

**PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES – January 26, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee of the town of Quispamsis was held in the Town Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, January 26, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

In attendance: Bob McLaughlin
 David Carlson
 Darin Lamont
 Darren Bishop
 Mark Hatfield
 Pierre Rioux, Councillor
 Violet Brown, Secretary
 S. Dwight Colbourne, P.Eng, Municipal Planning Officer

Absent: Jean Place
 Marc Gosselin

1. Call to Order

Bob McLaughlin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Mr. McLaughlin noted the addition of the Elections of Chair Person and Vice Chair Person to the agenda.

MOVED BY: Pierre Rioux
SECONDED BY: Darin Lamont

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- 3.** Violet Brown, PAC Secretary, called for Nominations for the Chair Person for the Planning Advisory Committee for the year 2016. Bob McLaughlin reoffered for another year. Violet asked for further nominations three times. With no other nominations, Bob McLaughlin was elected as Chair Person and stepped back up to the Chair.

Bob McLaughlin, the newly elected Chair Person, called for Nominations for the Vice Chair Person for the Planning Advisory Committee for the year 2016. Mark Hatfield reoffered for another year. Bob asked for further nominations three times. With no other nominations, Mark Hatfield was elected as Vice Chair Person.

4. Disclosure of Interest on Agenda Items

None

5. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

MOVED BY: Darin Lamont
 SECONDED BY: Mark Hatfield

That the Minutes of the December 22, 2015 PAC meeting be received and filed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Business Arising from Minutes

<i>Notice of Decision</i>	<i>By-Law Section</i>	<i>Address</i>
Tentative Subdivision Plan - Chansa Estates	By-law #035	Model Farm Rd, 5 Lots
Home Based Business	By-law #038 Section 6.K.	552 Gondola Point Road
Home Based Business	By-law #038 Section 6.K.	33 Edwards Drive
Taxi Service	By-law # 035	Saint John Business operating in Quispamsis
Tentative Subdivision Plan Renewal - Country View Estates Phase 7C	By-law #035	Flagstone Drive, 13 Lots
Tentative Subdivision Plan Renewal - Country View Estates Phase 8	By-law #035	Squire Drive, 5 Lots

MOVED BY: David Carlson
 SECONDED BY: Darren Bishop

That the Notices of Decision be received and filed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Unfinished Business

a) From December 22, 2015 PAC Meeting: Home Business – The Managing and Operation of Seasonal Yard Maintenance and Renovation Companies – 33 Edwards Drive, PID # 30084644

At the December 22, 2015 Planning Advisory Committee meeting, the decision of the Home Occupation at 33 Edwards Drive was tabled until further information was received on granny-suites, secondary dwelling units, home businesses or commercial vehicles permitted within this subdivision or at this address through current by-laws and subdivision restrictive agreements.

Service New Brunswick registered deed documents offered the following information:

Restrictions Schedule #1: “One dwelling house structure only shall be constructed on each lot shown on the Plan of Subdivision, and each such lot shall not be further subdivided.”

Restrictions Schedule #7: “No waste, junk, dilapidated and junk motor vehicles...and no commercial construction vehicles, equipment, trucks in excess of two ton or like vehicles shall be stored on the lot. Travel trailers shall be stored behind the front line of the dwelling house.”

The concern addressed at the December 22, 2015 PAC meeting with regards to the subdivision having a restrictive covenant that stated apartments were not permitted but if family care was necessary, an in-law suite would be acceptable for short term only, has not been substantiated with registered documentation. It was noted at that same meeting that the Ridgewood Park Subdivision at one time had water limitations due to only several community wells supporting the entire subdivision. This situation has changed with the Town's water residential service supplying the area and the homes are now monitored and paying for usage.

