

Public Comment Table on Submissions Received after release of Draft OPA No. 107
Table of Contents

Index Last Name, First name	Submission No.
1331135 Ontario Limited, The Domus Gropu	WS-27
1448774 Ontario Limited, Dom's Auto Parts (Peter Smith)	VS-9
1559360 Ontario Limited	WS-43 , VS-25
1816451 Ontario Limited	WS-57 , VS-30
2265719 Ontario Inc. (Highcastle Homes)	WS-39 , VS-13
2272449 Ontario Inc.	WS-40 , VS-18
2368364 Ontario Inc.	WS-74
2936 Hancock Road	WS-37 , VS-16
562503 Ontario Limited and Honey Harbour Heights Estates Ltd.	WS-29
Abe's Auto Recycling	WS-79
Agricultural Advisory Committee	WSA-4 , VS-1
Algoma Orchards Ltd. (Kirk Kemp)	WS-73
Anonymous	WS-6
Benoliel, Josh	WS-58 , VS-31
BILD (Carmina Tupe)	WS-35 , WS-85
Blaauw, Ron and Norma	WS-13
Bowmanville East Developers Group	WS-78 , WS-83
Brookfield Homes (Aidan Dekkema)	WS-56
Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited	WS-51
Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority	WSA-3 , VS-11
Cieciura (Design Plan Services), TJ	WS-61
Clarington Board of Trade	WSA-5
CN Rail	WSA-2
Coco Paving	WS-50
Cole, Allan	VS-29
CRH Canada Group Inc. Land Holdings (Katelyn Cummings)	WS-36
Cunningham, Barbara	WS-63
Curtis, Clifford	VS-21
Dearborn, Alec	WS-3

Delpark Homes (Prestonvale) Inc.	WS-22 , VS-7
Ellis, Ted and Joan	WS-5
Fairhaven Investments Inc.	WS-80
Fourteen Estates Limited	WS-30 to WS-34 , VS-20
Gibney, Linda	WS-66
Guthrie, Jeff	WS-24 , VS-6
Halminen Homes (Hannu Halminen)	VS-28
Hennessey, Steve	WS-67
High Street Courtice Inc.	WS-38 , VS-15
Hope Fellowship Church (Brian Bylsma)	WS-12 , VS-33
Hung, Caitlin and Warren	WS-59 , VS-32
Infrastructure Ontario and Hydro One Networks Inc.	WSA-1
Janssen, John and Ingrid	WS-55
Jury Lands Foundation	WS-14
Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board And Peterborough Victoria Northumberland Clarington Catholic District School Board	WSA-7
Klawitter, Terry	WS-18
Lee, Grant and Ruby	WS-28
Loblaw Properties Limited and Choice Properties REIT	WS-52
MacDonald, Patricia	WS-64
Martin, Bonnie	VS-12
MasonryWorx (John Armstrong)	VS-27
Medallion Developments Limited	WS-44 , WS-81 , VS-17
Mills, Bill	WS-11
Mohawk Upper James Investment Limited	WS-46 , WS-82
Nash Road Developments Inc.	WS-47 , VS-24
Norstar (James Okawa)	WS-23
One Life Farm (Tracy Fielding & Peter Alward)	WS-71 , VS-14
Ontario Power Generation	WSA-6
Orono BIA (Tino Montopoli)	WS-76 , VS-5
Pandey, Katie	WS-1
Pasricha, Ken	WS-10
Passalacqua, Joseph and Antoinette	WS-19

Preston Group (Dirk Janas)	WS-16 , WS-42
Quarry Lakes Golf & Recreation Centre Inc. (William J. Callaghan)	WS-72
Rakansky, Libby	VS-22
Rekker Gardens Ltd. (Richard Rekker)	WS-77
Rice Development Corp./ Ridge Pine Park Inc.	WS-15 , WS-45 , WS-84 , VS-23
Sailsbury, Barry	WS-2
SmartREIT (Ornella Richichi)	WS-41
Smith, Greg	WS-4
Snyder, Harvey	WS-25
St. Marys Cement	WS-49
Stephenson, Robert	WS-7
Strasser, Jay	WS-75
Tercot Development Group	WS-69
Tornat Construction Company	WS-8 , VS-26
Tribute Communities (Louise Foster)	VS-4
Vanstone Mill Inc.	WS-17 , VS-3
Veltri, Frank	WS-26
von Gunten, Eleanor	WS-62
Waldensperger, Mike	VS-19
Walker, Fiona	WS-76
Wannack, Robert	WS-54 , WS-86
Wilmot Creek Homeowners' Association	WS-48 , VS-2
Wood, Stephen	VS-8
Workman, Halina	WS-65
Wotten, David	WS-20
Wotten, Elaine	WS-53 , WS-10
Woudstra, Dirk	WS-68
Wynberg, Sheila	WS-70
Zarkovich, Milton	WS-21
Zemer Holdings Limited	WS-9
Zwetsloot, Sherry	WS-60

Public Comment Table on Submissions Received after release of Draft OPA No. 107

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
WS-1 D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Katie Pandey) June 28, 2016	Is requesting that the Draft Official Plan Amendment be adopted by Council.	Staff agrees with submission.
WS-2 Barry Sailsbury June 28, 2016	Location: 582 Lambs Road. Concerned about zoning requirements for future development.	OPA 107 does not propose any changes to the land use designations for this property.
WS-3 Alec Dearborn June 28, 2016	Location: 3831 Tooley Road. There is proposed and approved sanitary sewer on Tooley Road. 95% of the current residents do not want these services, nor will connect to the services.	Comment received and will be forward to the Region of Durham.
	There are trees being removed on Tooley Road. Would like confirmation that this was permitted.	Tree removal complaints have been forwarded to Region and Clarington's By-law Enforcement Office.
WS-4 Greg Smith June 28, 2016	Location: Northeast corner of Rudell Road and King Avenue in Newcastle. This block is planned for townhouses. Residents would prefer detached housing with a gas station at the corner.	Staff are recommending a local corridor designation along Highway 2 in the west end of Newcastle. The designation allows for convenience commercial within mixed use buildings. See section 8.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.
WS-5 Ted and Joan Ellis June 28, 2016	Location: Courtice Main Street.	The timing of the sanitary sewer is the responsibility of the Region. Staff is working with the land owners to develop an urban

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Would like to know when the sanitary sewer for the rest of Highway 2 to Courtice Road is going to start. Would like to see a downtown in Courtice and want to see the Secondary Plan realized.</p>	<p>design plan to guide the development of the Town Centre. Staff is also preparing a Draft Zoning By-law and a Draft Community Improvement Plan as the foundation to implement the Courtice Main Street Secondary Plan.</p>
<p>WS-6 Anonymous June 28, 2016</p>	<p>Wants to ensure that farm land and greenspace will be preserved. Once these resources are gone, they cannot be replaced. Too much nature is already lost.</p>	<p>The Official Plan provides for the protection of the natural heritage system and agricultural lands as this is the first priority for the community.</p>
<p>WS-7 Mr. Robert Stephenson – D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Katie Pandey) July 14, 2016</p>	<p>Location: Property between 3334 and 3382 King Avenue West in Newcastle. Area of property 12.77 acres. Located just west of the northwest corner of Rudell Road and King Avenue.</p> <p>Owner is proposing to develop the property with a mix of uses including townhouses and commercial retail. Proposed Official Plan maintains the Urban Residential designation. Suggest a Local Corridor designation to this stretch of King Avenue. A retail study was also prepared in support of a Neighbourhood Centre designation on the property.</p>	<p>Staff are recommending a Local Corridor designation along Highway 2 in the west end of Newcastle. The designation allows for convenience commercial within mixed use buildings. See section 8.1 in staff report PSD-060-16. A Neighbourhood Centre designation is not supported.</p>
<p>WS-8 Tornat Construction Corporation – D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Katie Pandey)</p>	<p>Location: 422-500 King Avenue West in Newcastle (northeast corner of King Avenue and Rudell Road).</p>	<p>Staff are recommending a Local Corridor designation along Highway 2 in the west end of Newcastle. The designation allows for convenience commercial within mixed</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>July 14, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-26</p>	<p>Owner is proposing to develop the property with a mix of uses including an apartment building, townhouses and commercial retail. Suggest a Local Corridor designation to this stretch of King Avenue West. The Region Official Plan states that compact urban form with a mix of uses is encouraged along arterial roads.</p> <p>Verbal submission (John Romanov, Romanov Romanov Architects) Requesting that a section of King Avenue West between Rudell Road and Pedwell Street be designated as a Local Corridor to allow for a higher density development, keep with the character of the area, increase urban intensification, allow for a smaller foot print, and create mixed use buildings at various price points. The area is an Arterial A road and is a significant intersection with public transportation access, which makes it a good location for a higher density development and Local Corridor designation.</p>	<p>use buildings. See section 8.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-9 Zemer Holdings Limited – D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Michael J. Fry) July 15, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 50 Martin Road in Bowmanville.</p> <p>Property has recently been rezoned to allow for a four storey apartment building containing 75 units. The Draft Official Plan (2016) proposes to redesignate the rear property from Urban Residential to Environmental Protection Area. This area contained mature trees, however, an Environmental Brief and correspondence with</p>	<p>See section 5.4 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>the Conservation Authority, the Municipality, and arborist, determined that most trees were infested by emerald ash borer. Consent was given to remove the trees. There are no features on the site that would warrant the Environmental Protection designation. Request that the designation be removed.</p>	
<p>WS-10 Ken Pasricha – D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Katie Pandey) July 15, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 2411 and 2415 Baseline Road in Bowmanville.</p> <p>Owner is proposing to develop the property with a mix of uses, including an apartment building, townhouses, and a commercial retail component. The property is proposed to be redesignated from Environmental Protection to Gateway Commercial. Gateway commercial does not allow the residential component.</p> <p>Requesting the designation be changed to Neighbourhood Centre which would permit a mixed use development. Baseline is an arterial road which would support mixed uses, transit and higher densities. The property is in close proximity of the Bowmanville Indoor Soccer Fields and Clarington Fields which would be beneficial to future residents.</p>	<p>This property is designated Gateway Commercial to take advantage of the exposure to large volumes of traffic along Baseline Road and exposure to Highway 401. A variety of retail uses are already permitted on the subject lands. Residential is not a permitted use. See section 7.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-11 Bill Mills July 17, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 3201 Rundle Road.</p> <p>Part of the property is proposed to be designated Environmentally Protected instead of</p>	<p>Staff reviewed the request. Mapping has been revised accordingly.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Agricultural due to the trees. Owner states that there are few trees on this section of the property. Please review the proposed designation.	
<p>WS-12 Hope Fellowship Church (Brian Bylsma) July 17, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-33</p>	<p>Location: 1685 & 1711 Bloor Street in Courtice. The first 100 metres from Bloor Street is proposed to be redesignated from Light Industrial to Residential. There is also a road planned for the south end of the property to connect Trulls Road on the west side to Courtice Road to the east. Requesting that the residential designation be extended to the planned road. This will allow for future use of the property for a long term care facility/seniors retirement complex.</p> <p>Verbal submission Current designation would be changed to part Light Industry and part Residential. There is a proposed new collector road. Supports this proposal and requests that the Residential designation be extended to the new proposed road so that the church could be surrounded by a variety of residential developments.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. Residential designation has been extended to the planned road. See section 6.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-13 Ron and Norma Blaauw July 21, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 3171 Tooley Road in Courtice.</p> <p>Object to the proposed zoning changes to the property. Do not agree with the Natural Heritage line and the Environmental Protection Designation. The lines are too close to the</p>	<p>The Natural Heritage System associated with the Farewell Creek Valley in this location includes of the geographical extent of the valley, a fish habitat and riparian corridor and an urban woodlot.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	existing house. Request that the line be drawn back at least 30-40 feet, enabling more enjoyment of the land.	See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. Changes are proposed for implementing Environmental Protection and Minimum Vegetation Protection Zones for infill situations.
WS-14 Jury Lands Foundation (Marilyn Morawetz) Aug. 8, 2016	Location: Camp 30 – Special Study Area 2. Supports the proposed policies for the site. Also supports the agreement between the Municipality and the landowners. The Jury Lands Foundation would like to assist the Municipality in developing a community vision for the site respecting its natural and heritage values. As part of the urban design process, specific attention will be paid to the buildings and land, adaptive re-use of the buildings and land, and the linked “green circle” of the public access pathway system incorporated with the Bowmanville and Soper Creeks and their eventual connection. Support for the intent to develop the surrounding area with a historical theme and integration with the site.	Supporting comments received. The Municipality will continue to work with the Jury Lands Foundation in developing a community vision for the site.
WS-15 Cap Reit, Wilmot Creek Lifestyle Communities – GHD (Bryce Jordan) Aug. 9, 2016 Also see WS-45 , WS-84 , VS-23	Location: Wilmot Creek – Special Policy Area B1. Policies in the proposed Official Plan state that the Wilmot Creek B1 Area can have a maximum of 960 units, however, Appendix B states that the housing unit target for this area is 921 units. Request that Appendix B to be revised to reflect 960 units.	Correction made. Appendix B has been revised to 960 units.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>WS-16 Preston Group – KLM Planning Partners Inc. (Roy Mason) Aug. 12, 2016 Follow up submission: Sept. 26, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-42</p>	<p>Location: Northwest corner of Courtice Road and Bloor Street.</p> <p>Supportive of the Official Plan Review efforts.</p>	
<p>WS-17 Vanstone Mill Inc. – GHD (Bryce Jordan) Aug. 12, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-3</p>	<p>Location: Northwest corner of Scugog Street and Highway 2 (King Street) in Bowmanville.</p> <p>Request that the land use designation of the property remains the same as currently shown in the existing Official Plan.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. The small Residential designation on the west side of the Bowmanville Creek will remain.</p>
	<p>Verbal submission Gerard Gervais, Gervais Development Corporation, on behalf of Vanstone Mills Inc. The proposed plan re-designates both the east and west side into environmental protection. No problem with the table land north of the intersection of Church Street changing to Environmental Protection but want the area where the three buildings are located to remain</p>	<p>Some of the Urban Centre designation for those buildings along Scugog Street and the Vanstone Mill building will be retained.</p> <p>Staff supports the dedication of the Bowmanville Valleylands north of Church Street intersection to the Municipality of Clarington.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	as Town Centre as they are still intending to redevelop the site.	
WS-18 Terry Klawitter Aug. 18, 2016	Location: 2427 Energy Drive. Mr. Klawitter has recently obtained a cut and fill permit from CLOCA to bring the property out of the flood plain. Requesting that the Environmental Protection designation reflect his permit approvals and his existing zoning permissions.	Mapping has been revised to clarify the floodplain limits.
	Also wants the current zoning to remain on the property as well as keep the current permissions to allow workshops.	No changes are being proposed to the zoning of the property.
WS-19 Joseph and Antoinette Passalacqua Aug. 18, 2016	Location: 46 Martin Road. Opposed to the proposed Environmental Protection designation on the property and request for it to be removed.	See section 5.4 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.
WS-20 David Wotten Aug. 19, 2016	Location: Solina (area to be added to the Solina Settlement Boundary). In favour of the proposed amendment to add the lands south of the Solina Hamlet boundary, to the Highway 407 and include it as part of the Hamlet. It provides an opportunity to develop the land for residential uses when the use of the farm is no longer feasible or desirable.	Supporting comments received.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
WS-21 Milton Zarkovich Aug. 22, 2016	General comment on affordable housing in Ontario. Housing is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain ownership due to the rise in housing prices. Rental housing demand will increase as a result, especially among young people and seniors. In order to encourage more rental housing, York Region allows the deferral of development charges for up to three years which would allow developers to build the rental units and pay the development charges afterward. In addition, property taxes paid for rental housing is higher than for a condominium. New rental housing would open up older rental buildings and therefore offer more availability and possibly lower prices due to competition.	Affordable housing is an objective of the Official Plan by promoting higher densities and a mix of housing types. Comment received and will be forward to the Finance Department for consideration.
WS-22 Delpark Homes (Prestonvale) Inc. – Weston Consulting (Polycarp Tam) Aug. 22, 2016 Also see VS-7	Location: 1539 Prestonvale Road North and lands to the South. Subject lands are within the C2 Secondary Plan Area. Request that the lands be removed from the secondary plan area because of the residential uses to the north and west and that the lands are bisected by the Environmental Protection designation to the west and south and Prestonvale Road to the east. These natural corridors provide a divide of the subject lands from the larger areas proposed to be redesignated from Future Urban Residential to	Agreed. These lands are within the South-West Courtice Secondary Plan. These lands were designated Future Urban Residential, being dependent on the extension of the Courtice Trunk Sewer, and a future sub-trunk extension and pumping station. The latter is contained within the 2023 to 2028 timeframe in the Region’s Development Charge By-law. The Region has now advised that up to 80 residential units could be serviced with a sanitary sewer connection to Roy Nichols Drive. A portion of their lands could develop utilizing existing services, although

