The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m.

DECLARATIONS of interest by members on any matters herein contained – NONE

ADOPTION OF MINUTES of February 26, 2019 (Agenda pg. 1)

Res. #35  Move by T-D Marimpietri
Seconded by D. Barton

THAT the Authority minutes of February 26, 2019 be adopted as circulated
CARRIED

DELEGATIONS

Staff Report #5630-19 (Agenda pg. 21) - Port Darlington Shoreline Hazard Study

(1) Speaker:  Jeff Mitchell, President, Port Darlington Community Association
Re:  PDCA concern that S.R. 5630-19 does not appropriately address the mandate set by Clarington Council to develop a Cedar Crest Beach erosion control solution.

B. Nicholson arrived at 5:04 p.m.
D. Mitchell arrived at 5:08 p.m.

Mr. Mitchell made a presentation to the Board (attached as H-1 to H-6) and answered questions from the Board. Discussion ensued.

Cont’d
DELEGATIONS (continued)

(2) Speaker: Pauline Witzke
Re: Whether results of CLOCA 2013 Flood Plain Mapping Study paint a realistic picture of the flood risk at Port Darlington

Ms. Witzke made a presentation to the Board (attached at H-7 to H-13) and answered questions from the Board. Discussion ensued.

(3) Speaker: Larry Defosse
Re: Reports and recommendations being put forth by CLOCA

Mr. Defosse addressed the Board and noted that after studying the material he was surprised that they did not include the option of marine structures (cofferdams) being installed for protection of the shoreline. Discussion ensued.

DIRECTOR, DEVELOPMENT REVIEW & REGULATION and DIRECTOR, ENGINEERING & FIELD OPERATIONS

(1) Staff Report #5629-19 (Agenda pg. 19)
Re: Permits Issued for Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alteration to Shorelines and Watercourses – February 1 to 28, 2019

Res. #36 Moved by D. Pickles
Seconded by T-D Marimpietri

*THAT Staff Report #5629-19 be received for information.*
CARRIED

(2) Staff Presentation - Staff Report #5630-19 (Agenda pg. 21 & separate appendices)
Re: Port Darlington Shoreline Hazard Study

P. Sisson and C. Jones made a presentation to the Board (attached as H-14 to H-62) and answered questions. Fiona Duckett, P.Eng., Baird and Associates Coastal Engineers and Judy Sullivan, P.Eng. President, Aqua Solutions 5 Inc. also answered questions. Discussion ensued.

Res. #37 Moved by C. Traill
Seconded by T-D Marimpietri

*THAT the Board take a 10 minute break.*
CARRIED

Correction to Minutes noted at CLOCA Board Meeting on April 16, 2019. Councillor Pickles clarified that he moved the original staff recommendation for Staff Report #5630-19, plus the amendment.

AMENDMENT

Res. #38 Moved by D. Pickles
Seconded by D. Mitchell

*THAT the following wording be added to #3 of the Recommendation:*
“and pending the results of negotiations with other potential funding partners, pursue Option #2 or #3 of the Baird Report.”

C. Traill requested a recorded vote.
DIRECTOR, DEVELOPMENT REVIEW & REGULATION and
DIRECTOR, ENGINEERING & FIELD OPERATIONS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>YE A</th>
<th>N AY</th>
<th>CONFLICT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Barton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hooper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Leahy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-D Marimpietri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. McDougall</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Mitchell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Mulcahy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Neal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Nicholson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Pickles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Traill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Yamada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMENDMENT CARRIED

AMENDMENT

Moved by B. Nicholson
Seconded by T-D. Marimpietri

 THAT in #2 of the recommendation, remove the words “be adopted” and add “be recommended for adoption following approval of flood mitigation as outlined in #5.”

C. Traill requested a recorded vote.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>YE A</th>
<th>N AY</th>
<th>CONFLICT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Barton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hooper</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Leahy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-D Marimpietri</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. McDougall</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Mitchell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Mulcahy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Neal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Nicholson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Pickles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Traill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Yamada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Cont’d
1. THAT the final Port Darlington (West Shore) Shoreline Management Report, Report on Flooding and Port Darlington Shore Protection Concepts Report be received;

2. THAT the amendments to the CLOCA Policy and Procedural Document for Regulation and Plan Review contained in Appendix 4 be recommended for adoption following approval of flood mitigation as outlined in #5.

