



QUISPAMISIS



12 Landing Court
P.O. Box 21085
Quispamsis, NB
Canada E2E 4Z4
T: 506-849-5778
F: 506-849-5799

quispamsis@quispamsis.ca
www.quispamsis.ca

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES – March 11, 2014

The regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee of the town of Quispamsis was held in the Town Hall Council Chambers on Tuesday, March 11, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

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

Absent: Marc Gosselin

1. Call to Order

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

2. Approval of the Agenda

MOVED BY: Mark Hatfield
SECONDED BY: David Carlson

That the agenda be approved.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. Disclosure of Interest on Agenda Items

None

4. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

DATED: February 25, 2014

Explore our past / Explorez notre passé
Discover your future / Découvrez votre avenir

MOVED BY: Darin Lamont
 SECONDED BY: David Carlson

That the Minutes of the February 25, 2014 PAC meeting be approved.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. Business Arising from Minutes

<i>Notice of Decision</i>	<i>By-Law Section</i>	<i>Address</i>
Home Business	By-Law #038 Section 6(L)1	3 Jasper Drive

MOVED BY: Darren Bishop
 SECONDED BY: Mark Hatfield

That the Notices of Decision be received and filed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Unfinished Business

None

8. New Business

Mr. Bob McLaughlin noted that the second agenda item was removed from the agenda and will not be heard this evening and asked if anyone attended for this item. No one was there for this tentative plan on Gondola Point Road (access through Morrison Lane) so the meeting continued with new business of 7.a)

#	<i>Variance Requested</i>	<i>By-Law Section</i>	<i>Address</i>
a)	Subdivision Tentative Plan – Gondola Point Park Phase 9	Subdivision By-law No.035	Kane Road to Amsworth
b)	PULLED: Subdivision Tentative Plan – Lyons, Lee & Alisha	By-law No.038 Section 6. (N)	490 Gondola Point – access through Morrison Lane

- a) Mr. Gerry Roberts represented the application for the Subdivision Tentative Plan called Gondola Point Park Phase 9, the extension of Kane Road to Amsworth Drive with eleven (11) lots. He acknowledged that he received the same information package that the committee has which included the concerns sent in from residents in the one hundred (100) metre radius that were notified of this subdivision application. He noted that the information sent out to residents also included the ghosted out plans for the future which were meant to inform residents that the surveyors and developers have reviewed possible future opportunities in order to ensure that each step of development is considered for the best use of land, best access to lots, etc. Mr. Roberts reviewed the August 1978 conceptual plans that were presented to the Town (Village of Gondola Point at that time) that showed Kane Road going all the way through to Gondola Point Road via Mathews Drive. The stages of development, with the start of Kane Road at two ends, coincided with 911 and for the ease of emergency coordination, one end of Kane Road became Amsworth Drive for at least the time being.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, more work was done in the area including Municipal Sewer connections and preparations; some down to Mathew Drive and some up to Kane Road. In 2013, a plan was approved for one lot (3F) with the sewer connection proposed to lead to the existing connection on Kane Road. Due to the required work of cutting into Kane Road, and looking at the big picture of future development with the Town's staff and the developer, it was decided to install the sewer lateral connections for each proposed lot from lot 3F down to Amsworth even though the cost was a higher than it would be for the one approved lot.

Mr. Roberts confirmed that this application was for eleven lots only and the future plans at this time are not certain. The land owner's (Mr. Scott) plan has always been to develop the area into subdivisions and in setting out proposed full development, PAC would be assured that each proposed phase would not box or land lock any other sections and full access, in and out, would be part of each development plan.

Mr. Rioux reviewed several concerns for access into future streets with some residents asking about access to Gondola Point Road, Meenan's Cove Road and the Gondola Point Arterial. He noted that the top part of this area seems to be high elevations and Mr. Roberts agreed that developing access to the Gondola Point Arterial would be difficult due to the steep slope and the existing property development not belonging to the Scotts. The original plan did suggest access to Meenan's and Mr. Roberts reviewed the 1978 with the committee to show the original proposed road access. He left the copy of this plan on the podium for any attending residents to review. Mr. Rioux asked if the proposed road, in the future development area, would come out above the Town's pumping station. Mr. Roberts stated the road would probably hug the property line and end up above that.