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Urban Residential. Furthermore these lands can be adequately serviced.</p> <p>Verbal submission (Jane McFarlane) The verbal submission is similar to written submission.</p>	<p>the southerly portion would have to wait for the future sub-trunk extension and pumping station. Supporting functional engineering information was submitted and reviewed.</p> <p>Given that the site is within an existing Secondary Plan, which would require only a minor amendment to incorporate the lands referenced, a portion of the lands have been removed from the Future Secondary Plan area and appropriate adjustments will be made in the future with the conformity update of the South Courtice Secondary Plan.</p>
<p>WS-23 Norstar (James Okawa) Aug. 22, 2016 Follow up submission: September 15, 2016</p>	<p>Location: Southeast corner of Bloor Street and Trulls Road (20 acres) in Courtice.</p> <p>Concerns around the representation of the Regional Corridor in the C1 Secondary Plan Area. Would like to see policies that allow the depth of the Regional Corridor along Bloor Street to be expanded, reflecting the goals of a mixed use transit supportive land use. Concerned that the 100 metre setback could restrict development without a full assessment through the subsequent Secondary Plan Review.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. Residential designation has been extended to the planned road. See section 6.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
WS-24 Jeff Guthrie Aug. 23, 2016 Also see VS-6	Location: 34 Martin Road. Opposed to the proposed Environmental Protection designation on the property and request for it to be removed. Verbal submission Spoke on behalf of the owners of 38 Martin Road and 42 Martin Road. The verbal submission is similar to written submission.	See section 5.4 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.
WS-25 Harvey Snyder Aug. 24, 2016	Location: 42 Martin Road. Opposed to the proposed Environmental Protection designation on the property and request for it to be removed.	See section 5.4 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.
WS-26 Frank Veltri – Clark Consulting Services (Bob Clark) Aug. 24, 2016	Location: Newtonville Hamlet. Supports the proposed expansion to the Hamlet, however requests that the expansion include the lands to the south (about three lots). The proposed expansion included all lands up to the Environmental Protection designation but Niblett Environmental has reviewed the extent of the designation and determined that the designation could be more accurately illustrated based on the mapping and information provided with the letter.	Disagree with additional lots. The expansion to the Hamlet is based on the use of existing roads. The expansion of approximately three lots to the south of Jones Avenue would require a new road to be constructed. Furthermore, there is limited water allocation and it will be the proponents’ requirement to obtain this allocation from the Region. The additional lots requiring an extension of George Burley Street South of Jones Avenue is not supported.
WS-27	Location: 2350 Courtice Road.	Municipalities are responsible for implementing environmental policies. See

