

# DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 20

Public Comments and Responses

City of Brockville, ON

May 2022





May 16, 2022

NPG Planning Solutions Inc. are the consultants to the City of Brockville for the Review of the City's Official Plan.

Together with Council, staff, the community, and agencies, we have prepared and released draft Official Plan Amendment No. 20 (released December 2021).

We thank all who have provided comments and feedback to the Official Plan Team. This document provides the feedback/comments received together with the response.

**City of Brockville OPA 20:  
Comments and Responses – Members of the Public  
May 16, 2022**

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
1	Denise Bowes	<p>I recommend that the official plan should include a need to keep replacing dead trees each year, with a larger budget to do so, and to plant a variety of species.</p> <p>I see from the agenda you have sent that housing figures largely in it, and so it should. I have often wondered why we are still allowing houses to be built that rely on fossil fuels for heat. Why not move towards in ground heat pumps and towards net zero housing with all new builds? We need our new official plan to accommodate many environmental changes that will help us reduce greenhouse gases. Manotick has had a subdivision of net zero housing for several years. Many of the new residents in the city are moving here from Toronto and Ottawa. Our city could become a draw not just for less expensive housing but for being on the forefront of energy efficient housing.</p>	<p>Sustainability, eco-living and climate change are critical factors for land-use planning. At a policy-level, OPA 20 addresses the impacts of climate change through: integrating climate change considerations in infrastructure planning; requiring climate mitigation policies through sustainable site design; utilizing and upgrading the City’s parks and natural areas for climate resilient infrastructure; ensuring that climate action planning is integrated across the City’s departments; and ensuring urban forestry policies address canopy cover, diversity of species, native plant material, and integration of stormwater management.</p> <p>At the site level, OPA 20 promotes energy efficiency and conservation through building design and other land-use planning/development means; requiring sustainable site design with climate mitigation strategies; encouraging LEED certification standards and energy efficient standards in new and renovated buildings; encouraging the reduction of surfacing park; ensuring that streets are tree-lined and shaded; and promoting environmentally sustainable landscaping practices.</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
2	Colin Dyke, Chairman Brockville Airport Commission	I did notice that the Brockville Airport was not mentioned in the plan. As the airport provides critical air ambulance support for the City and is an attraction for new business as well as tourism benefits for the City I would think that it is an important omission from the plan. I hope this can be addressed.	Noted. The airport is located in Elizabethtown-Kitley Township and land use jurisdiction is with the Township. The Official Plan is a land use plan for lands within the City of Brockville.  A new policy will be added to recognize the importance of the Airport to the City.
3	Dan Barraclough	I have just scanned through the Official Plan proposed changes and was surprised and disappointed that there was no mention, that I could find, of the Brockville Airport. I had expected to find information in Schedule 5. The fact that the city is ignoring a key asset is surprising. The impact on the health system, through air ambulance, on tourism and on the general future commercial and transportation opportunities should not be ignored. Brockville is fortunate to have an airport that is so conveniently located. The value of an airport with respect to future transportation modes should not be underestimated.  I hope that this will be rectified in the final plan update. The Airport Commission has lots of experience that should be drawn upon.	Noted. The airport is located in Elizabethtown-Kitley Township and land use jurisdiction is with the Township. The Official Plan is a land use plan for lands within the City of Brockville.  A new policy will be added to recognize the importance of the Airport to the City.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
4	Resident	<p>137 George St – ZBA from R9-Multiple Residential Zone and MD-2 Mixed use to R8- Multiple Residential special exception zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Concerns regarding traffic</li> <li>b. Concerns regarding the design of new building</li> <li>c. Concerns regarding the loss of century old Anglican church</li> <li>d. Concerns regarding the demolition effects on neighbourhood</li> <li>e. Concerns regarding parking</li> <li>f. Concerns regarding potential building preservation</li> </ul>	<p>These comments are for a specific development proposal and have been noted. The draft Official Plan Amendment would not address these site-specific concerns.</p>
5	Resident	<p>Wall Street Village – ZBA from R4-General Residential and I1-General Institutional to R9-Multiple Residential special exception zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Concerns regarding traffic flow</li> <li>b. Comments regarding the need for low-income housing</li> <li>c. Concerns regarding impact on downtown heritage features</li> </ul>	<p>These comments are for a specific development proposal and have been noted. The draft Official Plan Amendment would not address these site-specific concerns.</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
6	Resident	<p>St. Vincent de Paul Hospital – OPA and ZBA. OP to site specific “Skyline Development Area”. ZBA, from I1-General Institutional to R9-Multiple Residential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Concerns regarding high density next to low density</li> <li>b. Concerns regarding traffic</li> <li>c. Concerns regarding building heights</li> <li>d. Concerns regarding construction noise</li> <li>e. Concerns regarding the loss of privacy</li> <li>f. Concerns regarding an effect on the character of downtown</li> <li>g. Concerns regarding the impact on neighbours</li> </ul>	<p>These comments are for a specific development proposal and have been noted. The draft Official Plan Amendment would not address these site-specific concerns.</p>
