



## SAINT JOHN

### PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2012

The regular meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee was held in the Council Chamber, Lobby Level.

#### **PRESENT**

Eric Falkjar	Chairman
Erik Kraglund	
Morgan Lanigan	
Donald Gillis	
Anne McShane	
Dave Drinnan	
Mark Reade	Senior Planner
Sarah Herring	Planner
Jody Kliffer	Planner
Lynda Lockhart	Recording Secretary

#### **REGRETS**

Gerry Lowe  
Andrew Miller  
Michael Whelton

---

The Chair informed those in attendance that the applicant for the rezoning application for 269-271 Somerset Street had requested that it be withdrawn.

#### **Item 1: Minutes**

*It was MOVED and SECONDED that the minutes of the April 17, 2012 meeting be adopted as circulated.*

**CARRIED**

**EK/ML**

**Item 2: Silver Falls United Church**  
**840 Loch Lomond Road**

---

Proposal: To install a two-unit, double-sided poster panel sign

Type of Application: Variances to:

- a) Permit a poster panel sign in an "IL-1" Neighbourhood Institutional zone;
- b) Reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 7.5 metre to approximately 5 metres; and
- c) Reduce the minimum required side yard setback from 7.5 metres to approximately 3.6 metres

Mark Reade advised the application is for the installation of a 2-unit double-sided poster sign. There are three variances required for the application. Staff is recommending approval of the application.

Wayne Doucette appeared before the Committee on behalf of the applicant and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report.

No one appeared before the Committee opposed to the application.

After considering the report, the presentations and discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

No one appeared before the Committee opposed to the application.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED that the Planning Advisory Committee grant the requested variances to:*

- 1) permit a poster panel sign in an "IL-1" Neighbourhood Institutional zone;*
- 2) reduce the minimum required front yard setback from 7.5 metres to approximately 5 metres; and*
- 3) reduce the minimum required side yard setback from 7.5 metres to approximately 3.6 metres*

*in order to facilitate the installation of a pair of double-sided poster panels as generally illustrated on the attached plans.*

**CARRIED**

**DG/AMcS**

(Don Gillis declared a potential conflict of interest with Item 3 at 130-134 Milford Road and withdrew from the meeting).

**Item 3: Saint John Non Profit Housing**  
**130-134 Milford Road**

Proposal: To construct a six-unit seniors' dwelling, comprising a mixture of market rental and subsidized units.

Type of Application: Rezoning and Variance to:

- a) Reduced front yard setback to 4.2 metres, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 7.5 metres;
- b) Reduced rear yard setback to 2.5 metres, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 7.5 metres;
- c) Reduced side yard setback for an access road (driveway) to nil, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 1.5 metres; and
- d) Reduced minimum landscaping requirement along the northern side yard lot line to nil, whereas the Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 1.5 metres.

Three letters opposed and/or expressing concerns were received.

Jody Kliffer advised the proposal is to construct a six-unit seniors' dwelling on an existing vacant lot in Milford which requires rezoning the property from "R-1B" One Family Residential to "RM-1" Three Storey Multiple Residential and variances. Staff is recommending approval.

Narinder Singh, General Manager of Saint John Non Profit Housing Inc. appeared before the Committee and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations. Mr. Singh indicated he was approached by members of the Milford Community to look into developing an affordable senior s' housing project on the existing lot as a way to afford seniors living in the area a place to live without being forced to leave the neighbourhood. He further indicated that the project architect, Peter MacKenzie was also in attendance to answer any questions which may arise.

Ken Palmer, a resident of Milford appeared before the Committee in support of the application. He informed the Committee that he had conducted a survey regarding the desire to have affordable housing opportunities in the neighbourhood for senior residents of the community. Mr. Palmer indicated that the survey was completed by dozens of residents, strongly in favour of the proposal to include affordable housing for seniors in the Milford neighbourhood.

