



Town of Carleton Place
Interim Report

Carleton Place Community Improvement Plan

March 2022

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction 3
 - 1.1 Background3
 - 1.2 Project Overview3
 - 1.3 Purpose of this Interim Report.....4
- 2 Background Review Summary 5
 - 2.1 Key Issues5
 - 2.2 Trends.....7
 - 2.3 Constraints.....9
- 3 Opportunities and Gaps 10
 - 3.1 Accessibility..... 10
 - 3.2 Affordable Housing 10
 - 3.3 Brownfield Redevelopment..... 11
 - 3.4 Façade Improvement..... 12
- 4 Recommendations on Financial Incentive Strategies 13
 - 4.1 Accessibility Incentives..... 13
 - 4.2 Affordable Housing Incentives 13
 - 4.3 Brownfield Redevelopment Incentives 14
 - 4.4 Façade Improvement Incentives 15
- 5 Municipal Leadership Strategy 16
 - 5.1 Streetscape Improvement Plan..... 16
 - 5.2 Other Priority Public Investments 17
- 6 Conclusion 18

Appendices

- A Summary of Stakeholder and Public Input

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Town of Carleton Place is undertaking the development of a Community Improvement Plan (CIP). A CIP is a tool that enables municipalities to establish financial incentives to encourage certain types of development or improvements within defined study areas and allows them to direct funds to specific areas or initiatives that have a need for increasing funding and/or attention. This CIP intends to achieve a more affordable, accessible, and revitalized Carleton Place.

The CIP encompasses the five following focus areas:

- Accessibility, where “accessible” means barrier-free design that focuses on making new and existing buildings safe and accessible for everyone;
- Affordable housing, where “affordable” means that housing costs less than 30% of a household’s before-tax income, according to Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC);
- Brownfield redevelopment, where a brownfield property is one that was previously developed, is currently vacant, and may be contaminated;
- Façade improvement, where a “façade” is the face of a building; and,
- Streetscape improvement¹.

1.2 Project Overview

The three-phase project is currently in its initial phase, where the project team has since completed a background review of existing plans and policies and conducted the first round of public engagement in late January, 2022. Provided below is a summary of the project timeline and its major milestones:

¹ At the time that this Interim Report was written, the Town already had plans to make streetscape improvements on Bridge Street. However, streetscape improvements are still included as a focus area of the Carleton Place CIP. While external funding may not be prioritized for streetscape improvements in the next few years, including their eligibility criteria in the CIP allows for funding to be allocated to public streetscape improvement projects within the 10-year horizon of this CIP.

Phase 1, Background Research/Analysis (Winter, 2021 to Spring, 2022):

- Review background data (completed);
- Engage the community on the CIP's focus areas (completed); and,
- Summarize work completed to date in an interim report (we are here).

Phase 2, Prepare the CIP (Spring, 2022):

- Draft the CIP, Streetscape Improvement Plan, and Municipal Leadership Strategy.

Phase 3, Refine and Adopt the CIP (Spring to Summer, 2022):

- Engage the community on the draft CIP;
- Revise the CIP; and,
- Approve and implement the CIP.

1.3 Purpose of this Interim Report

The purpose of this report is to provide a general outline of the results and findings of work undertaken during the Phase 1 (Background Research/Analysis) portion of the project timeline.

2 Background Review Summary

2.1 Key Issues

The initial round of engagement occurred between November, 2021 and February, 2022. Throughout this engagement period, the project team identified key issues with respect to the CIP's five focus areas. More detailed information on stakeholder and public input, online survey results, and polling information can be found in Appendix A (for an accessible PDF version of the Summary of Stakeholder and Public Input, please go to <https://carletonplace.ca/community-improvement-plan.php> and refer to the "What We Heard" – Summary Document").

Provided below are summaries of stakeholder input, public input, and the major themes for the CIP, as identified through consultation.

2.1.1 Stakeholder Input

The project team reached out to 19 potential stakeholders identified by the Town and requested 30-minute interviews to discuss challenges and opportunities that a CIP could address for the Town of Carleton Place. A total of 18 stakeholders participated with the project team in a structured interview, with questions related to four² of the key themes of the CIP. These four themes of discussion were accessibility, affordable housing, brownfield redevelopment, and façade improvement.

A majority of interviewees also expressed interest in attending Public Information Centres (PICs) and stated that they would be willing to answer follow-up questions during the development of the CIP, if needed.

Stakeholders were primarily concerned with the preservation and restoration of heritage and historic features of the Town, followed by concern for vulnerable populations.

2.1.2 Public Input

Public input was collected in the form of an online survey, digital correspondence from Town residents, and the project's first PIC that was hosted on January 27, 2022.

² The fifth key theme of streetscape improvement was not a topic of discussion during the stakeholder interviews, but it was discussed at the first Public Information Centre.

Members of the public identified their key issues as the need for bicycle infrastructure throughout the Town and the need to adjust the initial CIP boundaries to include nearby areas of the Town that will benefit from access to financial incentives.

2.1.3 Major Themes

The project team identified 13 major themes that will guide future work on the CIP, and these themes reflect the feedback received through the stakeholder interviews, public information centre, digital correspondence, and online survey. A simple tabulation of the number of times each theme was discussed is below in Table 1.

