

## Agency Comment Summary Table

Agency	Details of Submission	Staff Response
Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority  June 2025	<p>Schedules A and B: The current Preferred Land Use Alternative designates some areas on the north side of the SP area as “Environmental Constraint: Land Use to be Determined”. As noted previously, CLOCA staff are concerned that these designated areas are prone to natural hazards and development constraints. Staff at CLOCA anticipate the steep valley slopes, watercourse crossing requirements, geotechnical considerations and floodplain issues along with required buffers would reduce the overall developable lands. Also, the provision of access and servicing would involve significant interference with valley features. As such, it is CLOCA staff opinion that there is no development opportunity on these portions.</p>	<p>Noted, the Secondary Plan establishes a policy framework that requires comprehensive technical studies at the development application stage to determine whether any portion of these lands may be suitable for development, consistent with Section 6.4 of the Secondary Plan and in consultation with CLOCA.</p>
	<p>In addition, these areas abut Greenbelt Natural Heritage System to the north and are within the former Lake Iroquois shoreline. Section 3.2.6.3 of the Greenbelt Plan (2017) includes a policy that applies to this area:</p> <p>In addition to the urban river valleys, portions of the former Lake Iroquois shoreline, particularly within Durham Region, traverse existing or approved urban areas. Municipalities should consider planning, design and construction practices that maintain or, where possible, enhance the size, diversity, connectivity and functions of key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas of those portions of the Lake Iroquois shoreline within their approved urban boundaries.</p>	<p>The Environmental Protection Area designation includes hazard lands (Policy 6.3.2). The Municipality may request Environmental Protection lands to be conveyed at minimum or no cost (Policy 6.3.7), but it doesn't require conveyance.</p>
	<p>Accordingly, we require that the hazardous lands associated with valley features in this area be placed in an appropriate</p>	

	<p>environmental protection zone category and conveyed to the Municipality free of encumbrances through future development applications.</p>	
	<p>Schedules A and B: A regulated watercourse/tributary flows from Liberty Street through southwest portions of the SP area. On Schedule "A", the lands associated with this watercourse are mapped as EPA, however, the watercourse is not shown on the drawing. Please delineate the watercourse on the mapping to be consistent with the designated land use.</p>	<p>Watercourse has been updated on Schedules A and B.</p>
	<p>Schedules A and B: Watercourse crossings are proposed for improved access through the land use scheme. CLOCA staff generally prefer a land use structure that has a fewer number of crossings and has minimal interference with valley lands. Crossings should be sized and located such that there is no increase in upstream or downstream erosion or flooding. Crossing locations, width, and alignment should be compatible with stream morphology, which typically requires location of the crossing on a straight and shallow/riffle reach of the watercourse with no evidence of erosion with the crossing situated at right angles to the watercourse. The crossing proposed for the northwest side of the SP area does not seem to be perpendicular to the watercourse. CLOCA staff recommend that the north access road connecting the site to Liberty Road be re-aligned to yield a watercourse crossing at right angles.</p>	<p>The specific alignment of the road as it crosses the stream can be addressed through Phases 3 and 4 of the EA at the draft plan of subdivision stage. A policy (6.3.12) has been added to generally require road crossings to be situated at right angles to the watercourse where feasible.</p>
	<p>Policy 6.3.2: "Environmental Protection Areas include natural heritage features, significant groundwater discharge areas in the for of baseflow springs and seeps, 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</p>	<p>Revised Policy 6.3.2 to "in the form of baseflow...".</p>

	<p>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 Protection Area once delineated.”</p>	
	<p>Policy 11.3.9: “Stormwater management for all development shall be undertaken on a volume control basis and shall demonstrate the maintenance of recharge rates, flow paths and water quality to the greatest extent possible under varying subsurface conditions. Peak flow control and the maintenance of pre-development water balance and prevention of erosion shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Municipality of Clarington in consultation with CLOCA.”</p>	<p>Revised Policy (now 11.3.10).</p>
	<p>Policy 11.3.10: “High Volume Recharge Areas and Ecologically Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas shall maintain a pre-development water balance in accordance with the Source Water Protection Plan Policies.”</p>	<p>Revised Policy (now 11.3.11).</p>
	<p>Policy 6.4.4: The studies referred to in this Section shall include, but is not limited to, a Hydraulic Analysis Study, 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.</p>	<p>Revised Policy (now 6.4.5): “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 Geomorphical Study as well as a Planning Justification and are required as part of a complete application. Prior to undertaking the identified</p>