Mr. Palmer argued that the inclusion of a seniors dwelling in the community would help the neighbourhood transition as younger families would then have more opportunity to enter the community as seniors move into the proposed development and the dwellings where they currently reside become available. Mr. Palmer also spoke of the advantages of the subject site as an existing residential lot that would benefit from “infill” development, and the proximity to transit stops and other community amenities.

Patricia Ferguson Bent of 152 Milford Road appeared before the Committee and noted the fence displayed in the photographs was on her property and was placed there by her mother to provide privacy. She expressed concerns with the variances citing that everyone should be made to follow the requirements. She further expressed concern that the project would cause water to drain onto her property, decrease her property values and there could be a potential for noise and lack of privacy. She asked if it could be possible to meet with City staff and the applicant so that she could get a better idea the placement of the building.

Jody Kliffer commented that the applicant is required to submit a stormwater management plan as part of the standard requirements for new developments, which should satisfy the concerns regarding the drainage of the subject site. Mr. Kliffer further commented, if it is the desire of the Committee, they could impose a condition to install a fence along the western property line. Mr. Kliffer responded he could not address Ms. Ferguson-Bent’s concern with fair market value; however it is usually the case whereby positive development within a community increases the value of properties in the surrounding area.

Mr. Singh reappeared before the Committee and indicated he would have no objection meeting with Ms. Ferguson-Bent or have another community meeting. He further indicated he would not be averse to installing a board-on-board wooden fence as a privacy barrier between the two properties and concluded as this is a Seniors Complex, it is highly unlikely noise will be factor.

After considering the report, the presentations, discussions and the reasons as outlined in the staff report and further to address the privacy concern the Committee resolved to amend the recommendation as follows:

*It was MOVED and SECONDED*

- 1. That Common Council rezone a parcel of land with an area of approximately 4774 square metres, located at 130-134 Milford Road, also identified as PID NO. 55123673, from “R-1B” One Family Residential to “RM-1” Three Storey Multiple Residential.*
- 2. That, pursuant to the provisions of Section 39 of the Community Planning Act, the use of a parcel of land with an area of approximately 4774 square metres, located at 130-134 Milford Road, also identified as being PID No. 55123673, be subject to the following conditions:*

- a. *The proposal be limited to a six-unit seniors' dwelling;*
  - b. *The site shall not be developed except in accordance with detailed elevation plans and a detailed site plan illustrating the location and treatment of the building, driveway and parking area a board-on-board fence along the western property line and landscaped areas to be prepared by the proponent and subject to the approval of the Development Officer. The required plans must be attached to the building permit for the development; and*
  - c. *All work shown on the site plan and building elevation plans must be completed by the proponent within one year of the rezoning of the subject site;*
3. *That the Planning Advisory Committee grant the requested variances to permit a front yard setback of 4.2 metres, a rear yard of 2.5 metres, driveway setback from the side lot line of nil, and no landscaping along the north side of the building.*

**CARRIED**

**ML/AMcS**

(Don Gillis returned to the meeting.)

**Item 4: Paul Jacquart**  
**24-26 Highmount Court**

Proposal: To permit a three-family dwelling

Type of Application: Rezoning and variances to:

- a) permit parking within the required 1.5 metres of landscaping adjacent to the main building; and
- b) permit parking within 1.5 metres of the side and rear property lines.

One petition signed by 11 neighbours opposed to the application was received.

Sarah Herring advised the application is to rezone the property to permit a three-family dwelling. The subject site currently has a two-family dwelling and the applicant is requesting permission to add a third unit in the basement. Staff is recommending approval.

Paul Jacquart appeared before the Committee and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report. He indicated that he and his family are relocating to the City and that they had purchased the property, which incidentally is only a few houses from his brother's residence. Mr. Jacquart

indicated it was his intent to reside in one of the units, rent one and had hoped to construct a third unit in the basement for his son. In response to the concerns expressed in the above mentioned petition, he failed to understand how rezoning the property to add an extra unit in the building would decrease property values as he had and will continue to upgrade the building.

