

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

FOCUS GROUP COMMENTING PRIOR TO OR FOLLOWING MEETING HELD JULY 24th, 2012			
Date Comments Received	Author / Owner / or General Public	Nature of Concern, Comment or Inquiry	Actions / Response by Staff
1 July 18, 2012	Eric Hampel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Would like to see remaining vacant land used for wetlands, parks and commercial development. ~ Looks for vibrant business and small town feel. ~ Supports nature trail network linkage between Shagbark and Mann complex. ~ Seeks clarification on higher densities shown as to whether they are for diversification of housing stock and longer term, since they are shown on properties that may have development already. ~ Supports addition of park space in north Ridgeway. ~ Believes promoting a heritage aspect to Village would benefit tourism. ~ Questions identification of Nigh and Ridge as a principal gateway and believes Gotham and Nigh might be more representative of this in terms of wayfinding signage directing to Ridgeway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Much of the vacant lands will be utilized for residential development if not already draft approved. There are opportunities for additional commercial and staff will maintain a planned location for a neighbourhood park in north Ridgeway. ~ Planning staff will be looking to support commerce through it proposed policies. ~ Intensification areas are needed in order to provide for variation of the predominant single detached while providing for the planned population at the 2031 planning horizon. Locations will be considered that are walkable to key destinations like the downtown, Gorham, parks & schools. ~ Planning staff intend to strengthen policies for the downtown and tourism in addition to build on the complete community principles and improved pedestrian realm. ~ Gateway locations will be reviewed during the process.
2 August 6, 2012	Claudia Chiesi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Indicates she is speaking on behalf of herself and of POA/TBA as their vice chair. ~ does not support commercial development outside current downtown and Gorham areas. ~ Dismisses the commercial at Bernard and Thunder Bay. Cites Bernard and Dominion already commercial and failing. ~ States beach is small and can only support existing and future residents. Adverting to the broader public will overwhelm the park with trash, etc.... ~ believes the drainage works in area of Bernard have failed to alleviate the problems and that adding additional density will exacerbate the problems. ~ Cites personal objections to opening Wells Avenue for a new road, the roundabout on TBay over at RBTL and additional development will defeat the ecology of open spaces and animal corridors and subsequently diminish the ambiance/appeal of Thunder Bay. ~ for each of the above she has indicated added costs to the Town would result. ~ Would prefer a modest approach (to development I assume) that reduces costs, keeps taxes contained, and protects fragile beach and green corridors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Staff indicated that the location of the potential commercial was something identified in the 2009 plan which was adopted by Council. Staff will consider comment. ~ Staff recognize Bernard Beach park area limited in size but is not prepared to recommend select public access. ~ Comments on area drainage will be conveyed to IS. ~ Staff indicate the Wells is shown as a "conceptual" road and no commitment to construct a new road has been made. ~ Draft Plan activity is or will occur and result in future development in the Thunder Bay and Maple Leaf area and that improvements to the roads will be made in those areas by the developers as a requirement of approval. ~ Staff will consider the comments made when reviewing future land use plans and drafting policy.