Table 1: Major themes identified in stakeholder interviews and public consultation

Major Theme	Number of Times Discussed in Stakeholder Interviews	Number of Times Discussed in Public Input	Total per Theme
Sustainability	3	3	6
Sidewalk accessibility	3	3	6
Heritage & history	5	0	5
Vulnerable populations	4	1	5
“15-minute cities” ³ development	3	2	5
Bicycle infrastructure	0	5	5
Adjusting CIP boundaries	0	5	5
Signage	3	1	4
Mixed-use development	3	0	3
Homelessness	3	0	3
Energy efficiency	3	0	3
Secondary suites	2	0	2
“8 to 80” urban design ⁴	0	2	2

³ A 15-minute city is one that is designed and spatially organized to give its residents the ability to walk or cycle to essential daily amenities within a 15-minute timeframe.

⁴ “8 to 80” urban design is where the design is intended to accommodate people from ages of 8 to 80 with a wide range of abilities.

As the project progresses, the project team will continue to seek out stakeholder and public input as it designs the financial incentives programs and prepares the CIP.

2.2 Trends

2.2.1 CIP Best Practices

The project team undertook a best practices review to identify trends in CIP programs in select municipalities. The three municipalities that were selected included the City of Belleville, the City of Welland, and the Town of Cobourg, due to their similarities in community improvement needs and goals.

Tables 2 to 4 below highlight CIP programs that were considered for the Carleton Place CIP, with programs that were common across multiple municipalities. Boxes with a '✓' indicate that a program was included in the CIP, while boxes with an '✗' indicate that a program was not included.

Table 2: CIP Programs for Affordable Housing

Program	Belleville CIP
Development Charge Rebate	✓
Building Permit Fee Rebate	✓
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	✓
Second Unit Grant	✓
Accessibility Top-up Grant	✓

Belleville’s recent Affordable Housing CIP formed the foundation of the project team’s best practices review for affordable housing incentives, being the first of its kind in eastern Ontario.

Table 3: CIP Programs for Downtown Revitalization

Program	Belleville CIP	Cobourg CIP	Welland CIP
Residential Permit and Fee Reduction Program	✓	✓	✓
Tax Increment Financing (TIF) or Grant (TIG)	✓	✓	✓

Background Review Summary

Program	Belleville CIP	Cobourg CIP	Welland CIP
Fire Retrofitting Program	✓	✗	✗
Façade Improvement Program	✓	✓	✓
Building Improvement Program	✗	✓	✓
Study Grant Program	✗	✓	✓
Development Charge Program	✗	✓	✓
Fees Grant Program	✗	✗	✓
Planning Application Fee Grant	✗	✗	✓

Common downtown revitalization programs are Residential Permit and Fee Reduction Programs, Tax Increment Financing (TIF) or Grants (TIG), and a Façade Improvement Program. These programs were common across all three municipalities' CIPs.

Table 4: CIP Programs for Brownfield Redevelopment

Program	Belleville CIP	Cobourg CIP	Welland CIP
Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grant Program	✓	✗	✓
Tax Increment Equivalent Grant (TIEG) Program	✓	✗	✓
Tax Assistance Program	✗	✓	✓
Building Permit Fees Grant and Development Charge (DC) Deferral Program	✓	✗	✓
Development Charge Exemption Program	✗	✗	✓
Environmental Remediation Tax Cancellation Assistance Program	✓	✗	✗

There were no brownfield redevelopment programs common across all three municipalities, however most of the programs offered were common across at least two municipalities' CIPs.

2.3 Constraints

The Town of Carleton Place is expected to grow to a population of 20,964 (an increase of 97%, according to County of Lanark population projections) within the next 20 years. This trend in growth will require a significant increase in housing stock in order to accommodate new residents. According to stakeholder input, housing prices are expected to continue to rise, creating a greater need for affordable housing at a time when affordable units are already limited in availability.

Additionally, the Town must be able to maintain funding levels of the CIP that align with their budget, while they provide financial incentives that are enticing enough to encourage uptake of CIP funding. As outlined in the Town's Official Plan,

“Council shall have regard for the phasing of improvements in order to permit a logical sequence of events to occur without unnecessary hardship to area residents and the business community. The improvements should be prioritized according to the following:

- a) The ability for the Town to fund community improvement projects;
- b) The availability of senior level government programs that provide assistance for community improvement; and,
- c) The alignment of required capital expenditures to undertake community improvement with departmental priorities and associated capital budgets.”

3 Opportunities and Gaps

The project team conducted an analysis informed by background research, best practices, public input, and existing Town policies to identify opportunities and challenges, or gaps, related to the creation and implementation of the Town of Carleton Place's CIP. These opportunities and gaps for four of the focus areas are briefly outlined in the following sections.

3.1 Accessibility

3.1.1 Opportunities

- Input received from the public indicated that there is a need for accessibility enhancements for both businesses and private residences.
- Creating an application that allows for accessibility and façade improvement funding to be requested jointly.
- Both interior and exterior accessibility renovations may be included.
- Accessible elements can also be worked into the draft Streetscape Improvement Plan.