7	Resident	<p>220 Bartholomew Street – ZBA from R2-single detached residential to R9-Multiple Residential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Concerns regarding destruction of the natural environment</li> <li>b. Concern regarding increase in traffic</li> <li>c. Concerns regarding the high amount of units proposed</li> <li>d. Concern regarding lack of sidewalks in area</li> <li>e. Concerns regarding increased noise</li> <li>f. Concerns regarding parking in area</li> </ul>	<p>These comments are for a specific development proposal and have been noted. The draft Official Plan Amendment would not address these site-specific concerns.</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
8A	Rani Tolton	<p>1-9 - The following dates for the following reports should not be excluded so citizens may know when these were prepared. If recent ones have been done, then the new reports should be mentioned with dates.</p> <p>“The reports that influenced the development of this Plan are: “the Foundation for the Official Plan” report, the “Land Use and Growth Management Strategy”, the “Downtown and Waterfront Master Plan and Urban Design Strategy”, and the “Economic Development Strategy.”</p>	There were no new reports prepared as this is an update to the existing Official Plan.
8B	Rani Tolton	<p>1-37 – 100 year flood level – this has to be taken seriously in view of climate change. The same percentages that have been relied on may not make sense anymore in view of climate change.</p>	Noted.
8C	Rani Tolton	<p>1-40- <b>Regulatory Floodplain</b> for rivers and streams, means the area, usually low lands adjoining a watercourse, which has been or may be subject to flooding hazards.</p> <p>These items need to be scrutinized with new eyes in view of climate change</p>	Noted.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
8D	Rani Tolton	2-10 to 2-19 – very difficult to read which is unfortunate	Noted – there are minor wording changes. Please see the draft of OPA 20 on the City’s website, Item 73.
8E	Rani Tolton	<p>2-13 - <i>Ensure protection of the City’s Employment Areas for long-term economic development.</i></p> <p>Agree but not at the expense of neighbourhood, species at risk, and without proper and appropriate research</p>	The City’s Employment Areas were identified, mapped, and associated policies prepared in 2019. There are no significant changes recommended.
8F	Rani Tolton	<p><i>Foster tourism potential in the City through the protection and enhancement of the City’s unique characteristics.</i></p> <p>This should also include the airport.</p>	Noted.
8G	Rani Tolton	<p>2-17 - 1. <i>Complete a Transportation Master Plan aligned to growth and servicing which integrates roads, goods movement, transit and active transportation.</i></p> <p>Very important and long overdue – if done with transparency and honesty and objectively</p>	Noted.
8H	Rani Tolton	2-19 - 23. <i>Complete Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Master Plan</i>	Noted.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		Also very important and similar to above – but needs to be done with transparency and honesty and objectively	
8I	Rani Tolton	<p>2-23 11. Address Reduce land consumption by ensuring the most efficient use of land to achieve the City’s goals of housing and jobs.</p> <p>Cannot stress how important this is. To be reasonable in deciding especially for the type of jobs. We cannot see ourselves as a major city such as Toronto or Montreal...</p>	Noted.
8J	Rani Tolton	<p>3-1 During the engagement process <b>doe</b> the Official Plan update,</p> <p>Spelling</p>	Noted, with thanks.
8K	Rani Tolton	3-5 Point 5. This is very good and glad to see it. I would caution that the City should not take short cuts with “friends and those who can do a good talk” I may sound cynical but this is what has been witnessed over and over again.	Noted.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
8L	Rani Tolton	3-28 – Tourism – to include the asset of the airport	Noted.
8M	Rani Tolton	<p>3-40 <i>A combination of generously sized landscaped strips and fencing or equivalent alternatives should be used to buffer developments from adjacent uses and to provide screening of on-site parking and service areas.</i></p> <p>Thrilled to see this!!</p>	Noted.
8N	Rani Tolton	<p>3-43 <i>disruption and pollution of natural water flows is limited by managing or eliminating stormwater runoff; and</i></p> <p>Thrilled to see this, have tried telling the City this before but to no avail</p>	Noted.
8O	Rani Tolton	<p>3-47 <b><i>be consistent with provincial policies and conform with the policies contained in this Plan, the Zoning-By-law, Property Standards By-laws, and all other related</i></b></p> <p>Nice to see this – again friends or smooth talking folks should not have favouritism</p>	Noted.
8P	Rani Tolton	3-95 2 <sup>nd</sup> last line “no” n missing	Noted, with thanks.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
8Q	Rani Tolton	<p>3-106 - <i>the use is not among those prohibited from locating in a flooding hazard in 3.7.1.4 of this Plan.</i></p> <p>Where is 3.7.1.4. It goes from 3.7.1.2 to 3.7.2.</p>	Noted this reference will be corrected to 3.7.1.1(4).
8R	Rani Tolton	<p>4-37 - <i>Large Format Retail uses shall not be permitted in the Corridor</i></p> <p>Need may BE</p>	Noted, with thanks.
8S	Rani Tolton	<p>4-42 –Re: 4.6.4.4. (Northwest Employment Lands) It cannot be emphasized enough that any development there needs to be done with the support of the homeowners. The homeowners are not against development but want development to occur with the proper transportation, noise, odour, vibration, environmental, water etc assessments done properly and ethically. As per Schedule 3, this area does abut to significant woodlands, and has water and Cataraqui screening here. This area also has endangered trees and bird species.</p>	The studies mentioned would be undertaken as part of any development of these lands.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
8T	Rani Tolton	5-7 – The City definitely needs a properly funded and developed Transportation Plan which is done thoughtfully and not in a rushed manner.	Noted.
