

Comments from	Preferred Option	General Comments
Janet McGinnis	2	<p>It is admirable that the Town is finding ways to meet population targets without requiring expensive annexation. I assume that "sensitive infill" would be reflect the character, size and materials of adjacent existing development. This would be particularly important in heritage areas. Scenario 1 would jeopardize these heritage areas. Intensification is necessary to maximize exciting hard services however it is also necessary to have new development harmonize with existing development no matter where it takes place in town. The scenarios have a Goldilocks quality with Scenario 1 being higher density anywhere, Scenario 3 is continuing low density sprawl and Scenario 2 is just right.</p>
Bill Slade	2	<p>How Will it Impact Me? Increased traffic, crowded shops, restaurants, the demand for certain services, reduced response time for medical, fire and police services emergencies. Our goal is to downsize in a few years to an apartment or townhouse, ultimately towards retirement or assisted living accommodation in Carleton Place as the years progress. The success of this plan may very well determine where and what is available.</p> <p>Comments on the Three Scenarios Scenario One: High density in a smaller area. This scenario limits the ability to construct an encompassing variety of housing options to meet forecasted requirements. Development within the town has to include integration within the existing neighborhoods. The requirement to meet the forecasted housing needs within the available land boundaries will reduce the ability to ensure the appropriate amount of open green spaces and recreational areas within the town limits.</p> <p>Scenario 2 (preferred option): Medium Density across a Larger area. Development can focus on integration within existing neighborhoods and allow for increasing green spaces and recreational facilities in conjunction with the increase in population density. This scenario allows the entire range of housing options with a greatly reduced focus on single-housing development. Using a concentric approach for development within Carleton Place and this scenario will maximize integration into existing neighborhoods in the least disruptive manner. This scenario will also allow the historical integrity of the town to be enhanced, integrated, and developed. It is the most inclusive scenario to meet the needs of our aging population, development of retirement facilities and amenities.</p> <p>Scenario Three -Low density across the entire town. This scenario will re-enforce the addiction to single housing developments. In today's housing shortage reducing housing density decreases the focus to meet the forecasted demands for affordable housing. Least desirable option.</p> <p>Comments, Thoughts on our Housing Situation Local families want their children to have the option to live and thrive in the lifestyle Carleton Place has to offer. Others want to leave the bustling confines of a large city. Some due to covid and technology are looking for a more relaxed small-town atmosphere as their job function now allows them to work from home. Still, others look outside large cities for more affordable accommodation. Within Lanark County and Carleton Place there is a current crisis in the availability of subsidized housing. This demand continues to grow and needs addressing. Scenario 2 promotes a younger family-oriented generation to start backfilling Carleton Places' aging population. It allows seniors a path to downsizing freeing up existing housing stock without the requirement to leave Carleton Place. Presently the crisis in housing shortage, including available housing, rental units and new home starts, as well as the cost of building materials has driven the price of accommodation up dramatically. Families and individuals wanting to move out of cities are forced to bypass our beautiful town. Carleton Place has seen a dramatic rise in the price of housing over the past few months. It is forecast that due to a housing shortage and a shortfall in new housing starts, this housing crisis will continue for a number of years unless interest rates rise dramatically. To safeguard new buyers from over-extending, the government is tightening mortgage requirements. The rental market is also not keeping up with demands despite a solid increase in rental construction, the pace isn't nearly enough. The number of housing units forecast to be repossessed will be insignificant in housing availability numbers unless interest rates that are at a historical low dramatically increase. The cost of the material has escalated at an extreme pace. In a development in Carleton Place originally the base cost of a townhouse six months ago ran around \$550K. Today, that same unit starting price is around \$650K. Existing single housing units are selling in a bidding war for well over the asking price. KPMG in a recent study found that only 54% of those surveyed between the ages of 23 to 38 believe they will never be able to buy a home of their own.</p>