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

PUBLIC COMMENTING LEADING INTO AND FOLLOWING FIRST PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING HELD JULY 31TH, 2012			
Date Comments Received	Author / Owner / or General Public	Nature of Concern, Comment or Inquiry	Actions / Response by Staff
1 July 31st, 2012	Donald Readatt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notes the plan shows connection of Yacht Harbour with North Shore and wants to know how the Town is going to acquire the private road? - Wants to know if improvements are done, who will be assessed the charge (meaning just those owners via local improvement charges, or from the Town's general levy / DC's)? - Indicates the majority of owners on Yacht Harbour do not want the connection and would prefer to remain in a quiet setting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff will give consideration to the comments made and concerns of the residents on maintaining the road as private. - from a pure planning perspective, the connection make sense for improved permeability and pedestrian connection / access. - Staff are aware present status of the road is very narrow. - Staff will be consulting Fire Services respecting emergency response - any efforts to connect the roads will require extensive discussion on many aspects and the mere fact that it is being identified, does not commit the Town to securing the connection, but rather, that it is a desirable future condition or solution that would improve connections in the neighbourhood..
2 July 31st, 2012	Stephen & Katen Golden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the connection being made between North Shore and Yacht Harbour. - Provides details on experience with roadway width and how difficult it is to navigate when any additional vehicles are present. - connecting two streets would bring more traffic down it compounding problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (Same as above)
3 August 1st, 2012	Mike & Eileen Walker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports Village Square. - Likes idea of quaint downtown with lots of flowers along streetscape. - Would like to see 283 removed asap. - Would like to see the Beer Store relocated over to Gorham and repurpose to property. - questions delay in Village Square construction. Was told budget existed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff confirms plans are moving forward with Village Square. - Staff confirms 283 Ridge Road N. is being dealt with in terms of demolition and divestment. - Staff will be supporting Village character in draft Secondary Plan.
4 August 1st, 2012	Bill Morkem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - wanted to know what dashed line along his property line represented. - Would like to see Thunder Bay Road extended through to Gorham from Ridge. - Road Allowance doesn't drain and is mosquito haven. - was told by previous directors (Reinas and Mostacci) that the road should develop with lots on south side to help pay for infrastructure. All felt it was critical link for cars and peds to connect Crystal Beach with Thunder Bay Neighbourhood. - Would like to know current planning staff position. - Mr. Morkem provided a sketch to staff showing how the area south of an extended Thunder Bay Road could develop. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dashed line on Plan represents a conceptual road location. - Respecting extension of Thunder Bay Road, the approved Neighbourhood Plan did not support it and the Town's park space (Crystal Ridge) extend north and fronts the road. - discussion on developing the road allowance may have occurred in past, however there are no current plans to build a road. Further consideration will be given during the Secondary Plans development. - Planning staff do see potential as a pedestrian link in future.
5 August 3rd, 2012	Cathy & Kevin McLoughlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports retention of downtown as charming village setting with unique/specially commercial and shops. - Wants to know when 283 will be torn down - is detracting from good work done on streetscape. - Wants to know when Village Square will be completed. - Supports idea of light industry at Gorham provided it is well regulated. - Would like to see the Beer Store move to Gorham and the existing Beer Store location used for parking. It would also get rid of big diesel trucks idling at the back of the town houses causing smelly emissions. - Does not support the Bernard / Thunder Bay Rd. location for commercial. Does not see a need for it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff will be proposing to strengthen policy for retention of character in Village core area. - Staff confirms 283 Ridge Road N. is being dealt with in terms of demolition and divestment. - Staff cannot pinpoint Village Square completion date. It is hoped to have construction started before yearend. - will consider remaining comments going forward.
6 August 7th, 2012	Peter Atrajs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not support opening Wells Avenue. - Bought recently and reason being the open space and forested Town lands. - Home to many animals - will move if built. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wells Avenue is shown as conceptual. - Town staff will give consideration to its future use as we go forward through the process.
7 August 8th, 2012	Barb Carlsson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wanted to know if ownership adjacent to Wells would be receiving Notice of the proposed change. - felt turn out at meeting was poor. Believes many are away on vacation and the Notice in the paper didn't indicate changes on the map. Believes most people remain unaware. - Would like to get a copy of the Natural Areas Inventory maps. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the Town ever decided to construct the road (Wells), it is likely requiring a Municipal Class EA C Class, which would include notification of the adjacent owners. - Staff considers the turn out of approximate 35 people quite reasonable. Furthermore, Staff believe the seasonal residents are in town to better capture their input. - Since been advised Ms. Carlsson had found the NAI on-line.