Mr. Nathan Ashfield, the property owner and applicant, spoke at the meeting regarding these concerns and others received during the process of his application. He stated that his lawyer interpreted the Schedule #1 above as meaning "one structure only" and that the covenant did not clearly state that apartments or in-law suites were not permitted. Definitions from the Town of Quispamsis Zoning By-law #038 were read out loud, including the interpreted meaning of Dwelling, Dwelling Unit and Secondary Unit. It was recognized that a covenant is an agreement between the original owner of the land and all of the subsequent owners who purchased the land. As such, the persons who are aggrieved when a restrictive covenant is violated are the people who have properties that are also affected by covenants ultimately deriving from the same seller. Most typically, that will be other homeowners within the same development having the same (or similar) restrictive covenants on their lots. It was noted that the Planning Advisory Committee does not have the authority to over-rule deed covenants and that these covenants are put in place by the subdivision developer not the Town. Nathan also commented that the Schedule # 7 was interpreted to mean commercial construction vehicles in excess of two ton, not commercial construction vehicles *or* equipment *or* trucks in excess of two ton. To this he stated that he does not have any commercial vehicles over two ton.

In response to the latest concern of the apartment dwellers within the home, Nathan explain that they do not own a trailer or have a lawn mowing business. Nathan stated that he used to own a lot more pieces of equipment and has sold everything except for the items listed in my application. He also stated that he does mow and will continue to mow a few lawns in the summer for family and friends and that there was a time when he did offer Lawn care but he has given that side of the business up. It was confirmed that Mr. Ashfield has the following vehicles, mentioned in the previous meeting, that he intends to keep on site for his personal use and they are his 4-cylinder diesel tractor (with cab, snow blower and bucket), his utility trailer, his cargo trailer, his antique truck, his two personal vehicles and the two personal vehicles of his renters plus a walk-behind snow blower. He also stated that his one-tonne dump truck is used as a dumpster during renovations of his home and will be parked in the yard while he works on his home but otherwise, will be parked at a commercial parking lot location. He further noted at this meeting that he has a 4-wheeler that he loads and unloads from time to time to enjoy the great outdoors, and a trail motorcycle that he puts around on with his daughter in the summer, plus he stated he likes to go canoeing which would result in more "loading and unloading" of equipment.

With regards to the seven variances that would be required from the Zoning By-law in order to operate his business at this location, Nathan made several comments:

Whereas Section 6.K(2)(a) of the Zoning By-law 038 states "While Section 8 of the Zoning By-law permits home based businesses, it is permitted as ONE of the following secondary uses: a home occupation, subject to Section 6.(K); an accessory dwelling unit, subject to Section 6.(D); or an in-law suite, subject to Section 6.(W), Nathan stated that the second dwelling unit was in

place when he purchased the property. Nathan also questioned why he is required to apply for a home occupation when the business does not operate at the home but off site. He listed his address of 33 Edwards Drive as he personal home, not his business location.

Mr. Colbourne explained the parameters surrounding a home occupation with regards to the building and operations within. Mr. Colbourne also reviewed the definitions of an in-law suite versus a Two-Family dwelling and explained how an in-law suite it to be created for a temporary need and is to be incorporated back into the home once the need is no longer there. Many times, an in-law suite does not include a full kitchen whereas an apartment is classified when a kitchen, bathroom and bedroom are indicated on the building permit. If a property owner purchases a home with a secondary dwelling, the owner is responsible to ensure the secondary dwelling unit is registered with the Town, with Service New Brunswick and with the Emergency Providers in the district and subsequently, is posted with two individual civic addresses. As it was clearly acknowledged that there is a second dwelling unit in the building, a second sewer account will be set up by the Town. As for approvals of apartments that appear in disregard of deed covenants, it was reiterated that the decision is not with the Town or the PAC Members.

Whereas Section 6.K(2)(b) states “Not more than one person is engaged therein in addition to any permanent resident of the dwelling unit in which it is located”, Nathan stated that the additional employees who park at his address and travel from 33 Edwards Drive to the job site can carpool from another location.

Whereas Section 6.(K)(2)(g) states “No equipment or material used therein is stored other than in the dwelling unit mentioned”, and whereas Section 6.(K)(2)(h)(1) states “ Not more than two (2) Utility Storage Trailers may be on the lot on which the dwelling unit is located”, and whereas Section 6.(K)(2)(j) states “The activity shall not involve the management or dispatching of more than one (1) commercial vehicle, and whereas Section 6.(K)(2)(h) states “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 on which the dwelling unit is located, Nathan commented that the equipment stored outside and in the garage on his property is all used for personal use and would be kept on the property even if he was not operating two businesses. Nathan also stated that the only commercial vehicle is his one-ton dump truck and this is parked off-site at a commercial parking lot and would be on-site only during times of home renovations, and that some of the equipment mentioned in his advertising actually belongs to his father and is not maintained on Edwards Drive.

