

## SORE QUESTIONS FOR MUNICIPAL CANDIDATES

**Members, please feel free to reach out directly if you have any further questions.**

1. Do you agree with the statement that intensive residential development should be directed to Glendale and those areas of Old Town, Virgil, St Davids and Queenston that do not compete with or require compromising the Town's cultural heritage assets?

**Any intensive residential development should be directed to areas that could support such proposals. I think the question of "competing with" and "require compromising" should be separated. I would certainly not be in favour of compromising the Town's cultural heritage. I would need more clarity on the position of the statement "competing with" to answer further. I believe that is much untapped potential and more accessible sites in areas closer to the QEW which would have less of an impact on current infrastructure, traffic, congestion, historical/heritage areas, and the natural habitat/green space. At the same time we need to be cautious with regard to ensuring any intensification in those areas is balanced, and also compliments the existing neighbourhoods.**

2. Do you agree that large-scale residential developments should be required to thoroughly assess the planning merits including compliance with the new NOTL OP, heritage, servicing, traffic and environmental matters (including watercourses) before any development application is made?

**Yes.**

3. Do you support character studies to identify, the cultural heritage attributes of sites and their surroundings before development applications are made in Old Town?

**Yes, within the appropriate areas of Old Town that have such attributes.**

4. Are you in favour of spending money to defend planning integrity in our community? Do you agree that funds spent to assess and oppose questionable/unsuitable development applications in Niagara-on-the-Lake is money well spent? If not, what approach would you take to uphold our Official Plan and the Ontario Heritage Act when faced with aggressive and litigious developers and problematic development proposals?

**Yes, so long as the underlining premise is for the good/betterment of our community, and they are to defend true historic/heritage aspects of NOTL. I am strong advocate of PROACTIVE rather than REACTIVE strategy. A better solution moving forwards would be to increase funding within the planning department to develop improvements in both staffing & efficiencies. The broad scope of many aspects of the Zoning By-Laws MUST be addressed appropriately ASAP so both residents, and developers have a better understanding of our growth vision for NOTL, and we all have better parameters to work within.**

With respect to the Solmar/Marotta group proposals for the Rand Estate:

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being most important, how critical do you think getting the Rand Estate right is for the future of Old Town NOTL

**8**

Do you support completion of the special character area study for the Rand Estate required by the new NOTL Official Plan before any decisions are made concerning appropriate land use at Randwood?

**Yes.**

Do you think the front and back half of the Rand Estate need to be comprehensively assessed before any redevelopment applications are approved rather than piecemealing the Estate into individual parcels?

**Yes.**

The Marotta group has proposed plans for the back half of the Rand Estate which vary between 170 and 190 residential units, and which would remove substantially all of the remaining cultural heritage attributes of 200 John and 588 Charlotte. Are you familiar with the Marotta plans?

**Yes.**

SORE has published a conceptual plan for the back half of the Rand Estate showing how it could be repurposed for residential use in a manner sensitive to both the Estate and the surrounding residential neighbourhood while conserving the cultural heritage attributes of Randwood. The SORE plan contemplates a mix of approximately 70 residential units and includes public access to this very important cultural heritage asset. Are you familiar with the SORE plan?

**Yes.**

- If you are not familiar with either the SORE or Marotta plans, can we send them to you so that you can respond to question below?
- **N/A**
- Do you believe the SORE or the Marotta plan is preferred for the back half of the Rand Estate? Please elaborate.
- **I have to say a combination of both. Would we all love to have large 50-60 ft wide lots, absolutely, but in reality we have to balance the desire for what "fits" with what can make a positive impact on our community. Both plans can be viewed as an extreme, with the Solmar plan being far too intensive, and the SORE plan too idyllic. I love the way the SORE plan works backwards from the heritage attributes & aspects.... Green space, and then added housing.... This is how ALL development should be instead of the focus being on the housing... and then "fitting" in the other elements.**
- The Town is currently prosecuting the Marotta companies under the Ontario Heritage Act for the November, 2018 clear cutting of a vast portion of the Rand Estate. If the prosecution is successful the Town is entitled to reinstate any illegally destroyed heritage landscape at the owner's expense. Do you support such reinstatement?
- **Yes, I believe anything that is proven to have been done contrary to regulation surrounding it there should be consequences to those actions.**
- Do you think Solmar/the Marotta group should be required to critically assess all access alternatives to access the Rand Estate, including adjacent land owned by the Two Sisters winery?
- **Yes.**
- The Marotta/Solmar proposal for a hotel/convention centre on the front half of the Rand Estate required a large traffic circle at the intersection of John St E and the Parkway, using lands owned by/under the control of the Niagara Parks Commission and likely impacting mature trees in that area. SORE's traffic experts believe the traffic circle will similarly be required for the proposed Rand subdivision. Do you support the installation of a traffic circle at that location?
- **Being from the UK, I am a strong advocate for traffic circles and the way they encourage traffic flow. I am not sure why this would be required at either entrance, and I would like to see further details on reasoning and alternatives. I feel a one way, or at the very most a 3 way stop would suffice.**