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

8	August 8th, 2012	Cathy & Kevin McLoughlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ wants date by which 283 will be removed. ~ questions about property standards (referred to By-law Enf.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ contacted Mr. McLoughlin to indicate actual date cannot be pinned down, only estimated. ~ Follow up on conceptual status of Wells Road Allowance.
9	August 9th, 2012	Peter Arajs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ indicates he has spoken with Councillor. ~ hopes matter can be resolved soon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Spoke with Councillor and confirmed there were no immediate plans for Wells to be constructed and it was showing on plans as "conceptual".
10	August 9th, 2012	Joan McNeil c/o Barb Carlson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ wishes the meeting was better attended. ~ Does not see a need for Wells to be constructed. ~ wants attention to drainage in the Bernard Beach Area. ~ believes Bernard is over extended and people are nit picking up after themselves. ~ does not think commercial at Bernard and TBay is a good idea. The Bernard / Dominion is enough. ~ Agrees downtown area could use more apartments but would like to limit to 3 storey. ~ Would like to see 283 demolished and public washrooms for the Village Square. ~ Agrees that the entrance to the Gorham area commercial needs enhancement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Staff considers the turn out of approximate 35 people quite reasonable. Furthermore, Staff believe the seasonal residents are in town to better capture their input. ~ No determination on Wells has been made. Remains conceptual. Will consider during process. ~ Planning staff are aware that additional drainage improvements for Bernard are planned by Infrastructure Services. ~ Staff notes opinion on Bernard and Thunder Bay commercial. ~ Planning staff welcomes support for additional density in and around downtown. ~ Planning staff have indicated that an RFP for redevelopment was being prepared for release. One component being requested is for public washrooms. ~ Planning staff would agree that the Gorham commercial area could use some beautification assistance.
11	August 9th, 2012	Michael Dunn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Would like information about a meeting regarding Wells Avenue extension. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ No extension proceeding at this time. Road remains conceptual. Will consider fate of Wells during process.
12	August 10th, 2012	Bruce Tomlinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Lives Beside Wells Avenue ROW. Identifies self as Board member of POATBA. ~ Does not agree with Wells being constructed, citing nature and ecological use and wind break from winter winds. ~ Critical of Town's engineering for drainage in Bernard. ~ Critical of in-filling in area and poor repair of road following servicing. Would prefer 80' lots. does not like variances being allowed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ No extension proceeding at this time. Road remains conceptual. Will consider fate of Wells during process. ~ Planning staff are aware that additional drainage works are scheduled by Infrastructure Services. ~ In-filling acceptable practice. Thunder Bay has plenty of in-fill potential. Infilling with 80' lots not efficient use of services.
13	August 10th, 2012	Charles Kautz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Takes issue with development signs not being updated. ~ critical of crumbling infrastructure and lack of infrastructure in the existing areas while new subdivision plans area approved and abandon. ~ Identifies self as "Steward" for storm discharge that terminates at Erie on his property. ~ His chosen words imply he is to be consulted and give permission prior to development approvals in the watershed. ~ indicates longstanding and documented riparian and property rights with government ministries. ~ requests copies of EIS & Hydraulic studies. ~ Would like tributary named as Kautz Creek. ~ Indicates his studies are available to any Ministry that requests them and claims to make annual report submissions to MOE. ~ Speaks about degradation to water quality having fiscal impacts on his family. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Two sets of comments received. Appears this set may be from individual perspective. ~ Town practice has been that if Developer makes request for change the sign must be updated. If changes are result of Town / Agency commenting, sign typically not requested to be updated. ~ Mr. Kautz makes claims and requests that Planning staff are unable to respond to with assurance. Copies of his comments will be supplied to IS for their consideration on response. ~ Town is not the authority for creek naming. Planning staff will investigate responsible authority.

