

As We Heard It Report

Strategic Properties Survey



July 2024

Table of Contents

Project Overview.....	1
Promotion	2
Participation	2
Key Themes.....	2
Public Engagement.....	4
Digital Survey.....	4
Feedback.....	4
Summary of Responses	4
Email Submissions	14
Questions Received.....	16
Appendix 1: Survey Results.....	18

Project Overview

As a part of the Official Plan review, the Town of Carleton Place launched the Strategic Properties Survey to further understand resident's opinions on the Strategic Properties designation.

The vision for Carleton Place is expressed through the following vision statement:

The Town of Carleton Place is committed to maintaining and celebrating its heritage through balanced and sustainable growth which will support a sense of place respectful of our unique historical, cultural and natural heritage where citizens can enjoy an unparalleled quality of life.

Area Specific Policies within the Official Plan can be used to create more detailed and specialized policies to guide development on areas of special concern. In Carleton Place, the sites designated as Mississippi District Strategic Properties constitutes Special Policy Areas.

Currently, the Town has identified and designated four (4) properties as "Strategic Properties". These are:

- McArthur Island (150 Mill Street);
- The former site of the Findlay Foundry (28 High Street);
- The Canadian Co-operative Wool Growers property (142 Franktown Road); and
- The DRS manufacturing plant property (115 Emily Street).

These are areas for targeted growth and intensification within the Town. These areas present opportunities for new residential and mixed used residential and commercial development which can complement and support the Central Business District and help provide linkages between the downtown core and the newer commercial and residential districts.

The Mississippi District Thoroughfares provide access to the following strategically located large land parcels which are identified as Mississippi District Strategic Property on Schedule A:

- All development and/or redevelopment shall integrate public pedestrian and recreational trail facilities with linkages to the existing pathway system, adjacent public spaces and Mississippi River shorelines.
 - All development shall be required to demonstrate that local natural heritage features on and adjacent to the site are protected and enhanced.
 - In order to be considered as a Strategic Property, the candidate property shall meet the following minimum criteria:
 - Minimum lot area of 0.8 hectares; and
 - Immediate adjacency to the OVRT, Trans Canada Trail, Mississippi River or other local trail identified on Schedule "B"; and
 - Local cultural or historical significance to the Town.

- Candidate properties shall be considered through and Official Plan and Development Permit Amendment. The statutory public consultation process shall be used to determine appropriate parameters for development or redevelopment of the lands.

The results of the survey will be used to:

- Identify how the Town should proceed regarding Strategic Properties;
- Identify further criteria for future Strategic Property sites; and
- Contribute to the creation of policies for the Strategic Property designation that will support the vision and goals for the Town of Carleton Place as outlined in the Official Plan.

Promotion

A project webpage was published prior to the survey to provide residents with important information regarding the Strategic Properties designation. A project summary and FAQ flyer was available on the project webpage for residents to consult.

The Strategic Property survey was active from June 24 to June 12, 2024. The survey was advertised three (3) times throughout the survey period in the Town of Carleton Place’s social media (Facebook) and the CP Scoop newsletter.

Analytics collected for the three (3) advertisements in the CP Scoop are shows below.

		Clicks on the Survey Link	Clicks on the Strategic Properties Project Page
Date of Advertisement in CP Scoop	June 24th	218 clicks	134 clicks
	July 2nd	262 clicks	112 clicks
	July 8th	172 clicks	57 clicks
	TOTAL	652 clicks	303 clicks

Participation

In total, the survey received 250 respondents, with three (3) comments received through email submissions.

Key Themes

Key themes from responses include:

- Desire for more public green space
- Importance of environmental protection/preservation in Town
- Desire for the preservation of Carleton Place’s built heritage
- Need for more affordable housing stock and housing for seniors
- Importance of walkability and reduced reliance on automobiles

- Concerns about “overdevelopment” of Carleton Place

Public Engagement

Digital Survey

An online survey was available from June 24 to July 12, 2024. This survey included questions aimed to gauge resident's opinions and concerns regarding the Strategic Properties designation in the Town's Official Plan.

250 respondents participated in the survey. Detailed summaries and an FAQ flyer of the project were available on a project page on the Town's website for residents to learn more about the project before completing the survey.

Survey results are included in Appendix 1.

Feedback

Summary of Responses

Overall, the majority of residents expressed support for the Strategic Properties designation.

80.4% of respondents answering that yes, they believe the designation should be used to identify certain properties in the Town's Official Plan.

The majority of respondents agreed that the four (4) properties currently identified in the Official Plan either fully fit the criteria in the Official Plan, with 51.2% answering that "All of the properties fit the criteria" and 35.2% answering that "Some of the properties fit the criteria".

There was strong support for Strategic Properties to be Mixed Use Residential land uses. Respondents that chose the "other" option expressed that they would like to see mixed use residential with green space, community facilities, or for the land use designation of the sites to be entirely green space.

Most respondents also identified that they would like for the Strategic Properties to be future landmarks *in the Town of Carleton Place.

When asked which, if any, locational criteria should be used when identifying Strategic Properties, 44% of respondents answered that Strategic Properties should be adjacent to a trail. Respondents also noted that Strategic Properties should be adjacent to the Mississippi River and located on arterial roads.

**Landmarks refer to any natural or man-made structures that are recognizable. Landmarks are important for wayfinding, sense of place, and are integral to a town or city's character. For example, the Carleton Place Town Hall represents a landmark in Carleton Place.*

An overwhelming majority of respondents, 88%, answered "Yes" when asked if they believe that Strategic Properties should incorporate public green space. This desire for more public green space is repeated throughout the data collected and is one of the main themes identified in survey responses. A major theme throughout the survey was the desire for more public green space in Town, especially on the Strategic Properties sites, and for the waterfront of Strategic Properties that are situated on the Mississippi River to be accessible to the public.

When asked if Strategic Properties should be sites with existing buildings or sites that are vacant, the majority of responses felt that they could be either. However, for sites with existing buildings, nearly 50% of respondents stated they believe these buildings should be preserved. 37% responded "other" and were asked to elaborate on their opinions, with a majority stating they believe that whether or not a building should be preserved depended upon the building's current state.

48% of respondents answered that, yes, Strategic Properties should be capable of supporting high density uses such as apartment buildings and mixed-use buildings similar to downtown. 24% answered "no", and 22.4% answered "some". Respondents who answered "some" were asked to explain where it would be appropriate or not appropriate to have high density uses. Responses explained that the appropriateness of such land uses depends on:

- Surrounding land uses and neighbourhood context
- The height of the hypothetical high-density development
- Whether the infrastructure (water, sewer, parking, sidewalks, etc.) at a site would be able to support a high-density development
- Whether the development was located somewhere "walkable"

When asked what they believed the Town should do if it were to remove the Strategic Properties designation, 54.4% believed the properties should be designated as Mixed-use residential (both residential and commercial) and 28% believed it should be designated as recreational/open space. 14.4% of respondents answered "Other" and were asked to elaborate on their answers. The majority of respondents who answered "other" noted they would like the properties to be designated as a combination of mixed use residential and recreational/open space.

60.4% of respondents agreed that developments on Strategic Properties should incorporate affordable housing*.

When asked "should Strategic Properties be subdivided into smaller sites rather than being treated as one large site?", responses were mixed. 26.8% answered "maybe", 25.2% answered "yes", 28% answered "no", and 18% chose not to answer.

**In Canada, housing is considered “affordable” if it costs less than 30% of a household’s before-tax income.*

Rental units where rent is at or below the average market rent in the regional market area are also considered “affordable”, as is ownership housing where the purchase price is 10% below the average purchase price of a unit in the regional market area.

Major themes of what respondents said should be included in the definition of a Strategic Property in Carleton Place are:

- Historical significance
- Heritage buildings
- Landmark
- Green space and parkland
- Large, vacant or underutilized property
- Close vicinity to downtown
- Walkability/Proximity to amenities to encourage “15-minute city” development style
- Opportunity for development of community facilities
- Development potential
- Proximity to the Mississippi River
- Mix of housing types and affordability
- More housing suitable for seniors

Major themes of what makes a Strategic Property special and unique included:

- Historical significance
- Strategic location in the Town
- Heritage buildings and architectural styles
- Green space
- Proximity to Mississippi River
- Landmark sites
- Size of lots and buildings
- Opportunity for mixed use or commercial uses
- Tourism draw
- Walkability and linkage to amenities
- Ability to host major infrastructure projects

When asked of individual Strategic Properties should be treated differently from each other, The majority of respondents answered “Yes”. Major themes of why Strategic Properties should be treated differently include the sites unique characteristics and the unique character of neighbourhoods surrounding each individual Strategic Property.

Those that answered “No” stated that treating each property differently would create more challenges for developers and the desire for all properties to have the same requirements for the inclusion of public green space and parkland on Strategic Properties sites.


Other respondents stated that they did not believe the Strategic Property designation should be used at all by the Town of Carleton Place. Some state they would only like to see low and

medium density development in Carleton Place. Others cite anxieties over whether or not such a designation gave developers too much control when it came to the decision of what to do with the property. Others described throughout the survey how they did not desire high density developments in the Downtown and felt this designation should be replaced with one that does not allow developments over 3-4 storeys.



Residents were asked to suggest properties, if any, they would like to be potentially designated as Strategic Properties in the future. These are shown on the map below.


