

Public Comment Summary Table

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-1 Gary Zubatiuk	You first have to look at the traffic issue on Liberty St. I can't get out of my driveway as it is with the traffic so heavy from 2:30pm to 6pm adding more homes on Liberty N. is going to compound this problem immensely.	Noted. Traffic impacts of the Secondary plan will be studied in the Traffic Assessment Report.
S-2	<p><b>Ryan Guetter (Weston Consulting) on behalf of the Soper Springs Landowner Group</b></p> <p>Submission: May 30<sup>th</sup> and November 14<sup>th</sup> 2025</p>	
S-2 Section 4.4.6	<p><i>On street parking on collector or local roads adjacent to the retail and service commercial uses shall be encouraged.</i></p> <p>We support the Municipality's response that on street parking is permitted on all local and collector roads, as outlined in new Policy 9.4.3. Municipality to confirm this new policy mentioned is added into the latest text, and there is no requirement for retail and service uses to be adjacent.</p>	Noted. Policy revised to "On street parking on collector or local roads adjacent to the retail uses, service uses and office uses shall be encouraged. On-street parking is not permitted along Liberty Street North."
S-2 Section 5.1.8	<p><i>The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines contain a Demonstration Plan which illustrates the planning principles that are inherent to the Secondary Plan. It is one example of how the Secondary Plan might be implemented within the Secondary Plan area.</i></p> <p>We support policy 5.1.8 as revised. In addition, we request that the below policy be included for further clarity on the Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines:</p> <p><i>"The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines, including the Demonstration Plan, are contained as Appendix 1 to this Secondary Plan but are not considered policy. The Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines are to be used as guidance in the interpretation and implementation of this Plan's policies."</i></p>	Policy 5.1.7 added "The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines contain a Demonstration Plan, which illustrates the planning principles that are inherent to the Secondary Plan. This Demonstration Plan is one example of how the Secondary Plan might be implemented within the Secondary Plan Area and does not preclude other plans demonstrating how the secondary plan may be implemented."

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-2 Section 5.4.10	<p><i>Air conditioning units, utility metres and similar features should not be visible from the public realm (street/sidewalk) and should be well integrated into a building massing, recessed or screened.</i></p> <p>We support policy 5.4.10 as revised with the addition of “or” as noted above.</p>	Revised as requested.
S-2 Section 5.6.6	<p><i>Garbage and recycling facilities shall be integrated within the building envelope, where appropriate.</i></p> <p>We support policy 5.6.6 as revised.</p>	Policy revised to “Garbage and recycling facilities shall be integrated within the building envelope where possible”
S-2 Section 6.2.2	<p>In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken regarding the natural heritage system and natural hazards. More detailed studies and staking of natural features and natural hazards including flooding and erosion may refine and/or confirm development limits as well as the presence of features on a site by site basis based on the recommendations from the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study; however, the more detailed studies must address the matters raised by the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study.</p> <p>We support policy 6.2.2 as it has been revised to include language that speaks to further assessment for refining and confirming development limits and features. However, we request that in the event that site-specific assessment addresses the concerns of the Subwatershed Study, the site-specific assessment should prevail and not require amendment to the plan. Additionally, staking of features shall only be required as outlined or set out as required in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study.</p>	<p>Revised Policy 6.2.2 to clarify: In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken with respect to the natural heritage system and natural hazards. Site-specific studies may refine and/or confirm development limits and the presence and boundaries of natural heritage features, provided that the general direction and recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study are maintained, except for recommendations in the Subwatershed Study related to natural feature boundaries.”</p> <p>6.3.6 states “The boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be refined through site specific studies prepared</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		as part of the review of <i>development</i> applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan without amendment to this Secondary Plan.”
S-2 Section 6.3.2 & 6.3.3	<p><i>6.3.2 Environmental Protection Areas include natural heritage features, hydrologically sensitive features, lands within the regulatory flood plain of a watercourse, headwater drainage features with a “Protection” classification and hazard lands associated with valley systems, including slope and erosion hazards. Areas associated with Environmental Protection Areas support their ecological integrity and include vegetation protection zones and other natural heritage areas.</i></p> <p><i>6.3.3 The Vegetation protection zone is currently not designated as part of the Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A. However, once the Vegetation Protection Zone is determined through site specific study, it will be considered part of the Environmental Protection Area once delineated. The boundary of the Vegetation protection zone is flexible and is not considered a separate designation apart from the Environmental Protection Area designation.</i></p> <p>We generally support this updated policy, subject to seeing the final language, with the expectation that the boundary of the feature will be subject to technical studies.</p>	No change. Suggested policy revisions are not appropriate as the boundary of the Vegetation Protection Zone (VPZ) is not flexible and is at minimum 15m wide. Policy 6.3.3 states that a site-specific study is required to confirm boundaries.
S-2 Section 6.3.5	<p><i>The delineation of the boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be detailed through appropriate studies prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan.</i></p> <p>We support the above policy as it has been revised to include language that speaks to the delineation of boundaries through</p>	No change. It is unclear what is meant by “delineation of EPA is not automatic”.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>findings of the appropriate studies. However, we would like to recommend that the policy be revised to note that the delineation of Environmental Protection Area is not automatic.</p>	
S-2 Section 6.3.5	<p><i>The delineation of the boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be detailed through site-specific studies prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan.</i></p> <p>We support policy 6.3.5 as the request language has been noted by the Municipality to be included. In addition, we request that the below policy be included in the Secondary Plan for refinements relating to boundaries of natural heritage features.</p> <p><i>“Where an Environmental Impact Study or other site-specific study required as part of development proposals adjacent to a natural heritage feature results in refinements to the boundaries of the natural heritage feature or its related vegetation protection zone, such refinements shall not require an amendment to the Clarington Official Plan or this Secondary Plan.”</i></p>	<p>Revised Policy 6.3.6 states: “The boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be refined through site specific studies prepared as part of the review of <i>development</i> applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan without amendment to this Secondary Plan.”</p>
S-2 Section 6.5.3	<p>Environmental Constraint: Moderate Constraint Area Overlay represent those lands identified in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study as ‘Moderate Constraint’. <del>The lands may include features such as linkage areas, Headwater drainage features with a conservation or mitigation, agricultural lands displaying evidence of hydrologic features.</del> An Environmental Impact Study prepared in support of a development application shall determine the extent of the features and function to be protected from development, including the identification of the requisite vegetation protection zone.</p> <p>We support policy 6.5.3, with the removal of the sentence above and the addition that “Modifications to a Moderate Constraint overlay will not require an amendment to this Plan.”</p>	<p>No change. These features are identified as Moderate Constraint Area Overlay in the Subwatershed Study. As such, the policy provides important understanding of why the lands are delineated as Moderate Constraint.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-2 Section 6.5.3	<p>Environmental Constraint: Moderate Constraint Area Overlay represent those lands identified in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study as 'Moderate Constraint'. The lands may include features such as linkage areas, Headwater drainage features with a conservation or mitigation, agricultural lands displaying evidence of hydrologic features. An Environmental Impact Study prepared in support of a development application shall determine the presence of or extent of the features and function to be protected from development, including the identification of the requisite vegetation protection zone. Modifications to a Moderate Constraint overlay will not require an amendment to this Plan.</p> <p>We support policy 6.5.3 as revised and request that policy is made clear that an amendment will not be required. A moderate constraint is not the same as EPA. We recommend that this additional text be included to provide certainty that moderate constraints can be revised without amendment.</p>	No change. Policy 6.5.8 states that development may be permitted within an Environmental Constraint Overlay without amendment to this Plan.
S-2 Section 6.5.5	<p><i>Environmental Constraint: Additional Area of Further Study Overlay represent areas providing candidate and / or unconfirmed significant wildlife habitat or potential wildlife linkages identified in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. An environmental impact study prepared in support of development applications shall confirm the presence or absence of the habitat and /or linkage and the extent of sensitivity of the habitat, in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan to the satisfaction of the municipality and appropriate agencies.</i></p> <p><i>We support policy 6.5.5, and request the removal of the language above.</i></p>	Reference to “appropriate agencies” deleted but the environmental impact study must be to the satisfaction of the Municipality.
S-2 Section 6.5.9	<p><i>Following the completion of the required studies to the satisfaction of the Municipality, development may be permitted in the Environmental Constraint Overlays as deemed appropriate by the study, without amendment to this Plan, and the underlying land use designation in Schedule A will apply. Where development in an Environmental</i></p>	There is no policy requirement stating that the lands are to be dedicated but Policy 6.3.7 states “may” be dedicated.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>Constraint Overlay is determined not to be appropriate, or the limits of the Vegetation Protection Zone is confirmed, the Environmental Constraint Overlay will be deemed to part of the Environmental Protection Area designation.</i></p> <p>We support policy 6.5.9, so long as the Environmental Protection Area designation does not require dedication of the EPA lands to the governmental authorities.</p>	
S-2 Section 11.3.2	<p><i>Stormwater management facilities shown on Schedule A are illustrative and final location and sizing shall be determined through the development application process.</i></p> <p>We support policy 11.3.2 with the addition of “An amendment to the Secondary Plan is not required for changes to the location of stormwater management facilities.”</p>	<p>Policy revised to “Wherever feasible <i>stormwater management ponds</i> should be located in Low Density Residential designations. Stormwater management facilities shown on Schedule A are illustrative and final location and sizing shall be confirmed by a Master Drainage Plan and Stormwater Management Reports submitted with <i>development</i> applications. An amendment to the Secondary Plan is not required for changes to the location of stormwater management facilities.”</p>
S-2 Section 12.1.2	<p><i>As part of a complete application the following information is required:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Net residential density by land use designation;</i></li> <li><i>ii. Identification of total square footage of non-residential land uses;</i></li> <li><i>iii. Number and type of units by land use designation;</i></li> <li><i>iv. Total residential unit count; and</i></li> <li><i>v. Estimated population;</i></li> <li><i>vi. Amount/type of non-residential space and number of jobs; and</i></li> <li><i>vii. The number of purpose built additional dwelling units by land use designation.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Revised policy to: “12.1.2 As part of a development application for residential developments the following information is required for the subject application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Net residential density by land use designation;</li> <li>b) Identification of total square metres of non-residential land uses;</li> <li>c) Number and type of units by land use designation;</li> <li>d) Total residential unit count;</li> </ul>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>We support policy 12.1.2, so long as this information is not required for the entire Secondary Plan, but only for the area included in the respective complete application.</i></p>	<p>e) Estimated population;  f) Amount/type of non-residential space and number of jobs; and  g) The number of purpose-built additional dwelling units and affordable housing units by land use designation.</p> <p>The required information only applies to the application.</p>
S-2 Section 2.2.3	<p><i>Protect and, where possible, enhance significant natural features within <del>and adjacent to</del> Environmental Protection Areas (EPA) based on the recommendations from the subwatershed study.</i></p> <p>We request that the above modification be made to policy 2.2.3 as indicated above.</p>	Policy revised as requested.
S-2 Section 3.2.1	<p><i>A Prominent Intersection is located at Liberty Street and Concession Road 3 and at the intersection of the Mearns Avenue extension and a second collector road internal to the secondary plan area.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above policy, we request that the policy be modified to indicate the conceptual nature of the Mearns Avenue extension and the second collector road as these are not fixed locations.</p>	No change. While the exact alignment may be refined through the EA and subdivision process, the intersection remains conceptually identified
S-2 Section 3.2.1	<p><i>A Prominent Intersection is located at Liberty Street and Concession Road 3 and at the intersection of the conceptual Mearns Avenue extension and a second collector road internal to the secondary plan area.</i></p> <p>We request that the policy be revised to include the above policy language in yellow highlighted text.</p>	No change. The Mearns Avenue extension shown on the secondary plan has the same status as any other road shown in an OP or Secondary Plan that is subject to the Class EA process.
S-2 Section 3.4.3	<p><i>Parks shall be located to achieve a number of objectives: create larger open spaces and realize co-benefits in terms of amenities by locating adjacent to other outdoor civic uses like stormwater management ponds provided they are central to the</i></p>	<p>Section 3.4.3 is now 3.6.2</p> <p>Policy 3.6.2 revised to “ensure that the entire community has good access to</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>neighbourhoods being served by the park;</i>  <i>i. ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within a short walking distance of their homes; and</i>  <i>ii. ensure good access and visibility from public streets.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 3.4.3, we recommend combining ii) and iii) into one as we believe there are redundancies in the wording.</p>	<p>parks within a short walking distance of their homes”.</p>
S-2 Section 3.4.3	<p><i>b) Parks shall be located to achieve a number of objectives:</i>  <i>i) create larger open spaces and realize co-benefits in terms of amenities by locating adjacent to other outdoor civic uses like stormwater management ponds provided they are central to the neighbourhoods being served by the park;</i>  <i>ii) ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within a short walking distance of their homes; and</i>  <i>iii) ensure good access and visibility from public streets.</i></p> <p>We support the Municipality’s agreement to revert to the original policy as noted above but request to see the final text to confirm the changes.</p>	<p>See above response. Policy 3.6.2 b revised to “ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within a short walking distance of their homes”.</p>
S-2 Section 3.4.4	<p><b><i>Stormwater Management Ponds</i></b>  <i>Where appropriate, stormwater management ponds will be treated as public assets and part of the parks and open space system. Their amenity and ecological value will be realized as:</i>  <i>a) areas of passive recreation through the inclusion of paths and trails;</i></p> <p>In addition to the above policy, we recommend that the below policy be included in the Secondary Plan:</p> <p><i>“Stormwater ponds will not be included in parkland dedication until the Planning Act prescribes regulations for acceptance of strata or encumbered parkland.”</i></p>	<p>No change. Stormwater ponds will not be included towards dedication under the Planning Act. It is very common in Ontario to have trails around stormwater management ponds, typically following the access roads for maintenance of the storm ponds.</p>
S-2 Section 3.4.6 b)	<p><i>ensure that the entire community is within a short walking distance of their homes.</i></p>	<p>Policy 3.6.2 b revised to “ensure that the entire community has good access</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>We do not support the changes to policy 3.4.6, we request that this be revised to the previous policy version as noted below:</p> <p><i>“3.4.6 b) ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within a short walking distance of their homes; and”</i></p>	to parks is within a short walking distance of their homes”.
S-2 Section 4.2.4	<p><i>Drive-through facilities are not a permitted use in any land use designation.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 4.2.4, we request that the policy be revised to allow for drive-through facilities as opposed to a prohibition.</p>	No change
S-2 Section 4.2.5	<p>Service stations are not a permitted use in any land use designation.</p> <p>In regards to policy 4.2.5, we request that the policy be revised to allow for service stations as opposed to a prohibition.</p>	No change
S-2 Section 4.3.4	<p><i>Permitted dwelling types shall include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. Apartment buildings;</i></li> <li><i>b. Townhouses;</i></li> <li><i>c. Stacked townhouses;</i></li> <li><i>d. Back to back townhouses;</i></li> <li><i>e. Dwelling units within a mixed use building;</i></li> <li><i>f. Retail and service commercial uses; and</i></li> <li><i>g. Other dwelling types that provide housing at the same or higher densities as those above.</i></li> </ul> <p>In regards to the above, we request clarification as to the removal of “Additional Dwelling Units” in this policy. We request that this dwelling type be included, in order to permit flexibility in unit types.</p>	No change. The OP has been amended to include ADUs, no need to add it here.
S-2 Section 4.3.6	<p><i>The implementing zoning by-law shall identify lands within the designation where ground floor retail and service commercial uses shall be required in mixed use buildings.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, we request that this policy be revised so as to remove the requirement for retail and service commercial and</p>	No change. This policy and the zoning change only applies where a mixed-use building is proposed.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	instead that they be permitted uses not mandatory uses.	
S-2 Section 4.4.3	<p>Permitted dwelling types shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Townhouses;</li> <li>b) Stacked townhouses;</li> <li>c) Back to back townhouses;</li> <li>d) Apartments; and</li> <li>e) Other dwelling types that provide housing at the same or higher densities as those above.</li> </ul> <p>We request that the Medium Density Residential designation permit semi-detached dwellings. It is recognized that these will not be the predominant housing form in the designation, but flexibility is desired to enable varied housing types more broadly. In addition, we request clarification for the removal of “Additional Dwelling Units” in this policy. We request that this dwelling type be included in the permitted uses in order to permit flexibility in unit types.</p>	<p>No change. Semi-detached dwellings should remain in a low- density area only.</p> <p>See above ADU comment.</p>
S-2 Section 4.4.8	<p><i>Buildings within the Medium Density Residential designation shall not exceed 4 storeys in height. Lands located on Liberty Street North with the Medium Density Residential designation shall not exceed 6 storeys in height.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 4.4.8 be revised as noted above to include permission of heights up to 6 storeys with the Medium Density Residential designation on Liberty Street North. We understand that this was already agreed to by the Municipality. In addition, it is recognized that the recent development approval at the intersection of Mearns Avenue and Concession Road 3 provides context for additional density of 12 storeys in the Medium Density Residential designation, and we look forward to discuss the merits of the above policy modifications and potential additional height in our upcoming meeting.</p>	<p>6 storeys is permitted along Liberty Street North, with an additional 2 storeys permitted if affordable housing is provided. 12 storeys is not appropriate for this area.</p>
S-2 Section 4.4.10	<p><i>Development within the Medium Density Residential designation shall have a minimum site density of 45 units per net hectare.</i></p>	<p>Policy revised: “Development within the Medium Density Residential</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>We request that policy 4.4.10 be revised to include the above language as we understand there is a typo.</p>	<p>designation shall have a minimum site density of 45 units per net hectare”.</p>
<p>S-2 Section 4.4.12</p>	<p><i>A minimum building height of 3 storeys is required adjacent to the Prominent Intersection.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 4.4.12, we request that the minimum building height be revised to 3 storeys to allow for flexibility in built form while still achieving the objectives of the Prominent Intersection.</p>	<p>Policy 4.4.12 deleted.</p>
<p>S-2 Section 4.5.2</p>	<p><i>The following residential building types are permitted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Detached dwellings;</i></li> <li><i>b) Semi-detached dwellings;</i></li> <li><i>c) Townhouses;</i></li> <li><i>d) Stacked townhouses;</i></li> <li><i>e) Back-to-back townhouses;</i></li> <li><i>f) Apartments; and</i></li> </ul> <p>We request clarification as to the removal of “Additional Dwelling Units” in this policy. We request that this dwelling type be permitted in order to permit flexibility in unit types.</p>	<p>The OP has been amended to include ADUs, no need to add it here.</p>
<p>S-2 Section 4.5.3</p>	<p><i>Detached and semi-detached dwelling units shall account for a minimum of 80 percent of the total number of units in the Low Density Residential designation, with various forms of townhouses and low rise apartments accounting for the remainder.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 4.5.3 be revised to remove the minimum percentage or lower the 80 percent requirement to enable and ensure flexibility of typology within the Low Density Residential designation. based on market demand. We recommend revising this policy to 60 percent or lower.</p>	<p>No change. This aligns with current Council direction for low density areas.</p>
<p>S-2 Section 4.5.6</p>	<p><i>Buildings within the Low Density Residential designation shall not exceed 3 storeys in height.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 4.5.6 be revised to 4 storeys in height.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-2 Section 4.5.7	<p><i>Development on lands designated Low Density Residential shall have a minimum density of 20 units per net hectare.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 4.5.7 be revised to a minimum of 13 units per net hectare with no maximum as agreed to by the Municipality.</p>	Policy revised to “Development on lands designated Low Density Residential shall have a minimum density of 13 units per net hectare”.
S-2 Section 5	<p>We request clarification and mention in the Secondary Plan text that the Urban Design Guidelines are not policies and recommend the below policy be included for further clarity:</p> <p><i>“The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines, including the Demonstration Plan, are contained as Appendix 1 to this Secondary Plan but are not considered policy. The Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines are to be used as guidance in the interpretation and implementation of this Plan’s policies.”</i></p>	Policy 5.1.1 revised to “The Soper Springs community shall be developed in accordance with the urban design policies of Section 5 of the Official Plan additional policies of this section, and the Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines. The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines provide guidance on the implementation of the Secondary Plan but should not be construed as policies”.
S-2 Section 5.1.3	<p><i>The network of streets shall be supplemented by mid-block pedestrian connections to break up long blocks (generally blocks longer than 250 metres) and to further enhance the pedestrian permeability of the area and provide access to transit.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.1.3, we request that mid-block pedestrian connections be considered eligible for parkland dedication under the Planning Act. Alternatively, the owners request that the Municipality provide compensation for the land considered for the mid-block pedestrian connections.</p>	No change. Walkways are not considered parkland and should not be accounted as parkland dedication.
S-2 Section 5.1.3	<p><i>The network of streets may be supplemented by mid-block pedestrian connections to break up long blocks (generally blocks longer than 250 metres) and to further enhance the pedestrian permeability of the area and provide access to transit.</i></p>	Policy 5.1.3 has been revised to use ‘should’, allowing flexibility while maintaining the Municipality’s intent to reduce long block lengths. Connections may be achieved through sidewalks, trails, or dedicated mid-block pathways.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>In regards to policy 5.1.3, we request that the above language modifications to allow mid-block pedestrian connections to be flexible and not mandatory. This was already agreed to by the Municipality.</p>	
S-2 Section 5.1.8	<p><i>The Demonstration Plan illustrates the planning principles that are inherent to the Secondary Plan. It is one example of how the Secondary Plan might be implemented within the Secondary Plan area. The Demonstration Plan is conceptual and an Official Plan amendment is not required to implement an alternative plan.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.1.7, we request that the above language be included.</p>	<p>The demonstration plan is part of the Guidelines not part of the Secondary Plan as such there is no requirement for an OPA.</p> <p>The policy is revised as follows to clarify it is part of the Guidelines: “The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines contain a Demonstration Plan which illustrates the planning principles that are inherent to the Secondary Plan. This Demonstration Plan is one example of how the Secondary Plan might be implemented within the Secondary Plan area and does not preclude other plans demonstrating how the secondary plan may be implemented”.</p>
S-2 Section 5.2.2	<p><i>A dense tree canopy should be provided along public streets in the road allowance to enhance the pedestrian experience of the community.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.2.2, we request that the above language be included.</p>	<p>Policy 5.2.2 revised to “Tree canopy coverage should be maximized to create comfortable walking environments for pedestrians and to enhance the pedestrian experience of the community”.</p>
S-2 Section 5.3.2	<p><i>Privately owned publicly accessible plazas shall be located at Prominent Intersections to contribute to their visual prominence, reinforce their role as community focal points, improve the relationship of built form to the public right- of- way, and contribute to the area’s identity. Alternative locations that provide a similar level of amenity may be considered to satisfy this requirement.</i></p>	<p>No change. Privately owned publicly accessible plazas are not exclusively required within or adjacent to retail uses. POPS may be provided within or adjacent to residential buildings.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	We request that this entire section be removed as retail is not a requirement for Prominent Intersections.	
S-2 Section 5.3.2	<p><i>Privately owned publicly accessible plazas, if provided, should be located at Prominent Intersections to contribute to their visual prominence, reinforce their role as community focal points, improve the relationship of built form to the public right- of- way, and contribute to the area’s identity. Alternative locations that provide a similar level of amenity may be considered to satisfy this requirement.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 5.3.2 be revised per the above language modifications to make it clear that the privately owned publicly accessible plazas are not mandatory.</p>	Policy 5.3.3 revised to: “Privately owned publicly accessible open spaces may be located at Prominent Intersections to contribute to their visual prominence, reinforce their role as community focal points, improve the relationship of built form to the public right- of- way, and contribute to the area’s identity. Alternative locations that provide a similar level of amenity may be considered to satisfy this requirement”.
S-2 Section 5.4.2	<p><i>Mid-rise buildings should have a clear base, middle and top to provide articulation and high quality design.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.4.2, we request that Mid-Rise be revised as this is no longer listed in the policies.</p>	Policy has been deleted.
S-2 Section 5.4.3	<p><i>A building setback shall be provided above the third storey for mid-rise buildings.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.4.3, the Municipality noted that they review this and respond. We kindly request that an update be provided on this immediately so this can be finalized.</p>	Policy 5.4.2 revised to “The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines and the implementing zoning by-law shall provide direction on building setbacks for buildings greater than 6 storeys”.
S-2 Section 5.4.4	<p><i>Development shall provide a transition between areas of different heights and density within the Secondary Plan area and to the areas and uses outside its boundaries through separation, step-backs and intervening land uses.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.4.4, we request that the above language be removed as it is too prescriptive and specific and there may be other ways to address transition.</p>	Policy 5.4.3 revised to say “Development shall provide a transition between areas of different heights and density within the Secondary Plan Area through separation, step-backs, and intervening land uses, intervening local roads or other similar means”. This text provides examples on how transition can be provided.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-2 Section 5.4.7	<p><i>Townhouses shall generally not comprise more than 6 attached units.</i></p> <p>We request that consideration be made for 8 attached units. In the Town of Whitby, site-specific application official plan amendment was approved for blocks of 8 attached units. Please see the attached Site Plan in Appendix 1.</p>	<p>Policy 5.4.6 revised to change “Townhouses” to “Street townhouses”. OP policy 9.4.5 h) and i) directs that street townhouse blocks shall generally not exceed 50 units and shall generally not compromise more than 6 attached units. Guideline 4.1.3.10 also direct that townhouses should not be more that 6 units.</p>
S-2 Section 5.4.10	<p><i>Air conditioning units, utility metres and similar features should not be visible from the public realm (street/sidewalk) and should be well integrated into a building massing, recessed and screened, where appropriate.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 5.4.10 be revised to include the above language.</p>	<p>Policy revised to: “Air conditioning units, utility metres and similar features should not be visible from the public realm (street/sidewalk) and should be well integrated into a building massing, recessed or screened”.</p>
S-2 Section 5.5.2	<p>The public realm adjacent to mixed use buildings will support a high level of pedestrian activity and include wider sidewalks and street furniture.</p> <p>In regards to policy 5.5.2, we request that the above language be removed as it is too specific.</p>	<p>No change. High level of pedestrian activity should be supported with wider sidewalks and street furniture for pedestrian comfort.</p>
S-2 Section 5.5.2	<p><i>The public realm adjacent to mixed use buildings will support a high level of pedestrian activity and may include wider sidewalks and street furniture.</i></p> <p>We request that the above policy modification be considered.</p>	<p>Policy revised to include “may”.</p>
S-2 Section 5.5.3	<p><i>Ground floor non-residential uses should have a floor-to-floor height of approximately 3.5 4.5 metres in support of larger display windows and signage area as well as providing opportunities for awnings, lighting, and other facade enhancements.</i></p> <p>We request that the approximate height be revised to 3.5 metres in</p>	<p>Policy has been deleted.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	order to provide non-residential uses with additional flexibility for design and function. This would not preclude higher heights where appropriate, but would enable flexibility.	
S-2 Section 5.6	<p><i>Parking, Servicing and Loading</i>  <i>New policy under Section 5.6: The Municipality may consider in the Zoning By-law reduced parking standards where the land use density and built form supports active transportation and public transit. The required parking ratios for the lands within the Secondary Plan are to be addressed in the Secondary Plan Area's Zoning By-law.</i></p> <p>We request to mention that it was agreed with the Municipality that parking ratios would be dealt with at a later phase beyond the Draft Secondary Plan text. We request this is added into the Secondary Plan text.</p>	Policy 5.6.9 added: "The Municipality may consider in the Zoning By-law reduced parking standards where the land use density and built form supports active transportation and public transit". The second sentence is not necessary.
S-2 Section 5.6.3	<p><i>The visual impact of garages in Low Density Residential areas should be reduced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Encouraging parking via laneways, where possible;</i></li> <li><i>b) Recessing garages located at the front of the building facing a street;</i></li> <li><i>c) Limiting driveways widths so that they do not exceed the width of the garage, where appropriate; and</i></li> <li><i>d) Minimizing the garages' appearance and area on a building façade so that windows, doors, and active elements of a residential building's façade take visual primacy, where appropriate.</i></li> </ul> <p>In regards to policy 5.6.3, we request that the policy be revised to include the additional text as indicated above.</p>	Policy revised to add "generally" to c) and by adding an additional broader criteria "e) Other similar means to reduce the visual impact of garages to the satisfaction of the municipality."
S-2 Section 5.6.7	<p><i>The visual impact of garage doors to below-grade structured parking should be minimized by locating them discreetly away from main pedestrian entrances and primary frontages, and where feasible, accessed from a lane.</i></p> <p>In regards to 5.6.7, we request that the above language be removed.</p>	Policy revised to "The visual impact of garage doors to below-grade structured parking should be minimized by such design actions as locating them discreetly away from main pedestrian entrances and