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

<p>14 August 10th, 2012</p>	<p>Charles Kautz</p>	<p>~ Identifies self as President of the "Thunder Bay Association of Home Owners on the south side of Thunder Bay Road". ~ Does not agree with concept road passing through properties south of Thunder Bay Road. Would like it removed. ~ Does not support commercial at the corner of Bernard and Thunder Bay Rd. and states more appropriate at Dominion and Bernard. ~ Does not recognize the the Bernard Road Allowance as a "Park" in terms of designation. Maintains that the road allowance is just that, a road allowance for access. In this case he says his members use it frequently for property maintenance and related needs. ~ indicates the storm drainage infrastructure installed by the Town has caused social, economic and environmental problems. Indicates the works have pushed beach goes further up the shores and along onto private property which has lead to many confrontations. Also states this has lead to all kinds of illicit activity including threats and arson. ~ states Bernard can not handle any more flows and any new captured flows should be sent to 6 mile creek for discharge. ~ Requests copy of C of A for Bernard outlet.</p>	<p>~ Second set of comments imply they are being submitted on behalf of residents on south side of Thunder Bay Road. ~ Acknowledge comment regarding conceptual road shown on plan. Planning staff will consider during process. ~ Acknowledge comment regarding commercial identity at Bernard and Thunder Bay. Planning staff will consider during process. ~ Town staff will consult appropriate staff regarding status / designation as "park". Resident's use this as access to their waterfronts for maintenance. ~ Planning staff are aware that additional drainage work is scheduled for the Bernard area. ~ concerns expressed regarding trespassing are matters for law enforcement, particularly those resulting in violence and vandalism. ~ Planning staff will provide Infrastructure Services with comments received.</p>
-----------------------------	----------------------	--	---

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

PUBLIC COMMENTING LEADING INTO AND FOLLOWING SECOND PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING HELD FEBRUARY 26TH, 2013			
Date Comments Received	Author / Owner / or General Public	Nature of Concern, Comment or Inquiry	Actions / Response by Staff
1 February 26th, 2013	Derrick Dea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Would like to see more imagination in transportation provisions such as buses, bikes and walking. ~ concerns over Gorham Road have not been alleviated (commercial competition to core). Would like to see that area go soft industrial. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Planning staff support efforts to make the Ridgeway downtown a more walkable, vibrant, pedestrian friendly environment, which would include effort to promote active transportation initiatives. Staff believe the policies contained in the draft Secondary Plan are a good indication of support for the Downtown core. Staff will review policies prior to next release. ~ Planning staff are proposing to change downtown "Commercial" to "Core Mixed Use" which is seen as a positive step towards creating a distinct mixed use commercial/residential village setting. Staff are envisioning more automotive accessible commercial uses in the Gorham area, which in itself provides for distinction between the two areas.
2 March 26th, 2013	Charles Kautz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Would like the Town to recognize tributary as Kautz Creek. Would like Town's acknowledgement in writing that will recognize the tributary as Kautz Creek. ~ Insists Town must gain his permission for any stormwater management within the watershed prior to permitting development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Planning are unaware of who is the approval authority for the naming of watercourses but will investigate. To the best of Planning staff's knowledge, the Town does not get involved in such practice. ~ respecting requiring Mr. Kautz's approval for stormwater management, Planning staff will provide Mr. Kautz's comments to Infrastructure Services for a position on the claim made.
3 March 28th, 2013	Darren & Lisa Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Submission of their concerns impacting family. ~ suggested 1.5m trail not accounting for ditching and machinery. ~ Large trees in centre of path. ~ Proposed trail would impact wildlife and nesting birds. Do not want habitat destroyed. ~ Noise concerns of path abusers (snowmobiles, ATV, dirt bikes) ~ trash ~ rather taxes be spent improving roads with pedestrian infrastructure. ~ inquired on purchasing from Town. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Planning staff have made a change in the designation of the Wells Avenue Road allowance in the Draft Secondary Plan, changing it from a Public Road to "Open Space" for the purposes of providing a pedestrian connection between the Friendship Trail and Thunder Bay Road. ~ Planning staff believes the change is beneficial to the broader community in providing such an access. ~ Planning staff do not share the opinion of the Smiths' regard dimensions of the trail or need for ditching. ~ Planning staff envision the trail to be a loose, permeable surface (wood chip or gravel) that would be sensitively located to preserve vegetation (and by extension habitat). ~ Planning staff acknowledge the concerns regarding snowmobiles and atv and when any plan for a trail is advanced, in addition to sensitivity in placement, staff will consider efforts to mitigate access to the trail by snowmobiles and atv's. This Secondary Plan is merely identifying and proposing redesignation. Implementation will require review at the time annual budgets are being prepared. There is no firm commitment on timing of such a trail. ~ Planning believes that the Town needs to take leadership role on matters of pedestrian connectivity and promotion of active transportation, and this trail is a good example and step in this direction. ~ staff appreciates the comments received, however believe the trail represents an improvement for the broader public. ~ Planning staff spoke with the Smiths' and provided them with the Town's By-law on purchasing Town owned land.

