

1. Do you think it possible to finalize a new Official Plan within the first year of the new Council's term? What in your view should be the key elements of a new Official Plan that differ from the existing Official Plan?

I do think it is possible to finalize the plan within the first year of the new term as work done towards this effort was mostly done the first half of the current term (and then tucked away) the elements of the plan should include the secondary plans for the distinct areas that make up NOTL and include the rural area as well. We need to incorporate an estate plan for large properties within the urban boundaries. We need to ensure that the zoning permissions for the airport allow us to build accessory buildings that compliment services there. We need to put a greater emphasis on parking within the plan as "parking" doesn't show as a title or subtitle yet comes up over 300 times in the document.

2. What is your ten-year vision for the communities that comprise NOTL (Glendale, Old Town, Queenston, St. David's and Virgil) with respect to residential and commercial development?

My simple answer is that each of these communities grow within the appropriate to their existing conditions and limits.

- **Old town - careful planning with respect to hospital, rifle range, parliament oak, and the wilderness. diversifying commercial mix to promote resident services within the old town, limiting infilling by controlling Lot severances**
- **Virgil - promoting use of industrial park lands as employment centres for our residents, traffic management, safe routes to school,**
- **St.David's - managing traffic, continuing development of quarry property, golf course land use, Lions Club/Pool property usage which benefits southern residents,**
- **Queenston - infilling lots to meet secondary plan guidelines, promote some commercial activity which serves residents, landuse of dock area with minimal impact on residents (especially as jet Boat lease will end in old town)**
- **Glendale - promote college building residences on their campus (plans are already there to double size) mitigate town/gown issues, put in place long-term rental (student housing) guidelines, work with region to promote the Glendale urbanization, traffic management with respect to New double diamond interchange and twinning of skyway, employment lands, transportation solutions for students, residents and employees.**
- **Rural areas - (including McNab) protection of agricultural lands, irrigation and drainage (as we see climate disruption) review of property size for complimentary (secondary) businesses on agricultural lands**

3. Is the current proposal for Randwood (the most recent revised plan submitted by the Marotta group) appropriate for this site and neighborhood given its significant cultural heritage

value and its location in an established residential neighborhood? Why or why not?

I respond with the preface that some of the established residential was partly cut out of the original land and has been at most only 25% of the Town's history.

I support the 2011 size of building addition and protection of the existing additional buildings. I am NOT in favour of the density, lack of park space and traffic patterns for the second phase of the development (residential)

When we look at the next closest hotels, they are all right beside residential neighbourhoods and have lot coverages which exceed that of this plan.

Remembering that Romance/Peterson had this property for sale, SORE members "our" Randwood did not purchase this property for their own purposes. The family/group/company which did should have also done their part and understanding what rules were put on the property before purchase and be aware that NOTL is a town of passionate activists who historically get the town and provincial bodies to side with residents (kings point, Willowbank)

4. What consideration should be given in your view to the various matters specified in OPA51 (the Official Plan amendment in 2011 that permitted Randwood to be changed from residential to commercial for the Romance Inn- see attached) when deciding whether the Marotta group proposal should be approved?

As the current planning we are working on goes back to the 1990's we are stuck with that to go forward with with any appeal by the owner to decisions made. I believe we should hold firm to the 2011 level of expansion.

5. What would you do to ensure the preservation and sensitive use of other heritage buildings and lands within each of the communities that comprise NOTL?

We need to adopt the new official plan, including the new secondary plans with special zoning areas (for example Willowbank in Queenston) our municipal heritage committee should be proactive in cataloging our registry of such properties.

6. How will you ensure appropriate public input into planning decisions affecting high-profile sites such as Randwood (e.g. encouraging staff to accommodate delegations, location of Council and committee meetings on matters of great public interest such as Randwood)?

I would ensure that procedure is followed by town staff with respect to delegations, I would remind the Lord Mayor or committee chair of the same. The town should encourage public input and host workshops to better prepare residents and make them aware of procedure. We can continue to hold meetings offsite - we should be aware that sometimes rooms are pre booked. We have the community centre, arena, Shaw festival (off season) and Niagara college as potential off site locations.

7. Under what circumstances if any would you support the expansion of the current NOTL urban boundaries into agricultural land or the Greenbelt? **The only exceptions I see would be to build public infrastructure (for example two properties the town acquired York Road and concession six were not able to be used for fire station building in the past 15 years) I was a part of the Queenston community association in the 1990's when we successfully kept over 30 acres from being developed on the outskirts of the village.**