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		primary frontages, where feasible, accessed from a lane; and / or screening from view”.
S-2 Section 5.6.8	<p><i>Above-grade structured parking adjacent to a public street(s) shall be lined with retail and commercial uses with direct access to the public street(s).</i></p> <p>In regards to 5.6.8, we request that this policy be removed entirely as retail and commercial uses are not mandatory.</p>	Policy revised to provide a broader range of uses: “Above-grade structured parking adjacent to a public street(s) shall be lined with residential and/ or non-residential uses”.
S-2 Section 6.2.2	<p><i>In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken regarding the natural heritage system and natural hazards. More Detailed Site-specific studies and staking of natural features and natural hazards including flooding and erosion may refine and/or confirm development limits as well as the presence of features on a site by site basis based on the recommendations from the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study; however, the more detailed studies must address the matters raised by the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 6.2.2, we request that the above language be revised as indicated.</p>	Policy revised to: “In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken with respect to the natural heritage system and natural hazards. Site-specific studies may refine and/or confirm development limits and the presence and boundaries of natural heritage features, provided that the general direction and recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study are maintained, except for recommendations in the Subwatershed Study related to natural feature boundaries”.
S-2 Section 6.3.2	<p><i>Environmental Protection Areas include natural heritage features, hydrologically sensitive features, lands within the regulatory flood plain of a watercourse, headwater drainage features with a “Protection” classification and hazard lands associated with valley systems, including slope and erosion hazards. Areas associated with Environmental Protection Areas support their ecological integrity and include vegetation protection zones and other natural heritage areas. Vegetation protection zones will form part of the Environmental</i></p>	<p>Policy revised to delete the last sentence as requested.</p> <p>Policy 6.3.3 added to confirm the intent of the VPZ:  “The Vegetation protection zone is currently not designated as part of the Environmental Protection Area on</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>Protection Area once delineated.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 6.3.2, we request that the above language be removed.</p>	<p>Schedule A. However, once the Vegetation Protection Zone is determined through site specific study, it will be considered part of the Environmental Protection Area and zoned accordingly”.</p>
S-2 Section 6.3.3	<p><i>Stormwater management ponds, except for the outfall, shall generally not be permitted to be developed in lands designated Environmental Protection Area but may be permitted or within the vegetation protection zones to an Environmental Protection Area.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 6.3.3, we request that stormwater management ponds be considered conceptual in the Secondary Plan and that the vegetation protection zones permit stormwater management ponds. In addition, servicing should be a consideration in determining the stormwater management pond locations. We request that stormwater ponds be permitted on EPA lands subject to further studies.</p> <p>Alternatively, we request that the policy state “generally not permitted”.</p>	<p>No change. Stormwater management ponds are shown with a symbol dot on the Plan so it is granted that they are conceptual. In addition, Policy 11.3.2 says that they “are illustrative and final location and sizing shall be determined through the development application process”. Stormwater ponds are not permitted in the EPA except for outfalls and LIDs. LID’s are address in Policy 6.3.4</p>
S-2 Section 6.3.5	<p>The delineation of the boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be detailed through appropriate site-specific studies prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan.</p> <p>In regards to policy 6.3.5, we request that the requirement to delineate the boundary of the lands designated as Environmental Protection Area to be determined through the Draft Plan application process, and not a requirement of the Secondary Plan. In addition, we request that the above language be included as indicated above.</p>	<p>Policy revised as requested</p>
S-2 Section 6.3.5	<p><i>The delineation of the boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and</i></p>	<p>Policy 6.3.6 revised to: “The boundary of lands designated as Environmental</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>shall be detailed through site specific appropriate studies prepared as part of the review of Draft Plan development applications. in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and Clarington Official Plan.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 6.3.5, we request the above modifications.</p>	<p>Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be refined through site specific studies prepared as part of the review of <i>development</i> applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan without amendment to this Secondary Plan”.</p>
S-2 Section 6.3.6	<p><i>The Municipality may require Environmental Protection Areas to be conveyed to a public authority, where appropriate, as part of the development approval process at minimal or no cost to the receiving public authority. Conveyance of lands designated Environmental Protection Area and associated vegetation protection zones shall not be considered as contributions towards the parkland dedication requirements under the Planning Act.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 6.3.6, we request that associated vegetation protection zones not be excluded in the parkland dedication contribution. In addition, we request that the Environmental Protection Area lands not be necessary to be conveyed, but can be held in private ownership.</p>	<p>No change. The policy states the Municipality “may require”. In addition, Section 10 of the parkland dedication by-law states: The Municipality shall not accept any natural heritage system, minimum vegetation protection areas, regulatory shoreline, flood susceptible lands or lands with hazardous characteristics in fulfilment of the land conveyance requirements of this by-law.</p>
S-2 Section 6.3.6	<p><i>The Municipality may require Environmental Protection Areas to be conveyed to a public authority, where appropriate, as part of the development approval process at minimal or no cost to the receiving public authority. Conveyance of lands designated Environmental Protection Area and associated vegetation protection zones shall not be considered as contributions towards the parkland dedication requirements under the Planning Act. It is recognized that EPA lands may not be appropriate to be conveyed in all circumstances and no conveyance shall be required for small scale developments, severances or for lot patterns that provide unique relationships to adjacent to the environmental features.</i></p>	<p>Policy 6.3.7 revised to include “Conveyance may not be appropriate in all circumstances.”</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	In regards to policy 6.3.6, we request that it be revised to include language regarding parks within the Environmental Protection Areas.	
S-2 Section 6.3.8	<p><i>The Soper Creek Subwatershed Study identified and assessed a number of Headwater Drainage Features. Those identified in the Subwatershed Study as “protection” are included in the Environmental Protection Area designation and are to be protected in situ, unless demonstrated otherwise by further site-specific environmental studies.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, we request that the Headwater Drainage Features be allowed to be relocated based on site-specific assessments. Additionally, we request the inclusion of the language noted above.</p>	Policy revised as requested.
S-2 Section 6.3.9	<p><i>For those Headwater Drainage Features identified in the Subwatershed Study as “conservation” and located outside of an Environmental Protection Area designation, applications for development shall:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Maintain and enhance or relocate and enhance drainage features and its riparian corridor;</i></li> <li><i>b) If catchment drainage has been previously removed or will be removed due to diversion of stormwater flows, restore lost functions through enhanced lot level controls (i.e., restore original catchment using clean roof drainage), as feasible;</i></li> <li><i>c) Maintain or replace on-site flows using mitigation measures and/or wetland creation, if necessary;</i></li> <li><i>d) Maintain or replace external flows;</i></li> <li><i>e) Use natural channel design techniques to maintain or enhance the overall productivity of the reach;</i></li> <li><i>f) Ensure that the drainage feature is connected to downstream; and</i></li> <li><i>g) Apply an appropriate vegetation protect zone to either side of the drainage feature.</i></li> </ul> <p>In regards to the above policy, as the sections listed are already included in the Subwatershed Study, we request that this be</p>	No change. This is important policy direction to include in the Secondary Plan.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	removed as the Subwatershed Study will prevail in relation to natural heritage, particularly for Headwater Drainage Features.	
S-2 Section 6.3.10	<p><i>Headwater Drainage Features that have been relocated and the associated riparian corridors established by permissions in policy 6.3.8 shall be designated Environmental Protection Area and shall be zoned appropriately to prohibit development.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, as this is already included in the Subwatershed Study, we request that this be removed as the Subwatershed Study will prevail in relation to these features.</p>	No change. The Subwatershed Study does not address designation or zoning. This is important policy direction to include in the Secondary Plan.
S-2 Section 6.4.1	<p><i>Land Use to be Determined is a land use designation shown on Schedules A and B. These lands require further analysis to determine if development can be permitted and is feasible. These lands are identified as Environmental Protection Area in the Official Plan. These lands were not identified as part of the Natural Heritage System in the Soper Creek Subwatershed study; however, the lands were identified as containing vegetation protection zones, candidate and / or unconfirmed significant wildlife habitat, low constraint areas and were also identified with Status Pending further Study and noted as locations for Enhancement/Restoration Opportunities. These are small areas surrounded by the Natural Heritage System. The boundary of the adjacent Natural Heritage System needs to be confirmed and the feasibility of access, serviceability and development of the Land Use to be Determined designation area needs to be demonstrated prior to any application for Official Plan Amendment to permit development.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 6.4.1, we support the framework that would recognize further development feasibility and serviceability will need to be demonstrated; however, we do not support the need for an Official Plan Amendment to implement and permit development.</p>	The intention is that an OPA would be needed. Policy 6.4.2 has been revised to clarify that an Official Plan Amendment is required to change the designation to permit development.
S-2 Section 6.4.2	<i>To confirm feasibility of development, lands within this designation shall be subject to a number of appropriate studies and staking of adjacent natural heritage features on the subject site and desktop</i>	Policy revised to reference abutting features so it is clear that the PPS