3. THAT the CLOCA Board of Directors Recommends to the Council of the Municipality of Clarington that consultations be commenced, to be led in collaboration between the Municipality of Clarington, Region of Durham and CLOCA, for the development of a Long-Term Incremental Voluntary Land Disposition Program for lands in the Port Darlington Area that are deemed to have unacceptable risk from natural hazards, based on the principle of willing seller-willing buyer, and pending the results of negotiations with other potential funding partners, pursue Option #2 or #3 of the Baird Report.

4. THAT the CLOCA Board of Directors Requests that the Municipality of Clarington Implement the Clarington Official Plan Regulatory Shoreline Policies, as amended by Official Plan Amendment 107, and the CLOCA Policy and Procedural Document for Regulation and Plan Review, through a Zoning By-law enacted under the Planning Act;

5. THAT the CLOCA Board of Directors recommends that the Council of the Municipality of Clarington consider the options to improve safe access along municipal road in the Port Darlington area as part of capital planning and budgeting and that the implementing road works be constructed where feasible and appropriate.

6. THAT the CLOCA Board of Directors Requests that St Marys Cement/Votorantim Cimentos support efforts to protect people and property in the Port Darlington Area through supporting implementing programs and projects as recommended in Staff Report #5630-19;

7. THAT Port Darlington residents and all contributors to the Study be thanked for their participation and contribution to the study process;

8. THAT Staff Report #5630-19 be circulated to participants in the Study Consultation, Watershed Members of Parliament and Provincial Parliament, the Region of Durham and the Ontario Ministries of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, Natural Resources and Forestry, and Municipal Affairs and Housing.

RES. #38, CARRIED AS AMENDED

NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Res. #39 Moved by T-D. Marimpietri
Seconded by J. Jones

THAT the Unfinished Business be received for information.
CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

Res. #40 Moved by C. Leahy
Seconded by D. Barton

THAT the meeting adjourn.
CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

RON HOOPER, VICE-CHAIR

CHRIS DARLING, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
PDCA Response to CLOCA Staff Report 5630-19

Port Darlington Shoreline Hazard Study

Presenter: Jeff Mitchell
President, Port Darlington Community Association

---

GENERAL CONCERNS

1. S.R. 5630-19 is NOT a fair or responsible presentation of the shoreline erosion hazard and the solutions required to address the problem.
3. PDCA fundamentally disagrees with CLOCA’s re-framing of the objective at s. 3.3.
5. Residents feel betrayed
MUDDIED WATERS and HAZARDS

- Shoreline protection and restoration objective is minimized due to a misplaced focus on occasional Lake Ontario high water levels and riverine flood scenarios.
- Equivocation by CLOCA staff around historical cause of the erosion problem – the Baird report is clear, along with 4 other reports since 1972.
- Do CLOCA staff support the understanding of the coastal consultants, or are they questioning it?
- Aqua Solutions’ response to potential impacts on Cove Rd. and West Beach shorelines ignored.
- Wave energy and uprush - the only true hazard – Baird options address this.

S.R. 5630-19, s. 5: “Much of the [CCB] shoreline has shoreline protection walls... these walls provide protection, but...disrupt the natural dynamic beach process”

- Misleading - there is NO dynamic beach, because it is starved.
- Remember the visual depiction of shoreline depletion from 1967 to the present day.
- East Beach revetments work.
VOLUNTARY DISPOSITION – WRONG!
(Final Recommendation #3)

- PDCA'S position is that this concept is ethically wrong and makes no economic sense.
- One-time costs to the municipality may exceed $50 million, for purchase and removal of about 50 homes.
- Municipality would also lose at least $300,000 in annual property tax revenue in perpetuity.
- Costs far exceed the cost of the preferred shoreline protection option ($16 million) set out in the Baird report.

PDCA'S REQUESTS

1. Please advocate on our behalf for Option #3 of the Baird report as the preferred option for remediating the shoreline protection objective because it is the right and just thing to do, the economic thing to do from a long-term perspective, and may very well benefit the adjacent wetland.
2. Please initiate a CLASS EA in order to move things forward asap.
3. Paving 2, above, substitute the staff report's final recommendation #9 for final recommendation #3, but with no polling of landowners and clarification that the funding formula for a local improvement must exclude levies to homeowners.
4. Please do not adopt the separate policy management areas proposed. These do not address the hazard that we are trying to protect against and should never have been part of this study.
5. Vigorously implement the S.R.'s final recommendation #6 seeking support from St Marys Cement in the implementation and financing of future costs of planning and construction.
Flood predictions for Port Darlington - a balanced approach

Presentation to the CLOCA Board Meeting of March 19, 2019
Pauline Witzke, Hons. B. Sc., Earth Sciences, University of Waterloo, 1982

