



**Public Meeting of Council
Wednesday, March 27, 2019, 7:00 PM
Provinces Room, Rodd Charlottetown Hotel
75 Kent Street**

Mayor Philip Brown Presiding

Present:

**Mayor Philip Brown
Deputy Mayor Jason Coady
Councillor Alanna Jankov
Councillor Greg Rivard
Councillor Julie McCabe
Councillor Kevin Ramsay**

**Councillor Mike Duffy
Councillor Robert Doiron
Councillor Terry MacLeod**

Also:

**Alex Forbes, PHM
Laurel Palmer Thompson, PII
Greg Morrison, PII**

**Robert Zilke, PII
Ellen Faye Ganga, PH IO/AA**

Regrets:

**Councillor Mitchell Tweel
Councillor Terry Bernard**

1. Call to Order

Mayor Philip Brown called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

2. Declarations of Conflict of Interest

There were no declarations of conflict.

3. Approval of Agenda

Mayor Philip Brown opened the meeting, introduced the members of the Council and the purpose of the meeting. Mayor Brown also mentioned the change in the sequence of the presentation and turned the meeting over to Councillor Rivard, Chair of Planning Board, explained the Public Meeting process and then proceeded to introduce the first application.

4. 183 Great George Street (PID #344044)

This is a request to obtain a site specific exemption for the property located at 183 Great George Street (PID #344044). It is a vacant lot located between Cedar's and The Old Triangle. The applicants made some amendments to the initial plans that were included in the public meeting mail out and the applicants will be presenting the changes tonight. Historically, mobile canteens were treated as temporary use and were not acknowledged in the by-law. In 2015, regulations were put in place to allow mobile canteens on private properties as grab-and-go type establishment with no alcohol sale. The applicants elaborated on this concept having outdoor entertainment, sale of alcohol and food, and additional seating within fenced property. Details will be provided by the applicant. When something does not adhere to the by-law text, a site specific exemption is requirement. The purpose of the site specific exemption would be to create an outdoor atmosphere where alcohol and food is sold from a mobile canteen within a fenced property. Seating would be located throughout the property and the washrooms would be located in a container at the rear of the property.

Mikey Wasnidge, applicant, presented details of their application showing the current state of the property, and the specifics of the proposed development. Mr. Wasnidge emphasized that they swapped the location of the mobile canteen & the washrooms, and the entrance to the property will be within the property along the right-of-way between the mobile canteen and Cedar's. This layout allows access to a side take-out window between midnight and 3 am while the rest of the property can be closed to the public. Mr. Wasnidge also discussed the different food and drink services, late night food service, site transformation plans, fence, washroom facilities, waste management, noise control and fire safety.

Councillor Terry MacLeod asked if they own the property and Ms. Wasnidge mentioned that they plan to lease the property. Mr. MacLeod commented that if you are one of the businesses beside the property and paying taxes year round, what would your thoughts be on this development. Mr. Wasnidge responded to say that he would find ways to cooperate and collaborate with business owners to drive new business. Mr. MacLeod noted that if you are in the shoes of the existing business owners who pay taxes, employ people and take advantage of burger love, and then this business comes in for 3 months and takes away their sales because they can't afford to compete with your lower costs liquor sales. He also added that half of Kent Street and Great George Street have empty buildings that need to be filled. Mr. MacLeod mentions that it is a tough decision as a council member and feels like this is not the right spot for such development. Mr. Wasnidge appreciated the feedback and the views of other business owners who may lose business to this project. However, people are investing in this community to make Charlottetown better and to attract more youth and more people to enjoy Charlottetown.

Lastly, Mr. MacLeod reminded them to keep these concerns in mind and suggested that he is neither for or against such a proposal at this time. As an official, he wants to look at empty buildings and try to fill those empty spots. Mr. Wasnidge indicated that we are not the same Charlottetown as we were six years ago and a number of these empty buildings

have been filled in successfully. Mr. Wasnidge suggested he understands Councillor Macleod's concerns but mentioned that he would respectfully disagree.