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>analysis of adjacent lands, to confirm the presence of and boundary of features and functions in the adjacent Environmental Protection Area designation and confirm the extent of the Vegetation Protection Zone to ensure no impact on the adjacent Environmental Protection Area from urban development. Vegetation Protection Zones is part of the Environmental Protection Area and are considered the same when evaluating adjacent lands. It is recognized that staking of features beyond the extent of the application area may not be possible in all circumstances.</i></p> <p>We request that 6.4.2 be modified per the language above.</p>	<p>“adjacent” requirement was not intended.</p>
S-2 Section 6.4.4	<p><i>6.4.4 The studies referred to in this Section may shall include an Environmental Impact Study, a Geotechnical Analysis confirming the long-term stable top of bank, a Hydrogeological Analysis, updated hydrology modeling to evaluate downstream flooding and erosion impacts and a Geomorphical Study as well as a Planning Justification and are required as part of a complete application. Prior to undertaking the identified studies, the terms of reference shall first be approved by the Municipality in consultation with the relevant agencies.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 6.4.4 we request that the above revision be included.</p>	<p>Revised Policy 6.4.5 to: “The studies referred to in this Section shall include: a Hydraulic Analysis Study, an Environmental Impact Study, a Geotechnical Analysis confirming the long-term stable top of bank, a Hydrogeological Analysis, updated hydrology modelling to evaluate downstream flooding and erosion impacts (if not already addressed by the Subwatershed Study) and a Geomorphic Study as well as a Planning Justification and are required as part of a development application. Prior to undertaking the identified studies, the terms of reference shall first be approved by the Municipality in consultation with the relevant agencies.”</p> <p>These studies are all required based on input from the Agencies.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-2 Section 6.4.6	<p><i>If further studies identified in this section determine that portions of the Land Use to be Determined designation can be developed, an Official Plan Amendment will be required to delineate the Environmental Protection Area boundaries and the appropriate land use designation on the developable portion.</i></p> <p>We request clarification for the need for an Official Plan Amendment to delineate the Environmental Protection Area boundaries and the appropriate land use designations on the developable portion. We suggest an underlying designation with establishment through a zoning by-law amendment application process based on the above comments and that no official plan amendment be required.</p>	<p>No change. These lands were previously designated EPA. We have revised to an Environmental Constraint Land Use to be determined but there is a significant amount of study required to demonstrate the principle of development on these lands.</p>
S-2 Section 6.5.3	<p><i>Environmental Constraint: Moderate Constraint Area Overlay represent those lands identified in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study as 'Moderate Constraint'. The lands may include features such as linkage areas, Headwater drainage features with a conservation or mitigation, agricultural lands displaying evidence of hydrologic features. An Environmental Impact Study prepared in support of a development application shall determine the extent the presence of or extent of the features and outline the area of removal or function to be protected from development, including the identification of the requisite vegetation protection zone, if required.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 6.5.3 be revised to include the above language.</p>	<p>Support adding “the presence of or extent”, but no need for remaining changes as the key matter is determining the function to be protected.</p>
S-2 Section 6.5.5	<p><i>Environmental Constraint: Additional Area of Further Study Overlay represent areas providing candidate and / or unconfirmed significant wildlife habitat or potential wildlife linkages identified in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. An environmental impact study prepared in support of development applications shall confirm the presence or absence of the habitat and /or linkage and the extent of</i></p>	<p>Policy revised to remove suggested text.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>sensitivity of the habitat, in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan to the satisfaction of the municipality and appropriate agencies.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 6.5.5 be revised per the above.</p>	
S-2 Section 6.5.7	<p><i>Environmental Constraint: Low Constraint Area Overlay identified in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study comprise features in which removal or development intrusion is not restricted by existing policies and regulations. It is encouraged that these features be incorporated into site level plans where possible to avoid net loss of natural cover. Should net loss of natural cover not be avoidable, in certain circumstances, appropriate compensation opportunities within other areas of the Secondary Plan area may be considered where appropriate.</i></p> <p>We request that for policy 6.5.7, it be revised to include the above language. Furthermore, should net loss of natural cover not be avoidable, in certain circumstances, appropriate compensation opportunities within other areas of the Secondary Plan area may be considered where appropriate.</p>	Policy revised as requested.
S-2 Section 6.5.8	<p><i>Until the environmental impact studies required in this Section 6.5 have been completed, land uses within the Environmental Constraint Overlays shall be limited to existing lawful permitted uses. We request that the above language be removed as indicated, and any uses permitted currently, whether existing or not, should continue to be permitted.</i></p>	No change. The secondary plan changes the land use and the new land uses are not permitted until the EIS is completed.
S-2 Section 6.5.9	<p><i>Following the completion of the required studies to the satisfaction of the Municipality, development may be permitted in the Environmental Constraint Overlays as deemed appropriate by the study, without amendment to this Plan, and the underlying land use designation in Schedule A will apply. Where development in an Environmental Constraint Overlay is determined not to be appropriate, or the limits of the Vegetation Protection Zone is confirmed, the Environmental</i></p>	Confirmed.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>Constraint Overlay will be deemed to part of the Environmental Protection Area designation.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, we understand that the overlays are not land use designations based on policy 6.5.1 and that all overlay constraints would need to be verified through environmental studies per policy 6.5.8 and based on policy 6.5.9, no amendment is required to reflect the findings of the studies. As the environmental overlays are not a land use designation, subject to the study, the underlying designation would apply. It is recognized that the land use to be determine is a different section than the overlays section. We request that the Municipality confirm this understanding is correct.</p>	
S-2 Section 6.5.9	<p><i>Following the completion of the required studies to the satisfaction of the Municipality, development may be permitted in the Environmental Constraint Overlays as deemed appropriate by the study, without amendment to this Plan, and the underlying land use designation in Schedule A will apply. Where development in an Environmental Constraint Overlay is determined not to be appropriate, or the limits of the Vegetation Protection Zone is confirmed, the Environmental Constraint Overlay will be deemed to part of the Environmental Protection Area designation.</i></p> <p>We request that the Municipality provide clarification to the above as well as Policy 6.3.7 with regards to “may be dedicated”. Please provide clarity as to “may be dedicated” as well as the circumstances surrounding such a dedication.</p>	Policy 6.3.7 is a may and not a shall.
S-2 Section 7.2.4	<p><i>The functions and sizes for the parks listed in Policy 7.2.2 are set out in Section 18.3 of the Official Plan.</i></p> <p>We support the introduction policies that would support or enable stratified or encumbered Parks and request that a policy be provided in the Secondary Plan and/or parent Official Plan in the future for the permission and implementation of stratified or encumbered Parks.</p>	No change. The Municipality does not currently allow for strata or encumbered parks. Parks must be unencumbered according to Section 14 of the parkland dedication by-law 2023-042.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	We request that stratified or encumbered Parks be part of parkland dedication.	
S-2 Section 7.2.4	<p><i>The functions and sizes for the parks listed in Policy 7.2.2 are set out in Section 18.3 of the Official Plan.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 7.2.2, we request that the Municipality of Clarington further consider strata or encumbered parks as introduced in other Municipalities. The City of Markham Parkland Dedication By-law Update 2025 allows applicants to identify land for conveyance in preparation for when policy direction is issued by the Provincial Government. The City of Markham also currently allows for strata parks, dual use and privately owned public spaces (POPS) on a case-by-case basis for parkland dedication. We request that the Municipality of Clarington consider this for their respective Official Plan, Soper Springs Secondary Plan, and prevailing and future Parkland Dedication By-laws.</p>	See response above.
S-2 Section 7.2.6	<p><i>Parks shall be encouraged to be designed to be accessible and shall have street frontage on not less than 30% of the park perimeter, where appropriate. Backing of residential and commercial uses onto parks shall be minimized with flankage of lots preferred.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 7.2.6, we request that the minimum street percentage be removed and alternatively the above language be</p>	No change. Parks must be designed to be accessible and have street frontage of 30%.
S-2 Section 7.2.9	<p><i>Privately owned and publicly accessible open space shall be encouraged within the Secondary Plan Area but shall not contribute to required parkland dedication.</i></p> <p>We request that privately owned and public accessible open spaces should be considered as parkland dedication.</p>	No change. Parks must be publicly owned in order to contribute to parkland dedication.
S-2 Section 7.2.9	<p><i>Privately owned and publicly accessible open space shall be encouraged within the Secondary Plan Area but shall not contribute to required parkland dedication.</i></p>	See response above.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>As mentioned above for policy 7.2.4, we request that consideration be given to privately owned public spaces to contribute to parkland dedication on a case-by-case basis as currently demonstrated in the City of Markham and the City of Vaughan, as examples. This will encourage landowners to build such POPs, which the local community will benefit from.</p>	
S-2 Section 9.2	<p><i>Transportation Network</i></p> <p><i>We request that policies under this section be updated to reflect the changes to the Transportation Network. We request that the following policy be included to this section of the Secondary Plan. The Transportation Network is conceptual and will be confirmed through the draft plan subdivision process.</i></p>	<p>Policy 9.3.2 revised: “The collector road network shown in Schedule B is conceptual and will be confirmed through the Class C Environmental Assessment Process. Further refinements will be considered through Phases 3 and 4 conducted during the draft plan of subdivision process without amendment to the Secondary Plan.”</p>
S-2 Section 9.3.1	<p><i>Subject to Section 9.2.3 herein, the road network set out on Schedule B serves as the primary framework for all forms of mobility and connectivity in Soper Springs. The road network includes a hierarchy of road types which is consistent with the hierarchy and road classifications in the Official Plan and the road classification criteria in Appendix C, Table C-2 of the Official Plan.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, we request that the language indicated be included to allow site specific studies to determine the ultimate location and functionality for the roads to be based on.</p>	<p>No change. Policy 9.3.2 addresses ultimate location of roads.</p>
S-2 Section 9.3.2	<p><i>The status and functionality of The collector road network shown in Schedule B is conceptual and will be confirmed through the Class C Environmental Assessment process, and the draft plan of subdivision process without amendment to the Secondary Plan.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, we request that the language indicated be included to allow site specific studies to determine the ultimate location and functionality for the roads to be based on.</p>	<p>No change. The EA process does not determine status in terms of collector versus arterial road. That is determined by the OP/Secondary Plan. The policy already allows for Phase 3 and 4 of the EA process to determine location.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-2 Section 9.3.3	<p><i>The Municipality may consider development on private roads outside of the Low Density Residential designation.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 9.3.3, we request that this policy be amended to consider development on private roads within the Low Density Residential designation. This will support the orderly design and layout of lands within the Secondary Plan where public roads cannot be implemented.</p>	No change. It is a Council direction not to permit private streets in Low density residential areas.
S-2 Section 9.5.2	<p><i>The active transportation network within the Soper Springs Secondary Plan includes off-street facilities including trails and multi-use paths for pedestrians and cyclists. Some Elements of the Active Transportation System are shown on Schedule B of this plan.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, we request that on-street parking permissions be included. This is further indicated in the Peer Review Memo of the TIS prepared by GHD, please see Appendix D.</p>	Policy 9.3.5 added clarifying that on-street parking is permitted on all local and collector roads.
S-2 Section 9.5.6	<p><i>Destinations such as the Environmental Protection Area, parks, and stores and connections to surrounding neighbourhoods will be integrated through off-street active transportation network including off-street bike lanes and multi-use paths.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above, we request that on-street parking permissions be included. This is further indicated in the Peer Review Memo of the TIS prepared by GHD, please see Appendix D.</p>	See above response
S-2 Section 11.2.3	<p><i>Applications for development shall demonstrate that all water mains can be appropriately looped and dead ends minimized without the need for additional crossings of the Environmental Protection Area outside of planned road right of way and trail crossings. If additional crossings of the Environmental Protection Area are proposed, an assessment of alternatives and potential impacts shall be provided to demonstrate impacts to the Environmental Protection Area are minimized and mitigated to the extent feasible.</i></p>	No change. Policy 11.2.3 establishes a necessary policy requirement to address water main looping and minimize impacts to the Environmental Protection Area.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	In regards to policy 11.2.3, we request that this be removed as it is dealt with in the Draft Functional Servicing Report.	
S-2 Section 11.2.4	<p><i>Applications for development shall assess whether an upstream sanitary creek crossing as part of a trail crossing is feasible with minimal impact to the Environmental Protection Area. If a sanitary crossing outside of the proposed road or trail network is determined to be not feasible, an updated servicing strategy shall be provided to determine the need for and preferred location for a sanitary pumping station.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 11.2.4, we request that this be removed as it is dealt with in the Draft Functional Servicing Report.</p>	Revised Policy 11.2.4: “Applications for development shall assess whether an upstream sanitary creek crossing as part of a road or trail crossing is feasible with minimal impact to the Environmental Protection Area. If a sanitary crossing outside of the proposed road or trail network is determined to be not feasible, an updated servicing strategy shall be provided to determine the need for and preferred location for a sanitary pumping station”
S-2 Section 11.3.2	<p><i>Stormwater management facilities shown on Schedule A are illustrative and final location and sizing shall be determined through the development application process.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above policy, we request that the policy be revised to mention that an amendment to the plan is not required for changes to the location of stormwater management facilities.</p>	Policy revised to include “An amendment to the Secondary Plan is not required for changes to the location of stormwater management facilities”.
S-2 Section 11.3.4	<p><i>A Master Drainage Plan / Master Environmental Servicing Plan shall be completed for the Secondary Plan Area prior to the submission of the first development application within the Secondary Plan Area.</i></p> <p>We wish to clarify whether the above policy is subject to completion by the entire landowners group or site- specific owners.</p>	It is required for the entire Secondary Plan Area.
S-2 Section 11.3.4	<i>Following approval of the Secondary Plan, drainage will be handled for the Secondary Plan Area separately rather than for the entire the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study Area. A Master Drainage Plan / Master Environmental Servicing Plan shall be completed for the Secondary Plan Area prior to the submission of the first development application within the Secondary Plan Area. In the alternative to the</i>	No change. The Master Drainage Plan is required for the secondary plan area.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>above, a Stormwater Management Report prepared with consideration of adjacent lands can be submitted with a development application.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 11.3.4 be revised to include the above language.</p>	
S-2 Section 11.3.5	<p><i>Stormwater Management Reports shall be prepared for each draft plan of subdivision application building on the recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study and the Master Drainage Plan/ Master Environmental Servicing Plan. As recommended by the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study, the required Stormwater Management Report and Plan shall incorporate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Infiltration-based LID practices located on private property and municipal property;</i></li> <li><i>b) Evaluation of erosion risks to receiving watercourses; and</i></li> <li><i>c) A site-specific water budget.</i></li> </ul> <p>In regards to policy 11.3.5, we request that this be removed as it is dealt with in the Draft Functional Servicing Report.</p>	No change. This is an important policy direction to include in a Secondary Plan.
S-2 Section 11.3.5	<p><i>Stormwater Management Reports shall be prepared for each draft plan of subdivision application building on the recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study and the Master Drainage Plan/ Master Environmental Servicing Plan, and where appropriate, include the catchment areas, and confinement to that catchment area in accordance with the Functional Servicing Report. As recommended by the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study, the required Stormwater Management Report and Plan shall incorporate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Infiltration-based LID practices located on private property and municipal property;</i></li> <li><i>b) Evaluation of erosion risks to receiving watercourses; and</i></li> <li><i>c) A site-specific water budget.</i></li> </ul>	