Properties residents suggested include:

- 6 Arthur Street
- 70 Caldwell Street (Caldwell Street Public School)
- 205 Bridge Street
- 153-205 Edwards Drive
- 95-97 Franklin Street (CP Public Works Yard)
- 325 Franktown Road
- 215 Lake Avenue W (Carleton Place High School)
- 2 Lansdowne Avenue
- 25-55 Lansdowne Avenue
- 80 Lansdowne Avenue
- 157 McKenzie Street (Notre Dame Catholic High School)
- 160 Miguel Street
- 82-84 Mill Street (Lanark County Food Bank)
- 75 Neelin Street (CP Arena)
- 150 Rosamond Street
- 151-163 Townline Road W
- 311 Townline Road W



2024-07-16

-  MunicipalBoundary
-  Survey Point



Email Submissions

Three (3) email responses were received.

1) "My main points on Strategic Properties are as follows.

- Develop a clear definition of the amount of commercial space required on a strategic property (see email below)
 - This could be a minimum commercial ratio or other specific definition of the intended "mixed-use" composition of a building
 - I am pleased with the McArthur Island development because it provides a lot of commercial space
 - I am disappointed with the Findlay Foundry development because of the extremely low percentage of commercial space
- Encourage development of more commercial units downtown.
 - I believe more commercial spaces downtown will make our downtown economically viable and provide a healthy amount of space for future commercial development. I want visitors to come into town rather than have lots of commercial space on highway 7 which only attracts passers by and discourages them from shopping downtown.
 - This could involve removing some existing poor residential buildings in the downtown area to be converted to mixed use properties."

2) "Started to read the very long and at times confusing strategic plan.

My concern is only with the designated properties outlined. DRS building, high street foundry area, Wool growers, etc.

The DRS building situated close to the river, has behind it another large abandoned building, which I am wondering if it is also included in the strategic planning.

We live on the corner of Woodward and Mississippi and the housing growth around us is huge.

Mississippi shores new development is very large and I wonder if runoff will impact our drinking water supply?

No doubt the foundry spot was, is contaminated, as I'm sure the DRS property and McArthurs even more so given the nature of past business operating there.

Will there be exhaustive studies to ensure the properties are eventually safe to build on (with no chemicals leaching into the river) and ensure our water supply stays safe for consumption?

Lastly, when actual building plans occur will CP residents be privy to building types and upgrades to accomodate many more residents."

3) "For specific suggestions for Strategic Properties, I would like you to add the following (see map below)

- Mill Street
 - The Rosemond Property
 - The property that houses the Food Bank
 - The property that houses the Public Works
- Downtown
 - The old Spartan Pizza location (Mill and Beckwith)
 - The car wash near the grand hotel

My reasoning for designating a property as a Strategic Properties is as follows:

- A property that has potential to be developed into a commercial space should be considered for a Strategic Property

My goal is to extend the downtown commercial spaces.

In this area of McArthur Island, which will already have commercial spaces, the 3 other Mill Street properties will support the businesses in this area. This will make it a bit of a hub downtown. Other businesses on Mill will start to connect it with downtown

On a perhaps separate topic, I want to increase the commercial spaces in/near downtown to get more business opportunities there. This will make the downtown more of a hub and thus be more sustainable."

Questions Received

<p>"Woolgrowers is highly functioning and profitable commercial space and tourist attraction so not sure why they are included."</p>	<p>The Strategic Properties designation is meant to be a <i>proactive</i> land use designation should the site ever be redeveloped. This does not impact the site's current use as the Canadian Cooperative Woolgrowers. These special policies will help guide the future redevelopment of the site if the property becomes vacant or is one day up for redevelopment.</p>
<p>"This level of intensification adjacent to the trail will lead to increased maintenance costs - who is going to be responsible for those costs?"</p>	<p>The Ottawa Valley Rail Trail (OVRT) is owned and maintained by the County of Lanark. The Mississippi Riverwalk Trail is owned and maintained by the Town of Carleton Place.</p>
<p>"The DRS building situated close to the river, has behind it another large, abandoned building, which I am wondering if it is also included in the strategic planning"</p>	<p>The Strategic Properties designation at 115 Emily Street applies to the entire parcel of land which includes the vacant DRS buildings and the vacant Hawthorne Mill building located on the site.</p>
<p>"Will there be exhaustive studies to ensure the properties are eventually safe to build on (with no chemicals leaching into the river) and ensure our water supply stays safe for consumption?"</p>	<p>All development on Strategic Properties must ensure that local natural heritage features are protected and improved. As part of the development permit application process, applicants are required to provide an Environmental Impact Assessment demonstrating development will have no adverse impacts to local natural heritage features.</p>
<p>"When actual building plans occur will CP residents be privy to building types and upgrades to accommodate many more residents?"</p>	<p>Development of a Strategic Property is subject to a Class III development permit.</p> <p>As part of the Class III development permit, the property is posted with a sign that outlines the details of the development proposal. Property owners within 120 metres of the subject property</p>

are notified of the development proposal by mail and the details are posted on the municipal website.


Concerned individuals are given fifteen (15) days for written comments.

Appendix 1: Survey Results

General Questions

1. Do you believe the Town should use Strategic Property Designations to identify certain properties in the Official Plan?

Do you believe the Town should use Strategic Property Designations to identify...




Answers	Count	Percentage
Yes	201	80.4%
No	33	13.2%
No answer	14	5.6%

Answered: 248 Skipped: 2

2. Having read the criteria for Strategic Properties outline in the new Official Plan, do you agree that the existing identified properties meet the criteria?

o Having read the criteria for Strategic Properties outline in the new Official Plan, ...



Answers

Count


Percentage

All of the properties fit the criteria	128	51.2%
None of the properties fit the criteria	10	4%
Some of the properties fit the criteria	88	35.2%
No answer	19	7.6%

Answered: 245 Skipped: 5

3. In general, what land use(s) should Strategic Properties be used for?

o In general, what land use(s) should Strategic Properties be used for?




"Other" Answers
Nothing
community like licensed daycare (we have extreme shortage of official daycares in the town)
I do not believe that these historic properties should be razed for development. Further, this level of intensification adjacent to the trail will lead to increased maintenance costs - who is going to be responsible for those costs?
All waterfront property should be public parkland only.
Green space!!!
Existing buildings should be converted into apartments that keep the original character of the building. Vacant lots (such as Findlay Foundry such be kept undeveloped and changed in to natures / parkland.

It would be preferable to NOT build at all. People of CP are getting fed up of all the houses being built and bottle neck in the Wendy's parking lot it is an accident waiting to happen. Too many people now in our town. Less and less recreational outdoor
Mixed Residential Commercial but also cultural.
Community Center, Lanark counties main (and largest) museum(Hawthorne street property) Industry would be amazing. Some sort of factory not even a need for water use just a huge employment opportunity for residents
green space
Mixed used, but ensuring the commercial is unique businesses & restaurants that will add interest points to the town. NO MORE CHAINS!
Properties on accessible waterways should consider preservation of public access and use.
Parks... green space
Green spaces. No residential or commercial development at all
The areas indicated in the plan should not be used for developers to get rich and the town rake in more tax \$\$\$\$
Consider more opportunities to maintain the properties as cultural or historical/heritage sites
Mixed residential and green space
Green space
Mixed use with residential/ community use spaces ex: creative hub, co-working spaces, youth/ teen indoor play spaces, indoor dog activity spaces, community childcare facilities, etc. Many of these listed spaces are known as "third spaces."
I would like to see a mix of residential and public space; or commercial, residential and public space. These sites are valuable to the town(!) not just to those who develop them.
Mixed but must incorporate public attractions / space. There are key areas near trails and water.
In some cases undeveloped- park/recreation
Whatever the owner wants
Depends on the property. Definitely green space is a must in my opinion.
Mixed use but with significant public green space.

4. Should Strategic Properties be future landmarks* within the Town?

**Landmarks refer to any natural or man-made structures that are recognizable. Landmarks are important for wayfinding, sense of place, and are integral to a town or city's character. For example, the Carleton Place Town Hall represents a landmark in Carleton Place*

o Should Strategic Properties be future landmarks* within the Town?



Answers	Count	Percentage
Yes	170	68%
No	45	18%
No answer	30	12%

Answered: 245 Skipped: 5

Locational/Site Specific Questions

1. Should there be locational criteria for Strategic Properties? Choose all that apply.

o Should there be locational criteria for Strategic Properties? Choose all that apply.



“Other” Answers

collector roads should be able to support the traffic if chosen as a criterion

adajacent to downtown core

Accessible to the public via walking paths and sidewalks

It would be nice to say adjacent to public transportation, but since that doesn't exist...

Location within the historic downtown facing Bridge Street and at key intersections along Bridge St (such as Lake Ave and High St). Current school sites too.


Either Adjacent to a trail (OVRT, Trans Canada Trail) or Adjacent to the Mississippi River but not necessarily both

Stop building.

High street is too hard to navigate as is, will be impossible without lights with hundreds of new residents. Same for Hawthorne, lights at lake and caldwell? Emily is out of the question leading to bridge it's always backed up there
No need to identify strategic properties. It signals the developer that they are important thus giving the developer leverage over the town.
Location to Schools
None should be required as the land should be kept the way it is
Consider development in the spirit of walkable key amenities and balanced development on both sides of the river.
Away from our small roads that lead to the down town core
No properties in the old town centre should be considered for commercial or residential development
Such strategic properties/ densification zones should not block access or impede visual viewing of the river.
I disagree with the current requirement for adjacency to an arterial/collector road. This requirement can be deleted. Two of the existing (entirely appropriate) Strategic Properties, and any number of future potential ones, are not adjacent to such roads.
I dont want development in the downtown core.
Main Street, Coleman, Hwy 7, Townline Rd, McNeely
Some collector roads are already saturated with traffic. For example the roads leading to the former DRS site.
Properties within the downtown district, facing Bridge Street, should also be considered.
Adjacent to future public transit.