Lane MacLaren, resident, thinks that this is a great proposal and is a good addition for the downtown. Mr. MacLaren is on the same page with Mr. MacLeod that he is not against the proposal. We have seen food trucks within the City and have added on to the atmosphere in the downtown. He feels for the permanent establishments trying to attract as many customers as they can and then when summer comes and more activity becomes available, they then have to compete with other businesses. Mr. MacLaren asked if this is approved, would there a different tax rate/consideration to temporary business to pay higher tax rates. Mayor Brown inquired with Mr. Wasnidge if they will be renting and Mr. Wasnidge confirmed they were. The Mayor stated that if it is a vacant lot it would be taxed on residential rate. When it is occupied, it will contribute to HST/ other taxes but there is nothing to force them to pay more than what is required. Mr. MacLaren then asked if a food truck is located at the corner, will there be no levy paid. Mr. Rivard responded that there are fees for food trucks but because of the sale of alcohol, this will fall under a different section.

Heidi Zinn, resident and one the board of directors of Fusion Charlottetown, mentioned that one of their missions is to make Charlottetown a place where people want to work hard, play hard and live well. They are fully in support of this vision of someone young who wants to stay in Charlottetown and keep their business in Charlottetown. It is important to support young entrepreneur and that they should be able start somewhere. We do not know what Mr. Wasnidge's group is capable of and what else they can do in the future. If we send a message to our youth saying you must come in with big business plans and expect them to succeed and do well, we are setting people up for failure. If we want these spaces filled in the future, we must support youth now. She then commented that for someone who works in the tourism business, seeing people like Mikey is a big step forward. It may hurt some businesses but competition is a good thing and we need to be innovative to bring Charlottetown to the next level.

Colin Young, resident, would like throw his support for Mikey and added leaving the property as an empty lot or make use of it and beautify the place should be an easy decision.

Mitch Cobb, resident and owner of Upstreet Brewery, commented that there were a lot of vacant lots in the last 10 years and that a few years ago, these lots started to be filled with new businesses and added vibrancy to Charlottetown which makes it separate from the rest of Charlottetown. Adding Mr. Wasnidge's proposal only serves to add to vibrancy and contribute to a new area of Charlottetown. We need to encourage new and interesting ideas and new businesses. I would say that this proposal is not an inexpensive proposal. Leasing a building would also have the same capital investment as what is being proposed. Mr. Cobb feels that it is not fair to say that we should fill an empty building first before putting something on a vacant lot.

Jalen MacLeod, resident and co-owners of truck-and-roll food trucks, and can speak on a food truck business perspective. Mr. MacLeod mentioned that they had a very nice welcome when they started their business and would like to show support to a new businesses and not put others down. As a young islander, we should try to support these new businesses. They may not have the same start-up costs as other businesses but none of these businesses would have owners in their 20s. These young individuals may not have the credit to put a business in a building but they are able to put something to shape the cuisine of Charlottetown in a different way and bring in new people to the City. They are not looking at it as competition because the more competition or options, it becomes more ideal to try out difference cuisine. If there are fewer restaurants serving the same cuisine, Charlottetown will not be able to attract the culinary tourism. Mr. MacLeod also added that food trucks pay taxes.

Kim Devine, resident, also expressed her support to this application and these energetic and enthusiastic entrepreneurs who would like to bring in new ideas to Charlottetown. The City has a very good food scene and we would like to build on and take it to another level. Ms. Devine also added that the City needs to support these new ideas and the people who bring them to the table are important to the City as whole. This is what we need to continue to grow and prosper. We are lucky to have these young people who make things happen in Charlottetown and make the City a more vibrant place. Ms. Devine also commented that the design elements are really good and that it will add more vibrancy to the block, thus, encourages the Council to support this application.

Councillor Alanna Jankov shared that since this idea was presented by Mr. Wasnidge, she went door to door around the neighbourhood and has heard nothing but amazing positive feedback. Ms. Jankov also encouraged other residents who have other comments to send it along to keep the momentum going.

Mr. Wasnidge thanked the people who came and supported this application.

Mayor Brown asked for any comments or questions; there being none, the meeting proceeded to the next item. Councillor Rivard then proceeded to introduce the next application.

