



QUISPAMIS PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – August 9, 2022

Present: Darin Lamont Kendall Mason Chrissy Scott, GIS Technologist
 Darren Bishop Mark Guest
 Brenda Fowlie Jennifer Jarvis, Planning Technologist
 Brent Preston Violet Brown, PAC Secretary
 Marc Gosselin S. Dwight Colbourne, Municipal Planning Officer

Absent: None

1. **Call to Order**

Darin Lamont called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Moved By Brent Preston

Seconded By Marc Gosselin

That the Agenda be approved as written.

Motion Carried

3. **Disclosures of Interest**

Mark Guest declared a conflict of interest on item 7.5 – 157 Quispamsis Road due to his employment with the Consulting Company for Medavie New Brunswick.

4. **Approval of Previous Minutes**

Moved By Brenda Fowlie

Seconded By Mark Guest

That the minutes of the June 28, 2022 PAC meeting be received and filed.

Motion Carried

5. **Business Arising from Minutes - Notice of Decisions**

Moved By Darren Bishop

Seconded By Kendall Mason

That the Notices of Decision be received and filed.

Motion Carried

6. Unfinished Business

None

7. New Business

7.1 184 Hampton Road - Sign Variances

Anthony Boulton attended seeking approval to place signage on the building at 184 Hampton Road, PID 249797.

Ms. Jennifer Jarvis introduced the application with the proposal to keep the border signage that was installed along the front of the building by the previous owner and add a second fascia sign in the triangular peak portion. The design of the building does allow for this much signage, however, a variance for a second fascia sign is required from the Town's Zoning By-law 036, Section 13.A.(1) and approval of a seven decimal fifty-five (7.55) square metre variance for the total size of the fascia signage from Section 13.A.(1)a.i)

Mr. Boulton stated that they were still working out the final design for the sign copy and added they will work with the client to make it less busy.

Notice was sent to property owners within 100 metres; no concerns were received. No one attended to speak for or against.

Moved By Brent Preston

Seconded By Kendall Mason

That the Planning Advisory Committee proceed with approving the variance for one (1) additional fascia sign, and the variance of seven decimal fifty-five (7.55) square metres for the total area of the fascia signs at 184 Hampton Road, PID 249797, subject to the following terms and conditions must be considered:

1. A permit is obtained prior to erecting any signage; and
2. No further permanent signage is permitted without the approval of the Planning Advisory Committee.

Motion Carried

7.2 318 Hampton Road - Rezoning Application - R1 to NC

Sarah Mallory-Wright attended, representing Madison Wright, seeking approval to rezone 318 Hampton Road, PID 00451815 from Residential (R1) to Neighbourhood Commercial (NC).

Ms. Jarvis reviewed the application that came from Council, with the request for the PAC written views on the rezoning of the proposed residential commercial use on the property with 100% business on one floor and 100% residential on the

other. She noted the Town of Quispamsis Municipal Plan By-law 054, Section 4.13.1, states that it is a proposal of Council to Permit Neighbourhood Commercial uses within residential areas only as an amendment to the Zoning By-law (under Section 59 of the Community Planning Act) and subject to the provision of parking, buffering, etc. The initial review by staff noted there appears to be adequate parking with space for the residential unit provided in a separate private driveway which has in excess of the one decimal five (1.5) off street parking that is required by Section 6.(P)(2)(c) of Zoning By-law No. 038. A variance from Section 6.(P)(3)(b) of the Zoning By-law No. 038 will be required for the business parking within the front setback. Ms. Jarvis stated that the applicant will be working one chair with seven other chairs being rented out to other hairdressers. Furthermore, she added that municipal services are provided to the lot and must be connected for both units.

Ms. Mallory-Wright reviewed the new parking proposal with ten spots across the front on Hampton Rd, 1.5 spaces near the front door for accessibility, and staff parking in upper level where there already is a parking lot. She asked if the upper parking lot can be left unpaved/gravel. Ms. Mallory-Wright confirmed that there will be no access between the residential and business units, that the residents' entrance is the upper level, and that there is a second door available on the Hampton Road side of the main dwelling for code compliance.

Notice was sent to property owners within 100 metres of the subject property. No concerns were received, and no one attended to speak for or against.