3.1.2 Gaps

- Some businesses in older or heritage buildings in the Town may be unable to meet interior accessibility standards due to floor area size or seating needs.
- Priority areas and/or priority accessible features must be identified to determine the incentive programs that need to be initiated first.

3.2 Affordable Housing

3.2.1 Opportunities

- Input received from the public indicated that there is a need for additional affordable housing units across the whole of the Town.
- Non-financial incentives could also be provided through the CIP, such as education for those looking to add a second unit to their dwelling.
- Potential to provide affordable housing funding to brownfield redevelopments that include affordable units.

- Local organizations have expressed support and interest in the financial incentives, suggesting potential quick uptake.

3.2.2 Gaps

- Ensuring developments that benefit from the incentive program(s) result in units that remain at or below average market rate in the long term requires documentation, monitoring and reporting to ensure compliance.
- Incentives must be significant enough to be worth pursuing in order to get uptake in the program and achieve the desired outcome.
- Financing a range of incentive programs that will address a variety of housing typologies when municipal funds are limited; it may not be practical or possible to finance multiple incentive programs concurrently.

3.3 Brownfield Redevelopment

3.3.1 Opportunities

- Input received from the public indicated that there is a desire for brownfield redevelopment projects to focus on sustainable materials and green building design.
- Potential to provide affordable housing funding to brownfield redevelopments that include affordable units.
- Potential to require public green space and waterfront access, where applicable, at brownfield redevelopment sites.
- Potential to require enhanced accessibility features over the minimum Ontario Building Code requirements at brownfield redevelopment sites.

3.3.2 Gaps

- Limitations by the Province on how funding can be used may discourage redevelopment.
- Incentives must be significant enough to be worth pursuing in order to get uptake in the program and achieve the desired outcome.
- Risk that landowners may choose not to redevelop land and instead wait for an appreciation in value – may require consideration for penalties on unused brownfield sites.

3.4 Façade Improvement

3.4.1 Opportunities

- Town's existing façade improvement plan (operated in partnership with the Downtown Business Improvement Area) has had excellent uptake.
- Create an application that allows for façade improvement and accessibility funding to be requested jointly.
- Encourage historic elements in façades – materials, designs, original building colours or signage, etc.
- Possibility to create a tiered program with greater funding available to those undertaking significant façade improvements above and beyond the minimum.
- Input received from the public indicated that there is a desire for the eligibility area to extend beyond the downtown area to encourage enhancements to the "gateway" to the Town from Highway 7.

3.4.2 Gaps

- Considerations required to ensure that façade improvements are not removed from a building if a business moves from the eligibility area.
- Input received from the public indicated that there should be a priority for façade improvement funding to be given to small or local businesses before being given to properties or business owned by larger corporations.

4 Recommendations on Financial Incentive Strategies

Consideration for how the programs in the three CIPs (Downtown, Affordable Rental Housing, and Brownfields) may be stacked will be critical to ensure the financial viability of the programs, and the phasing of the programs over time. Provided below are preliminary recommendations on the financial incentive strategies for Accessibility, Affordable Housing, Brownfield Redevelopment, and Façade Improvement. It should be emphasized that these recommendations are preliminary, and the final funding levels may be different in the Town’s CIP.

4.1 Accessibility Incentives

Proposed Program	Recommended Provision
Exterior Accessibility Improvement Program	Offers 50% of project costs up to a maximum of \$5,000 for property owners who install exterior accessibility enhancements to their building.
Interior Accessibility Improvement Program	Offers 50% of project costs up to a maximum of \$5,000 for property owners who install interior accessibility enhancements to their building.

4.2 Affordable Housing Incentives

Proposed Program	Recommended Provision
Development Charge Rebate	Offers coverage of partial to 100% of development charges over 10 years, dependent on the amount of affordable housing units provided.
Building Permit Fee Rebate	Offers coverage of partial to 100% of building permit fees over 10 years, dependent on the amount of affordable housing units provided.

Recommendations on Financial Incentive Strategies

Proposed Program	Recommended Provision
Tax Increment Financing (TIF)	Offers coverage of partial to 100% of taxes over 10 years, dependent on the amount of affordable housing units provided.
Second Unit Grant	Offers a \$5,000 rebate for homeowners who add a legal second unit with an additional \$2,000 added, if more than \$30,000 was spent on adding the legal second unit.
Accessibility Co-application	Allows applicants to apply for accessibility funding incentives jointly with their affordable housing application.

4.3 Brownfield Redevelopment Incentives

Proposed Program	Recommended Provision
Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) Grant	Offers a grant equal to 50% of the cost of up to two (2) eligible environmental studies to a maximum grant of \$20,000 per environmental study, capped at \$35,000 per project.
Tax Increment Grant (TIG) Program	Offers an annual rebate equivalent to up to 50% of the municipal portion of the incremental tax increase or total remediation costs, whichever is less. The maximum duration of this rebate is 10 years or when the cumulative rebate equals the total eligible costs, and a limit of one rebate per property. ⁵
Building Permit Fees Grant	Offers a rebate equivalent to 50% of the building permit fees associated with the development up to the cost of remediation.
Development Charge Deferral Program	Offers a deferral of up to 50% of the Development Charge for a period of up to 18 months without interest, subject to a Deferral Agreement.

