avenue are not maintained or open for public use as a Conservation Area. The public should not be encouraged to utilize the CLOCA owned lands.	Revised.
2.4.1	CLOCA supports the specific measures directly related to Valleylands, Woodlands and Urban Forest in this section. Given that there are several wetland features (some of which are Provincially designated) that are located within the Plan area, a section specific to wetlands should be included. The points related to Woodlands would also be applicable to wetlands.	Section for "Wetlands" added under 2.4.1. Guidelines will refer to setbacks, restrictions on crossings, etc.
2.4.2 e)	Although staff fully support urban agriculture, we would recommend that community gardens and the like be located away from the Natural Heritage System. This may prevent or discourage garden waste from being dumped into the valley systems.	Added "measures to protect Natural Features must be considered."
2.4.2 h) 6.	Stormwater ponds are not permitted within the vegetation protection zones of natural features.	There should be flexibility for locating SWM ponds or outfalls within the

Section No.	Comment	Consultant's Response
		VPZ. The only SWM facility within the VPZ is an existing, approved facility in the southern edge.
2.5.1	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.	Trail network revised.
2.5.1	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.	Agree.
2.5.1	New pedestrian crossings of tributaries should be limited to ensure protection of the ecological integrity of the tributary and riparian corridor.	Agree. Guideline added
2.5.1	Where feasible, road crossings should be utilized as trails crossings.	Agree. Guideline added
2.5.1	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 and flows as well as minimize impacts to the riparian area.	Agree. Guideline added
2.5.1	The location of pedestrian trails should be designed to avoid interfering with the meanderbelt of the creeks.	Agree. Guideline added

Durham Region's Comments on the Sustainable Urban Design Guidelines

Section/Topic	Comment	Response
1.4 Interpretation & Implementation	The Guidelines should be utilized to evaluate various types of Planning Act applications not just draft plans of subdivision applications.	Agree, revised
11	The coordination and consistent approach to street lighting between draft plans of subdivision and along arterial and collector streets should also be provided for.	2.2.1 Guideline 11. revised to include "street lighting". Repetition with Guideline 12 that identifies "street lighting as a component of street furnishings.
Bottom of page	Delete the reference to Local Corridor....as it is not relevant to the Arterial Roads.	Deleted. The guidelines will include a section on Local Corridors and Prominent Intersections before Section 2.2 Roads.
Section 2 – The Public Realm, Sub-Section 2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline 4 identifies that an 800 metre (10-minute walk) to higher order transit or community centre be ensured. As noted in our comments on Section 3.0 – Community Structure, Policy 4 (Residential Neighbourhoods), a 10-minute walk to the higher order transit bus stops is not possible for most of the secondary plan area at this time (i.e., to Regional Highway 2 or the planned Bowmanville GO Station). The Region acknowledges it appears that a 800-1,600 metre (a 10-20 minute walk) is more realistic. The Municipality should explore opportunities to reach this goal. • Further, this policy refers to “community centre”, but it is not clear whether this is referring to the Village Corridor or Neighbourhood Centre identified in the secondary plan, or to the Bowmanville West 	<p>Revised. Removed reference to "community centre" and replaced with "Neighbourhood Centre or Village Corridor". Updated the diagram on Page 6 to include "800 - 1600m" walking distance</p> <p>Revised to match policy in Secondary Plan that states "...an approximate 5 minute walk (400 metres) of existing and future local transit services". As noted, this leaves the option for potential future local transit to be delivered at full build-out. Higher order transit has been revised to read "...within a 10 to 20 minute walk (800 to 1,600 metres)..."</p>

Section/Topic	Comment	Response
	Town Centre (as noted in the secondary plan policy above).	
Section 2.2.2 – Arterial Roads, Type A Arterial – Bowmanville Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline 1 should be reworded to indicate that the maximum right-of-way width for Bowmanville Avenue is 36 metres. • Guideline 2 should indicate that a sidewalk is on one side of the road (west side), which is consistent with the Class EA Study preliminary design completed for Bowmanville Avenue (Baseline Road to Nash Road) and the cross-section included on page 9. 	Revised guidelines for Type A Arterial.
Section 2.2.2 – Arterial Roads, Type B Arterial – Green Road and Nash Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subtitle should add Longworth Avenue (west of Green Road), as it is designated as a Type B Arterial in the ROP, and soon to be designated in the Clarington OP as such, once Deferral 2 is resolved by the Region. • Guideline 2 should be reworded to indicate that a 3.0 metre width is required for a two-way cycle track on one side of the street, not a bicycle lane. 	Revised. Cross section for portion of Longworth, west of Green Road added.
Section 2.2.2 – Arterial Roads, Type C Arterial – Longworth Avenue:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subtitle should add “(east of Green Road)”, as this is the part of Longworth Avenue that is designated as a Type C Arterial. • Guideline 2 should be reworded to indicate that 1.5 metre width is required on both sides of the street for one-way cycle tracks, not bicycle lanes, consistent with the cross-section shows. However, to be flexible in case on-road bike 	Revised.

Section/Topic	Comment	Response
	lanes on both sides is proposed, the guideline could be reworded.	
Typical Cross-Sections:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please update the cross-sections to reflect the above comments. • For Green Road/Nash Road, the cross-section shows four travel lanes. However, according to the Clarington TMP and Preferred Land Use Plan Transportation Review prepared by R.J. Burnside (August 2020) for the secondary plan, only two through lanes are required for these roads. The cross-section should be revised to show a centre median/centre left-turn lane and room for right-turn lanes and/or bus stop bays/lanes. The 30 m right-of-way is still appropriate, as a two-lane Type B Arterial. • A new cross-section should be added for Longworth Avenue, west of Green Road, as this is planned as a 4-lane Type B Arterial, as noted previously, and should be planned within a 36 m right-of-way. 	Cross sections updated/added to correspond with the comments.
Section 2.2.6 – Streetscape Elements	Under Sidewalks, Guideline 1 should indicate, perhaps in the sub-bullets, that a 3.0 metre wide boulevard multi-use path (e.g. on Bowmanville Avenue) can be provided in lieu of a sidewalk.	Revised.
d) Low-rise apartment buildings	Clarification should be provided regarding the permissive heights of buildings. A range of permissive heights (expressed in metres and	Building heights had not been confirmed at the time of the Draft Secondary Plan. Based on the Municipality's working definitions for the land

Section/Topic	Comment	Response
e) Mid-rise Apartment Building	storeys) for each type of building form may be clearer to the reader. It is also noted that mid-rise apartment buildings allow a height of 6 storeys, which does not correlate with section 10.4 c) of the BSP which allows a maximum of 4 storeys.	use designations across secondary plans, the building heights will be revised to coordinate with the Secondary Plan. The building heights will be provided in storeys as there are often inconsistencies with how storeys are translated into metres, resulting in amendments at the time of a development application.
3.3.1 and 3.3.2 Commercial and Mixed-Use Development	<p>It is noted that building design at the street level and building heights needs to be added.</p> <p>Further, the height of mixed-use buildings needs to be determined and should correspond with the permissions in the appropriate designation of the BSP.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to requiring a minimum ground floor to ceiling height for single use apartment buildings as part of an implementing zoning by-law to enable non-residential uses on the ground floor to achieve mixed use buildings over time.</p>	Agree, guidelines to be provided.