
Roll Call

Council Members:

Mayor D. Henderson
Councillor J. Baker
Councillor D. Beatty
Councillor L. Bursey
Councillor J. Earle (late 5:12 p.m)
Councillor J. Fullarton
Councillor L. Journal
Councillor M. Kalivas
Councillor D. LeSueur
Councillor M. McFall

Staff:

Mr. B. Casselman, City Manager
Mr. C. Cosgrove, Director of Operations
Ms. D. Cyr, Director of Finance
Ms. D. Livingstone, Deputy City Clerk (Recording Secretary)
Ms. M. Pascoe Merkley, Director of Planning
Mr. D. Paul, Director of Economic Development
Ms. S. Seale, City Clerk

Others:

Mr. Nick Gardiner, Recorder and Times
Mr. Chris Holski, Bell Media

MAYOR'S REMARKS

Nil.

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

Nil.

MOTION TO MOVE INTO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL

Moved by: Councillor Journal

THAT we adjourn and meet as Committee of the Whole Council, with the Mayor in the Chair.

CARRIED

CORRESPONDENCE, DELEGATION(S) AND PRESENTATION(S)

1. Mr. Raul Cirne addressed Council with comments regarding the Official Plan. These comments were made on behalf of himself, Mr. Colin Williams, Mr. John Henderson, and Mrs. Renate Henderson.
2. Mr. Peter Lammens provided comments regarding the Official Plan that were distributed at the meeting.
3. Mr. Chris Tyrrell and Mr. Greg Bender, MMM Group, were in attendance. Mr. Chris Tyrrell presented a PowerPoint presentation outlining the Official Plan process, a overview of the Official Plan, comments and changes that were requested and made, the Sustainability Plan companion document, and the next steps

STAFF REPORTS

1. Draft Official Plan

Moved by: Councillor Earle

THAT Council direct the Consultant to change areas of the Hwy 29 Corridor, currently designated Neighbourhood Residential, to Corridor Commercial with the existing site specific restrictions for servicing.

DEFEATED ON A LATER VOTE

Motion to Defer

Moved by: Councillor Journal

THAT the motion to change the areas of the Hwy 29 Corridor currently designated Neighbourhood Residential be changed to Corridor Commercial in the draft Official Plan be deferred to the June 14th Council meeting pending notification of affected residents.

DEFEATED

The vote on the original motion was now taken and the motion was defeated.

Original Motion

Moved by: Councillor Earle

THAT Council direct the Consultant to change areas of the Hwy 29 Corridor, currently designated Neighbourhood Residential, to Corridor Commercial with the existing site specific restrictions for servicing.

DEFEATED

Discussion ensued to bring Official Plan to the June 14th meeting.

Moved by: Councillor Journal

THAT the correspondence regarding the Official Plan be received from:

Peter Lammens, dated May 27, 2011; and
Clift White dated May 31, 2011; and
Ted Hudson dated May 31, 2011.

CARRIED

A copy of the correspondence is attached to the Minutes.

MOTION TO RETURN TO COUNCIL

Moved by: Councillor Kalivas

THAT we revert from Committee of the Whole Council, to Council.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE COUNCIL

Moved by: Councillor Kalivas
Seconded by: Councillor Beatty

THAT the report of the Committee of the Whole Council be adopted and that the necessary actions or by-laws be enacted.

CARRIED

CONFIRMATORY BYLAW FIRST AND SECOND READING

Moved by: Councillor Baker
Seconded by: Councillor Fullarton

THAT By-law Number 054-2011 to confirm the Proceedings of Council at its meeting held on May 31, 2011 be read a first and second time.

CARRIED

CONFIRMATORY BYLAW THIRD READING

Moved by: Councillor Baker
Seconded by: Councillor Fullarton

THAT By-law Number 054-2011 to confirm the Proceedings of Council at its meeting held on May 31, 2011 be now read a third time, signed by the Mayor and Clerk, sealed with the Seal of the Corporation and be recorded.

CARRIED

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

His Worship noted that the Brockville General Hospital Heart and Stroke Fundraiser is scheduled for June 8th, 2011 from 5-9 p.m. at the Memorial Centre.