5. 197 Minna Jane Drive (PID #469841)

This is a request to rezone the property at 197 Minna Jane Drive (PID #469841) from Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) Zone to the Highway Commercial (C-2) Zone and amend the designation in the Official Plan from Concept Planning Area to Commercial in order to construct a 70-unit apartment building with underground parking as well as an additional building in the future which will likely contain a commercial daycare centre. This request includes a major height variance from 49.2 ft to approximately 69.75 ft. The public meeting is only for the rezoning but the variance was included in the notice to ensure that adjacent properties are notified as well. All of the properties in the area are located near the Maritime Electric easement and are

zoned C-2 except for this lot. This application was also discussed with the provinces traffic operations engineer who indicated that any new use of the property could only be served from Minna Jane Drive or Daniel Drive. The applicant, Ron Lord, is here to answer any questions.

Heather MacLean, resident, verified the location of the building. Mr. Lord explained that the former John Yeo Drive is now named Daniel Drive and presented the map that shows the existing Bed, Bath & Beyond, PEI Liquor Shop, etc are located. Mr. Lord added that this is the only remaining CDA lot and others are C-2. He has worked with staff to determine what the best zone would be for this property and C-2 was identified to be the best fit. The apartment building will not compete with the neighboring senior apartments but would like to address the need for housing. Mr. Lord mentioned that Charlottetown has the fastest growing GDP, best population growth and fastest immigration increases in Atlantic Canada which is amazing.

Mayor Brown asked for any comments or questions; there being none, the meeting proceeded to the next item. Councillor Rivard then proceeded to introduce the next application.

6. 88 Brackley Point Road (PID #396770)

This is a request to rezone the property at 88 Brackley Point Road (PID #396770) from the Single-Detached Residential (R-1L) Zone to the Medium Density Residential (R-3) Zone and amend the designation in the Official Plan from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential.

The property is a 3.404 acre of land with an existing single family dwelling. The plan is to demolish the existing dwelling and subdivide the property into two lots in order to facilitate the construction of a 30-unit apartment building on one lot and a townhouse development on the other portion of the lot. The property has frontage on both Brackley Point Road and Pope Ave. The main access will be along Pope Ave and will have a right-in, right- out along Brackley Point Road. The Police has confirmed this exit to have safe site distance and this is required as secondary access to meet fire regulations. The parking for the apartment unit will be underground while the townhouse units will have surface parking. Derek French, consultant, to the applicant is here to provide more details of the application.

Derek French noted that he has been working closely with the owner, Ron Wood, for years on putting this development together. Mr. French provided a brief history of the property and the details of the development. Mr. French presented the concept plan, highlights of the development, summary of types of dwellings within 500 meters, parking, traffic, existing condition of the lot, neighbouring properties and details of the proposed apartment building and town house units. The vision for this development is to provide options to different types of people/families of all ages, young families, single parents, older or mature families. The property would be close to schools, church and

accommodation for parks in the area. There is also a good number of safe sidewalk systems in the area to accommodate the schools/students.

Derek Smith, resident, commented there is a huge problem with traffic along the school. If you drive around 3:30 pm, it is not safe to drive and there's significant traffic at that time. Mr. Smith noted that the apartment building does not belong in the neighbourhood.

Colin Young, resident, commented that he does not believe that this is the direction the community would like to go. Mr. Young is concerned about the traffic around the school and the area is surrounded by students, even cutting through the property to get to the school area. It is a dangerous idea for the area. Mr. Young also added that he respects the effort of Mr. Woods to make it as appealing to the community but he believes that Mr. Woods would just like to maximize the revenue of the property at the expense of the community.

Heather MacLean, resident, commented that she thinks that the development looks lovely but the traffic is the issue in this application. For the exit right along Brackley Point Road, Ms. MacLean noted that she will not exit right unless she goes to the airport so the cars will exit onto Pope Ave. You have to see the traffic in the morning and afternoon to confirm the issue. Some students are special and you will notice that there are non-stop pedestrian traffic along that area. Adding more cars along that area is a concern too.