8U	Rani Tolton	6-5. Like the yearly update – thinking of the same and nice to see it there	Noted.
9	Rani Tolton	<p>pg 4 under Maintaining, Rehabilitating and Promoting Brockville's Assets</p> <p>"Brockville has many existing assets that are unique to the community and are key for livability and tourism. These have been identified as the waterfront, the St. Lawrence River, the Brockville Tunnel, the Brock Trail, and the Aquatarium."</p> <p>The Airport unfortunately is not mentioned as a very essential and necessary asset. The airport is valuable to not only the citizens of Brockville but to a large portion on the surrounding area - for Search and Rescue, medevac (very essential and noticeable during the pandemic), local businesses at the airport and the</p>	<p>Noted. The airport is located in Elizabethtown-Kitley Township and land use jurisdiction is with the Township. The Official Plan is a land use plan for lands within the City of Brockville.</p> <p>A new policy will be added to recognize the importance of the Airport to the City.</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>surrounding areas. Aviation is going to be the way of the future.</p> <p>On pg 6 of Community-Building: Social Infrastructure, Downtown Revitalization, and Economic Development, paragraphs 1 &amp; 2</p> <p>"Multiple stakeholder groups have expressed the desire for a business hub and the creation of an economic development agency in the downtown similar to InvestOttawa that will <b>support small businesses and provide a space for coworking, collaboration, resources, and initiatives.</b> Furthermore, <b>the St. Lawrence College has noted an interest for the creation of a Downtown Innovation Centre that will foster connection and collaboration between the college and the municipality,</b> which presents further potential in bringing creativity and vibrancy to the downtown.</p> <p>Economic growth and retention were also identified as key issues across the board for all stakeholder groups. Brockville's older population base has left a labour shortage in the community with a <b>lack of skilled</b></p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p><b>workers in its place.</b> There is a need for skilled trades to provide for more training and employment opportunities...."</p> <p>Developing the airport in a sound and organized manner can provide economic growth and would bring in skilled workers. The Airport is an example of "collaboration between neighbouring municipalities".</p> <p>Below are some areas where the Airport can be used as a great asset.</p> <p>Section 1-46 - Transportation system –</p> <p>Section 2-17 - points 1 &amp; 3 - airport of value</p> <p>Section 2-23 Points 11, 12, 15-17</p> <p>Section 3-28 - Tourism - the whole thing</p> <p>Section 4-4 - Bicycyle rentals - many airports have bicycles available (for free) to go into town. No one would mind renting a bicycle. There are systems where through your mobile phone can pay e.g. similar to renting a car MODO, we share etc. or some sort of a credit card system.</p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>Section 5-2 - Transportation</p> <p>Section 5-16 - first section - eg. bicycling from the airport, Mac Johnson etc.</p> <p>The Entire Transportation system talks about road, highways, rail, marine but not AIR.</p> <p>Section 6-37 - cross-jurisdictional co-operation, transportation is mentioned - this should also be applicable to the Airport</p> <p>Section 6-39 - Financial management #2 public infrastructure - Airport is a very important infrastructure that needs to be maintained. In the recent disasters across the country - Airports were the only means of accessing supplies, people, emergency care etc.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and looking at the Airport as a valuable asset for Brockville and the surrounding communities.</p>	
10A	Patti Whyte	<p><b><u>General Comments about Official Plan Draft</u></b></p> <p>Overall, I believe that the revisions and deletions visible in this draft have improved</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>The wording choices of shall/should/may are deliberate to communicate where requirements are mandatory versus where there is some discretion.</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>upon the previous version and that the draft presents a more positive depiction of a very detailed plan, more in keeping to some of my thoughts on what Brockville should be / become. I am pleased to see a focus on affordable and attainable housing, new and innovative housing, and new development landscaping requirements and active transportation. (I am still saddened, however, that developers can still buy their way out of retaining or planting trees etc. by giving funds to the City.) In many ways, the plan has been made more current (i.e. climate change, housing) and it is clearer by having been tidied up in many instances. I recognize and appreciate the amount of work that goes into developing, bring to current state, and amending such an all-encompassing document.</p> <p>I am concerned that many amendments to this document remove the word 'shall' and replace it with 'should' (as noted in the 'text' document). This change in language can completely change the intent, and transparency of decisions that might be made based upon the statements. "Shall" takes a stand – and means 'will', whereas</p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>“should” _offers leeway in decision making without stating the criteria under which decisions will be made or who will make the decisions. This revised document has become too loose in many areas because of this shift in language. I don’t understand why there was seen to be a need to change this language and believe in almost all cases, these amendments should not be made. I am also generally concerned that those in ‘outlying’ _areas of Brockville cannot see themselves considered in much of this plan.</p>	