2. Should Strategic Properties incorporate public green space?

Should Strategic Properties incorporate public green space?



Answers	Count	Percentage
Yes	220	88%
No	15	6%
Other	13	5.2%

Answered: 248 Skipped: 2

Other - Should Strategic Properties incorporate public green space?

depends on the property and its use.

Wherever possible, yes. Some may not have the capacity (such as properties along Bridge Street).

Yes, OR at least carefully planned access to directly adjacent to public green space that can developed using cash-in-lieu of parkland fees obtained from the developer of the strategic property

Identifying a property as strategic gives ythe devloper leverage over the town.

Depends on the location

Yes where feasible

Depending on location and size of property

Always any new sub division

no devlopement at all


Wherever possible, yes.

Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!


3. Should Strategic Properties be sites with existing buildings? Or can they be vacant/undeveloped?

o Should Strategic Properties be sites with existing buildings? Or can they be...



4. If the sites have existing buildings, should those buildings be preserved?

- o If the sites have existing buildings, should those buildings be preserved?



Answers	Count	Percentage
Yes	123	49.2%
Other	96	38.4%
No	30	12%

Answered: 249 Skipped: 1

Other - If the sites have existing buildings, should those buildings be preserved?
Depends on what the buildings are and if they are historically significant.
depends on the building. A building that is cost prohibitive to rehabilitate cannot be designated in such a way as to force a developer to abandon building
Preserving buildings is good but in some cases not practical.
only if the buildings have historical relevance
Depends on the building
Depends
Depends what the existing building is.
If it's reasonable
Depends on condition
If the buildings are of historical significance to Carleton Place the yes
Depends on what condition of the building(s) that are currently there. Do they have any significance? Are they too expensive to be saved? Does it make sense to save them?
Considered on an individual basis


Depends on structure
Depends on heritage value of existing buildingg
Not all of them, it depends on best use and the significance of the building.
Where reasonable and appropriate. If the building is of historical significance, and if costs of preservation are not unreasonable compared to the value of the development.
depends if the buildings are in good repair and up to code
Depends on condition and cost to bring to modern standards. If considered to expensive to bring up to standard than demolish but keep some portion of the building on site as a memorial to past history.
depends on potential of the buildings to serve a strategic purpose
Perhaps only the facade
Depends on the state of the buildings
Not historical buildings
Depends on the building
If of historical value
Depends on structural state of building and costs to rehabilitate.
Only if historic/heritage characteristics
It really depends on the property and the state of the building that's there.
Depends on the building
Depending on the historical value of the building.
Depends on the building
Stop building
Only if they have tangible heritage value, otherwise it would be better to build new building to today's standards
If possible but not essential. Depends on many factors.
Not necessarily - DRS on Emily should come down.
Buildings should be preserved if they have heritage or architectural value.
Identifying a poperty as strategic, or very important to the town gives the developer leverage.
Only if feasible on a cost-basis
If possible to keep architectural heritage, but depends on the the engineering soundness of the buildings and the public value of the proposed plan.
If they are of historical significance or have a meaning to the history of the town.
Dependant on building (historical and ability to incorporate)
Age and landmark dependant
Depends on the state of the building. Perhaps parts can be integrated. Germany did a great job of this.
Depends on condition of existing building and costs to remediate
If Financially reasonable. If it becomes too much an impedance, then maintaining the historic feel should be prioritized
Preserve at least the facade when a building is of historical significance to the town.
It depends if buildings are worth preserving.
Depends on the existing building

Not necessarily.
Some have historic buildings that are left to crumble which should not be allowed to happen
Yes, if historically or architectural character exists and can be reasonably incorporated into practical use.
Where they can be preserved, yes. Otherwise demolish and build new.
Depends on historic relevance
Depends if the building are salvageable at a reasonable price
Case by Case consideration. Some properties may not be able to preserved
Depends on the condition of the building
If it's cost effective and reasonable
Preserved if possible, but only when historical significance and/or structurally sound and/or cost effective to do so.
In some capacity
Only when the building can be renovated to fit the use of the oroperty
Not necessarily. If the existing building has significant historic value, the developer should look to incorporate as much of the facade as possible into their planning.
Dependent of current state of existing building.
Depends on structure and it's state
Should be case specific.
only if architecturally sympathetic to the town's heritage-styled buildings
Preserve if possible.
Where possible incorporating the existing building into the new architecture would preserve historical significance. The reno that was done with the NAC is a great example.
Depends on existing building
If viable and not cost prohibitive always nice to retain a structure especially if it has history
Some of the sites may not be salvagable (eg old DRS plant). Those that can be saved should be if possible.
Preserve if warranted or designated heritage.
Maybe - depending on how decrepit they are and if it is possible to incorporate them into a new development in a way that makes sense.
If they can be preserved at reasonable cost.
Depends on if it is financially feasible to restore/preserve the existing structure. Would need to pay to have studies done.
If the building is of historical or architectural significance
Financial considerations must be taken into account. Condition of present structure. Proper use of structure when completed.
Depends on the condition of the current building
Depends on the building and how it would fit into the site.
Preserve them if in a restorable condition.
Depends on the condition of the existing building
Case-by-case. Buildings should be preserved if it makes sense (environmentally, economically, etc...)

Depends on the condition of the buildings, or if they can be cohesively incorporated into the new building/property's plans
Depending on any real historical significance to the town.
Case by case basis. Some existing buildings have historic or cultural value, others do not. On both existing and potential future sites.
If possible, especially if they have historic value.
If it is possible to preserve
Historically significant buildings should be preserved
Depends on the site and the condition of the building. The old stone buildings, to me represent the history of the town and have the character and craftsmanship that I think should be preserved.
That depends on the building and its location.
Yes absolutely, if the buildings have heritage value and it is technically feasible to preserve and maintain them. If historical significance is one of the criteria, then shouldn't we be trying to preserve and repurpose historic buildings there?
That depends on the buildings - if occupied, then yes unless the occupants accept fair financial compensation.
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

5. Should Strategic Properties be capable of supporting high density uses such as apartment buildings and mixed-use buildings similar to downtown?

Should Strategic Properties be capable of supporting high density uses such as...



Answers	Count	Percentage
Yes	120	48%
No	60	24%
Some – if yes, identify where it would be appropriate or not appropriate	56	22.4%
No answer	12	4.8%

Answered: 248 Skipped: 2

Some – if yes, identify where it would be appropriate or not appropriate

- Not appropriate to insert apartment buildings where they would tower over existing communities of single and two story homes.
- Depends on surrounding land use and how many storeys the new development would be
- Per location
- Should fit in with existing neighbours if they have them if no neighbouring structures then yes
- Mixed use buildings. No apartment buildings.
- Not the wool growers property. This would be unacceptable. It should be preserved, and the land left for public use. You've taken too much green space away from us already
- Only on properties where there is already a building. Not adding more high density buildings.
- Everywhere but the 150 mill street location
- I prefer medium to low density not high.

Depending on the neighborhood and natural environment surrounding the property. High density around the water and trails ruins the beauty of these features in my opinion.
Yes, if roads and infrastructure and neighbourhoods are capable of handling the high density uses.
Not the wool growers that should all be public space ie farmers market and restaurants
McArthur Island is inappropriate. The others are appropriate.
We don't want everything high density
Not appropriate- Wool Growers - so much history
I think that someone should realistically look at what life is like on the roads they plan to build on. For example, to build on High street at the Foundry location seems unrealistic and would further clog the downtown core. Where's the parking?
Avoid apartments.
If on Arterial roadways
Keeping structures at a 4 story height limit
Accessible apartments may require less parking if they are walkable to amenities. I would buy a condo by the river for my retirement today!
Some areas cannot handle high density housing - I think up to medium density should be max.
Medium density or low rise apartments.
If the structures on the site suit higher density
In areas where there is access to key roads ie McNeely, hwy 7.150 Mill Street cannot support additional traffic with a one lane bridge
Both McArthur Island and DRS manufacturing plant property have no collector roads near by. Development should be restricted to medium density. Shops/stores within walking distance to help reduce carbon footprint.
If the area can't support a business then it shouldn't be required.
The DRS older building on the back near the river should probably be preserved but the "newer" part can be taken down.
NOT beside the waterfront. This area should be a new community pool/ recreation / community complex with underground parking to preserve views and access..
Needs to be mindful of potential impact on surrounding neighbourhoods
Let residents have a say
Findlays - not appropriate
Only if they fit in to the surrounding area. Don't allow massive multi story buildings. Two story max. Must have sufficient parking to avoid overflow all over the streets.
Only on arterial roads where there are existing buildings
High density is important, but needs to have traffic/parking/sewage/electric grid considerations
DRS
downtown is a disgrace most of the places should be replace with old style appearances but with modern building materials.
I agree with development of mill st., findly and drs locations only. Not wool growers.

High density use for the sites on the river (McArthur Island, Findlay Foundry, and Leigh Instruments/DRS) may cause environmental problems. Medium density might be more appropriate.

I support this if the existing surroundings are not affected specifically with regards to nature preservation and public's access to waterways

No building within view of the town hall should be higher than the town hall, in order to preserve the high regard and recognition of the municipal public office.

Appropriate properties, The wool growers, McArthur Island, Findlay Foundry site. Not appropriate property former DRS site. Would like to have given my reasoning but this format does not allow more than the characters required.


Yes, but not at the expense of public green space. Should we really replace the woods on MacArthur Island with apartment buildings? Especially when we have so little public waterfront. We should develop that as a park and build density nearby.