		studies, the terms of reference shall first be approved by the Municipality in consultation with the relevant agencies.”
	<p>Policy 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 and the policies of Section 20 of the Clarington Official Plan. Such facilities shall not be located within natural heritage features but Low Impact Development features may be permitted within the vegetation protection zone provided the intent of the vegetation protection zone is maintained and it is supported by an Environmental Impact Study. See Section 6.3.4.</p>	<p>Revised policy 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 consistent with Policy 6.3.4 of this Secondary Plan and Sections 3.4, 14.4 and 20 of the Official Plan.”</p>
<p>Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority February 2026</p>	<p>Schedules A and B: Designated Land Uses on the North Side The current land use alternative (Schedule A) designates some areas on the north side of the SP area as “Environmental Constraint: Land Use to be Determined”. These areas are designated as “Environmental Constraint: Additional Area for Further Study Overlay” through Schedule B. As noted previously, CLOCA staff are concerned that these designated areas are prone to natural hazards and development constraints. Staff at CLOCA anticipate the steep valley slopes, watercourse crossing requirements, geotechnical considerations and floodplain issues along with required Vegetation Protection Zone (VPZ) would reduce the overall developable lands. Also, the provision of access and servicing would involve significant interference with valley</p>	<p>Noted, the Secondary Plan establishes a policy framework that requires comprehensive technical studies at the development application stage to determine whether any portion of these lands may be suitable for development, consistent with Section 6.4 of the Secondary Plan and in consultation with CLOCA.</p>

	<p>features. As such, it is CLOCA staff opinion that there is no development opportunity on these portions.</p>	
	<p>In addition, these areas abut Greenbelt Natural Heritage System to the north and are within the former Lake Iroquois shoreline. Section 3.2.6.3 of the Greenbelt Plan (2017) includes a policy that applies to this area:</p> <p><i>In addition to the urban river valleys, portions of the former Lake Iroquois shoreline, particularly within Durham Region, traverse existing or approved urban areas. Municipalities should consider planning, design and construction practices that maintain or, where possible, enhance the size, diversity, connectivity and functions of key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas of those portions of the Lake Iroquois shoreline within their approved urban boundaries.</i></p> <p>Accordingly, we recommend that the hazardous lands associated with valley features in this area be placed in an appropriate environmental protection zone category (e.g. High Constraint Areas) and conveyed to the Municipality free of encumbrances through future development applications.</p>	<p>The Environmental Protection Area designation includes hazard lands (Policy 6.3.2). The Municipality may request Environmental Protection lands to be conveyed at minimum or no cost (Policy 6.3.7), but it doesn't require conveyance.</p>
	<p>High Constraint areas on the northern limits of the SP area have not been considered as a part of the ongoing hydrology and hydraulic modelling and mapping exercise associated with the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. Should development potential be contemplated for these areas, it must be demonstrated there would be no downstream flooding and erosion impacts.</p> <p>The required studies for evaluating the feasibility within these areas are stated through Section 6.4.5 of the Draft SP. But it should be noted that updating the hydraulic model and the</p>	<p>Noted, Policy 6.4.5 requires updated hydrology modelling to evaluate downstream flooding and erosion impacts.</p>

	<p>inclusion of these areas as developed areas may impact the land use structure across other parts of the SP given the potential increase in the extent of hazardous areas as a result of increased downstream impacts. Should the Municipality consider the Environmental Constraint Land Use to be Determined as potentially developable (subject to applicable studies) in this area, a high level assessment of the serviceability of these lands, updated hydrology modelling, and downstream flooding and erosion impacts should be conducted.</p>	
	<p>Schedules A and B: Watercourse crossings are proposed for improved access through the land use scheme. CLOCA staff generally prefer a land use structure that has a fewer number of crossings and has minimal interference with valley lands. Crossings should be sized and located such that there is no increase in upstream or downstream erosion or flooding. Crossing locations, width, and alignment should be compatible with stream morphology, which typically requires location of the crossing on a straight and shallow/riffle reach of the watercourse with no evidence of erosion with the crossing situated at right angles to the watercourse. The crossing proposed for the northwest side of the SP area does not seem to be perpendicular to the watercourse. CLOCA staff recommend that the north access road connecting the site to Liberty Road be re-aligned to yield a watercourse crossing at right angles.</p>	<p>The specific alignment of the road as it crosses the stream can be addressed through Phases 3 and 4 of the EA at the draft plan of subdivision stage. A policy (6.3.12) has been added to generally require road crossings to be situated at right angles to the watercourse where feasible.</p>
	<p>Policy 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." Should this area be subject to future studies,</p>	<p>This policy has been removed.</p>