10B	Patti Whyte	<p><b><u>Section 1 Comments</u></b></p> <p><i>This area speaks about <b>land use framework, infrastructure deployment, and supporting the protection of employment lands.</b></i></p> <p><b>Land Use Framework and Infrastructure Deployment</b> (<i>specific to NorthWest Brockville and other areas without city services</i>)</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p>As a resident living in the northwest part of Brockville, I implore the City to commit to bringing municipal services such as</p>	<p>On the issue of servicing, the lands in the northwest are in the Urban Reserve and are not planned for servicing.</p> <p>On the issue of sidewalks, this will be addressed through the Secondary Plan for the lands east of Stewart and north of Victoria.</p> <p>On the issue of natural gas, the comment is noted.</p> <p>Regarding the definition of Protection of Employment Lands – these are lands designated for jobs on Schedule A of the Official Plan.</p> <p>Provincially is crossed out because the definition of significant has been expanded, consistent with the PPS (2020).</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>transportation, city water and natural gas to all residents of this City and to clearly state this intent in the Official Plan.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the City speaks about infrastructure, it should be clarified whether they are actually considering all residents and residential areas in their planning or just those in the city core and larger residential areas.</li> <li>• Victoria Road IS a residential road, with a good portion of the road in the City of Brockville limits and needs to be given consideration. It is one of only a few roads that do not offer the same services as within the rest of Brockville.</li> <li>• Sidewalks should be planned for in future infrastructure development and transportation networks, and include from Laurier to Centennial Road. It is a danger to walk to amenities in Brockville by walking along the side of the highway, and/or trying to cross Highway 29 after Centennial Road</li> </ul>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>and before Home Hardware to get to the sidewalk starting near the radio station. (The shoulder ends long before Home Hardware, presenting additional dangers to get to the crosswalk). The Butcher Shop, Home Hardware, Kensington Plaza, Luna, the Cross Roads plaza, Food Basics etc. are all easily within walking distance, but it is not safe to do so from the area near Victoria Road (Centennial Road). This area of Brockville does not feel included in any “transportation network”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic lights at Victoria Road would add to the safety of all, as people routinely drive around to the right of cars waiting to turn (from either direction) – an accident waiting to happen (and which has).</li> </ul> <p>I implore the City to commit to working with Enbridge Gas or other companies to bring more affordable natural gas heating to all residents, and to clearly state this intent in the Official Plan. Affordability of housing is fast becoming affordability of heating options, and for many who live on the fringes</p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>of the City, affordable natural gas heating is not available.</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enbridge Gas approached residents on Victoria Road (Elizabethtown and Brockville) this past summer about putting in a gas line, and later said they were advised by the City that there was a 5 year moratorium on any digging as the Brockville section of the road had just been paved! Gives appearance of zero planning.</li> <li>• It is also an unrealistic and huge barrier to expect individual residents to pay Enbridge for the cost to install new infrastructure (gas lines) and also to incur a surcharge EVERY MONTH, committed to in a contract, for decades! on top of a gas bill from Enbridge if they became a new customer. Enbridge was referencing tens of thousands of dollars PER HOUSEHOLD to put in the gas lines and of course the customer would need to have their own furnaces etc.</li> </ul>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>hooked up and/or reconfigured. Not an option for most, if not all and if only 1/3 could commit, the cost rises to \$80,000 per household!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is becoming completely unrealistic. When does a city step in to address the needs and challenges in heating our homes for those of us on the fringes of Brockville? I am not able to find clear information on this in the draft official plan as presented.</li> </ul> <p><b>Protection of Employment Lands:</b> I could not find a definition of what this actually means. Can someone clarify? Is this stated 'somewhere' in the plan?</p> <p><b>1-37 Definition of Provincially Significant Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the word "provincially" crossed out?</li> <li>• I was initially concerned that specific reference to species at risk was completely removed as well as the definition of wildlife habitat that was in this section, (i.e. as per your notes in blue, as copied below) but see revised definitions added under both</li> </ul>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		Wildlife Habitat and Woodlands. It would be helpful if there was a notation directing readers to where strikethrough references were moved (if in fact moved, rather than deleted).	
10C	Patti Whyte	<p><b><u>Section 2 Comments</u></b></p> <p><b>2.2 Policy 4.</b></p> <p>The addition of 2.2 about addressing climate change seemed positive – at first glance. Although I appreciate the reference to climate change in this section, it alarms me that further reading leads one to believe the focus is only on the waterfront and downtown core. I am truly concerned about the impact of climate change throughout the city and specifically on properties (trees, greenspaces) and private well, particularly if lands are developed nearby (that would likely involve removal of trees, the addition of structures and parking lots, disturbance to water tables, bedrock etc.)</p> <p><b>2-13 – <i>Ensure protection of the City’s Employment Areas for long-term economic development</i></b></p>	<p>Regarding 2.2 Policy 4, the policy applies City-wide.</p> <p>With regard to protection of employment areas, commitment to jobs is part of a commitment to citizens. The policies of the Plan and the PPS (2020) require land-use compatibility with neighborhoods and industry.</p> <p>Regarding the Transportation Master Plan, the comment is noted.