Nola Etkin, resident, echoed the concerns about traffic. Ms. Etkin mentioned that a lot of kids walk past her house and along Pope Ave not only before and after school, but also during lunch break. The exit onto Brackley Point Road from Coles Drive is a nightmare and the intersection is also a bad intersection because of the offset. It is even worse during the winter when there are snow banks thus making it even more difficult to see incoming cars. Brackley Point Road is a busy road and the proposed right-out is not very far between intersections. Brackley Point Road traffic is bad and Pope Ave is going to be worse.

Jerry Ivany, resident, asked how would they propose the right-in, right-out be controlled. Mr. French responded that they are looking at putting a concrete curb to minimize cars turning left and this will be located at the property entrance to Brackley Point Road. Mr. Ivany indicated that safety is a major concern. Children walk back and forth between two schools and there are families dropping off their children, and most of the time, children cannot be controlled as soon as they step out of the vehicle. Mr. Ivany congratulated the proponent for the presentation and noted that everything is good except for the safety issues. He also feels that the townhouses are okay but the apartment is the problem. They would like to keep it as single family houses and not interested in having an apartment within the neighbourhood. Mr. Ivany also added that there are lands along Brackley Point Road that may probably be available in the future

and should this application be approved, the whole east side may end up being rezoned. The west side of the area having smaller older house, may also be envisioned over time, to end up with apartments as well. Mr. Ivany feels that this is a dangerous proposition with the amount of traffic that will be expected. Currently, it is rare to see residents that would only have one car. Also, during noon time, there are about hundreds of high school students walking down Pope Ave to the local fast food area. The access to Stone Park Junior High level is also not open to parents or to parents dropping off or picking up kids would park along the road. Mr. Ivany also appreciated the neighbourhood for taking care of the community and would like to keep it as single family dwellings. Finally, Mr. Ivany noted that he has submitted his written comments to the department and Mayor Brown acknowledged to have received it.

Mike Dillon, resident, asked about the location of the development. The report indicated that the apartment building is situated about 450ft away from Brackley Point Road but the apartment is actually along Pope Ave. It doesn't show how close the apartment complex would be from the closest R-1 lot along Pope. Laurel Palmer Thompson referenced the apartment to the single family dwelling owned by Mr. Woods which is adjacent to the proposed development. Ms. Thompson indicated that they looked at the distance along Brackley Point Road and not along Pope Ave. Staff were not looking at the massing along the streetscape because the apartment building is not located beside single detached dwellings. It is set back so the distance is not much of a concern. Mr. Dillon commented that it would be nice to have public documents include the distance of the apartment building to the nearest residential dwelling along R-1s. Mr. Dillon read sections of the report that provided comments on the townhouses but mentioned that he does not see anything in the document on apartment buildings. Ms. Thompson noted that discussions on townhouse units were included and there were also discussions about the apartment unit where it integrated in the streetscape. Mr. Dillon added that the report shows that staff is in support of the townhouse units but it does not provide the same for apartment units. Mr. Dillon also mentioned that there are inconsistencies to the document pertaining to recreation and open space amenities and asked if there are reasons why it was not included in the document. Ms. Thompson responded that staff looked at the land uses in the area. Ms. Thompson mentioned about picking out specific comments from the document but it should be considered that this is a balance report and it did cover the pros and cons of the development as a whole, and does meet the criteria for recreation and park land use. Staff looked at the overall aspect of the area when reviewing a development. Mr. Rivard also added that the report shows the Positive, Neutral and Shortcomings as it pertains to the application and the shortcomings as it pertains to the apartment building was presented. Mr. Dillon also commented that there are no sidewalks along some roads and thus would like to encourage the City to put the infrastructure to make it a great location for recreation and parkland. Mr. Dillon also noted Stone Park Bowl as being a great asset in the neighbourhood and is much underutilized. There are safety, lighting and mobility issues at the moment and would like the neighbourhood to maximize this park and for the City

to invest on this as well. Mayor Brown noted that is owned by Public School Branch while the Centennial Park is managed by the City.