		<p>With these challenges, Carleton Place has to focus its housing strategy and improve what has become a dire situation for many in our lower-income sector and those in the Millennial, Gen Z, and the Boomers now facing downsizing or assisted living. Many Municipalities have put aside their addiction to single-family homes and encourage development of townhouses or apartments, in addition, to offer relief to nonprofits and increase the availability of subsidized housing.</p> <p>Concerns and Recommendations: Climate Change has to be incorporated into all planning and decision-making regarding future development. Infrastructure should be upgraded to accommodate both the existing and proposed housing development.</p> <p>Amenities such as the pool, beach, parks, arena and library should be continually evaluated</p> <p>Increase in traffic. Carleton Place is not currently designed to handle a larger population. McNeely Avenue, a major cross-town transit reduces from 4 lanes to 2 at a bridge. This will include widening existing streets and planned integration of traffic from new developments.</p> <p>Parking has to be considered. All applications for development should have a parking plan that accommodates the needs of the development.</p> <p>Timely access to critical services. All medical, fire, and police services are located on the downtown side of the river.</p> <p>One final thought, by 2038 the world's population is forecasted to be 10B. As climate change occurs and sea levels rise by the turn of the century or sooner, an estimated 2B climate change refugees. 110M in North America alone from flooded coastal cities. How do you plan for those days?</p> <hr/> <p><i>Follow up email:</i></p> <p>Does the Official Plan contain statements regarding climate change, it's affect on our community and plans for adaptation that would be applicable in all three scenarios of development?</p> <p>Would you recommend this is the document we should consider inclusion?</p> <p>Over the next few years the impact of climate change has to be inclusive in our development planning. Builder have to be guided either through encouragement, by-laws or changes to the building code as we face intensity in weather, invasive species, vast reduction in burning fossil fuel, droughts, health concerns, food sourcing and so on.</p> <p>Sustainable development will include areas to be considered i.e.: lowlands, flood plains, wetlands and the potential of intense wind or rain activity and flooding.</p> <p>The Official Plan should contain statements regarding the effect on our infrastructure of these events and our plans to deal with them over the time period of the document.</p> <p>I did most of my climate change courses with Baltic Universities. We are so far behind in sustainable development and adaptation to climate change. The IPCC warned us of catastrophic consequences in 13 years, four years ago. While we may not be in an area of catastrophic consequences we will certainly feel the affect and impact.</p> <p>It gets back to my question, is this the document that should address development plans, infrastructure replacement or upgrades and our climate future?</p>
Jan Hopkins	2	<p>I wanted to say that my inclination was for the second scenario, as it seemed to be the better balance of interests.</p>

Jackie Kavanagh		<p>Great work on pulling on this together in an easily readable and understandable format. Sorry for my late response.</p> <p>The 2 biggest issues/challenges I see are around 1. traffic 2. affordability.</p> <p>Any of the scenarios detailed could be favourable but considerations around traffic flow along major arteries and traffic flow north/south need to be considered. With only so many crossing points over the river, the placement of larger unit developments will need to be strategically considered. Developments that are closer to HWY infrastructure make more sense because people can flow into the downtown but also access the Hwy corridor more easily. It would be interesting to know how many cars per household as well. On-street parking seems to have become an issue and too much density could lead to even greater problems with this.</p> <p>The 2nd key issue is affordability. With the housing market moving in the direction it is, I wonder how many/who can still afford brand new single-family homes. If we want to ensure we have housing stock that is affordable to the greater population, semis and low rise apartments should definitely plan a role in future growth.</p>