	<p>it needs to be shown under appropriate category through Schedule A and Schedule B.</p>	
	<p>Throughout Schedule B, several areas are designated as areas that further studies for them would be required. However, through Schedule A such areas are not designated as “Land Use to Be Determined” rather, they are categorized within designated land uses such as “Medium Density Residential”. To be consistent, these areas should be marked as “Land Use to be Determined” through Schedule A.</p>	<p>To clarify, Schedule B shows constraint overlays, these are not areas designated as 'Land Use to be Determined' on Schedule A.</p>
	<p>Policy 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 and zoned accordingly.” Based on this policy, areas designated as Environmental Constraint: Vegetation Protection zone (VPZ) Overlay on Schedule B should be shown as “Land Use to be Determined” through Schedule A to be consistent with the SP text.</p> <p>These areas include all VPZ Overlay designated lands on the perimeter of residential areas as well as the Medium Density Residential at the intersection of Mearns Ave. and Concession Rd. 3.</p>	<p>To clarify, the Vegetation Protection Zone (VPZ) Overlay is not shown as Environmental Protection Areas on Schedule A. The VPZ Overlay is shown on Schedule B and is based on the findings of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. An Environmental Impact Study prepared in support of development applications shall confirm the extent of the Vegetation Protection Zone based on the sensitivity of the adjacent feature and in accordance with minimum Vegetation Protection Zone requirements of the Official Plan.</p>
	<p>Policy 6.2.1: 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</p>	<p>Policy revised to add "in consultation with CLOCA".</p>

	<p>and shall have appropriate regard for the recommendations of the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. A more detailed study shall prevail over the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study provided the more detailed study is to the satisfaction of the Municipality and the Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority (CLOCA).</p> <p>Please add CLOCA at the end of the policy.</p>	
	<p>Section 6.3 should include policies for in-situ restoration of Environmental Protection areas that have been subject to unauthorized removals. Should net loss of natural cover not be avoidable, appropriate mitigation and compensation opportunities within other areas of the Secondary Plan area may be considered where appropriate. Also, criteria for the compensation of environmental features such as tree replacement at a ratio of 3:1 should be added.</p>	<p>Policy 11.4.7 states: "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 and be subject to a restoration / compensation plan to create an overall net benefit to the natural heritage system."</p>
	<p>CLOCA supports the preparation of the Secondary Plans, based on accurate and current background information compiled through appropriate studies, to provide direction on the appropriate land uses. The finalization of the of the proposed land use structure for the Soper Springs SP should be informed by the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study. It is our understanding that the floodplain modeling, resulting constraints mapping, and the master functional servicing and stormwater management plan within the subwatershed study area should be completed prior to the finalization of land use scheme within the SP area. CLOCA staff recommend the SWS be completed and approved to guide the location of SWM pond locations, establish appropriate stormwater targets and recommendations based on the proposed land uses (quantity, quality, erosion, water balance) and</p>	<p>The interim report has indicated that the Secondary Plan will have no downstream impacts on the Soper Creek Subwatershed. The Soper Creek Subwatershed Study Phase 2/3 report will be finalized and approved by the Deputy CAO. A Master Drainage Plan Terms of Reference will be approved shortly in co-ordination with the Municipality and consultants. This approach is acceptable to the Conservation Authority.</p>