Moved By Marc Gosselin

Seconded By Mark Guest

That the Planning Advisory Committee support Council with the rezoning of 318 Hampton Road, PID 00451815 from Residential (R1) to Neighbourhood Commercial (NC), subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Approve the Discretionary Use, as found in Section 15.(B)(1)(a) of Zoning By-law No. 038 to allow the Residential/Commercial Use at 318 Hampton Road;
2. Approve a variance to Section 6.(P)(3)(b) to permit parking within the front yard setback;
3. The main building be connected to municipal water service for both the proposed business and residential component;
4. A parking plan, identifying fifteen (15) parking stalls for the commercial venture, including one (1) barrier free parking stall and one decimal five (1.5) parking stalls for the dwelling unit, is to be submitted and approved by the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a Building Permit;
5. As per section 6.(P)(5)(c) the parking area for the business, not the residential component, will be surfaced with hot-mix asphalt, portland cement, concrete, or asphalt stone chip seal coat;

6. A site drainage plan must be submitted to and approved by the Town, identifying how drainage will be managed on the lot in response to the introduction of a parking surface in the front yard;
7. A site plan be submitted identifying a three (3) metre buffering zone as it relates to any neighboring residential (R1) zones; the site plan is to be approved by the Town prior to Building Permit issuance;
8. All signage is to be approved by the Town and is to be located so as not to create a sight distance problem along Hampton Road and Autumn Avenue;
9. All building lights to be downward directed;
10. The Owner is to enter into a Development Agreement with the Town of Quispamsis; and
11. A Building Permit is issued prior to construction.

Motion Carried

7.3 16 Braun Crescent - Side Yard Setback (Carport)

Dr. Arnold & Paula Brown attended seeking approval to erect a car port such that it requires a three (3) metre side yard setback variance at 16 Braun Crescent, PID 30349542.

Ms. Jarvis reviewed the proposal to construct a seven decimal one (7.1) metre by three decimal six (3.6) metre car port to be attached to the existing building in the side yard that abuts Pleasant Avenue. The car port will be approximately fifteen metres from the edge of the pavement on Pleasant Avenue but still requires a three (3) metre setback from the Town's Zoning By-law 038, Section 8.(E)(1)(a).

Notice was sent to property owners within 50 metres; no concerns were received, and staff have no concerns. No one attended to speak for or against.

Moved By Darren Bishop

Seconded By Brent Preston

That the Planning Advisory Committee approve the three (3) metre setback from the Town's Zoning By-law 038, Section 8.(E)(1)(a), to allow for the construction of a car port at 16 Braun Crescent, PID 30349542, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The side lot line is clearly defined prior to construction, if the property pins are not identifiable, a professional surveyor licensed by the Province of New Brunswick must be hired to locate and mark the property line; and
2. A building permit is obtained prior to any construction.

Motion Carried

7.4 2 Edwards Drive - Fence Height in Front Yard

David Power attended seeking approval to erect a fence such that it is 180 centimeters in height in the front yard at 2 Edwards Drive, PID 30071641.

Ms. Jarvis introduced the application noting the property is at the corner of Edwards and Melanie Drive and as such results in the property having two front yards. As per the Town's Zoning By-law, any fence found in a front yard can be no taller than seventy-five (75) centimetres. The applicants are seeking a one hundred and five (105) centimeter variance to Section 6.(S)(2), to allow a fence height of one hundred and eighty (180) centimetres in a front yard, specifically the front yard abutting Melanie Drive.

Notice was sent to property owners within 50 metres; no concerns were received and staff have no concerns. No one attended to speak for or against.

Moved By Kendall Mason

Seconded By Mark Guest

That the Planning Advisory Committee approve the one hundred and five (105) centimeter variance to Section 6.(S)(2) of the Town's Zoning By-law No 038, to allow a fence height in a front yard of one hundred and eighty (180) centimetres in height at 2 Edwards Drive, PID 30071641, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Lot lines are clearly delineated prior to construction, if the property pins are not identifiable, a professional surveyor licensed by the Province of New Brunswick should be hired to locate and mark the property line; and
2. A building permit is obtained prior to any construction.

Motion Carried

Mark Guest stepped out of the room at 7:35 p.m.

7.5 157 Quispamsis Road - Similar to a Discretionary Use - Ambulance Bay

Trevor Pierce attended on behalf of Medavie New Brunswick, seeking approval for a paramedic base at 157 Quispamsis Road (PID 30215461).