Cheryl Batten	1	<p>I believe that intensification is necessary. Option 1 is the best option and I firmly believe that this town needs more apartments/condos in the downtown area. Higher density in the downtown will result in a vibrant downtown rather than one that is continually struggling. Walkability should be taken into account when determining residential areas. Access to services for those who do not own a vehicle should be a concern. Option 2 is more reasonable but I think it is still lacking in that apartments and condos, spread throughout the town, will be out of reach of most services. I don't think Option 3 is an option at all. It would result in the need for much more costly infrastructure which of course, means a lot more taxes. Spread means that every household has to have a vehicle to get around. Very little would be within walking distance. And lastly, a few questions: I'd like to know if the vacant land calculation for Mississippi Res District includes the .4 hectares of the combined Allan Street/Charles Street properties. Will Option 3 use all of the available land and then annexing would be necessary for any future growth past 2038? The map is difficult to read. It's not clear where the four intensification sites are. Please confirm. Low rise apartments of 4 floors are shown in both Option 1 and 2. Will the new bylaw of 2 floors max have to be repealed to accept these options? Thank you</p>
Bruce Patterson	NA	<p>It is important to have walk ways and a bike trail network to make walking and biking safe for residents and to encourage people to walk and bike instead of driving in a car. Path ways that link neighbourhoods are important such as a walkway from the water tower neighbourhood to the Walmart area. It would be great to leave parts of the town in their natural state like an urban forest. Lots of green space is good for residents and nature. Plenty of wide sidewalks and pedestrian crossing lights help to make pedestrians feel safe.</p>
Mark Hinton	2	<p>I am in support of Growth Plan 2, including urban greenfields in addition to all other vacant land within the existing built-up area, including a future residential district. I appreciate the fact that CP is growing and am in favor of this growth but, not in favor of expanding the town limits. There is plenty of area within the existing town limits to accommodate the projected growth. I would also like to see more emphasis on Infill & Intensification of vacant lands and strategic properties within walking distance of our downtown core. This is a great opportunity to build high density units within existing developments and support downtown Carleton Place businesses. There is obviously a great need for affordable housing within CP and would encourage council to insensitive builders with tax breaks and subsidies to encourage these types of units. Utilizing infill within the town limits would make this possible and sustainable.</p>
Michelle van Marum	NA	<p>Good day. I am a citizen deeply concerned with the lack of affordable housing in our town. The three scenarios do not seem to be planning for much affordable housing at all. Where is that in the town's long term planning? Scenario three especially, does not seem to be providing for units that the average wage earner could possibly afford. This is of special concern to me, as I feel that if Carleton Place does not actively make allowances for smaller more affordable units, it will impact more than just the house hunting market. Eventually all the young people will leave the town as they will not be able to make a go if it. Additionally all the lower income workers such as servers, hair dressers, baristas, clerks, and most blue collar workers will not be able to afford to live in this community where we hope they will work. This has potential to impact the economy in more</p>

		ways than just housing. Carleton Place cannot increase the number of jobs in our town without making sure the workers we hope to attract can afford to live here. As a resident of Carleton Place I would like to see high density housing with lots of smaller affordable units sprinkled all throughout our community . Please adjust your planning so that seniors, those on assistance and those minimum wage folks that we want to come work in our retail and service jobs can afford to live in the beautiful community they work in and have relationships in. Let's be known as an inclusive community that cares about housing all its residents regardless of income level . Thank you for reading this.
Laura Cupper / David Scott	3	We would prefer that Carleton Place not increase its population by 97% . We prefer Growth Scenario #3 provided provisions are included for parks, playing fields etc.
Gerry Andrews	2	Great presentation. Preferred option is Scenario # 2. Any future development must avoid any development upstream from the current water supply intake . Please avoid future colossal blunders like the permit given to Cavanaugh construction to develop the Bodnar lands upstream from the Towns water intake. For example , development of the rural greenfield upstream from the intake in Scenario #3 should not be permitted . Since the River is the key and most important feature of the Town it must be protected at all cost for future generations. Unfortunately, its importance has not be fully recognized by either Council or planners in the past.