ADJOURNMENT

Moved by: Councillor Baker
Seconded by: Councillor Fullarton

THAT Council adjourn its proceedings until the next regular meeting scheduled for June 14, 2011.

CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

Mayor

City Clerk

Your worship and members of Council:

I wish to preface my comments by making it clear that I am not speaking on behalf of Citizens Brockville, but that I speak on behalf of four citizens who have tried, individually and then collectively, to evaluate this latest version of the new Official Plan.

I say tried, because the printed copies, that we individually obtained from the Planning Department, were: incomplete, contained several basic flaws and were extremely difficult to read, especially due to the small font size.

The original document uses color to emphasize changes, however, these aren't at all apparent when the document is printed in black and white. It is hoped that color will NOT be used in the final version.

The front page contains the date of 'May 2010', which should read 'May 2011'.

Our initial reaction was that the 265 pages, in the July 2010 version, had been substantially reduced, however we found that this had only been achieved through the omission of the 'Table of Content' pages and Subsections 3.5, 3.6 and 3.7, in their entirety. All these pages were missing from the copy that each of us was given, although we find that they are included in the on-line version. Incidentally, the new version contains 273 pages plus the 6 Schedules.

We appreciate that some of the 'white space' is needed to accommodate notations regarding changes, subsequent to each earlier versions, but hope that it will not be necessary in the 'Final Version'. This should allow a larger font to be used and also reduce the number of pages needed.

Some of the page numbers applicable to each Subsection, as shown in the Table of Contents, are inaccurate.

It was good to see a few earlier suggestions and criticisms incorporated into the document, but there's been no improvement in the amount of notice regarding meetings nor in the timing of the release of documents before they are to be considered by Council.

We were also pleased to see the word 'shall' used more frequently (1,403 times), but there are still far too many requirements that are prefixed with 'may' (369 times).

There are almost no dates established for the start or completion of the 52 studies, or for the 68 strategies contemplated, nor are any targets given or the frequency of the reviews set.

When will the Master Plan for St. Lawrence Park be undertaken? The lack of it will preclude any further development of the park?

Several sections deal with the 'pedestrian walkway' and the City's acquisition of land, which need not necessarily complete the walkway at the time the land is acquired. What is missing is an indication of the minimum depth/width that is acceptable. The figure of 30m has been deleted. Why does the Plan not specify any figure?

We are concerned that other words and phrases, which appeared to protect the public's interest, have also been removed. Who truly benefits by their removal?

Where is the definition of 'Parking areas', which is referred to 9 times, and for 'Parking guidelines'?

Could the document not include a diagrammatic illustration of 'Angular Plane'? It would go a long way to clarifying this peculiar term. Further, for development along the waterfront, a similar requirement but starting at the water's edge would, in our opinion, also be beneficial.

There's a definition for 'Prestige Industrial', but what is meant by "Prestige Employment"?

The Plan fails to include any measures to comply with Section 16.2.b of the Planning Act.

Why has the proposed development, at the Windsor Drive/Centennial Rd. intersection, been omitted from Schedules 1, 3 and 4, and partially from Schedules 5 and 6?

Numerous sections of the areas, defined as being 'Screening Areas for the CRCA' have been deleted from Schedule 3 – why?

There is a small parcel of land, at the southeast end of Henry St, which has no line attaching it to any 'Site Specific Policy Area' notation – we believe that it should also be attached to 'Section 4.2.4.1'.

We respectfully ask that the City provide a written response to our latest comments well before the next Council meeting on June 14th.

We will wish to be heard as a delegation at the meeting, when the new Official Plan is to be considered and/or approved by Council.

Thank you for your attention.

Raul Cirne

Colin Williams

John Henderson

Renate Henderson

**REVIEW OF 2010 OFFICIAL PLAN
CITY OF BROCKVILLE
May 27th, 2011 – Peter A. Lammens**

General: I guess it is difficult to avoid, but the entire document consists of flowery statements which after a while will lose its meaning and importance. This is very typical of the way we govern the state, province or municipal affairs. Examples are programs defined by the Government of Canada some 10 years ago as how to improve the overall living conditions of the aboriginal people in the north and the need to have a consistent day-care program. Where are we with this? We don't have to ask!!