	determine the least impactful locations for watercourse crossings.	
Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority  March 2026	<p>The interim submission of the Phase 2/3 Report for the Soper Creek Subwatershed Study was provided to CLOCA by the Municipality of Clarington on March 19, 2026, and its review will be expedited by technical staff in an attempt to meet Municipal staff’s internal reporting deadline to finalize the SP policy document and schedules by March 27, 2026. In terms of the required sequence of studies and approval governing the proposed development, it is CLOCA staff position that the Subwatershed Study (SWS) be completed and approved first, as it establishes the foundational hydrologic and hydraulic conditions that inform the final secondary plan. Currently, Hydrology and Hydraulics model updating exercise is being undertaken.</p> <p>Once the SWS has been finalized it is then appropriate to seek approval of the secondary plan, as all policy directions and land use considerations are to be informed by, or based on, the analysis and findings of the SWS including those critical to natural hazards and protection of people and property for the lands within the SP and downstream. We understand that recommendations of the SP will be refined through the Master Servicing Plan/Preliminary Municipal Engineering Report for the entire Secondary Plan area.</p>	<p>The interim report has indicated that the Secondary Plan will have no downstream impacts on the Soper Creek Subwatershed. The Soper Creek Subwatershed Study Phase 2/3 report will be finalized and approved by the Deputy CAO. A Master Drainage Plan Terms of Reference will be approved shortly in co-ordination with the Municipality and consultants. This approach is acceptable to the Conservation Authority.</p>
	<p>The response matrix refers to Section 6.3.13 of the latest SP draft which addressed unauthorized vegetation and wetland removals in the area referred to as “the lobe”. It should be noted that CLOCA provided previous commentary <i>regarding the systematic and unauthorized vegetation removals across the SP area</i>. For example, the area shown on the mapping below was subject to vegetation and watercourse alterations. Accordingly:</p>	<p>Policy 6.3.13 revised: “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</p>

	<p>The SP needs to be modified to add a policy to address all unauthorized removals (past or future) in addition to the lobe area. Any net loss of natural cover either as a result of unauthorized activities or contemplated within a complete Planning Application must be addressed through appropriate mitigation and compensation opportunities within other areas of the Secondary Plan area, where appropriate. However, criteria for the compensation of lost environmental features should be 'like for like' such as tree removals should be replacement at a ratio of 3:1 (at a minimum) should be added into the policies. Note that the current draft provides a tree replacement ratio of 2:1 requirement and is focused on the lobe area. A policy item should be added to Section 6.3 of the SP including the following:</p> <p><i>For areas that were previously the subject of unauthorized environmental feature removals and for areas where environmental features are destroyed pre-maturely prior to Municipal approval, appropriate in-situ mitigation and compensation should occur on-site and shall be calculated at a 3:1 ratio.</i></p>	<p>Low Density Residential without amendment to this Secondary Plan, subject to the terms and conditions of the Compensation Agreement dated February 2020 between the applicable landowner and the Municipality of Clarington.</p> <p>Policy 11.4.7 is included which states: "Where trees, shrubs and other <i>natural heritage features</i> are destroyed or harvested pre-maturely prior to proper study and approval, compensation should occur on <i>site</i> and shall be calculated at a 3:1 ratio <u>except as set out in Policy 6.3.13</u> and be subject to a restoration / compensation plan to create an overall net benefit to the <i>natural heritage system</i>"</p>
	<p>As previously noted in past correspondence, the current land use alternative (Schedule A) designates some areas on the north side of the SP area as "Environmental Constraint: Land Use to be Determined". These areas are designated as "Environmental Constraint: Additional Area for Further Study Overlay" through Schedule B. As noted previously, CLOCA staff do not support this approach are concerned that these designated areas are prone to natural hazards and development constraints. Staff at CLOCA anticipate the steep valley slopes, watercourse crossing requirements, geotechnical considerations and floodplain issues along with</p>	<p>Noted, the Secondary Plan establishes a policy framework that requires comprehensive technical studies at the development application stage to determine whether any portion of these lands may be suitable for development, consistent with Section 6.4 of the Secondary Plan and in consultation with CLOCA.</p>