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>1331135 Ontario Limited, The Domus Group (Mike Domovich) Aug.25, 2016</p>	<p>Does not support the proposed Environmental Protection designation on the property, recognizing the 2 acres of woodlot on a 22 acre parcel of land. Contends that the Municipality has no jurisdiction to make the change, only the Province, Region and CLOCA have this jurisdiction. There have been no studies or reports to support the proposed land use change. The woodlot is too small to protect and some trees should be allowed to be cut down as part of an application for a subdivision. The proposed change to the land use designation is illegal. Only areas outside the Urban Areas can be changed. The Municipality intends to expropriate without compensation.</p>	<p>section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.</p>
<p>WS-28 Grant and Ruby Lee Aug. 25, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 38 Martin Road. Opposed to the proposed Environmental Protection designation on the property and request for it to be removed.</p>	<p>See section 5.4 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.</p>
<p>WS-29 562503 Ontario Limited and Honey Harbour Heights Estates Ltd. – CM Planning Inc. Development Consulting (Carolyn Molinari) Aug. 25, 2016</p>	<p>Location: Proposed minor rounding out of the Hampton Hamlet. Lands are north of Ormiston Street, adjacent to the Hamlet of Hampton. Support the proposed inclusion of the property in the Hampton boundary.</p> <p>Also support the following changes to the Plan: 1) section 3.4.4 which states that the refinement of a natural heritage feature through an Environmental Impact Study would not require an amendment to the Plan; 2) proposed section</p>	<p>Supporting comments received.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	14.4.7 which eliminates conflict with 14.4.3 regarding the extent of the vegetation protection zone from lands designated Environmental Protection; 3) proposed policy 3.4.9 which clarifies “self sustaining” as it relates to the vegetation protection zone.	
	Would like to see a 5 metre setback to the woodlot as opposed to a 30 metre setback as supported through an Environmental Impact Study. The limits of the rounding out of the hamlet boundary should use the 5 metre setback.	See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.
	Section 3.4.9 requires that a self-sustaining Vegetation Protection Zone be planted, maintained or restored. Would like clarification on whether the need for and extent of the planting, maintenance or restoration is to be according to the findings of an Environmental Impact Study.	The need to plant, maintain, or restore is more a function of whether or not the self-sustaining vegetation is present on the site. Clarity would be provided through the Environmental Impact Study.
	Section 3.4.4 states that refinements shall not require an amendment to the Official Plan, while policy 3.4.6 states that refinements will require an amendment. One is brought forward by a conservation authority the other by a development application. Would like clarification to eliminate the potential confusion during the processing of a development application.	Staff have amended the wording to provide clarity.
	Request that section 3.4.16 be reworded to allow for the potential reduction to the Minimum	See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Vegetation Protection Zone if supported by an Environmental Impact Study.	
	Would like to confirm if the 15 metre setback to a feature applies to lands which border an urban settlement area.	15 metres applies to development in Rural Settlement areas.
	Requests that section 23.10.5 be revised to allow woodlands to be considered for parkland dedication.	This is standard Municipal practice. Natural heritage features are to be dedicated gratuitously to the Municipality as part of the development process. Parkland dedication is for active park facilities.
	Request that section 23.13.2 be modified to exempt studies already completed or that it be recognized by Clarington that the Environmental Impact Study for this site be exempt from this policy.	At the time of a development applications, the provisions of the applicable policy document will be applied.
	Section 23.16.3 requires a landscape analysis. Can this be covered through the requirements of a tree preservation plan and grading plan?	A landscape analysis is more than just trees. It deals with all the natural elements of the site including grades. For clarity a study description has been added to Appendix A.
WS-30 2408428 Ontario Inc. and 2408406 Ontario Inc.(Fourteen Estates Limited) –	Location: Block 32 on draft plan 18T-87083 Part of Lot 8, Concession 1, Hamlet of Newtonville. Supports the following changes to the Plan: Section 3.4.4 which states that the refinement of a natural heritage feature through an Environmental Impact Study would not require an amendment to the Plan.	Supporting comments received.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
CM Planning Inc. Development Consulting (Carolyn Molinari) Aug. 25, 2016	Section 3.4.9 requires that a self-sustaining Vegetation Protection Zone be planted, maintained or restored. Would like clarification on whether the need for and extent of the planting, maintenance or restoration is to be according to the findings of an Environmental Impact Study.	The need to plant, maintain, or restore is more a function of whether or not the self sustaining vegetation is present on the site. Clarity would be provided through the Environmental Impact Study.
	Concerns with section 12.4.6 a) which requires all development to be serviced by Municipal water and c) prohibits development once capacity of Municipal water is reached, regardless of the designation of the lands. This leaves municipal infrastructure underutilized and does not support section 12.3.2 that identifies hamlets as the predominant and preferred location to accommodate future rural growth. Request that the policy be deleted or revised to allow development on designated lands within the Hamlet of Newtonville.	This is an existing Official Plan policy. OPA 107 does not propose any changes to the policy. No changes are proposed.
	There are significant changes to the Environmental Protection designation on the property. Request that the existing approved Official Plan designation and the current zoning for residential hamlet development be maintained.	See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.
	Section 3.4.4 states that refinements shall not require an amendment to the Official Plan, while policy 3.4.6 states that refinements will require an amendment. One is brought forward by a conservation authority the other by a	Staff have amended the wording to provide clarity.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	development application. Would like clarification to eliminate the potential confusion during the processing of a development application.	
	Request that section 3.4.16 be reworded to allow for the potential reduction to the minimum vegetation protection zone if supported by an Environmental Impact Study.	See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Request that section 23.13.2 be modified to exempt studies already completed or that it be recognized by Clarington that the Environmental Impact Study for this site be exempt from this policy.	At the time of a development application, the provisions of the applicable policy document will be applied.
	Section 23.16.3 requires a landscape analysis. Would like confirmation on whether this be covered through the requirements of a tree preservation plan and grading plan.	A landscape analysis is more than just trees it deals with all the natural elements of the site including grades. For clarity a study description has been added to Appendix A.
	Based on the Growth Plan Policies and that there is no need for any settlement boundary expansions, we question the need for any expansion to Newtonville. Especially since there is vacant designated, undeveloped lands already and that there is a limited water supply capacity available in Newtonville. Opposed to the hamlet boundary expansion in Newtonville.	Opposition acknowledged. No change.
WS-31 1744856 Ontario Inc. (Fourteen Estates Limited) –	Location: Northeast of Morgans Road and Highway 2. Land owner is interested in developing the property for a landscape yard type use.	Supporting comments received.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
CM Planning Inc. Development Consulting (Carolyn Molinari) Aug. 25, 2016	Supports the proposed Rural designation on the property.	
	Request that the Environmental Protection designation not be extended and that the area currently designated Greenspace be redesignated to the Rural designation.	See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.
	Section 3.4.4 states that refinements to the Environmental Protection shall not require an amendment to the Official Plan, while policy 3.4.6 states that refinements will require an amendment. One is brought forward by a conservation authority, while the other by a development application. Would like clarification.	Staff have provided clarity to the policy.
	Request that policy 3.4.16 be reworded to allow for the potential reduction to the Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone if supported by an Environmental Impact Study.	See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Requests clarification of policy 13.5.6 and 13.5.7 and requests that small scale landscape industry uses, without the restriction regarding horticulture, be added back in as a permitted use through site specific rezoning.	Comment received however the policy remains. A site specific zoning by-law amendment will be required.
	Request that a policy be added to section 14.4 that, where a site specific study results in refinements to the Environmental Protection designation, such refinements shall not require an Official Plan Amendment.	Staff agrees with submission and has added an additional policy.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>WS-32 2408428 Ontario Inc. and 2408406 Ontario Inc.(Fourteen Estates Limited) – CM Planning Inc. Development Consulting (Carolyn Molinari) Aug. 25, 2016</p>	<p>Location: Lands east side of Regional Road 18 and north of Highway 401, known as Newtonville Gardens, Draft Plan 18T-87083.</p> <p>Support the proposed Maps A1 and D3 which reflect the draft approved portion of the subject property and shows the Environmental Protection designation and the natural heritage system in the correct location.</p>	<p>Supporting comments received.</p>
	<p>Request clarification on policy 23.17.5 or rewording of this policy to ensure that applications that have attained draft plan approval would not be affected.</p>	<p>Draft approved plans would not be affected.</p>
<p>WS-33 1829963 Ontario Inc. (Fourteen Estates Limited) – CM Planning Inc. Development Consulting (Carolyn Molinari) Aug. 25, 2016</p>	<p>Location: The Keystone Pit lands, on the south side of Regional Road 20, east of Gibbs Road and west of the Canadian Tire Motorsport Park.</p> <p>Support the redesignation of the property to Rural and request that an exception be added to allow for the existing uses permitted through OPA No. 98 to continue as permitted uses on the subject property in addition to the uses permitted in the Rural designation.</p>	<p>OPA 107 does not propose any changes to the the site specific exception provided to the property through OPA No. 98.</p>
	<p>Request that low intensity recreational uses be permitted in the Rural designation and further that unserviced campgrounds on private land be added as a permitted use and/or added to the definition of low intensity recreation.</p>	<p>No policy change is recommended.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Request adding a policy to either the mineral aggregate resource section in Chapter 3 or Chapter 15 to allow for the rezoning of aggregate extraction zoned land for an appropriate use prior to the surrendering of the licence by Ministry of Natural Resources. Such rezoning would not affect the licenced use of a pit and would allow for the conditions imposed by Ministry of Natural Resources for the surrendering of a licence to be met.	No policy change is recommended.
WS-34 Honey Heights Development Limited(Fourteen Estates Limited) – CM Planning Inc. Development Consulting (Carolyn Molinari) Aug. 25, 2016	Location: Lands south of Regional Road 9, on the west side of Lowery Road. Requests that the Environmental Protection designation be maintained as it currently exists in the current Official Plan.	See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.
WS-35 BILD (Carmina Tupe) Aug. 26, 2016 See also WS-85	Opposed to proposed policy 2.2.3 which states that where there is a conflict between a proposed land use and the protection of the natural heritage system, the latter will prevail. This limits the landowners as they cannot conduct studies that could demonstrate the full potential of the land uses. Suggest the Municipality revise the policy to allow for greater flexibility when considering proposed land uses.	See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. The policies provide flexibility for an Environmental Impact Study to refine the exact extent of the natural features.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Opposed to policy 3.4.6 which speaks to refinements to a natural heritage feature or hydrologically sensitive feature based on information from the Province or the conservation authority, subject to an amendment. This policy should also consider supplementary information and studies that provide a reasonable justification for alternative environmental features and/or buffers.</p>	<p>The Municipality has a responsibility to implement these refinements. The Amendment process is designed to ensure that province or the agency provides the supporting information and explain the changes to the affected property owners and the public.</p>
	<p>Opposed to policies 3.4.8, 3.4.9, 3.4.16 and Table 3-1 which does not allow development within the minimum 15 metre Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone. This sterilizes future development of urban area lands. Would like clarification on how this was considered through the land budget planning.</p>	<p>See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16. The Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone was taken into consideration when conducting the land budgeting exercise.</p>
	<p>Opposed to Table 4-2 and policy 4.3.8, specifically the gross to net hectare conversion when calculating residential densities.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. The table has been revised to reflect net densities. Floor Space Index has been removed from table. Floor Space Index is addressed in a standalone policy. FSI are set by the Region and the Clarington Official Plan must conform. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>In addition the floor space index targets are not achievable and would be impossible to implement.</p>	<p>FSI are set by the Region and the Clarington Official Plan must conform however minor adjustments have been</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		made. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	<p>Opposed to policies 4.6.3 and 4.6.4, which states that Secondary Plans will be developed in a sequential order that has already been predetermined by the Municipality. Does not want development to be phased because secondary plans should not be contingent on the plans of another landowner in another secondary plan.</p>	<p>Sequencing has been removed. See section 4.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>Also opposed to the policy that states that all existing secondary plans must be updated prior to any new secondary plans being prepared. Suggests revising the policy so that Secondary Plans not be approved or adopted until current secondary plans are updated.</p>	<p>Updating the secondary plans for the community’s downtowns and the employment lands in Courtice to support job creation and the extension of the GO train are key to create jobs in Clarington. The preparation of Secondary Plan background studies could commence during this period.</p>
	<p>Opposed to the removal of the policy which stated that private funding being available to commence and complete Secondary Plans in policy 23.13.1. Would like to see this policy remain in order to allow for the opportunity to contribute private funds.</p>	<p>See section 4.2 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>Policy 23.13.3 allows the Municipality the right to peer review any and all studies at the applicant's expense. Want clarification to what extent this policy would be applied.</p>	<p>This policy may apply when a study is conducted independent of the Municipality, the Municipality does not have the expertise, and/or there is a disagreement between the Municipality and the applicant.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Would like clarification on the process described in policy 23.17.8 which requires applicants/landlords to enter into a cost sharing agreement, prior to approval of any draft plan of subdivision and that proof be provided to the Municipality that they have met their obligations under the cost sharing agreements prior to registering a subdivision.</p>	<p>The process will be dealt with on a case by case basis.</p>
<p>WS-36 CRH Canada Group Inc. Land Holdings (Katelyn Cummings) Aug. 26, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 44 Port Darlington Road. The ready mix concrete plant operated by Dufferin Concrete in Bowmanville.</p> <p>Requests that the Environmental Protection designation reflect the boundaries established in the zoning by-law. Supports keeping the Environmental Protection designation but it should be similar to the zoning by-law mapping as it keeps a proper setback to the watercourse.</p>	<p>Portions of this property remain in the floodplain. Similar to other properties with site specific zoning after an EIS, the Environmental Protection limits have been amended to match the zoning limits.</p>
<p>WS-37 Owners of 2936 Hancock Road – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Aug. 26, 2016 Also see VS-16</p>	<p>Location: 2936 Hancock Road (southwest corner of Nash Road and Hancock Road). Applicants are looking to propose townhouses. No development applications have been submitted yet.</p> <p>Verbal submission Currently designated in a low density urban residential designation for which he is supportive. Provided comments on the height and density regimes of the Official Plan stating the current density proposes to provide a</p>	<p>No minimum densities are proposed in OPA 107. Built form typologies are to remain generally defined. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16. Staff met with consultants to provide clarity regarding school sites.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>minimum density but the minimum does not correspond with an appropriate maximum and requested the language of "limited apartments" be clarified. Suggests that policy 18.5.3 in the proposed plan would require clarity in the event of a school site not being required.</p>	
<p>WS-38 High Street Courtice Inc. – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Aug. 26, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-15</p>	<p>Location: 1475 Highway 2 in Courtice.</p> <p>A land use planning application is being prepared for the property along the corridor. Proposing various housing types and tenures on the property including apartment, townhouses and single detached units.</p> <p>Verbal submission Intent is to have further dialogue with staff to gain clarity regarding specific requests filed in their written correspondence. Commented on the natural heritage suggesting that the science dictate the land use based on scientific studies. Referenced a drainage feature on the property which has been studied at length and is being dealt with through an application process noting that level of detail would not be on the Official Plan schedule. Commented on building heights stating that the Courtice Secondary Plan will be maintained and they have provided suggestions to staff concerning matching building heights to the Regional Official Plan and mixed-used corridor. Suggests that there be a policy that would allow for trails and trail network lands to</p>	<p>An application will be made to amend the Courtice Main Street Secondary Plan. In case of conflict the specific policies of the Secondary Plan prevail. This submission has been discussed with the consultant.</p> <p>This will be handled as part of the application process.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	be considered through parkland dedication and there be a permission for stormwater management facilities in all designations.	
<p>WS-39 2265719 Ontario Inc. – Candevcon Limited (Scott Waterhouse) Aug. 26, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-13</p>	<p>Location: Northglen West development area. Submission pertains to the Transportation Maps and the Type C Arterial Road in the north part of the Bowmanville Urban Area. The proposed Plan shows this Type C Arterial Road coinciding with the urban boundary and the arterial road between Liberty Street and Lambs Road is proposed to be deleted. An Environmental Impact Study and Traffic Impact Analysis was conducted and has determined that the Type C Arterial Road is not required. Request that the arterial road be deleted from the proposed Transportation Maps J1 and J3.</p> <p>Verbal submission The verbal submission is similar to written submission.</p>	<p>After meeting with the applicant, no mapping changes are required. The applicant has agreed to provide the road connection to the Type C arterial as shown in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>WS-40 2272449 Ontario Inc. – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Aug. 26, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-18</p>	<p>Location: Northeast corner of Bloor Street and Prestonvale Road in Courtice.</p> <p>Support the proposed Map A2 which re-designates the property from Future Urban Residential to Urban Residential and in support of the Regional Corridor height, density and built-form typologies.</p>	<p>Supporting comments received.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Supports policy 14.4.6 in that the location and extent of the Environmental Protection area is approximate and the precise limits of these areas shall be detailed through appropriate studies.	Supporting comments received.
	Supports policy 3.4.4 which states that as part of a development application refinements can be made and do not require an Official Plan Amendment.	Supporting comments received.
	Request that the Municipality consider including a Neighbourhood Centre designation at the intersection of Prestonvale and Bloor.	Regional Corridor policies allow for mixed use development. Courtice Town Centre is supported as the main concentration of commercial uses in Courtice. No changes are proposed. After meeting with the applicant, only residential is requested now.
	Request that policy 4.5.2 be revised to reflect the previous version in the 2015 Proposed Plan.	The intent remains that development within built-up areas will be given development priority over greenfield development.
	Would like clarification from the Municipality that development applications could proceed on the lands immediately after the OPA is approved.	The development on the site can proceed once the OPA 107 is approved and there are no pending OMB appeals to the policies that may be applicable to the site.
	Suggests that the subject property is suitable for a mixed use development that would provide for	Bloor Street is a Regional Corridor which permits mixed use development. Policy has been revised for clarity.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	both stand alone commercial and residential as well as mixed use formats.	
	Section 20 should be revised to ensure that stormwater facilities be permitted in all designations based on good engineering practices and appropriate approval authority.	Traditional stormwater management facilities (ponds) shall not be located within lands designated Environmental Protection. However once constructed, facilities are designated Environmental Protection.
	Verbal submission The verbal submission is similar to written submission.	See comments above.
WS-41 SmartREIT (Ornella Richichi) Aug. 26, 2016	Location: 2334 Highway 2, (Walmart) in Bowmanville and 185 and 245 Highway 2 (Bowmanville Mall) as part of the Bowmanville East Town Centre. Understands that the Municipality will undertake a review of the Bowmanville West Town Centre Secondary Plan once the Official Plan Review process has been completed.	Staff position is to update existing Secondary Plans first.
	Sites are currently developed for commercial uses. The development of residential/mixed uses may occur in the future. Request greater flexibility for a variety of built forms in response to site constraints and market conditions. The proposed policies require a minimum of 4 storeys which may not be able to be achieved in every instance.	All commercial sites are allowed to develop as per approved site plans. Staff accepts the recommendations and a policy has been introduced to allow commercial developments to proceed at different heights over time provided that the minimum of two full stories is maintained.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Policy 10.3.5 states that new commercial developments within an Urban Centre shall be a minimum height of 2 storeys. These lands already have a master approved Site Plan and request that this policy only be applicable if a minor variance or rezoning is required.</p>	<p>Correct interpretation of policy. Policy is only applicable for new applications other than site plans.</p>
	<p>Request that the multi-storey requirement be replaced with policy language requiring applicants to provide for the consideration of multi-storey developments. This suggested revision would continue to encourage the intensification of Urban Centres while also providing flexibility to existing developed sites so that they can transition to increased densities in a phased approach.</p>	<p>More specific policies for redevelopment and intensification for Town Centres will be provided through the Secondary Plan process.</p>
<p>WS-42 Preston Group (Dirk Janas) Aug. 26, 2016 Also see WS-16</p>	<p>Location: 1738 Bloor Street. Disagrees with the definition of wetlands and woodlands as they are both based on size and do not take into account the ecological features and functions. 0.5 ha for wetlands to be included in the natural heritage system and 1.0 ha for woodlands to be included in the natural heritage system is very small. These smaller features limit the potential for important features and functions. Suggests that an assessment of the ecological significance through a features and functions</p>	<p>See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	analysis in an Environmental Impact Study is more appropriate.	
<p>WS-43 1559360 Ontario Limited – The Biglieri Group (Jake Murray) Aug. 29, 2016 Follow up submission: Sept. 26, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-25</p>	<p>Location: Property in the community of Hampton, on the north side of Taunton Road, east of Holt Road (5075 Holt Road).</p> <p>The subject site is excluded from the minor rounding out of the Hampton Hamlet Boundary and is designated Prime Agricultural. Request that the subject site be changed to Hamlet. These lands are suitable for residential development and represents an efficient expansion to the Settlement Area. A planning rationale report was prepared to justify the requested expansion.</p> <p>This area is designated Prime Agricultural area due to the Class 2 agriculture soil capabilities. A 2006 report for the subject site indicates that the site has limited agricultural potential due to the low tillable area (approximately 14 ha) and the vast resources required to transform the site to an agricultural operation. Conclusions of the report states that it is unlikely that the site is able to produce any capital or production gain as an agricultural land use. The site has not been used for agricultural purposes for over a decade and it is highly unlikely to be used for such purposes. The Region and Clarington have agreed with the assessment. Rounding out of</p>	<p>See section 9.2 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p> <p>The submitted Reports did not suggest that the land was not Prime Agriculture but instead that due to a number of circumstances, including the size of the lot, a farm was not viable on the property. Amendment 107 does not propose to remove the site specific exception to permit the golf driving range use.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>the hamlet of Hampton would benefit many local businesses within Hampton and the cluster of businesses at Taunton and Old Scugog Road. The population increase may also benefit the elementary school that is under capacity. Residents can add investment in the community by supporting local businesses and opening new businesses.</p> <p>Verbal submission The verbal submission is similar to written submission.</p>	
<p>WS-44 Medallion Development – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Aug. 30, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-81, VS-17</p>	<p>Location: Lands on the southeast corner of Lambs Road and Concession Street East. Wants to ensure the appropriate future development of the subject property and that the policies and provisions of the Official Plan are appropriate. Will be providing further comments.</p> <p>Verbal submission Comments on phasing of Secondary Plans. Timing associated with those studies becomes challenging and suggested there could be policies put in the plan that would allow for landowners to have a working relationship to advance studies with the Municipality and that he would provide written suggestions for language to be considered. Concern with the current mandate and he will be submitting further comments on the matter.</p>	<p>See section 4 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>WS-45 Rice Development Corp./ Ridge Pine Park Inc. – Borden Lander Gervais (Stephen Waque) Sept. 2, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-15, WS-84, VS-23</p>	<p>Location: Lands east of Bennett Road, south of Highway 401 and north of the CN railway.</p> <p>A private Regional Official Plan Amendment application was submitted in 2002 to expand the urban boundary of Newcastle in order to develop the next phase of the Wilmot Creek Lifestyle Community Would like to ensure that nothing in the draft OPA 107 precludes the continued independent processing of the development application and the concept plan may be revised.</p> <p>Verbal submission The verbal submission is similar to written submission.</p>	<p>The requested expansion of the urban boundary of Newcastle is already included in the proposed OPA 107 in order to conform to the Regional Official Plan.</p> <p>The private OPA and OPA 107 both provide for an expansion of the Urban Area Boundary to include Wilmot Creek Phase 8. Provided that a Secondary Plan process is agreed to by the applicant and there is agreement on the content of the amendment, the independent processing of the private OPA could be adjudicated at the OMB with Council’s support. Discussions are ongoing.</p>
<p>WS-46 Mohawk Upper James Investments Ltd. – D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Katie Pandey) Sept. 6, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-82</p>	<p>Location: 3145 Mearns Ave. (northeast corner of Mearns Avenue and Concession Road 3). Within the B2 Secondary plan Area. Concerned with the proposed increase in the Environmental Protection designation on the subject lands. This would greatly reduce the developable area of the subject property. The Municipality has not presented justification for the increased area to be protected. Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority has identified the area as High Volume Recharge Area. Protection of the recharge area could be done by using Low Impact Development stormwater management measures. There is no need to increase the</p>	<p>See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Environmental Protection designation because of the high volume recharge area. Expansion of the targeted natural heritage system could be determined through a detailed site walk investigation. The location of the targeted natural heritage area may change after completion of detailed site work and discussion with the regulatory agencies. The increase in the Environmental Protection designation is not warranted and premature.</p>	
<p>WS-47 Nash Road Developments Inc. – Borden Lander Gervais (Stephen Waque) Sept. 7, 2016 Also see VS-24</p>	<p>Location: Lands just outside the Courtime Urban Boundary, northeast corner of Nash Road and Hancock Road.</p> <p>The subject lands have been designated Prime Agricultural and Protected Countryside in the proposed OPA 107. The lands are adjacent to the new Highway 418 which is under construction. The lands are also within the Greenbelt Area. Removing the lands from the Greenbelt Area was a continued request since 2003. Requesting a flag to be placed on the subject property map advising that the Greenbelt boundary is under review and that the property could be removed from the boundary.</p> <p>Verbal submission The property was purchased in 2003. It was located outside the Greenbelt area. At that time, an application was submitted for an urban</p>	<p>There are a number of areas in the Municipality under review by the Province. Council has supported the removal of this site in the context of broader additions to the Greenbelt which requires a study. The adoption of this Plan is to implement the existing Greenbelt Plan. The addition of this notation is not supported.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	boundary expansion. The property was then included in the final version of the Greenbelt area without any notice to owner. In 2006, both the Municipality of Clarington and the Region of Durham requested that the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing remove the subject property from the Greenbelt Plan Area.	
<p>WS-48 Wilmot Creek Homeowners' Association (Lynn Stilwell) Sept. 7, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-2</p>	<p>Location: Special Policy area B2 and the new area Wilmot Landing (which would be lands developed outside of the gated portion of the community).</p> <p>Concerned about condominiums in a land lease community. Concerned about a 30% increase in population for the Wilmot Creek area and the impact it will have on the community. The increase could impact the existing recreational facilities.</p>	<p>The Municipality is required to meet a minimum density of 50 people and jobs per hectare.</p>
	Infrastructure for bridge crossing over railway is inadequate for pedestrian and small motor powered vehicles. Section 16.3.3 c) states that multiuse paths should be separated where possible from vehicle traffic. Would like to ensure this will be applied to the CN railway bridge crossing and that it will be accessible.	Bridge concern will be addressed through the Secondary Plan and site plan approval process.
	Concerned with security and access to the existing gated community.	This an issue between the property/owner developer and the community.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Do not support rental apartments in the new areas.	Final housing mix for the development will be determined through the Secondary Plan. The goals and objectives of the Province, Region and Municipality is to provide affordable housing to meet the diverse needs of residents of all ages and incomes throughout their entire life cycle and promote a mixture of housing types within neighbourhoods.
	Lack adequate evacuation routes if there were ever an emergency. Request that the current emergency exit from Fairway Drive to Cobbledick Road be upgraded to a full time entry/exit point.	This will be reviewed in the context of the Secondary Plan.
	Support policy 16.3.1 which recognises the existing lifestyle community.	Supporting comments received.
	Support Section 4.6 (Map C) and Section 16.3.2 (b) which states that Special Policy area B2 will be subject to a secondary plan.	Supporting comments received.
	Recognize that this area is a neighbourhood and that the density target in table 4-2 indicates a density of 10 units per gross hectare not 30 units per gross hectare.	The minimum density requires 50 people and jobs per hectare for all new developments.
	Wants to ensure that Section 16.3.3 c) which states accessible design will be incorporated for all aspects of buildings, will mandate elevators	The requirement of building elevators is only mandated through the Building Code