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>We request that policy 11.3.5 be revised to include the above language. The landowners reserve the right to review the final Subwatershed Study and Master Drainage Plan/Master Environmental Servicing Plan.</p>	
<p>S-2 Section 12.1.2</p>	<p><i>As part of a complete application the following information is required for the subject application:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Net residential density by land use designation;</i></li> <li><i>ii. Identification of total square footage of non-residential land uses;</i></li> <li><i>iii. Number and type of units by land use designation;</i></li> <li><i>iv. Total residential unit count; and</i></li> <li><i>v. Estimated population;</i></li> <li><i>vi. Amount/type of non-residential space and number of jobs; and</i></li> <li><i>vii. The number of purpose built additional dwelling units by land use designation.</i></li> </ul> <p>We request that policy 12.1.2 be revised to include the above language.</p>	<p>Policy revised.</p>
<p>S-2 Section 12.1.6</p>	<p><i>Approval of development applications shall be conditional upon commitments from the appropriate authorities and the proponents of development to the timing and funding of the required road and transportation facilities, parks and community facilities. These works shall be provided for in the subdivision and / or site plan agreements. Phasing of the development, including temporary and/or partial/interim construction of servicing, roads and stormwater management facilities as a result of non-participating landowners or participating landowners with different timelines shall be permitted prior to full completion of works, including external road works as may be required by the Municipality of Clarington.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 12.1.6 be revised to include the above language.</p>	<p>Revised policy 12.1.8 and policy 12.1.9 added to address phasing: “Phasing of the <i>development</i>, due to partial construction of internal collector roads or the partial completion of internal and external sewer, water and stormwater works as a result of non-participating landowners, participating landowners with different timelines or the timelines for completion of external road works, may be required by the Municipality of Clarington. Phasing may include temporary and / or interim road and <i>infrastructure</i> solutions prior to full build-out”.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-2 Section 12.1.7	<p><i>Approval of development applications shall also be conditional upon commitments from the appropriate authorities and the proponents of development to the timing and funding of required stormwater management, sanitary sewer and water supply facilities, including both partial/interim and temporary facilities. These works shall be provided for in subdivision and / or site plan agreements. Phasing of development, based on the completion of external sewer and water services, may be implemented if required by the Municipality of Clarington. Phasing may include interim road and infrastructure solutions prior to full build-out. Phasing of development based on the completion of external sewer and water services or portions thereof is permitted and, may be implemented. Phasing may include interim/partial road and infrastructure solutions prior to full build-out.</i></p> <p>We request that policy 12.1.7 be revised to include the above language.</p>	<p>Policy 12.1.7 revised to: “Approval of development applications shall be subject to conditions of draft plan approval, where applicable, requiring commitments from the appropriate authorities and the proponents of development to the timing and funding of the required road and transportation facilities, parks and community facilities which may include interim transportation facilities. These works shall be provided for in the subdivision and / or site plan agreements.”</p>
S-2 Section 12.1.11	<p><i>The Municipality will require, as a condition of draft approval, that proof be provided to the Municipality that landowners have satisfied all their parkland obligations with respect to the Master Parkland Agreement prior to registration of a plan of subdivision.</i></p> <p>We request that a Master Parkland Agreement not be required as a condition of draft approval, but that it be encouraged, but not required.</p>	<p>No change. The Municipality requires the parkland agreement to ensure that the parkland is provided.</p>
S-2 Section 12.1.11	<p><i>The Municipality will require, as a condition of draft approval, that proof be provided to the Municipality that landowners have satisfied all their parkland obligations with respect to the Master Parkland Agreement prior to registration of a plan of subdivision.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 12.1.11, the Municipality agreed to send the Draft Master Parkland Agreement for the Landowners Group to review before finalization of the Secondary Plan. Additionally, parkland obligations and calculations should be based on Gross Developable Area, as defined in the parkland by-law and Planning Act.</p>	<p>Policy 12.1.12 revised to: “If the landowners, have entered into a Master Parkland Agreement as set out in Policy 12.1.10, the Municipality will require, as a condition of draft approval, that proof be provided to the Municipality that the landowner has satisfied all their parkland obligations with respect to the Master Parkland</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		Agreement prior to registration of a plan of subdivision.”
S-3	<b>Ari Soberano (3253 Liberty Street N Limited Partnership “Sharno”)</b>	
S-3	1. In relation to the Schedule A – Land Use Plan, we request that the area identified in red in Appendix C as Medium Density Residential be consistent with the land to the east.	Revision made to Schedule A to designate area as Medium Density Residential.
S-3	<p>In relation to previous site-specific requests for 3253 Liberty Street N Limited Partnership and Jayzee Properties, in relation to certain Environmental Protection Area depictions on Schedule A and B, we propose a special policy area approach to address refinements to these areas and we request that the schedule be modified in those locations for the aforementioned properties based on previous comments, and request that the policy below be included in the Secondary Plan. We request that the medium and low density residential designations be depicted with the Environmental Constraints Overlay.</p> <p><i>“The areas with an Environmental Constraints Overlay as shown on Schedule A Land Use and Schedule B Environmental Constraint and Transportation Plan have been identified as containing features consistent with Environmental Protection Area designation from the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study existing conditions report including specifically watercourses. However, the presence and precise delineation of the natural heritage features shall be determined through an Environmental Impact Study prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Official Plan. If the Environmental Impact Study establishes that development can proceed, then the underlying designation shall apply over those lands without the requirement for an amendment to this Plan. Further, it may be determined that only a portion of the lands within the Environmental Constraints Overlay may be suitable for development.”</i></p>	No change. The existing policies in Environmental Constraint overlay are very clear and in all cases except for the “Land Use to be Determined” already have an underlying designation. As such this policy is not necessary. In the “Land Use to be Determined” designation, the policy framework for determining if future development is feasible is clear and an OPA is required.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	We request that the above policy be included in the Secondary Plan to support the underlying designation applying to lands or portions of lands when the necessary site-specific study demonstrates that development can occur. We look forward to discussing how this could be implemented in our upcoming meeting.	
S-3	<p><b>Ari Soberano (3253 Liberty Street N Limited Partnership “Sharno”)</b></p> <p>Submissions: January 2026</p>	
S-3 Section 3.1.1	What does the word “provide” mean? We request “allow” instead. Can this section be consistent with the language from 4.3.3 that says retail uses and service uses <u>may</u> be provided, as this language appears to give the impression that mixed-use <u>is</u> required which is not the case.	Revised Policy to clarify that mixed-use development is permitted, not required. The word “provide” has been replaced with “allow”.
S-3 Section 3.3.2	The 5-minute rather than a “short” walking distance is too limited, which will lead to many smaller parks.	Revised Policy 3.3.2 to replace “5-minute walking distance” with “short walking distance” to allow greater flexibility in the planning and design of the park system while maintaining walkable access objectives.
S-3 Section 3.6.1	<p>3.6.1. Parks are vital public spaces connecting to a broader public realm network. A quantity and quality of park space shall be provided that meets the needs of residents and enables a variety of opportunities for passive and active recreation to the satisfaction of the Municipality <b>and in keeping with the current Parkland Dedication By-law</b></p> <p>We request the above addition.</p>	No change.
S-3 Section 3.6.2	We cannot guarantee 5 minutes. Please revert back to original language of “short” as outlined above.	Revised Policy 3.6.2 to replace the 5-minute standard with “short walking distance.”
S-3 Section 4.1.1	Is there a definition of “net” hectare and “gross” hectare? Why did this increase from 50 to 60 people?	Net and gross density are defined in the Official Plan. The land budget

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		provides a minimum that would achieve in excess of 60 people and jobs per gross hectare.
S-3 Section 4.1.2	What is meant by the word “needs”? There is no requirement for commercial uses in this SP area, so we want to make sure this is clear within the text.	Revised policy 4.1.2 to replace “feature” to “allow”. The term “needs” is intended to reference day-to-day functional needs of residents and does not introduce a requirement for commercial development within the Secondary Plan area.
S-3 Section 4.1.3	What is meant by “mix of uses”? There is no requirement for commercial uses in this SP, so we want to make sure this is clear within the text.	The phrase “mix of uses” is intended to include a mix of residential building forms and densities, with the option to include non-residential uses where appropriate but not as a requirement.
S-3 Section 4.3.5	<p>4.3.5 Within mixed use buildings, only retail uses, service uses and office uses, as well as residential lobbies and building services shall be permitted on the ground floor of a mixed use building. Within Apartment buildings, only residential uses, as well as residential lobbies and building services shall be permitted on the ground floor of an Apartment building</p> <p>We request the above addition for further clarity.</p>	Revised policy as requested.
S-3 Section 4.3.10	We request the maximum height for Prominent Intersections be 12 storeys, to match “bookends” along Concession Rd 3 with the most recent OTL approved building.	No change. The tallest buildings and highest densities within the Medium Density designation (6 or 8 storeys, where affordable housing is provided) are directed near the Prominent Intersection to provide built form and housing type variety along the Local Corridor and to function as a focal point in the community (Policy 4.3.11). Prominent Intersections are not