⁵ Further financial analysis to determine the program's financial incentives, as part of drafting the CIP, will determine whether funding caps may be required for the TIG Program and Building Permit Fees Grant.

Recommendations on Financial Incentive Strategies

It is important to note that:

- costs of investigating and remediating a potential brownfield property (i.e., assessment, remediation, risk management) are eligible for CIP funding; and,
- costs of developing a brownfield property (i.e., construction of materials and labour, management, purchase of equipment) are not eligible for CIP funding.

4.4 Façade Improvement Incentives

Proposed Program	Recommended Provision
Façade Improvement Program	Offers a grant up to 50% of the cost of up to \$15,000 in façade improvements. An additional \$2,500 grant may be given to applications that include the restoration of heritage features with approved materials and designs.
Streetfront Improvement Program	Offers a separate grant equal to 50% of the cost of eligible side and/or rear facade improvement/restoration works to a maximum grant of \$5,000 per property/project. This may be provided for properties where the side and/or rear facades are highly visible from a public parking area and/or public open space.
Accessibility Co-application	Allows applicants to apply for accessibility funding incentives jointly with their façade improvement application.

5 Municipal Leadership Strategy

A Municipal Leadership Strategy identifies and prioritizes municipally-led initiatives for the Town to enhance its infrastructure, streetscapes, and public areas that are fully or partially within the CIP area boundary. Potential candidate projects for the Municipal Leadership Strategy emerged through public and stakeholder consultation, and their prioritization within the Municipal Leadership Strategy will consider the following: public realm and connectivity; ability to implement; timeline to implement; potential costs; and tangible benefits to the community.

In this section, the following components of the CIP's Municipal Leadership Strategy are described in further detail:

- the Streetscape Improvement Plan, where proposed enhancements to the streetscape (i.e., the public right-of-way) would be considered as candidate projects of the Municipal Leadership Strategy; and,
- other public investments that the public would like the Town to prioritize.

5.1 Streetscape Improvement Plan

A Streetscape Improvement Plan is a strategy to improve and beautify the public right-of-way, which is the space framed by buildings and open spaces. The Streetscape Improvement Plan would look into improvements or additions to sidewalks, street furniture, paving, lighting, street trees and landscaping.

As determined through input received from the public through engagement, the top streetscape improvements they would love to see prioritized are landscaping, public seating, pedestrian-scaled lighting, and street trees. However, these improvements are planned to be implemented in the short term along Bridge Street (from Lake Avenue to the Central Bridge), as part of the Bridge Street reconstruction project. In addition to the various streetscape improvements encompassed by the Bridge Street construction project, input received from the public is that they would like to see:

- cycling infrastructure (e.g., bike lanes, "Share the Road" signage), particularly within the downtown area, as cycling is an accessible and affordable form of mobility to people of a wide range of ages and abilities;

- traffic-calming measures, as residents perceive the traffic speeds along Bridge Street to be too fast, particularly within the downtown area;
- the conversion of on-street parking spaces to patios or public seating areas, commonly referred to as “parklets”;
- opportunities for sustainable practices in design and construction; and,
- opportunities to implement “8 to 80” urban design principles.

Given that the above suggestions from the public may have merit, the project team will explore them further, in the concept drawing for the draft Streetscape Improvement Plan.

5.2 Other Priority Public Investments

To supplement the streetscape improvements identified by the public and stakeholders for the draft Streetscape Improvement Plan, other investments that the public has expressed for the Town to prioritize are as follows:

- place-making opportunities, including gateway (enhanced signage) treatments for the entrances⁶ into the Town;
- high-quality public spaces and “green development” (i.e., parks, green corridors) that are accessible and allow for opportunities to rest; and,
- wayfinding and signage, including accessible signage at trailheads in Carleton Place.

⁶ A landscape feature is already planned at the northwest corner of Lake Avenue and Bridge Street, as part of the Bridge Street reconstruction project.

6 Conclusion

This report has provided an opportunity for the project team to review all of the information and community input gathered to date and craft a series of recommendations on how the Carleton Place CIP will be shaped. The financial incentive strategies recommended in this report are intended to be reviewed by the TAC, Town staff, Council, and the public. Recommendations agreed upon between the project team and Town staff will be included in the preparation of the draft Carleton Place CIP. The draft CIP documents are anticipated to be presented to the public in late Spring, 2022.

Appendix A

Summary of Stakeholder and Public Input



Town of Carleton Place

'What We Heard' Summary of Stakeholder Interviews and Public Input

February 2022

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 Stakeholder Interviews	4
2.1 Key Findings by Theme.....	4
3.0 Public Input	9
3.1 Public Information Centre (PIC) #1	9
3.2 Digital Correspondence	11
3.3 Online Survey	12
4.0 Conclusion/Major Themes	13
Appendix A – Zoom Poll Results	14
Appendix B – Online Survey Results	16

1.0 Introduction

This document is a summary of feedback received from stakeholders and the public during the preliminary stage of the Carleton Place Community Improvement Plan (CIP) project. This “What We Heard” engagement summary provides a brief overview of the knowledge gained through targeted liaison with stakeholders in the community and a Public Information Centre (PIC), which was held on January 27, 2022. The summary then closes with a brief discussion on the major themes that the project team identified during their engagement with stakeholders and the public.