</p> <p>On walkability, the typo is noted, with thanks. The Official Plan contains significant updates relative to active transportation.</p> <p>On the Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Master Plan, the comment is noted.</p> <p>On the issue of land supply/consumption, this has been addressed through the land needs analysis.</p> <p>On the typo, thank you, this will be corrected.</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The attached 2 documents as referenced previously confirm in writing the understanding that City Council <i>“recognizes there is a balance between required development and the responsibility to represent the needs of existing residents”</i> and that the City will continue to work with residents <i>“around supporting economic development while at the same time, considering residential property interests, natural resources, the environment and taxpayer interests”</i>.</li> <li>• Agree with 2-13 – but not at the expense of neighbourhood, species at risk, safety of water/wells, property values, and enjoyment and use resale of property by residents, and without in depth, appropriate research prior to development.</li> <li>• <b>The City’s commitment to residents through the documents needs to be referenced in the OP.</b></li> </ul>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p><b>2-17 Complete a Transportation Master Plan aligned to growth and servicing which integrates roads, goods movement, transit and active transportation.</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be considered as one plan for the entire boundary of the City, and transparent, considering public input, and not solely designed to accommodate or satisfy a possible client who might express interest in pursuing business in the City.</li> </ul> <p><b>2-18 14. Improve the overall walkability of the City of Brockville by connecting trails, streets, and open spaces by ensuring that new development is oriented to pedestrians and provides connectivity for pedestirans (typo) between private development, active transportation routes, transit, and cycling.</b></p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please work to connect those of us further outside of city core.</li> <li>• <b>The City’s commitment to all residents in this regard needs to be referenced in the OP.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>2-19 - 23. Complete Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Master Plan</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all residents of Brockville have the option of safe municipal water supply or sewer services. ALL Residents should be considered, including those who must use wells for their water source, when the City develops such a Master Plan. Impacts on water tables and well water quality and quantity must be considered.</li> <li>• <b>The City’s commitment to all residents in this regard needs to be referenced in the OP.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>2-23 11. Address Reduce land consumption by ensuring the most efficient use of land to achieve the City’s goals of housing and jobs.</b></p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The City must <u>set reasonable and attainable goals</u>, recognizing there are limits to our growth, both in terms of available land for housing and business development, while also considering the nature of our population (age, education, income) and the need for affordable housing options. The focus must be on seeking job and business opportunities <u>suitable</u> to our population and its wants. Does Brockville define itself in a manner that people agree with, or are loud minority voices leading our way down paths the majority may not appreciate? Who are we and what do we want?</li> <li>• Bigger is not necessarily better. We are not Toronto or Ottawa and need to consider what is <u>reasonable and attainable</u>, and best suited to Brockville's future.</li> </ul> <p><b>2.24 – 25 Housing</b></p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p><b>Comment:</b> Happy to see this outlined in detail as a priority for Brockville.</p>	
10D	Patti Whyte	<p><b><u>Section 3 Comments</u></b></p> <p><b>3-19 3.2.6.2</b></p> <p><i>5. The former Brockville Shopping Centre is considered an anchor development within the Stewart Boulevard/Highway 401 Gateway Commercial and Mixed-Use Node. The City of Brockville recognizes the contribution redeveloping this area could have of increasing housing supply and as a Transit Oriented Development node. As such, the City of Brockville will review incentives for the owner to instigate redevelopment.</i></p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is there specific reference to this future development in the official plan?? Is this actually an appropriate reference in an official plan? I don't recall see the Aquatarium (another 'anchor') appearing in the OP in this way.</li> <li>• Further, it seems completely inappropriate to reference</li> </ul>	<p>Given the priority of this site for transit-oriented development, a commitment to review incentives is appropriate.</p> <p>On the specific retail policies, this provides more flexibility.</p> <p>On tree replacement, there are circumstances where invasive species, noxious trees, and dangerous trees are not appropriate on a site and the removal and replanting benefits the overall tree canopy health.</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>conversations to be held with the owner about offering incentives, in this document!</p> <p><b>3-21 Specific Retail Commercial Policies</b></p> <p>2. Prior to the completion of a comprehensive retail strategy for the City, proponents of development proposals including more than 3,000 square metres of retail floor space shall <b>should</b> be required to undertake the preparation of a Retail Market Impact Study to the City's satisfaction in accordance Section 3.2.6.4.4.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the intent to changing the language form 'shall' to 'should'? Is it to accommodate a specific developer/development? It negates the requirement and reduces it to not being required by a proponent.</li> <li>• Who decides and what are the criteria for decision making / where can this be found?</li> </ul> <p><b>3-92 3.6.6</b></p>	