Mr. Dwight Colbourne reviewed the application of the three (3) bay paramedic base proposed to be constructed at what is currently addressed as 157 Quispamsis Road; corner of Quispamsis Road, Alma Lane, and Route 119. He stated that the Planning Advisory Committee is being asked to review the application as similar to or compatible with (as per Section 3.(D) of Zoning By-law 038) a Public Utility Facility listed as a Discretionary Use in Section 8.(B) as the property is currently zoned Residential (R1). He added that since a Public Utility Facility is listed as a Discretionary Use in the R1 Zone it is subject to a review by the

Planning Advisory Committee and this is brought forward to the PAC as being Similar To a Public Utility Facility as well as looking at its compatibility with the area. The property is located in a Single or Two-Family Dwelling Residential Zone (R1), and this review is a tool being used for the PAC to review the application and determine if this tool is appropriate and for the committee to determine if it is similar to a Public Utility Facility. The Zoning By-law provides the authority to the PAC through Section 3.(C) of the zoning by-law to impose terms and conditions or prohibit uses of land, buildings and structures with consideration to properties within the zone or in abutting zones and the health, safety and welfare of the general public. The zoning by-law also provides the PAC with the authority to consider a development that is not otherwise permitted in the zone if it is considered similar to or compatible with that particular zone. The authority granted to the PAC by the Town's Zoning By-law and the Community Planning Act is why the application has been brought to the PAC. The zoning by-law, as per Section 6.(AA), permits facilities or buildings for public utilities in residential zones. If the PAC proceeds with considering this application, this section offers parameters around the terms and conditions such as setbacks, landscaped buffer areas, off street parking and architectural compatibility with adjacent residential development. Mr. Colbourne stated that a public utility facility is not currently defined in the Town's Zoning By-law, but looking at what is generally defined as a public utility, it can include transportation measures so it can be electricity, telecommunications, gas and transportation. The Public Utility Board, or New Brunswick Energy and Utilities Board, does govern transportation through the Motor Carrier Act. The Community Planning Act references and offers some definition to a Public Utility but in that section (87(7)) it is specific to subdivisions and easements designated for electric and telecommunication services to maintain their infrastructure.

Mr. Colbourne reiterated that the PAC needs to consider if this is a reasonable use of the land, and in keeping with the intent of the Zoning By-law and Municipal Plan By-law. As per his staff report, Mr. Colbourne offered a hypothetical scenario of NB Power wishing to construct a depot on this lot, similar to the building in Rothesay, they would go through this same process and if a telecommunication company wanted to develop this lot, it would also have to go through this same process. Mr. Colbourne stated that his staff report also offered information on how this development came to be proposed on this particular lot; through a request for vacant lots in a designated area along Route 119. The town sent a list of properties, their zones and permitted uses, and Medavie chose this lot as the location for the best services, needs and demands for the area. Notice was sent to property owners within 100 metres; several correspondences were received and each of those were available for the PAC to review and they were briefed in the staff report.

Mr. Colbourne reviewed proposal through the parameters of Section 6.(AA) with respect to setbacks, buffers, architecture, etc. similar to how the Planning

Department would review a rezoning application. This proposed development meets all the setbacks; the building is more than two times the height of the building away from any residential property, it has direct access to a public street, there is existing vegetation around the property to be retained with the possibility of increasing any buffers such as the parking lot buffering. Any such requests would become part of a Development Agreement. There has been a study done on the property from an environment element, and a review by the Department of Transportation and Infrastructure (DTI) was done with respect to the access off Alma Lane and the proximity to the Route 119. As the area is part of a wetland, a Watercourse and Wetland Alteration (WAWA) permit will be required as a condition of any approval. Mr. Colbourne reiterated again that this was brought to the PAC for a review as “similar to” use as a planning tool. The next level, if the PAC thinks it should be reviewed by Council under the terms of rezoning, Mr. Colbourne stated to the PAC Members that at this stage, the similar to would be more restrictive in that it retains its residential zone and the development would be restricted to the development currently being proposed. If that use was deceased, that land would retain the residential zoning and any future development proposal would either have to fall within the residential zoning or return to the town for review. If the property goes through the rezoning process and is zoned to possibly Institutional based on the information we have on the development, it would be similar to the Kingsway Care Centre across the way. Once a property is rezoned, any other business listed as permitted or discretionary use under that zone can be put there. With the R1 zone, the development agreement would be for this applicant only and if they pull out, the zone stays as residential. This review should offer the PAC information to determine if the development is desirable for this particular land, in keeping with the zoning by-law and the municipal plan and if the PAC prefers the applicant proceed to Council for consideration of rezoning.