2.0 Stakeholder Interviews

The project team reached out to 19 potential stakeholders identified by the municipality and requested 30-minute interviews to discuss challenges and opportunities that a Community Improvement Plan (CIP) could address for the Town of Carleton Place. A total of 18 stakeholders participated with the project team in a structured interview with questions related to the four¹ key themes of the CIP. These four themes of discussion were brownfield redevelopment, façade improvement, accessibility, and affordable housing.

A majority of interviewees also expressed interest in attending Public Information Centres (PICs) and stated that they would be willing to answer follow-up questions during the development of the CIP, if needed.

2.1 Key Findings by Theme

2.1.1 Brownfield Redevelopment

Brownfield redevelopment stakeholders brought up the need for these sites to be redeveloped in a way that benefits the community. For example, affordable housing was the most suggested redevelopment option for brownfield development, followed by public green space.

Several stakeholders mentioned that brownfield sites near the waterfront would be ideal areas for public green spaces, as it would allow more access to the scenic views for which the Town is known.

Stakeholders noted that the DRS building is a site that needs attention, and the SRC site, as the anchor to downtown, is a potential site for brownfield redevelopment. Findlay Foundry has also been mentioned by several stakeholders as a site with great redevelopment potential. Stakeholders mentioned that the “right-hand side” of Highway 7 (i.e., the segment of Highway 7 between McNeely Avenue and Franktown

¹ The fifth key theme of streetscape improvement was not a topic of discussion during the stakeholder interviews, but it was discussed at the first Public Information Centre.

Road), where residents or visitors enter the Town from the east, may be a potential area for redevelopment².

Some stakeholders have observed that current development seems to lean towards single-detached homes or high-end condominiums. While these housing options are important to attract new residents and families, it was said by these stakeholders that they are not suitable for the current residents of Carleton Place.

Sustainability and environmental sensitivity in new developments were mentioned by stakeholders as important aspects to consider for eligibility, in that sites that require remediation should ensure that new development avoids exacerbating or repeating previous issues. Incentivizing the use of sustainable materials or designs was mentioned by one stakeholder as a funding option.

Brownfield Redevelopment stakeholders would like to see incentives for brownfield sites to align more with Town needs and goals, as well as prevent brownfield sites from being developed into more industrial lands. Stakeholders' suggestions for funding levels included waiving taxes for five years for redeveloped sites, waiving development and permit fees, and partially reimbursing for environmental remediation efforts. Penalties for vacant sites were also suggested by a stakeholder as a "stick-and-carrot" method of incentivizing the turnover of brownfield sites.

2.1.2 Façade Improvement

As noted by stakeholders, the older areas around Bridge Street are in need of revitalization, the downtown area of Carleton Place is historic, and the buildings are in need of care to restore them to their former glory.

It was also said by stakeholders that the current façade improvement plan is not working; there are contradictions written into the document that make it restrictive and not user-friendly. However, according to a stakeholder, even with the challenges, the total amount of funding is still used every year, so there is a clear interest in the program and what it provides.

Some stakeholders discussed having the façade improvement program expanded to include interior renovations that would benefit the building, or having funding to

² The consulting team recognizes that this is not a brownfield area, per se.

replace doors or windows—key features of façades that, if replaced with more energy-efficient options, would increase the sustainability of a building.

Stakeholders introduced the idea of not restricting the façade program to the downtown area, such that the entrances to the Town, industrial sites, and private residences could also be included.

Ideas for funding from stakeholders included the possibility of having tiers of funding, either percentage-based or in flat amounts, depending on the extent of proposed improvements to a building. For example:

- lower-tier amounts could be provided for basic upgrades like paint and signage;
- mid-tier amounts could be provided for lighting or window upgrades; and,
- higher-tier amounts could be provided to those who are willing to convert their façades in a way that incorporates historic materials and designs. More than one stakeholder requested support for “Banff-style” hanging signage.

There were also concerns from stakeholders that CIP funding recipients would improve their building façade with add-on features (e.g., architectural lighting) but then remove those features, if they were to relocate their business to another building. Some stakeholders suggested that the parameters for façade improvement funding be mindful of this risk and structured to prohibit this kind of activity.

2.1.3 Accessibility

Discussions with stakeholders around accessibility centered on the work planned for the downtown sidewalk (raising and grading) and how it will affect storefront access. The general consensus among the stakeholders was that raising the sidewalk will reduce the height of steps along the street overall, though some businesses on the west side may see a height increase that would actually reduce accessibility.

Some stakeholders mentioned that the upcoming sidewalk project will affect the façades of buildings and some notable heritage features, such as basement windows and front step stamps that detail original owners of buildings and their years of completion. These stakeholders expressed the importance of preserving or properly replacing these features, which should be taken into consideration in the structuring of the CIP’s Accessibility Improvement Program.