6. Should development on Strategic Properties be required to incorporate affordable housing*?

**In Canada, housing is considered "affordable" if it costs less than 30% of a household's before-tax income.*

Rental units where rent is at or below the average market rent in the regional market area are also considered "affordable", as is ownership housing where the purchase price is 10% below the average purchase price of a unit in the regional market area.

o Should development on Strategic Properties be required to incorporate afforda...



Answers	Count	Percentage
Yes	151	60.4%
No	60	24%
Other	20	8%
No answer	18	7.2%

Answered: 249 Skipped: 1

Other - Should development on Strategic Properties be required to incorporate affordable housing*?

Builders will tell you whatever you want to hear but the reality is none of these new Carleton place developments will have affordable living options. We all know this.

if its feasible it would be beneficial to the community at large

On some, not necessarily all

It depends on what is being built on the property and if it makes sense. Is it being subsidized by some government entity to have affordable housing included? It would be hard to force a private developer to include affordable housing.

Affordable housing is incredibly important, but not every strategic property can or should necessarily accommodate an affordable housing option

None of the 'affordable' housing is actually affordable for people on low incomes, so it doesn't really apply.

STOP BUILDING. TOO MANY PEOPLES in CP.

Yes, if it's mixed and not clumping together all low income.

Some properties but not all.

I would like to see how anyone could build affordable housing these days given the building costs that have risen
Yes and this units must be built first... example of New York City and City of London where developers promise "affordable" housing, but fail to follow through.
Enough development already in the town without more
This could be part of the "mixed use", again considering impact on neighborhoods (all involved)
Affordable housing is very important, and if a strategic property can't include it, then the developers need to execute an alternative plan to supply equivalent affordable housing.
Depends on the location of the proposed housing. Areas next to parks or green space would be more suitable than a location next to existing shops and amenities.
low rental families should be subsidized and integrated into regular priced accommodation.
Only if the property owner is receiving subsidy in order to help offset the loss of revenue. This is a terrible market to force affordable housing.
Not sure how maintaining the quality finishes and look and feel of the character of the neighbourhood can be met by incorporating "affordable housing" when building materials are costly.
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

7. Should Strategic Properties be subdivided into smaller sites rather than being treated as one large site?




Maybe - please identify where it would be appropriate or not appropriate
Depends on the size of the property. Findlay Foundry should be a single site as it is small.
I think that answer is very dependent on what is being submitted and what area etc. lots of variables there
usually no but if it was a planned opportunity to build better and needed to be smaller sites built out with a goal/ plan in mind it should be considered
it depends on the proposal
Depends on the proposal
Only makes sense to sub-divide the sites to ensure that public green space is included for all sites. Otherwise, I would like them to be treated as one large site.
Depends ...so option could be given to developer

Having something like a food court, so all residents can appreciate the view/site and enjoy. You turn sites by the river into residential area, and only some rich people will enjoy the view.
Where it makes sense for development, and can introduce competition, potentially enabling greater choice and affordability
where it would be of maximum use for apartments for affordable housing and expansion for business venture depending on the size of property and location
The former foundry site should be subdivided
If the property was being used for mixed use.
Findlay Foundry site could be subdivided. Woolgrowers should not be.
If multiple developers can submit a joint cohesive plan
DRS Site
It depends on the property. This wouldn't make sense for a location such as the site of the current food bank on Mill Street, but it would for the site of Caldwell School if it were to be redeveloped.
It would depend on the size of the property and what would be appropriate to build there.
I should be both
Sites like the swamp by the highway could be split to make a Carleton place nature Center. It would be a tax break and a possible partnership with MCVA for funding.
Depends on the surroundings. For example, there's plenty of room on the island for more buildings
An example would be if the Foundry location were turned into affordable housing for seniors and an effort was put in to make sure a large portion of the Foundry "park" was preserved as it is now with the boat access and beautiful native wildflowers.
Large sites such as Emily street may be too far gone to fully rehab. This could be divided.
should remain as green space and what it currently is
If the site is large enough.
It depends on the proposed project(s)
Depends on the site and developer capacity. If a larger property can be more efficiently developed for additional uses by dividing it makes sense.
Phased development
Dividing both McArthur Island and The DRS manufacturing plant properties would give more leeway for medium and a limited amount of high density.
Depending on individual circumstance.
Treat areas with opportunities for parks as large sites (if appropriate)
DRS
This is dependent on the site
If land was sufficient to accommodate without it looking hodge podge
with multiple uses then separate
Where appropriate as decided by the town.
depends on size
If the town will gain or keep the key parts for public access and landmarks while allowing some development to occur.

If a site is too big for a single developer than it could be split, but the split would have to fair (ie a developer shouldn't be able to excise an undesirable portion)
Whatever the owner wants
Depends on the proposal
It depends on the plan for the area
As long as it is in service of the other goals. They should still be planned as one large site. And adjacent smaller sites should be able to assembled into Strategic Property-sized parcels.
I think much of the green space should be preserved
It would be appropriate as long as smaller sites still maximize the density/usefulness of the original property.
Smaller sites give more equitable access to opportunity for smaller builders or businesses, but there must be an overarching plan to create cohesion.
Appropriate sites, McArthur Island and Wool Growers. Non appropriate sites Findlay Foundry and former DRS.
That depends on the size and location of the property.
I don't know the pros and cons to comment on this one. Whatever ensures the best planning in line with green development goals.
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Questions about the Future of Strategic Properties

1. If the Town were to do away with remove the Strategic Properties designation, how should the four (4) Strategic Properties be designated?



Other - If the Town were to do away with remove the Strategic Properties designation, how should the four (4) Strategic Properties be designated?
Mixed use with a larger than required portion set aside for recreation/open space.
Mixed use but do prioritize recreation at these site or others.
Not sure. My primary concern would be to maintain their heritage character, the sense of green space, and ensuring the Town's resources -including the trail- are not overburdened by development.
Waterfront should be recreational only
Public green space with high density housing.
Again, on an individual basis
All of the above based on use

Mixed use and recreation/open space
medium to high density residential
No opinion.
Residential only
Just stop building. We are losing our freedom to outdoor recreational area. We want to preserve nature in support of climate change.
Mixed use as defined above but that includes recreational and/or cultural considerations
Mixed use AND Recreational
Recreational/ open space or community Center and park. If we don't invest in places to go or things to do, vandalizing and crime is going to get worse.
They should be designated the same as the surrounding neighbourhoods.
McArthur only small commercial such as restaurant. Other properties could be mixed use but commercial and not industrial.
I think both mixed use and recreational
Commercial if on arterial roads
Not sure
Maybe a combination of recreational and mixed use
Combination of mixed use and recreational
No more development period
Mixed use residential and recreational/open space.
With the exception of the wood growers which should be left alone, the rest could be mixed use residential.
Rec/ Community / Open spaces near water, mixed use away from the water. Please keep the vibe CP and not mini stittsville or Barrhaven!
Residential along side recreational/open space
Residential and recreational
Any of the above, as appropriate for the site.
Mix of residential, commercial and green space
To me they are parcels of land that should be treated independently. All should fit in with their surrounding neighbourhood regarding the look and feel of the neighbourhood.
Due to the location of these properties being close to the trail system and/or the river, these properties MUST include substantial Public open space to be enjoyed by both the residents of the sites and the town.
Depends. Mixed-use for some, but I think those near the river should be turned into parks-- this would benefit residents, attract tourists, and be good for local businesses (I think this every time we enjoy takeout or ice cream at Stewart Park in Perth)
It would be nice to have recreational open space - but people need affordable housing too
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!
Sadly, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Open-Ended Questions

1. What should be the definition of a strategic property in Carleton Place?

A location where there's opportunities for residents and tourist to enjoy the location and space .
Not sure, but stop destroying our town.
Properties that are developed within our current Official Plan without making changes to appease developers .
A property that is accessible to all residents and does not impact the view, natural environment or the water quality of the site.
Areas of targeted intensification that allows the town to grow strategically while building services in a specific geographical area.
Large enough to create an employment draw.
water or trail abutting/fronting those properties surrounded by older residences and businesses those with easy access by means other than vehicle
A property that's unique or offers a unique view or experience
A large property within the downtown area and immediate surroundings that can support mixed use and maintain green space and access to existing trails and waterway
A location that can be used by the public for a variety of purposes.
A strategic property should be easily walkable to all downtown amenities and high density so that folks aren't forced to use cars if they don't have them. They should also include public green space as it should be close to the water.
You tell me, I thought that he'd been established
Landmark
No comment
To be developed, so the large part of the residents can benefit from the space it occupies. Especially along side the river.
Properties that have potential for more intense growth, have local cultural or historical significance, and/or properties that align with business and cultural/recreational goals of the town and town plan
Property that is vacant.
Top of the list is affordable housing needed.
Historic significance within accessibility of residents and tourists.
Vacant buildings, that can be redesigned into affordable living spaces.

complimentary to existing development without hindering character of town
Should incorporate cultural, historical, economic, and environmental factors within its definition.
a property with the potential to help define the town visually and in character
Currently, it seems that strategic properties are historic ones. Strategic properties should be places in future or existing developments to allow services, green spaces, and recreation. I moved here 25 years ago because of all the forests we had in town.. they are almost all gone now with only trees fronting water. Where are our green spaces? Where are the stores? Where is there anywhere for youth to have fun without having to spend a lot of money? In the winter, everyone is stuck inside their homes as there isn't any indoor activities here.. besides at the arena.
A place that can provide great benefit to the community. Not just contributing to continued growth. I would suggest that most people in CP are not happy about seeing constant, excessive housing developments.
A significant heritage, historic, or strategically located property that is attractive as a development project.
Preserving a town property with historical significance
A property of strategic future importance to the quality of life in Carleton Place that merits special consideration for the kind of future development/redevelopment that is appropriate to the site.
.
A property which includes a mix of rental apartments and commercial uses
Properties will heritage and/or cultural significance
I think you missed some important questions in this survey. Instead of asking about the "labeling" and suggestions for Strategic properties, why did you not include questions about what types of properties the public would prefer to see in those locations?
Assuming we will all feel the middle area is acceptable, or deciding what is "affordable" according to what is already here is missing the bigger picture. More people will not have choice over properties---instead, the people who can ALREADY afford these properties will now have more choice, but those who are priced out of the market already will still not have any new options. You should have provided a space for general feedback.
More green space and less building homes.
Historical buildings
Green space and saving old trees best as possible.
I agree with the definitions you have in the strategic plan you attached to this survey.
What you have is fine, but I would not like to see these sites used for buildings with more than four storeys.
Properties with unique characteristics, history or location
A property that has a large area, unique properties and a heritage building- or the grandiose history of a previous building.

