

1. **Municipal Bylaws including zoning and site plan approval by-laws provide a framework to protect the collective interests of residents and business interests. Are you in favour of enforcing bylaws equitably and consistently? Do you foresee any circumstances when the Township shouldn't enforce it's bylaws?**

Joe Condy: The whole purpose of bylaws is to ensure that all residents rights are respected equally. As such, all bylaws need to be observed and enforced appropriately. Currently, some bylaws are being upgraded as the need is identified. This needs to be an ongoing process to ensure it meets the needs of the township.

Andrew Garrett: I support fair and consistent bylaw enforcement, while recognizing that education, discretion and common sense have an important role in achieving compliance.

Wenda Lalande: Yes I agree we should enforce the By Laws equitably. By Laws are a difficult part of the Township's responsibilities in that they are not as black and white as they appear. For those infractions that are straight forward, they make it easy to say yes to equitable enforcement. But some require the advice of lawyers and planners etc while some may even go so far as to reach the tribunal or even court where the outcome may not be as one would hope, resulting in thousands of tax payers dollars. Those decisions are very difficult to make and may result in what could be perceived as "Not following the By Laws"

Julie Nizman: I absolutely believe that bylaws should be enforced equitably and consistently. If bylaws are not enforceable or lack clarity, it may indicate that they need to be updated.

Lisa Ross-Black: Bylaws are useful to ensure community members are held to the same standards and requirements. They are guidelines that serve to provide a logical, rational framework that considers the community's long term interests and well-being. The intent is to protect and manage differing perspectives before problems occur and complexities (including costs) increase. Enforcement is required and is best managed in early days. Given the vast area that makes up Stone Mills Township, I believe assistance from community members to identify potential concerns is helpful.

Frank Rowan: Yes I believe by-laws need to be enforced. We have rules and regulations that are for everyone to follow. If taken to court over a by-law it could become very expensive to fight, but in the end I believe we should still enforce these by-laws.

2. **For twenty years Stone Mills Township has refused to designate (with minor exceptions) Prime farmland. In the face of Alto and other land use pressures, do you believe it is time for Stone Mills to make this designation?**

Joe Condy: If we are doing this JUST to try and stop ALTO, it will have very little impact on their process. They already have no issue planning to take it right through wildlife sensitive areas. That said, the LEAR study created many more questions on specific land uses than it answered. I do believe we need to develop a process to review and update the land study. Recently, I had the opportunity to read over an independent review of the LEAR study and it identified other methods to

more accurately identify the class of agricultural land. When speaking with OFA representatives, they also had some very good ideas on better understanding how land use needs to be addressed.

Andrew Garrett: Having grown up on a farm on Highway 41 and being a property owner myself, I have a strong appreciation for land stewardship. I also believe private property rights matter. Protecting agricultural land and our natural environment is important, but we need to be thoughtful about introducing additional restrictions that may affect property values, retirement plans and the opportunities available to landowners. If something has been debated for twenty years, I would want to understand why previous councils made the decisions they did before suggesting I have the answer.

Wenda Lalande: Stone Mills Council brought forward a motion to County Council that a LEAR (Land Evaluation and Area Review) study be done to determine if there is more prime agricultural land in the Township than was once believed to be. The LEAR Study is presently in draft form pending the feedback from County farmers. Each farmer now has the right to work with the County planner in an effort to ensure that their land is properly categorized.

Julie Nizman: Currently, Stone Mills Twp has approximately 1,000 acres of designated Prime farmland. The LEAR study, in its draft form, approximates Prime farmland at about 10,000 acres. Obviously, the methods used to classify lands need to be reviewed. We do need to make sure that we are accurately classifying lands in order to protect agricultural lands and our farmers. I believe that the land classification issue is independent of the ALTO issue.

Lisa Ross-Black: *Designating land as Prime farmland is tricky. The designation itself comes with restrictions that affect how the landowner can manage and use their property. (In an urban setting, the equivalent would be having a home designated as historically significant -- limiting the types of renovations, etc that can be done in order to protect the cultural significance -- but on a much more impactful scale.) As business owners, farmers respect many regulations that serve to protect the land and water as responsible stewards. ALTO, on the other hand, doesn't seem to share in many of the concerns expressed by community members. The big questions:*

(1) would ALTO respect the designation any more than other concerns being raised?