	<p>required Vegetation Protection Zone (VPZ) would reduce the overall developable lands. Also, the provision of access and servicing would involve significant interference with valley features. As such, it is the position of CLOCA staff that there is no development opportunity on these portions and provide further justification in the section below.</p> <p>These areas abut Greenbelt Natural Heritage System to the north and are within the former Lake Iroquois shoreline. Section 3.2.6.3 of the Greenbelt Plan (2017) includes a policy that applies to this area:</p> <p><i>In addition to the urban river valleys, portions of the former Lake Iroquois shoreline, particularly within Durham Region, traverse existing or approved urban areas. Municipalities should consider planning, design and construction practices that maintain or, where possible, enhance the size, diversity, connectivity and functions of key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas of those portions of the Lake Iroquois shoreline within their approved urban boundaries.</i></p> <p>Accordingly: The SP needs to be modified, consistent with the <i>Planning Act</i> requirements and Provincial Policy Statement to ensure that hazardous lands associated with valley features in this area are placed in an appropriate environmental protection zone category (e.g. High Constraint Areas) that does not facilitate inappropriate development.</p>	
	<p>The required studies for evaluating the feasibility within these areas are stated through Section 6.4.5 of the Draft SP. However, based on the findings of the Draft Subwatershed Study, it is likely that updating the hydraulic model to include these areas as developable will result in increased</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>downstream flooding and erosion impacts. Should the Municipality consider the Environmental Constraint Land Use to be Determined as potentially developable (subject to applicable studies) in this area, a high level assessment of the serviceability of these lands, updated hydrology modelling, and downstream flooding and erosion impacts should be undertaken prior to adding development designations in this portion of the draft plan. Where supporting analysis is not available, “land use to be determined” provisions should be utilized.</p>	
	<p>A new policy item (6.3.12) has been added to the SP policy documents Regarding crossings: “Where new roads cross watercourses they should do so generally at right angles where feasible”. It is staff opinion that the oblique angles for crossings should be considered at a time when all alternative angles for crossings have been explored and there is no feasible right-angle option available.</p> <p>Accordingly: CLOCA staff request that the north access road connecting the site to Liberty Road be re-aligned to yield a watercourse crossing at right angles. We also request the following requirements be added to the policy regarding watercourse crossings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- culverts have an open bottom where it is feasible, or where it is not feasible, the culverts should be appropriately embedded into the watercourse;</li> <li>- maintenance of ecological and hydrological functions of the valley or stream corridor be preserved;</li> <li>- crossing location, width, and alignment should be compatible with stream morphology, which typically requires location of the crossing on a straight and shallow/riffle reach</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Policy 6.3.12 revised to include requirements for watercourse crossings.</p>

	<p>of the watercourse with no evidence of erosion with the crossing situated at right angles to the watercourse;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the crossing is sized and located such that there is no increase in upstream or downstream erosion or flooding;</li> <li>- risks associated with erosion and flood hazards on the crossing structure are avoided or mitigated as verified by a qualified professional;</li> <li>- there is no obstruction of fish and wildlife passage;</li> <li>- where unavoidable, intrusions on natural features or hydrologic or ecological functions are minimized and it can be demonstrated that best management practices including site and infrastructure design and appropriate remedial measures will adequately restore and enhance features and functions;</li> <li>- any works that are to be located below the bed of the river within a watercourse shall be located below the long term scour depth.</li> </ul> <p>In addition and as it relates to CLOCA requirements, enclosures of watercourses are not permitted, whereas daylighting of buried watercourses is required if associated with an application for new development.</p>	
	<p>Throughout Schedule B, several areas are designated as areas that further studies for them would be required. However, through Schedule A such areas are not designated as “Land Use to Be Determined” rather, they are categorized within designated land uses such as “Medium Density Residential”. To be consistent, these areas should be designated as “Land Use to be Determined” through Schedule A.</p>	<p>To clarify, Schedule B shows constraint overlays, these are not areas designated as 'Land Use to be Determined' on Schedule A.</p>
	<p>The roads network on Schedule A has not considered the issue related to the nonparticipating landowner. The policy item 12.1.9 states that “Phasing of the development, due to</p>	<p>Policy 9.3.2 added to provide flexibility regarding the northern collector road. Policy 11.2.4 revised to provide</p>

	<p>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 infrastructure solutions prior to full build-out.”</p> <p>Given the nonparticipating parcel covers of a large portion of the SP area, a phased and / or interim solution for servicing and infrastructure provision may not be feasible. Accordingly, an alternative road network should be considered as well, given there is possibility that the nonparticipation issue may be permanent.</p>	<p>flexibility regarding sanitary servicing crossings.</p>
	<p>The current circulation does not contain an updated Functional Servicing Study report. As per the circulation email, the draft Functional Servicing/PMER report was anticipated for March 20, 2026. Staff look forward to reviewing the report once circulated. To maintaining consistency throughout the review process, carry over comments from our Engineering staff are attached to this letter.</p>	<p>Noted. The Preliminary Municipal Engineering Report will address these comments.</p>
<p>Region of Durham  June 2025</p>	<p>Generally, Regional Works is comfortable with Clarington deferring all real servicing work to a later phase of the project. Regional works understands that these lands can be serviced, however it has not been confirmed how they will be serviced.</p>	<p>Noted. The Preliminary Municipal Engineering Report will provide servicing options.</p>
	<p>Regional Works comments:  - Watermain and sanitary sewer crossing of the NHS over and above the proposed road network are likely required.  - The limits of the areas that would need to be serviced by the future sanitary sewage pumping station (SSPS) have not</p>	<p>Noted. The Preliminary Municipal Engineering Report to address these comments.</p>

