



**TOWN OF SAINT ANDREWS
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

**October 19, 2022, 7:00 p.m.
W.C. O'Neill Arena**

A. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

At the Planning Advisory Committee Meeting on Wednesday, October 19, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present:

Vice Chair Jill Stewart, PAC Member Jeff Cross, Kevin Simmonds, Dwight Ingalls, Councillor Lee Heenan.

Paul Nopper, Clerk - Senior Administrator, Alexander Gopen, Senior Planner, Southwest New Brunswick Service Commission.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Prior to the approval of the Agenda, Vice Chair Stewart informed the Planning Advisory Committee of the formal recognition of the loss and recent passing of Chair Chris Flemming. Chris was an inspirational leader dedicated to our County, our Community, and our Committee. I am grateful for his leadership as Committee Chair and he will surely be missed. A moment of silence was recognized by the Planning Advisory Committee.

Motion: 065 - 10/22

Moved By PAC Cross

Seconded By PAC Simmonds

That the Agenda be approved as presented.

4 – 0

Carried

C. DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

D. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

1. Minutes of the 220817 Planning Advisory Committee for Wednesday, August 17, 2022, 7:00 p.m.

Motion: 066 - 10/22

Moved By Councillor Heenan

Seconded By PAC Ingalls

That the Minutes of the 220817 Planning Advisory Committee Meeting of Wednesday, August 17, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. be adopted.

4 – 0

Carried

E. AGENDA ITEMS

1. PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

2. ZONING APPLICATIONS

1. Obtaining Views of the PAC on Amendment MP20-02-01 Secondary Municipal Plan for Bridle Path International Inc., PAC221008

Planner Gopen provided a presentation to the PAC on Amendment MP20-02-01 for 256 and 260 Water Street. The Amendment exempts the development from the height requirements with the implementation of a Development Scheme By-Law. This was a recommendation by the PAC. 3 vacant lots and the former site of the former HMS Transportation building. Proposed 36-unit, 12.2 m high Mixed-Use development. It is in the Historic Business District, which height is controlled by the Secondary Municipal Plan. The Secondary Municipal Plan cannot be varied but does require an amendment. Lots would need to be consolidated prior to development. A view of the property as it currently sits was provided to the PAC. A copy of the site plan for 256 and 260 Water Street was provided to the PAC. Facade context renderings were provided for PAC to review with views of Water Street and Princess Royal Street. Municipal Plan Policies 2.1.2(2)(8) Environment and Climate Change Policies, 2.5.2(1) Economic Policies, 2.5.2(6) Economic Policies were provided. It was noted that this Mixed-Use development is in a good location and bad for vacant buildings. The Secondary Municipal Plan referenced that there are buildings nearby of close heights but would still be the tallest in the area. The intent is to have a consistent streetscape, the majority of buildings are 9.8 m tall. Many members of the public are concerned about the size of the development of the lot. The Lidar Map of the height of buildings was provided for reference. With the Development Scheme By-Law, there are still opportunities for public consultation and discussion. PAC's views and judgment are important for this process and for Council. Is what is proposed for this site good for the Town? This is a key question to be answered by Council.

PAC thanked Planner Gopen for his presentation. This project was discussed in August of 2022 and the Council took the views of the PAC and made an amendment to the By-Law. It was noted that there is significant interest in this development and PAC's opportunity to provide feedback is important.

Councillor Heenan - It was brought forward that this development hinges on the height requirements of 12.2 m and the underground parking is reviewed. The development would not move forward if underground parking is not feasible. The previous variance height approved at the PRAC meeting in February of 2018 was 13.25 m for reference. Vice Chair Stewart went around the table for comment.

PAC Cross - Still has some struggles with the Princess Royal side of the building, but would be addressed in the Development Scheme By-Law. Where the height was approved at 13.25 m before, and now the 12.2 m height is in line with the regulations.