Park land, public use and community all need to be considered.

A large (greater than X) plot of land, with or without existing buildings, that has potential to become an exciting/forward thinking development with a combination of residential and commercial uses, within walking distance of downtown, that should be preserved in (historical or natural elements) some capacity for the public to enjoy.

A property with potential to bring value to as many residents of the town as possible, such as indoor and outdoor community spaces, nature reserves, or mixed residential-commercial community spaces (like apartments with businesses on the main floor, duplexes with adjacent public green spaces, etc.)

There should be no properties designated as strategic. The label identifies the property as important to the town. This gives the developer leverage over the town in pursuing the development. The town will likely, as has occurred, bend over backward to please the developer. Ultimately designating a property as strategic is bad for the town.

Any area that is undeveloped or under developed. Or an area where there are several or numerous older buildings in disrepair, or environmentally of concern, where all buildings could be demolished and a new neighbourhood constructed.

I don't have a full definition, but it should be a place of special significance that cannot be replaced. The properties that border the Mississippi River suit this definition.

An area of significance that would do better to be developed than its current state. I believe 3 of the current areas meet this criteria, the wool growers site does not

One whose current use is unfulfilled and has potential to improve the community DRS is vacant, former Findlay Foundry site is vacant so these are probably the most useful for development. McArthur Island is in the process of development, Woolgrowers is highly functioning and profitable commercial space and tourist attraction so not sure why they are included.

An underutilized property within walking distance of the "main street" commercial area that is sufficiently large that it can be redeveloped with mixed use, including public greenspace.

A property that has no cultural or historical significance to the town or its residents. Additionally, every effort should be put forth to first see if the public would prefer it to be a public space, particular a public green space.

Carleton Place has an opportunity to set an example across Ontario for how they go about growing and being conscientious of their public's opinions and environmental solutions. More condos, more duplexes, more cookie cutter homes out of reach for many is not what people want to see. I think many accept change and growth, but it seems the town has lost its way.

Nowhere have I seen any indication of making these places amenities beyond just a park solution. I endorse the park solution, but I would advise you to get more creative.

It's strange when people who live above many in town, and some even outside of town, male

decisions on how to house the poor. The current council does a poor job of representing the average resident.

Potential for growth and development

Green spaces, landmark buildings.

An area that holds cultural meaning and provides a unique feeling or experience for the town. It should also hold tourism and consumer revenue purposes. Example a multi use sports facility to accommodate Lanark County but able to host sporting events the bring in alot of people.

Already serviced water/sewer

Close to arterial roads and trails

Large enough for infill or max density residential/commercial

Historic buildings/sites and those with a connection/adjacent to the natural beauty of rivers, parks and trail networks.

there should be no or very limited special considerations (deferral/non charge for town costs eg planning/building) for any strategic properties, unless they meet other criteria of the Planning (eg low rental)..

One that recognizes the exponential growth presently happening in Carleton Place is unsustainable and causing major infrastructure issues as well as destroying critical green space that homes thousands of diverse species of animals, birds and insects.

na

I am fine with the current definition of a strategic property.

Simply put, a property that could bring better use and value to the towm. For example, the old buildings along Moore I'd happily see come down and have something built like on Stittsville main near abbott st. Aptartments above with commercial below. Like bridge st now but new version.

Architecture, building's materials, building' history, location, previous use.

I don't think we need a " strategic property " development plan

A property that has the potential.....(see answer below)

I do think any strategic property should be owned by the town. Hard to say a property is strategic when the property owner(s) may have a different opinion

Properties well located to develop 15 minute city style livable cities, properties that are currently under utilized and can provide for appreciate in character and quality of the town via development.

No high density/ no high rise in the town core
A property of historical significance that will not be used for residential or commercial development Parks. Recreational spaces
Those properties that express the core of the town or are key elements of it or anchor a particular context.
Heritage property that has some cultural heritage or value in identity for the community of Carleton place
Why make any property "strategic"
Those properties that would benefit (1) people in need of housing, (2) the projected population growth, (3) the maintenance and use of heritage properties, (4) increased tax base.
Unsure
I'm not sure what the definition should be. But I am afraid that you will get a developer buying up locations in order to move large projects ahead with little to no pushback just because they purchased the "strategic property". Developers are interested in making money, not looking after the betterment of the town or surrounding neighbors.
Any property that benefits from the proactive management of Carleton Place, in order to preserve the community perspective while considering natural growth and prosperity of the town.
Strategic properties should be properties prioritized for support and development by the town to ensure preservation and heritage as well as future use.
properties with historic value that should be utilized for public use.
There shouldn't be strategic properties.
If it has historical significance, such as the train station, The Grand, etc - i
No answer
The ones you have already selected are appropriate.
A property location which is highly accessible, central and visible to the community which provides a central hub for community services, new types of commercial stores and mixed/lower cost housing - not above 3 stories.
Landmarks such as The Mill, or possibly old churches that are no longer in use.
Location or historical significance.
A property with historic value to the towns construction
properties with historical or heritage significance located in geographically important or attractive areas that can be developed in a manner that all residents can access and enjoy
Something that means something to the history of the town
strategic properties refer to specific attributes or characteristics of land that are considered critical or advantageous in achieving planning objectives (intensification, complimentary to the community with its location to the river and the downtown core).
Properties in key places in carleton place that add to the value of the community.
Properties that are underdeveloped/underutilized based on size and location.
Properties that reflect local culture and settings and significantly add to the CP brand

Landmark.
na
Any property large enough for development within the town limits.
Property where development should be a priority
A strategic property to PROTECT public interest such as access to the river or historic landmarks we want to preserve. These must not be used for high rise apartments but instead for creating welcoming areas to gather with smaller shops/ buildings to support its use.
Create a separate definition for strategic development lots that are intended for large residential builds.
New business to take the burden of taxes off residential properties
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have the potential to generate substantial economic benefits, such as through business development, job creation, or decrease tax 2. Enhance the quality of life for residents, including properties used for public amenities like parks, community centers, and recreational facilities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> transportation, or connectivity, such as properties near major roads, transit hubs, or central business districts.
Has little impact on the surrounding homes and neighbourhood.
Any large, central location
A property where the space is currently underutilized and could be repurposed to meet the current housing crisis but also while supporting walkable communities.
The current definition is sufficient
Not sure
One that will preserve the character of the town, attract tourism, and serve the population
Waste of time, remove work on this classification
Property that can be (re)developed to support a higher density in town
Mixed use property developed by the Town to aid and sustain the growing population and then some. Mainly found on arterial roads, including space for affordable housing.
Green space or landmarks
A large, underutilized, centrally located lot appropriate for containing a landmark mixed-use, pedestrian-centric development.
A property purchased by the town that is locally owned and may be in need of repair and the owner is willing to sell rather than repair. Something that could be torn down and accommodate a larger residence. Roads are already there as well as sewer and water.
A property that is large and it's development would impact the neighborhood.
Access to downtown, especially essential services, should be considered.

Within town limits
Any property with or without a building that is historical, close to the downtown area and Mississippi River.
I'm not sure they should be designated as strategic properties. They are parcels of land. Each of the four sites in question are different and should be developed according to the neighbourhoods they occupy.
A property, located along the Mississippi River, along the OVRT, within the downtown district, or of significant scope that can support higher density mixed use development which contributes to the overall quality of life of the town and adds value to the surrounding neighbourhood.
These properties are strategic because they provide an opportunity to define our community as a progressive walkable community which promotes environmental design and is proud to maintain its history. Building homes is one thing however building community is another matter to be carefully considered. All of these properties also have a historical significance to the town which should be preserved and showcased. The anticipated, significant growth pressures should not be accommodated at the expense of CP's character and heritage. Therefore a strategic property not only provides accommodations and neighbourhood commercial uses but should also be a focal point for the community with open community space and historical recognition. These properties need to instill and reflect pride in our community.
A strategic property in Carleton Place should be defined as a parcel of land identified for targeted growth and intensification, with the potential to support mixed-use, medium, and high-density development. These properties should contribute to the expansion and diversification of the town's housing stock, support the Downtown District, and connect with surrounding residential neighborhoods. Key criteria for strategic properties should include: Size: Minimum lot area of 0.8 hectares. Location: Immediate adjacency to major transportation corridors, trails, or water bodies such as the OVRT, Trans Canada Trail, or Mississippi River. Significance: Possessing local cultural or historical importance. Potential: Capacity to integrate public pedestrian and recreational trail facilities and enhance public spaces.
A property that helps build a thriving community by integrating social, economic, and environmental values, combining residential, commercial, and public space in ways consistent with green development standards.
Town should do away with the "strategic Property" designation. It has just resulted in prime properties not being developed as politicians quibble over what they would like to see other people spend their money on. It's becoming the Carleton Place version of the NCC and Lebreton Flats.
You have already defined it? Not clear why you would ask.