	<p>been confirmed. A future Class EA will be required to determine the location for the SSPS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough detail has been provided to show an acceptable local water system for these lands. To prevent unacceptable dead ends, it is quite likely that additional crossings of the NHS will be required. It is our understanding that Clarington is deferring this work to the Draft Plan stage.</li> <li>- Not enough detail related to future sanitary sewer design has been provided for at least three critical crossings of the NHS. The proposed 'sanitary sewer to be suspended underneath pedestrian bridge' is not acceptable. It is our understanding that Clarington is deferring this work to the Draft Plan stage.</li> <li>- At this time, it is not clear if the entire Secondary Plan Area can be serviced without the proposed Bowmanville – Northeast Sanitary Sewage Pumping Station identified within the 2023 Region Development Charge Background Study. It is our understanding that Clarington is deferring this work to the Draft Plan stage.</li> </ul> <p>If acceptable solutions to these key issues cannot be confirmed as part of the Draft Plan stage, future changes and revisions to the Secondary Plan may be required, even if it is approved as currently proposed.</p>	
	<p>Consider revising the minimum target density in policy 4.1.1, as it appears low relative to the required minimum densities in specific land uses and in background reports.</p> <p>4.1.1 Realize efficient and transit-supportive urban densities by achieving minimum density target of 50 people and jobs per gross hectare.</p>	<p>Revised Policy 4.1.1: “Realize efficient and transit-supportive urban densities by achieving a minimum density target of 60 people and jobs per gross hectare.”</p>
	<p>The Preferred Land Use Plan Paper (2024) states that the target density is 74 people and jobs per hectare.</p>	<p>To clarify, the density identified is the actual density of the Land Use Plan.</p>

	Former Regional Official Plan policy 5.4.5.1 sets a minimum target of 53 people and jobs per hectare in the designated greenfield area.	Noted.
	Staff appreciate that transit-supportive densities are planned for within the study area, including along Liberty St. N. / Regional Road 14.	Noted.
	Staff appreciate that a range and mix of dwelling types and uses, including retail and non-residential uses, are being considered.	Noted.
	<p>Policy 7.2.6 – Considering adding: Accessibility features will include park benches at close distances throughout walking trails and parks to allow for rest points.</p> <p>7.2.6 Parks shall be designed to be accessible and shall have street frontage on not less than 30% of the park perimeter. Backing of residential and commercial uses onto parks shall be minimized with flankage of lots preferred. Accessibility features will include park benches at close distances throughout walking trails and parks to allow for rest points.</p>	Added Policy 7.2.10: “Placement of park benches should maximize accessibility and rest points.”
	Urban Design and Sustainability Guideline, Section 5.3.2 Sidewalks – Consider adding: Sidewalks will include resting points with furniture that is complimentary to the streetscape to provide resting points for older adults and those with disabilities.	Revised guideline but changed “will” to “should”.