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	in any apartment building and the new clubhouse facility.	but the developer can incorporated elevators to serve their anticipated clientele.
	Section 16.3.5 states that the Municipality will not provide or assume any infrastructure or community facilities. Should be revised to allow for Municipal Fire and Rescue services which are currently provided.	Policy has been revised for clarity.
	Request that Map K be revised to show the waterfront trail running along the CN rail and hydro corridor, not along the waterfront edge, through Wilmot Creek. Would also like to see barriers or security between B1 and B2 to eliminate unauthorized access into the community.	The location of the waterfront trail is appropriate and is in its' intended long term location at the waterfront. No changes are proposed.
	<p>Verbal submission (Byron Faretis) Association is pleased to know that the Special Policy area "B2" will be subject to a Secondary Plan. The Association is not anti-development and do recognize the benefits that development can provide for both Wilmot residents and the Municipality. Concerned about the size, scale and scope of the development and its impact on the Wilmot community. Rice Developments has recently shared their latest concept drawing for Phase 8 and Wilmot Landing. Some of the Association's earlier concerns have been addressed; however, there are still a number of major issues including the</p>	See comments above.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>adequacy of the existing bridge to handle the increase in population travelling between both parts of the community. Requested the Committee to recognize the significant interest the residents have vested in the community and to provide them with the opportunity for strong input into the development affecting their lives and their homes.</p> <p>Lynn Stillwell) President, Wilmot Creek Homeowners' Association, (WCHA). The Association has previously met with Rice Development Corporation to address concerns with the proposed expansion including housing mix, density, impact on facilities and infrastructure and security. The verbal submission is similar to written submission.</p>	
<p>WS-49 St. Marys Cement – MHBC (Brian Zeman) Sept. 7, 2016</p>	<p>Remove the Environmental Protection designation within the License area and from the dock area. Policy 16.4.1 supports this request.</p>	<p>Staff disagree with the proposed mapping changes. The Environmental Protection area and watercourse on the western portion of the property is the re-established channel of the Darlington Creek through the St. Mary's operation. This is a St. Mary's agreed-to feature. The remainder of the Environmental Protection extent in this vicinity is associated with an existing wetland.</p> <p>The Environmental Protection area on the east portion of the site also represents a St. Mary's agreed to feature. This overflow</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		<p>channel was created when the Westside Marsh was reduced in size, a Hydrotechnical Report was provided that identified the need to provide an overflow outlet that will act in parallel to the existing Westside Creek outlet to Lake Ontario. Because the Marsh has less flood storage now, it has less ability to attenuate the flood flow. The overflow will allow the unattenuated flood flow to exit to the Lake. The overflow channel is dry, but has a series of culverts under the access road to allow flood flow to drain from the Marsh to the Lake.</p> <p>Agree to remove the watercourse on the eastern portion.</p>
	<p>Map B (Priority Intensification Areas)</p> <p>Please clarify why the property is included in the Built Up and Greenfield areas since most of the policies relating to these areas concern intensification and residential / employment targets.</p>	<p>Province of Ontario defined the Built Boundary which includes both residential and industrial lands.</p>
	<p>Map DI (Natural Heritage System)</p> <p>It is requested that the natural heritage system be removed from within the licensed boundary and in the dock area. Please remove the 2</p>	<p>Agree to remove the watercourse on the East. Staff do not support other changes.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	water courses noted above and remove the ANSI designation.	
	<p>Map F1 (Natural Hazards and Waste Areas)</p> <p>There are regulatory shoreline areas identified on the quarry property, more specifically within the licensed area as well as a waste disposal assessment area. We request removal of the waste disposal assessment area and regulatory shoreline on the subject lands as well as the two watercourses noted above.</p>	<p>Waste Disposal Assessment Area information is provided by the Province of Ontario. Staff do not support request.</p> <p>Regulatory Shoreline Area data provided by the Conservation Authority. No changes are proposed.</p>
	<p>Map K (Trails) shows a portion of the trail system as being located on St. Marys' property. It is requested that this be revised to remove the identification of the trail within the St. Mary's property boundary. The watercourses noted above are illustrated on this map as well and should be removed.</p>	<p>See comment above re: watercourses. No changes are proposed.</p>
	<p>It is noted that there is no recognition in the Visions and Principles section regarding the importance of mineral aggregate resources. We request that wording be included to protect mineral aggregate resources and to make available as much of the resource as is realistically possible to be consistent with the PPS.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>To ensure consistency with the PPS, we request that the goals and objectives provided in Section 3 be revised to recognize the importance of protecting mineral aggregate resources and to make available as much aggregate as is realistically possible.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. Aggregates are identified in the Objectives sufficiently.</p>
	<p>It is noted that Section 3.2.5 identifies “significant aggregate resources” as a defined term. This term is not provided in the definition sections. We request that this term be replaced with “deposits of mineral aggregate resources” and be defined in accordance with the PPS.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. Deposits of mineral aggregate resources are the same as potential aggregate resource areas that are identified on Map G as provided by the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines Resources.</p>
	<p>There are numerous policies in section 3.4 that are more restrictive than the PPS and the ORMCP as it relates to aggregates (i.e. 3.4.2, 3.4.8, 3.4.14, 3.4.26 and Table 3-1) but currently as drafted these policies apply to new or expansion of mineral aggregate operations.</p> <p>We request that a notwithstanding clause be added to Section 15 which would outline that the policies of Section 3.4 do not apply to mineral aggregates and also to include the applicable tests for aggregate/natural heritage in Section 15 of the Official Plan</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. With respect to these policies, the PPS represents minimum standards. The Municipality has higher standards for the protection of the Natural Heritage System. Section 15.3.4 (formerly 4.5.15) outlines which features a new aggregate operation or an expansion of an existing operation is not permitted within. This is an existing policy.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Section 3.6.2 states The Municipality has enacted a site alteration by-law to regulate alterations to grade, the excavation of material and /or the placement /depositing of fill across the Municipality with the exception of those areas regulated by the respective Conservation Authority. We request that the words "or areas licensed under the ARA" be added to this section after the words "Conservation Authority."</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. This provisions is already provided for in the Site Alteration by-law.</p>
	<p>It is noted that Section 3.6.25 (b) is not consistent with Section 2.5.2.4 of the PPS. We request that this section be revised to be consistent with the PPS.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. Policy revised.</p>
	<p>Section 3.6.25(d) precludes aggregate extraction in areas with significant natural heritage features as defined by the municipality. As noted above, aggregate extraction is not prohibited in all significant natural heritage features identified in section 3.4.3 based on the policies of the PPS and ORMCP. We request the reference to section 3.4.3 to be deleted and replaced with section 15.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. The Clarington Official Plan completed its Oak Ridges Moraine Conformity exercise was approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in October 2005.</p>
	<p>Section 3.6.26 refers to a map to identify Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas for protection. Significant natural features should not be automatically removed from these areas, as extraction in accordance with provincial</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	policy, is permitted in certain environmental areas and these areas should continue to be protected in accordance with policy 2.5.1 and 2.5.2.5 of the PPS.	
	It is noted that Section 3.6.27 is not consistent with Section 2.5.2.5 of the PPS, we request that this section be revised for consistency with the provincial plan.	Staff agrees with submission.
	As monitoring and enforcement of aggregate operations is carried out by the MNR, we request that Section 3.6.34 be deleted.	This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.
	It is requested that Policy 7.3.7 be revised to include reference to the consideration of the existing St. Mary's dock.	Staff agrees with submission.
	Regarding Section 11.3.2 i), please provide clarification of 2 the hectare size limit for asphalt/ready-mix facilities.	This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.
	Section 11.7.4 restricts freight transport facilities to the General Industrial Designation, we request a site specific exemption for Hutton Transport to recognize the use on the site which is currently designated Light Industrial.	The property is zoned General Industrial which permits the use as it exists.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Section 14.4.4 restricts development on lands designated Environmental Protection and is not consistent with the PPS and ORMCP for mineral aggregate resources. Similar to above, we request revision to this section to ensure consistency with provincial plans:</p> <p>For areas outside of the ORMCP, mineral extraction should be in accordance with policies of 2.1 of the PPS.</p>	<p>This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed. Regarding the ORMCP – see comments above.</p>
	<p>We request that Section 14.4.7 be revised to reflect that the mandatory setback of development from lands designated Environmental Protection should not apply to aggregate extraction and should be determined based on Environmental Impact Study recommendations.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed.</p>
	<p>We request that the goals and objectives sections (15.1 and 15.2) be revised to be consistent with section 2.5 of the PPS.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. PPS policies do not need to be replicated in the Official Plan in order for them to be consistent.</p>
	<p>It is requested that section 15.3.2 be revised to identify that other lands, other than those currently identified as a potential aggregate resource areas on Map G, may have resource potential and that a new or expanded mineral aggregate operation can be considered by amendment on these lands if it is identified</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. The policies clearly outline where aggregate extraction can, and cannot occur, and should a new aggregate extraction operation want to establish, an amendment to the existing Official Plan would be required.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	through technical studies that the lands have mineral resource potential.	
	We request that section 15.3.3 be modified to be consistent with policy 2.5.2.4 of the PPS which provides that existing operations shall be permitted to continue without the need for official plan amendment, rezoning, or development permit under the Planning Act.	No changes are proposed. Existing policy allows the continued use.
	It is recommended that section 15.3.4 be split to recognize the different policies that apply to lands within the Oak Ridges Moraine and lands that are located outside of the Oak Ridges Moraine.	This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.
	Applicable policy for lands within the Oak Ridges Moraine should be consistent with section 35 of the ORMCP and policies applicable to lands outside of the Oak Ridges Moraine should be consistent with section 2.1 of the PPS.	Clarington Official Plan policies regarding the Oak Ridges Moraine were approved by the Ministry in 2005.
	Additionally, section 15.3.11 applies outside of the ORMCP and is not consistent with the PPS and contradicts the policies in section 15.3.4.	Staff agrees with submission. The proposed policy change to 15.3.11 made it in conflict with 15.3.4. Policy modified. No changes are proposed. Provincial Policy and Plans are considered a minimum

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		standard in terms of protection of the natural heritage system.
	In section 15.3.5, please delete the reference to rural residential concentrations as there is not a definition provided for this term. Please remove the reference to rural clusters as these areas should not be precluded if an operator were to assemble these lands for future extraction.	Staff agrees with submission.
	It is requested that 15.3.6 be modified to be consistent with the PPS definition for mineral aggregate operation which provides that associated facilities used in extraction, transport, beneficiation, processing or recycling of mineral aggregate resources and derived products such as asphalt and concrete, or the production of secondary related products.	No changes are proposed. Section 15.3.6 describes the permitted uses, as well as limited accessory uses, to aggregate extraction. It is not the intent of the Official Plan to permit other uses in aggregate extraction as requested without an amendment to the Official Plan.
	Section 15.3.7 restricts the use of portable concrete batching and portable asphalt plants to 3 years. We request the removal of the 3 year time limit as asphalt and concrete facilities are permitted as a part of a mineral aggregate operation.	No changes are proposed. This policy is about 'portable' units, not permanent units. Permanent units are provided for in section 15.3.8.
	It is requested that section 15.3.8 be revised as asphalt and concrete plants area a permitted use as a part of a mineral aggregate operation	No changes are proposed. As defined by the Official Plan section 15.3.6, these are not permitted uses. However, these uses

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	[PPS definition] and therefore should not require an Official Plan Amendment to permit their use.	may be permitted in accordance with 15.3.8. via an Official Plan Amendment.
	Section 15.3.9 references the list and description of policies contained in Appendix A. Since appendices do not form a part of an Official Plan and may be altered without public notification or consultation, it is requested that the contents of Appendix A be included in the Official Plan document as a section rather than an appendix.	Disagree with including the description of studies as part of the Official Plan. As noted in section 15.3.9 scoping of the study, in consultation with the applicant, is permitted.
	Section 15.3.1 1 (a) does not reference the site specific exemption for the Bowmanville Quarry pertaining to ANSI's provided in Section 15.3.4. If the ANSI is not removed from the property as requested above, this reference should be included as well as an exemption to apply to the adjacent cement plant property which is designated General Industrial.	No changes are proposed. The Bowmanville Quarry ANSI is Provincial and reference to it is unnecessary in Section 15.3.11 which speaks to regional ANSIs.
	It is requested that Section 15.3.11 (b) be revised to be consistent with Section 2.1.5 of the PPS.	Staff agrees with submission. Policy modified.
	Section 16.4.3 (c) should be deleted.	No changes are proposed. Environmental Protection designation remains.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Section 16.4.3 (d) should be deleted to correspond with the removal of the Waterfront Greenway designation from the property.	Agree to removal of 16.4.3 d) given that Waterfront Greenway was eliminated on the property.
	Section 16.4.6 provides direction encouraging St. Mary's to provide opportunities for public access to the waterfront. This section should be removed.	No changes are proposed.
	It is requested that the reference to fuel storage facility be removed from Section 16.4.5 a) because fuel storage should not be a restricted use on the property if it is carried out in accordance with government regulations.	No changes are proposed.
	Section 16.4.5e) was revised to require St. Mary's to monitor the shoreline. It is unclear of what this requires and it is requested that this section be deleted.	This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.
	It is requested that the site specific policy for Special Policy Area C should include permission for the use of alternative fuels and encourage other sustainable design and climate change measures in accordance with Section 5.5 of the draft Official Plan	No changes are proposed.
	Section 19.7.3 (b) requires a vibration study to be prepared for any development within 75 metres of a railway corridor. This section should	This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	be clarified to be applicable to sensitive land uses.	
	Policies included within the draft Official Plan applying to lands both within and outside of the ORMCP dealing with endangered and threatened species habitat should be modified to reflect the provisions of the Endangered Species Act in accordance with the PPS. The original policies of the ORMCP pre-date the 2007 Endangered Species Act.	The municipality does not support development within the natural heritage system, including endangered and threatened species habitat however Table 3-1 has been amended to include the provision 'in accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements'.
WS-50 Coco Paving – MHBC (Brian Zeman) Sept. 7, 2016	Coco Paving Inc. owns lands which are located at 3022 Regional Road 20, Municipality of Clarington. Map A 1 (Land Use) and Map D2 (Natural Environment) identify an area south of the Hydro corridor that has been designated "Environmental Protection Area", we request clarification for this designation.	Approximate 8 ha woodlot is designated Environmental Protection is the current Official Plan as well as the proposed Official Plan.
	Map G (Potential Aggregate Resource Area) identifies the majority of the property as being a primary potential aggregate resource area except for the Natural Core Area. There is a small portion in the south western corner that we request be identified as a Primary Area for the Potential Aggregate Resource Areas to the boundary of Regional Road 20 at Longsault Road.	No changes are proposed. The data on Map G is provided by the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines Resources. However, it appears that the area in questions not identified as a Resource Area includes a Residential Property.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>It is noted that there is no recognition in the Visions and Principles section regarding the importance of mineral aggregate resources. We request that wording be included to protect mineral aggregate resources and to make available as much of the resource as is realistically possible to be consistent with the PPS.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed.</p>
	<p>To ensure consistency with the PPS, we request that the goals and objectives provided in Section 3 be revised to recognize the importance of protecting mineral aggregate resources and to make available as much aggregate as is realistically possible.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. Aggregates are identified in the Objectives sufficiently.</p>
	<p>There are numerous policies in section 3.4 that are more restrictive than the PPS and the ORMCP as it relates to aggregates (i.e. 3.4.3, 3.4.5, 3.4.8, 3.4.2.6 and Table 3- 1) but currently as drafted these policies apply to new or expansion of mineral aggregate operations.</p> <p>We request that a notwithstanding clause be added to Section 15 which would outline that the policies of Section 3.4 do not apply to mineral aggregates and also to include the applicable tests for aggregate / natural heritage in Section 15 of the Official Plan.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed.</p> <p>With respect to these policies, the PPS represents minimum standards. The Municipality has higher standards for the protection of the Natural Heritage System.</p> <p>Section 15.3.4 (formerly 4.5.15) outlines which features a new aggregate operation or an expansion of an existing operation is not permitted within. This is an existing policy.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>It is noted that Section 3.2.5 identifies "significant aggregate resources" as a defined term. This term is not provided in the definition section. We request that this term be replaced with "deposits of mineral aggregate resources" and be defined in accordance with the PPS.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. Deposits of mineral aggregate resources are the same as potential aggregate resource areas that are identified on Map G as provided by the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines.</p>
	<p>Section 3.6.2 states that the Municipality has enacted a site alteration by-law to regulate alterations to grade, the excavation of material and/or the placement/depositing of fill across the Municipality with the exception of those areas regulated by the respective Conservation Authority. We request that the words "or areas licensed under the ARA" be added to this section after the words "Conservation Authority".</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. This provisions is already provided for in the Site Alteration by-law.</p>
	<p>Section 3.6.18 prohibits the removal of woodlands in the Oak Ridges Moraine. We request that this policy be revised to reflect that woodlands may be removed for aggregate extraction subject to Section 35 of the ORMCP.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. An existing policy and the Official Plan policies are compliant with the ORMCP based on the Ministry approval in October 2005.</p>
	<p>It is noted that Section 3.6.25 (b) is not consistent with Section 2.5.2.4 of the PPS. We request that this section be revised to be consistent with the PPS.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. Policy added.</p>
	<p>Section 3.6.20(d) precludes aggregate extraction in areas with significant natural</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. The Clarington Official Plan completed its Oak Ridges</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	heritage features as defined by the municipality. As noted above, aggregate extraction is not prohibited in all significant natural heritage features identified in section 3.4.3 based on the policies of the PPS and ORMCP. We request the reference to section 3.4.3 to be deleted and replaced with section 15.	Moraine Conformity exercise was approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in October 2005.
	Section 3.6.26 refers to a map to identify Mineral Aggregate Resources Areas for protection. Significant natural features should not be automatically removed from these areas, as extraction in accordance with provincial policy, is permitted in certain environmental areas and these areas should continue to be protected in accordance with policy 2.5.1 and 2.5.2.5 of the PPS.	Staff agrees with submission.
	It is noted that Section 3.6.27 is not consistent with Section 2.5.2.5 of the PPS, we request that this section be revised for consistently with the provincial plan.	Staff agrees with submission.
	As monitoring and enforcement of aggregate operations is carried out by the MNRF, we request that Section 3.6.29 be deleted.	This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.
	The Rural Area goals and objectives found in Sections 13.1 and 13.2 are focused solely on agriculture. We request that language be included in these sections to recognize and	No changes are proposed. Goals and objectives regarding aggregates are more appropriate to be contained, as they are,