(2) is the designation overly restrictive to farmers?

(3) what metrics are used to fairly assess farmland?

I believe engaging farmers in this discussion is essential to addressing whether the Prime farmland designation is a help or a hindrance, or if there are other options to consider.

Frank Rowan: Yes, I do believe it is time. We should know how much land in the township is prime land. Not only for ALTO sake but so that things like solar farms are not put on prime land.

3. Newburgh has trash pickup. What are the problems with expanding this service and how would you overcome them?

Joe Condy: The garbage issue has been brought up several times. I personally live on a street that "officially" only picks up on the south (Newburgh) side of the road. This issue came up several times as I was knocking on doors. To address the issue we have to look at some of the factors that impact expansion of the garbage pickup. These include feasibility of the trucks to pick it up. Not all roads will allow the garbage trucks to access them. The idea of pick up spots has also been suggested, but this opens the door to people dumping garbage from outside the area, and critters getting into the garbage. Who cleans that up? One other glaring issue is the cost. The bag fee does not cover all the costs of the garbage and recycling in the township. Full door to door pickup would most certainly cost more. I'd need a lot more input from township staff and other specialists to assess best options.

Andrew Garrett: Infrastructure is another major consideration. Whether we're discussing roads affected by new development, the Yarker Fire Station or expanding garbage collection, these decisions have real costs. I believe in identifying needs, understanding the evidence and prioritizing investments based on affordability. I wouldn't make commitments to major expenditures without understanding their implications for taxpayers.

Wenda Lalande: The problem with Township-wide garbage pick-up stems from the vast number of small roads/ lanes that lead into cottage country. Council has looked at this several times over the past 12 years and came to the conclusion that there is no simple solution. I would bring forward the idea to look at a hybrid solution whereby those living where pick-up could be managed easily would pay extra as do inhabitants of Newburgh and those who live on unserviceable roads would continue driving to the dump.

Julie Nizman: If asked, most people would like to have trash pickup. The difficulty lies in the implementation of garbage pick up. Many of our roads will not support large garbage trucks. We also have many areas where racoons and other wildlife are a problem for outdoor waste containers. There are areas outside of our township that have tried having waste bins at main roads where rural residents can drop their garbage. This option is problematic when bins get overfull and garbage is improperly left outside the bin (again ... racoons). We do have individuals in our township who offer garbage/recycling pickup as a business at a reasonable cost (less than \$30/month). Garbage service is certainly something we should keep "on our radar", but unless there is some new innovation in garbage pickup, our current system is probably the most fiscally reasonable. It may be worth looking at whether garbage pickup makes sense on a limited scale, in the hamlets (as is done in Newburgh), but I still suspect that overall, costs and implementation difficulties will continue to be prohibitive.

Lisa Ross-Black: *While campaigning, many residents shared their concerns about the value received for the taxes being paid. Realistically, expanding garbage pick up will involve costs. During upcoming budget discussions, it makes sense to explore options and associated costs, then ask residents to weigh in on the value. As someone who is employed full time, I have wondered why all landfill sites have the same open dates and times. What would be involved in opening from 3 to 7, rather than from 12 to 4 on a Wednesday?*

Frank Rowan: Problems would be cost. Perhaps one way would be to take the fees people pay to have garbage pick taken off their property taxes to less the burden on them.

4. **During the 2025 drought numerous wells in the Township went dry or experienced water quality issues. The south of the Township with karst limestone was particularly susceptible to dry wells and water quality degradation. Are you concerned that continuing development along southern areas will create greater stress on our water resources? Assuming yes, how would you solve this problem?**

Joe Condy: I live right next to a very large farming operation and saw them having to bring in large tractor trailers of water all summer. That's a glaring indicator of what concentrated water demand can do to our water source. It's part of the reason that I do not support concentrated housing, a subdivision for example, in our township. Rather I would like to see minimum lot size be evaluated as an option. This would keep spacing adjusted to what the water source can provide. Again, I need to talk to specialists on this issue to establish a good practice. This directly ties into preservation of wetlands and rivers. You can't consider options for development and water sources without considering how these areas are directly linked to it.