Predicting nature

- Scientists need to set context for results of studies that predict future natural conditions
- One example - Weather forecasting - has evolved from inconsistent to surprisingly accurate over the years - why?
  - Economic drivers and social drivers - impact of closing schools when the forecast is wrong!
  - Validation of models - predictions are compared to what actually happened to adjust the assumptions and mathematical equations to more closely mimic real conditions
H-9

How this applies to Port Darlington Flooding

- CLOCA 2013 Floodplain mapping study predicted the following conditions for Cedar Crest Beach Road, elevation 75.9 m.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm</th>
<th>Flood</th>
<th>Elevation (m)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Velocity (m/s)</th>
<th>Depth x Velocity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H-10

How does this compare to what we have seen for at least the last 50 years?

- Water appeared on Cedar Crest Beach Road for the first time in 2017. It rose to about 10 cm (4 inches) deep - according to the flood elevations calculated by the CLOCA study, this should have happened every 5 years.

- The water was from Lake wave uprush through a vacant lot, entering the marsh and then running back to the lake, not riverine flooding; this problem would be mitigated through properly designed lakeshore erosion protection.

- The CLOCA study predicts water at CCBR road level (75.9m) every two years. This does not match what we have seen for over 50 years. Water at this level is extremely unlikely if the marsh overflow is maintained and Lake level is less than 75.8 m.

- The velocity of the water at the east end of Cedar Crest Beach road in 2017 was 0.0. (no flow). At the west end the water was flowing, but this was caused by wave uprush, not riverine flooding. The minimum value in CLOCAs table is 0.8 m/s when there is 10 cm of water on the road. Surprisingly, the prediction is 0.6 m/s where there is no water on the road (?).

- At no time were vehicles unable to access the area.
Meanwhile on West Beach Road . . .

- The 2013 CLOCA floodplain mapping study predicts that West Beach Road (lowest elevation 75.8 m) would be overtopped in a 10 year flooding event. Overtopping of West Beach Road was seen for the first time in at least 50 years in 2017. This is a statistical mismatch, and the model should be adjusted.

- Water level at West Beach Road where homes are established is controlled by Lake Ontario water levels since there is no obstruction between the marsh and the Lake. Roadway flooding could only be at the regional flood level of 78.1 meter level (7.5 feet of water above road level!) if Lake Ontario is also at that level. Lake Ontario’s highest ever level was 75.88 m in 2017. Is it realistic that it could get 7 feet higher, or should the outputs of the flood model be calibrated?

What does this tell us?

- Predictions for flooding in the CLOCA 2013 floodplain mapping study are unrealistically high and have not been calibrated against what has been observed for over 50 years.

- Concern: these predictions are being used to come to the conclusion that, to quote CLOCA’s staff submission, “during a 50 year, 100 year and regional storm flood event, the combination of depth and velocity of flood water would create conditions that could result in people being swept away”

- Residents are worried that the CLOCA Board will take the CLOCA staff statements regarding flood risk at face value, when they obviously overestimate the real risk. These statements are being used by CLOCA staff to support their recommendations that residential use of this area should be phased out. These statements also have the potential to severely effect property values.
What do we want?

- Predict water build up by early warning systems and manage as required (eg. Breaking through barrier beach with a backhoe)- residents are really pleased with the systems that have been installed!
- The voluntary disposition and further building restriction solutions proposed are extreme, expensive and unnecessary. Do not proceed with them.
- Raise the roadway, regrade driveways and establish erosion and wave up rush controls.

Thank you for your consideration!
LOCATION: WHERE WATERSHEDS MEET THE LAKE

- Three Watersheds
- Bowmanville Creek 92.1 km²
- Soper Creek 77.2 km²
  - Total 169.3 km²
- Westside Creek 5.38 km²
H-17

PROVINCIALLY SIGNIFICANT COASTAL WETLANDS

- Bowmanville Coastal Wetland Complex at Bowmanville/Soper Creeks
- Westside Coastal Wetland Complex at Westside Creek

H-18

NATURAL HAZARDS AT PORT DARLINGTON

- Great Lakes Related Hazards
  - Flooding Hazards
  - Erosion Hazards
  - Dynamic Beach Hazards
- River and Stream Related Hazards
  - Flooding Hazards
  - Erosion Hazards
H-19

VISUALIZATIONS OF LAKE ONTARIO AND RIVERINE FLOODING

- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=time_continue=4&v=LtjYykUDSNE
- Maximum Daily Mean Water Level 2017
- Riverine Regulatory Flood
- https://youtu.be/UNsT5lxCzN4
- Lake Ontario 100 Year Flood

