

Planning Advisory Committee Monday, March 19, 2018

A meeting of the St. Marys Planning Advisory Committee was held on Monday, March 19, 2018, in the Boardroom, Municipal Operations Centre, 408 James Street South, St. Marys, Ontario at 6:00 pm to discuss the following.

1.0 Call to order

2.0 Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

3.0 Approval of Minutes

Regular Meeting of February 5, 2018

Motion:

Second:

4.0 Question Period: Official Plan Review

5.0 Official Plan Review: Correspondence

6.0 Official Plan Review (OPR): Discussion Papers

- OPR Paper #4: Residential
- OPR Paper #11: Natural Heritage & Hazards

7.0 Next Meeting

8.0 Adjournment

Present:

- Chairman Councillor Don Van Galen
- Councillor Jim Craigmile
- Member William J. (Bill) Galloway
- Member Steve Cousins
- Member Marti Lindsay
- Member Dr. J. H. (Jim) Loucks
- Mark Stone, Planner
- Mark Swallow, Planner
- Grant Brouwer, Director of Building and Development
- Susan Luckhardt, Secretary-Treasurer PAC

Regrets:

- None

1.0 Call to Order

Chairman Don Van Galen called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2.0 Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest:

None.

3.0 Approval of Minutes:

Minutes dated February 5, 2018

Motion by: Councillor Jim Craigmile

Seconded by: Member Marti Lindsay

THAT the Minutes dated February 5, 2018 be approved as circulated.

MOTION CARRIED

4.0 Question Period: Official Plan Review

Victor LeBreche of Lebreche Patterson and Associates was present and stated that he is representing the Hensel family who own land at 555 Emily Street. Victor LeBreche had no questions at this time but asked if there would be opportunity to ask questions later in the meeting.

5.0 Official Plan Review: Correspondence

Chairman Don Van Galen asked for questions on the correspondence regarding the Official Plan Review as provided in the Agenda package.

Staff responded to questions regarding the designation of Residential lands on Emily Street and the timing of decisions regarding land use designations. Staff provided clarification of parcel boundaries.

6.0 Official Plan Review (OPR): Discussion Papers

• OPR Paper #4: Residential

Mark Stone provided a summary of draft OPR Paper #4: Residential. There was discussion regarding policies for infill development.

General Policies for Intensification/Infill Development

- The land use, building form, massing and density of proposed development shall respect and enhance the character of the neighbourhood;
- The extent to which a neighbourhood is homogenous in nature and/or in a state of transition shall be considerations in assessing development proposals;
- Proposed land uses and development should have minimal impacts on adjacent properties in relation to grading, drainage, shadowing, access and circulation, and privacy; and,
- Existing trees and vegetation should be retained and enhanced where possible and additional landscaping should be provided to integrate the proposed development with the existing neighbourhood.

Policies for Infill Development – creation of lot(s) for single detached and semi-detached dwellings between existing lots

- Proposed building heights should reflect the pattern of heights of adjacent housing and shall not exceed two storeys;
- A similar lot coverage to adjacent housing is provided to ensure that the massing or volume of the new dwelling reflects the scale and appearance of adjacent housing;
- The predominant or average front yard setback for adjacent housing is maintained to preserve the streetscape edge, and character;
- Similar side yard setbacks are provided to preserve the spaciousness on the street; and,
- The depth of a new dwelling provides for a usable sized rear yard amenity area and minimizes the potential impacts of the new home on the enjoyment of adjacent rear yards.

Policies for Townhouse, Multiple and Apartment Dwellings

- The location and massing of new buildings should provide a transition between areas of different development intensity and scale. Appropriate transitions can be achieved through appropriate setbacks or separations of buildings and/or the stepping down of heights;
- Lots shall be located in close proximity to a Collector or Arterial Road;
- When considering building heights, potential shadowing impacts, views onto adjacent lower density lots and abrupt changes in scale should be considered;
- New buildings that are adjacent to low rise areas are designed to respect a 45 degree angular plane measured from the boundary of a lot line which separates the lot from an adjacent lot with a low rise residential dwelling;
- Proposed development is located on a site that has adequate land area to incorporate required resident and visitor parking, recreational facilities, landscaping and buffering on-site;
- Proposed buildings should be designed following consideration of the materials and characteristics of existing buildings in the neighbourhood;
- Service, parking, loading and garbage areas should be located and screened to minimize impacts on adjacent uses;
- Potential adverse impacts between higher density and low density development shall be mitigated through building setbacks, visual screening, landscaping, fencing and other forms of buffering;
- Generally, there should be minimal changes to existing site grades; and,
- The use of retaining walls along street frontages should generally be avoided. Where a retaining wall cannot be avoided, increased setbacks and terracing of walls should be considered.

In response to Councillor Jim Craigmile, staff will follow up regarding the number of permitted storeys for development on infill lots with respect to topography.

Chairman Don Van Galen asked for questions from the Public. Victor Lebreche requested a copy of tonight's PowerPoint presentation, if available. Staff will follow up and provide the presentation.

- **OPR Paper #11: Natural Heritage & Hazards**

Mark Stone provided a summary of draft OPR Paper #11: Natural Heritage & Hazards. Mark Swallow provided additional comments.

Key recommended amendments:

- Identify uses permitted on lands designated Natural Heritage
- Add policies for components of natural heritage system – significant wetlands, woodlands, valleylands, wildlife habitat, areas of natural significant interest and fish habitats
- Natural Hazard designation (floodway) – permitted uses shall be forestry, conservation uses, flood or erosion control works/infrastructure, agriculture, utilities and outdoor recreation uses
- Flood Fringe Overlay – permitted uses in accordance with underlying designations

Mark Stone spoke to the steps in the OP review – the next step will be a Public Open House.

Chairman Don Van Galen asked staff when a response would be provided to the correspondence received for the Official Plan Review. Mark Stone stated that the Town would specifically respond to all correspondence in the later stages of the project.

Motion: Official Plan Review (OPR): Discussion Papers

Motion by: Member William J. (Bill) Galloway

Seconded by: Member Steve Cousins

THAT the Planning Advisory Committee for the Separated Town of St. Marys receives the Draft Official Plan Discussion Papers as presented by staff and further, directs staff to schedule an Open House to be hosted by Council at the earliest opportunity.

MOTION CARRIED

7.0 Next Meeting

T.B.A.

8.0 Adjournment:

Motion by: Member William J. (Bill) Galloway

Seconded by: Member Dr. J. H. (Jim) Loucks

THAT the meeting adjourn at 6:50 pm.

MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Don Van Galen
Chairman

Susan Luckhardt



Secretary-Treasurer

Copies to:

- PAC Members
- CAO-Clerk
- Council
- Mark Stone, Planner

draft unapproved