I strongly believe that the City of Brockville needs to document all the recommendations with estimated timing, cost and resource requirements. Included must be show-stoppers such as financial, resource and government restraints. In addition, the document needs to be reviewed on a bi- annual basis. A spreadsheet would be the recommended tool.

Community Improvement - 3.4.2

This section gives many examples where and how improvements can be made. In the OP we see references to design, heritage and control.

Not knowing where to put it right now, my suggestion is **to ensure that new developments are designed to make them aesthetically correct on all four (4) sides if at all possible.** (also see note below)

As far as improvements are concerned there must be an effort in place to upgrade the north and south elevations of King St. West buildings. Examples are the rear of the old R&T, New York Restaurant and adjacent buildings. We don't have much to offer if you look up from the Water St. parking lot. This is more true when we look from Beattie Dodge lot to the rear of the buildings along the north side of King St. W.

The Planning Period – 6.2

It is based on a 20-year planning horizon to the year 2031. This is a small window for a large list of objectives! All those involved in the process must start soon. (see my reference to a spreadsheet tabulation)



**EASTERN
INDEPENDENT
TELECOMMUNICATIONS LTD.**

Clifton T. White, President
clift.white@eit.ca



SUITE 112, 100 STROWGER BLVD, / P.O. BOX 1509 / BROCKVILLE, ON K6V 5J9 / K6V 5Y6
TEL: 613-342-9652 ext 201 FAX: 613-342-3888
WEBSITE: www.eit.ca

May 31, 2011

City of Brockville
1 King Street West
Brockville, Ontario
K6V 3P5

From: Concerned businessmen and landowners of Brockville North (Highway 29 & Stewart Boulevard)

To: Clerk of the City of Brockville

Subject: The proposed Official Plan for the City of Brockville and meeting May 31, 2011

Thank you for the opportunity of providing this information.

Further to our correspondence of September 13, 2010, we appreciate that Brockville North (Stewart Boulevard) will now be given consideration for development in the Official Plan. However, we are concerned with Section 4.6.4.4 (Stewart Boulevard corridor), which states that lands will not be developed until such time as full municipal servicing and appropriate transportation infrastructure has been provided at no cost to the City.

It is our opinion that the *City should have a serious interest in leading the way in providing services and appropriate transportation infrastructure to encourage development in the area.* In this regard, Clift White forwarded a letter to Mayor Henderson and copied Bob Casselman and Dave Paul on February 7, 2011 (see attached letter) bringing attention to an article published in the Recorder and Times on January 18, 2011 stating that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities is calling for Ottawa to come to the table to work out a plan to address infrastructure requirements for the future. We respectfully submit that the City, if not already doing so, should be making every effort as a member of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to identify priority projects such as the Stewart Boulevard corridor with an objective to obtain Federal and Provincial Government funding to assist with this important development. As noted in the article, infrastructure has to be a priority for our Governments – Municipal, Provincial and Federal.

We respectfully submit that the extension of services and infrastructure on Stewart Boulevard to the City limits in the north end has to be a priority for the City of Brockville.

We appreciate the opportunity of providing this information and look forward to attending the meeting on today's date.

Sincerely

The concerned businessmen and landowners of Brockville North and Highway 29 including but not limited to:

Clift White, landowner

Stan Hall, Highway Pentecostal Church

Jack Henderson, The Flower Shop

Sherri Hudson, landowner

Paul Veenstra, Coombe Custom Homes

Arnold Dixon, Kia of Brockville

Mike Veenstra, SV Homes

Al Phillips, Garden World

Mike McParlan, McParlan Auto Sales

Keith Bean, Brockville Motors

cc: Mayor Henderson, Lorraine Bagnell

encl: Letter to Mayor Henderson of February 7, 2011;
Newspaper article of January 18, 2011