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

INFORMAL DEPARTMENT & AGENCY CIRCULATION COMMENT SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT SECONDARY PLAN - FEBRUARY 8th, 2013			
Date Comments Received	Agency or Department	Comment Summary	Staff Response
1 April 3, 2013	NPCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing advisory comments to ensure the Town is using the most recent data layers and to contact Geoff Verkade to confirm metadata. - Suggest adding High Vulnerability Aquifers to mapping. - (Specific to RTB2) Suggest that the EP designation along the shoreline match NPCA's Regulated Shoreline Hazard Limit. - (Specific to RTB3) Suggests Regulated Shoreline Hazard Limit be added to this schedule. - Suggests a selection of textual edits as outlined in their written response of April 3, 2013. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meeting arranged with NPCA Rep to review and clarify commenting. - advised most recent had been downloaded and checked with only minor inconsistencies. Both NPCA and Town working to resolve. - HVA discussions clarified. Status with Ministry still not final. Reserve actions until such time Ministry has signed off and an appropriate amendment can be made to Parent OP. - relevant textual revisions made where appropriate.
2 April 11th, 2013	NCDSB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No comments at this time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nil
3 March 18th, 2013	Fort Erie Museum and Cultural Heritage Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secondary Plan was circulated to Members in advance of meeting of March 18th, 2013. - Committee appreciative of meeting and discussing Plan. - Committee satisfied however staff agreed to enhance wording in policies relating to heritage building designation promotion. - Minutes are to be considered as their comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Staff made adjustments and added policy as discussed in meeting. - Will appear again at MCHAC when next draft ready.
4 March 21, 2013	DSBN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No initial matters of concern. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nil
5 March 22nd, 2013	Region of Niagara	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally very supportive with some comments for consideration. - Would like policy speaking to meeting Greenfield Growth target shortfall in other areas of greenfield within the municipality if we are not able to gain additional units from already draft approved greenfields. - Would like a stated minimum on the density range provided under "Low". - Would like wording to state that any work relating to the Gateway Features that area within Regional ROW's requires Regional Approval. - Suggest checking ownership status and by extension road class for Gorham south of Dominion. - Indicate servicing should be able to service up to 2031 and the water tower is to come down. - Would like secondary Plan to identify location of Pumping Stations on the Schedules and would imply wording should be added to address sensitive land uses in their proximity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning staff have no concerns with making requested modifications. - Modifications will be made for subsequent draft release.
6 March 27th, 2013	Fort Erie Environmental Advisory Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secondary Plan was circulated to Members in advance of meeting of March 27th, 2013. - Committee appreciative of opportunity to review. - Staff explained environmental protection remains strong and mirrors parent OP. Staff have not compromised on the strength of the parent policies. - Modifications made to Plan since 2009 were explained to Committee and shown to not impact enviro. - EAC prepared a resolution to act as their comments. The resolution can be found along with their minutes of meeting. - The Resolution read: "EAC strongly supports the Ridgeway / Thunder Bay Neighbourhood Plan as it directs development into existing urban areas, it promotes a pedestrian friendly development and it emphasizes the preservation of existing environmental and natural heritage features in the Ridgeway / Thunder Bay Neighbourhood." 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning staff conducted consultations with EAC to discuss schedules and policy. - EAC generally supportive of the Secondary Plan and recognizes consistency with parent OP policies. - discussion on trails through Mann. EAC not adverse to concept.