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		intended to introduce additional height beyond the applicable designation. This approach supports Clarington's Official Plan, which envisions Local Corridor development at heights ranging from 3–6 storeys.
S-3 Section 4.4.8	We request to increase height to 6 storeys for all Medium Density Residential designation.	No change. The requested increase to 6 storeys has been reviewed; however, the existing height limit reflects the planned built form of the Secondary Plan and supports appropriate scale and transition.
S-3 Section 5.1.3	<p>5.1.3 The network of streets should supplemented by mid-block pedestrian connections to break up long blocks (generally blocks longer than 250 metres) and to further enhance the pedestrian permeability of the area and provide access to transit.</p> <p>We request "should" be replaced with "may be".</p>	No change. The term "should" provides flexibility, while establishing an expectation for incorporating mid-block pedestrian connections to improve connectivity.
S-3 Section 5.2.1	The language should be clearer that public art is not mandatory.	Revised Policy to replace "should" with "is encouraged to".
S-3 Section 5.2.2	<p>5.2.2 Tree canopy coverage in the road allowance along public streets should be extensive enough to create comfortable walking environments for pedestrians and to enhance the pedestrian experience of the community.</p> <p>We request the above addition for further clarity.</p>	No change.
	<p>5.2.3 Streets and the adjacent built form should be designed to animate the street through retail uses being located close to the front lot line and with transparent ground floor glazing, where retail uses are proposed, and through outdoor amenity areas and street furniture within the public right of way.</p> <p>We request using the word "may" rather than "should".</p>	No change. The use of the word "should" establishes a design expectation while allowing flexibility through the development application process.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>5.3.3 Privately owned publicly accessible open spaces shall be located at Prominent Intersections to contribute to their visual prominence, reinforce their role as community focal points, improve the relationship of built form to the public right-of-way, and contribute to the area's identity. Alternative locations that provide a similar level of amenity may be considered to satisfy this requirement.</p> <p>We request using the word "may" rather than "shall" as agreed in past conversations with the MOC.</p>	<p>Revised Policy to replace "shall" with "may".</p>
	<p>5.4.2 The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines and the implementing zoning by-law shall provide direction on building setbacks for high-rise buildings. Setbacks are not required for mid-rise buildings.</p> <p>We request the above addition for further clarity.</p>	<p>Revised Policy to: "The Soper Springs Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines and the implementing zoning by-law shall provide direction on building setbacks for buildings greater than 6 storeys."</p>
	<p>6.2.2 In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken regarding the natural heritage system and natural hazards. Site-specific studies may refine and/or confirm development limits as well as the presence of features on a site by site basis based on the general recommendations from the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. These site specific studies must adhere to the general recommendations outline in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study and address all issues identified within.</p> <p>We request the addition of the word "general" as outlined above.</p>	<p>Revised Policy to: "In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken with respect to the natural heritage system and natural hazards. Site-specific studies may refine and/or confirm development limits and the presence and boundaries of natural heritage features, provided that the general direction and recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study are maintained, except for recommendations in the Subwatershed Study related to natural feature boundaries."</p>
	<p>6.3.7 The Municipality may require Environmental Protection Areas to be conveyed to a public authority, where appropriate, as part of</p>	<p>Revised Policy to: "The Municipality may require Environmental Protection</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>the development approval process at minimal or no cost to the receiving public authority. <b>The Municipality understands that conveyance may not be appropriate in all circumstances.</b> Conveyance of lands designated Environmental Protection Area and associated Vegetation Protection Zones shall not be considered as contributions towards the parkland dedication requirements under the Planning Act.</p> <p>We request the revision noted above.</p>	<p>Areas to be conveyed to a public authority, where appropriate, as part of the development approval process at minimal or no cost to the receiving public authority. Conveyance of lands designated Environmental Protection Area and associated Vegetation Protection Zones shall not be considered as contributions towards the parkland dedication requirements under the Planning Act. Conveyance may not be appropriate in all circumstances.”</p>
	<p>6.4.3 To confirm feasibility of development, lands within this designation shall be subject to a number of studies and staking of adjacent natural heritage features [<b>desktop analysis for adjacent/abutting lands if access is not provided</b>] to confirm the presence of and boundary of features and functions in the abutting Environmental Protection Area designation and confirm the extent of the Vegetation Protection Zone to ensure no impact on the abutting Environmental Protection Area from urban development. The municipality may consider enhancement, compensation and restoration to ensure an overall net positive or <b>net neutral impact</b> on the natural heritage features and system.</p> <p>We request the revisions noted above.</p>	<p>Revised Policy to: “To confirm feasibility of development, lands within this designation shall be subject to a number of studies and staking of abutting natural heritage features to confirm the presence of and boundary of features and functions in the abutting Environmental Protection Area designation and confirm the extent of the Vegetation Protection Zone to ensure no impact on the abutting Environmental Protection Area from urban development.”</p>
	<p>6.5.6 For the Environmental Constraint: Additional Area of Further Study Overlay located adjacent to the Prominent Intersection to Liberty Street North and Concession Road 3, further study is required to confirm the presence and limits of environmental constraints prior to any development.</p> <p>This is no longer applicable due to revisions of Schedule A&amp;B. We ask for this section to be removed.</p>	<p>Policy deleted.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>7.2.4 The functions and sizes for the parks listed in Policy 7.2.3 are set out in Section 18.3 of the Official Plan <b>and will be in keeping with the current Parkland Dedication By-law.</b></p> <p>We request the revision noted above.</p>	<p>No change, park sizes and functions are addressed in the Official Plan, while parkland dedication requirements are established by the Planning Act and implemented through the Parkland Dedication By-law.</p>
	<p>9.1.5 Use mid-block connections and trails to augment the network established by streets to improve permeability for users of active transportation where appropriate.</p> <p>We request using the word “encourage” rather than “use”.</p>	<p>Revised Policy 9.1.5: “Mid-block connections and trails should be used to augment the network established by streets to improve permeability for users of <i>active transportation</i> where appropriate.”</p>
	<p>9.4.3e) Where feasible, the integration of transit waiting areas in buildings located adjacent to transit stops</p> <p>Can you please explain what it means to integrate transit waiting areas in buildings? It is not appropriate for private buildings to have public waiting areas for public transit. Bus shelters may be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Policy deleted.</p>
	<p>11.3.1 Stormwater management facilities, such as ponds and Low Impact Development features, shall be incorporated in the Secondary Plan Area to mitigate the impacts of development on water quality and quantity, consistent with the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study, the policies of Section 20 of the Clarington Official Plan and the policies of this Section. <b>Such facilities shall not be located within the natural heritage features but may be permitted within the vegetation protection zone provided the intent of the vegetation protection zone is maintained and is supported by an Environmental Impact Study.</b></p> <p>The sentence above was wrongfully omitted in the latest draft of the SP text, and we request it is reinserted.</p>	<p>Revised policy 11.3.1: “Stormwater management facilities, such as ponds and Low Impact <i>Development</i> features, shall be incorporated in the Secondary Plan Area to mitigate the impacts of <i>development</i> on water quality and quantity, consistent with the Soper Creek <i>Subwatershed</i> Study, the policies of Section 20 of the Clarington Official Plan and the policies of this Section consistent with Policy 6.3.4 of this Secondary Plan and Sections 3.4, 144 and 20 of the Official Plan.”</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-3 Section 11.3.9	Support the revisions and comments from the other landowners.	Noted.
S-3 Sections 11.5.1 and 11.5.2	Request the removed of the word “strongly”.	Revised as requested
S-3 Sections 11.5.3	Request the word “meeting” rather than “exceeding”. There is no requirement to exceed the OBC.	Revised as requested.
S-3 Sections 11.5.3	<p>12.1.9 The Secondary Plan recognizes that comprehensive planning requires the equitable sharing amongst landowners of the costs associated with the <i>development</i> of land. It is a policy of this Secondary Plan that prior to the approval of any draft plan of subdivision, <b>participating</b> applicants/landowners shall have entered into appropriate cost sharing agreements that establish the means by which the costs (including Region of Durham costs) of developing the property are to be shared. <b>Certain policies will be included in these agreements for non-participating, but benefiting, landowners.</b> The Municipality will require, as a condition of draft approval, that proof be provided to the Municipality that <b>participating</b> landowners have met their obligations under the relevant cost sharing agreements prior to registration of a plan of subdivision. <b>Participating</b> landowners are encouraged to enter into a Master Parkland Agreement with the Municipality prior to the approval of any draft plan of subdivision. The Master Parkland Agreement shall identify the minimum size and general location of <i>parks</i> that shall be provided and dedicated in accordance with Schedule A. <b>Certain policies will also be included in the Master Parkland Agreement for non-participating, but benefiting, landowners.</b></p> <p>We request the above revisions be included for absolute clarity.</p>	Revised Policy to: “Phasing of the <i>development</i> , due to partial construction of internal collector roads or the partial completion of internal and external sewer, water and stormwater works as a result of non-participating landowners, participating landowners with different timelines or the timelines for completion of external road works, may be required by the Municipality of Clarington. Phasing may include temporary and / or interim road and <i>infrastructure</i> solutions prior to full build-out. “
S-3 Additional policy	The areas with an Environmental Constraints Overlay as shown on Schedule A Land Use and Schedule B Environmental Constraint and Transportation Plan have been identified as containing features consistent with Environmental Protection Area designation from the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study existing conditions	No change. The existing policies in Environmental Constraint overlay are very clear and in all cases except for the “Land Use to be Determined” already have an underlying

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>report including specifically watercourses. However, the presence and precise delineation of the natural heritage features shall be determined through an Environmental Impact Study prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Official Plan. If the Environmental Impact Study establishes that development can proceed, then the underlying designation shall apply over those lands without the requirement for an amendment to this Plan. Further, it may be determined that only a portion of the lands within the Environmental Constraints Overlay may be suitable for development.</p> <p>We request that the above policy be included in the Secondary Plan to support the underlying designation applying to lands or portions of lands when the necessary site-specific study demonstrates that development can occur.</p> <p>Additionally, the SP text must include policies that permit landowners to upgrade infrastructure—such as culverts and bridges—at the draft plan stage. This is necessary to allow landowners to proactively advance the development of their lands without unnecessary delay.</p>	<p>designation. As such this policy is not necessary. In the “Land Use to be Determined” designation, the policy framework for determining if future development is feasible is clear and an OPA is required.</p> <p>Further, the Municipality doesn’t support relocation of watercourses, this position is supported by CLOCA.</p>
	<p><b>Ari Soberano (3253 Liberty Street N Limited Partnership “Sharno”)</b></p> <p>Submission: February 24, 2026</p>	
S-3 Section 3.6.2b)	the “5 minutes” to be replaced with “short” as agreed	Revised as requested.
S-3 Section 4.3.9	Notwithstanding policy 4.3.8 (update to reflect correct policy number)	Revised as requested.
S-3 Section 4.3.11	12 storeys at Prominent Intersection, or some form of language that leaves room for more density for Prominent Intersections than just the Medium Density Local Corridor designation.	No change. Prominent Intersections are intended to accommodate the tallest buildings within the permitted height range of the designation, including additional height where affordable housing is provided.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-3 Section 4.5.3	Notion that this is to be calculated on a landowner-by-landowner basis, so not one landowner takes all 20% of the townhouse/apartment allocation in the Low-Density Designation.	Reference added.
S-3 Section 5.1.3	Missing the word “be” after “should”	Revised as requested.
S-3 Section 6.2.2	Sharno and LOG to comment when the final language is provided.	Policy 6.2.2 revised for clarity.
S-3 Section 11	Provide justification as to why SWM ponds in EP Lands are allowed in the OP, but not in this SP.	See updates to policy 11.3.1.
S-3 Section 11.5.2	Remove the word “strongly” as agreed. Kindly update.	Revised as requested.
S-3 Section 12.1.4	Please add or revise to include the following: “Notwithstanding that the upgrading of existing roads, culverts, bridges, and infrastructure by the landowners/proponents required to facilitate development will be considered through appropriate agreements with the Region and/or Municipality, the Development Charge eligibility of such works shall not be adversely affected.”	Revised as requested.
S-3 Additional Policy	Watercourse re-location policy: The areas with an Environmental Constraints Overlay as shown on Schedule A Land Use and Schedule B Environmental Constraint and Transportation Plan have been identified as containing features consistent with Environmental Protection Area designation from the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study existing conditions report including specifically watercourses. However, the presence and precise delineation of the natural heritage features shall be determined through an Environmental Impact Study prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Official Plan. If the Environmental Impact Study establishes that development can proceed, then the underlying designation shall apply over those lands without the requirement for an amendment to this Plan. Further, it may be determined that only a portion of the lands within the Environmental Constraints Overlay may be suitable for development.	The Municipality doesn’t support relocation of watercourses, this position is supported by CLOCA.
	<b>Ari Soberano (3253 Liberty Street N Limited Partnership “Sharno”)</b>	

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Submission: March 16, 2026	
S-3 Section 4.1.1	Based on the comment matrix, this should be 53 persons not 60 persons to reflect the Envision Durham minimum density target	No change. The land budget provides a minimum that would achieve in excess of 60 people and jobs per gross hectare.
S-3 Section 4.3.11	Based on the comment matrix, MOC indicated Prominent intersections are key locations where massing and height are intended. However, the density is the same as the Medium Density Local Corridor designation, with no additional density above this for being the Prominent Intersection. If 12 stories is not acceptable, we would like to request at least 10 stories.	No change. The tallest buildings and highest densities within the medium density designation (6 or 8-storeys, where affordable housing is provided) are directed near the Prominent Intersection to provide built form and housing type variety along the Local Corridor as well as to visually and functionally create a focal point in the community (Policy 4.3.11) This supports Clarington's Official Plan, which envisions development along Local Corridors to have heights ranging from 3-6 storeys.
S-3 Section 4.4.4/4.4.5	Is the 'commercial and mixed use' built form now only permitted in those lands outlined in 4.4.3 under the Medium Density Residential designation? Our understanding was that this built form in past SP text versions was applicable to all Medium Density Residential lands.	Correct. Policy 4.4.5 revised to specify that commercial and mixed use buildings are only permitted at the intersection of Mearns Avenue and Liberty Street North and the intersection of Mearns Avenue and the northern collector road.
S-3 Section 5.6.3 c	Should refer to 'interior width' to be consistent with the UDG.	Policy revised to: "c) Limiting driveway widths so that they generally do not exceed the width of the garage;"
S-3 Section 6.3.13	We are not familiar with "the lobe". This should be marked right on Schedule A or Schedule B to remove any confusion. Also, this 1-hectare consideration should be on the same landowner's parcel, not impacting other landowners' land in the Secondary Plan.	Policy 6.3.13 revised to include address, 3145 Mearns Avenue, and remove reference to ratio.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-3 Section 9.3.2	Consider adding “Further refinements and relocations will be considered through Phases 3 and 4 conducted during the draft plan of subdivision process without amendment to the Secondary Plan. What is shown in Schedule B is only an illustration rather than an ultimate. An alternative, ultimate road network is possible and subject to further study as outlined”	The collector road is not only an illustration. It is the municipality’s position but refinements can occur through Phases 3 and 4 of the EA. A completely different collector road network would require an OPA and redoing the Phase 1 and 2 of the EA. However, Policy 9.3.3 provides greater flexibility on relocation of the northern collector road.
S-3 Section 9.3.3	We are looking for similar language to 6.4.4, without the requirement of an OPA. Proposing the following language: The northern collector Road/trail and servicing crossings of the Soper Creek tributary can be altered or relocated or an additional local road crossing provided without amendment to the Secondary Plan subject to completion of technical studies, determination of mitigation measures and obtaining permits and approvals from the Municipality of Clarington, Region of Durham, Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority and other agencies having jurisdiction. and The fulfilment of the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for any Schedule C project will be required for road/trail crossings, where appropriate.	Policy 11.2.4 has been revised to include road or trails crossings. Trail crossings and local road crossings don’t need an amendment to the Secondary Plan or a Class EA so they don’t need to be mentioned in this policy.
S-3 Section 11.3.4	Kindly add “.... Secondary Plan Area based on the Terms of Reference to the satisfaction of the Municipality...”	A Master Drainage Plan is required prior to approval of the first development application.
S-3 Section 11.3.5	Like Section 11.3.4, reference to The Master Environmental Servicing Plan to be crossed off as well, as this will all be incorporated into the MDP. Consider revising to “Stormwater Management Reports shall be prepared for each draft plan of subdivision application building on the recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study and the Master Drainage Plan/ Master Environmental Servicing Plan.”	Policy revised to remove reference to ‘Master Environmental Servicing Plan.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-3 Section 11.4.7	Consider the following revision, “Where trees, shrubs and other natural heritage features are destroyed or harvested pre-maturely prior to proper study and approval, compensation should occur on site and shall be calculated at a 3:1 ratio, or 2:1 in some circumstances like outlined in section 6.3.13, and be subject to a restoration / compensation plan to create an overall net benefit to the natural heritage system.	No change. Policy 6.3.13 revised to remove reference to ratio.
S-3 Section 12.1.10	We request “school sites” be removed as it is not applicable in this Secondary Plan	Revised as requested.
S-4	<b>Estates Of Soper Creek (John Spina)</b>	
S-4	As previously requested, the requested modifications to Schedule A in accordance with the attached Appendix B remain outstanding	No change. The area in question is identified as 'High Constraint' due to valleylands/slope hazard, in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. This was confirmed through consultation with CLOCA and Aquafor Beech. This area remains as EP on the land use schedules.
S-4	The owner requests a number of policies to be included in the Transportation Section 8 that would enable the following: a. A policy that would stipulate the closure and disposal of the portion of Mearns Avenue to the adjacent owner for the portion that extends beyond the planned Mearns Avenue Road as depicted on Schedule A.	No change. Municipality has a road closure and conveyance policy which would be followed.
S-4	As previously requested, the owner requests a policy be introduced that would enable permissions for the use of “grinder pumps” as servicing solution for residential lands where it can be demonstrated based on good engineering principles.	No change. Clarington policy should not override the Region’s servicing requirements.
S-4	It is requested that this depiction of the developable area be designated as Medium Density – Residential in the Draft Secondary	No change. An OPA will be required to change the designation.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Plan where it is currently designated Environmental Constraint: Land Use to be Determined.	
S-4	It is requested that a policy approach be included to Mearns Avenue to be closed and conveyed to adjoining owners and a reference be included for the underlying designation to be Medium Density – Residential.	No change. Municipality has a road closure and conveyance policy which would be followed.
S-4 Section 3.4.2	<p><i>Environmental Protection Areas and Associated Areas</i>  <i>Environmental Protection Areas are the primary component of the parks and open space system. The conservation and enhancement of Environmental Protection Areas will bring the imprint of the area’s natural features and original geography into the development of the Soper Springs Secondary Plan area in a way that defines Community Structure and identity.</i>  <i>The features of the Soper Creek systems contribute particularly strongly to Community Structure and connect to a broader natural heritage system beyond the Secondary Plan area boundaries.</i>  <i>Access to Environmental Protection Areas and associated areas through the development of public trails will be undertaken in a manner which conserves their ecological integrity. Environmental Protection Areas will serve as the backbone of network of parks, trails and open spaces.</i></p> <p>The policies state EPA lands as a primary feature and backbone of the parks and open space system that contribute to the Community Structure. These lands should be considered for park land dedication as many residents will benefit from using the trails and having access to these areas.</p>	No change. Municipality does not accept EP as parkland dedication. Section 10 of the parkland dedication by-law states: The Municipality shall not accept any natural heritage system, minimum vegetation protection areas, regulatory shoreline, flood susceptible lands or lands with hazardous characteristics in fulfilment of the land conveyance requirements of this by-law.
S-4 Section 4.1.3	<p><i>Locate the highest intensity of development and greatest mix of uses along Concession Road 3 and Liberty Street to foster access to commercial amenities and transit.</i>  <i>This policy should also permit the Mearns Avenue Extension to have the highest density and heights within the secondary plan area since it is proposed to be a future collector road.</i></p>	No change. Liberty Street and Concession Road 3 are identified for the highest densities as they are along the Local Corridor identified in the OP.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-4 Section 4.2.2	<p><i>Schedule B identifies four overlays that establish areas where further study is required before development, as per the underlying designation, may be permitted:</i></p> <p><i>a) Environmental Constraint: Moderate Constraint Area Overlay;</i>  <i>b) Environmental Constraint: Low Constraint Area Overlay;</i>  <i>c) Environmental Constraint: Vegetation Protection Zone Overlay;</i>  <i>and</i>  <i>d) Environmental Constraint: Additional Area of Further Study Overlay.</i></p>	Noted.
S-4 Section 4.3.11	<p><i>Notwithstanding Policy 4.3.7, the built form fronting Concession Road 3 shall be at least 5 storeys.</i></p> <p>We request that the above be removed and be consistent with Policy 4.3.7. We note that there is only one area with frontage on Concession Road 3 and it is labelled as Environmentally Constrained Land Use to be determined. Please indicate the Medium Density Local Corridor applies to the parcel of land northeast of the Mearns Avenue and Concession Road 3 intersection should it be determined to be developable without amendment to the Secondary Plan.</p>	No change. Lands at the intersection of Concession Road 3 and Mearns Avenue are already designated Medium Density Local Corridor, but further study is required to confirm if the property is large enough for development to occur.
S-4 Section 4.4.6	<p><i>On street parking on collector or local roads adjacent to the retail and service commercial uses shall be encouraged.</i></p> <p>We request that on street parking should be permitted on local roads even if it is not adjacent to retail and commercial uses.</p>	New policy 9.3.5 clarifies that on street parking is permitted on all local roads.
S-4 Section 5.6.6	<p><i>Garbage and recycling facilities shall be integrated within the building envelope.</i></p> <p>This policy is assumed to be applied to apartment buildings but is not possible in other development forms such as a townhouse condominium. We request that this policy be reworded to provide clarity or 'where appropriate' should be added at the end.</p>	Policy 5.6.6 revised to: "Garbage and recycling facilities shall be integrated within the building envelope where appropriate."
S-4 Section 6.2.1	<p><i>All development within and adjacent to the Environmental Protection Area shall adhere to the policies of the Clarington Official Plan, as it pertains to the policy areas of the Natural Heritage System in Section</i></p>	No change. Other comments requesting changes to Environmental Protection Area permissions and