Mr. Colbourne was asked if the property was rezoned, would it be to Commercial or Institutional. Mr. Colborne stated that there is an opportunity for the property to be zoned Commercial as that would permit this type of development, but it could also be zoned as Institutional. This would require further review of the Planning Staff to consider what that land could handle for development under either zone.

Mr. Pierce spoke on the choice of this lot, chosen by Medavie, for the best location for the speed of service, the density of the area and the lot size. The group he works with has built fourteen of these bases so far and Medavie has chosen each one based on service.

The access off Alma Lane was reviewed for the proximity to Route 119. Mr. Colbourne stated that the zoning by-law requires a minimum of 11 metres from intersection or 30 metres from traffic lights and if this access meets the criteria, it can remain off Alma Lane. He added that one of the comments received was for the traffic on Alma during school hours (morning and afternoon) and if an

ambulance was moving through that area to respond to a call, they would still have to maneuver through the traffic and cars are required to move over as per the Motor Vehicle Act.

Mr. Colbourne was asked if the residential property across the street on Alma Lane could be zoned commercial as well. Mr. Colbourne stated that the same rules apply, and the same review would be required from all by-laws.

Doug MacAskill attended with his concerns and asked about the other properties that were considered for this development and if he could have information on them. Mr. Colbourne noted the RFP received by the town asked for properties in the area along the Route 119. The town offered a map of the vacant properties and the information on the property zones. He added that the proponent chose the property using their criteria and that the Town did not get involved in that process. Mr. MacAskill talked about the Quispamsis Road and the undesirability of an access off that road. He then asked who owned the property of 157 Quispamsis Road, stating he thought it was still Bruce Robinson and that in the process of voting, Derek Bishop should refrain since he believes Bruce Robinson is Derek Bishop's best friend. (For the record, Mr. MacAskill was indicating to Darren Bishop but calling him Derek). The Chairperson stated that Mr. Bishop would not have to refrain from voting based on friendship as there is no business partnership between the two parties. Mr. MacAskill then asked Mr. Bishop if he would confirm that he is not a business partner to Mr. Robinson. Mr. Bishop stated that he is not Mr. Robinson's business partner in any way. Mr. MacAskill reiterated that he thought it would be a conflict of interest to have Mr. Bishop vote and in his opinion it would be like having his wife on a board.

Mr. MacAskill stated he was dead set against the development, saying he works long hours and wants to go to bed at night without the loud ambulances next door. He added that he bought his property to live in a residential property and that the number of times the ambulance comes out will be busy. He felt the base should be in commercial zone where it won't go by his house at all hours of the day and night. Mr. Colbourne asked for clarification on the difference between the ambulance process versus the fire station. He understood that the ambulances do not sit at the base waiting to be dispatched but perhaps PAC would want to have that clarified.

Michelle MacKay attended from across the street from the proposal. She stated she is a nurse and understands we need this but not in this area as it will increase noise and traffic. She stated that the communication mentioned a health service centre and thought that would increase traffic as well. She added that she wants to keep her kids safe going to and from school and there are no sidewalks there now. She reiterated that there will be noise increase at all hours of the night, and we all need to sleep. She felt like this application was already approved and she was not going to have a say in it. She mentioned the barrier and stated that there are no trees to separate my property from this building, it will be built basically in

my front yard. As for the noise, she asked that something about the sirens, perhaps the ambulance could be a kilometre or two out before they turn them on.

Mr. Colbourne, as a point of order, clarified that this application has not been approved, this is being reviewed by the PAC and as his opening remarks stated that the PAC has the authority to ask the applicant to entertain the idea of rezoning. This is just an avenue for the first review. As for buffering, he already stated that some areas may require more buffering. Some buffering may be sufficient, some may be required to be enhanced and this would be governed by the Development Agreement.