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

FORMAL DEPARTMENT & AGENCY CIRCULATION COMMENT SUBMISSIONS ON DRAFT SECONDARY PLAN - JUNE 13th, 2013			
Date Comments Received	Agency or Department	Comment Summary	Staff Response
1 June 13, 2013	FE Building Dept.	<p>~ No comments on the Plan.</p> <p>~ Building Department will comment at time of development applications</p>	~ Nil
2 May 14, 2013	FE Active Transportation Committee	<p>~ Committee passed Resolution supporting Secondary Plan at its May 14th, 2013 Meeting "BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Town of Fort Erie Active Transportation Committee provides its endorsement of the Ridgeway-Thunder Bay Secondary Plan for its promotion of Active Transportation through policies aimed at supporting a complete community concept over the long term. The Plan promotes walkable neighbourhoods with particular focus on enhancing connection to the downtown core of Ridgeway. Furthermore, the Plan seeks to enhance connections to the Friendship Trail and leverage its role as an important active transportation corridor for both local and regional interests.</p> <p>And whereas the Committee recognizes the Plan's efforts to improve and provide new infrastructure along key routes within the Plan Area and connecting points of interest within the community such as schools, neighbourhood parks, the downtown core, Bernard and Maple Leaf Waterfront Parks and the Gorham commercial area.</p> <p>And whereas the Plan also seeks to work with authorities for enhancing trail networks that would link local natural features such as the Shag Bark Nature Park and the Mann Farm wetlands that may provide opportunities for educational experience.</p>	~ Nil
3 June 17, 2013	FE MCHAC	<p>~ Committee passed a Resolution supporting Cultural Heritage policies of the Secondary Plan at its June 17th, 2013 Meeting</p>	<p>~ Staff met for an additional time with the Committee (May 13, 2013) to review the modified policies discussed in previous meeting.</p> <p>~ Committee content with modifications.</p>
4 June 17, 2013	FE EAC	<p>~ No Identified Concerns. (Resolution approved at prior meeting)</p> <p>~ Pleased with Secondary Plan</p> <p>~ Committee passed Resolution:</p> <p><i>"EAC strongly supports the Ridgeway / Thunder Bay Neighbourhood Plan as it directs development into existing urban areas, it promotes a pedestrian friendly development and it emphasizes the preservation of existing environmental and natural heritage features in the Ridgeway / Thunder Bay Neighbourhood."</i></p>	~ Nil
5 June 25, 2013	Region of Niagara	<p>~ reference their preliminary comments and that most of the requested revisions have been made.</p> <p>~ indicate some outstanding changes (which have since been addressed)</p> <p>~ acknowledge addition of general urban design guidelines as a positive measure for Ridgeway.</p> <p>~ concludes with support for the Secondary Plan</p>	<p>~ Planning staff acknowledges some changes were outstanding from the mapping revision requests that have since been made and will appear on the final draft schedules at time of Council's consideration on adoption.</p>
6 June 25, 2013	FE Fire Dept.	<p>~ No expressed concerns with Secondary Plan</p> <p>~ comment given stating no concern with present conditions of Yacht Harbour and North Shore Dr.</p> <p>~ Indicated that if future development occurs on Yacht Harbour, consideration on road standard would be reviewed at that time.</p>	<p>~ Staff had spoken with Fire Department staff to convey resident opinion on "conceptual" connection of Yacht Harbour with North Shore Drive.</p> <p>~ Resident comments are not in favour of connecting roads. Staff commented that it would seek FEED comment.</p> <p>~ In conceptual terms, Planning staff see a future connection of these two roads as a practical improvement to the road and pedestrian network and have chosen to retain a "conceptual" connection for status.</p> <p>~ Planning staff recognize there are inherent constraints respecting the state of the private road (Yacht Harbour) and that any potential for connection would require further investigation and willing participation from all stakeholders.</p> <p>~ For the purposes of the Secondary Plan, staff are continuing to show this as a "conceptual" connection with the understanding such connection may never come to fruition within the Planning period.</p>