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p><i>3.4, the Watershed and Subwatershed Plans policies in Section 3.5, the Hazards policies in Section 3.7 and the Environmental Protection Areas policies in Section 14.4 and the policies of this Section and shall have appropriate regard for the recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study.</i></p> <p>We request that the policy above be synthesized within the secondary plan policies since it is part of planning for this specific area where the policies of the secondary plan would take precedence over the policies of the Official Plan. If we must adhere to the Official Plan policies as specified then it would impact other comments within the memo including asking for stormwater ponds to be located within the VPZ and EPA lands where demonstrated to be appropriate.</p>	<p>policies are not supportive, irrespective of following the policies of the Official Plan.</p>
<p>S-4 Section 6.3.6</p>	<p><i>The Municipality may require Environmental Protection Areas to be conveyed to a public authority, where appropriate, as part of the development approval process at minimal or no cost to the receiving public authority. Conveyance of lands designated Environmental Protection Area and associated vegetation protection zones shall not be considered as contributions towards the parkland dedication requirements under the Planning Act.</i></p> <p>The Planning Act does not state that Environmental Protection Area and associated vegetation protection zones do not count toward parkland dedication requirements. In fact the EPA lands within the Soper Creek Secondary Plan will provide public recreational space through trails and greater connectivity with natural areas. An alternative parkland rate should be considered for these lands as it would entice developers to develop more trails. Also Policy 6.3.7 further proves the need for these lands.</p>	<p>No change. As previously indicated, the Municipality's parkland dedication by-law states: The Municipality shall not accept any natural heritage system, minimum vegetation protection areas, regulatory shoreline, flood susceptible lands or lands with hazardous characteristics in fulfilment of the land conveyance requirements of this by-law.</p>
	<p><b>Estates Of Soper Creek (John Spina)</b></p> <p>Submission: December 10, 2025</p>	

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-4 Section 3.3.2	<p>Urban Residential areas shall combine with other elements of the Community Structure to create neighbourhoods at a walkable scale which contain a mix of land uses and housing types, provide access to local retail and services, and are within <del>short</del> walking distance to a Neighbourhood Park and/or Parkette.</p> <p>We request that the wording be changed as noted above to be more concise and can be better interpreted.</p>	Policy 3.6.2 b revised to “ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within a short walking distance of their homes”.
S-4 Section 3.4.3	<p>b) Parks shall be located to achieve a number of objectives:</p> <p>i) create larger open spaces, where appropriate, and realize co-benefits in terms of amenities by locating adjacent to other outdoor civic uses like stormwater management ponds provided they are central to the neighbourhoods being served by the park;</p> <p>We request that the additional wording, noted above, be added to provide flexibility as larger open space blocks are not always possible due to the significant constraints posed by the Environmental Protection Areas.</p>	Policy 3.6.2 revised to:
S-4 Section 3.4.3	<p>Parks</p> <p>b) Parks shall be located to achieve a number of objectives:</p> <p>ii) ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within <del>a short</del> walking distance of their homes; and</p> <p>We request that the wording noted above to be removed as noted. A ‘short walking distance’ can have a variety of interpretations in terms of distance thus the change in wording provides flexibility.</p>	<p>“Parks shall be located to achieve a number of objectives:</p> <p>a) create larger open spaces and realize co-benefits in terms of amenities by locating adjacent to other outdoor civic uses like stormwater management ponds where possible provided they are central to the neighbourhoods being served by the park;</p> <p>b) ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within a short walking distance of their homes; and</p> <p>c) ensure good visibility from public streets”.</p>
S-4 Section 3.4.3	<p>Parks</p> <p>b) Parks shall be located to achieve a number of objectives:</p>	

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>ii) ensure good access and visibility from public and/or private streets.</p> <p>We request the wording noted above be added since private roads will be included in many developments within the secondary plan.</p>	
S-4 Section 3.4.4	<p><i>Stormwater Management Ponds, where appropriate</i></p> <p><i>a) areas of passive recreation through the inclusion of paths and trails</i></p> <p><i>We request the wording to be added as noted above to provide flexibility on where paths and trails are located in terms of accessibility and planning of the larger trail network within the secondary plan area.</i></p>	No change. Policy 3.7.1 says "Where appropriate, stormwater management ponds will be treated as public assets and part of the parks and open space system. Their amenity and ecological value will be realized as..."
S-4 Section 4.2.2	<p>Schedule B identifies four overlays that establish areas where further study is required before development, as per the underlying designation, may be permitted</p> <p>Please identify what studies would be contemplated.</p>	No change. 6.5.3 to 6.5.7 already give a breakdown of which studies.
S-4 Section 4.3.7	<p><i>Building heights shall be a minimum of 3 storeys and a maximum of 6 storeys.</i></p> <p>We request that the heights along the local corridor be determined following the Eiram Development OLT Appeal as their proposal would far exceed the height limitations set within the secondary plan. There should be flexibility to allow for the maximum height to be determined at the development application stage specifically along Concession Road 3.</p>	No change. The Secondary Plan provides a baseline height. Landowners are able to apply for an OPA if they wish to increase the heights beyond what is permitted in the Secondary Plan.
S-4 Section 4.3.11	<p>Notwithstanding Policy 4.3.7, the built form fronting Concession Road 3 shall be at least 5 storeys, where appropriate.</p> <p>We are requesting flexibility through the wording above to be included as the site may not be sufficiently large enough to facilitate a 5 storey building on the northeast corner of Mearns Avenue &amp; Concession Road 3</p>	Policy 4.3.12 revised to end with "where feasible".

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-4 Section 4.5.3	<p>Detached and semi-detached dwelling units shall account for a minimum of 80 <del>70</del> percent of the total number of units in the Low Density Residential designation, with various forms of townhouses and low rise apartments accounting for the remainder</p> <p>We request that detached and semi detached account for 70 percent since this would allow 30 percent to be dedicated to other forms including townhomes which can be large depending on the type of townhome being proposed/designed for example a bungalow loft may require 36-40ft for a double car garage. This housing type may be desirable to seniors and would assist with creating homes that support 'aging in place'. The flexibility will greatly benefit the proposed built form and size of townhomes being proposed.</p>	No change. This aligns with current Council direction for low density areas.
S-4 Section 5.1.3	<p>The network of streets shall be <del>supplemented by</del> encouraged to include mid-block pedestrian connections to break up long blocks (generally blocks longer than 250 metres) and to further enhance the pedestrian permeability of the area and provide access to transit.</p> <p>We request that the wording be changed as noted above to provide flexibility for the inclusion of mid-block pedestrian connections where determined to be appropriate.</p>	No change. Mid-block connections are intended to break up long blocks.
S-4 Section 5.2.1	<p>Public art should be incorporated into the public realm, especially at Prominent Intersections, to contribute to the neighbourhood's sense of identity, where appropriate.</p> <p>We are requesting flexibility through the wording noted above as landowners should not be obligated to provide public art.</p>	Policy 5.2.1 revised to add "encouraged": "Public art is encouraged to be incorporated into the public realm, especially at Prominent intersections, to contribute to the neighbourhood's sense of identity".
S-4 Section 5.2.3	<p>Animated streets <del>should</del> may be created by incorporating public spaces which are designed to achieve animation and passive surveillance and through the provision of outdoor amenity areas and street furniture.</p> <p>We request that the wording be changed as noted above as there</p>	Policy 5.2.3 revised to "Streets and the adjacent built form should be designed to animate the street through retail uses being located close to the front lot line and with transparent ground floor glazing, where retail uses are proposed, and through outdoor

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>may be other ways of creating animated streets without obligating landowners to solely integrate public spaces.</p>	<p>amenity areas and street furniture within the public right of way."</p>
<p>S-4 Section 5.3.2</p>	<p>Privately owned publicly accessible plazas <del>shall be</del> are encouraged to be located at Prominent Intersections to contribute to their visual prominence, reinforce their role as community focal points, improve the relationship of built form to the public right- of- way, and contribute to the area's identity. Alternative locations that provide a similar level of amenity may be considered to satisfy this requirement.</p> <p>We request that the wording be changed as noted above to provide flexibility to landowners when designing prominent intersections. Landowners should not be obligated to provide POPs but do so willingly if, in their own opinion, it does contribute to the building design.</p>	<p>Policy 5.3.3 revised to: "Privately owned publicly accessible open spaces may be located at Prominent Intersections to contribute to their visual prominence, reinforce their role as community focal points, improve the relationship of built form to the public right of way, and contribute to the area's identity. Alternative locations that provide a similar level of amenity may be considered to satisfy this requirement."</p>
<p>S-4 Section 5.5.2</p>	<p>The public realm adjacent to mixed use buildings will support a high level of pedestrian activity and include wider sidewalks and street furniture, where appropriate.</p> <p>We request the additional wording be added as it would provide flexibility to the landowner when designing the public realm for mixed use buildings. The landowner should be obligated and/or limited to include only the items identified above.</p>	<p>Policy 5.5.2 revised to say "may include" in last sentence. No other changes.</p>
<p>S-4 Section 6.2.1</p>	<p>All development within and adjacent to the Environmental Protection Area shall adhere to the policies of the Clarington Official Plan, as it pertains to the policy areas of the Natural Heritage System in Section 3.4, the Watershed and Subwatershed Plans policies in Section 3.5, the Hazards policies in Section 3.7 and the Environmental Protection Areas policies in Section 14.4 and the policies of this Section and shall have <del>appropriate</del> regard for the recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. <b>More detailed study shall prevail over the Subwatershed Study.</b></p>	<p>Policy 6.2.1 revised to include an additional sentence as follows: "A more detailed study shall prevail over the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study provided the more detailed study is to the satisfaction of the Municipality in consultation with the Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority ("CLOCA")."</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	We request the changed noted above as it would provide flexibility to the landowners.	
S-4 Section 6.2.2	<p>In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study, <i>where applicable, shall form the basis for any study undertaken regarding the natural heritage system and natural hazards. More detailed studies and staking of natural features and natural hazards including flooding and erosion subject to any existing agreements between the Municipality and individual landowners may refine and/or confirm development limits as well as the presence of features on a site by site basis with consideration of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study; however, the more detailed studies must address the matters raised by the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study.</i></p> <p>We request the additional wording be added to recognize any and all existing agreements relating to table lands.</p>	Policy 6.2.2 revised to “In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken with respect to the natural heritage system and natural hazards. Site-specific studies may refine and/or confirm development limits and the presence and boundaries of natural heritage features, provided that the general direction and recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study are maintained, except for recommendations in the Subwatershed Study related to natural feature boundaries”.
S-4 Section 6.3.3	<p><i>Generally Stormwater management ponds, except for the outfall, shall not be permitted to be developed in lands designated Environmental Protection Area or within the vegetation protection zones to an Environmental Protection Area.</i></p> <p>We request the additional wording be added to provide greater flexibility and it is more aligned with the broader policies of the MOC’s Official Plan. Please refer to policy 20.3.7 of the MOC’s Official Plan and reflect the wording as prescribed.</p>	No change. While stormwater management ponds are not permitted in these areas, Policy 6.3.5 provides limited flexibility by allowing Low Impact Development features within the outer 5 metres of the Vegetation Protection Zone, subject to specified criteria and supporting studies. Therefore, no additional policy wording is required.
S-4 Section 6.3.6	The Municipality may require Environmental Protection Areas to be conveyed to a public authority or remain under the ownership of private entities whose objectives are land conservation, where appropriate, as part of the development approval process at minimal or no cost to the receiving public authority. Conveyance of lands designated Environmental Protection Area and associated	No change. The existing policy states the municipality "may" require conveyance "where appropriate".

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>vegetation protection zones shall not be considered as contributions towards the parkland dedication requirements under the Planning Act.</p> <p>We request the wording noted above be added as some of the landowners would like the EPA lands to remain under their ownership without being obligated to convey them to the MOC as part of their development approval at minimal or no cost as agreed upon with the private entities. The MOC provides no benefit for conveying these lands therefore the municipality must consider them to be of no worth to them. The parkland dedication should not account for these lands because they are not developable.</p>	
S-4 Section 6.3.4	<p>Low Impact Development features may be permitted in the outer 5 metres of the vegetation protection zone provided:</p> <p><del>a) the vegetation protection has not been reduced below that required in Table 3-1 of the Official Plan;</del></p> <p>c) it is supported by the findings of the appropriate studies.</p> <p>Please outline the 'appropriate' studies for our understanding. We also request that part a) of the policy be either deleted or reworded as the reduction in the VPZ should not affect our ability to implement LIDs as long as we can demonstrate it will be only within the VPZ and will not negatively impact associated key natural and hydrogeological features.</p>	<p>No change. Subsection (a) is in keeping the requirements to be no less than the Official Plan.</p> <p>Policies 3.5.6, 3.4.15 and 3.4.16 and Table 3-1 in the Official Plan provide the requirements for the studies needed to be completed.</p>
S-4 Section 6.3.5	<p>The delineation of the boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be detailed through appropriate studies prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan.</p> <p>Please outline the 'appropriate' studies.</p>	<p>Policy 6.3.6 revised to "The boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be refined through site- specific studies prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan."
S-4 Section 6.4.1	<p>Land Use to be Determined is a land use designation shown on Schedules A and B. These lands require further analysis to determine if development can be permitted and is feasible. These lands are identified as Environmental Protection Area in the Official Plan. These lands were not identified as part of the Natural Heritage System in the Soper Creek Subwatershed study; however, the lands were identified as containing vegetation protection zones, candidate and / or unconfirmed significant wildlife habitat, low constraint areas and were also identified with Status Pending further Study and noted as locations for Enhancement / Restoration Opportunities. These are small areas surrounded by the Natural Heritage System.</p> <p><i>An Official Plan Amendment application shall be required and should include the boundary of the adjacent Natural Heritage System, <del>needs to be confirmed and the feasibility of access, serviceability and as well as demonstrate the developability of the Land Use to be Determined designation area needs to be demonstrated prior to any application for Official Plan Amendment to permit development.</del></i></p> <p>We request that an underlying designation be included for the "Land Use to be Determined" designations as it would not require an OPA. It will not circumvent the review by public agencies as we would still need to justify the developability of these areas and the developer would undertake and submit the appropriate studies in support of their application. If an OPA is required, an OPA application can be filed by the applicant with the supporting materials rather than providing these supporting materials first and then being able to file the OPA application.</p>	The intention is that an OPA would be needed. Policy 6.4.2 has been revised to clarify that an Official Plan Amendment is required to change the designation to permit development.
S-4 Section 6.4.2	To confirm feasibility of development, lands within this designation shall be subject to a number of studies and staking of adjacent natural heritage features to confirm the presence of and boundary of features and functions in the adjacent Environmental Protection Area	Policies 6.4.4 and 6.4.5 in the Secondary Plan outline the required studies. Policy 6.4.2 revised to: "To change the designation to permit