Jeremy Crosby, resident, commented that he bought the property because of the character of the area and spoke to residents and no one is in favor of the proposed development. Mr. Crosby pointed out that the property is designated low density since it was developed in the early 70s and some points from the Official Plan to maintain Charlottetown's existing neighbourhood and new development is harmonious to existing neighbourhood. The proposed rezoning is against the future land use map and that it should remain low density residential. If this rezoning is approved, there may be potential changes to the concept plan and increase the density to at least 100 more units. It may also open the door to more rezonings along Brackley Point Road. The increase in density may be considered to be out of character and may increase the traffic issues. Mr. Crosby is not opposed to development but should be mindful of the surrounding neighbourhood.

Marco MacDonald, resident, mentioned that he studies at Stone Park School and he has concerns for the safety not only of himself but of his fellow students and for his sisters (and friends) studying at Tiny Tots Daycare. There is heavy traffic before school, during lunch break, when there are school events and even when teachers arrive before students arrive and after school hours. None of the students feel that this application is best idea for students at Stone Park.

Trevor Matheson, resident, commented that his children attend daycare at Tiny Tots. Mr. Matheson is concerned about the noise, heavy traffic, trucks and dust that may arise during the construction period which may affect the kids at the daycare. Mr. Matheson also indicated that the apartment buildings noted in the map are along the outer rim of the 500 meter area which are along Doncaster Ave and St. Peters Road. This property along the heart of the neighbourhood with single family dwellings. Mr. Matheson would like to applaud Mr. Woods for the proposal but a giant apartment does not fit in the neighbourhood.

Danielle Plante, resident, is voting against the development. There are too many cars parked in front of her house and there's too much traffic.

Pat Ellis, resident, commended that Mr. Woods did undergo a lot of planning on this. Ms. Ellis understands that some residents may have difficulty dealing with ownership of single family dwellings but does not see that the apartment units fit the vision of the neighbourhood. Traffic is present everyday. Ms. Ellis liked the green space concept and she mentioned that the townhouses are reasonable but not the apartment units and would like to see the properties remain as single family dwellings.

Marcia Gardiner, resident, mentioned that she has spoken to a number of residents within the neighbourhood and has not heard any positive comment about this

development. There are no difficulties/concerns with the townhouse development but the apartment is a big problem. There is a huge walking traffic of school children in the area and the auto traffic is also quite a problem.

Joan Ivany, resident, asked why this lot is being divided into two different properties. Ms. Ivany is afraid that if the application is approved, the other section will also become apartment buildings. Ms. Ivany compared it to the development behind the Charlottetown Mall where the development was proposed as a single development but has since changed from the initial plans. She is afraid that the same situation may happen to this area. Mr. French responded that it is more for accessibility and that there needs to be frontage for each of the lot. Ms. Ivany asked why she had to apply for a variance to develop her property while this new development has less frontage. Mr. French mentioned that they are within the requirements. Ms. Thompson also added that under the old bylaw, it is required that the streetscape align with the existing dwellings. The new bylaw requires that new development meet the minimum setback requirements.

Don Crosier, resident, asked how far would the exit from Brackley Point Road be from Cedar Ave, how wide would the exit be and where do you expect cars to turn when going downtown. Mr. French responded that it is approximately 75 feet from Cedar and access would be 20 feet wide. Mr. French mentioned that they can drive down to the Bypass highway or roundabout along Oak Drive and go back towards Brackley Point Road. Mr. Crosier is convinced that they are not turning right and will be difficult to enforce that. Traffic is a problem along Brackley Point Road. He is not opposed to the development but the exit on to Brackley Point Road is a concern. He also clarified the number of townhouse units in the proposed development. Mr. French confirmed that the plan indicates 17 townhouse units and Mr. mentioned that the letter indicates 16.

Matthew Walker, resident, commented that there are traffic issues along Pope Ave and this development is a disaster waiting to happen. Mr. Walker also commented on what precedent it sets for other development such as the previous application along 68 Brackley Point Road. Ms. Thompson responded that though she is not the planner who reviewed the recent application, she is aware of an old application that was also rejected because the property does not have a safe site line distance existing to Brackley Point Road, even if the development was just for a single family dwelling. Mr. Walker commented that he loved the town house proposal and would fit the neighbourhood but not the apartment.