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>6. “plant replacement trees where trees are removed. Replacement planting requirements shall be established using an aggregate caliper formula, to the satisfaction of the City. If replacement trees cannot be accommodated on-site, off-site compensation may be considered to maintain and enhance the neighbourhood canopy;”</p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% disagree with this option – _it negates the need to preserve trees and/or maintain or plant <i>trees</i> / greenscape in the location to be developed, and gives the developer an easy out.</li> <li>• Is there specific and detailed criteria related to this ‘consideration’? Who decides? Where can this information be reviewed?</li> </ul>	
10E	Patti Whyte	<p><b><u>Section 4 Comments:</u></b></p> <p><b>4-42 –Re: 4.6.4.4. (Northwest Employment Lands)</b></p> <p><b>Comments:</b></p>	The comment is noted.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>As in comments for 2-13 - development needs to be done with the support of the homeowners, who seek not to stop development, but to ensure it occurs with appropriate and considerate assessments for transportation, noise, odour, vibration, environmental, water quality/quantity/safety, enjoyment and use of property etc. As per Schedule 3, this area abuts significant woodlands, with Cataraqui screening in the area. It has also been acknowledged that there are endangered tree and bird species that must be considered.</p>	
10F	Patti Whyte	<p><b><u>Section 5 Comments:</u></b></p> <p><b>335. 5.3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I disagree with the amendment which deletes the following statement from the current OP:</li> </ul> <p>“The City shall ensure that a cost-effective and adequate system of water supply and sewage treatment is provided to support, enhance, and sustain existing and future residents and businesses in the City.”</p>	The comment is noted.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The replacement text proposed, although this provides nice overall statements, does not address the needs (rights?) of all residents of Brockville.</li> </ul> <p><b>340. 5.3.5 –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I appreciate this addition, which acknowledges the serious impact climate change will have on many facets of our lives.</li> <li>I hope some consideration is being given to assist homeowners on private wells with ‘adaptive and mitigative measures’ as it is likely that many could see dry wells and lack of water in homes in the future.</li> </ul>	
10G	Patti Whyte	<p><b><u>Section 6 Comments:</u></b></p> <p><b>357. 6.3 –</b> annual reporting appreciated! Will these be accessible to the public?</p> <p><b>358. 6.3(1) –</b> appreciate regular reviews of OP.</p>	It is intended the annual reporting will be through Council and will be publicly available.