Aaron Niedbala	Hybrid 1-2	<p>Firstly, I believe Scenario 3 is quite undesirable for a wide variety of reasons: environmental, societal, financial (including affordable housing), aesthetic etc. Car-dependent sprawl is a mistake Canadian cities have been making for decades, but not one that we need to continue making in Carleton Place. It is my understanding that, broadly speaking, this is the majority opinion of residents of Carleton Place and I sincerely hope that Scenario 3 isn't seriously considered.</p> <p>While I'm not personally against it, I do not think that Scenario 1 is realistically achievable. It requires infilling all existent vacant properties within the city with high density dwellings. This feels like a very aggressive stance to take and doesn't really meet the objective of balanced growth. It could also backfire and create additional demand for low-density housing in adjacent municipalities. However, the density targets set by Scenario 1 may be desirable for some specific properties (eg. some of the Strategic Properties).</p> <p>There is a lot of room between Scenarios 1 and 2. Scenario 1 boils down to "develop *no* Urban Greenfields" while 2 boils down to "develop *all* Urban Greenfields". The Urban Greenfields that are added in Scenario 2 account for a 75% increase in built area over Scenario 1 - that's a huge difference! Additionally, the classification of UG vs. Intensification Site (IS) seems fairly arbitrary in some cases. Specifically UG-40 and UG-30 seem like they could easily be classified as Intensification Sites for the purposes of this Review.</p> <p>The UG-50 district is enormous; distant from downtown and other shopping; would be poorly integrated into the rest of the town if not developed carefully; would result in car-dependant sprawl if done all at once. I oppose development of UG-50 as a homogeneous block of undifferentiated housing. If it is to be developed, it should be done incrementally over time to allow for the possibility of new amenities or shopping, connections with the rest of town, new transportation options, schools, parks etc. If its current classification as a residential district precludes this then that classification should be revisited. I would even prefer modest portions of RG-50 or RG-10 (eg. not more than 20%) be developed compared to the prospect of UG-50 becoming a sprawling block of residential housing.</p> <p>Balanced development implies development of all sorts, shapes and densities: high, medium and low. None of the current Scenarios really achieves the objective of balanced growth. Since there is so much room between Scenarios 1 and 2, and each of them on its own has issues, I would prefer a new hybrid Scenario somewhere between Scenarios 1 and 2. I'll present an illustrative example of such a Scenario here, but this is just a suggestion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - some specific sites (Strategic Properties) would be targeted for intensification up to levels suggested in Scenario 1 (or even higher than the current density limits in the town's OP). - UG-40 and UG-30 are classified as Intensification Sites and developed as such - UG-20 included as medium density. - A modest portion of UG-50 (eg. not more than 30% of it) is included as medium-low density.

		<p>Other notes:</p> <p>I recognize that the following comments may be outside the scope of what's being considered in this phase of the Comprehensive Review. I'll mention these here anyway since city planning is a holistic process (and, after all, it is a *Comprehensive* Review).</p> <p>- The Highway District is conspicuously absent from this review. I understand that it's being reconsidered as part of the upcoming OP review. But there is considerable opportunity to add housing to this district, so it's relevant here already. Additionally, even the naming of this district fundamentally limits its potential and detracts from its integration into the surrounding areas. As the Highway District is surrounded by residential areas, it will become increasingly important to integrate these areas into something more cohesive. Their rigid separation contributes to car-oriented development and lifestyle. And the rigid zoning preventing residential development unnecessarily forces development into other areas.</p> <p>- The Background Report assumed a 55% net area available for housing in greenfields. I believe that the width of residential streets in new developments is too wide and leads to unnecessary waste of land; lowered walkability; lowered density; higher upkeep and maintenance costs to the municipality; and affects the look and feel of new neighbourhoods. I would like to challenge this assumption and propose narrower streets, one-way streets and/or other modern traffic patterns in new developments as a way of addressing all of these problems. The design of road networks directly affects the way neighbourhoods can be designed and implemented.</p> <p>- Many of the problems with new developments (destruction of mature trees; disruptive construction; and especially the "cookie cutter" look and feel) are attributable to their scale ie. the amount of land developed as part of a single project. Consider the differences between the Bodnar subdivision and the building nearing completion at the end of Bell St. The Bell St. building has maintained most of its mature trees and integrates fairly well into the character of its neighbourhood. Even for new, greenfield developments, we can develop incrementally at smaller scale to attain these same benefits.</p>
Amit Patel	2	I prefer Growth Scenario 2 for Carleton place
Shane Edwards		<p>I noticed that there did not seem to be much information about the role of highrise buildings to address the density issues. Given that there was a proposal for a highrise on the Emily Street property I assume that the Municipality has looked at the issue. I had also thought one of the preliminary discussions of buildings in the south area of CP included highrise accommodation. Does the virtual package materials include consideration of highrises for residences?</p> <p>Also is there a CGIS map for Carleton Place? I have found it a good resource for some of the other local municipalities.</p>