PAC Simmonds - Had a discussion with staff to be brought up to speed with the building size and orientation of the building. The building is 90 ft. in front and 130 ft. long. For reference, the grocery store is 85 ft wide and 160 ft. long. It would be like dropping a grocery store-size building on the lot. Note that the grocery store had a parking lot and vacant space before expansion. The grocery store is longer than proposed. We looked at the Serendipin Art building and Leather House building. Together the frontage is about 90 ft. but you do not have the same depth throughout the whole building. There is a 100 ft. stretch of building space to Church Lane to give depth orientation. I am trying to view the building size and scope already in the community. The building is allowed to go to 12.5 m if they circumvent sections a, b, and c. Also thought it would be a good idea for a Heritage Assessment done on the development through a third party to identify the impact on the downtown. Think it would be a good idea to review. Stormwater Management would be also a good idea but that is part of the development process. I think we should get more information and allow the process to continue. In addition, I would like to know what type of green space would be between the proposed building and the Dollar Store.

PAC Ingalls - I asked for the streetscape view. A couple of perspectives are shown but no elevations are shown against the existing buildings along Water Street or residents on Princess Royal Street. Would need this for evaluation. This would help show how it will be formed. Would like height lines showing elevation against other buildings. Good for future projects to show this as well. I do not think the 2018 development should be included in the discussions as this is a new proposal. I would like to see an elevation along Princess Royal Street to have a separation between the first floor to the public realm. Should not be the same elevation from the public to the private realm. Change of elevation from the sidewalk to the first floor. Water Street does not need the change in elevation but thinks it would help on Princess Royal Street. The mass of the building can be modified by articulating aspects of the facade to have a better fit with Saint Andrews.

PAC Cross - I like the way they have done the front similar to other buildings in Town. Looks like three separate buildings and appreciate it. The side on Princess Royal Street has concerns but like the elevation separation difference from the streetscape to the first floor. Have to be cognizant of the apartments in the public realm. Some sort of buffering would really help that.

Vice Chair Stewart - Happy with the new renderings which are very helpful. This gives perspective to the building.

Councillor Heenan - Two points of discussion from Monday night. One person spoke about what will ever happen to the wasteland if we do not develop it. We do not have other opportunities for this development at this time. The developer is not asking for any financials from the Town on this project. Have to make sure we are doing this process correctly. Mr. Holmes's accountant was there on Monday and noted that 18 apartments were not feasible. If we do allow or support the height, we are setting precedence. There are no other lots downtown available and heritage buildings cannot be

touched. No other development of this magnitude can be built in Town at this point.

Vice Chair Stewart summarized the comments from the PAC on the height and underground parking, agreed views to Council were strong but added to have an elevation change to Princess Royal Street, the height is aligned with previous approvals, and discussed building mass and scale and would suggest a Heritage Assessment. We will indicate those views to Council.

PAC Simmonds - In discussions, should we look at suggesting a Traffic Study to this? Would like this reiterated to the Town.

Vice Chair Stewart - Will add to the views to include a Traffic Study.

Motion: 067 - 10/22

Moved By Councillor Heenan

Seconded By PAC Cross

That the Planning Advisory Committee of the Town of Saint Andrews provides the following views, as per Section 110 of the Community Planning Act, on Amendment MP20-02-01 to the Secondary Municipal Plan MP20-02 for 256 and 260 Water Street, Bridle Path International Inc:

- 1. That the streetscape on Princess Royal Street should include an elevation change from street level to the ground floor of the building.*
- 2. We acknowledge that the height falls in line with the previous approvals, it would be beneficial if there could be a street view rendering that labeled the adjacent buildings with their heights for visual comparison.*
- 3. Impact studies that should be undertaken include traffic and heritage.*

4 – 0

Carried

3. VARIANCE APPLICATIONS

1. 56 Rose Lane PID 01325885 Variance Application, PAC221004

Planner Gopen provided a presentation to the Planning Advisory Committee on the variance request for 56 Rose Lane, for John MacDonald. It is a 3.5-acre lot with a significant slope to the water. It is an Estate Residential Zone with two existing dwelling units close to the water. This is a narrow lot. One dwelling is 1,200 sq. ft. and would like to move this closer to the road as an accessory dwelling unit. There is a cottage by the water, which will be demolished and a new main dwelling to be created. The request is to place a 1,200 sq. ft. accessory dwelling unit in the front yard. The Zoning By-Law Z22-01 Section 4.1.7(1)(b) does not allow for an accessory dwelling building in between the road and the main building and accessory structures are limited to 904 sq. ft. Rose lane cannot be subdivided off as it does not meet Subdivision By-Law standards. The road dead ends at the subject property. Site maps and visuals were provided to the PAC for review. There is limited car traffic on the road. Municipal Plan Section 2.4.2(a) General Land Use and Development was referenced. It is extremely unlikely to have more development on Rose Lane. The slope of the property will diminish the visibility of the main structure and the accessory dwelling unit. the accessory dwelling unit would be less than 1% of the lot area.