Mr. Colbourne reviewed the intent of the home business provisions within the Zoning By-law as well as the need to create a balance between encouraging and supporting entrepreneurship and acceptable levels of disturbance within a residential area. For this reason, the By-law limits the amount of activity associated with the business that can be conducted outside the main dwelling. Mr. Colbourne reiterated the fact that there is a secondary dwelling unit as well as a home business application with at least two types of services listed at this property, which is not compliant with the Zoning By-law and a decision was required from the PAC on whether or not the business would be permitted. Mr. Colbourne also noted that there is a significant amount of opposition to this business within the residential area as well some non-compliance with deed covenants, as brought forward by the residents within the subdivision. Furthermore, the secondary dwelling unit would need approval and that the Town utilities accounts updated to reflect the second unit on the property.

Nathan reviewed numbers from his accountant and the job sites he attended last year with a final note that he would have loaded equipment from his home on approximately thirty-six (36) days. He commented that he came to the PAC because of the complaints from the neighbors, in particular because of the look of his property during the times when all of his business equipment was parked out front, near the community mailbox and on the road. He has since cleaned up his property, parked the vehicles to the rear of the property or off-site, etc. and feels that he has done what was necessary to appease the neighbors.

Two of the PAC members suggested that Mr. Ashfield consider pulling his application at this time and consider reapplying once the authorization of the second dwelling unit is resolved.

Mr. Ashfield pulled his application.

8. New Business

#	Variance Requested	By-Law Section	Address
a)	Sign Variance	By-law #036, Section 18.(A)(2)	30 Vincent Road
b)	Commercial Development	Millennium Drive Development Scheme By-Law	80 Millennium Drive
c)	Discretionary Use – Youth Centre in Commercial Zone CHANGED TO: Temporary Use Variance	Zoning By-law #038 Section 12.(B) CHANGED TO: By-law #038 Section 3.(B)(1)	26 Pettingill Road
d)	Review only – LPP – Bonney Construction Subdivision (purchase vs easement)	Subdivision By-law #035	89 Pettingill Road

a) Sign Variance – Valley Christian Academy – 30 Vincent Road

Ms. Linda Hallahan attending seeking a variance for a second freestanding sign at 30 Vincent Road, PID 244269 in order to advertise the Valley Christian Academy School in a separate building behind the church. As per By-law 036 Section 13.A.(3), only one freestanding sign is permitted. The lot is located in an Institutional (INST) Zone, with a lot size of 26504 square meters. The intent of the bylaw is to reduce the number of freestanding signs to prevent driver distraction. This property currently has approximately 156 meters of street frontage, with approximately 50 meters between the existing sign and the new proposed sign. It should be noted this is fairly consistent with other areas of the town.

Notice was sent to property owners within 100 meters of the property; one concern was received related to the distraction to drivers. It was noted by PAC members that site inspections were done and they did not see any line-of-sight concerns.

MOVED BY: Darin Lamont
 SECONDED BY: Mark Hatfield

That the PAC grant the approval for the variance for a second freestanding sign at 30 Vincent Road, PID 244269, with the following condition:

- 1) A sign permit must be issued within one (1) year of the variance and must otherwise conform to the sign bylaw.

MOTION CARRIED

b) Commercial Development – 80 Millennium Drive, PID 176435

Mr. Graham McKinnon attending on behalf of Mr. Rick Brown of B & R Brown Holdings Ltd, seeking approval for a development located on Millennium Drive in the Business Park Commercial Zone. Any development on Millennium Drive is guided by the Development Scheme By-law for Millennium Drive No .017. Under this by-law the Development Officer is required to, after reviewing the application for completeness and determining that it is not incomplete, transmit to the Planning Advisory Committee, Council, the Building Inspector, and any other person deemed necessary, one (1) copy each of the site plan documents. The Council, the Building Inspector, and any other person deemed necessary by the Development Officer have up to fourteen (14) days to submit recommendations in writing to the Planning Advisory Committee concerning the following:

- i. The adequacy of the data and procedures used by the applicant to determine the impacts of the proposed development;
- ii. The effects of the projected impacts of the proposed developments; and
- iii. The recommended conditions or remedial measures to accommodate or mitigate the expected impacts of the proposed developments.