With all due respect, it is worth noting that there is no mention of "Strategic Properties" in the Planning Act of Ontario. It is also rather odd that the term "Strategic Properties" is ONLY used by the Director of Development Services and the Planning Department of The Town of Carleton Place and "Strategic Properties" do not appear in any Official Plan of any other Municipality in Canada. In addition, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Firstly, it's worth noting that there's no mention of Strategic Properties (SP) in the Planning Act of Ontario. It's also rather odd that the term Strategic Properties is ONLY used by the Director of Development Services of the Town of Carleton Place (CP) and the concept of SP doesn't appear in any Official Plan of any other Municipality in Canada.

Secondly, CP doesn't have the infrastructure (facilities, systems) to support mid-and-high-density housing developments. It's common knowledge that the infrastructure has to establish first in order to sustain and service mid-and-high-density developments. It also has been proven that higher-density living raises major concerns about quality of life of residents, such as noise pollution, overcrowding, lack of green spaces, and limited privacy (affecting residents' well-being and satisfaction with their living environment).

Lastly, it's appalling that this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Answered: 120 Skipped: 130

2. What makes a Strategic Property special and unique?

Mainly location, as properties on the river are limited and maximizing the use of these properties for as many residents as possible should be considered.
They are typically larger plots of land in the town space. Most are historical in some fashion. They are great spaces to have unique and open concept areas for the public for markets, shops, green spaces, etc
Great images for our town beautiful but also functional and practical for residents and tourists.
Not sure, but stop destroying our town.
From what I see currently most are dilapidated properties with developers trying to dictate what they are going to build.
Historical significance, but please consider the current usage of these properties - eg: footpaths in Findlay Foundry leading to Bridge St., Stacy's trail access, etc. Townspeople have enjoyed these paths for many years, would be a shame to lose that access.
Environmental significance (greenspace, rare flora or fauna)
Impact - the property will have minimal impact on the surrounding properties
Age, materials, inability to replicate
Historical building or property that has relevance to the town's history and can play an important role for the town's future.
Location, location, location. Maintain character or create a unique structure that creates a draw.
Location. History. Views
Heritage buildings, walkability to downtown, access to green space
Location specifically is what makes it special and unique. Close to water and close to downtown.
?????
Attraction, use and access
Cultural/heritage significance, unrealised opportunities for sympathetic development, uniquely public locations or landmarks
Not sure
Chance to design green spaces, and affordable houses and bring in new businesses.
It's location, natural surroundings and past use (history), that had a significant impact on the history and past development of Carleton Place.
Historic significance within accessibility of residents and tourists.
Heritage, location,
once replaced developed it has to be an added value to community
Each property's individual cultural, historical, economic, and environmental value.
can contribute to a key theme that will define the town for years to come
It's what they offer to the people. We focus so much of housing, and not enough on the people living here. Green spaces, recreation, entertainment, services.
Historic buildings. Something that has great potential to benefit the town in general.
Location and/or historical significance. Environmental concerns, ie flooding risk, wildlife use.

Historic heritage or unique characteristics.
Historical significance
Location more than anything else and it's capacity to contribute to a better Carleton Place in the future, be that through preservation or restoration or expansion of those historic uses. They are opportunities to build better and for the benefit of the community in partnership with landowners who may not be able to realize such a vision on their own.
It's adjacency to the water or other public space. Should be a high visibility site.
history or architecture
It's a unique location with lots of space to develop. However, they should not be considered commercial spaces as many of the current commercial properties in the areas of these specific spaces are already empty and commercial development is taking place on the town outskirts. These properties would be perfect for AFFORDABLE housing, although the costs to renovate the buildings already located on these sites is going to make this impossible, unfortunately.
We want. More green space and less building homes
Their history and architecture should be preserved
Unsure
I think history plays the biggest role. Location too.
Location and the way it fits in with its surroundings.
See above
It's size and its history, and location are important factors.
Combination of location, size, proximity to amenities/downtown, development potential, existing buildings features, etc.
Its location relative to what's available around it. I.e. an opportunity to introduce small businesses, community spaces, or parks to an area that only has residential use right now and where residents can't easily access amenities like the new proposed use for the strategic property except by car. We should aim to use strategic properties to make all neighbourhoods of Carleton Place as enjoyable, walkable, and diverse as downtown.
Nothing.
Location (i.e., Riverside) and perhaps the presence of a salvageable building made of heritage materials like limestone
Opportunity to be a place where people with either be able to gather or desire to be
They have a historical link to our history and they have significant future use and/or attract tourists, visitors and shoppers because of their uniqueness.
It may have some historical significance which should be incorporated into the new design.
The amount of green space, its biodiversity, cultural or historical significance. An example would be Stacey's Trail.
Whoever approved the destruction and building in the area around Stacey's Trail, blocking it off and ruining the beauty by the Mill, should take a long look at themselves in the mirror. Truly heart breaking.
Location and access
Scope and scale. Future looking towards green spaces and the environment
The area provides something different than anywhere else in the community

Already serviced and close to existing transit infrastructure
Historic buildings worth preserving, and sites that allow for access to natural features/amenities that attract people to visit and live here.
Historical significance to the town and not being utilized
Older buildings (>75years) Stone buildings.
One that listens to the voice of the community. The community as a whole does not want more housing developments and shopping centers.
Historical significance to town of CP
Access to green space, proximity to walking trails, and proximity to local businesses.
Walkable to amenities. Unless there is public transt put in then everyone should have option to walk.
Architecture, building's materials, building' history, location, previous use, heritage designation.
You tell me
It has the potential to enhance the lifestyle and character of the community due to its historical and/or geographical assets.
Historic buildings, large footage acreage,
See above.
No high density no high rise in the town core
We do not need to designate properties in the downtown residential core to be used as commercial or high density residential space.
Unusal, historic or topography
Historical and or cultural heritage that is unique to Carleton place.
Historically significance. Shopping within walking distance (move away from big box stores) to help reduce carbon footprint and for improved general health of the residence. Good example of this location is area around Freshco.
One or more of these factors: (1) Cultural or historical significance (2) Contribution to ambiance ("feel") of the town (3) Potential impact on delivery of services to residence
No strategic designation at all
Landmark sites. Historical significance.
Property in high flow areas that can add value to our community
It's historical significance.
Mostly its location and history.
A property that can enhance the entire community through development and growth while being able to maintain the feel of the town.
It's heritage and connection to the town as well as accessibility of use for community to use

Its location within the town.
historical and architectural uniqueness
There isn't anything. The current plan covers zoning.
The architecture and the age. The aesthetics
Variety.
Its location, historic-inspired architecture, and its use of underground parking where possible to maintain greenspace in the downtown core.
Properties that hold history for Carleton Place, or are landmarks
Location along the waterway or historical significance.
It is what the town was built on. We lose too many of these sites to new construction
properties with historical or heritage significance located in areas where public access can be designed to link with existing recreational opportunities.
Its history
Location, Accessibility, Natural Resources (Miss River) Environmental Factors, Heritage Factors
Location of Property
The fact that the properties have history within Carleton place.
That the developments will continue to support Carleton place becoming a desirable community to live and raise families (not low income private developments).
An opportunity to improve the use and value of an underdeveloped property. The ability to qualify for financial incentives for development from any or all levels of government.
Location multi use visual appeal
Where they're situated
The ones the town has designated are special and unique in the history they hold. The remaining buildings must at all costs be preserved and integrated into any future development and NOT DEMOLISHED
Historical background, location.
Potential to make tax revenue for the town and improve the appearance.
Potential for development
Location
History (of building most important)
That they can provide benefit to the whole town and not just developers greedy pockets.
Hopefully the land can be used wisely
If it can maintain a current building and lets say turn it into apts/condo's. Unless the apartments you speak of have elevators I don't see any new projects geared to seniors as stacked townhouses are not for seniors. There seems to be a lack of housing for seniors available. I for one would like to sell my four bedroom two story but have no where to go as options are pretty much non existent. Majority being built are townhomes with more stairs than I have. There are four women on my street alone who are now widows who don't need our large homes but have no where to go!!!
Either it's ability to host a major infrastructure project (hospital, school, recreation, water treatment plant, etc...) that will be required by the town in the future.

Or Scenic grounds along the river that would affect the "skyline" (for lack of a better word).
The history it holds. The location (close to amenities? Parks? Etc.)
Not sure
Historical buildings, proximity to the river
heritage, strategic location, size, ability for infill
Strategic property keeps both residents and new buyers in the town interested in what is happening in town. It brings new opportunities for development and growth.
Can be enjoyed by all
Size and location. They do not necessarily need to be culturally or historically significant if they are capable of *becoming* culturally or locally significant through favourable development. Similarly, they do not necessarily need to be on a local trail if they are capable of *becoming* a local trail.
Since the map function only allows me to input one new property, I'll include additional suggestions in this available space instead. Some may require property assembly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Works yard on Franklin St. - Hunger Stop location on Mill St. - Anytime fitness + adjacent parking lot on Lansdowne/Laura St. This narrowly misses the minimum size requirement. - Total Rythm Dance Studio + adjacent parking lot on Lansdowne Ave. - Large lot off the southern end of Lansdowne Ave. - Circle K (+ ideally including the adjacent underutilized lot) around 163 Townline Road. - The large undeveloped lots along McNeely will already be designated as mixed-used and could benefit from SP designation.
to be able to make CP attractive and to give more housing to the people who need it
A property that will be welcomed by those living around it.
Size and location
Location and historic aspects of the property.
It's location
History, location, proximity to trails and Mississippi River. Carleton Place is unique in that there is access to nature while keeping with the growing community. High rise buildings on strategic properties would take away from the unique feeling only Carleton Place has to offer. If you google "what is strategic property"? It reads, it's strategic due to its close proximity to existing development, services and facilities. Meaning the land is in a sustainable location with potential to be developed in the immediate, shorter term or longer-term future. It ultimately means land that has potential for future development.
Again, I see them as parcels of land.
Firstly, its location as well as its potential to support higher density mixed development that adds to the overall quality of life of the town and adds value to the surrounding neighbourhoods.