Andrew Garrett: Our rivers, wetlands and groundwater are valuable resources. Recent drought conditions have demonstrated how important reliable water is to our communities. I support responsible development backed by appropriate environmental and hydrogeological assessments. I also believe we should understand the protections already in place before assuming additional regulations are necessarily the best solution.

Wenda Lalande: Water quantity is always an issue in various parts of the township. Depending on the amount of snow fall; spring rain; summer rain etc people have been plagued with this for decades. I would suggest a few things: - education/ reminders to constituents regarding water conservation such as rain barrels to water your gardens; short showers not bathing; top of your pool from water companies not from your well; if the problem persists, consider putting in a cistern as is done in many parts of Loyalist Township (I still have a cistern in my house though it has not been used for many years). Rural development is one route towards having an impact on taxes and the southern part of the township with the beautiful Napanee River and its proximity to the 401/ Kingston make this a very desirable place to build.

Julie Nizman: Because our residents rely solely on wells, it is vitally important that we protect our water resources. This includes not allowing a level of development that will overstress available water systems. There are a few things that we can do to protect our water systems. Individually, we can use effective irrigation techniques, rainwater harvesting (rain barrels), and efficient water system maintenance and use. We have a number of people moving to our area from larger centers where they had city water systems. I would like to see a "water education campaign" that would help people who are new to wells (and a "refresher" for the rest of us) about "living on a well". At the township level, we need to make sure that we are looking at new and innovative ways to manage

our groundwater and infrastructure in order to slow down surface run-off and encourage groundwater recharge.

Lisa Ross-Black: Knowing water scarcity can be a problem, I would suggest that any future development should be assessed based on water levels during July and/or August ... after spring run off has occurred, and our most vulnerable time of year has arrived. Gathering metrics during our 'worst' time for water availability would be a better guard against future shortages.

Frank Rowan: Make sure that any new homes are spreading far apart so as not to put stress on the water resources in the area.

5. The lands adjacent to the Napanee and Salmon Rivers are facing development pressures. Warner Pasture subdivision, the Robinson Road development and the McKeown Drive development are all in the Napanee River valley. Would you support changes to the official plan to provide greater protection for our river and wetland environments?

Joe Condy: This issues ties in with proper identification of land use identification, but also impacts on adjacent watersheds and rivers. Additionally, it has to take into account the impact on water aquifers as well. With proper identification that considers this, I would support changes to the official plan to recognize all the significant impacts on development.

Andrew Garrett: Having grown up on a farm on Highway 41 and being a property owner myself, I have a strong appreciation for land stewardship. I also believe private property rights matter. Protecting agricultural land and our natural environment is important, but we need to be thoughtful about introducing additional restrictions that may affect property values, retirement plans and the opportunities available to landowners. If something has been debated for twenty years, I would want to understand why previous councils made the decisions they did before suggesting I have the answer.

Wenda Lalande: Protection for our rivers is a deep concern of mine not only regarding development but of equal importance, the manner in which property owners with waterfront maintain their yards. I attended a very insightful lecture about 10 years ago and the speaker addressed the importance of protecting the shoreline, an area called the Riparian zone where many important species live. By allowing this area (approximately 9 metres) to stay as natural as possible, this can help drop the temperature of the water by 1 degree. It is easy to do but many landowners want their yards manicured right down to the water. Wetlands should always be protected as they are a vital part of our ecosystem system- the tremendous importance of a wetland on so many levels such as habitat; drainage and filtration should not be devalued for the need to increase "waterfront property"

Julie Nizman: It is imperative that we protect our water supply. New developments need to ensure proper water supply and protection for both new and existing residents. Our official plan and development approval process need to keep water protection as a top priority.

Lisa Ross-Black: *We are all stewards of our environment ... land, water and air. We need to make thoughtful decisions to balance growth opportunities with this responsibility.*

Frank Rowan: Yes, I would as everyone needs clean water to live. Once its polluted its very costly to repair or remedy.