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	support other rural resources (i.e. mineral aggregate resources) in these areas.	within Chapter 15 Aggregate Extraction Areas.
	Section 14.4.4 restricts development on lands designated Environmental Protection and is not consistent with the PPS and ORMCP for mineral aggregate resources. Similar to above, we request revision to this section to ensure consistency with provincial plans.	This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed. Regarding the ORMCP – see comments above.
	We request that Section 14.4.7 be revised to reflect that the mandatory setback of development from lands designated Environmental Protection should not apply to aggregate extraction and should be determined based on Environmental Impact Study recommendations.	No changes are proposed.
	We request that the goals and objectives sections (15.1 and 15.2) be revised to be consistent with section 2.5 of the PPS.	No changes are proposed. PPS policies do not need to be replicated in the official Plan in order for them to be consistent.
	It is requested that section 15.3.2 be revised to identify that other lands, other than those currently identified a potential aggregate resource areas on Map G, may have resource potential and that a new or expanded mineral aggregate operation can be considered by amendment on these lands if it is identified	No changes are proposed. The policies clearly outline where aggregate extraction can, and cannot occur, and should a new aggregate extraction operation want to establish, an amendment to the existing Official Plan would be required.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	through technical studies that the lands have mineral resource potential.	
	We request that section 15.3.3 be modified to be consistent with policy 2.5.2.4 of the PPS which provides that existing operations shall be permitted to continue without the need for official plan amendment, rezoning, or development permit under the Planning Act.	No changes are proposed. An existing policy that allows the continued use.
	It is recommended that section 15.3.4 be split to recognize the different policies that apply to lands within the Oak Ridges Moraine and lands that are located outside of the Oak Ridges Moraine.	No changes are proposed. An existing policy.
	In section 15.3.5, please delete the reference to rural residential concentrations as there is not a definition provided for this term. Please remove the reference to rural clusters as these areas should not be precluded if an operator were to assemble these lands for future extraction.	Staff agrees with submission.
	It is requested that 15.3.6 be modified to be consistent with the PPS definition for mineral aggregate operation which provides that associated facilities used in extraction, transport, beneficiation, processing or recycling of mineral aggregate resources and derived	No changes are proposed. Section 15.3.6 describes the permitted uses, as well as limited accessory uses, to aggregate extraction. It is not the intent of the Official Plan to permit other uses in aggregate extraction as requested without an amendment to the Official Plan.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	products such as asphalt and concrete, or the production of secondary related products.	
	Section 15.3.7 restricts the use of portable concrete batching and portable asphalt plants to 3 years. We request the removal of the 3 year time limit as asphalt and concrete facilities are permitted as a part of a mineral aggregate operation.	No changes are proposed. This policy is about 'portable' units, not permanent units. Permanent units are provided for in section 15.3.8.
	It is requested that section 15.3.8 be revised as asphalt and concrete plants area a permitted use as a part of a mineral aggregate operation and therefore should not require an Official Plan Amendment to permit their use.	No changes are proposed. As defined by the Official Plan section 15.3.6, these are not permitted uses. However, these uses may be permitted in accordance with 15.3.8. via an Official Plan Amendment.
	Section 15.3.9 references the list and description of policies contained in Appendix A. Since appendices do not form a part of an Official Plan and may be altered without public notification or consultation, it is requested that the contents of Appendix A be included in the Official Plan document as a section rather than an appendix.	Disagree with including the description of studies as part of the Official Plan. As noted in section 15.3.9 scoping of the study, in consultation with the applicant, is permitted.
	Section 15.3.13(e) is not consistent with section 35(2) (e) of the ORMCP. It is requested that this section be revised.	No changes are proposed.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	We request that Sections 18.7 and 18.8.2 include a policy that major recreational uses or tourism nodes cannot be permitted unless they comply with Sections 2.5.2.4 and 2.5.2.5 of the PPS.	Agree to policy amendment to ensure that adjacent aggregate resources are considered.
	It is requested that Section 19.3.1 1 be revised to allow for consideration of the closure and conveyance of a road allowance which would allow for better integration and rehabilitation of adjoining mineral aggregate operations.	Existing renumbered section 3.6.32 identifies this already.
	Please clarify that mineral aggregate extraction operations may be permitted by Official Plan Amendment on lands designated "Utility".	Mineral Aggregate extraction is not permitted on lands designated utility.
	Policies included within the draft Official Plan applying to lands both within and outside of the ORMCP dealing with endangered and threatened species habitat should be modified to reflect the provisions of the Endangered Species Act in accordance with the PPS. The original policies of the ORMCP pre-date the 2007 Endangered Species Act.	The Municipality does not support development within the natural heritage system, including endangered and threatened species habitat however Table 3-1 has been amended to include the provision 'in accordance with Provincial and Federal requirements'.
WS-51 Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited –	Location: 2000 Green Road and 2405 Highway 2. Concerned that the density, height and built forms in table 4-2 would apply to non-residential buildings.	All commercial sites are allowed to develop as per approved site plans. All new non-residential development will have consideration for the table as stated in Section 10.3.4. However, a policy has been

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (Jonathan Rodger) Sept. 8, 2016		introduced to allow commercial developments to proceed at different heights provide that the minimum of two full stories is maintained.
	Would like clarification as to whether external garbage and recycling compactors would be interpreted as refuse area where a fully enclosed roofed building would be required.	External garbage and recycling compactors would be interpreted as a refuse area.
	Disagrees with the change in convenience store size from 250 sq. m to 100 sq. m. in Section 5.4.9. Request it remain 250 sq. m.	Agreed.
	Section 5.4.12 should use policy language such as “encourage’ when speaking to shared parking, parking structures and below grade parking, instead of making it a requirement.	Staff agrees with submission.
	Would like clarification on whether Section 5.6.5, which states that a Sustainability Report is required for all development application, is applicable to minor expansions or improvements to existing buildings.	Sustainability information applies to all development applications, it relates to both building and site. The extent of the report will be subject to the nature and size of the development.
	Section 10.3.4 which states that there is a need for applicants to demonstrate how the proposal contributes to the densities in Table 4-2 and floor space index requirements. Request that the words “over the long term” be added to allow flexibility over the short and	Staff agrees with submission. The table has been revised to reflect net densities. Floor Space Index has been removed from table. Floor Space Index is addressed in a standalone policy. FSI are set by the Region and the Clarington Official Plan