H-20

FLOOD HAZARD

Flood Risk = Vulnerability + Frequency + Social Impacts + Economic Impacts + Environmental Impacts

Table 2.0: Flood related hazards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood</th>
<th>Hazard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Depth x Velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d&gt;0.1m</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d&gt;0.3m</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d&gt;0.8m</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d&gt;1.0m</td>
<td>d x v &gt;0.4m2/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior property damage, electrical hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no access or egress by personal vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structural damage to homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personal safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H-21

FLOOD MITIGATION

- West Beach and Cedar Crest Beach will continue to be flood damage centres with significant flood risk.
- The frequency of flooding and safe access during more frequent flood events can be improved by elevating the road elevation.
- Detailed feasibility analysis will be required.

H-22

NATURAL HAZARDS AT PORT DARLINGTON

- Great Lakes Related Hazards
  - Flooding Hazards
  - Erosion Hazards
  - Dynamic Beach Hazards

- River and Stream Related Hazards
  - Flooding Hazards
  - Erosion Hazards
EAST BEACH COTTAGES ORIGINALLY SET BACK FROM BLUFF CREST

ALL SHORELINES ERODE
H-25

NATURAL HAZARDS AT PORT DARLINGTON

- *Great Lakes Related Hazards*
  - Flooding Hazards
  - Erosion Hazards
  - **Dynamic Beach Hazards**

- *River and Stream Related Hazards*
  - Flooding Hazards
  - Erosion Hazards

---

H-26

COASTAL SEDIMENT PROCESSES – WHERE DOES BEACH MATERIAL COME FROM?

- Bluffs composed of glacial till (mixtures of *clay*, sand, gravel, and cobbles left behind by glaciers) are eroded by the combination of waves and high tides.

- Inland glacial deposits can be eroded by water and deposited in the Lake by rivers and streams.

- When waves converge on the headlands of rocky shores by the process of refraction, they erode the rock and sediment from these areas and deposit it in beaches.
H-27

COASTAL SEDIMENT PROCESSES – HOW DOES SEDIMENT MOVE?

- Waves, driven by the prevailing wind, contacts the shoreline on an angle
- The water driven over the beach by the wave, retreats back to the Lake taking the steepest, shortest route – perpendicular to the beach
- Sediment moved by the wave energy over the beach is moved parallel to the shore, between the breaking waves and the shoreline. As these waves break and recede along a shoreline, they erode and deposit sediment in a zigzag pattern called long shore transport.

H-28

COASTAL SEDIMENT PROCESSES – LANDFORMS

- Long shore transport can create landforms such as various types of beaches, bars, spits and barrier islands.
- Sand spits, formed by long shore sediment transport, enclose inlets and create coastal marshes.
H-29

COASTAL SEDIMENT PROCESSES – HUMAN IMPACTS

- Groynes, piers that jut out perpendicular to the beach disrupt the longshore drift.
- Sediments will be trapped and deposited on the up-current side of the pier, and the removal of the sediment from the longshore drift will lead to erosion of the down-current side.

![Alteration of sediment transport by a groynes](image)
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COASTAL SEDIMENT PROCESSES – HUMAN IMPACTS

- Natural erosion and deposition are necessary to maintain shorelines.
- A common strategy to prevent or reduce shoreline erosion is to "armour" shorelines with rock, seawalls, and other hard structures.
- Seawalls are built along shorelines and are used to reduce erosion caused by waves. They can be effective in the short term, but they substantially alter sediment processes.
- Over the long term, seawalls may actually increase erosion due to increased scouring at the base. In a long seawall, this can result in a total loss of beach sediment. The fine sediment is removed first, and gradually, a beach that was predominantly sand changes to gravel, cobble and finally bedrock or clay.
- Small seawalls in front of individual lots can also cause erosion, particularly at the sides, where wave energy is concentrated. This can lead to a "chain reaction" of seawall installation as adjacent property owners feel compelled to protect their own shorelines from erosion caused by neighbouring seawalls.
H-31

BARRIER DYNAMIC BEACHES
PORT DARLINGTON (WESTSIDE CREEK AND BOWMANVILLE CREEK)

H-32

SHORELINE EROSION MITIGATION

- Shore Protection Concepts - Baird
- Alternatives ranging from off shore breakwaters, jetties, beach creation, and armour stone revetments
- Estimated $4M to $16M cost
- Environmental Assessment process
DEVELOPMENT AT PORT DARLINGTON: FROM SMALL AND SEASONAL TO LARGER AND PERMANENT
DEVELOPMENT AT PORT DARLINGTON:
FROM SMALL AND SEASONAL TO LARGER AND PERMANENT

- Various Plans of Subdivision were
  Registered to Subdivide the
  Original Township Lots
  between 1917 and 1962
HISTORY OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

- In 1959 the Former Township of Darlington Zones Cedar Crest Beach Lands "A - Agricultural, permitting a permanent "single detached dwelling" in all "A" Zoned Land.