Mike Eyolfson, resident, is opposing the apartment piece of the application but finds the townhouse to be suitable. Mr. Eyolfson did a canvassing along Heather Ave and there were no residents who provided positive responses to this application. Drainage is also a concern along this area and asked what steps are in place to mitigate this problem. Mr. French mentioned that they would design a storm water for the property and will

have to be reviewed by the City and integrated into the City's storm water system. He also commended Mr. Woods for the proposal but does not believe the apartment building belongs to the area.

Shelley Morrison, resident, urges the department to read the letter that will be sent tomorrow. Ms. Morrison has numerous concerns about being harmonious and following City plans which seems to be not followed in this. Ms. Morrison commends the Wood family for the proposal and is not opposed to development as long as it is done properly. Also, letters were notified at least a week ago and did not have time to prepare or be made aware of this. Most of the community was away for March break. Ms. Morrison presented a map that shows the number of residents that were opposed to the development. A petition was circulated and a total of 327 signatures were received in opposition to this application. Mayor Brown received the application and confirmed that this will be included in the Planning Board package. Mayor Brown also encouraged residents who wish to send their comments to submit it before noon of March 28, 2019 to planning@charlottetown.ca.

George Bitar, resident, noted that the area is a high traffic volume area. Everyone is in agreement that the apartment building is not desired in this area. Mr. Bitar asked what weight the community carries in making a decision. The community would like to keep the neighbourhood as single family dwellings. Mr. Brown responded that the Zoning & Development Bylaw is a living document does change over time. That is the purpose of the public consultation and the public is given notice, and the comments heard tonight will be considered when Council makes a decision on the 8th of April. Mr. Bitar asked if one is legally entitled, does this process matter. Mayor Brown responded that if a zone is being changed, a process is in place before a Council decision is made. Mr. Rivard also added that every resident has the right to apply for a change to the Zoning By-law and the department cannot deny applicants from coming forward. This is why the process includes a public consultation to hear comments from the public before it is reviewed a second time by the Planning board (April 1st) and the board makes a recommendation to Council to accept or reject and then Council makes the final decision. Dividing the lot may be a little tricky to better their livelihood but if they don't divide the property, this would not be happening.

Karen Dunning, resident, indicated that the homestead was a heritage home owned by George Coles and the plan is to tear it down. Ms. Thompson clarified with the Heritage department that the property was not George Coles' home. Ms. Dunning also asked if this property is rezoned to R-3, and the owners decide not to develop it, does it give other developers an opportunity to develop it into two 64-unit apartment dwellings. Mr. Rivard confirmed that once it is rezoned, it does allow developers to build based on the zoning. Mr. Forbes added that this application is based on the application they have submitted and the applicant will only be allowed to build as per their plan. Mayor Brown added that an R-3 zone would allow for apartment units but this specific application would be specific to the plans submitted based on a Development Agreement. Brackley

Point Road is a core road and is difficult to pull in and out of the driveway and she believes that there is a better way of designing it. Ms. Dunning is not opposed to developing small homes and would like to ask if these houses are to be rented or purchased and Mr. French responded that it can be a mix of both.

Susan Frizzell, resident, commented that if there was a party in one of the townhouse units, there is not enough parking space. Mr. French responded that it would have a long driveway. Ms. Frizzell also asked about enough parking for visitors for the apartment units. Mr. French mentioned that they are required 30 parking spaces and there are 28 parking spaces underground and about 10 surface parking. Ms. Frizzell then asked if there are plans to add more parking spaces in the future to accommodate the need for parking spaces and thus, reducing the green space in the area. Ms. Thompson responded that the applicant is required to provide 30 parking spaces. It will be up to the developer if they want to add more parking spaces.

Peter Poirer, resident, emphasized that the site map shown during the presentation shows properties within the area are all R-1 lots. The image is enough to show that an apartment building does not belong in that area. The townhouse units should be acceptable.