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	medium terms. Also would like clarification if this would apply to minor expansions or improvements to existing buildings.	must conform. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Section 10.3.5 which states a minimum of 2 storeys for all new commercial development in the prescribed locations. Request that wording be added to allow flexibility for operational needs and site context and to recognise that the policies will be implemented over time when intensification comes to fruition. Also would like clarification if a partial mezzanine would satisfy the minimum two storey requirement.	A mezzanine would not be considered a second storey based on the definition in the plan for “Storey”.
WS-52 Loblaw Properties Limited and Choice Properties REIT – Zelinka Priamo Ltd. (Jonathan Rodger) Sept. 9, 2016	Location: 80 King Avenue West (No Frills) and 2375 Highway 2 (Loblaws). Concerned that the density, height and built forms in table 4-2 would apply to non-residential buildings.	A policy has been introduced to allow commercial developments to proceed at different heights provide that the minimum of two full stories is maintained.
	Would like clarification as to whether external garbage and recycling compactors would be interpreted as refuse area where a fully enclosed roofed building would be required.	External garbage and recycling compactors would be interpreted as a refuse area.
	Section 5.4.12 should use policy language such as “encourage’ when speaking to shared parking, parking structures and below grade parking, instead of making it a requirement.	Staff agrees with submission.
	Section 5.5.3 states the development of a Green Development Program in consultation with public and key stakeholders. Loblaw and CP	Staff will be advised to invite Loblaw and CP REIT to participate when this program is initiated.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>REIT would like to be involved in that process and request notification be provided.</p>	
	<p>Would like clarification on whether Section 5.6.5, which states that a Sustainability Report is required for all development application, is applicable to minor expansions or improvements to existing buildings.</p>	<p>Sustainability information applies to all development applications, it relates to both building and site. The extent of the report will be subject to the nature and size of the development.</p>
	<p>Section 10.3.4 which states that there is a need for applicants to demonstrate how the proposal contributes to the densities in Table 4-2 and floor space index requirements.</p> <p>Request that the words “over the long term” be added to allow flexibility over the short and medium terms. Also would like clarification if this would apply to minor expansions or improvements to existing buildings.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. The table has been revised to reflect net densities. Floor Space Index has been removed from table. Floor Space Index is addressed in a standalone policy. FSI are set by the Region and the Clarington Official Plan must conform. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>Section 10.3.5 which states a minimum of 2 storeys for all new commercial development in the prescribed locations. Request that wording be added to allow flexibility for operational needs and site context and to recognise that the policies will be implemented over time when intensification comes to fruition.</p> <p>Would like clarification if a partial mezzanine would satisfy the minimum two storey requirement.</p>	<p>A mezzanine would not be considered a second storey based on the definition in the plan for “Storey”.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>WS-53 Elaine Wotten Sept. 9, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-10</p>	<p>Location: 5834 Solina Road, in the Hamlet of Solina.</p> <p>Would like the subject property to be zoned commercial as it was back in 1977. Was never notified when the zoning of the property was changed to Hamlet Residential.</p> <p>Verbal submission Request that the commercial zoning designation be reinstated on her property. She stated there has been substantial growth in the area with new families relocating, and feels her property would be appropriate to have commercial zoning which would create a base for a central hub for the community. The property would accommodate this zoning as it is centrally located, has a 250ft frontage, and a septic system for 80 people and could operate as a daycare or a corner store to serve the area residents.</p>	<p>The submission provided a Notice of Public Meeting in 1977 where a portion of the site was shown as a Commercial site. The Hamlet of Solina Secondary Plan was adopted with this site designated for commercial permitting uses such as a general store, hardware store, antique store, butcher shop, bakeries, personal services, farm implement dealerships, service stations. The property was never rezoned as a commercial site</p> <p>In 1996 the new Clarington Official Plan was adopted and the former Newcastle Official Plan was repealed. Under the 1996 Clarington Official Plan, there was much less detail contained in the Plan for hamlets. The lands were designated Hamlet Residential but the uses permitted allowed for other uses such as general stores, home-based occupations, arts and craft shops, service stations and farm-related commercial uses.</p> <p>Essentially all Residential lands in a hamlet could have commercial uses subject to a rezoning. OPA 107 does not propose any changes with respect to commercial permissions in hamlets. The proponent could make a zoning application for their</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		lands for one of these types of commercial uses. No changes are proposed.
WS-54 Robert Wannack Sept. 9, 2016 Also see WS-86	Location: 1984 Highway 2. Property is proposed to be designated Environmentally Protected due to the Provincially Significant Wetlands on the subject lands. Objects to the Environmental Protection designation and disagrees that the lands are considered a Provincially Significant Wetland.	See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16.
WS-55 John and Ingrid Janssen Sept. 9, 2016	Location: Northwest corner of Taunton Road and McCallum, the area south and west of the existing Hamlet of Hampton. Requesting a minor rounding out of the Hamlet of Hampton. This would allow for development of about 3-4, 1 acre lots that would be accessed through a court off of Taunton Road.	See section 9.2 in staff report PSD-060-16.
WS-56 Brookfield Homes (Aidan Dekkema) Sept. 9, 2016	Location: south of Concession Road 3, east of North Street in Newcastle. Objects to the sequential order of the Secondary Plans which identify the lands as N2. Request that the lands be developed with the rest of the	Sequencing has been removed. See section 4.1 and 4.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>North Newcastle Village community in order to continuously build out the community. Objects to the requirement of the municipally initiated comprehensive review in order to accelerate the sequencing of the secondary plan process. The private sector initiated secondary plans should be an option for the Municipality to initiate the secondary plan process.</p>	
<p>WS-57 1816451 Ontario Limited – MPS Miller Planning Services (Rodger Miller) Sept. 12, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-30</p>	<p>Location: 24 acre and a 15 acre vacant parcel south of Baseline Road and west of Rundle Road. Have requested that the subject lands be removed from the Special Study Area No 4 and the Courtice Employment Lands Secondary Plan, or allow for a site specific amendment to permit the construction of a new auto mall.</p>	<p>Special Study Area 4 and the Courtice Employment Lands Secondary Plan have been revised to no longer include the employment lands east of Highway 418.</p>
	<p>Section 11.6.6 permits auto malls in the Light Industrial designation, however only on sites located on a Type A arterial road. Suggest modifying the policy to also include sites with exposure to Highway 401 or other major freeways.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission regarding auto-malls, the policy has been revised to delete the reference to a Type A Arterial Road.</p>
	<p>Map D1 identifies a natural heritage system on a small portion of the subject property. After reviewing Figure 14-A Natural Heritage System, South Darlington, no evidence as to what the corresponding reference to this area. Request clarification on which natural heritage feature was identified on this property.</p>	<p>The natural heritage feature identified on site is a deciduous swamp.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Verbal submission The verbal submission is similar to written submission.</p>	
<p>WS-58 Josh Benoliel Sept. 12, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-31</p>	<p>Location: 18 acre parcel on the southeast corner of Baseline and Solina Road.</p> <p>Plans are to build a commercial warehouse, which has an outdoor storage component (tenant Superior Quilting Ltd.). Staff have met with the owners and owners have clarified that the outdoor storage component is tractor trailers used to ship products and may also contain some shipping containers. Would like clarification that these components accessory to the operation of the business would be permitted. Lands are zoned M2 and permits the proposed use. Any changes to the zoning would compromise the plans for the site. Object to the zoning change from M2 to M1.</p> <p>Verbal submission The verbal submission is similar to written submission.</p>	<p>OPA 107 does not propose any changes to the land use designations for this property.</p> <p>No changes are being proposed to the zoning of the property.</p> <p>Shipping containers may not be used as an accessory structure for storage.</p> <p>The tractor trailers may be permitted as part of the transportation of goods associated with the operation of any business and is not considered outdoor storage, unless they are used for permanent storage on the site.</p>
<p>WS-59 Caitlin Hung Sept. 12, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-32</p>	<p>Location: 3196 Rundle Road.</p> <p>Objects to the Environmental Protection designation on the property. Site previously had a detached dwelling that was removed from the property. Intent is to rebuild a detached dwelling on the property sometime in the future.</p>	<p>See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Concerned that the proposed policy changes will not allow for a detached home to be built on the property.</p> <p>Verbal submission This property has been changed to environmentally protected under the proposed Official Plan. This change would be to implement the natural heritage system. There are no other properties in the area are being designated as environmentally protected. Requests that the designation be removed.</p>	
<p>WS-60 Sherry Zwetsloot Sept. 12, 2016</p>	<p>Location: Martin Road Land Assembly. Opportunity on the properties to allow for an R4 zone.</p> <p>The vision for the site is to create affordable housing. The properties are in close proximity to amenities, GO service and the 401 and overlook Lake Ontario. Concerned about the natural heritage feature identified on the properties (woodlot). Recognising this feature on the properties may discourage developers from buying the properties. With limited access off Martin Road, the depth of the properties to access the lots and parking is essential. By designating the back of the properties Environmental Protection, the bottom third of the properties will be undevelopable. Opposed to</p>	<p>See section 5.4 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	the protection of the woodlot along these properties.	
WS-61 TJ Cieciora (Design Plan Services) Sept. 13, 2016	Location: 57 acres property at the northeast corner of Highway 401 and Bennett Road. Would like to know why these lands were not included in the urban boundary and whether there is an opportunity to include these lands within the urban boundary or to a more appropriate land use designation.	The subject property is outside the urban boundaries of Bowmanville as established by the Regional Plan. The Region through their Land Budget analysis determined that an urban boundary expansion in Bowmanville was unnecessary to 2031.
WS-62 Eleanor von Gunten Sept. 14, 2016	Location: the Tooley Road Area and McLean Road. Advocating for the protection of our natural heritage system as there are many benefits that nature provides. This area is full of springs and is very wet, poor drainage. Would like to see the area remain as is with lots of space and trees. Most people in the area do not want a sanitary sewer and the associated expenses. Concerned that the property taxes will increase as well.	See sections 5.1 and 5.5 in staff report PSD-060-16. Comment received and will be forward to the Region of Durham.
WS-63 Barbara Cunningham – D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Dan Dissanayake) Sept. 14, 2016	Location: 1546 Cobbledick Road in Newcastle. The lands are located in Special Study Area 2 of the Durham Region Official Plan. There are currently no land use permissions. The policy in the Durham Region Official Plan states that this area requires further study, after which appropriate designations shall be adopted by	Special Study Area 2 requires further study prior to establishing any new uses on the property to ensure those uses will not prejudice the conclusions and recommendations of the intended studies. The request is being forwarded to the Durham Region.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>amendment to the Plan. Requesting details as to the nature and timing of the study and what the process would be for the owners to expedite the process. Request that the Region make an effort to review Special Study Area 2 as soon as possible.</p>	
<p>WS-64 Patricia MacDonald – D.G. Biddle & Associates Ltd. (Dan Dissanayake) Sept. 14, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 724 Green Road (just north of Highway 401).</p> <p>The subject property is currently designated Prestige Employment and Environmental Protection. The property is also within the Built Boundary. The proposed Official Plan designates the whole property as Environmental Protection.</p>	<p>The proposed Official Plan designates the property Community Park and Environmental Protection. The Environmental Protection limits have not increased on this property. See Section 7.1 of the staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>Given the Built Boundary identified on the lands, this provides support for development of the site that is outside the yet to be determined environmental protection limits.</p>	<p>The Built Boundary delineation from the Province does not provide development rights. The Built Boundary only recognizes the limits of the developed urban areas.</p>
	<p>Objects to the removal of the Prestige Employment Area designation. The proposed change reduces the development potential of the property.</p>	<p>Given the small amount of developable land, and that the property is adjacent to the existing Community Park, the Community Park designation was determined to be most appropriate for this site. With this designation the property will be added to the land acquisition strategy of the Municipality.</p>
	<p>Request that the southwest area of the property be designated Urban Residential to reflect the</p>	<p>The southwest corner of the property is designated Environmental Protection in the</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Built Boundary designation. The requested changes would conform to the Region Official Plan.	current Official Plan and is proposed to remain Environmental Protection in the proposed OPA 107. No changes are proposed.
WS-65 Halina Workman Sept. 18, 2016	Location: A vacant parcel of land adjacent to 3222 Tooley Road. Requesting information on the four season study (from Curtis Verbal Submission VS-21) completed for a large development on the property which is wooded. Request that the wooded area be preserved in order for their ability to clean the air and drainage benefits. The trees also act as a noise barrier. The trees on Nash and Tooley Road have been removed. Objects to property owners having the right to clear cut the trees. Would like the trees to be preserved. A number of wildlife photographs have been submitted in support of the importance of the area for wildlife and reiterating the water concerns.	See sections 5.1 and 5.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Also objects to the sanitary sewer. Intensification must be compatible with the area and planned carefully.	Comment received and will be forward to the Region of Durham.
WS-66 Linda Gibney Sept. 20, 2016	Location: Tooley Road. Concerns with Cliff Curtis' plans (Verbal Submission VS-21) to build up the area behind his property. Has witnessed some tree removal	See section 5.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>on the property and has some concerns. Would like to see this area preserved and provided some photographs of the trees in the area. Would like to see a balanced and sustainable development plan.</p>	
<p>WS-67 Steve Hennessey Sept. 20, 2016</p>	<p>The housing market is booming in Bowmanville with many new housing developments coming on are sold out very quickly. Clarington has seen an increase in housing prices which indicates the lack of housing supply in the Municipality. Bowmanville sales will more than double this year compared to the 10 year average.</p>	<p>There is a very hot housing market at the present time with many factors affecting it. One of those seems to be a shortage of supply of ground-related units across the GTA but even this is disputed. It is not a Clarington problem as there are many lots approved but not under construction. Bowmanville construction is higher this year with apartment units commencing construction. Averages are just that: some years higher and some year lower.</p>
	<p>Number of comments regarding sequencing of secondary plans</p>	<p>See section 4 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-68 Dirk Woudstra Sept. 22, 2016</p>	<p>Location: Lot 29, Concession 4. 3463 Somerville Drive in Orono. The flat field at the west end of the property.</p> <p>Would like the designation to be residential land instead of identifying it as table land. There is a proposal on Concession 5, east of Oshonski Road that is proposed for residential development and requests a similar designation for the subject lands.</p>	<p>OPA 107 does not propose any changes to the land use designations for this property, except for the area outside the Urban Boundaries of Orono. The land use is proposed to change from Green Space to Environmental Protection. See section 5.1 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
WS-69 Tercot Development Group- GHD (Bryce Jordan) Sept. 23, 2016	Location: 11.3 hectare property in the Brookhill Secondary Plan area. Properties 2499 Nash Road, 2538 Regional Road 57, 2494 Regional Road 57. Would like confirmation that Environmental Protection designation does not extend south of Nash Road.	The extent of the Environmental Protection designation will be determined through an Environmental Impact Study and Geotechnical Analysis. See section 5.1 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed. Currently, the Environmental Protection designation does not extend south of Nash Road in relation to this property but given the proximity to the Bowmanville valley in this location, the Environmental Impact Study and a Geotechnical Analysis of the slope it is required.
	Objection to include wetlands that are larger than 0.5 ha in size in the Natural Heritage System. The inclusion of a wetland should not be based on size but instead be based on the ecological features and functions and their significance.	The wetlands will be determined by CLOCA and MNR. The Environmental Impact Study to refine and to identify the exact extent of the natural features of a site.
	Updating Secondary Plans prior to developing new Secondary Plans in Greenfield areas is unnecessary use of Staff's time and will impede the timing of development for the new Secondary Plan areas. Especially the Brookhill Secondary Plan area which already achieves the goals of the Growth Plan.	Not all Secondary Plans are in compliance with the proposed policy framework and updates are necessary. Brookhill Neighbourhood is relatively recent and any changes should be limited.
	Concerned with the minimum density targets being combined with the floor space index. Concerned that the new targets will be used as	Staff agrees with submission. The table has been revised to reflect net densities. Floor Space Index has been removed from table.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	a basis for the update to the Brookhill Secondary Plan.	<p>Floor Space Index is addressed in a standalone policy. FSI are set by the Region and the Clarington Official Plan must conform. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p> <p>The Brookhill Secondary Plan will be updated to be in conformity with Amendment 107. Minimum densities and floor space index implications will be assessed through the update to the Secondary Plan.</p>
<p>WS-70 Sheila Wynberg Sept. 28, 2016</p>	<p>Location: Lands in the B1 Secondary Plan. Suggests revising the policies to allow land owners to front end the costs of background studies for Secondary Plans which would accelerate the Secondary Plan process.</p>	<p>See section 4.2 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-71 One Life Farm (Tracy Fielding & Peter Alward) Sept. 29, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-14</p>	<p>Location: 2899 Taunton Road. Concerned that the proposed Environmental Protection designation will hinder their farm operation, specifically the placement of greenhouses, future building for selling food, livestock buildings, and not being able to clear cut some trees to allow more sunlight to grow crops. Also would like clarification of how the Environmental Protection designation would affect the future expansion of the house (i.e. additions, decks,</p>	<p>Staff met with the farmer and recognized that some of the vegetation would not qualify to be in the natural heritage system. For clarity, a portion of the former Christmas tree plantation has been removed from the natural heritage system. The designated Environmental Protection designation has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>Farmers are permitted to remove a limited amount of trees under Normal Farm</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>second floor, etc.). Also concerned how the designation will affect the resale of the property.</p> <p>Would like to know why the trees are identified for protection and what qualifies the vegetation to be a significant woodlot.</p> <p>Verbal Submission</p> <p>Property was purchased five years ago with the intention of operating a small organic farm. He advised the property is approximately 26 acres with approximately 1/2 acre designated environmentally protected. Concerned that the proposed mapping changes the designation of the property to approximately 90% environmentally protected and this will be very prohibitive to a small farming operation. Requests that the land remain as Prime Agriculture.</p>	<p>Practices. The balance of the natural heritage features were associated with the replanting requirements of the former aggregate pit operation. A portion of this woodlot is associated with a water feature.</p> <p>See Section 5 of the Staff Report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-72</p> <p>William J. Callaghan – Quarry Lakes Golf & Recreation Centre Inc. Sept. 29, 2016</p>	<p>Location: North Bowmanville to Concession Road 4.</p> <p>Suggests that the proposed amendment needs to recognize the increase in growth to the community with the Highway 407 and GO Train extension to Bowmanville. Suggests opening more land in Clarington to Concession 4 for residential development in order to take advantage of the Highway 407 extension.</p>	<p>The subject property is within the Provincial Greenbelt and is outside the urban boundaries of Bowmanville as established by the Regional Plan. The Region through their Land Budget analysis determined that an urban boundary expansion in Bowmanville was unnecessary to 2031.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
WS-73 Kirk Kemp – Algoma Orchards Ltd. Sept. 30, 2016	<p>Location: Municipal Park Designation in Courtice, by the waterfront.</p> <p>Exploring the idea of having a park, agri-tourism operation and a residential component for this area. The proposed amendment to the Plan does not mention the agri-tourism or residential component for this area. There is a park proposed on a large portion of the lands. Objects to the amount of land being designated as a Municipal Park. Requests that a Special Study Area designation be applied to the lands.</p>	<p>See section 6.2 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
WS-74 2368364 Ontario Inc. – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Sept. 30, 2016	<p>Location: Lands at the southwest quadrant of Martin Road and Baseline Road.</p> <p>Proposing commercial uses on the subject property. Applying to alter the floodplain with Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority. Reconfiguring the developable area to increase the viability of the subject property over the long term. Would like clarification that once the natural heritage system and floodplain are redefined, an Official Plan Amendment application will not be required.</p>	<p>An Environmental Impact Study and a floodplain analysis will determine the limits of development.</p>
WS-75 Jay Strasser – The Biglieri Group (Jake Murray) Oct. 3, 2016	<p>Location: 3553 Liberty Street North (property is split by the Bowmanville Urban boundary).</p> <p>The lands that are within the Urban Boundary are proposed to be redesignated from Future Urban Residential to Environmental Protection</p>	<p>See section 5.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	to recognise the wooded are on the property. Objects to the Environmental Protection designation. Requests that a site-specific assessment be conducted to determine the significance of the wooded area on the subject site before any land use changes are proposed for the site. Suggests that the Environmental Protection designation inhibits development and should not be based on high level mapping.	
WS-76 Fiona Walker Oct. 4, 2016 Also see VS-5	Location: Orono expansion. Requesting an expansion to the Orono Urban Boundary to develop in an affordable, green, self-sustaining way. Orono is a small town that needs a strong population base in order for businesses to survive. Orono is a unique tourism destination and could provide housing choices that are different from the other urban areas in the Municipality.	See section 9.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.