HISTORY OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

- In June 1984 Draft Zoning By-law Proposes to Zone Regionally Designated Hazard Lands "EP"
HISTORY OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

- Final 1984 Zoning By-law Zones Hazard Lands as Residential: Continuing 1959 Permissions

HISTORY OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

- 1996 Clarington Official Plan Incorporates a Regulatory Shoreline Area and Policy recognizing shoreline natural hazards

---

- SETTLEMENT AREA BOUNDARY
- OAK RIDGES MORAINES BOUNDARY
- REGULATORY SHORELINE AREA
- FLOOD PLAIN
HISTORY OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

- 2017 Amended Clarington Official Plan Incorporates Environmental Protection Designations

CASE STUDY EXAMPLES

- Frenchmans Bay Harbour
- Burlington Beach
- Long Point
CASE STUDY EXAMPLE: FRENCHMANS BAY, CITY OF PICKERING (1956 AIR PHOTO)
CASE STUDY EXAMPLE: FRENCHMANS BAY, CITY OF PICKERING  (CURRENT DAY)
CASE STUDY EXAMPLE: HASTINGS DRIVE
LONG POINT, LAKE ERIE
PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES TO CLOCA POLICY AND PROCEDURAL DOCUMENT

- New Port Darlington (West Shore) Shoreline Management Policy Area
- 13 new policies that implement the Shoreline Management Report
- Respond to resident comments and established property rights to ensure that the following may be permitted:
  - Development to **mitigate vulnerability** of existing dwellings
  - **Replacement dwellings** destroyed by forces other than natural hazards
  - Interior alterations and **renovations** including general upkeep and maintenance
  - Non-habitable **accessory structures**
  - Repairs, replacements or maintenance of **existing septic systems**
  - Private **shoreline protection works**
PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES TO CLOCA POLICY AND PROCEDURAL DOCUMENT

- Three key development controls:
  - Replacement dwellings destroyed by forces of flooding and/or erosion is not permitted
  - Development on vacant parcels of land is not permitted
  - Redevelopment, replacement or expansion of existing habitable structures within Shoreline and/or Riverine Natural Hazards is not permitted
- Consistent with existing Planning Act, Provincial Policy Statement and Clarington Official Plan requirements

Legend

- Lake Ontario Erosion Hazard Line (Estimated)
- Regulated Area Limit (Estimated)
- Lots Subject to Policy 4.7.1
- Assessment Parcel
H-59

RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

• Voluntary disposition:
  • THAT the CLOCA Board of Directors Recommends to the Council of the Municipality of Clarington that consultations be commenced, to be led in collaboration between the Municipality of Clarington, Region of Durham and CLOCA, for the development of a Long-Term Incremental Voluntary Land Disposition Program for lands in the Port Darlington Area that are deemed to have unacceptable risk from natural hazards, based on the principle of willing seller-willing buyer;

H-60

RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

• Local Improvements – Shoreline Erosion Protection
  • In the event that the Board of Directors does not support staff recommended Item No. 3 (voluntary disposition) staff would recommend the following as an alternative:
    • THAT The CLOCA Board of Directors Recommends to the Council of the Municipality of Clarington that in collaboration with Municipality of Clarington, Region of Durham and CLOCA staff, landowners on Cedar Crest Beach Road be polled as to whether or not they wish to proceed with a formal petition for a Local Improvement for the purposes of conducting an Environmental Assessment and establishing comprehensive erosion protection works along the Lake Ontario shoreline.
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RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

• Local Improvements – Flood Mitigation
  • THAT the CLOCA Board of Directors recommends that the Council of the Municipality of Clarington consider the options to improve safe access along municipal road in the Port Darlington area as part of capital planning and budgeting and that the implementing road works be constructed where feasible and appropriate.

H-62

RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

• Planning policy:
  • THAT the CLOCA Board of Directors Requests that the Municipality of Clarington implement the Clarington Official Plan Regulatory Shoreline Policies, as amended by Official Plan Amendment 107, and the CLOCA Policy and Procedural Document for Regulation and Plan Review, through a Zoning By-law enacted under the Planning Act;