	<p>Exhibits C (Map J1) and Exhibit D (Map J3) – The proposed OPA to implement the Soper Springs Secondary Plan identifies the deletion of the east-west Type C Arterial road, from Liberty Street North to Lambs Road bordering the north end of the Secondary Plan area. Although the Envision Durham Regional Official Plan is now Clarington’s plan to which it should conform post Bill 23, we identify that the Draft Transportation Assessment Report (April 2025), prepared by TYLin, does not provide any analysis to recommend the justification of the deletion of this section of the Type C Arterial road. In fact, it acknowledges that the protection for this arterial road corridor in the future can be accommodated through a local road connection in the Secondary Plan and has no impact on the development of the area. Policy 8.4.5 in Envision Durham provides criteria that should be met to justify the deletion of an arterial road, and the analysis of the criteria noted in this policy is not part of the Transportation Assessment Report. We suggest that this component of the OPA be removed and that the deletion of the road be investigated through another study (e.g., Clarington OP Review and/or TMP Update).</p>	<p>A transportation memorandum prepared by municipal staff concludes that removal of the Type C Arterial road will not adversely affect network connectivity or capacity and is supported given the planned collector road network and environmental constraints.</p>
<p>Region of Durham  August 2025</p>	<p>Notes should be added to the Secondary Plan mapping to identify that the proposed collector road intersection locations along Liberty Street are subject to change pending completion of the EA study for these roads</p>	<p>Policy 9.3.2 states that the collector road network shown in Schedule B is conceptual and subject to confirmation through the Class C Environmental Assessment process. Additional notes have not been added to Schedule A or Schedule B, as the policy framework is considered sufficient to convey flexibility in collector road alignment and intersection locations pending completion of the EA.</p>

	<p>Policies 4.4.4 - 4.4.6: For the proposed commercial uses at the intersection of Liberty Street and the Mearns Avenue Extension, the development blocks will need to have sufficient frontage along Mearns Avenue to accommodate the on-street parking noted in Policy 4.4.6, as well as vehicle access. On-street parking will not be permitted on Liberty Street, and vehicle access from Liberty Street may not be feasible or may be restricted.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>Technical comments were provided on the Transportation Assessment Report.</p>	<p>Revisions are being made to the Transportation Assessment Report to address these comments.</p>
<p><b>Urban Design and Sustainability Guidelines</b></p>		
	<p>The Demonstration Plan shows a local road connection to Liberty Street immediately north of Concession Road 3. This local road appears to be within the functional area of the planned roundabout at the Liberty Street/Concession Road 3 intersection, so the Region would not allow it. We recognize that the Demonstration Plan is conceptual, but this local road connection should be removed to avoid creating an expectation that it would be approved by the Region</p>	<p>Noted. The Demonstration Plan is conceptual and does not imply approval for access locations. The local road connection is shown for illustrative purposes only and does not represent an approved access.</p>
	<p>Page 17, Section 3 - Under Point #4: Blocks need to have sufficient frontage to accommodate access at an appropriate spacing from nearby intersections, particularly for blocks located along arterial roads. We suggest adding vehicle access to the considerations listed in this point, i.e., “Block depths should be designed to maximize density, allow for appropriate built form typologies, and accommodate adequate setbacks, outdoor amenity spaces, service, parking and vehicle access arrangements, and transitions in scale.”</p>	<p>Revised.</p>
	<p>Page 32, Section 5.3: The text states that “Soper Springs is surrounded by 3 Type C Arterial Roads”, but Liberty Street,</p>	<p>Revised.</p>

	Concession Road 3, and Lambs Road are all designated as Type B Arterial roads.	
	Page 34, Section 5.3.2: Point #1 should include sidewalks on both sides of arterial roads, not just collectors	Noted.
Region of Durham  February 2026	<p>In previous comments submitted in June 2025, Regional Works stated they were comfortable with Clarington deferring all real servicing work to a later phase of the project.</p> <p>Regional Works understands that these lands can be serviced, however it has not been confirmed how they will be serviced. This draft has not included any new servicing work to address the comments in the June 2025 submission.</p> <p>The Region had considerable comments on the servicing report for the Soper Springs Secondary Plan that have not yet been addressed. Clarington, the Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority (CLOCA) and the landowners should all be aware that the Region expects that there are utility corridors that need to cross the natural heritage system that are not shown on the attached land use plan. Typically, these issues are resolved before Secondary Plans are approved.</p>	Noted. Revisions are being made to the Preliminary Municipal Engineering Report to address these comments.
	<p>Regional Works offers the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A comment-response table should have been provided to identify how our previous comments were addressed and to facilitate our review of the current submission.</li> <li>- An update to the Transportation Assessment Report is in progress. The Region may have additional comments on the Secondary Plan once this update is complete.</li> <li>- Notes should be added to Schedule A and Schedule B to identify that the proposed collector road intersection locations along Liberty Street are subject to change pending</li> </ul>	Revisions are being made to the Preliminary Municipal Engineering Report to address these comments.