6. Concerns have been expressed regarding traffic exceeding speed limits in the Township. Kingston has been proactive in implementing traffic calming measures in areas of concern such as Queen Mary and Woodbine roads, Amherstview has done the same along Speers Boulevard. Are you in favour of implementing similar traffic calming measures in our rural towns, villages and hamlets?

Joe Condy: I am 100% on board with traffic calming measures. After nearly 20 years with Stone Mills Fire, I've seen a few bad accidents where speed has been a major contributing factor. Prime example is the intersection of County Road 11 and County Road 16 into Strathcona. This is a blind hill. We responded to one very bad one where a car going fast came over the hill and ended up under the transport trailer. Fortunately, he survived. But I've talked to many people in our communities that echo similar speed issues. This needs to be addressed very soon.

Andrew Garrett: Traffic safety is something I take seriously. I'm supportive of reasonable traffic-calming measures where there's a demonstrated need, particularly in our villages and hamlets. The farm I grew up on is located on Highway 41, and recently my aunt attended a County meeting and successfully advocated for slow-moving farm vehicle signs in the community. It's a good example of how residents can bring forward practical concerns and achieve meaningful improvements.

Wenda Lalande: Traffic calming measures have been discussed numerous times by Council with both the OPP as well as the County's Technical Advisory Committee with limited success. It is time to re-visit this with more firmness. Townships to our south have initiated measures and we need to see the same kind of consideration given to the people of Stone Mills. This will be brought forward with the new Council.

Julie Nizman: There are three options for dealing with speeding issues: Enforcement, Engineering, Education. Enforcement is expensive and is only a temporary fix (while cruisers are present). Engineering can also be expensive but does include the traffic calming measures implemented in Kingston and Amherstview as mentioned. Narrowing of lanes and introduction of visible "barriers" can help slow traffic. I would support implementation of these traffic calming measures where possible. Where calming measures are limited, we are left with Education. Temporary, electronic "Slow Down" signs can help draw attention to reduced speed zones. Personally, I have been much more aware of my driving speeds since talking to people about traffic issues during my campaigning. I don't like people speeding past my driveway, so I try to remember that when I'm driving elsewhere. It may not make a big difference, but I am committed to being an example of the change I would like to see!

Lisa Ross-Black: While campaigning, I witnessed several vehicles zipping along well above the posted speed limits. And, in some areas, noted there is a lack of signage to point out the limits. A multi-pronged, proactive approach ... one that includes traffic calming measures, increased signage, and a community awareness campaign ... could help make a difference.

Frank Rowan: Yes, where we can slow traffic down we should try to do so. We would need co-operation from the Province on routes like Highway 41.

7. **Since the Fire Station in Yarker was built, the number of homes in the area of the village has increased significantly. The location, size and design of the Yarker Fire Station is considered by many as not being adequate. What is your take on this? Will you commit to address this issue?**

Joe Condy: As a long time member of Stone Mills Fire, this has been a growing issue for some time. I know that this issue has been and is being reviewed. I would support an upgrade of the Yarker station and would really look forward to the challenge to make this a planned and cost effective upgrade.

Andrew Garrett: Infrastructure is another major consideration. Whether we're discussing roads affected by new development, the Yarker Fire Station or expanding garbage collection, these decisions have real costs. I believe in identifying needs, understanding the evidence and prioritizing investments based on affordability. I wouldn't make commitments to major expenditures without understanding their implications for taxpayers.

Wenda Lalonde: I agree that the Fire Station in Yarker no longer meets the needs of the current and future community. I would support that it is time for a new station.

Julie Nizman: A large portion of the development fees collected from new builders is related to fire services. As our population increases, we need to ensure that all of our services, including fire departments, are adequate to keep up with demand. Service infrastructure needs to be reviewed regularly. A fire safety education campaign may also be helpful (proper use of fire extinguishers, proper burning procedures, where to find current burn restrictions), as many of our new residents are new to rural living.