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>designation and confirm the extent of the Vegetation Protection Zone to ensure no impact on the adjacent Environmental Protection Area from urban development. <b>If any impacts to the EPA designation are proposed then options for enhancement, compensation and restoration should be considered if it results in an overall net positive benefit to the natural heritage features.</b></p> <p>We request that a list of studies be outlined for the secondary plan area to ensure that all landowners are advised and are agreeable to the proposed list. Also, we request that the wording noted above, in red, be included as it would be beneficial for protection and/or enhancement of natural heritage features from future development.</p>	<p>development, an Official Plan Amendment application will be required along with studies to confirm the boundary of the Natural Heritage System, confirm the feasibility of access and serviceability and determine the appropriate land use designation if development is feasible."</p>
S-4 Section 6.4.6	<p><del>If further studies identified in this section determine that portions of the Land Use to be Determined designation can be developed, an Official Plan Amendment will be required to delineate the Environmental Protection Area boundaries and the appropriate land use designation on the developable portion. An Official Plan Amendment will be required to delineate the Environmental Protection Area boundaries and the appropriate designation as well as demonstrating the developability of portions of the Land Use to be Determine designation through the submission of further studies</del></p> <p>We request that this policy be reword as the Official Plan Amendment submission would include the justification demonstrated through site specific studies as part of a complete application submission. The justification should not come before the OPA application.</p>	See above.
S-4 Section 7.2.6	<p>Parks shall be designed to be accessible and shall have street frontage on not less than <del>30%</del> 15% of the park perimeter. Backing of residential and commercial uses onto parks shall be minimized with flankage of lots preferred.</p> <p>We request that the street frontage required be reduced to 15% to</p>	Policy 7.2.6 revised to allow for less than 30% at the sole discretion of the Municipality: " <i>Parks</i> shall be designed to be accessible and shall have street frontage on not less than 30% of the <i>park</i> perimeter. Backing of residential and commercial uses onto <i>parks</i> shall

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	provide greater flexibility with proposed development layouts. A 15% street frontage would still be adequate for parks.	be minimized with flankage of <i>lots</i> preferred. The municipality may consider a lesser percentage, at its sole discretion, where the park is flanked by other public lands which ensures public access and visibility".
S-4 Section 7.2.7	<p>Areas conveyed for parkland purposes will be <del>programmable</del> lands.</p> <p>We request the wording be deleted as noted above. We ask that the policy be replaced with the following " Areas conveyed for parkland purposes shall demonstrate how they can be used for recreational purposes"</p>	No change. Parks must be programmable. "Recreation purposes" is too broad and can exclude facilities such as playgrounds.
S-4 Section 9.1.5	<p>Use mid-block connections and trails to augment the network established by streets to improve permeability for users of active transportation, <b>where appropriate</b>.</p> <p>We request the additional wording be added to provide flexibility to each landowner in determining and justifying where mid-block connections may make sense to integrate within their broader development proposal.</p>	Policy revised as requested.
S-4 Section 9.3.2	<p>The collector road network shown in Schedule B is conceptual and will be confirmed through the Class C Environmental Assessment process, and the draft plan of subdivision process without amendment to the Secondary Plan.</p> <p>The layout shown on Schedule B should reflect or reference the new collector road layout that we presented to Tylin for their review. This was illustrated by Schaeffers in a separate memo.</p>	Changes to the proposed collector roads at this stage would require an EA. Policy revised to say: "The collector road network shown in Schedule B is conceptual and will be confirmed through the Class C Environmental Assessment Process. Further refinements will be considered through Phases 3 and 4 conducted during the draft plan of subdivision process without amendment to the Secondary Plan."

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-4 Section 9.3.3	<p>The Municipality may consider development on private roads outside of the Low Density Residential designation</p> <p>Please reconsider this policy as there are building designs that could benefit from a private road within the Low Density Designation.</p>	No change. Not permitting private roads in low-density areas is consistent with our other Secondary Plans.
S-4 Section 9.4.1	<p>The Municipality shall ensure that transit facilities are integrated early and appropriately within and adjacent to Soper Springs and ensuring that transit requirements are addressed through municipal capital works and private development applications.</p> <p>Please identify on Schedule B where the transit facilities are planned for the secondary plan area if they are to be addressed through private development.</p>	No change. This is a decision for Durham Region Transit to decide on as part of their 5-year review, consultation, and internal deliberations.
S-4 Section 9.5.5	<p>To support increased network connectivity, mid-block connections shall be encouraged established throughout the Secondary Plan Area and in particular through the Medium Density Local Corridor – designation to Concession Road 3.</p> <p>We request the change in wording be included since it would provide flexibility to the landowner in determining where it is appropriate to include mid block connections for supporting pedestrian connectivity. The landowner should not be obligated where it isn't appropriate or does not make sense to do so.</p>	Policy 9.5.5 revised to "may be" instead of "shall be".
S-4 Section 9.5.7	<p>All collector and local roads shall also be planned to include a vibrant and healthy tree canopy, consisting of primarily native plantings. The tree canopy will provide shade and enhance and establish a vibrant urban environment. A tree canopy plan shall be prepared for each plan of subdivision.</p> <p>We request the removal of references to a tree canopy plan as this can be covered under the landscape architectural plans.</p>	Policy 9.5.7 revised to clarify that they can be submitted as part of the required landscape architecture plans.
S-4 Section 12.1.3	All new development within the Soper Springs Secondary Plan area shall proceed on the basis of the sequential extension of full municipal services either by servicing through adjacent plans of	No change.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>subdivision, including servicing through provisions or through the Regional and Municipal capital works programs and plans of subdivision and may be advanced by landowners/proponents with appropriate agreements with the Region and/or Municipality.</p> <p>We are seeking clarity on how sequential development and phasing will work when additional infrastructure is needed such as a PRIVATE pumping station to service some of the Estates of Soper Creek blocks?</p>	
S-4 Section 12.1.6	<p>12.1.6 Approval of development applications shall be conditional upon commitments from the appropriate authorities and the proponents of development to the timing and funding of the required road and transportation facilities, parks and community facilities. These works shall be provided for in the subdivision and / or site plan agreements. Phasing of the development, <b>due to partial construction of internal collector roads</b> as a result of non-participating landowners or based on the completion of external road works, may be required by the Municipality of Clarington.</p> <p>We are seeking clarity as each developer would be responsible for the portion of the collector road within their own property and should not be held up by another owner (participating or non-participating) if they do not proceed or their portion of the road is not constructed</p>	Phasing policies revised and moved to new policy 12.1.9.
	<p><b>Estates Of Soper Creek (John Spina)</b></p> <p>Submissions: January and February 2026</p>	
S-4 Section 3.6.2b)	Revise to: "b) ensure that the entire community has good access to parks within a <del>5-minute</del> <b>short</b> walking distance of their homes <b>where possible</b> ;"	Policy 3.6.2 revised to replace "5 minutes" with "Short".
S-4 Section 4.4.10	Revise to: "4.4.10 Development within the Medium Density Residential designation shall have a minimum site density of 45 units per net hectare <b>where feasible</b> . "	No change. Additional words not appropriate.
S-4 Section 6.2.2	"based on the general direction of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study provided recommendations in the Soper Creek Subwatershed	Policy 6.2.2 revised to provide clarity.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Study other than on natural feature boundaries are adhered to. "</p> <p>Could this be stated clearer?</p>	
S-4 Section 6.3.8	<p>If the trails are going through the EPA avoiding disturbance may not be possible. Would we required to compensate for removal of trees to achieve these trails? I think since the MOC is requesting that these trails be created that the compensation be a 1:1 ratio.</p>	<p>No change. The policy doesn't say avoid disturbance. It says conserves their ecological integrity. Trails can be accommodated in Natural heritage features without impacting their ecological integrity provided they don't for instance require filling in a wetland.</p>
S-4 Section 6.4.5	<p>(if not already addressed by the Subwatershed Study) Downstream and erosion impacts should have considered all development blocks within the Estates and we are not supportive of having to do a supplementary study.</p>	<p>No change. The Soper Creek Subwatershed Study didn't consider downstream and erosion impacts of the lands identified as 'Land Use to be Determined'. That is why the policy requires this analysis to be completed as part of a development application.</p>
S-4 Section 9.3.2	<p>We are still seeking flexibility to introduce an alternative road network.</p>	<p>Policy 9.3.3: added: "Notwithstanding Policy 9.3.2, the northern collector road crossing of the Soper Creek tributary can be altered or relocated or an additional local road crossing provided without amendment to the Secondary Plan subject to completion of technical studies, determination of mitigation measures and obtaining permits and approvals from the Municipality of Clarington, Region of Durham, Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority and other agencies having jurisdiction; and the fulfilment of the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		Assessment for any Schedule C project.”
S-4 Section 9.3.4	Please allow for us to front units onto the collector road with driveway access.	No change. Appendix C in Clarington's Official Plan outlines access on collector road. Specifically, Individual accesses to detached, semi-detached, and street townhouse dwellings <u>may</u> not be permitted. They are not prohibited. An additional policy is not necessary
S-4 Section 12.1.4	<p>"12.1.4 Upgrading of existing roads, culverts, bridges and similar infrastructure by the landowners/proponents in order to facilitate development will be considered through appropriate agreements with the Region and/or Municipality. "</p> <p>Would these be reimbursed through DCs?</p>	Policy 12.1.4 revised to “Notwithstanding that the upgrading of existing roads, culverts, bridges and similar infrastructure by the landowners/proponents required to facilitate development will be considered through appropriate agreements with the Region and/or Municipality, the Development Charge eligibility of such works shall not be adversely affected”.
S-4 Section 6.3.13	Policy reference to compensation agreement	Policy 6.3.13 added: “Notwithstanding Policy 6.3.1, the area commonly referred to as “the lobe” located at 3145 Mearns Avenue and designated Environmental Protection Area which was previously the subject of unauthorized natural feature removal, may be designated as Low Density Residential without amendment to this Secondary Plan, subject to the terms and conditions of the Compensation Agreement dated February 2020

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		between the applicable landowner and the Municipality of Clarington”.
S-4	Show "Missing Block" on Schedules	No change. The area in question is identified as 'High Constraint' due to valleylands/slope hazard, in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. This was confirmed through consultation with CLOCA and Aquafor Beech. This area remains as EP on the land use schedules.
	<p><b>Estates Of Soper Creek (John Spina)</b></p> <p>Submission: March 16, 2026</p>	
S-4 Section 4.3.10	<p><i>Development</i> within the Medium Density Local Corridor designation shall have a minimum <i>site</i> density of 100 units per net hectare, where appropriate.</p> <p>We are requesting this additional wording because we may not be able to meet this minimum density requirement for our block located at the corner of Mearns Avenue and Concession Road 3.</p>	No change. "Where appropriate" is not an appropriate or definitive criterion for managing density and provides neither landowners or Municipality with certainty.
S-4 Section 4.4.10	<p><i>Development</i> within the Medium Density Residential designation shall have a minimum <i>site</i> density of 45 units per net hectare, where appropriate.</p> <p>We are requesting this change because some of our blocks may not be able to achieve this density</p>	No change. "Where appropriate" is not an appropriate or definitive criterion for managing density and provides neither landowners or Municipality with certainty.
S-4 Section 5.2.1	Public art should be incorporated into the public realm, especially is encouraged at Prominent Intersections, to contribute to the neighbourhood's sense of identity.	Policy revised to add "is encouraged to be" before "incorporated".
S-4 Section 6.2.2	In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the basis for any study undertaken regarding the natural heritage system and natural hazards. Site-specific studies may refine	Policy 6.2.2 revised to: "In addition to these policies, the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study shall form the

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	and/or confirm development limits as well as the presence of natural heritage features based on the general direction of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study with respect to the natural heritage system provided recommendations in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study other than on natural feature boundaries are adhered to, where appropriate.	basis for any study undertaken with respect to the natural heritage system and natural hazards. Site-specific studies may refine and/or confirm development limits and the presence and boundaries of natural heritage features, provided that the general direction and recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study are maintained, except for recommendations in the Subwatershed Study related to natural feature boundaries”.
S-4 Section 6.3.4	<p><i>Stormwater management ponds</i>, except for the outfall, shall not be permitted to be developed in lands designated Environmental Protection Area or within the <i>Vegetation Protection Zones</i> to an Environmental Protection Area unless justified to the satisfaction of the Municipality of Clarington in consultation with the Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority.</p> <p>Please consider the wording above or using ‘generally’ in the current policy language</p>	No change. Policy is consistent with other Secondary Plans.
S-4 Section 6.3.6	The boundary of lands designated as Environmental Protection Area on Schedule A are approximate and shall be <del>detailed</del> refined through site specific studies prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Clarington Official Plan without amendment to this Secondary Plan.	Revised as requested.
S-4 Section 6.3.7	The Municipality may require Environmental Protection Areas to be conveyed to a public authority, where appropriate, as part of the <i>development</i> approval process at minimal or no cost to the receiving public authority. Conveyance of lands designated Environmental	No change. Bill 23 did not require EPA’s to be used for parkland dedication.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Protection Area and associated <i>Vegetation Protection Zones</i> shall not be considered as contributions towards the parkland dedication requirements under the Planning Act. Conveyance may not be appropriate in all circumstances.</p> <p>Please add that this policy be subject to the provisions of the Planning Act relating to Parkland dedication due to the changes that came with Bill 23</p>	
S-4 Section 6.3.9	The Soper Creek Subwatershed Study identified and assessed a number of Headwater Drainage Features. Those identified in the Subwatershed Study as “Protection” are included in the Environmental Protection Area designation and are to be protected in situ unless demonstrated otherwise by further <i>site</i> -specific environmental studies, where appropriate.	No change. The term “where appropriate” is not necessary. The test is unless demonstrated by future studies.
S-4 Section 6.3.13	<p>Notwithstanding Policy 6.3.1, in the area commonly referred to as “the lobe” and designated Environmental Protection Area in the central area of the plan which was previously the subject of unauthorized natural feature removal shall be designated low density residential subject to the compensation agreement dated February 2020 between the applicable landowner and the Municipality of Clarington without amendment to the secondary plan. <del>in-situ restoration of the Environmental Protection Area shall be provided or alternatively appropriate compensation at a tree replacement ratio of 2:1 and generally encompassing an area of approximately 1 hectare may be considered within other areas of the Secondary Plan at the Municipality's discretion in consultation with the Region of Durham and CLOGA.</del></p> <p>We need not spell out the nuances of the agreement as the agreement speaks for itself and it is not widely applicable to all landowners.</p>	Policy 6.3.13 revised but reference to the agreement still included.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-4 Section 6.4.3	<p>To confirm feasibility of <i>development</i>, lands within this designation shall be subject to a number of studies and staking of <i>abutting natural heritage features</i> to confirm the presence of and boundary of features and functions in the abutting Environmental Protection Area designation and confirm the extent of the <i>Vegetation Protection Zone</i> to ensure no impact on the abutting Environmental Protection Area from urban <i>development</i>. <del>The municipality may consider enhancement, compensation and restoration to ensure an overall net positive impact on the natural heritage features and system</del></p> <p>If lands are developable then they would have met the test of no impact</p>	<p>Policy revised to “To confirm feasibility of development, lands within this designation shall be subject to a number of studies and staking of abutting natural heritage features to confirm the presence of and boundary of features and functions in the abutting Environmental Protection Area designation and confirm the extent of the Vegetation Protection Zone to ensure no impact on the abutting Environmental Protection Area from urban development.”</p>
S-4 Section 6.4.4	<p><del>Studies submitted in support of an Official Plan Amendment application shall also assess the impact</del> Any proposed road crossing of the Environmental Protection Area <del>into this designation to</del> <b>shall</b> demonstrate that roads and servicing can be provided without a net negative impact on the natural heritage features and functions within the abutting Environmental Protection Area designation <b>without amendment to the secondary plan.</b></p>	<p>Policy revised to: “Studies submitted in support of an Official Plan Amendment application shall also assess the impact of any proposed road crossing of the Environmental Protection Area into this designation to demonstrate that roads and servicing can be provided without a net negative impact on the natural heritage features and functions within the abutting Environmental Protection Area designation. The Municipality may consider enhancement, compensation and restoration to ensure an overall net positive impact on the natural heritage features and system.”</p> <p>The policy provides clarity on what the studies are assessing and that an OPA is required.</p>

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
S-4 Section 6.4.5	The studies referred to in this Section shall <b>consist of the following studies</b> <del>include, but are not limited to:</del> a Hydraulic Analysis Study, an Environmental Impact Study, a Geotechnical Analysis confirming the long-term stable top of bank, a Hydrogeological Analysis, updated hydrology modelling to evaluate downstream flooding and erosion impacts (if not already addressed by the Subwatershed Study) and a Geomorphical Study as well as a Planning Justification and are required as part of a complete application. Prior to undertaking the identified studies, the terms of reference shall first be approved by the Municipality in consultation with the relevant agencies.	Policy 6.4.5 revised to delete reference to 'but not limited to'.
S-4 Section 6.4.6	A detailed block plan will also be required in support of an Official Plan Amendment application to demonstrate that the remaining lands outside of the Environmental Protection Area and associated <i>Vegetation Protection Zone</i> <del>can be large enough to</del> be developed for urban uses and associated roads, trails, and stormwater management facilities and determine the appropriate density of <i>development</i> without impact on the abutting Environmental Protection Area.  Please elaborate on what is meant by 'large enough'. If the lands can be developed then they are large enough	Policy revised as requested.
S-4 Section 6.5.8	Following the completion of the required studies <del>to the satisfaction of the Municipality,</del> <i>development</i> may be permitted in the Environmental Constraint Overlays as deemed appropriate by the study, without amendment to this Plan, and the underlying land use designation in Schedule A will apply. Where <i>development</i> in an Environmental Constraint Overlay is determined not to be appropriate, or the limits of the <i>Vegetation Protection Zone</i> is confirmed, the Environmental Constraint Overlay will be deemed to be part of the Environmental Protection Area designation.	No change. The studies must be satisfactory to the Municipality.
S-4 Section 9.2.2	The transportation network in the Soper Springs Secondary Plan Area should be developed in accordance with Schedule B Environmental Constraint and Transportation and the policies of this	No change. The Transportation Assessment Report will be finalized once the Trip Generation Memo is reviewed and will not be revised.

