

Council Chambers
PEMBROKE, Ontario

September 12, 2006

The regular meeting of the Planning and Waterfront Committee was held this afternoon with Councillor O'Neill in the Chair and all members present with the exception of Councillors White, Henderson and Levasseur. Staff members present were Colleen Sauriol, Manager of Planning and Building Departments; Bob Hughes, Chief Building Official; and Terry Lapierre, Chief Administrative Officer.

MOTION: Moved by Councillor Lowe, seconded by Councillor Severin that the minutes of the meeting of June 6, 2006 be approved as circulated.

CARRIED.

ITEM # 1: Relief from Sign By-law – 1025 Pembroke Street East – Joe Barone

Mrs. Sauriol outlined Mr. Barone's request to allow an existing billboard to remain at the property at 1025 Pembroke Street East should he decide to build a residential building on this lot. The City's Zoning By-law does not allow a billboard sign to be located closer than 200 feet to a residence. Mrs. Sauriol explained that one or two parking spaces would be affected by the billboard, but Mr. Barone assured the Committee that parking spaces could be reconfigured to meet the parking requirement. Mrs. Sauriol noted that there is plenty of land available to accommodate the parking. She also noted that the billboard predated the Zoning By-law and the Sign By-law, and recommended that the Committee approve the request.

MOTION: Moved by Deputy Mayor Scott, seconded by Councillor Lowe that the Committee accept the Planning Department's recommendation to leave the billboard at 1025 Pembroke Street East at its present location.

CARRIED.

ITEM # 2: Development Charges By-law Appeal – 498 Sheppard Avenue

Mr. Lafrance was present to appeal the Development Charges applied to the two units of his semi-detached building. Mrs. Sauriol explained that Mr. Lafrance feels that he should not have to pay both development charges as he considers one unit to be a granny suite.

Mrs. Sauriol advised the Committee that under the Development Act the complainant is permitted to provide evidence and submissions at a hearing and Council may dismiss the complaint or rectify any error that was the subject of the complaint. If Council wishes to provide relief, a formal resolution will be provided for the Council meeting of September 19, 2006.

Mrs. Sauriol further explained that a granny suite is defined as a one-unit detached residential structure containing bathroom and kitchen facilities that is ancillary to an existing residential structure and that is designed to be portable. As well, she explained, the City has granted permission for granny flats to be constructed on a temporary basis in houses zoned "R1", but this permission is on a temporary basis and the house reverts to a single family dwelling when the agreement expires.

Mrs. Sauriol recommended that the appeal not be upheld and that a development fee be imposed for each dwelling unit.

Deputy Mayor Scott was informed that there are two addresses for the property, and Mr. Lafrance indicated that was for 9-1-1 purposes. Deputy Mayor Scott suggested that only half the development fee be charged for the second unit.

Mayor Jacyno was advised by Mr. Hughes that when Mr. Lafrance applied for the building permit he indicated that it was two units. Councillor Severin asked if the building could be severed because there is only one sewer and water service, and Mrs. Sauriol indicated there is a possibility if each unit had its own water and sewer service, or one portion of the building could be used as a rental unit.

Mr. Lafrance advised that it had taken years for them to get the land and when they began discussions the development fees weren't in place. Mrs. Sauriol agreed that Mr. Lafrance had been in before the development fees were put in place but there were notices in the paper when it was instituted. She stressed that it is still two units from the City's point of view.

Mayor Jacyno suggested that a temporary agreement be entered into such as in a granny flat agreement, but Mrs. Sauriol stressed that it is a second unit. Councillor Severin suggested that if each such case is reviewed separately it would not set a precedent. Development charges are in place, he added, because these people use our services. He agreed with Deputy Mayor Scott about applying half the fee to the second unit. Deputy Mayor Scott pointed out that the intention with granny suites is to have some control.

MOTION: Moved by Deputy Mayor Scott, seconded by Councillor Severin that one development fee of \$2,339.90 be applied for the first unit and a half fee of \$1,169.95 be applied for the second unit.

CARRIED.

Councillor Lafrenier agreed with the 50% reduction and suggested that the guidelines with regard to granny suites be revisited, recognizing the aging population. She stressed that the next Council should look at this. Councillor Lowe agreed.

Mayor Jacyno noted that due to the fact that Mr. Lafrance came to the City some time ago, and has shown good faith by paying both fees, he felt this was a good solution. He stressed that there should be a better definition of granny suite. Councillor O'Neill noted that the intent of the granny suites was to provide facilities for elderly or ill parents.

Mrs. Sauriol indicated that this item will go to Council for approval on September 19, after which a cheque will be issued.

ITEM #3 – Parking Authority Update

Mrs. Sauriol indicated that a by-law to amend the parking by-law will be prepared for Council's consideration at the meeting of September 19, 2006 to restrict parking on the west side of William Street between Supple and Esther Streets. Mayor Jacyno was advised that the cars involved probably belong to Algonquin College students.

ITEM # 4: Planning Advisory Update

Mrs. Sauriol discussed the rezoning application for 455 Draper Street. She noted that the Planning Advisory Committee did not recommend this application to allow an upholstery and woodworking business at 455 Draper Street. She noted that she also recommended that the business cease. She explained that a by-law allowing a "temporary zone" had been prepared for Council's debate at their meeting of September 19.

Councillor Lafreniere was advised that this business had been running since 1993, adding that it was unfortunate that it wasn't mentioned sooner. Councillor Severin

agreed, adding that the business had been operating illegally for some time and the owner has had the opportunity to find out that the business is viable without having to pay property tax.

Mrs. Sauriol explained that the matter can be debated at the next meeting of Council and that the applicant is in agreement with the suggestions in the “temporary” by-law. Mayor Jacyno suggested that there should be a spot for the business in an industrial park. If the “temporary” by-law is defeated, explained Mrs. Sauriol, the Economic Development Department will be asked to look into finding another spot for the business. Mrs. Sauriol further noted that if the “temporary” by-law is agreed to, it will be circulated to the neighbours for their comments before it becomes final. The complainant does not want them to continue, even on a temporary basis, she added.

ITEM # 5: Sydenham Street – Mora Developments

Mrs. Sauriol noted that a Subdivision Agreement for the development of 28 lots along Sydenham Street has been submitted. The previous Subdivision Agreement signed in 1991 has expired, she explained, adding that there are a few changes as approved by the Planning and Waterfront Committee at its meetings of January 10, 2006 and May 9, 2006. She explained that she is waiting for a letter of credit and proof of insurance, and when they are received a by-law will be prepared for Council’s review.

In reply to a question from Deputy Mayor Scott about the house which is presently being built on the lot, Mrs. Sauriol said it is still considered one large lot so the building is permitted.

ITEM # 6: D’Youville Drive Assumption

Mrs. Sauriol indicated that there are still some minor deficiencies on D’Youville Drive and once these deficiencies have been completed, an assumption by-law will be prepared for Council’s debate.

MOTION: Moved by Councillor Severin, seconded by Councillor Lowe that the meeting adjourn.

CARRIED.