PAC thanked Mr. Gopen for the presentation. They asked for clarification on the placement of the accessory dwelling unit. Mr. Gopen noted that it would be approximately 150 ft. from the main road. PAC asked if we had received any feedback from any adjacent residents. It was noted that Mr. Gopen received one question but it was for clarification on the proposed development and were in favour of it. PAC asked if the proponent had any questions for the PAC. No questions or additional comments were provided by Mr. MacDonald.

Motion: 068 - 10/22

Moved By PAC Cross

Seconded By Councillor Heenan

That the Planning Advisory Committee approves the Variance Application for 56 Rose Lane PID 01325885 for John MacDonald to allow for a 1,200 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelling Unit and to allow an accessory building to be placed closer to the front lot line than the main building with the following condition:

1. *Any dwelling constructed on PID 01325885 in the future shall not be visible from Rose Lane or any other public street.*

4 – 0

Carried

2. 481 Mowat Drive PID 01325729 Variance Application, PAC221005

Planner Gopen presented to the Planning Advisory Committee on the variance request for 481 Mowat Drive, for Dheeraj Busawon and Irene Andrushchenko. The property is at the corner of Cornelia St and Mowat Drive with a 0.3 acres corner lot in the Estate Residential Zone. This is an undersized lot. There is an existing 730 sq. ft. single-unit dwelling accessed from Mowat Drive. The front yard of the property is between the house and Mowat Drive and the flankage yard is between the house and Cornelia St. The minimum flankage yard is 25 ft. The request is to place an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in part of the flankage yard and link up to the current water and sewer services on the lot. Note that the Zoning By-Law Z22-01 Section 4.1.7 (1)(b) does not allow accessory buildings in any part of the flankage yard and thus why a variance is being requested. Aerial and site plans of the property and proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit were provided to PAC for review. With the new driveway on Cornelia Street, Public Works was asked for any concerns, but no concerns were provided. The intent of the Zoning By-Law is for accessory buildings to be less visually dominant than the main buildings. The location of the main building makes it impossible to place accessory buildings anywhere except in the flankage yard if setbacks are maintained. Suggest additional screening to mitigate visual impacts on Cornelia St. Section 55(1) of the Community Planning Act was provided for reference. It is recommended that the PAC approve the placement of the Accessory Dwelling Unit with the condition of a buffer of trees being placed no more than 3 meters apart to be installed in the flankage yard lot line.

PAC asked Planner Gopen why the original lot is undersized and with two buildings being 1300 sq. ft. Planner Gopen noted that

Zoning By-Laws talk about maximum lot sizes and shapes but not minimums. Perhaps this property was subdivided prior to some of the Zoning By-Laws. Basically, the lot does not meet the requirements of the Estate Residential Zone. PAC also asked if Cornelia Street is a Town road or private. Clerk Nopper noted that the road is not the Town's but plowing and maintenance of the road are kept by the Town. It is effectively a public road but not in name.

Mr. Dheeraj Busawon had no further comments as the applicant to the PAC.

Motion: 069 - 10/22

Moved By PAC Simmonds

Seconded By Councillor Heenan

That the Planning Advisory Committee approves the Variance Application for PID 01325729, 481 Mowat Drive, for Dheeraj Busawon and Irene Andruschchenko to allow a 600 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelling Unit to be placed in the flankage yard with the following condition:

1. *A buffer of trees spaced no more than 3 metres apart shall be installed and maintained between the flankage lot line and the proposed development, with the exception of access. Condition to be completed at the time of development to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.*

4 – 0

Carried

4. TERMS AND CONDITIONS APPLICATION

5. SIGN APPLICATIONS

F. NEW BUSINESS

G. PAC MEMBER COMMENTS

H. CLOSED ITEMS

I. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: 070 - 10/22

Moved By PAC Stewart

At 8:03 p.m. that the meeting be adjourned.

Carried



Jill Stewart, Acting Chair



Paul Nopper, Clerk - Senior
Administrator