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Secondary Plan, with further guidance provided in the Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines and the Soper Springs Transportation Report <b>as revised from time to time.</b>	
S-4 Section 9.3.3	The northern collector road crossing of the Soper Creek tributary can be altered or relocated or <b>reclassified</b> <del>an additional local road crossing provided</del> without amendment to the Secondary Plan subject to completion of technical studies, determination of mitigation measures and obtaining permits and approvals from the Municipality of Clarington, Region of Durham, Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority and other agencies having jurisdiction; and the fulfilment of the requirements of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for any Schedule C project.	No change. TYLIN has determined that the collector road function is necessary.
New Policy Request	Please indicate the small apartment block as Land Use To Be Determined. It was understood that this change would be accommodated. This will not circumvent the review process as we would justify that the block can be developed.	No change. The area in question is identified as 'High Constraint' due to valleylands/slope hazard, in the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. This was confirmed through consultation with CLOCA and Aquafor Beech. This area remains as EP on the land use schedules.
New Policy Request	Regarding the unopened Mearns Avenue road allowance we request a policy to be included that states "Requests for conveyance of the Mearns Avenue road allowance to any landowner shall be reviewed at the draft plan application stage. If the road allowance is used for any proposed future roadways an amendment to the secondary plan will not be required."	Municipal policies on road conveyance will govern and an OPA is not required for use of the road allowance for a local road.
	<b>Jay Strasser (Jayzee Properties)</b>	
S-5	Please see the information attached hereto as Appendix F related to the lands municipally addressed as 3347 & 3403 Liberty Street North. This Appendix demonstrates the existing conditions and environmental constraints on the lands. We would request that this be considered in Schedule A and B depictions of the Environmental Protection Area, and the schedules be revised appropriately.	No change. Consideration of this information at this time would require a full EIS and peer review of the EIS as well as staking of the features in the field. Refinements of the EPA can be done

Submission Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		at the draft Plan of subdivision stage.
S-5	<p>In relation to previous site-specific requests for 3253 Liberty Street N Limited Partnership and Jayzee Properties, in relation to certain Environmental Protection Area depictions on Schedule A and B, we propose a special policy area approach to address refinements to these areas and we request that the schedule be modified in those locations for the aforementioned properties based on previous comments, and request that the policy below be included in the Secondary Plan. We request that the medium and low density residential designations be depicted with the Environmental Constraints Overlay.</p> <p><i>“The areas with an Environmental Constraints Overlay as shown on Schedule A Land Use and Schedule B Environmental Constraint and Transportation Plan have been identified as containing features consistent with Environmental Protection Area designation from the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study existing conditions report including specifically watercourses. However, the presence and precise delineation of the natural heritage features shall be determined through an Environmental Impact Study prepared as part of the review of development applications in accordance with the policies of this Secondary Plan and the Official Plan. If the Environmental Impact Study establishes that development can proceed, then the underlying designation shall apply over those lands without the requirement for an amendment to this Plan. Further, it may be determined that only a portion of the lands within the Environmental Constraints Overlay may be suitable for development.”</i></p> <p>We request that the above policy be included in the Secondary Plan to support the underlying designation applying to lands or portions of lands when the necessary site-specific study demonstrates that</p>	<p>No change. The existing policies in Environmental Constraint overlay are very clear and in all cases except for the “Land Use to be Determined” already have an underlying designation. As such this policy is not necessary and adds confusion. In the “Land Use to be Determined” designation, the policy framework for determining if future development is feasible is clear and an OPA is required.</p>

<b>Submission Number</b>	<b>Details of Submission</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
	development can occur. We look forward to discussing how this could be implemented in our upcoming meeting.	

### Urban Design Guidelines Comments

Guideline Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<b>Weston Consulting on behalf of the Landowner Group (May and November 2025)</b>	
2.2	<p><i>Neighbourhood Parks are to serve the basic active and low intensity recreational needs of the surrounding residents. Neighbourhood parks are to be a minimum size of 2.5 hectares depending on the area served and the activities to be provided.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above guideline, we suggest this goes beyond the Official Plan and request that it be revised to be in conformity with the Official Plan range in areas for Neighbourhood Parks of between 1.5 to 3.0 hectares.</p>	Revised to a minimum of 1.5 hectares.
4.1.3 (10)	<p><i>Rows of street townhouses should generally be limited to a maximum of 8 units.</i></p> <p><i>Rows of street townhouses is outlined as a maximum of 8 units, which should be updated in the Secondary Plan text to reflect 8 units to be consistent.</i></p>	Revised to 6 units to match SP and OP policies.
4.2.4	<p><i>Minimize the design of a slab building and reduce the overall massing with a maximum building length of 60m.</i></p> <p>We request that the above noted guideline be removed and addressed at the Site Plan or Draft Plan of Subdivision stage.</p>	Added “generally” before 60 m.
4.2.5	<p><i>To help mitigate overlook and maximize sunlight to the lower levels of the buildings, a minimum separation distance of 15m is required. This space should be void of any building projections.</i></p> <p>A minimum 15 metre separation was not contemplated in the previous draft and we request that this be removed to provide flexibility for appropriate and functional building design.</p>	Guideline clarified that this is where there is a window-to-window separation.
4.2.7	<p><i>Apply a 45 degree angular plane, measured from the property line of an adjacent low rise residential area to the proposed mid-rise building.</i></p> <p>We request that guideline 4.2.7 be removed as this may limit potential building envelopes on development sites. We are not certain that angular plane is necessary between the heights of buildings proposed in the designations</p>	Guidelines revised to stepbacks applying to buildings above 6 storeys

Guideline Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	as they are mid and low rise, which can co-exist without the need for an angular plane requirement.	
5.1.1 (5)	<p><i>Ensure off-road trails or Multi-use path provide a continuous and connected network that led to destinations such as a transit stops or Local Corridor, where possible.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.1.1 (5), please include the requested language as indicated above.</p>	No change. The active transportation network should connect to sidewalks, pedestrian connections or cycling infrastructure to ensure safety and no dead end trails.
5.1.2(1)	<p><i>Trails are an important part of the active transportation network and should be connected to sidewalks, pedestrian connections and cycling infrastructure, where possible.</i></p> <p>In regards to policy 5.1.2(1), please include the requested language as indicated above.</p>	See above comment. No change.
6.2.1.3	<p><i>Neighbourhood parks a minimum 2.5 hectares in size and configured to accommodate both passive and active programming.</i></p> <p>In regards to the above guideline, we suggest this goes beyond the Official Plan and request that it be revised to be in conformity with the Official Plan range in area for Neighbourhood Parks of between 1.5 to 3.0 hectares.</p>	Revised
7.1	<p><i>Energy Conservation</i></p> <p>We request that section 7.1 be revised as in our opinion there is too much detail and prescription to be captured in guidelines.</p>	No change.
<b>John Spina/Estate of Soper Springs Comments (December 10, 2025)</b>		
	<p>The 'Gateway' identified on Schedule A of the Land Use Plan does not have any prescriptive guidelines within the Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines.</p> <p>Can you confirm if this was done purposefully?</p>	Schedule A does not illustrate any Gateway.
5.3.2.1	It appears that all roads within the secondary plan area will require sidewalks on both sides of the road. Will the MOC consider sidewalks on one side of the road for local roads as it isn't common to have sidewalks on both sides of the street for every road typology.	Guidelines have been revised to allow sidewalks on at least one side of the street.
3.3	The diagram besides the policy requires block lengths to not exceed 250m with active transportation. This would include pedestrian connections that require a	No change. The urban design guidelines are not policy. The

Guideline Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	minimum width of 6m. Will the MOC consider 3m pedestrian connections as 6m is a large width and is typically required for access to a stormwater facility for vehicular access.	250m being referenced is consistent with policy 5.1.3. The illustration showing a 6 metre wide pedestrian connection is illustrative in nature and is not policy.
<b>Ari Soberano / Sharno (February 24, 2026)</b>		
	All demo plans need to be updated to reflect the land designations of the most recent Land Use plan, and provided to the LOG for review	Updated.
4.2.5	the '15m separation' is still there. Please add the word "generally" in front of this.	Revised.
4.4(3)	please add back that "the intersection will be the primary gateway".	Revised.
4.4(4)	This section should make notion that POPs are not required. Something along the lines of, "If elected by the Developer...."	Added "where provided"
5.1.1(5)	not updated. Please add "where possible"	No change. The goal should be to connect to key features in the community. "Such as" is a qualifier and transit/local corridor connection is a suggestion
6.2.2(1)	Please remove any mention of "5 minutes" and revise to "short", to be consistent with the SP text agreed	Revised.
7.1	Revise for all sections to include "consider", as these are not obligations	Revised.
<b>Steven Ramjass/John Spina/Estates of Soper Creek (February 27, 2026)</b>		
2.5	<p>"Multi-use paths (MUPs), Natural Heritage System (NHS) parks / trails, and a Municipal MUP are proposed for Soper Springs."</p> <p>Why distinguish the Municipal MUP from the NHS Trails? It is preferable to name it all NHS Trails because they both go through the NHS.</p>	The legend has been revised to clarify. The park trails are specific connections from the parks to the trail system. The multi-use paths are connections to through the neighbourhood to the NHS. The Municipal MUP is part the larger Clarington trail system

Guideline Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		that connects this neighbourhood to others.
2.5	<p>"The NHS parks / trails and Municipal MUPs are either paved or unpaved that provide access to environmental areas such as the EPA. They are intended to keep users on a designated path to minimize disruption to the surrounding landscape. These trails are narrower than MUPs and usually have a surface of crushed aggregate or woodchip."</p> <p>Further to my comment above there is no difference between the Municipal MUP and NHS trails based on this description. It is preferable that they all be named NHS Trails.</p>	These guidelines have been revised for clarity.
4.1.4	Design driveways to be as far away from parks, schools and open space features, where possible.	Revised.
4.2	<p>"For the purposes of these guidelines a mid-rise building is defined as a building between 3 and 6 storeys in height."</p> <p>Could this be reworded for buildings greater than 3 but less than 6 stories? As it is written it overlaps with the low rise section.</p>	Revised to 4 - 6 storeys.
5.1.3.1	<p>"Offer dedicated or shared cycling infrastructure off-road throughout the community. "</p> <p>Please reword to state 'May be offered'</p>	Collector Roads have MUPs, so this guidelines matches with the purpose of collector road network.
5.1.3.4	Provide clear signage shall be provided for all cycling routes. Provision of clear signage shall be provided for cycling route where applicable.	Revised.
5.3	<p>"The network of roads consists of Collector Roads and Local Roads and is bound by Arterial Roads."</p> <p>What about private roads?</p>	These UDG are based on the Demo Plan local road network, which is conceptual. Private roads are not contemplated in the Demo Plan, but they are only allowed in medium density.
5.3	There is no private road cross section and I am assuming if there is no reference we would defer to the Municipality of Clarington Official Plan. If a cross section is planned to be including I recommend a 7.5m R.O.W for	Private road ROW to be confirmed through development review process.

Guideline Number	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	sidewalks on one side which is consistent with private roads in other areas of Bowmanville.	
5.3.2.3	The sidewalk network should be designed to connect to adjoining trails and MUPs and transit stops, <b>where possible</b> .	No change. The pedestrian network should connect.
6.2.3.4	"They should be highly visible and located within Local Corridors at Prominent Intersections and gateways."  Please exclude refer to gateways.	Revised.
7.1.3	"Construction of all low and medium density residential buildings <del>to be</del> <b>may be</b> Solar Ready, which includes all the necessary piping and equipment needed to install a rooftop solar power system. "  Please reword for greater flexibility.	Revised.
7.3.1	<b>Consider</b> Implementing a comprehensive rainwater and water recharge strategy in conjunction with required stormwater management ponds.	Revised.
7.5.8	<b>Consider</b> Buying local building materials and minimize the distance travelled to reach a construction site.	Revised.
7.7.3	Minimize surface runoff and reduce urban heat island effect through the installation of green roofs , <b>where possible</b>	Revised,
7.8.1	<b>Consider</b> Displaying in the sales centre, promotional information on the sustainable features of both the community and builders house designs.	Revised.
7.8.2	<b>Consider</b> Including education packages to residents regarding waste reduction, energy and water efficiency, and access to transit.	Revised.
<b>Ari Soberano / Sharno (March 16, 2026)</b>		
1.7	Demo Plan- We request SGL show a conceptual road pattern that reaches all the way to the southern end of the development limits for this block to be consistent with the conceptual road patterns of all other developable blocks	No change. This alignment is made to ensure that all low density units in this area front onto a conceptual local road. As this Demonstration Plan is conceptual and not a final plan for the area, alternative road layouts can be submitted as part of an application for the Municipality's approval.

<b>Guideline Number</b>	<b>Details of Submission</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
4.3.10	We request the following: Utility meters, air conditioning units, and similar infrastructure should generally be incorporated as part of the building design, and generally be screened and not visible from the public realm.	No change. The guideline follows policy direction for utilities to be hidden from view of the public realm.
5.1.2(1)	kindly add in 'where reasonably possible' at the end	No change.
5.1.2(5)	kindly add in 'where reasonably possible' at the end	No change.
5.3	Cross Section illustrations will likely need to be updated based on the outstanding revised TIS. Many of the sizing for sidewalks, etc, will need to be updated. Kindly make a note of this in the UDG text.	Cross-section confirmed with TYLIN.. Local roads cross-section is conceptual and shown to have sidewalk on one side.
6.2.1(2)	appreciate the update to 'short'. Can we remove any 'meter' range, and just leave as 'short'.	No change. Metre sizing for parks is typical for urban design guidelines to more closely outline what "short" means.
6.1.3(1)	kindly remove the word 'large' as may not be feasible in all circumstances.	Revised.
6.1.3(2)	Third last line letter 'n' is missing in 'many'	Revised.
6.2.1(4)	kindly add in 'where reasonably possible' at the end	No change.
6.2.2(1)	appreciate the update to 'short'. Can we remove any 'meter' range, and just leave as 'short'.	No change. Metre sizing for parks is typical for urban design guidelines to more closely outline what "short" means.
7.1(6)	kindly add in 'of' before 'charging' in the first line.	Revised.