Mr. Mike Murphy of Kane Road spoke to the PAC with concerns for the Amsworth and Kane Road connection. He has lived on Kane Road for ten years and is worried that this connection will create increased traffic when used as a short cut. The concern is not so much for the proposed eleven lots at this time but the potential of connecting roads to Kane and bringing traffic from Merritt Hill, Mathews Drive and others. These roads once connected could increase the travellers from about one hundred existing homes with an average of two cars per home. Added to this are the beach travellers and then the potential of another one hundred plus new homes and it is Mr. Murphy's opinion that Kane Road is not set up for this traffic now. He review the situation on Minstrel Drive and Southwood where speed bumps and traffic circles were required to slow down traffic and asked how this could be avoided on Kane Road. Mr. Murphy asked if slower speed signs or eliminating left turns at the end of Kane Road would be possible. He also asked if the Town would consider a road barrier similar to Autumn Avenue where the traffic is not permitted to travel through to the Co-Op. This would keep traffic from Merritt Hill Road travelling through Kane Road.

It was noted by Mr. MacLaughlin that when residents live on a quiet street for awhile that there is an adjustment when traffic increases as they are not accustomed to this. Mr. Rioux commented that the Autumn Avenue blockage was recently reviewed due to a petition sent to Council to have it reopened and it was understood that this could end up being used as a short cut but the difference was that the traffic on this road could be in the thousands not just the hundreds. It was noted that many drivers might not use Kane Road as a short cut because they would think it would be slower travelling and they would not experience the beautiful views

of Gondola Point Road.

Mr. Fred Stillwell of Kane Road spoke on the same topics as Mr. Murphy to reiterate the quality of life as they are currently accustomed to on a Cul de Sac. He stated that he understood that Kane Road would eventually be pushed through but just has concerns for the hundreds of cars and construction equipment all day. There was lots of construction equipment through this road last summer when work was being done and it was a nuisance. Kane Road being used as a short cut would be an even bigger concern.

Mr. MacLaughlin asked if anyone else wished to speak on this application with topics that were not already reviewed. Mr. Carl Brandon of Gondola Point Road came to the podium to review his letter of concerns. Firstly, his concern for the water table and well water. When he lived at his previous home of 492 Gondola Point Road, the area above was developed into a subdivision and this caused sulphur in drilled wells in that area. He had to invest in a water purifying system and did not want to have the same concerns at his current home. His second concern was for silt in the river. The development and excavation along with the heavy rains of last summer caused silt to run out in the river to a distance of one hundred feet out. He asked how this would be controlled. He stated that he previously called the Department of Environment but never received a reply. Mr. MacLaughlin stated that part of any development agreement is a water testing report. Mr. Brandon asked Mr. Roberts if the entire development was being done by Scotts or if lots were being sold to other developers that may not monitor the concerns as well as Scotts. Mr. Roberts said that Scotts usually does do their own building but have recently started selling some lots within a development. Mr. Brandon's final concern was for the damage from heavy equipment along Gondola Point Road. In his letter, he requested that the construction equipment travel through Kane Road but in hearing the concerns from residents on Kane Road at this meeting, said he understood residents on both roads had the same concern.

Mr. MacLaughlin asked again if anyone else wished to speak on this application with topics that were not already reviewed. No one came forward so Mr. Roberts was asked to return to the podium.

In response to previous comments, Mr. Roberts stated that the plan to develop this area has always been there. He understands that everyone would like to live on a Cul de Sac but this is not possible, future developments will always come. He noted that he remembered when Pettingill and Vincent Road were both gravel roads; before development of municipal standards were required for highly developed areas. He stated that proper designs tie properties together and that more roads connecting make access and exits more convenient for everyone. Mr. Roberts stated that a barrier on Kane Road would not be a good idea and as in the case of Autumn Avenue, short cuts are still being used on other roads in the subdivision. He stated that the silt will be monitored and that Mr. Scott is a very reliable and responsible developer plus he lives in that area so he will be aware if this becomes a problem. The water quality will be reviewed and an assessment will be done as part of this development.

Mr. MacLaughlin stated that it is understood that residents that have been in an area without development for awhile find it harder to accept new development and he commented on how PAC acknowledges the concerns from everyone affected by each development and reviews