Other ideas from stakeholders for funding towards accessibility improvements included: interior renovations that would allow for wheelchair users to move around stores more easily; fully accessible washrooms; and the option to expand accessibility funding to include private residences.

It was suggested by a stakeholder that, while funding for accessibility improvements may be limited to one area or to businesses to start, the opportunity to expand accessibility funding to cover the whole of the Town and include private residences may help meet other goals of the Town, such as universal housing and housing for those with disabilities.

2.1.4 Affordable Housing

Stakeholders have expressed that affordable housing is a need that is reaching levels of concern, and they noted that rental prices have skyrocketed to take advantage of those who are not able to purchase their own homes. Stakeholders have said that “affordable” is a term with meaning that varies widely from person to person; for some people, market rent is affordable under the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) definition of 30% of income, but for others, this definition would limit them to just a couple hundred dollars per month for housing costs. Stakeholders expressed that a range of housing options must be provided, and housing providers must collaborate to house the residents of Carleton Place. Further, stakeholders indicated that rent-geared-to-income is a huge local need; the current local waitlist is long and continues to grow, as more residents face increasing economic pressures.

Stakeholders have indicated that certain demographic groups are especially vulnerable: seniors and women with children are in need of specialized affordable housing, which is hard to find in the area. Stakeholders mentioned that LGBTQ2S+³ community members are also in need of housing that is safe and affordable, as they are sometimes at risk of violence or isolation.

According to stakeholders, there is a lack of multi-unit affordable housing options in Carleton Place. Stakeholders also mentioned that affordable housing should be located in areas that are walkable and do not require the need for a private vehicle;

³ LGBTQ2S+ is an acronym for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer or Questioning, Two-Spirit, Plus.

these stakeholders said that affordable housing should be sited to give residents the ability to walk or cycle to essential daily amenities, which would build off of the “15-Minute City” concept by Carlos Moreno (retrieved from a Dezeen article by Lizzie Crook dated October 26, 2021, downloaded from “[15-Minute City concept by Carlos Moreno wins Obel Award 2021](#)”).

Stakeholders recommended that there should be policy changes to support the provision of secondary suites and additional units in single-detached housing, which would allow individual homeowners to enter the rental market and provide more housing options. Stakeholders expressed that there is a mismatch between what the market needs and what is being built. For example, single-detached homes are being built, when it has been said by some stakeholders that one-bedroom rental units are what are most needed at the moment.

Stakeholders said that, while social housing is one affordable housing option, the bigger issue is having enough rental options on the market that:

- can qualify for financial relief opportunities like rent subsidies or supplements; or,
- may entice people who are over-housed to downsize and free up their home for those who are looking to increase the size of their living space.

Stakeholders’ suggestions for financial incentives to promote affordable housing included: waiving development permits and fees; a policy to allow secondary suites and financial incentives that encourage their development; and encouraging partnerships between developers and housing managers, which may ease some housing pressure.

3.0 Public Input

This section of the report summarizes public input provided up to February 9, 2022.

Note: public input provided after this date will be considered by the project team during the development of the Carleton Place Community Improvement Plan (CIP).

3.1 Public Information Centre (PIC) #1

On Thursday, January 27, 2022, the project team hosted a PIC to engage the general public in the preliminary stage of the project and gain feedback on the key focus areas for the CIP. It was held virtually from 6:00 PM to 7:30 PM via the Town’s Zoom platform, where a total of 34 people attended. The event was also live-streamed on the Carleton Place City Hall Facebook page (to watch the recording of the virtual PIC, go to [Community Improvement Plan – Public Information Centre #1](#)). The PIC consisted of a presentation, an interactive feedback component, and question and answer periods by the project team.

The project team provided the public with information on the project work to date, and those who attended the PIC via Zoom were asked seven polling questions⁴ to seek their input on the direction that the CIP should take in regard to the focus areas’ eligibility boundaries and financial priorities for the Town. Zoom attendees were invited to use the chat function to submit questions and discuss the ideas presented with other attendees.

The PIC started with an introduction to the project, the project team, and the project’s purpose. A “question and answer” period then followed to allow for initial questions from attendees to be addressed. During this period, the project team heard that the Town of Carleton Place lacks sufficient employment lands, and that seniors are in need of affordable housing options within the Town. Attendees also stated that:

⁴ It is important to note that the polling questions from the PIC were also uploaded to the project’s website on January 28, where the public had until 4:00 PM on February 7, 2022 to respond to the polls and provide their feedback.

- they would like the streetscape improvement plan to include cycling infrastructure and traffic-calming measures to reduce vehicular speeds on Bridge Street; and,
- they would like to see new developments embrace sustainable practices.

The PIC then progressed into the interactive public engagement portion, where Zoom attendees were asked to provide their opinion on various aspects of the CIP via Zoom Poll. The seven questions were split into the five focus areas of Brownfield Redevelopment, Façade Improvement, Streetscape Improvement, Accessibility, and Affordable Housing. Appendix A provides detailed tables of the polling responses from Zoom attendees.