Walter Anthony Scott	2	<p>Scenario 1: Increased density 45/34 units/ha does save the greenfields from residential exploitation, but also increases local service demand and also increases the possibility of NIMBY resentment.</p> <p>Scenario 2: 40/30 Uses more greenfields but spreads out development whilst leaving some greenfields available for alternative developments and also unexpected further population increase.</p> <p>Scenario 3: 35/26 Leaves very little expansion possibility without extending boundaries.</p> <p>COVID-19 is showing that many people don't want to live in apartments but want the freedom of a house with a yard. An argument for Scenario 3. However the new rental units in Carleton Place are doing very well, which is an argument in favour of Scenarios 1 and 2.</p> <p>On the whole I would prefer to see Scenario 2 followed for the future growth of the town</p>

Melanie Boyd	3	<p>After studying the open house information package, we believe that Scenario 3 is the preferred option for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it allows for sensitive infill in residential areas and prevents impact on existing residents in those areas of the town - it includes a lower density option for strategic properties along the Mississippi River which should help to minimize ecological impacts on the river - following lower density development in areas of the town that are closer to the historic downtown core will help to minimize impacts on traffic flow in this area and help to preserve the character of this part of town which is an important feature of Carleton Place
Maciej.matthias@gmail.com	2	<p>Thank you for an informative and clear presentation of the situation. I believe that the only responsible option is option two, where we keep the rural greenfields green for a few more years. This leaves additional growing room for the future, and moves the town in the direction of some high density dwellings. This option would hopefully encourage clean up of underutilized or derelict existing properties and replacement with new buildings that will improve the overall appeal of Carleton Place.</p>
Marc Scheppler	1-2	<p>Scenario 1 or 2 make more sense. I hope this development plan will not be more advantageous to Developer versus citizens, as we are seeing an increase of prices, overcrowded sub-divisions that have been built and are currently being planned. We move to Carleton Place to enjoy the tranquility and nature the town offers. If growth is anticipated then this should be at the forefront of developments to come by keeping the small country town charm we currently enjoy. Affordable housing is always at the forefront of new housing developments, but now we see that home ownership is fast becoming a luxury that many cannot afford. Rules that developers have to abide by are now not in the favour of buyers. City counsel needs to ensure that homes built are beneficial to citizens and abides to vision of what Carleton place should look like. Lot sizes, height of buildings are some factors that need to be enforced as well as competition and subsidies to build new homes to level the playing field and provide more affordable housing prices of newly built homes. This last point probably needs to involve provincial as well as federal partners to bring affordability of housing to citizens of Lanark county.</p>
Name Withheld	3	<p>Build out not intensify. Enough rental and du/tri/quadplexes. CP is already losing character and appeal. CP starting to look trashy. IMPORTANT - Enact bylaw that curbs inconsiderate, ill-mannered builders, eg: Pat Linnen / Gord Scott at 119 Bell: (1) police called 2x due to noise, blocking streets & sidewalks, (2) perimeter fence often left open, rubbish blowing all over, (3) worked 7days/week - no noise-free day, (4) not informing neighbors of asbestos risk. IMPORTANT - Enact bylaw for onsite parking increase like Almonte. Our ratio is too low, thus forcing on-street parking.</p>
Mark Smith	na	<p>Detailed comment break down of each section of the current Official Plan. To be reviewed by staff as part of the comprehensive policy review.</p>
Bill Katsoulis		<p>The Highway District, a land designation in the Official Plan (2013) was not included in the growth scenarios provided in the Comprehensive Review Background Report. This is to be expected as residential use is not permitted in the Highway District. However, our firm recognizes this area as having great development potential and asks the Town to consider allowing residential use in the Highway District in the amended Official Plan.</p>
LGL Health Unit		<p>Build compact neighbourhoods with a mix of land uses to support pedestrian and cycle environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Build a robust active transportation network (e.g., cycling, walking, transit) to encourage healthier transportation, decreased use of motorized vehicles, and improve access to transportation infrastructure for people who do not own a personal motor vehicle. Prioritize moving people, as opposed to just moving motor vehicles. <input type="checkbox"/> When road improvements and/or new developments are undertaken, consider conditions of approval including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Traffic-calming infrastructure