Lisa Ross-Black: Our population continues to grow, and our community emergency services need to match that growth. Management of our Township budget should include reserves to support growth needs while respecting taxation levels.

Frank Rowan: I do not know the particulars of this problem, but I would agree to re-examine this issue.

8. Will you maintain the current councils' opposition to alto? Are you opposed to council signing an NDA as requested by ALTO?

Joe Condy: I stand against ALTO. That will not change. I am in full support of other alternatives that will upgrade and expand the existing VIA rail network. It is hard to predict what moves the federal government will try to enact, but I will support all options to stop the ALTO development in not only our township, but those affected by this.

Andrew Garrett: As for ALTO, my opposition remains firm. I believe council needs to continue advocating strongly for our residents and maintaining transparency throughout the process. I would oppose this project fully and would want to learn how to work against it more effectively if possible. I would not support a confidentiality agreement that restricts our ability to represent the community through transparency specifically. I have not met one person in favour of this project.

Wenda Lalande: Yes I am very much opposed to ALTO coming through Stone Mills or anywhere else for that matter. The cost; the environmental impact; the effect on farms; the change in how EMS will navigate around the route; the alteration to people going to and from work; the instability of the rails on fractured bedrock (karst topography). Council has already passed a motion to not sign a Confidentiality Sharing Agreement (non-disclosure agreement) and I would vote to continue to uphold that.

Julie Nizman: I oppose ALTO 100%. Our argument can't just be that "we don't want it in our backyard" or "it will inconvenience us". As a project, the benefit does not appear to justify the cost. The ridership numbers are largely unsubstantiated and the projected costs are vague. The closest "comparatives" of HSR systems in other countries do not share our snowy climate. My understanding is that the current NDA requested by ALTO is a 5-year agreement and is very vague. I agree, and would continue to support, not signing this type of agreement. ALTO's proprietary information can be protected with much more narrowly focussed NDAs that would not prevent taxpayers from having access to general information about the project.

Lisa Ross-Black: There is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding ALTO, with what feels like more questions than answers coming to light with each passing day. As a community, we need to be able to freely discuss the implications of ALTO. An NDA prevents that from being possible, while not providing any guarantee of helpful information in return. Given the current situation with ALTO, I fail to see any benefits to signing an NDA and support the current council's opposition.

Frank Rowan: Yes, I would continue my opposition to ALTO.

9. When new developments are approved will you support improvements to existing infrastructure impacted by the development such as, in the case of Warner Pasture, improvements to Colebrook Road?

Joe Condy: This ties into the water usage question above and has a direct parallel. IF an expansion is approved, it must consider all aspects of the area involved. That should include everything water to roads to services.

Andrew Garrett: Infrastructure is another major consideration. Whether we're discussing roads affected by new development, the Yarker Fire Station or expanding garbage collection, these decisions have real costs. I believe in identifying needs, understanding the evidence and prioritizing investments based on affordability. I wouldn't make commitments to major expenditures without understanding their implications for taxpayers.

Wenda Lalande: I would be in favour of improving infrastructures when new development occurs. We have seen this recently on Cutler Road, north west of Yarker and Centreville Road where many new houses have gone in and subsequently the roads were improved. The only one consideration I have heard from our Roads department and also from the residents on these roads is that when the road was widened and tarred, the speed increased substantially. But that is a topic for another question.

Julie Nizman: The impact of new developments needs to be accurately assessed. In the case of Warner Pasture, increased traffic on Colebrook Road is definitely a concern. Most would assume that Colebrook Road is just a quiet sideroad. It is actually a major bypass route for Yarker. I travel it myself when travelling from Moscow to Kingston and when I was commuting, I was generally in a group of vehicles taking the same bypass. Lighting at Colebrook Rd and County Rd 1 will have to be reviewed, along with road widths and pedestrian walkways.

Lisa Ross-Black: Growth in Stone Mills needs to be done responsibly ... for the betterment of our communities, and for the safety of our residents. Creating a new subdivision without considering changing infrastructure needs is not in anyone's best interests.

Frank Rowan: Yes, when new homes are being built the future property tax should help to reduce any development costs at the beginning of the project.