All of these properties are located in the original and historic area of CP. Their size, location, accessibility provide flexibility to include a variety of uses. The size of these properties provides opportunity to build landmarks that acknowledge the unique character and heritage of CP. These properties should have very specific design criteria over and above any outlined in the Dev. Permit B/L.

The locations of these properties provide opportunities to be hubs for the trail system and/or provide public open spaces for the enjoyment of the river. These properties also provide opportunities for innovative environmental design (rain gardens, building and roofing materials etc.) The 3 sites adjacent to the river will require careful consideration of storm water management.

All of these properties are within easy walking of our historic downtown core and any commercial uses permitted in these properties should compliment and not compete with the downtown business district.

Strategic Properties are special and unique due to their potential to drive significant positive change in Carleton Place. They are uniquely positioned to:

- Foster Mixed-Use Development: These properties can support a blend of residential, commercial, and recreational uses, creating vibrant community hubs.
- Enhance Connectivity: Strategic properties are crucial in linking different parts of the town, particularly connecting newer commercial and residential districts with the Downtown District.
- Promote Sustainability: By prioritizing green infrastructure, active transportation networks, and pedestrian-friendly designs, these properties can lead the way in sustainable urban planning.
- Preserve Heritage: Strategic properties often include sites of cultural or historical significance, ensuring that development respects and incorporates the town's heritage.

I think they *will* be special and unique if we can develop them in a way that includes public green space, helps grow our network of trails and parks, and shows leadership on green development standards (not just walkability but energy efficiency and climate resiliency too). The town has made a good start on this with Carleton Junction and the farmers market and other development along the trail. Let's keep doing more of that, and preserving existing trees and green space as we build more "missing middle" housing.

Meets the criteria and is a site that is currently undeveloped??

It is worth noting that there is no mention of "Strategic Properties" in the Planning Act of Ontario. It is also rather odd that the term "Strategic Properties" is ONLY used by the Director of Development Services and the Planning Department of The Town of Carleton Place and "Strategic Properties" do not appear in any Official Plan of any other Municipality in Canada. In addition, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Firstly, it's worth noting that there's no mention of Strategic Properties (SP) in the Planning Act of Ontario. It's also rather odd that the term Strategic Properties is ONLY used by the Director of Development Services of the Town of Carleton Place (CP) and the concept of SP doesn't appear in any Official Plan of any other Municipality in Canada.

Secondly, CP doesn't have the infrastructure (facilities,systems) to support mid-and-high-density housing developments. It's common knowledge that the infrastructure has to establish first in order to sustain and service mid-and-high-density developments. It also has been proven that higher-density living raises major concerns about quality of life of residents, such as noise pollution, overcrowding, lack of green spaces, and limited privacy (affecting residents' well-being and satisfaction with their living environment).

Lastly, it's appalling that this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Answered: 128 Skipped: 122

3. Should individual Strategic Properties be treated differently from each other? Why or why not?

Yes. Depending on size, location and condition, such as the nature and zoning of surrounding land and what is required to make the property feasible for development. Special considerations should be considered for the Foundry lot as I believe it would require significant and expensive remediation which has the potential to be very expensive. The more costs that a developer could cover for this work, the better.

Yes, just depends on location, what's already there, what the plan is for the spot

Because we have an opportunity to plan the next 50100 years here of how our town can be enjoyed by people who live here but let's make us a stop along the way for people who want to tour the national capital region.

Voting you all out.

No this would only create more challenges by individual developers to force the town to again change the O.P.

Yes, each site you mentioned as a proposed Strategic Property has its own issues and impacts on the town's population.

Yes...all properties are not the same...a property on waterfront should have public water access via a walking path for example where's, an interior property may not require public access

The scope of development on each specific property may be different and should be considered for several factors including maintaining appropriate greenspace, and allowing public access overall benefit to current and future residents.

Maybe, some can be restored, some are water front. Develop with intention using the specific surroundings as a public draw.

yes, it should be dependent on the property location and surrounding neighbourhoods

Yes they should. Each property will hold our own unique assets

Yes. Because they have different qualities

Possibly, depending on their surroundings

No. They should all be treated the same.

Why?

Yes, properties are unique

Yes ...if adjacent to recreation or open spaces or the river the strategic property should not allow high density buildings

Yes. Carleton Place is growing but it is still small enough that we can consider each property individually. Each strategic property may fill different needs and fit different purposes Ie: "gateway" properties such as the thrift store/former Tim Hortons, should be treated very differently than other brownfield infill, the DRS manufacturing plant property would be a great candidate for residential intensification and perhaps an expansion of riverside park, but building more bland condos on the former Findlay foundry grounds is such a terrible waste of what could have been an amazing waterfront mixed use commercial landmark/anchor property to help boost commercial traffic downtown and make our core more of a destination.
No. All should be mixed with recreational space
Yes depending on the locations within the town.
Consider location, impact of development on the environment or adjacent properties. Any development must fit with the immediate surroundings and not detract from it's natural beauty and be a natural fit for the neighbourhood. Development should be seen as a positive and enhance the reputation of Carleton Place as a welcoming place to live.
Yes. Based on location and previous historic use and existing land development. Findlay boundary for example could have an apartment within the heritage structure however some other locations would be a shame to mass develop a beautiful historical property.
Yes each property should be treated independently. Too many new buildings in our town are cookie cutter buildings.
only in how they impact immediate surroundings
Yes. To ensure integrity of each property. To 'lump' properties together is counterproductive to what the objective of a strategic property is.
each will have its individualized potential based on its location, heritage values and [most importantly] its capacity to contribute to a broader theme that defines the town
Yes, locations differ
Depends on their intended use. Green space should not be treated the same as commercial businesses.
Yes, because each site is unique.
Yes. Each is unique in location, size, environment, historical value etc
Yes. The Wool Coop, for example is not on the river. The other properties mentioned are on/near the river.
No
Yes. Each property has different potential, based on its location. Some could require preservation of the current street-front experience, some could require restoration or renovation to reach certain goals (such as a minimum of 3 stories along Bridge Street with at least 2 stories of residential above street-facing commercial/public spaces). Redevelopment of the Public Works Yards/Foodbank properties would merit a different treatment given the historic buildings that surround those properties. The opportunity for green space on the Wool Growers property should be maximized. Etc...
Yes, 150 mill street doesn't have the funding to make the project look good.
Yes - each site is very different so the policy should reflect that.

Properties should be treated on a case by case basis due to the proposed development and impacts on neighborhoods
Yes, depending on the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
Yes. Some spaces have more potential for unique development and are more strategically located. For example, the Woolen Mill is not located near water and has less draw for some people.
No more properties. More green space and less building homes.
Give owner choice
Yes. They are not alike in terms of location and will not by definition lend themselves to a "one plan fits all" approach.
Yes they should be treated differently because the surroundings in each case are different.
Yes, each has it's unique character
Yes, every property is vastly different. Individual needs are not going going to be met by one set of rules written in stone. The rules should resemble mesh , that's flexible and encompassing. Not every part applies to every property but it will be there for one that will.
Yes, because each property has its own unique conditions, location, surroundings, natural features, buildings, etc.
Yes, because while it may make sense to preserve some buildings or repurpose them, others may be beyond repair to the point where it would be better to demolish the property and use the land for other uses, like public green space. Some locations may be suitable for mixed use, while others may serve a better purpose. It depends on what the area already has vs what it needs. We do not need more housing in areas that are already housing dense, but should focus on making those areas more enjoyable and less car dependent by creating amenities within walking distance.
No. There should be no strategic properties. It is like a green flag to the developer giving him/her great leverage over the town, staff and council.
Yes, because access to arterial roads, proximity to forests and water, and the type of adjacent neighbourhoods and schools would need to be considered.
Yes, due to the factors that make them historic and/or significant.
Yes, because every site presents different opportunities, advantages and disadvantages
See comments already stated
Unless the designated properties are adjacent or relatively close (i.e. less than 3 blocks), each proposed development should be evaluated on its own merits.
Yes. Because some locations are more important than others, and some locations have an opportunity to be a spot of Carleton Place that helps retain the original small town feeling that this and last Council have lost. The old location of Barry's Pet Food on Town line should be turned into a green space for the families that live along the busy and dangerous Town line intersection. Additionally, building a condo is inconsiderate of the people who live in the surrounding area, effectively blocking all sunlight in that area of Ferrill Crescent.

Who even makes these decisions? Do they even live in town? Are they just hungry for a payout?

Ask the residents. Put out a poll. Quit thinking you actually speak for everyone, you don't know best. As has been made evident by the Southwell Land controversy.

Yes, access and location

Yes. Based on location alone they'll fit into different neighborhoods

Probably. In what way do you mean?

Maybe depends on a number of factors and a one size fits all may not work for future designated properties. bwe should limit ourselves

Yes, because some may be preserved and others may be too costly to rehab. If the property on Emily is too expensive to conserve then it would be great to see the majority of space become recreationally focussed and accessible to all in town.

Yes, each site has different characteristics.

Yes. Each one is different and should be tailored to the specific needs of the area.

na

Yes, each property has its own unique characteristic. The development should be based on these characteristics.

Yes as they all have unique features.