Robert Johnson of 23 Highmount Court appeared before the Committee and requested the Committee consider deny the application stating the proposal would increase traffic, noise, reduce property values, reduced care and upkeep of the apartment building, reduce safety for young children and reduce on-street parking.

Staff responded there have been several homes in the area that have been rezoned from "R-2" One and Two Family Residential to "R-4" Four Family Residential and was not aware of any negative consequences.

Doug Critch of 26 Highmount Court appeared before the Committee opposed to the application expressing concern the proposal would increase traffic and objected to having a parking lot next to his bedroom and further objected to a fence being constructed.

Mr. Jacquart reappeared before the Committee and assured the Committee, and his neighbours, that he and his elderly tenants would be respectful of the neighbourhood and keep the building in good repair. He further commented this is a large property and can accommodate the additional unit which will result in increasing densification in the area which is in keeping with PlanSJ Growth Strategy.

The Chair commented in his opinion, if approved, rezoning the property would change the nature of this cul-de-sac.

After considering the report, the presentations and considerable discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED*

- 1. That Common Council rezone a parcel of land having an area of approximately 694 square metres, located at 24-26 Highmount Court, also identified as PID Number 55046015, from **"R-2" One and Two Family Residential to "R-4" Four Family Residential.***
- 2. That, pursuant to the provisions of Section 39 of the Community Planning Act, the proposed development of the parcel of land with an area of approximately 694 square metres, located at 24-26 Highmount Court, also identified as PID Number 55046015 be subject to the following conditions:*

- a. *The use of the subject site be restricted to a maximum of three dwelling units;*
  - b. *The development and use of the site be in accordance with a detailed parking and landscaping plan, to be prepared by the proponent and subject to the approval of the Development Officer, indicating the location and details of a board-on-board privacy fence between the parking area and the adjacent property at 20 Highmount Court and the removal of the paved and gravel parking areas on the Fern Hill Cemetery Company property;*
  - c. *That the approved plans mentioned in condition (b) and above must be attached to the application for a building permit for the development and that no permits, other than site preparation permits, be issued until the Development Officer has approved the Plans; and*
  - d. *All site improvements shown on the approved plans for the development, except for landscaping, must be completed prior to the opening of the Facility for business, and the landscaping must be completed within one year of the building permit approval.*
3. *That the Planning Advisory Committee grant the requested variances to permit parking within 1.5 metres of the main building and within 1.5 metres of the side and rear property.*

**CARRIED**

**DG/ML**  
**“NAY” EF**

**Item 5: Independence Plus Incorporated**  
**3 Glenburn Court**

Proposal: To rezone the property to an institutional zoning that allows for more than six adults in a group care facility.

Type of Application: Rezoning

Four letters opposed and/or expressing concerns to the application were received.

Jody Kliffer advised the property is an existing special needs group home for people with learning disabilities on Glenburn Court since 2002. The application is to rezone the property from “RM-1” Three Storey Multiple Residential to “IL-1” Neighbourhood Institutional to allow for an additional two residents at the facility. Staff is recommending approval.

David Black, Executive Director of Independence Plus Incorporated appeared before the Committee and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report. In response to the above-

mentioned letters, Mr. Black indicated he had just received them earlier that day and had not had a chance to meet with the neighbours in an attempt to appease their concerns. He added that he was unaware of any major concerns with the group home since Independence Plus Inc. took ownership of the building in 2002. Mr. Black explained that the rezoning application came as a result of wanting to move a resident from another group home in the City to the group home at 3 Glenburn Court. The resident in question is currently in a home with five other adults who are unable to speak, which creates many challenges for the resident as he is fully capable of conversing with others and has no behavioural problems. Mr. Black suggested that it is very challenging for the gentleman to endure living conditions in which he has no capacity to engage with others throughout the entire day. The extra room at 3 Glenburn Court appeared to be a viable solution to this scenario; however the addition of the extra resident triggered the need for a rezoning.