Mayor Brown asked for any comments or questions; there being none, the meeting proceeded to the next item. Councillor Rivard introduced the application.

Mayor Brown asked for any comments or questions; there being none, the meeting proceeded to the next item. Councillor Rivard introduced the application.

7. Amendments to the Zoning & Development Bylaw (Bylaw 2018-11)

This is a request to amend the Zoning & Development Bylaw pertaining to Housing Transitional Facility, Site regulations for Lodging Houses, Group Homes, Site Landscaping Requirements, Undersized Lot Regulations, Asphalt, Aggregate & Concrete Plant and General Housekeeping amendments.

Mr. Zilke went through the different sections of the amendments. Mayor Brown asked how many M-2 zones are there in the City and the proximity to residential dwellings. Mr. Zilke mentioned that there are two sections. Mr. Brown asked if these are the ones north of Winsloe and West Royalty Industrial Park and Mr. Zilke confirmed. Mr. Zilke added that the M-2 zone along the Industrial Park is directly adjacent to residential lots and thus the requirement for environmental assessment if it will stand the test of land use compatibility assessment. Mr. Brown also confirmed that M-2 in the north would be off the Sherwood road and heavy industrial within that area and Mr. Zilke also confirmed. Mr. Forbes also emphasized that the environmental impact assessment is a requirement of the province before a permit can be issued. Mayor Brown also asked whether the existing asphalt plant along Sherwood Road is on a non-conforming use and if that is sold or becomes dormant for six months, it returns to its original zone. Mr. Forbes confirmed that a portion is zoned

Industrial but the back portion that contains the asphalt plant is R-2. If they cease using it for six months, it goes back to R-2.

One resident asked why it was removed from the bylaw. Mr. Zilke responded that discretionary uses undergo an approval process. Mr. Forbes added that discretionary uses were removed in the current bylaw. It was a discretionary use at the airport at that time as a specific use. And that is the purpose of this current amendment, whether we need that use or not. It is a request to provide direction where that use can be located and whether it is necessary. Another question asked on landscaping is if the objective is to put trees and green space is a requirement, why is hardscaping allowed. Mr. Zilke responded that hardscaping would be decorative stone work or ornamental grasses. He also asked if it has to be a mixture or an alternative. Mr. Zilke mentioned that it should be a mixture or how the bylaw is defined.

Mayor Brown asked for any comments or questions; there being none, the meeting proceeded to the next item. Councillor Rivard introduced the application.

8. Secondary and Garden Suite Registry By-law

This is a proposal to create and implement the Secondary and Garden Suite Registry Bylaw to create and make available to the public a registry of all approved Secondary and Garden Suite(s) as per the previous Affordable Housing Amendment requirements.

Darren Ings, resident and real estate appraiser, asked how the City is going to zone the properties with secondary or garden suites. Is it going to be an R1 or R2 zone. Mr. Zilke responded that it doesn't apply to a zone but to the form of a building. Secondary suites will only be permitted to single detached dwellings, regardless of what zone they are situated. Mr. Ings clarified that single detached dwellings will now be two units, so he asked if they are R1 or R2, and that they cannot have both (one family or two families). Mr. Zilke noted that R1 allows for single detached dwelling. A secondary suite is secondary in nature, not like a semi or duplex and would have size restrictions. Mayor Brown also clarified that new terminologies are in place to reflect these changes to the definitions. Mr. Ings asked what the appraisal would be and Mr. Zilke confirmed that they are to be appraised as a single-detached home. A secondary suite is still part of main dwelling. You cannot sell a secondary suite independently. Mr. Ings asked if this can generate income and Mr. Zilke confirmed. Owners should register on a registry to allow for secondary suite. Once it is sold, the new owner should again register the secondary suite. He also asked if this database will be accessible to the public and Mr. Zilke confirmed that it will be available online.

Mayor Brown asked for any comments or questions; there being none, the meeting proceeded to the next item.

9. Adjournment of Public Session

Moved by Councillor Greg Rivard and seconded by Councillor Kevin Ramsay that the meeting be adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.