Yes, depending on the site's location and on the existing building(s) on the site.

See my first answer

Yes, because some lend themselves better to certain uses than others, e.g. the former Findlay property, due to its prime (almost) downtown, waterside location, has more potential to be developed into a space for gathering to celebrate the arts (build a theatre?), dining, etc. with stunning window and patio views of the river, town hall, new bridge, etc. This space deserves to be used by everyone, whereas the wool growers property with less natural beauty but proximity to shopping, restaurants, etc. could be developed into housing with parkland to enhance the lives of the residents.

Of course, some properties might be better suited for housing, others low lever apts/senior apts

This survey is more or less dictating what the town wants to hear not what individuals want to see. Not enough variety in the survey to make all of our idea's known.

Yes, I do not believe in abolishes rules and we should look to balance development which would consider different treatment.

They should remain or become green space/ park...

Those in the residential downtown core should not be used for medium or high density residential. Anything along the river should be designated as green space.

No. Overall consistency is needed across all.
Yes. Some are located in not easily accessible areas and may need special consideration.
Differently. Not all sites are equal... some are connectable to collector roads, others do not. Both DRS and McArthur Island do not have collector roads that directly attach to arterial roads. Princesses Street traffic will end up on Lake Avenue East, as a residence on Lake Avenue East there are times it is nearly impossible to get out the lane already. This will be compounded with traffic from DRS (when DRS/Leigh Inst. were active the traffic patterns were different due to a lower population base). With a projected population growth part of DRS property should be used to expand Riverside Park (river access, parking). Both Findlay Foundry and Woolgrowers have access to High Street and Franktown Road.
Each instance deserves individual consideration. Treatment should differ if warranted.
No strategic designation for any properties
Yes - each has its own "footprint" and relationship to the buildings in the area. Also, there is the need for increased traffic and how traffic patterns will affect current roadways.
Yes. Different areas have different existing infrastructure and offer different opportunities
Yes. If they are located in different areas in town, as the four previously identified properties are, they have different impacts on their neighbors, infrastructure and road ways. They cannot be lumped into one category of land for redevelopment.
It should be treated differently. Strategic properties might influence the overall perception of the town
Yes, each property and surrounding areas are unique and deserve individual consideration for planning and development.
If a site is fully commercial and privately owned it should not be leveraged as a strategic property.
Yes dependent on location and the attraction of that location eg river versus a trail
yes, some should be preserved
They shouldn't.
Yes, differently - because each is unique and has specific issues that would need to be addressed.
No answer
Yes, we need variety.
Absolutely. Copy/paste buildings evoke Barrhaven! Avoid this at all costs if you wish to remain a small town vibe. Buildings should be purpose and site-specific, keeping in mind the architectural features of existing houses and buildings in CP. Please focus on accessible ground-level spaces for an aging population/ those with strollers, mobility issues.
Each should be considered individually as well as the collective impact on CP
The 4 properties listed are in different states of repair and have different uses. Each sites to be treated in its own context.
Each has its own history and value
Yes, because most times there is history behind the property
Yes, Certain areas that we want intensification may not be supported given the existing infrastructure or road network. Also given their location this can change the diversity of the

lands characteristics. Also some of the community needs vary from property to property. There are also environmental considerations with the strategic properties being close to the river as well some properties have more of an economic and social impact than others
Yes, if they have a heritage building it should try and be incorporated into the development.
Yes -- each property should have a separate consultation and development plans that focus on the local (neighbouring) stakeholders.
Differently but complementary
Of course. They all have different elements, locations, history.
Yes
Yes because each site is different
Yes. There are heritage buildings, flood plains and park lands that need to be part of the plan. Also, the needs of the town as a whole and not a small number of residents adjacent to the site must be taken into account in the planning. For example the Hawthorn site was maligned by adjacent residents as not able to accommodate the high density site plan proposed. Yet it had over the years 150 and sometimes more employees going to it daily.
Yes to accelerate development
Yes. The town residents should have a say in how each is classified and used. Don't lump them all together into a single purpose (big apartment buildings). A spot near a trail should be treated different from a spot near the water.
No equal for all
Properties on the river corridor should not be used for high density development
Differently as each should stand alone depending on location but retain Carleton Place's small town feel. No super modern architecture.
Yes, each property is unique and should have unique consideration. I understand a desire to avoid favouritism, but instead, it feels lazy to say all these properties must be treated identically.
Yes, not all properties are the same and the future need of the property might be slightly different depending on its location.
Yes. Different locations and their proximities to existing amenities, residential, commercial, and industrial spaces give them all unique problems for development.
Not sure
Yes, to preserve the beauty of the river, properties adjacent to the river should require small density housing and more public green space for all to enjoy.
No
Yes, individual strategic properties should be treated differently. You wouldn't want a commercial site in the middle of a residential street.
Yes. Each strategic property presents its own challenges and potential benefits. Any development on a strategic property should be in harmony with the surrounding neighbourhood and not adversely impact that character, look and feel, and traffic of that neighbourhood.
Yes they are in different areas and those areas have different needs

Yes, but not extensively so. The core idea should remain in place for each one.

- Wool Growers should integrate into Carleton Junction park. It may need to subdivide due to the unusually boundaries and nearby parking sprawl (Tim Hortons, Police HQ)
- DRS *must* maintain and enhance both the existing informal desire path that runs along the Mississippi and the historic mill. This should be added to its designation at a policy level. Losing either of these as part of redevelopment would be a major failure of good planning and sensible development.
- Findlay is central and should have had lower parking requirements than other properties.
- Future, to-be-designated Strategic Properties may not be fully appropriate as mixed-use developments if they are too small.
- Some of these properties may be suitable for Transit-Oriented Development. Wool Growers is centrally located and may be ideal for this purpose (who knows, maybe you could put a rail terminal there again!)

no

Yes, some can be to build more accommodations or some could be playgrounds or parks

All should be encouraged to have high density, mixed used development which research demonstrates helps support a healthy city. They should also include publicly accessible green space.

The 3 sites on the water need to take the environment into account.

Yes. For example a high rise downtown is unacceptable, but a high rise by highway 7 could be considered

Yes, there are always exceptions to everything. Certain factors may require that a property be evaluated individually based on its unique nature.

Yes, each strategic property should be treated differently as they will all be different. It's the process that should be the same.

Yes. The Wool Growers already exist in a neighbourhood of mixed uses. The McArthur Island site does not affect neighbouring properties as it is an island. Therefore, mixed uses makes sense. The Findlay Foundry site is a blank slate but should consider the neighbouring properties especially height of structures. As it is adjacent to our Main Street (where there is existing mixed uses) mixed uses for this site makes sense. The former DRS property is surrounded by residential (some century old homes) the river and the public beach. The existing old stone building, I feel is a landmark and should remain if it is sound. It would be nice to see it as a senior residence with some green space. The remaining land mixed residential with low profile structures to blend in with the neighbouring properties. As far as density for this property it should be low to medium as the commuter roads are already at their max with three schools, a church, canoe club, beach/park and sea cadets.

Yes. Different locations and different scales of potential development should see properties treated differently. For example, the current site of the Public Works Yard or the Food Bank property should be treated differently from a property on Bridge Street, or a larger site, like the Caldwell Public School, should any of those be designated as strategic in the future.

All of them have historical significance that should be reflected and acknowledged in their development and design.

All should have specific design criteria to reflect their unique significance to the town because of their prominent location, size, historical significance and opportunity for mixed uses.

All must have significant open space.

The 3 sites adjacent to the river will require careful consideration of storm water management.

Both McArthur Island and the Findlay Foundry site have existing development proposals so it may be difficult to institute desirable criteria at this time.

Yes, individual Strategic Properties should be treated differently from each other due to their unique characteristics, opportunities, and challenges.

Location and Context: Each property's location relative to transportation networks, natural features, and existing infrastructure varies, requiring distinct planning and development strategies.

Historical and Cultural Significance: Properties with unique historical or cultural importance need specialized preservation and integration strategies to maintain their community value.

Community Needs and Preferences: Different neighbourhoods have varying needs and priorities, so customizing development plans ensures the specific requirements and aspirations of local residents are met.

Environmental Considerations: The environmental context, such as proximity to water bodies or green spaces, influences the appropriate development and conservation practices for each property.

Yes, properties with significant forests, waterfront, or historic buildings should be developed in a way that preserves and enhances these.

Every property has its own unique characteristics. Can't have a one size fits all policy for all of them. They all have their own charms and challenges.

Yes - it depends on the location and the current surroundings.

I am once again pointing out that there is no mention of "Strategic Properties" in the Planning Act of Ontario. It is also rather odd that the term "Strategic Properties" is ONLY used by the Director of Development Services and the Planning Department of The Town of Carleton Place and "Strategic Properties" do not appear in any Official Plan of any other Municipality in Canada. In addition, this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Firstly, it's worth noting that there's no mention of Strategic Properties (SP) in the Planning Act of Ontario. It's also rather odd that the term Strategic Properties is ONLY used by the Director of Development Services of the Town of Carleton Place (CP) and the concept of SP doesn't appear in any Official Plan of any other Municipality in Canada.

Secondly, CP doesn't have the infrastructure (facilities, systems) to support mid-and-high-density housing developments. It's common knowledge that the infrastructure has to establish first in order to sustain and service mid-and-high-density developments. It also has been proven that higher-density living raises major concerns about quality of life of residents, such as noise pollution, overcrowding, lack of green spaces, and limited privacy (affecting residents' well-being and satisfaction with their living environment).

Lastly, it's appalling that this SURVEY questionnaire is biased and encourages the acceptance of Strategic Properties!

Answered: 131 Skipped: 119