

---

## ***Addendum***

---

### **Delegations**

1. Mr. Simon Fuller with respect to Staff Report No. 2012-020-02, Proposed Amendment to Sign By-law 84-89; Tall Ships Landing

### **Correspondence**

1. Correspondence from Mr. M. Veenstra respecting Staff Report No. 2012-2012-018-02, Request from Release from Fees and Imposts – Wildewood Subdivision – Phases 2 and 3

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the correspondence from Mr. M. Veenstra received February 1, 2012 respecting Staff Report No. 2012-018-02 be received.

2. Correspondence from Pamela Sweet, FoTenn Consultants Inc. respecting Staff Report No. 2012-020-02, Proposed Amendment to Sign By-law 84-89; Tall Ships Landing

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT the correspondence from Ms. P. Sweet dated February 7, 2012 respecting Staff Report No. 2012-020-02 be received.

**Dear EDP committee members;**

We have requested waivers on various fees and imposts associated with the development of Wildwood in order to facilitate its development into a vibrant residential subdivision, creating jobs and tax revenue.

We have received a report dated 31 January 2012 advising that our requests be denied. This report inadvertently fails the reader by omitting the extra cost required to develop Wildwood versus other residential developments in the City. It also neglects to mention the significant upside of the short and long-term economic benefits to the City during these tumultuous times.

Currently the City of Brockville receives \$1000.00 a year in taxes on these vacant lands... that works out to \$66.00/lot

Once these lands are approved as subdivision lands the tax jumps to \$600.00 per lot being \$9,000. 00/yr.

Once a house is built on a lot the taxes jump to \$4,000.00/yr. X 15 lots= \$60,000. /yr.

This is at absolutely no risk financially to the city

**&**

This project will result in the creation of jobs immediately.

**Development Charges Exemption**

As long as various neighboring communities [including downtown Brockville] have no development charges, we must continue to match this as well, in order to have parity.

**North Trunk Sewer Extension Impost Exemption**

Wildwood is unique compared to any other residential area; it has absolutely no soil depth and is virtually a flat sedimentary rock. This is the most expensive residential area to service in Brockville.

All lots require the importation of hundreds of loads of earth fill, and trenches must be blasted into the rock to accommodate the sewer and water pipe. The costs to service a single family lot is 25% more in Wildwood compared to that of other developments, [currently our costs to service are \$7,300.00 per house more].

The above noted additional cost strongly supports waiving the North Trunk sewer fee.

### **Cash-In-Lieu of Parkland Exemption**

Wildwood is adjacent to the Dana Street Park, which was planned and dedicated as part of the original Dana and Beley Street residential design.

Under section 3.5.3.1 clause 45 in the new official plan, Council may and has the ability to waive any fees for cash-in-lieu of parkland at its sole discretion.

### **Lot Grade Deposit Exemption**

As per the Planning report, it appears there may be changes to the Ontario Building Code to Lot Grade requirements.

This raises several questions...

How is subsidence dealt with around the foundation prior to final landscaping?

What happens if the home is started late fall and winter sets in prior to backfilling?

What happens if backfill material is frozen?

How is substantially graded defined?

We require more information on this issue, as it has not been conveyed nor clearly defined.

### **Payment of Interest on Deposits**

How long must one wait to be re-imbursed for deposits provided to the city once full compliance has been met? A week, a month, a year, this unknown prompts the need for interest on deposits as requested or at the least a review of this policy.

**Conclusion**

- ✓ Over the past 25 years Spring Valley Homes has built over 250 residential units.
- ✓ Created hundreds of jobs by employing local people, while simultaneously injecting over thirty million dollars into the local economy.
- ✓ To date our previous residential developments currently provide in excess of \$750,000. In taxes annually to the City of Brockville.

We are now in the process of planning to service the final 2 phases in Wildwood; do we move forward or wait for the market to stabilize? When will that occur?

Should we proceed... we are exposed to incredible financial risk, and must make a huge investment, in excess of one million dollars alone for sewer and infrastructure improvements prior to one house being constructed.

The waiver of these fees and imposts would provide the necessary cost incentive to allow this project to move forward during these uncertain economic times, and immediately provide the City with much needed job opportunities and tax revenue.

Respectfully submitted by:



Michael Veenstra  
February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2012 | Brockville

**Spring Valley Homes Ltd.**  
PO Box 1543  
Brockville, ON  
K6V 6E6  
T: 613.341.1383  
F: 613.498.3334  
E: svhomes@ripnet.com

February 7, 2012

Mr. Simon Fuller  
c/o The Fuller Group  
2700 Queensview  
Ottawa, ON  
K2B 8H6

**Re: Brockville report on Amendment to Sign By-Law 84-89, Tall Ships Landing**

Dear Mr. Fuller,

As requested I have read the staff report dated Feb. 2, 2012 and have the following comments:

**Policy Framework:**

**The New Official Plan**

This plan is not in effect until the last date of appeal (Feb. 8, 2012) is reached and no appeals are received. However this Plan and the current OP must be read as whole. There are many objectives and policies of the Plan that can be interpreted to support the new sign. For example the Official Plan promotes a "flexible and adaptable economy... through the creation of an environment that encourages investment and a broad range of employment opportunities and that support the growth of tourism in the City". Views and vistas are to be protected, and the unique character and experience of the Downtown and Central Waterfront area is to remain vibrant and attractive to residents and visitors alike.

**The Economic Development Strategy and the Community Strategic Plan**

These plans aim to grow and promote the City's tourism industry, amenities and events with a focus on the downtown and waterfront areas.

**The Current Official Plan**

There is nothing in the current Official Plan that prohibits this sign, and it is a subjective decision as to whether the proposed sign enhances and accentuates the waterfront and waterfront view corridors.

It is Council's job to interpret and weigh these policies to ensure that the amendment to the Signs By-law is justified and conforms to the Official Plan that is in effect. The policies noted can be interpreted in different ways. They do not speak to signs directly and in fact lend themselves to promoting the tourism amenities in the waterfront area.

The proposed signs are not impacting on views or vistas since they are flush with the building not protruding above it. The signs will promote the downtown and waterfront area since the building is much more than a condominium development, but a unique mixed-use and cultural attraction. The uses are aimed at promoting the City's tourism industry, while meeting other objectives of the Official Plan such as the provision of downtown residential and commercial uses.

#### **The Sign By-Law**

The Sign By-Law 84-89 is the legal basis for considering this application. It is maintained that the proposed sign is not projecting above the roofline and it could be argued that it is on the side of the building not on a roof. However the application has been filed in good faith assuming that an amendment is needed. The emphasis has been on safety and structural issues. It is assumed that there are no safety or structural issues at play here and the argument is tied to one of aesthetics.

The City may want to consider the preparation of guidelines for signs in the Downtown and Waterfront area and have discussed the idea of creating an urban design review committee. Until that time, I would maintain that the amendment to the Sign By-law does not conflict with the policies of the Official Plan or other Council policy documents.

Sincerely,



Pamela Sweet, FCIP, RPP  
Vice President  
FoTenn Consultants Inc.