The proposed use of the land is to develop the property with a series of (up to five) upscale 1372sqm multifunctional buildings. These buildings are designed to house retail, office, service, food service and light manufacturing businesses in spaces between 457sqm (1500sqft) and 1372sqm (7500sqft). The intention is to construct building number one on the north east corner of the lot (adjacent to the Home Hardware store) with construction commencing in the spring of 2016. Future buildings will be constructed one at a time as demand dictates.

Buildings two and three will be built in a row behind building one. Buildings four and five will be on the south side of the lot. The buildings will be constructed of wood or steel and/or a combination of both with some brick for aesthetics.

Staff's initial review of the application finds that no variances are required and the design is in accordance with the Standards of Review as per below:

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A ii: Fire Regulations will be questioned for the proposal; as such, any recommendations from the Provincial Fire Marshall will have to be incorporated into a final project. The local Fire Department was contacted and their feedback was with regarding to lane widths being a minimum of 6.0m and sprinkling of the buildings.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A iii: Setbacks: The proposed site plan indicates the forward two buildings are set 8.0m and 22.9 m away from the streetline with the smallest sideline setback of 14.1m. The By-law establishes that the principal building is to be located not more than 15.0m and not less than 7.5m from the front property line. The 22.0m setback at the front is reasonable give a retention pond is being created for stormwater management and to provide additional greenspace in the development.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A v: Traffic: The By-law requires convenience and safety of both vehicle and pedestrian traffic within the site and with respect to the adjoining properties. When we examined the proposed traffic movement patterns being one way movements within the site it meets the criteria of the by-law. The development is not anticipated to introduce significant loads onto Millennium Drive as it is a collector street and design for the higher levels of services.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A vi: Parking: The By-law requires parking to be concentrated to the rear with a provision for 25% of the required parking can be developed on one side of the building. This proposal shows parking spaces in front of each building but nothing in that front setback area with respect to Millennium Drive. The Developer owns the land behind the Home Hardware Store which provides additional land for parking lot development if required. The parking layout does not incorporate Parking with Persons Having a Disability. These will need to be incorporated into the final plan.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A vii: Screening: This section emphasizes the need for screening to protect sight lines from garbage storage and parking areas. The proposed vegetation within the site will provide screening as well as the 15.0m buffer between the development and the residential area. There is ample room behind the buildings for fencing of waste bins which must be a minimum 6.0m away from the building.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A viii: Town Services: The development will be serviced by municipal water and sanitary sewerage which will become a municipal asset – owned and maintained by the Town. A municipal services easement will be required over the private lane.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A ix: Utility Services: The electrical servicing will need to be confirmed by NB Power. It is proposed that two feeder lines will run part way down the sidelines and then underground to the buildings as required by the by-law.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xi: Refuse Disposal: The development has not addressed refuse management with respect to refuse dumpsters within the development. The level of requirement would be usage based so this is an item that will have to be addressed at the building permit stage for each building.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xiii: Nuisances: The nature of nuisances that arise from retail establishments generally focus around hours of delivery and garbage pick-up. A normal condition would be to state the garbage must be in a compound or dumpster to be picked up only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xvi: Existing Vegetation: The development as proposed provides a high level of vegetation and greenspace to soften the overall development.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xvii: Trail: As the property backs onto residential properties, there is a requirement for trail development and a fifteen (15) metre buffer.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xviii: Erosion Control: Construction methods should ensure minimized impacts due to sedimentation. These will have to be submitted as part of the engineered design drawings for the development prior to final approvals and the Developer's Agreement.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xx: Storm Water Runoff: A preliminary stormwater management plan was completed by Terrain Group that recommended drainage swales down the property lines to control the exterior drainage and an upgrade to the culvert under Millennium Drive or the introduction of some sort of retention with controlled release into the cross-culvert. The proposed development plan incorporates the swales down the side line and the use of a retention area to control the flow. The pond will be an aesthetic feature as well as stormwater management.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xxii; Signage: A request has been made to the developer to submit preliminary design details for the freestanding sign. The fascia signs for each building will have to be considered based on the dividing of each building.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xxiv; Lighting: All exterior lighting are required to be downward pointing, as such there does not appear to be any concerns in this area.

