

PUBLIC Comments		
44	The approach overlooks significant natural, heritage, and land use concerns. Urges the Town to not approve the OPA, claims the panhandle is a non-starter.	No development is proposed as part of the proposed OPA. Environmental and heritage matters would be addressed as part of detailed future planning applications for the lands.
45	Concerned about the need of an OPA for something that was already amended by the OLT, and does not see a justification for the purpose of this application.	This is a new application to establish the principle of access to the subject lands, irrespective of any future development of the lands.
46	The subject lands can be accessed via vinelands on East-West or vinelands on John Street instead.	That is not what is being proposed through this OPA.
47	Neighbour is concerned about potential destruction to the heritage wall, and wishes to be consulted in the event that Solmar installs infrastructure to protect their gardens and fencing.	Matters related to heritage features designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act will need to be considered in the design and construction of both the primary access and emergency access at the time of a future zoning by-law amendment and heritage permit. A heritage impact assessment will be prepared at the appropriate time.
48	Desire for Solmar to submit a comprehensive application with an OPA and development proposal to address existing OLT concerns, conduct technical studies, and engage in additional consultation with adjacent property owners.	That is not what is being proposed through this OPA. When a detailed development application is proposed, appropriate review and consultation on that application will occur at that time.
49	Claims the issue of emergency access and rezoning request are two separate issues and should be treated as such.	This is not a request for rezoning, and that is exactly what is being proposed through this OPA - to deal with the issue of access separately from a future application to address the detailed development of the subject lands.
50	Articulates that it would be more appropriate to address the Rand Estate holistically, and identify a higher level of access - one primary through John Street E and one emergency access to either John Street E. or Charlotte Street	We do not agree.
51	Claims that the width of the road is misstated, and that the Traffic Brief that identified the road as 7m in width is instead 11.5. Wants additional commentary regarding how the additional width will be accommodated	The traffic brief refers to a pavement width of 7 metres, not 11.5 metres.