

2. Approval of Agenda

Moved By Darren Bishop

Seconded By Brenda Fowle

That the Agenda be approved with the amendment to state that the meeting is virtual not at Town Hall.

Motion Carried

3. Disclosures of Interest

No disclosures were declared.

4. Approval of Previous Minutes

Moved By Marc Gosselin

Seconded By Brent Preston

That the minutes of the December 8, 2020 PAC meeting be received and filed.

Motion Carried

5. Business Arising from Minutes - Notice of Decisions

Moved By John Groden

Seconded By Kendall Mason

That the Notices of Decision be received and filed.

Motion Carried

6. Unfinished Business

None

7. New Business

7.1 100 Nightingale Lane

Golota Lamah and his wife Jeanette Onivogui attended the meeting seeking approval for a Day Care (Childcare) Facility at 100 Nightingale Lane, PID 30336903. They are both directors of the Day Care that will provide childcare services to children in their home. They said that they started the venture by looking for buildings large enough to operate a daycare but learned that their home can

provide for childcare services to as many as fifteen (15) children. They calculated about 40% of the children would be infants and the rest to be school children ages based on the provincial guidelines. They plan on doing some interior renovations during the winter months and some exterior/yard renovations in Spring to be ready to start the daycare by the beginning of the next school year at the latest.

Ms. Fowlie asked about the name of Daycare noting that researching the name brought up others so she wondered if it was to be a franchise or one operation only. Mr. Lamah stated that the name was picked by them and they are working on getting the name registered and he confirmed that this is not a franchise. He added that the entrance will be around the back of the house and that they will build a pathway to direct parents and children to the entrance, not through the house.

Mr. Colbourne asked for clarification on the ratio of children at different ages noting that the number of staff may need to increase due to provincial requirements and if this occurs, the number of parking spaces may then be an issue. Mr. Lamah confirmed the provincial guidelines and clarified that even infants of different ages have different ratio percentages. He added that they are in the process of doing a market analysis to determine what is needed in the community and included the information that the province requires two rooms, one for infants and one for older children. With regards to parking, he stated that there is ample space in the driveway plus two spaces in the garage to eliminate any parking on the street. It was asked if they intended on erecting a fence in the back yard with consideration of the holding pond near the rear of the property. Mr. Lamah noted they will be putting up a fence in the yard as the province requests this as well.

Mr. Colbourne was asked how many people can be employed. He explained that this application falls outside the Home Occupation since it is asking for more than five (5) children, so the number of employees is relative to the number of children in different age groups. He added that the Zoning By-law permits a maximum of fifteen (15) children so there is enough room in the dwelling for children and staff, and enough space for parking. It was asked if staff knew how many daycares of this size are in the town compared to Home Occupations that are approved for up to five (5) children or larger facilities that hold over fifteen (15) children. Ms. Chrissy Scott noted that there are two registered Day Care Facilities operating in private homes with a maximum of fifteen children and other Day Care Facilities that are registered through schools or churches. It was also noted that there are two larger facilities near the Middle School, another one under construction plus one afterschool program.

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

Moved By John Groden
Seconded By Marc Gosselin

That the Planning Advisory Committee approve the Day Care Facility at 100 Nightingale Lane, PID 30336903, for the purpose of providing childcare services for up to fifteen (15) children, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The Day Care Operator must enter into an Agreement with Town;
2. The Day Care Facility and operation shall comply with all provisions of Zoning By-law 038 Section 6.(L)(2) and all other applicable Zoning By-law provisions;
3. The Day Care Facility and operation must comply with all Provincial regulations and conditions as may be set by the authority having jurisdiction;
4. A copy of Provincial approval(s) to operate shall be submitted to the Town for its records and reference;
5. The Day Care Operator must ensure that the children remain on the property of 100 Nightingale Road while under their care and not permit the children to trespass onto neighboring properties;
6. In keeping with the Noise By-law, loud music or the sound from instruments that may be deemed a nuisance to residence in the area are kept inside the house to not disturb or cause hardship in the area.
7. Any alterations to the building are subject to a Building Permit;
8. A fence must be constructed in the rear yard area and its construction completed as per the Town's Zoning By-law; and
9. There shall be no on-street parking.

Motion Carried

7.2 222 Model Farm Road

Steven and Krystal Cross attended the PAC Meeting seeking approval for a Home Occupation, that of Homemade Jerky and Smoked Food Production at 222 Model Farm Road, PID 230730. Mrs. Cross addressed some of the concerns and questions that were received as part of the PAC notification. She stated that they use a Traeger Select Smoker almost every day for their personal meals and for making jerky for family and friends. She added that this is a part time venture as they will both be working full time at other jobs. The end goal is to sell product at markets and local stores with some pick ups at the house at arranged times similar to pick up of on-line sales. She added that this is their home, so they do not want a lot of customers stopping by. There will only be the two of them as employees and the room being used will be a Class 5 kitchen for compliance with the Public Health Act and its regulations. Mr. Cross stated that the overhead costs of renting a Commercial location for this part time venture would not be covered with their sales. Ms. Cross explained that there is smoke for the first few minutes after lighting a smoker then the smoke stops once it reaches 150 degrees and that they run the smoker at 200 degrees or higher. Mr. Cross added that the smoker burns approximately 0.5 to 2.0 kilograms of pellets per hour with the process for jerky

taking about 4 to 6 hours per recipe, whereas a pellet stove burns 4.5 to 6.5 kilograms per hour and they usually run these 24 hours per day. It was asked if the Cross family have been using their smoker for long and Mr. Cross stated that this process of smoking meats is not new to them. He explained the process of the pellets moving from the hopper to the fire pot, which is about 2.5 to 3 inches in diameter and 1.5 inches deep, through an auger that regulates the amount of pellets required to keep the temperature regulated to the recipe. Mr. Cross stated that there is not a lot of smoke compared to a wood stove that burns three or four cord of wood a winter and runs around the clock and that smokers are a greener (environmentally) way of cooking versus using petroleum products. He confirmed that they have been residing at this address since August 2020 and have been making meals and jerky since this time and he doesn't like that they are not certified. Mr. Cross stated that the smoker usually runs 4 to 5 times a week and Ms. Cross stated that this smoker is their main source of cooking since they left their natural gas operated barbeque out West when they moved in 2019.