Standards for Review: By-law No.17 Sect. 7 A xxvi; Character: The individual buildings along Millennium Drive can be classified as destinations in their own right and when the properties along the whole street are examined it is anticipated there will be a unified or consistent appearance or theme along the street. The preliminary drawings for the complex do indicate this will be the intent for the new structure.

Written notice was sent to property owners within 100 metres of the said property. The Town received one concern from a resident on Granite Drive, a property that backs onto the said property. Mr. Arnot's concerns were for drainage, buffer zone and noise. Each of these concerns were addressed by Mr. Colbourne as he reviewed the standards above or by Mr. McKinnon during his remarks. Mr. Arnot noted that there may be a possible depreciation of homes. It was noted that the property owners that back onto Millennium Drive would have been aware of the fact that those lands are zoned Business Park Commercial which would indicate commercial businesses. Mr. Colbourne reiterated the requirements of the noise by-law and the Development Scheme By-law for Millennium Drive. The Town received one email encouraging the proposal.

No one attended the meeting to speak for or against this application.

MOVED BY: David Carlson

SECONDED BY: Mark Hatfield

That the PAC support the proposed development at 80 Millennium Drive, PID 173435 as reviewed above and to approve the parking in front of the buildings as well as between building #5 and Millennium Drive, and in accordance with Section 7 of the Development Scheme By-law, set the following terms and conditions:

- 1) The business/property owner enter into a Development Agreement and complete the development in accordance with the terms and conditions therein and the approved plans;
- 2) Signage is to be submitted to the Town and approved as part of the Developer's Agreement;
- 3) All lighting on the building must be mounted and downward facing;
- 4) The civic number must be visible on the buildings in accordance with Numbering of Buildings By-law;
- 5) Municipal Services Easements are part of the final plan to permit access to the Town to inspect and maintain the water and sewerage system;
- 6) All infrastructure designs, including the private lane, are to be completed and stamped by a professional engineer registered and license to practice in the province of New Brunswick; and
- 7) All garbage must be in a compound or dumpster to be picked up only between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

c) KV Oasis - Temporary Use Variance requested for a Youth Centre at 26 Pettingill Road, PID 30256200

Mr. Larry Cain, Treasurer and Ms. Yennah Hurley, Executive Director for the KV Oasis Youth Centre attended seeking approval for the operation of a Youth Centre, to include educational programs, wellness and health services by registered and licensed professionals, at the location of 26 Pettingill Road. Ms. Carol Hughes, the property owner of the building housing Pet Corral and three other units, was in attendance also.

The intention is to operate a multifaceted Centre that will have programs for recreation and entertainment plus professional services such as doctors and counselors. The Centre will serve youth ages 12-25 from the communities of Quispamsis, Rothesay, Hampton and the Kingston Peninsula and anticipates 1000 kids going through the Centre each week on average. The hours of operation will be 9am-9pm Monday to Thursday, 9am-11pm Friday, 10am-11pm Saturday and 1pm to 8pm Sunday. These are subject to change but will not open earlier or close later than those given times.

It was asked if this Youth Centre is currently in operation and noted that it was not and that there are no Centres in the province that offer what this Centre will offer. The Saint John Teen Resource Centre (SJTC) was the closest facility but that is now closed.

As the proposed building is located in a Central Commercial Zone, it was determined that the services proposed at the Centre are outside the scope of the Discretionary Use provisions within the Central Commercial zone and align more with those permitted in an Institutional Zone. As such, the PAC does not have the authority to approve this application as a Discretionary Use. Mr. Colbourne reviewed the options based on what would be best suited for the applicants, the property owner and the neighborhood as reviewed with the Town's Solicitor. If the property is Re-Zoned to Institutional, the Youth Centre would be a permitted use and would not require approvals from PAC. However, if the Youth Centre were to move to another location, the property owner would only be permitted to rent to a limited option of businesses such as Churches, School or similar Youth Centres and not those under the Central Commercial category without going through the re-zoning process again. Recognizing that the PAC has the authority to approve a Temporary Use Variance for one year, at which time the applicant would apply for an Amendment to the Zoning By-law 038, it was recommended that this option would align best for timing for the applicants and suitability for the property owner. The application to Council would be requesting to add the applicable uses within the Institutional Zone as Discretionary Uses within the Central Commercial Zone for this property.