WS-77 Richard Rekker – Rekker Gardens Ltd. Oct. 4, 2016	Location: 2258 Highway 2 (northeast corner of Highway 2 and Maple Grove Road). Request that the westerly Urban Boundary of Bowmanville be extended to include the subject property. Due to growth pressures, relocating business to 2004 Darlington-Clarke Townline Road. Once the transition has been completed, it will leave the 30 acres vacant. Suggests that once Longworth Avenue is extended to Holt Road or Maple Grove Road, the subject	The subject property is outside the urban boundaries of Bowmanville as established by the Regional Plan. The Region through their Land Budget analysis determined that an urban boundary expansion in Bowmanville was unnecessary to 2031.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>property will become a natural extension to the western Urban Boundary of Bowmanville. The property will be better suited for residential and commercial development.</p> <p>The expansion would coincide with the Region and Clarington’s long range vision, where a comprehensive plan was implemented, part of which included the recent construction of the new Durham Region East police facility, directly adjacent to the property.</p>	
<p>WS-78 Bowmanville East Developers Group – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Oct. 5, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-83</p>	<p>Location: B1 and B2 Secondary Plan Areas. Concerned with the Secondary Plan Areas and the sequencing of the Secondary Plans.</p>	<p>See section 4.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-79 Abe’s Auto Recycling – GHD (Steve H. Edwards) Oct. 6, 2016</p>	<p>Location: 2532 Concession Road 3, Bowmanville.</p> <p>Business provides an essential environmental recycling service for automotive parts, disposes hazardous fluids and batteries and provides steel as raw material to Gerdau Steel in Whitby. Surrounding the subject property is residential development, which has made it desirable to relocate the recycling operation.</p> <p>Owner acquired a property at 1535 and 1553 Trulls Road and is designated Employment Area</p>	<p>This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>within the Durham Region Official Plan. The proposed amendment designates the property General Industrial and Special Study Area 4.</p> <p>This site is being considered for the relocation of the business. Concerned with the following policies:</p> <p>Policy 11.3.2 states that auto wreckers shall not be permitted unless they are developed on parcels less than 2 hectares. The restriction functionally prohibits the auto recycling business. Business would require 6 to 8 hectares. Suggests that this policy be amended to specify a range of 2 to 8 hectares.</p>	
	<p>Policy 11.3.5 states that employment areas shall be developed on municipal sewer and water. The proposed use can be developed on private services because of the low water and sewer demand. Suggest adding wording which states that development can occur on private services, provided they can be supported by private services. Should also make a reference to the appropriate studies that would be required such as soils and hydrogeology.</p>	<p>This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.</p>
	<p>Policy 17.1.1 states that until land uses are determined for Special Study Area 4, uses are limited to existing uses. This area requires the completion of a Secondary Plan. Timing of completion is unknown. An Official Plan</p>	<p>This is an existing policy. No changes are proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Amendment is required for auto recycling uses according to the Plan, however the policy framework would essentially prevent consideration of the relocation of Abe’s Auto. Suggest adding that Council may consider the use of land other than existing uses prior to when the planning is completed for the area.</p>	
<p>WS-80 Fairhaven Investments Inc. – Humphries Planning Group Inc. (Rosemarie Humphries) Oct. 12, 2016</p>	<p>Location: South of Special Study Area 3 - Goodyear Redevelopment Area, Blocks 112 and 113 located within a registered plan of subdivision 40M-2294.</p> <p>This area has not been able to develop in the past because of the Goodyear plant operation. With the redevelopment of the Goodyear site, the remaining blocks of land in the plan of subdivision can be developed. Request that the blocks be included in Special Study Area 3 in order to be part of the study.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission. Mapping has been revised to include the area in Special Study Area 3.</p>
<p>WS-81 Medallion Developments Limited – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Oct. 13, 2016 Also see WS-44 and VS-17</p>	<p>Location: Southeast corner of Lambs Road and Concession Street East.</p> <p>Concerned with the Secondary Plan Areas and the sequencing of the Secondary Plans. Region Official Plan already addresses sequential development and therefore it is unnecessary to have sequencing and phasing in the local Official Plan. Request that B1 and B2 Secondary Plan Areas be merged into one secondary plan area and that all references to</p>	<p>See section 4.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	sequencing and phasing of secondary plans in the Official Plan Amendment 107 be removed.	
	Request that the landowners have the ability to initiate the secondary plan process in collaboration with the Municipality. The Municipality and landowners would share the costs and collaborate through the Secondary Plan process. Policy recommendations in this regard have been submitted. Landowners would coordinate and fund the studies for the secondary plan in collaboration with the Municipality.	See section 4.2 in staff report PSD-060-16
	Request clarification be added to Section 3.5 and Section 20 to allow landowners to assist with the preparation of watershed and subwatershed plans.	See section 4.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Request that flexibility be provided to adjust the minimum vegetation protection zone. Request the clarification be added to section 3.4.16.	See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Suggest that section 23.10 be revised to permit the dedication of land associated with the creek for parkland dedication purposes as the land directly contributes to the planned recreational network.	This is standard Municipal practice. Natural heritage features are to be dedicated gratuitously to the Municipality as part of the development process. Parkland dedication is for active parkland facilities.
WS-82	Location: B2 Secondary Plan Area.	See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
Mohawk Upper James Investment Limited – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Oct. 13, 2016 Also see WS-46	Environmental Protection limits impedes development of the subject lands. Support policies 14.4.6 and 3.4.4 which recognizes that the limits are approximate and provides the ability to define the limits without requiring an Official Plan Amendment. Requests that the same flexibility be applied to the minimum vegetation protection zone in table 3-1 as a result of technical studies. Suggest policy 3.4.16 be revised to reflect this.	
	Request that the landowners have the ability to initiate the secondary plan process in collaboration with the Municipality. The Municipality and landowners would share the costs and collaborate through the Secondary Plan process. Policy recommendations in this regard have been submitted, specifically for policy 23.2.3. Request that B1 and B2 Secondary Plan Areas be merged into one secondary plan area.	See section 4.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Map J shows the extension of Mearns Avenue as a Type C arterial road. Proposed policy 19.6.1 states that the location of future roads are approximate, the exact alignment will be determined through appropriate studies. Support the conceptual nature of the future road location. Support reduced right of way widths as	Comment noted.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	a general practice to ensure efficient use of land.	
<p>WS-83 Bowmanville East Developers Group – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter) Oct. 13, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-78</p>	<p>Location: B1 and B2 Secondary Plan areas.</p> <p>Request that B1 and B2 Secondary Plan Areas be merged into one secondary plan area.</p> <p>Request that the landowners have the ability to initiate the secondary plan process in collaboration with the Municipality. The Municipality and landowners would share the costs and collaborate through the Secondary Plan process. Policy recommendations in this regard have been submitted, specifically for policy 23.2.3. Landowners would coordinate and fund the studies for the secondary plan in collaboration with the Municipality.</p> <p>Region Official Plan already addresses sequential development and therefore it is unnecessary to have sequencing and phasing in the local Official Plan. Request that all references to sequencing and phasing of secondary plans in the Official Plan Amendment 107 be removed.</p>	<p>See sections 4.2 and 4.3 in staff report PSD-060-16</p>
	<p>The preparation of secondary plans would not create undue capital costs to the Municipality. If initiated by landowners, the preparation of secondary plans would not have inherent capital costs to the Municipality insofar as infrastructure</p>	<p>See sections 4.2 and 4.4 in staff report PSD-060-16</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	and capital projects. Future infrastructure and community facilities would be addressed through cost sharing principles and other financial considerations prior to development.	
	Cost recovery should be provided if the studies that are funded are already captured as part of the development charges or capital resources.	See sections 4.2 and 4.4 in staff report PSD-060-16
	Request clarification be added to Section 3.5 and Section 20 to allow landowners to assist with the preparation of watershed and subwatershed plans.	See section 4.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
	Environmental Protection limits impedes development of lands. Support policies 14.4.6 and 3.4.4 which recognizes that the limits are approximate and provides the ability to define the limits without requiring an Official Plan Amendment. Requests that the same flexibility be applied to the Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone in table 3-1 as a result of technical studies. Suggest policy 3.4.16 be revised to reflect this.	See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
WS-84 Rice Development Corp. (Roger Howard) Oct. 14, 2016	Location: Wilmot Creek Phase 8 Concerning policy 16.3.7 and Map A4. Phase 8 will include both a private and public community. Would like clarification that Special Policy Area B2 permits both private and public development.	Special Policy Area B2 allows both standard development on public roads and private leasehold developments.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>Also see WS-15, WS-45, VS-23</p>	<p>Policy 16.3.7 states that high rise residential uses and commercial uses shall be on a public road within a plan of subdivision. The rental apartments will be accessed by a private road and would not be in a plan of subdivision. Request that this requirement be removed in order to permit the apartments on a private road provided the permission be based on a traffic study.</p>	<p>Special Policy Area B2 requires higher density development on public roads however this can be reviewed further through the development of the Secondary plan</p>
	<p>Map A4 includes lands between the Hydro Corridor and the CN Rail Line and is designated Special Policy Area B2. This area may not be part of the Wilmot Creek community due to the proximity to the rail line. It may be suitable for outdoor storage of recreational vehicles and boats. Would like clarification on what the Municipality envisions for the future development of this parcel.</p>	<p>Uses will be determined through the Secondary Plan process.</p>
<p>WS-85 BILD (Carmina Tupe) Oct. 14, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-35</p>	<p>Opposed to policies 4.6.3 and 4.6.4, which states that Secondary Plans will be developed in a sequential order that has already been predetermined by the Municipality. Does not want development to be phased because secondary plans should not be contingent on the plans of another landowner in another secondary plan.</p>	<p>See section 4.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Opposed to the removal of the policy which stated that private funding being available to commence and complete Secondary Plans in policy 23.13.1. Would like to see this policy remain in order to allow for the opportunity to contribute private funds.</p>	<p>See section 4.2 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>Policy 23.13.3 allows the Municipality the right to peer review any and all studies at the applicant's expense. Should the Municipality require a peer review, BILD is of the opinion that the costs associated with the peer review should not be borne onto those same individuals that provided the cost of the original study. This would be double the charge for the same work</p>	<p>This policy may apply when a study is conducted independent of the Municipality, the Municipality does not have the expertise, and/or there is a disagreement between the Municipality and the applicant.</p>
	<p>Opposed to the Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone. This is a blanket setback across the Municipality, including intensification sites which sterilize developable lands. Request the policy be revised to not include a Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone and instead include language that will consider an alternative approach to define the Minimum Vegetation Protection Zone, such as through the conservation authority or through an Environmental Impact Study.</p>	<p>See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>Opposed to Table 4-2 and policy 4.3.8, specifically the gross to net hectare conversion when calculating residential densities. In</p>	<p>The table has been revised to reflect net densities. Floor Space Index has been removed from table. Floor Space Index is</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>addition the floor space index targets are not achievable and would be impossible to implement.</p>	<p>addressed in a standalone policy. FSI are set by the Region and the Clarington Official Plan must conform. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
<p>WS-86 Robert Wannack – The Biglieri Group (Jake Murray) Oct. 14, 2016</p> <p>Also see WS-54</p>	<p>Location: 1984 Highway 2.</p> <p>Property is proposed to be designated Environmentally Protected due to the Provincially Significant Wetlands on the subject lands. In order for the lands to be considered a wetland an evaluation must be completed in accordance with the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System. This requires ground-truthing. In 1974 the site was actively farmed for agricultural crop production and did not exhibit any characteristics of a wetland. This would also confirm that the wooded area is not considered old growth forest. Objects to the Environmental Protection designation and requests that a site-specific assessment be conducted to determine the significance of the wooded area and wetland, prior to any land use designation changes.</p>	<p>See section 5.1 in staff report PSD-060-16. No changes are proposed.</p>
<p>Agencies & Committees</p>		
<p>WSA-1</p>	<p>Supportive of the policy recommendations that were included in the Draft Official Plan 2016, but recommend the remaining changes be made as</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
Infrastructure Ontario and Hydro One Networks Inc. (Tate Kelly) June 17, 2016	well. Requested policy changes mainly for wording changes related to utility corridors.	
WSA-2 CN Rail (Helene Fleisher) July 13, 2016	Requesting a number of policies be added to the Official Plan which address proximity of sensitive uses to the rail facilities, noise studies, vibration studies, safety measures, berms, etc.	Staff agrees with submission.
WSA-3 Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority (Stefanie Penney) Aug. 26, 2016 Also see VS-11	Supportive of the policies in the proposed Plan. Suggested revisions include: Add watercourses instead of intermittent & permanent streams to the definition of Hydrologically Sensitive Features.	Supporting comments received. Staff agrees with submission.
	Recommend using one term, either Natural Heritage Evaluation or Environmental Impact Study as they both provide the same information.	Staff agrees with submission.
	Policy 3.4.34 consider strengthening the policy as suggested.	No changes are proposed. Requested policy changes have not been incorporated given that the policy has deferred to the Conservation Authority as the approval authority for minor shoreline work.
	Add clarity that noise, traffic and dust are subject to other Municipal by-laws.	No changes are proposed. Unnecessary to state that other Municipal by-laws apply.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Suggested wording changes to policy 3.7.9.	This policy has been deleted from Amendment 107.
	Add a bullet point to Section 17.5.2 to ensure stormwater management manage quantity, quality and ensure erosion rates in receiving systems are not increased.	Amendments to this policy are unnecessary as this requirement is covered through the Stormwater Management policies.
	<p>Verbal submission (Chris Jones) CLOCA has jurisdiction over the western half of the Municipality and have provided input to the Official Plan Review. Mapping at the scale of the Official Plan is conceptual, and will not be perfect as nature is constantly changing and evolving and that precision comes at the detailed design stage when applications are under a site-specific review. The establishment of a series of fixed vegetation protection zones is an important innovation and provides a level of certainty to landowners and proponents of development allowing development to proceed more smoothly. He indicated that CLOCA supports the objectives of fixed width vegetation protection zones. However, that it does not preclude the ability to apply common sense to a specific site and provides the opportunity to use the zone for other complementary uses such as trail systems and low impact development stormwater measures.</p>	Verbal Submission received.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>The Official Plan proposes new direction related to low impact development and green infrastructure in numerous locations which will require innovation and common sense to be applied when reviewing new stormwater management techniques which will result in development being more resilient to climate change and flooding.</p> <p>The sequential phasing of Secondary Plans will allow for the planning and implementation of LIDs or green infrastructure measures. Mr. Jones thanked staff for working with CLOCA.</p>	
<p>WSA-4 Agricultural Advisory Committee (Brenda Metcalf) Aug. 29, 2016</p> <p>Also see VS-1</p>	<p>Location: all agricultural lands within the Municipality.</p> <p>Committee is pleased with Staff’s efforts to take into consideration the Committee’s comments throughout the Official Plan Review process, especially the protection of the “whitebelt” area.</p> <p>Support policy 13.3.6 which supports the expansion of the Greenbelt Plan Area to provide the long term protection of prime agricultural lands.</p>	<p>Supporting comments received.</p>
	<p>Mapping is of some concern. Committee supports the protection of the environmental features and floodplains but does not support the outright prohibition of buildings in the</p>	<p>The policies provide flexibility for an Environmental Impact Study, when required, to mitigate impacts of agriculture related structures. New structures, however are not</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	Environmental Protection areas, which is contrary to farming practices.	permitted within the Natural Heritage System.
	Supports the land uses proposed in the Plan for the Countryside Areas, which more closely reflect the Province’s direction.	Supporting comments received.
	Supports the rounding out of hamlets and the elimination of the Country Residential Subdivisions and farm retirement lots.	Supporting comments received.
	Concerned with farm help accommodations only being temporary. Does not allow for good quality living conditions. Would prefer to see a permanent dwelling be permitted which would not be severable.	Staff agrees with submission.
	Support policies related to major recreational uses, landscape industries, and agri-tourism uses subject to a site specific rezoning in the Rural Area designation.	Supporting comments received.
	Support the Growth Management policies and phasing which will allow for further protection of the agricultural lands.	Supporting comments received.
	Verbal submission Agriculture is the number one economic driver in the Region of Durham. Must control uses in rural areas that could impede farming practices.	Supporting comment received.
	Concerned that the Highway 407 and feeder roads (especially north of Taunton and west of Solina Road) has deconstructed productive	Supporting comment received.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	farmland. The new designations in the rural areas of Clarington and the policies will help.	
	<p>It is important to have growth management policies in order to protect farmland and supports intensification within the urban boundaries.</p> <p>Supports policy that states the Municipality supports the expansion of the Greenbelt Area to provide long-term protection of Prime Agricultural land.</p>	Supporting comment received.
	Requests that the Municipality will continue to work with the agricultural community when reviewing development applications.	Municipality supports the agricultural community and the Advisory Committee's efforts.
<p>WSA-5 Clarington Board of Trade Aug. 30, 2016</p>	<p>Support the policies in the proposed Official Plan.</p> <p>Emphasizes that the policies will align Clarington's vision with the development market and it will also eliminate cost and time for the development process since the zoning will be updated to implement the policies.</p>	<p>Supporting comments received.</p> <p>Initial work on the new zoning bylaw to implement this Official Plan amendment has begun.</p>
	Support Section 17, specifically the four Special Study Areas, including the Courtice Employment Area since this will drive employment growth.	Supporting comments received.
<p>WSA-6</p>	Has concerns with the proposed Environmental Protection designation on three areas of the	Staff agrees with submission.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
Ontario Power Generation (Ray Davies) Sept. 6, 2016	OPG’s Darlington Nuclear site. Request that the Environmental Protection designation along the Darlington site shoreline be removed from Map A1.	
	The proposed trail route on Map K through the Darlington Nuclear site does not align with the Province’s Waterfront Trail. Request that Map K be revised to reflect the waterfront trail route.	Map K has been revised accordingly.
WSA-7 Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board And Peterborough Victoria Northumberland Clarington Catholic District School Board (Christina Coulter and Stephen MacPhee) Sept. 20, 2016	Recommend revising Policy 18.3.6 f) which considers joint use of parking lots between school sites and sports fields. School Board is supportive of policy however, there are concerns about school parking lots being used during school hours.	Policy has been revised accordingly.
	Recommend revising Policy 18.5.1 which gives a specific minimum size for future school sites. Suggest revising the policy to remove the numerical size and instead state “in accordance with current school board policies and/or Ministry of Education guidelines.	Staff agrees with submission.
	Recommend wording changes to Policy 18.5.2 to soften the language about where the school should be sited and the design. Also recommends adding language that requires the developer to provide sidewalks along the frontage of a school.	Staff agrees with submission.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>School Board would like to discuss alternative language for Section 18.5.2 f) which states that schools should have at least 25% of the site perimeter or 140 metres frontage on a continuous collector road.</p>	<p>No changes are proposed. This is especially important with the increased size of schools, busing, parent drop-offs etc.</p>
	<p>Recommend adding a new Policy which states that the development community is encouraged to provide an alternative development plan for the area identified as a future school site. The alternative development plan would assist with the overall review of the entire development particularly in the event that the school board does not proceed to acquire the site identified for a future school. Consideration should be given for parking for adjacent municipal parks and an alternative land use.</p>	<p>Amendment 107 includes section 18.5.3 which meets this intent.</p>
	<p>Policy 23.3.5 states that when preparing secondary plans, consideration should be given to the location of the school. The location shall be prominent with significant street frontage and orientation to the street. School board would like to discuss this policy further since schools can present challenges in terms of frontage and access requirements.</p>	<p>The School Boards are integral to the Secondary Planning process. This matter can be reviewed through Secondary Plans. They do present challenges because of their size, busing, and other aspects that are contrary to building a walkable community. Schools are key community infrastructure and should be located with that role in mind.</p>
	<p>Suggest revising policy 23.8.1 to include wording “on or before” January 1, 2007, when</p>	<p>Staff agrees with submission.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	stating when a site plan is required for a portable classroom.	
	Suggest adding a policy which states that a site plan is required for a school site which exceeds more than 6 portables.	All new site plans for school sites identify all of their portables. This policy is unnecessary.
	Suggests wording changes to Policy 24.1.12 to add “or Authority having jurisdiction” to ensure other authorities, not just the Municipality, are not obligated to provide services, such as schools by a certain timeframe.	Staff agrees with submission.
	Supports the removal of the school symbols from the Land Use schedules.	Only elementary schools have been removed from Map A. All schools will be indicated on Secondary Plan land use schedules.
Verbal Submissions September 12, 2016 Public Meeting		
VS-1 Agricultural Advisory Committee of Clarington (Brenda Metcalf)	See comment WSA-4	See comment WSA-4
VS-2	See comment WS-48	See comment WS-48