Mr. Cross was asked if they had any neighbors complain to them over the last six months that they have lived there and used the smoker. Mr. Cross stated that they have not had anyone approach them regarding the smoke or the smell. He stated that they will be cooking the same foods that they have been for the last six months including the same jerky recipes that they have been making 2 to 3 times a week just for household as it is a healthy and quick snack. He reiterated that they will be cooking the same foods, will have the same smells and the same amount of cooking times as he still works full time and this will still be a part time venture. The hours on the application were stated at 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. so that they will be covered for cooking not just in the workdays evenings but for days off, vacation or weekends to cook at different times. He added that there are no plans for a second smoker since there will not be time but perhaps plans for a newer smoker. It was asked if the intent would include using wild animals for jerky and it was noted that this would not be permitted for the business under the Health Regulations. Mr. Cross confirmed that there are only two employees, the two owners of the home as operators, but their children may help out with packaging in order to engage them and teach them a bit about to run a business.

Ms. Heidi Sinclair of 10 Leeswood Drive spoke on her concerns for smells but noted that she had not noticed any smells so far and if there are no changes, there are no further concerns for using her clothesline in the summer or smells going into her house.

Ms. Jennifer Landers spoke on her concerns from her home at 6 Leeswood Drive that is directly behind the Cross resident. She stated that there is a big difference of neighborhood tolerance for smell if your neighbor is just smoking or barbequing meals for home or recreational, as no one wants to complain, then there would be for a commercial operation. She stated that just because a smoker doesn't smoke doesn't mean it doesn't still smell as it is cooking and this smoking meat smell may be a nuisance to others. She added that because it is being done for profit, not just

for fun, the neighborhood has a right to say what is acceptable and not acceptable. Ms. Landers noted that she also has concerns for the resale value of their home as it would be hard to sell if the house next to them is a smoking business. She further added that her concerns are for health reasons because she has read reports that state barbeques and smokers release a carcinogen chemical called PAH which is known to cause cancer and these carcinogens can be absorbed into your clothing that hangs on the clothesline and then into your skin. As Ms. Landers referenced her email correspondence, the PAC Secretary noted that all the correspondences of concerns and support were part of the PAC review package, in full detail, and posted on the Town's website on Friday, January 8, 2021 for all to review.

Ms. Leanne Sherwood spoke with concerns from her home across the street at 1 Sunny Lane noting that hers were the same concerns as Ms. Landers. She further noted concerns for this becoming larger with additional smokers and more traffic that would appear to be like a continual yard sale in a residential area. Ms. Sherwood also mentioned the hours which were noted in the meeting as being mostly after work, but the application stated twelve hours a day, seven days a week which she felt was not fair to the neighbors.

Ms. Cross asked if the neighbors that were on the virtual meeting had smelled any smoke from August to now. Ms. Sinclair said she has not noticed any smells adding that there are a bunch of trees between her house and the Cross residence. Ms. Sherwood said she has not noticed any smell but stated that it has not been done as a business yet so it is possible that she may in the future. Ms. Landers said she had noticed the smell but has not complained because they are trying to be good neighbors, but it will be a problem if this is a business. Ms. Cross said she grew up in a family business and the best rule is the truth. She stated that there is no intention of making it bigger from this location and that they applied for a Home Occupation because there is a demand for their jerky.

Notice of this application was sent to property owners within 100 metres of the subject property. No one else attended the meeting to speak.

Moved By Darren Bishop

Seconded By John Groden

That the Planning Advisory Committee approve the Home Occupation at 222 Model Farm Road for the production of homemade jerky and smoked food products, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. It shall be secondary to the main residential use of the dwelling;
2. Not more than one person is engaged therein in addition to any permanent resident of the dwelling unit in which it is located;
3. It is confined to the dwelling unit and deck and no part of it is located in an accessory building or structure;

4. The floor area of the dwelling unit, which is devoted to it, does not exceed the lesser of twenty-five (25) percent of the floor area of the dwelling unit, or thirty-two (32) square meters;
5. No change, except for a sign, pursuant to the Town's Sign By-law is made in the outside appearance of the building which would indicate that a home occupation is being conducted therein;
6. No goods or services other than those directly pertaining to the home occupation are supplied or sold therein or therefrom;
7. No equipment or material used therein is stored other than in the dwelling unit;
8. Not more than one (1) commercial vehicle used in connection therewith, or not more than one (1) vehicle of any kind bearing a sign in connection therewith is parked on the lot;
9. There is to be no parking on the street or within Town property;
10. The PAC approval to operate the business is non-transferable. The approval is solely for the benefit of the property owner named herein. In the event the business is discontinued or the lands are transferred, the said approvals shall terminate;
11. A logbook shall be made available to the Town if requested; and
12. Any changes to the operation will require the applicant(s) to return to the Planning Advisory Committee.

Motion Carried

8. Information Items and/or Discussion

Moved By Darren Bishop

Seconded By Marc Gosselin

That the November 17, 2020 Council Meeting Minutes be received and filed.

Motion Carried

9. Adjournment

Moved By Darren Bishop

That the Meeting adjourn at 8:24 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



CHAIRMAN



SECRETARY