It was noted that this property was never rezoned Institutional nor had it received a Temporary Use for a Francophone School. The previous tenant at 26 Pettingill Road was *ARCf de Saint Jean* and had approached the PAC for an ARCf Daycare in this zone as a "Discretionary Use" since it is not identified as a main use in Central Commercial Zone.

Concerns reviewed included the closing of 11pm which would suggest participants, upwards of 150 per day as per the applicants' estimates, to be in the area after 11pm as they depart the facility. It was suggested that PAC include a condition to ensure the property is vacated immediately upon closing. As well, with 70% of the participants of legal age to drive, parking was reviewed. The 2008 plot plan for the Mall property shows approximately 35 parking spots.

Parking at the rear of the building was proposed and will need to be confirmed for availability and number of spots. There is no outside area proposed for the facility; however given the intent of the Centre it would be reasonable to think it would be required, which could impact the available parking area. The adjoining vacant land is not owned by the same property owner and there is no agreement to make use of this area in any manner for the proposed Centre parking.

Notice was sent to residents within 100 metres of the property. The Town received one call asking for more information and attendance to the meeting yet no one attended to speak for or against the application.

MOVED BY: Mark Hatfield

SECONDED BY: Darin Lamont

That PAC grant approval from Zoning By-law 038 Section 3.(B)(1), for the KV Oasis Youth Centre to be located at the property of 26 Pettingill Road (PID 30256200), for a temporary period not exceeding one year, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The Youth Centre Facility must comply with all Provincial regulations in accordance with the jurisdiction having authority and a copy of such approval(s) to operate is to submitted to the Town;
- 2) A review is completed by the Department Public Health;
- 3) Any alterations to the building are subject to a Building Permit including fire rating separation between businesses and the number of washrooms required, and all requirements of the Building Inspection department as per the National Building Code of Canada are to be meet;
- 4) Plans to be approved by Provincial Fire Marshalls office and a copy of approval submitted to Town;
- 5) Any outside activity area to be appropriately fenced to protect from traffic in the area, and installation of a fence is subject to a Fence Permit from the Town;
- 6) Any outside activity is in compliance with the Noise By-law;
- 7) All activities cease at the closing hours of the Centre with participants and staff vacating the property immediately;
- 8) The operator of the Youth Centre Facility shall enter into a Development Agreement with the Town which ensures compliance with terms and conditions setforth by the Planning Advisory Committee;
- 9) There shall be no on-street parking as such ample parking must be provided to meet the minimum requirements similar to the following facilities:
 - a. business or professional office, medical or dental clinic:
 - i. one (1) space per every twenty eight (28) square meters of floor area;
 - b. club, lodge or place of public assembly:
 - i. one (1) space for every eight (8) square meters of floor area;
- 10) All signage shall comply with the Sign By-law for the zone in which the Youth Centre Facility is located; and
- 11) Extension beyond one year is subject to an application for Rezoning or a By-Law Amendment.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

d) Bonney Construction Ltd. – Amending Subdivision Plan - Land for Public Purposes – 89 Pettingill Road (PID 30280127

The purpose of this plan is to create Land for Public Purposes and the relocation of an existing Access Easement. The Town is acquiring the thirty-four (34) square metres of land from Bonney Construction Ltd. through a Purchase and Sale Agreement. The land acquisition is necessary in order to provide clear title access to both the municipal sanitary sewerage infrastructure as well as to allow the general public access to the pedestrian trail corridor within Parcel 13-3 shown on the plan. The plan will also relocate a portion of an Access Easement in favour of Lot 2008-2 (91 Pettingill Road).

MOVED BY: David Carlson
SECONDED BY: Darin Lamont

That PAC grant approval of the proposed subdivision to create the thirty-four (34) sq. m LPP parcel vesting to the town the necessary Land for Public Purposes providing access to the trail and for Municipal Services purposes subject to the mortgage encumbrance being discharged prior to registration.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Information Items

Council Meeting Minutes – December 1 & 15; Council Special meetings Dec 9 & 22, 2015

10. Adjournment

MOVED BY: David Carlson

That the meeting be adjourned.

The Planning Advisory Committee meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

The next Planning Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for February 9, 2016.

Respectfully Submitted,


CHAIRMAN


SECRETARY