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
Wilmot Creek Homeowners' Association (Byron Faretis and Lynn Stillwell)		
VS-3 Vanstone Mills (Gerard Gervais)	See Comment WS-17	See Comment WS-17
VS-4 Tribute Communities (Louise Foster)	<p>Tribute Communities own a couple of parcels of land in Courtice and have submitted comments in writing prior to the release of the Draft Official Plan Amendment 107.</p> <p>Concerned about the mandated 15 metre vegetative protection zone as it prohibits developers from having some exceptions.</p> <p>Suggests that consideration be given to softening some of the wording around the prescriptive 15 metre vegetative protection zone to allow that zone to be used for infiltration galleries, trail systems, etc., and flexibility to have either a lesser or greater setback.</p>	<p>See section 5.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	Chapter 4, floor space index is impossible to meet which is mandated by the Province and suggested that the policies speak to the floor space index but not put the actual floor space index in the Official Plan to allow for flexibility as staff works through the requirement.	Staff agrees with submission. The table has been revised to reflect net densities. Floor Space Index has been removed from table. Floor Space Index is addressed in a standalone policy. FSI are set by the Region and the Clarington Official Plan

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
		must conform. See section 4.5 in staff report PSD-060-16.
VS-5 Orono BIA (Tino Montopoli) Also see WS-76	<p>Would like to explore the possibility of expanding the boundaries of the Orono Urban Boundary.</p> <p>Reviewed the history of the Village of Orono noting there has been no development in Orono since the mid 1970's and businesses in Orono have been struggling for twenty years. Orono is an urban area with no possibility of rounding out the urban boundary and suggested the boundaries be expanded to align with the westerly boundary of the Durham County Senior's Complex and from Taunton Road extended south to connect with the current boundary. Additional land could accommodate up to 140 dwellings and this population base would provide needed support to local businesses. Proposing the use of private communal septic/sewer systems currently being used all over North America to eliminate the need for a trunk sewer from Newcastle. Supports the achievement of complete communities and urged Council to help change the downward trend and bring economic vitality to Orono.</p>	<p>Staff have included the proposed expansion to the Orono urban boundary to Amendment 107.</p> <p>See section 9.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
VS-6 Jeff Guthrie	See comment WS-24	See comment WS-24

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
VS-7 Delpark Homes (Prestonvale) Inc. – Weston Consulting (Jane McFarlane)	See comment WS-22	See comment WS-22
VS-8 Stephen Wood	<p>Requesting the Committee to consider expanding the Kendal Hamlet boundary to include his farm at 6759 Regional Road 18, on the east side of Newtonville Road, across from the community of Kendal. There will be long term benefits to the taxpayers and residents of Clarington and Durham Region if the boundary is expanded, noting the construction of Highway 407 and expansion of GO train service through Clarington will see an increase in population resulting in additional property tax revenue. Increased revenues could then be used to extend municipal water services to the hamlet of Kendal and avert any potential disaster resulting from the combination of Kendal's unusually high water table, shallow wells and septic systems. The review of the Official Plan is an opportunity to designate more lands for development in Kendal and have the development community pay for the costs to extend municipal services.</p>	See section 9.3 in staff report PSD-060-16.
VS-9	Location: 1604 Baseline Road. Concerned with the designation of the property as a Special Study Area in the new Official Plan with the	No changes are proposed. Save and except the below, all policies are existing.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
1448774 Ontario Limited, Dom's Auto Parts (Peter Smith)	Municipality's intent of eventually hoping for the relocation of the business elsewhere. It is not practical or possible for Dom's to relocate, be sold, leased or partnered due to this policy and the Municipality's continued desire to treat Dom's as a Special Study Area is limiting the operation of the business. Dom's should stay as a permanent use. Request that any specific reference to Dom's Auto Parts in Section 16.5 of the Official Plan be deleted; that Section 16.5.1. Special Policy Area D – Auto Wrecking Yard Facility be reworded and that Section 16.5.2 remain unchanged. Requests the Committee to not consider relocation but to accommodate the business within the planning area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As requested, all references to Dom's auto have been removed from the policies. • A policy reference has been amended
VS-10 Elaine Wotten	See comment WS-53	See comment WS-53
VS-11 Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority (Chris Jones)	See comment WSA-3	See comment WSA-3
VS-12 Bonnie Martin	Location: 2385 Maplegrove Road. Opposed to the designation of her property being changed from Hamlet-Agricultural to Hamlet-Environmentally protected. Had previous discussions with staff regarding why the property is being proposed to be designated as	See section 5.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>a natural heritage system as the trees in question were either dead or diseased. Staff from the Municipality and CLOCA conducted a site visit of the property to discuss the heritage features on her property. Also concerned with the environmental assessment being undertaken on a block of properties including the subject property to permit the Longworth extension to Holt Road. The subdivision behind this property intends to offer forested lots. The Environmental Protection designation devalues the property and it is not in her best interest. Requests that the designation of the property remain as Hamlet-Agricultural as there is no reason to warrant the change in designation.</p>	
<p>VS-13 Highcastle Homes, 2265719 Ontario Inc. – Candevcon Limited (Scott Waterhouse)</p>	<p>See comment WS-39</p>	<p>See comment WS-39</p>
<p>VS-14 Peter Alward</p>	<p>See comment WS-71</p>	<p>See comment WS-71</p>
<p>VS-15 High Street Courtice Inc. – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter)</p>	<p>See comment WS-38</p>	<p>See comment WS-38</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
VS-16 Owners of 2936 Hancock Road – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter)	See comment WS-37	See comment WS-37
VS-17 Medallion Development . – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter)	See comment WS-44 and WS-81	See comment WS-44 and WS-81
VS-18 2272449 Ontario Inc. – Weston Consulting (Ryan Guetter)	See comment WS-40	See comment WS-40
VS-19 Mike Waldensperger	Location: 2401 Maplegrove Road. Objects to the changing of the Agricultural designation to Environmental Protection Designation on the property as the trees proposed to be protected are dying. The only healthy trees, being heritage maples, border their property and the developers property and that they have been tagged. If a property is to be environmentally protected it should have some significance and property owners should be provided with suggestions on the types of trees to grow in the area. Also concerned with the proposed extension of Longworth Road. It does not make sense to change the designation to environmentally protected if there is nothing to protect.	See section 5.1 in staff report PSD-060-16.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>VS-20 (Fourteen Estates Limited) – CM Planning Inc. Development Consulting (Carolyn Molinari)</p>	<p>Carolyn Molinari, CM Planning addressed the Committee on behalf of Fourteen Estates, the owners of five properties in Clarington. Provided general comments regarding the natural heritage system policies. Also referred to the Rural Settlement Area policies for Newtonville.</p> <p>Ms. Molinari confirmed that Fourteen Estates opposes the proposed hamlet expansion of Newtonville.</p> <p>In addition please see comments WS-30 to WS-34</p>	<p>Please see responses WS-30 to WS-34</p>
<p>VS-21 Clifford Curtis</p>	<p>Mr. Curtis explained that he was present regarding his property which is located on Tooley Road in the Worden East Neighbourhood. Purchased this property in 1981. It was located within the Courtice urban boundary and was zoned R1. Mr. Curtis stated that has authorized the preparation of a number of studies. Mr. Curtis stated that he has prepared a draft plan, has met with Clarington staff, and intends to submit this plan within the next couple of months. There are two primary issues with the Draft Official Plan.</p> <p>Concerned that the Municipality intends to have the existing Neighbourhood Plan changed to a Secondary Plan status. This provision is not</p>	<p>Amendment 107 includes policies that allow for the refinement of the natural heritage system through the preparation of an Environmental Impact Study. See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>within the Official Plan but will be done concurrently with the Official Plan approval. This is inappropriate because it will take a Neighbourhood Plan and change it to a Secondary Plan without adequate public consultation and review. This will not give anyone the right to appeal Clarington’s position. The Regional Official Plan only requires a Secondary Plan for greenfield living areas larger the 20 hectares and most of this neighbourhood should be considered infill.</p> <p>The second issue is with the use of Natural Heritage Mapping in the Durham Official Plan to designate properties within the urban boundary as environmentally protected lands. This mapping is provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources which he feels is inaccurate and does not properly show tree cover. The maps need to be ground truthed. The Environmental Impact Study for the property only identifies a need to keep a 30 metre width of undisturbed land to the west of his property line. Concluded by asking for the Clarington Official Plan to be amended to reflect the Environmental Impact Study results between Poppyfield Drive and Springfield Lane to restrict the Environmentally Protected designation to the west of his property and that the existing Neighbourhood Plan be voided.</p>	

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
<p>VS-22 Libby Rakansky</p>	<p>Concerned with the land use in Special Study Areas, secondary plans and protection of the remaining natural areas.</p> <p>Specific concerns with the protection of Special Study Areas of Farewell Heights and Special Study Area No. 1 – Hancock Neighbourhood. The Special Study Area designation for Farewell Heights was removed. The extension of the Urban Boundary further north was not supported because there was not enough groundwater recharge area within the wetland complex. This land was cleared prior to the Official Plan Amendment and Council needs to ensure that the nature areas are rehabilitated prior to development.</p> <p>Requested Council to ensure that all policies are adhered to and that the estimated densities in Appendix B are amended after the Environmental Impact Study is completed.</p> <p>All natural heritage is to be protected and Courtice north is the only groundwater area with a wetland complex in the Greater Toronto Area.</p> <p>Section 4.3.5, Priority Intensification Areas help ease the development on the Courtice North groundwater area.</p> <p>Requests that the three remaining wooded</p>	<p>See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>areas are protected to allow Tooley Creek to function.</p> <p>The Clarington Official Plan requires the reduction of greenhouse gases and, as a result, the extension of George Reynolds Drive (Map J2) should be deleted from the Hancock Neighbourhood.</p> <p>Requests that the trail through the Special Study Area No. 1 be deleted as it is privately owned land. Suggests that the trail should continue through Hancock Road.</p> <p>Requested a listing of all flora, fauna and insects to be required as part of environmental studies. Also requested that climatology, the lowering of greenhouse gases and the impact of the lowering of the water tables in Courtice be considered prior to future development.</p> <p>Requests Council to ensure all Official Plan policies are adhered to and that Clarington support the provincial expansion of the Greenbelt.</p>	
<p>VS-23 Rice Development Corp./ Ridge Pine Park Inc. – Borden Lander Gervais (Stephen Waque)</p>	<p>See comment WS-15, WS-45, WS-84</p>	<p>See comment WS-15, WS-45, WS-84</p>
<p>VS-24</p>	<p>See comment WS-47</p>	<p>See comment WS-47</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
Nash Road Developments Inc. – Borden Lander Gervais (Stephen Waque)		
VS-25 1559360 Ontario Limited – The Biglieri Group (Anthony Biglieri and Jake Murray)	See comment WS-43	See comment WS-43
VS-26 Tornat Construction Company – Romanov Architects (John Romanov)	See comment WS-8	See comment WS-8
VS-27 MasonryWorx (John Armstrong)	Congratulated Clarington on the progressive Draft Official Plan and noted that the Official Plan pays more attention to the built form. The Plan has good policies and language to focus on urban design guidelines and focusing on the appropriate exterior materials. Provided additional suggestions which included focusing on using a quality built form. Encouraged Clarington to draft urban design manuals that are applicable throughout the municipality. Pleased to see that Clarington has separated the architectural guidelines from the urban design guidelines. Suggests more focus on the urban ribbons and that the sides and rears of buildings are visible and that there should be concern for how these buildings will look in 50 years. Referred to a public opinion survey that supported masonry as the most preferred and	Supporting comments received.

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	durable exterior building material. Requesting consideration for brick and stone to be used as the preferred building material and that the side and rear facades of buildings should use the same high quality materials.	
VS-28 Halminen Homes (Hannu Halminen)	<p>Mr. Halminen noted that staff has done a good job on the Draft Official Plan and thanked staff for all the work that was involved.</p>	<p>Supporting comments received.</p>
	<p>Preparation of Secondary Plans will be sequential and driven by staff resources. Suggests that it would be more cost effective and faster to have a landowner or developer group to participate and fund a portion of this. There have also been several small changes to the natural heritage and environmental lines and he believes should be finalized by an Environmental Impact Study.</p>	<p>See section 4 in staff report PSD-060-16.</p>
	<p>Also concerned with land on Trulls Road north of Vivian Drive on the north side of the existing subdivision. This area is located in a special study area and the Region of Durham needed to define whether Adelaide Road would continue and where it would end. A proposal was submitted in 2008 and then withdrawn to wait for the Official Plan review. This area is currently C3 which means this land would not be developed until 2025 to 2030. Requesting that the existing Neighbourhood Plan be amended to</p>	<p>The Farewell Height Neighbourhood in Courtice is subject to the requirement for a Future Secondary Plan. Halminen Homes constructed a subdivision on the east side of Trulls Road. A residual 2.77 ha parcel is located on the north side of the subdivision, north of the former urban area boundary.</p> <p>The subject lands and other lands that are identified as the Farewell Heights neighbourhood are contained with Special</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>include these lands 100 metres north so that they do not have to wait for a Secondary Plan. This land is planned for development in 2023 and that it would create 25 lots and be a sufficient use of infrastructure.</p>	<p>Study Areas 2 and 3 of the Regional Official Plan. Until those further studies are completed, which would be done through a Subwatershed study and Secondary Plan, the Regional Plan states that "the existing zoning by-laws that apply to the Special Study Area may remain in force or may be amend provided that such by-laws allow only uses, such as agricultural and /or temporary uses in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act and the Regional Plan, and provided that such uses, if developed, will not prejudice the conclusions and recommendations of the intended studies."</p> <p>Furthermore, allowing one parcel within future Secondary Plan area to be developed separately, effectively removing it from the Secondary Plan process, would set a precedent for other lands to "separate" from proper planning of a Secondary Plan area. No changes are proposed.</p>
<p>VS-29 Allan Cole</p>	<p>Location: Courtice Road North in the Hancock Neighbourhood. Concerned with the increased urban sprawl and the protection of the Harmony Farewell Iroquois Beach Wetland Complex. Concerned with the recent sale of properties on Courtice Road North and with the potential sale of the 16 acre parcel of land located at 3105</p>	<p>See section 5 in staff report PSD-060-16. No moratorium is proposed.</p>

Submission Number Name (Contact) Date	Details of Submission	Staff Response
	<p>Courtice Road. This property is zoned primarily agricultural and a portion is environmentally protected. Requests that the living area of this land to be limited to a 300 foot lot that can be accessed by Courtice Road. Area has been greatly affected by Highway 407 and that the development has increased quickly in the six years he has lived in the area. Requested for a moratorium be placed on the Hancock Neighbourhood for future developments until the wetland complex can be restudied to determine how the area has responded to the deforestation from the 418. Requesting that Council to continue to protect the environment and protected areas. Submitted a petition signed by residents in the Hancock Neighbourhood.</p>	
<p>VS-30 1816451 Ontario Limited – MPS Miller Planning Services (Rodger Miller)</p>	<p>See comment WS-57</p>	<p>See comment WS-57</p>
<p>VS-31 Josh Benoliel</p>	<p>See comment WS-58</p>	<p>See comment WS-58</p>
<p>VS-32 Warren Hung</p>	<p>See comment WS-59</p>	<p>See comment WS-59</p>
<p>VS-33 Hope Fellowship Church (Brian Bylsma)</p>	<p>See comment WS-12</p>	<p>See comment WS-12</p>