Alaina Campbell attended on behalf of her parents Mike and Mona Campbell of 150 Quispamsis Road. She noted first that she is familiar with case law as she is a lawyer and that if this is a friend's business, Darren Bishop should not vote. She mentioned the traffic pattern and that fact that the notice was only sent out to property owners within 100 metres. She felt that notice should have been sent to anyone who resides in Eastwind Estates, anyone who travels Quispamsis Road or Alms Lane, as well as the Kingsway Subdivision across the way as they would all have their traffic pattern disrupted. As for the definition of the Public Utility Facility in the Community Planning Act, they are not buildings that have people coming and going. They are depots but not continued services in and out. Ms. Campbell added that Alma Lane has busses lined up every morning, 5 or 6 trying to turn left. She stated she has a vested interest since her parent live near there and her kids go to the school in the area and since she works long hours, the kids get dropped off at their grandparents for the bus pickup. The ambulances will have to take a right where there is a blind hill (Quispamsis Road) and residents with children. She stated that there has been no contemplation for sound barriers or busses and kids. Furthermore, she added that traffic has no room to pull over due to steep ditches and small shoulders, and there is no place to put the snow in the winter. Ms. Campbell stated that this zone was not meant to be high traffic and not for public utility facility. If the property is rezoned to commercial, yes anything can go there but it has not been rezoned. This John Hart subdivision, Eastwind Estates, has restrictive covenants that is an allure to others and that as a Discretionary Use, this development should have similar architectural aspects.

The Chairperson mentioned the requirement of traffic study noted in the staff report and that covenants are not part of the PAC review. He reiterated that if the property is zone differently and the ambulance decides not to go there, a restaurant can go in that location without having to return to PAC or Council. Mr. Colbourne thanked the residents for offering their concerns and let them know that if the PAC decides to refer this development to Council for rezoning that they would be notified again and have another opportunity to speak on their concerns.

Mr. Pierce was asked if the sirens were used on the ambulances from the base onward. He stated that they use the lights and not the sirens unless something got in front of them and impeded the path which is unlikely to happen in the middle

of the night as there would not be any traffic. He added that not all three ambulances sit at the base as they sometimes sit in strategic places within the town. As for the base location, there is easy access with the roundabout direct from Alma Lane, better than from Quispamsis Road.

Moved By Brent Preston

Seconded By Kendall Mason

That the Planning Advisory Committee proceed with approving the three bay paramedic base for Medavie Health Services New Brunswick on the property currently addressed as 157 Quispamsis Road, PID 30215461, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The off-street collective parking shall comply with Zoning By-law 038 Section 6.(P)(3)(e), 6.(P)(4), 6(P)(5);
2. A full comprehensive traffic flow analysis will be required to be submitted with a review on the proposed entrance/exit off Alma Lane versus Quispamsis Road;
3. Once the proposed entrance/exit is confirmed, a civic address change may be required;
4. The completion of an Environmental Site Assessment prior to final development and permitting approvals from the Town (noted as completed already);
5. Approval of the Department of Environment and requirement of a Watercourse and Wetland Alteration (WAWA) permit;
6. The proposed development shall be forwarded to Department of Transportation and Infrastructure for review and comment as it relates to development near the provincial highway Route 119 (noted as completed already);
7. Street lighting at the entrance to the development shall be installed;
8. All building light fixtures and parking lot lights to be downward directed;
9. All materials and equipment ordered on site are the responsibility of the Developer;
10. The Owner is to enter into a Development Agreement with the Town of Quispamsis;
11. The lands shall be developed in accordance with the Building and Development Plans filed with and approved by the Town;
12. If the Development does not substantially proceed within six (6) months of the date of approval, the Developer shall restore the lands to an attractive natural state, and such restoration is to be completed within sixty (60) days;
13. All signage requires Department of Transportation approval and must not be a nuisance or cause interference to drivers on the Route 119;

14. The civic number must be visible on the building in accordance with Numbering of Buildings By-law; and
15. The building is to be developed as to blend in with the neighborhood architecturally.

On the question, clarification was requested on a condition requesting sound barriers as to what type of barriers, acceptable decibel levels, procedural policies of Emergency Service Providers, and who is responsibility for options to address concerns – the Consulting Engineer or the PAC or the Town. It was recognized that sound barriers would be required for every residence in the town that are close to the streets and not necessarily required at the base location if the sirens are not on when they leave the building. Mr. Pierce confirmed that out of the fourteen buildings developed to date, none of these properties have installed any sound barriers. It was stated that there is no perfect location for EMS but this is a central location and ideal for the best service. Mr. Pierce confirmed that there will be no access off Quispamsis and likely a row of trees planted along that roadside.

As a Point of Order, Mr. Colbourne asked if Mr. Bishop felt he was in conflict of interest. Mr. Bishop stated that he would abstain from voting.