		<p>o Streetscaping features. Planting trees and installing other amenities (e.g., benches, planter boxes) to create an inviting streetscape to maximize youth-, family-, and age-friendliness of the area.</p> <p>Supportive infrastructure for active transportation such as bicycle-activated street lights, pedestrian rest areas, and bicycle parking.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> All new roads shall be designed as Complete Streets</p> <p>Encourage accessibility features in parks, trails and recreational facilities and connectivity of local active transportation infrastructure, including the Ottawa Valley Rail Trail (OVRT). Accessibility and connectivity features allow for more equitable access to community amenities and induce greater use and physical activity.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> When developing, maintaining and improving parks, trails and recreational facilities, consider the inclusion of park amenities that improve the health promoting and health protecting features of the space.</p> <p>Create a community garden to encourage increased physical activity, healthy eating, knowledge of the food system, increased mental well-being, and social connections.</p> <p>o Installation of a splash pad as it provides a family-friendly recreation option and more equitable access for cooling down during days of extreme heat, especially for community members who may not have access to air conditioning or other cool-down methods.</p> <p>o Provision of sufficient shade structures (e.g., trees, built structures) and a source of free, potable water to help prevent heat-related illnesses.</p> <p>o Installation of a playground with barrier-free components and surfaces to allow for optimal accessibility and natural/adventure play components that encourage challenging play experiences, creativity, and age appropriate risk-taking behaviour.</p> <p>o Design standards that support the creation of community hubs to provide opportunities for recreation, social interaction, a sense of ownership over the space, and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED).</p> <p>Implement a community-wide compost program to encourage residents to compost food waste, thereby reducing the Town's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by reducing food decomposition in garbage dumps.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Support citizens in their efforts to grow their own food.</p> <p>Promote the provision of an adequate supply and range of housing types. Housing is an important determinant of health. Affordable housing can make it easier for people of all socioeconomic status to obtain a safe place to live.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Encourage economic development, including through diverse land use designations and emphasis on preserving natural heritage features such as the Mississippi River. Income is an important determinant of health.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Develop design standards to support the creation of neighbourhood hubs to provide opportunities for recreation and social interaction. Include commercial grade kitchens in adequate space to allow for safe food literacy and meal sharing activities.</p> <p>Protect natural and cultural heritage features including wetlands and animal habitats. Protecting the natural environment is an important factor for maintaining and/or improving outdoor air quality, increasing carbon sequestration, decreasing local temperatures, and providing outdoor recreation areas. Natural storm water management infrastructure (e.g., wetlands) help build a municipality's resilience to extreme weather events such as flooding or heavy rainfall. While planning for the expected population growth of the Town, consider the economic value provided by the Town's existing natural infrastructure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incorporate vegetation and tree-planting in new, existing, and future developments to assist with dissipation of localized heat, increase areas for shade, and reduce water runoff and soil erosion.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Promote energy efficient development that uses alternative or renewable energy sources. These types of developments can decrease the amount of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that originate in a municipality.</p>
--	--	--

Nu Globe Developments Ltd.		<p>This letter is intended to provide commentary on the major points explored within the Survey, and communicate my Client's desire for their lands to be considered as appropriate for <i>both</i> commercial and residential land uses, in part to help to address current and future economic and development interests of the Town of Carleton Place. A redesignation of the subject lands to accommodate a mix of commercial and residential uses could be considered as part of the ongoing Municipal Comprehensive Review.</p>
Houchaimi Holdings Inc.		<p>This letter, which is intended to be constructive, challenges aspects of the ongoing study's inputs and the associated results – specifically the notion that there is enough land supply within the existing Town boundary. We agree with the assertion that the approved growth projections will be realized, but in the paragraphs below, we argue that the projections likely fall short of the actual development trends in Carleton Place, and that based upon available information, it appears as though the County's population projections should be met in advance of 2033.</p> <p>Put simply, the Town's approval of any of the three growth scenarios – and lack of consideration of further annexation – could amount to a short term throttling of growth and development and could cause an approvals backlog in the medium and long term.</p> <p>Until there is evidence to suggest that the rate of growth will not continue to increase, it would be more appropriate to prioritize permit issuance figures in 2019 and 2020 and assume a higher annual number of building permits issued (e.g. 315 new units per year). A rate of 315 building permits per year would position the Town to satisfy the demand of 3,124 units identified in the Background Report in fewer than 10 years. Over a 20-year planning horizon, this approach could amount to as many as 6,300 new dwelling units or an approximate population growth of approximately 14,250 to 15,5005.</p>