these as part of their decision. The PAC is aware that with any construction development, there will be equipment and other traffic in the area. He asked Mr. Dwight Colbourne to speak to the barrier suggestion. Mr. Colbourne reviewed several concerns; firstly he noted that the typical daily traffic on town streets is less than you would see on a traffic study. A national standard would state around 500 trips per day but streets and roads in Quispamsis are more like 300 or less trips per day. Traffic studies are usually conducted in heavier density areas but here we are currently looking at eleven lots added to one road. Going forward, Mr. Colbourne stated that although the plan is reviewed now with single family homes, this may change based on the needs of the community. He stated that as this is developed, alternate access and exit routes will be reviewed. Mr. Colbourne reviewed the barrier on Autumn Avenue and how the road would potentially be used as a short cut to the highway, to Millennium Drive and other commercial districts, which could bring commercial vehicles through a residential area. There is also a concern for emergency vehicles getting through the shortest route to an emergency and if they encountered a road barrier, this could cause problems. He stated that PAC could request a traffic study on Kane Road but at this time, there would not be much traffic. With regards to the concerns for water, Mr. Colbourne stated that with the Town's Subdivision By-law, developers are required to undertake a comprehensive water supply and source assessment which looks at the capacity required to support the level of development as well as the quality. These reports are sent to the Town and the staff reviews and recommends that they meet National Standards before approval is done. This is already done for this development of eleven lots and will be done again for the next phase of the development. The width of the street was mentioned by a resident, with the thought of it being narrow at the end, but Mr. Colbourne confirmed that it is a typical municipal street size and not narrower; it is measured as eight feet of asphalt with one foot on each side of the asphalt as a road shoulder.

Mr. MacLaughlin asked if there were any further questions or concerns and Mr. Andrew Rowe of Prince Road spoke to the concern for Mr. Ron Scott Senior's personal property being used to store equipment and as a lay-down area for business. He asked if this was permitted in a residential zone and stated concern for safety of children in the area. Mr. Colbourne stated that the Town's By-law states that all material and equipment must be stored only on the lot(s) being developed and that this will be monitored.

MOVED BY: Darin Lamont

SECONDED BY: Mark Hatfield

That the PAC approve the tentative Subdivision Plan called Gondola Point Park Phase 9, the extension of Kane Road to Amsworth Drive for eleven (11) lots with the following conditions:

- 1) Submission of an abbreviated water supply assessment report is required in accordance with Section 8C(i)(c) of the Subdivision By-law;
- 2) Submission of Lot Grading Plan that clearly demonstrates acceptable surface water drainage control practices for each of the lots;
- 3) The Developer to present the proposed development to the Department of Environment and obtain necessary approvals with copies to be submitted to the Town;
- 4) Submission of a subdivision plan creating a Municipal Services Easement across Scott Bros Ltd. property (PID 00249243). The easement is to be vested in the Town for the

purpose of providing the necessary access to the storm sewer infrastructure as proposed on Gondola Point Park Subdivision Phase 8 Storm Easement Plan and Profile design drawings from EXP Services Inc. (Dwg. No. 4-1);

- 5) The Developer to work with the Town to develop a trail and pedestrian walkway schema for the area prior to Final plan approvals and dedicate a land area of 1615 sq. m for LPP purposes;
- 6) Standard Developer's Agreement, bonding and subdivision fees will be required;
- 7) Subdivision filing fees of three hundred ten dollars (\$310.00) for a eleven (11) lot phase;
- 8) Plans to be properly signed by the necessary utilities and owners; and
- 9) The Town verifies that Mr. Scott's lay-down area is not on personal property.

On the question:

Mr. Rioux noted that any lots beyond these eleven (11) lots will be reviewed separately. Mr. Colbourne was asked if there any variances required for this subdivision or the remnant lot and he stated that everything was covered by the conditions and that access to the remnant lot is adequate at this time with regards to the number of proposed roads and the size of each; all within the Subdivision By-law requirements. It was added that the Town and the developer will review the access and exits as the phases develop with traffic studies required for the heavier density properties.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Subsequent to the motion being carried, several questions were raised by members of the audience; no names were given. The first was to ask who is responsible for damage to the Kane Road during construction; noting that it was just paved last year. Mr. Colbourne stated that the developer is responsible for any damage caused by his equipment and the Town monitors this to ensure damages are repaired. There is also bonding put up to ensure the infrastructure is put in place and the Town will do an inspection prior to the commencement of the development plus the Town staff reviews the project on a daily basis.

Another question was asked on the notice of future phases and if residents on Kane Road would be notified; noting that this was a short notice and surprise to many of them. Mrs. Violet Brown explained the process for notification which included letters to residents within one hundred (100) metres of the civic address of the lot being developed and that the application must be delivered to the Town a minimum of two weeks prior to the meeting date. Mr. Colbourne noted that Kane Road residents would likely be notified of the next few phases and that these guidelines for notification are based on the Provincial Planning Authority. Another question was asked on the reports, such as the water or traffic studies, and whether they can get copies or access to copies of each. Mr. Colbourne stated that all documentation that is part of a Planning Advisory Committee review becomes public information and is available to anyone requesting it.

9. Information Items

Council Meeting Minutes January 21 and February 4, 2014

10. Adjournment

MOVED BY: David Carlson

That the meeting be adjourned.

The Planning Advisory Committee meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

The next Planning Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for March 25, 2014.

Respectfully Submitted,



CHAIRMAN

SECRETARY