

Planning Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Oct 29 2019

Town Council Chambers

Present

Mayor L. Boucher, Chair (arrived at 5:45 p.m.)

Councillor W. Cormier

Deputy Mayor D. MacInnis

T. Barkhouse

C. Hughes

R. Sers

J. Bain, Director of EDPC, Planning & Development Services

P. Dec, Planner

A. Dunphy, Planner

J. Lawrence, CAO

S. Scannell, Director of Community Development

D. Halfpenny, Secretary

Guests

Councillor D. Roberts

Councillor M Farrell

Councillor A. Murray

Call to Order

J. Lawrence advised that Chair Mayor L. Boucher would be late and that Councillor W. Cormier would be chairing the meeting until her arrival.

W. Cormier called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. and asked P. Dec if an agenda was available.

P. Dec stated that he had not circulated an agenda as the intention of these special meetings is to work through as many of the items as can be covered.

Approval of Special Meeting Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the Special Meeting Minutes of October 22 were approved as circulated. Motion Carried

W. Cormier turned the floor over to P. Dec

P. Dec acknowledged that the Planning Advisory Committee had accomplished a great deal during the Oct 22 Special meeting. He provided a quick review of items of consensus and reintroduced items that had been tabled. He explained the Eastern District Planning technique is to look at the documents as how does the Town of Antigonish want the documents to work.

P. Dec noted that the PAC had done a great job with the Floodplain work. He stated that ponding had been added to the Moderate Floodplain risk.

Councillor W. Cormier commented that the reference to the berm is actually more of a restored bank and he provided background of a business using the river as a spot to wash gravel and had dug out a portion of the bank.

Accessory Buildings in 1-20 zones

P. Dec asked that committee members provide a decision as to whether accessory buildings may be permitted in a 1-20 high risk zone. He acknowledged that consistency is important to remember when making a decision. He reminded the committee that residential locations as well as the Shopping Mall would be subjected to the same policy.

P. Dec stated he had reviewed the LUB for the Town of New Glasgow and Town of Truro and advised that the Town of New Glasgow permits accessory buildings in 1-20 zones and Town of Truro prohibits them. He noted that the province has not responded to his request to date for clarification.

Discussion followed on moderate and high risk floodplain areas including a review of highlights respecting challenges at the Antigonish Market Square location and residential area at 13 Court Street.

T. Barkhouse expressed concern over potential to add 25% of an existing building in a floodplain.

Discussion followed on 200 sq ft. as a more realistic number. P. Dec will work on this and bring back to committee.

J. Bain commented that by excluding accessory buildings in an 1-20 zone the only way for an application to obtain an accessory buildings in 1-20 zones they would be required to go through a Development Agreement where they are subject to all the floodproofing requirements such as needing a sign off by a qualified Engineer, etc.

Discussion followed on disallowing accessory buildings in 1-20 and DA being only option to build in such zones.

Consensus was reached that accessory builds are to be prohibited in 1-20 zones and only option for consideration is through DA..

Mayor L. Boucher joined the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Residential Policies

P. Dec reminded the committee that they had agreed to relax parking in the downtown area. He asked if the committee would also like to relax the parking requirements in the residential areas. He provided a comparison of the 1994 LUB parking requirements and the proposed parking requirements for residential areas RN-1 and RN-2. He advised that a 4 unit building would require 6 parking spots with the 1994 LUB and the proposed would decrease the number down to 3 parking spaces required.

Single family dwellings were noted to require two unobstructed parking spaces.

M. L. Boucher asked if it would be permissible to have different parking requirements for different areas.

P. Dec replied of course it just has to be clarified what type of parking where.

Discussion followed and it was agreed that the 1994 LUB parking requirements should be maintained for residential areas and relaxed in the downtown area. Consensus achieved.

DA Policies for Multiple Unit Buildings

P. Dec review the types of multiple unit buildings-townhouses, carriage houses, and urban cottages requirements.

P. Dec will do some work on and bring back to the Committee a clear definition for next week.

He noted that the current 1994 LUB has many useful and well thought out provisions that have not been carried forward in the proposed WSP LUB. He asked PAC if they would consider adding these provisions back into the LUB.

Discussion followed on landscaping, stormwater management requirements, required green space, rain gardens as part of a stormwater management plans, and permeable surface requirements.

W. Cormier commented that the Antigonish Farmers Mutual features a prime example of a rain garden for stormwater management.

Mayor L. Boucher advised that her new development has landscaping features with swales located below and specific design to allow rain to soak into the ground.

P. Dec commented that one a prime example of using a parking variance is the Development at 74/76 Church Street where negotiation in the Development process allowed for the consideration of 15 parking spaces per unit based instead of 19 based on the rationale that it is in close proximity to the downtown and local amenities, some of the units are accessibility units, etc. He advised that the new policy doesn't mention on a case by case basis and what is required depending on circumstances and recommended a policy be put in place.

Discussion followed on parking variances for Development Agreements.

Deputy Mayor D. MacInnis commented that there needs to be a policy for parking spaces.

Councillor W. Cormier advised that their needs to be some degree of flexibility

P. Dec stated that through the Development Agreement council can consider a lower amount of parking through the negotiation process.

R. Sers noted that it is a starting point but that there should be more clear definition of the Development Agreement policy.

J. Bain advised that it is important to have some direction to negotiate, that the 1994 version is a bit nebulous but helpful. He advocated to include in the new 2019 but to massage the wordage to clarify the policy.