	<p>completion of the EA study for these roads, consistent with revised Policy 9.3.2.</p> <p>If acceptable solutions to these key issues cannot be confirmed as part of the Draft Plan stage, future changes and revisions to the Secondary Plan may be required, even if it is approved as currently proposed.</p>	
	<p>An update to the Transportation Assessment Report is in progress. the Region may have additional comments on the Secondary Plan once this update is complete.</p>	<p>Revisions are being made to the Transportation Assessment Report to address these comments.</p>
	<p>Notes should be added to Schedule A and Schedule B to identify that the proposed collector road intersection locations along Liberty Street are subject to change pending completion of the EA study for these roads, consistent with revised Policy 9.3.2.</p>	<p>Policy 9.3.2 states that the collector road network shown in Schedule B is conceptual and subject to confirmation through the Class C Environmental Assessment process. Additional notes have not been added to Schedule A or Schedule B, as the policy framework is considered sufficient to convey flexibility in collector road alignment and intersection locations pending completion of the EA.</p>
	<p>The Region appreciates that the revised minimum target density in Policy 4.1.1 now meets the former Regional Official Plan Policy 5.4.5.1, which sets a minimum target of 53 people and jobs per hectare in the designated greenfield area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	<p>The revised secondary plan states that the estimated population of the secondary plan is 3,250 residents and 1,280 units. This results in an estimated designated greenfield area density of approximately 77 people per hectare (assuming a net designated greenfield area of approximately 42 hectares).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

	<p>This is well above the estimated designated greenfield area density of 48 people and jobs / ha in the Durham GMS Phase 2 Area Municipal Growth Allocations and Land Needs 2051 - Final Report. If this trend continues, staff may wish to reassess the land needed to accommodate planned growth to 2051, as the existing Community Area within the 2051 Urban Boundary may accommodate growth well beyond 2051.</p>	Noted.
	<p>Changes to the policy wording for non-residential uses in the Medium Density Local Corridor designation may reduce the expected jobs in the secondary plan area.</p>	Noted.
	<p>Staff request an updated land budget for the revised plan to assist with growth monitoring and forecasting activities, and to confirm the above estimates, especially given that the minimum required densities were lowered for the Medium Density Residential and Low Density Residential designations.</p>	Land budget provided for review.
<p>Region of Durham</p> <p>March 2026</p>	<p>In previous comments submitted in June and December 2025, Regional Works stated they were accepting of Clarington deferring all detailed servicing work to a later phase of the project; however, it still has not been confirmed how the lands will be serviced.</p> <p>As a reminder, considerable comments on the servicing report that accompanied the Soper Springs Secondary Plan have not yet been addressed. It is noted that utility corridors that need to cross the natural heritage system are not shown on the attached land use plan. Typically, these issues are resolved before Secondary Plans are approved.</p>	Noted. The Preliminary Municipal Engineering Report will address these comments.
	<p>It is our understanding that Clarington has undertaken a scoped update to the Master Servicing Report, known now as PMER. Once the PMER is received, Regional Works will review and provide comments.</p>	Noted.

	<p>No additional materials related to the Transportation Study was provided in the circulation. Therefore, the Region's comments from the previous submission should be addressed prior to approval of the Soper Springs Secondary Plan. Once the scoped update to the Traffic Impact Study is provided, the Region will review the document and provide comments.</p> <p>An update to the Transportation Assessment Report is in progress. The Region may have additional comments on the Secondary Plan once this update is complete.</p>	<p>Revisions are being made to the Transportation Assessment Report to address these comments.</p>
	<p>Schedules A and B: Notes should be added to Schedule A and Schedule B to identify that the proposed collector road intersection locations along Liberty Street are subject to change pending completion of the EA study for these roads, consistent with revised Policy 9.3.2.</p>	<p>Policy 9.3.2 states that the collector road network shown in Schedule B is conceptual and subject to confirmation through the Class C Environmental Assessment process. Additional notes have not been added to Schedule A or Schedule B, as the policy framework is considered sufficient to convey flexibility in collector road alignment and intersection locations pending completion of the EA.</p>
<p>Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board and Peterborough Victoria Northumberland and Clarington Catholic School Board</p>	<p>We can confirm that schools are not required in the Soper Springs Secondary Plan area. However, it is important that the potential school sites in Soper Hills Secondary Plan area remain as this will be part of the overall accommodation plan for both boards.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>