Motion Carried

Mark Guest returned to the room.

7.6 28 Reynar Drive - Discretionary Use - Accessory Buildings

Randy Charlton of TerraEX Inc., on behalf of the town of Quispamsis, attended seeking approval for the development of Hammond River Park with accessory buildings to provide shelter and public washrooms at 28 Reynar Drive, PID 00073346.

Ms. Jarvis reviewed the proposal to develop the site with a washroom building, two (2) picnic table shelters, an additional two (2) picnic table pads, a multi-user swing, a “log jam” play station, several trees and trails to match existing trails that run throughout the park. She added that Section 6.(BB)(1)(a) of Zoning By-law 038 states that no alteration of existing buildings or land shall occur on any property bordering a watercourse without first requesting and being granted approval by the Planning Advisory Committee, and as per Section 23.(B)(1)(a) of Zoning By-law 038 states that the use of accessory buildings is a Discretionary use and as such requires a review and approval by the Planning Advisory Committee.

Notice was sent to property owners within 100 metres; one correspondence was in favor, one concern was referenced the previous demolished building, the young adults partying damaging property. As Ms. Jarvis’ staff report stated, the

previous building, constructed around 1976 as a log cabin with field stone foundation, was a seasonal use and did not contain bathroom facilities open for public use. The town evaluated this building as having no significant value and was demolished for safety reasons in 2021.

Moved By Mark Guest

Seconded By Darren Bishop

That the Planning Advisory Committee approve the development of Hammond River Park with accessory buildings to provide shelter and public washrooms as a Discretionary Use as per Section 23.(B)(1)(a) and approve the development occurring on a property bordering a watercourse, as per Section 6.(BB)(1)(a) of Zoning By-law No. 038 at 28 Reynar Drive, PID 00073346, subject to the following:

1. A Building Permit is obtained prior to construction of the building structures.

Motion Carried

7.7 Street Renaming Request - Landing Court to Parking Lot

Mr. Colbourne reviewed Councillor Noah Donovan's request for a street name approval, that of Equality Lane, for the Laneway between end of Landing Court and Arts & Culture Park. The laneway is located on municipal property containing the Arts and Culture Park, the Town Hall and Town's skateboard park. The Municipal Plan was referenced as it provides direction and strategy based on a community vision that moves towards and promotes the building of a more sustainably healthy, vibrant, inclusive and safe community. Mr. Colbourne noted that as per the Town's Subdivision By-law 035 and the Community Planning Act, the Development Officer and the Planning Advisory Committee are to be asked for their views with respect to the approval of the street names. The street name of Equality Lane was checked against the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) with no conflicts found. There is a civic number assignment to the Comex bus shelter for emergency purposes; however, the naming of this laneway would have negligible impact in that regarding.

Moved By Brent Preston

Seconded By Marc Gosselin

The Planning Advisory Committee support the naming of the laneway from the end of Landing Court to the Arts and Culture Park and Kennebecasis Library Overflow Parking Lot to Equality Lane subject to the following:

1. A street sign is requested to and installed by the Town of Quispamsis Public Works Department; and
2. Notice is sent out to the Emergency Services and New Street Distribution list.

Motion Carried

7.8 Hillcrest Holdings Ltd and Langard Ltd Subdivision - Land Exchange Proposal

Mr. Colbourne reviewed the application for land swap of small lots of land between Hillcrest Holdings Ltd. and Langard Ltd. in preparation of further development of PIDs 30191431 and 30191449. He added that the PAC needs to review this because there are public streets within the plan. He noted that the topography is mostly flat, so no street grade variances are required.

Moved By Kendall Mason

Seconded By Mark Guest

That the Planning Advisory Committee support the Development Officer in bringing the Hillcrest Holdings Ltd. and Langard Ltd. Subdivision Plan to the Council for consideration of assent and final approval for registration subject to the following:

1. Any further development of the Future Streets and adjacent lands being subject to approval by the Town; and
2. The creation of Parcels "A" through to "D" are for consolidation purposes only for future development of the lands and are not to be considered building lots on their own.

Motion Carried

8. Information Items and/or Discussion

None

9. Adjournment

Moved By Darren Bishop

Seconded By Brenda Fowlie

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



CHAIRMAN



SECRETARY

The PAC meetings are live-streamed and available for review on YouTube.