P. Dec will work on wordage and add to 2019 proposed version of LUB.

Old Town Zone

P. Dec showed the current mapping for the Old Town Zone area and recommended changing the boundaries to better reflect the current housing in these areas. He explained that the intent of Old Town was to maintain the aesthetics of the heritage home area by adding requirements for architectural design, requiring building to have similar slope to roofs, be a minimum of 1 ½ stories, etc. He commented that the top of Hawthorne and a portion of Brookland Street and potentially Hillcrest Street could be clipped out of the current mapping

Discussion followed . Consensus was reached. PAC agreed with the removal of top of Hawthorne portion and Brookland Street portion from Old Town Mapping. However, it was determined that Hillcrest Street should remain as part of Old Town.

P. Dec used 74-76 Church Street policy as an example of how existing policy added clarification for distances needed for waste containers, , stormwater management, preservation of trees, snow storage, amenities area, etc

Discussion followed: Consensus was reached that the 1994 details should be added to the 2019 updated policy.

P. Dec will work on including addition of 1994 requirements into the proposed 2019 version and will bring a copy for review at next PAC special meeting.

RN-1 with 5 or more units and RN-2 with 7 or more units

P. Dec illustrated possible configurations for Urban Cottages and Carriage Houses for possible parking areas and overall lot layout..

Discussion followed. PAC members insisting the proper buffering is key point.

W. Cormier provided an example of the St Mary's parking lot and how former Town Planner S. Day had come up with an idea to keep the existing house and have it act as a buffer to the parking lot, add some landscaping all while ensuring proper snow storage and parking flow was achieved.

P. Dec to do further work on for next meeting.

Heritage Buildings

P. Dec pointed out that there was an issue with the proposed policy as the word 'any' made the policy entirely too vague. He concluded that perhaps it may be a typo as if the word was removed it made more sense.

Consensus was made by PAC that the word any should be removed.

Small Lot Development

P. Dec pointed out that this proposed section of the LUB has been changed considerably from the 1994 version.

Discussion followed with PAC insisting that they do not want flag lot configurations, they want requirements of subdivision law, they want to avoid l-shaped lots, the direction given to P. Dec was to make sure old policy is revised, clear definition of infill development, map what works and what doesn't, have a minimum frontage. It was agreed that small units side by side not behind each other would look better.

Mayor L. Boucher stated that she didn't have a problem with having small lot development but that they need to be good development .

P. Dec agreed that with as of right frontage could be 12m. He commented that the direction from PAC has given him enough direction to determine the potential and he will be able to have something drafted for review at next meeting.

PAC to review revised material at next meeting.

New Mobile Home Parks

P. Dec advised that there isn't much to prevent medium density development. He stated that there is no need to change the policy.

Consensus by PAC

Design Issues

Better small lot development

P. Dec noted that design requirements for Main Street have built form provisions for facades, architectural, neighbouring, primary entrance and mixed use buildings. He advised that in the new version of the LUB there is the addition of a 3meter floor to floor height to meet ventilation requirements.

Building in behind existing buildings in downtown

Two areas that P. Dec suggested needing changes were the need to use DA in all cases and that requirement that all buildings built behind must comply with the Main St design requirements.

Discussion followed. PAC members agreed that it is important to maintain the vibrancy of downtown and that increasing the density is important and therefore the Site Plan Approval would work best and buildings behind should have more relaxed design requirements as they will not be seen from the street and potential more of a residential nature.

Consensus by PAC to meld elements of old policy into the new policy..

James Street

P. Dec acknowledged that he James Street area is a little more lenient for design elements than the downtown area. Proposed LUB will see parking for new developments required to be behind the building.

PAC comments should have more direction in policy as noted in old policy,

Consensus that old policy should be incorporated into new.

Signage Issues

PAC agreed that the policy of no billboards should remain; strict enforcement of mobile signs for grand openings and special events (minimum of 14 days); no internally illuminated signs, no flashing signs, one sign per business with inclusion of professional office, and signage to be no more than 10 % of facade of building in total (multiple businesses, signs in total must make up 10% of the size of building frontage). This policy should include James St also. The Commercial zone 20% of the facade of the building.

P. Dec will rework the signage policy as per PAC recommendations.

Development Agreement notification process.

P. Dec asked PAC members to review the requirements proposed by WSP. It was agreed that the proposed mailout zone of 150m from a proposed development was too large an area and that 30 m would be a more reasonable calculation. Mail out packages will be sent to the neighbouring businesses outlining proposed development, dates of hearing, timelines to respond if any concerns or letters of support for project, contacts etc. Signage requirements to remain but include minimum size requirements.

Mayor L. Boucher asked that the notification packages be sent out in plain language.

Discussion followed on variances for Development Agreements, limited rezoning. granting of variance will be part of the negotiation process leave as is in.

Consensus reached to have P. Dec make necessary changes as discussed and put in 2019 copy of LUB.

Accessory structures Flag Pole and such are not to be added in.

P. Dec thanked the committee for their input and commented that a tremendous amount has been accomplished. He reminded PAC that the **next special meeting** is scheduled for

Monday, November 2nd at 5:15 p.m.

P. Dec informed the PAC that there is a Development Agreement application in the review process for developer K. Vandesande's Haley Road project. P. Dec advised that he will have the report ready for review in the next two- three weeks. A date of **November 26th** was set for the **next regular PAC meeting**.

Motion to Adjourn.

"It was moved and seconded that the Planning Advisory meeting be adjourned." Motion carried

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.