The majority of attendees were in support of the Façade Improvement eligibility area being focused on the Downtown District, and they prioritized landscaping, public seating, and street trees as their top three streetscape improvements.

Attendees overwhelmingly favoured prioritizing accessibility improvements to businesses in the Town and picked entrance ramps, accessible washrooms, and automatic doors as the top three priority enhancements needed in the Town.

With regard to affordable housing, PIC attendees indicated that there is a need for one- and two-bedroom units in the Town, and that low-income single-parent families and individuals with disabilities are perceived to be facing the greatest core housing needs. Attendees would like to primarily see non-profit developers specialized in affordable housing building small- and mid-sized apartment buildings to meet the Town's affordable housing needs.

Following the Zoom polling, the project team opened a second "question and answer" period, where attendees who had selected "other" to Zoom polling questions were encouraged to elaborate on what other choices they would like and what further options should be considered. Additional comments from attendees ranged from concerns regarding the feasibility of interior accessibility requirements for historic buildings to the encouragement of redeveloping brownfield properties to support affordable housing development. Attendees also expressed interest in the "8 to 80" urban design principles (i.e., where public spaces accommodate people from ages of 8 to 80 with a wide range of abilities), with several locations in the Town highlighted by attendees as specific examples of where those principles could be put into practice.

The project team then concluded the evening's activities and thanked participants. Those with additional input were advised to email the project team directly.

3.2 Digital Correspondence

In addition to the first PIC, interested parties had been invited to submit their thoughts and comments to the project team via email.

Some individuals that submitted comments expressed concern that they have not seen any Cycle Routes/Share the Roads signage anywhere in Carleton Place, and that there is a lack of accessibility signage at trailheads within the Town's boundaries. Coupled with a noticed increase in cycling interest and infrastructure usage, residents have a keen interest in cycling infrastructure enhancements, particularly within the downtown area of Carleton Place.

Feedback from individuals on façade improvement included suggestions to expand the Façade Improvement eligibility boundary to include areas outside of the downtown, specifically:

- the blocks closest to the river and north of the bridge on Bridge Street;
- a portion of Moore Street;
- the streets that run parallel to Bridge Street (Beckwith Street and Victoria Street); and,
- the rear façades of buildings that face Bridge Street.

Streetscape improvement was a common topic of discussion among feedback received via email. Some of the suggestions for streetscape improvement features included "parklets" (i.e., conversions of on-street parking spaces to patios or public seating areas) and traffic-calming enhancements to the Bridge Street corridor. Some individuals are interested in extending the streetscape improvement eligibility boundary across the bridge to the north into Sinclair Square, and east along Lake to the farmer's market/Ottawa Valley Recreational Trail.

Individuals who sent written feedback stated that "8 to 80" urban design and green development are a priority, and the Town needs place-making and high-quality public spaces that feature rest stops and accessibility.

Suggestions from individuals on affordable housing incentives included waiving development charges to assist in lowering the cost of construction of new rental units

and ensuring the financial incentives can be adapted to encourage the development of various unit types as needed. Three-bedroom apartments were specifically mentioned by individuals as being a high priority need in the Town to meet the housing needs of families.

Individuals' comments on brownfield redevelopment focused on the opportunities to encourage brownfield redevelopment to have a focus on green spaces and public spaces with connections to existing active transportation networks in Town. There was a suggestion from an individual that "cash-in-lieu" of development fees go towards sidewalks, paths, and green spaces within the development or the nearby community. Public input generally expressed that the CIP should incentivize brownfield redevelopment that contributes to the "public good", for example heritage preservation, affordable housing, parks, active transportation, accessibility, and water access.

3.3 Online Survey

An online survey ran from January 28, 2022 to February 7, 2022. The questions used for the online survey were the same seven polling questions that were presented to the public at PIC #1 through Zoom. A total of 61 respondents completed the survey. Detailed tables of online survey responses can be found in Appendix B.

The majority of respondents were in support of the Façade Improvement eligibility area being focused on the Downtown District, and they prioritized landscaping, street trees, and pedestrian-scaled lighting as their top three streetscape improvements.

Respondents overwhelmingly favoured prioritizing accessibility improvements to businesses in the Town, and they picked entrance ramps, accessible washrooms, and railings as the top three priority enhancements needed in the Town.

With regards to affordable housing, online survey respondents indicated that there is a need for two-bedroom units in the Town, and that low-income single parent families and individuals with disabilities are facing the greatest core housing needs.

Respondents would like to primarily see non-profit developers, who are specialized in affordable housing, build small- and mid-sized apartment buildings to meet the Town's affordable housing needs.

4.0 Conclusion/Major Themes

The project team identified major themes that will guide future work on the CIP, and these themes reflect the feedback received through the stakeholder interviews, public information centre, digital correspondence, and online survey. A simple tabulation of the number of times each major theme was discussed is below in Table 1.