**EASTERN
INDEPENDENT
TELECOMMUNICATIONS LTD.**

Clifton T. White, President
clift.white@eit.ca



SUITE 112, 100 STROWGER BLVD, / P.O. BOX 1509 / BROCKVILLE, ON K6V 5J9 / K6V 5Y6
TEL: 613-342-9652 ext 201 FAX: 613-342-3888
WEBSITE: www.eit.ca

February 7, 2011

Mayor Dave Henderson
City of Brockville
1 King Street West
Brockville, Ontario
K6V 3P5

Subject: City Infrastructure

Dear Mayor Henderson:

I read with interest in the February 2nd issue of the Recorder and Times about the development of a pair of new subdivisions in the north end. I believe this is good news and hopefully they will proceed in an orderly manner.

Further to the above, I respectfully bring your attention to the attached article on infrastructure which notes that the Federation of Canadian Municipalities is calling for Ottawa to come to the table to work out a plan to address infrastructure requirements for the future.

Of particular interest is the statement that it is prudent that a plan be in place to address local infrastructure needs for when funds are available. In this regard, I refer you to a letter, from myself and concerned businessmen and landowners of Brockville North, that was submitted to the Clerk of the City of Brockville in September 2010 regarding extending services to the City limits along Highway 29 and Centennial Road and submitting an application for infrastructure funding to support this initiative.

As you are aware, it is my opinion and that of many others that Highway 29 is the busiest route into our City and a prime area for early development. We compliment the City for voting in favour to recognize this area for development in the Official Plan and again respectfully submit that the City consider being proactive in bringing needed services to the area in the interest of future development.

With substantial interest in residential development in the north end and adjacent to this route to the city limits, it is conceivable that residential development will create further demand for commercial business along the route effectively infilling vacant commercial land with thriving new businesses. This is not unlike the manner in which Parkedale Avenue was developed.

There is a serious need to extend services along Highway 29 to the City limits and I believe that this is a case where "Build It and They will Come" is reality as many are

already there. It also appears that finding a way to be proactive in this important initiative would bring substantial economic benefits to the City.

Regards

Clift

C. T. White
President & CEO
Eastern Independent Telecommunications Ltd.

cc: Bob Casselman, Dave Paul

Editorial

It's not sexy, but it's time to talk infrastructure

By KALVIN REID Posted January 18, 2011

It's telling that despite a massive federal government investment in infrastructure in recent years, Canadian municipalities are still facing a significant infrastructure deficit.

In the throes of the recession, the Conservatives unveiled the massive Economic Action Plan, a \$62-billion plan to jolt some life into the sagging economy.

While it plunged the country into a massive deficit, it also injected \$15.7-billion into local infrastructure projects. The program touched practically every corner of the country, and if a new community centre, water plant, bridge replacement or road reconstruction benefited, there was an Economic Action Plan sign there to remind taxpayers of their federal government's contribution.

Yet despite this public display, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities estimates a \$123-billion infrastructure deficit is still being shouldered by municipal governments. Municipalities are in a challenging spot.

Many municipal governments in Canada are struggling to get by, hampered by costs that are beyond their control.

In part, big cities such as Toronto have to bear some of the responsibility for that. In large part, they set the standard for public sector wages. When Toronto police or firefighters get a raise, a flawed arbitration process all but ensures that same rate of pay is awarded to firefighters and police officers in other communities.

It's an unsustainable model that foists hefty costs on local governments.

Then factor in other municipal responsibilities-- recreation facilities, snow removal, transit and, in Ontario at least, social services --and there is little left to replace those aging pipes that bring clean water to our taps. Quite sensibly, the federation is calling for Ottawa to come to the table to work out a long-range plan to address this need.

Cash in the short term is unexpected. With a \$56-billion deficit, the government should be committed to getting its financial affairs in order before it embarks on any grandiose spending plans.

However, it is prudent that a plan, which could include new spending or ways to find efficiencies and savings to free up dollars for infrastructure projects, be in place to address local infrastructure needs when the funds are available--and it is imperative that the federal government be part of that plan.

Talking infrastructure may not be politically sexy, but it has to be a priority for our governments-- municipal, provincial and federal.

Otherwise, we'll find out very quickly how much we take it for granted.