APPENDIX "3" TO ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT NO. CDS-59-13 DATED JULY 8, 2013

7	June 25, 2013	NPCA	<p>~ Comments on schedules: ~ suggests that Highly Vulnerable Aquifer's be illustrated on schedules. ~ Acknowledges mapping of EP matches that of NPCA. ~ Identifies text label on schedule RTB-3 and implies it does not support the statement. ~ Requests textual edit to legend label for Fish Habitat classification on RTB-3a from "no data" to "other". ~ Comments on texts: ~ Indicates under NPCA policy trails are not permitted in wetlands or other natural heritage features. Seeks to encourage relocation out of feature area into buffer area. ~ suggest revision to wording to provide more clarity on NPCA regulation over hazard lands in policy 4.18.12.1 (c). ~ Recommends additional policy addition to advise readers to consult OP policies on developing adjacent to Fish Habitat. Suggested wording being an adaptation of regional policy.</p>	<p>~ Staff had gone through a process of confirming feature and designation limits as suggested in preliminary comments and further review by NPCA confirms delineation appears matching. ~ Planning staff have considered comments concerning HVA's and at present, are not in a position to make additions without further consultation and implementation means coming from upper level Official Plan and Regional Plan documents. In the opinion of Planning Staff additions such as that suggested needs to be investigated from a municipal wide context and not at the Secondary Plan stage. Staff notes that this should not have any impact on future implementation if required, as the Secondary Plan would be part of the parent OP and by default, amended. Planning staff reserve any action on this request at this time. ~ While NPCA encourages the Town to modify its position on a trail in the Wetland, Planning staff do not share the opinion of the NPCA. Reasons for staff's position were discussed in consultation with NPCA staff and Planning staff maintain educational and feature protection benefits can be derived through a sensitively planned, permeable nature trail system. Planning staff are maintaining the "conceptual" existence of a nature trail on its schedules. ~ Staff will consider the requested modification to wording of policy 4.18.12.1 (c) as suggested. ~ Planning staff acknowledges NPCA's recommended policy addition request, however Planning staff suggest that such policy coverage exists in the parent OP Section 8.3.5 and therefore already in place, covering the Secondary Plan Area.</p>
---	---------------	------	--	--

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED BETWEEN NOTICE AND PUBLIC MEETING SCHEDULED FOR JULY 8th, 2013		
Date Comments Received	Author / Owner / or General Public	Nature of Concern, Comment or Inquiry
1	Victor Dewitt	Blog submission. Comment related to OPA 15. ~ wanted to know who the direct benefactors would be should the plan ultimately be approved.
2		

PUBLIC SPEAKERS & SUBMISSIONS MADE AT THE PUBLIC MEETING OF JULY 8th, 2013		
Date Comments Received	Author / Owner / or General Public	Nature of Concern, Comment or Inquiry
1		TO BE ADDED FOLLOWING PUBLIC MEETING
2		

PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS MADE AFTER THE PUBLIC MEETING OF JULY 8th, 2013 - PRIOR TO COUNCIL DECISION ON ADOPTION		
Date Comments Received	Author / Owner / or General Public	Nature of Concern, Comment or Inquiry
1		TO BE ADDED PRIOR TO RECOMMENDATION REPORT
2		