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>Overall, this amended OP draft document reads more clearly and is an improvement on the previous OP in many areas. However, as a 40 year resident and tax payer I still have concerns that ALL residents are not considered in much of the City's planning and that the focus is more central to the waterfront and central core. I hope to see public invitations for input in moving some of the ideas and planning forward into Brockville's periphery.</p>	
11	Mark Touw, IBI Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can the secondary plan be initiated by the landowners or is the intent that the municipality must initiate and lead this process?</li> <li>2. Is there a specific expectation for timing to initiate the secondary plan process? Related to this, is initiation and/or approval of a secondary plan tied to land needs or can the process proceed based on the growth management study completed in support of the subject OP Review?</li> <li>3. Can you clarify what is required with respect to proposed policy 3.2.3.5 as it relates to a "financial plan"? It is not entirely</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The landowners or the City could initiate the process.</li> <li>2. The process can proceed based on growth management studies completed in support of the Official Plan.</li> <li>3. Financial plan is related to infrastructure and what costs will be borne by development and implications for the City's development charges.</li> </ol>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		clear how the referenced policy 3.2.3.4 would apply to the secondary plan area.	
12	Jim Hutton	<p>Further to Andrew McGinnis' email regarding the above-noted property, I have attached a concept plan of our client's property for your consideration.</p> <p>On behalf of our client our firm will be applying for a residential plan of subdivision for 14 lots located in Elizabethtown-Kitley (United Counties of Leeds and Grenville - approval authority).</p> <p>The parcel of land owned by our client also has frontage along North Augusta Road within the City of Brockville. On the concept plan the lands located within the City of Brockville have been identified as Block A, outlining 4 potential lots to be accessed via North Augusta Road and to be serviced with individual on-site sewage disposal and water supply services. We have had a preliminary meeting with City staff to discuss the development of these lands and a number of issues were identified (including Official Plan designation and justification of services) and it was suggested that we may wish to request that the necessary Official Plan revisions be included in the overall review of</p>	<p>The Growth Management Analysis includes principles for determining growth areas. One of the principles is that there will be no employment land conversion. As these lands are identified as Urban Reserve Future Employment, they were excluded from consideration.</p> <p>Further to the above, the detailed evaluation criteria for growth options includes building complete communities, which means schools, parks, transit, walkability and more. The lands on North Augusta do not achieve the complete community criteria. A second issue is introducing sensitive land-uses adjacent to employment areas which is not consistent with the PPS (2020).</p>

#	Person or Organization	Description of Issue Raised	Response
		<p>the Official Plan. I have several emails from City staff that I will forward to you, as the information exchanged thus far may be helpful.</p> <p>On behalf of our client we feel that it would be beneficial to have the development of the lands along North Augusta Road included in the City's Official Plan review.</p> <p>Please contact me if you have any questions or to discuss any supporting information or other issues that need to be addressed to allow this request to proceed via the Official Plan review.</p>	