Table 1: Major themes identified in stakeholder interviews and public consultation

Major Theme	Number of Times Discussed in Stakeholder Interviews	Number of Times Discussed in Public Input	Total per Theme
Sustainability	3	3	6
Sidewalk accessibility	3	3	6
Heritage & history	5	0	5
Vulnerable populations	4	1	5
"15-minute cities" development	3	2	5
Bicycle infrastructure	0	5	5
Adjusting CIP boundaries	0	5	5
Signage	3	1	4
Mixed-use development	3	0	3
Homelessness	3	0	3
Energy efficiency	3	0	3
Secondary suites	2	0	2
"8 to 80" urban design	0	2	2

As the project progresses, the project team will continue to seek out stakeholder and public input as it designs the financial incentives programs and prepares the CIP.

Appendix A – Zoom Poll Results

Which option for the Façade Improvement eligibility area (limited to commercial properties/buildings only) do you prefer?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Option A – Downtown District	11	36.67%
Option B – Highway 7 & McNeely Avenue area	1	3.33%
Option C – Downtown District and Highway 7 & McNeely Avenue area	8	26.67%
Option D – All of Carleton Place	10	33.33%

Total Respondents: 30

What streetscape improvements would you like prioritized in your downtown (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Public seating	23	71.88%
Pedestrian-scaled lighting	10	31.25%
Textured pavers	8	25.00%
On-street parking	8	25.00%
Landscaping	24	75.00%
Street trees	22	68.75%

Total Respondents: 32

What accessibility improvements do you feel need priority within the Town (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Entrance ramps	29	87.88%
Railings	14	42.42%
Automatic doors	22	66.67%
Accessible washrooms	24	72.73%
Elevators	5	15.15%
Other	3	9.09%

Total Respondents: 33

Would you prefer funding for accessibility improvements to be available to:	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Businesses	23	67.65%
Businesses and private residences	11	32.35%
Private residences	0	0.00%

Total Respondents: 34

Knowing that there are those who are under-housed in Carleton Place, what configuration could best meet this need in the community (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Studio unit	17	50.00%
One-bedroom unit	23	67.65%
Two-bedroom unit	23	67.65%
Three-bedroom unit	19	55.88%
Other	4	11.76%

Total Respondents: 34

What age demographic is in greater core housing need and should be prioritized for affordable housing support in Carleton Place (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Retired adults	21	61.76%
Middle-aged adults	7	20.59%
Young adults	16	47.06%
Individuals with disabilities	24	70.59%
Low income single parent families	25	73.53%
Low income dual parent families	19	55.88%
Other	3	8.82%

Total Respondents: 34

Who should participate in providing affordable housing (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Individual homeowners via secondary suites (basement apartments, coach houses, etc.)	24	70.59%
Traditional housing developers (affordable housing units mixed in with market housing units in a subdivision)	24	70.59%
For-profit affordable housing developers (small/mid-sized apartment buildings)	24	70.59%
Non-profit developers specialized in affordable housing (small/mid-sized apartment buildings)	30	88.24%
Social housing provider (government agency)	27	79.41%

Total Respondents: 34

Appendix B – Online Survey Results

Which option for the Façade Improvement eligibility area (limited to commercial properties/buildings only) do you prefer?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Option A – Downtown District	24	40.00%
Option B – Highway 7 & McNeely Avenue area	5	8.33%
Option C – Downtown District and Highway 7 & McNeely Avenue area	18	30.00%
Option D – All of Carleton Place	13	21.67%

Total Respondents: 60

What streetscape improvements would you like prioritized in your downtown (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Public seating	28	45.90%
Pedestrian-scaled lighting	34	55.74%
Textured pavers	15	24.59%
On-street parking	21	34.43%
Landscaping	39	63.93%
Street trees	39	63.93%

Total Respondents: 61

What accessibility improvements do you feel need priority within the Town (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Entrance ramps	44	73.33%
Railings	27	45.00%
Automatic doors	26	43.33%
Accessible washrooms	37	61.67%
Elevators	3	5.00%
Other	4	6.67%

Total Respondents: 60

Would you prefer funding for accessibility improvements to be available to:	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Businesses	38	62.30%
Businesses and private residences	21	34.43%
Private residences	2	3.28%

Total Respondents: 61

Knowing that there are those who are under-housed in Carleton Place, what configuration could best meet this need in the community (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Studio unit	16	27.12%
One-bedroom unit	33	55.93%
Two-bedroom unit	49	83.05%
Three-bedroom unit	19	32.20%
Other	4	6.78%

Total Respondents: 59

What age demographic is in greater core housing need and should be prioritized for affordable housing support in Carleton Place (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Retired adults	34	56.67%
Middle-aged adults	9	15.00%
Young adults	24	40.00%
Individuals with disabilities	37	61.67%
Low income single parent families	44	73.33%
Low income dual parent families	30	50.00%
Other	1	1.67%

Total Respondents: 60

Who should participate in providing affordable housing (select all that apply)?	Number of respondents	Percent of total respondents
Individual homeowners via secondary suites (basement apartments, coach houses, etc.)	19	31.15%
Traditional housing developers (affordable housing units mixed in with market housing units in a subdivision)	36	59.02%
For-profit affordable housing developers (small/mid-sized apartment buildings)	38	62.30%
Non-profit developers specialized in affordable housing (small/mid-sized apartment buildings)	43	70.49%
Social housing provider (government agency)	37	60.66%

Total Respondents: 61