Mr. Black responded to questions from the Committee regarding staff to resident ratio and parking. With respect to the inappropriate behavior, Mr. Black advised if it could not be corrected that it may be necessary to assign a staff person to escort the individual to and from work. The Committee asked Mr. Black for a definition of a "Level 4" resident, which was noted in one of the letters received by the Committee from the community in relation to the classification of the residents at this group care facility. Mr. Black explained that Level 4 describes the level of service needed for the residents, which includes a high level of care typically designated for residents with physical disabilities, but also for mental disabilities.

Ed Doiron of 8 Glenburn Court appeared before the Committee to express his concern with the rezoning application. Mr. Doiron stated that the group home should never have been permitted to be there in 2002, and therefore should not be permitted to expand its operations now. Mr. Doiron noted that the noise from emergency vehicles that frequently visit the neighbourhood due to incidents at the subject site, and noise from residents frequently smoking on the street in the middle of the night is unacceptable. Parking is also a concern as there is limited on-street parking in the area, which is currently being further reduced by the City as new signs indicate that there can be no parking within 10 feet of a driveway.

Michael Richard of 20 Glenburn Court also appeared before the Committee to express his concerns. Mr. Richard complained about the size of the individual units for the residents of the group home, stating they were below the required standards of the New Brunswick Department of Social Development; to which the Committee responded that it was not within their jurisdiction to decide upon. Mr. Richard also stated that the backyard was not sufficient for the needs of the residents, which forces them to spend time on the street.

Theresa Woosnam of 2 Glenburn Court also appeared before the Committee to express her concerns with the application. Ms. Woosnam indicated that several residents of 3 Glenburn Court walk around the neighbourhood, at times engaging in inappropriate behavior that is offensive to residents and children of the neighbourhood. Ms. Woosnam also mentioned an existing parking problem on

Glenburn Court, which would be exacerbated by the proposed increase of residents at the subject site.

Peter Fraser of 10 Glenburn Court also appeared before the Committee and expressed his concern relating to the existing parking problem on Glenburn Court. Mr. Fraser stated that he had no problem with the existing number of residents at the group home, but did not want to see that number increased.

Alex Driscoll of 5 Glenburn Court appeared before the Committee to recommend that the applicant move one resident from 3 Glenburn Court who is unable to speak to the other group home with several residents who are also unable to speak, therefore creating the space needed for Mr. Black to move the gentleman to Glenburn Court who has full capacity to speak to provide a better fit for the community.

Staff responded to questions from the Committee that the on-site parking meets the requirements of the Zoning By-law and the Section 39 condition limits the use to a Group Home. Any other use would need to come back to the Committee for its consideration.

Mr. Black reappeared before the Committee and responded that it would be unfair to uproot any of the residents from Glenburn Court and move them to other locations as they have been at the residence for upwards of ten years and feel at home in the neighbourhood.

The Committee suggested that Mr. Black meet with the members of the neighbourhood to try and solve some of the issues that pertain more to “good neighbourly conduct” and are not directly related to land use planning.

After considering the report, the presentations, the letters received, and considerable discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED*

- 1. That Common Council rezone a parcel of land with an area of approximately 510 square metres, located at 3 Glenburn Court, also identified as PID NO. 00020925, from “RM-1” Three Storey Multiple Residential to “IL-1” Neighbourhood Institutional.*
- 2. That, pursuant to the provisions of Section 39 of the Community Planning Act, the use of a parcel of land with an area of approximately 510 square metres, located at 3 Glenburn Court, also identified as being PID No. 00020925, be limited to a group care facility with a maximum of eight residents.*

**CARRIED**

**ML/DG**  
**“NAY” AMcS**

The Chair called for a brief recess.

**Item 6: Estate of Julie M. Arsenault**  
**269-271 Somerset Street**

---

Proposal: To recognize an existing three-family dwelling as a permitted use.

Type of Application: Rezoning and variances to:

- a) permit four parking spaces within the required front yard landscaping; and
- b) reduce the minimum required gross floor area for a one-bedroom dwelling unit in a three-family dwelling from 41 square metres to approximately 36 square metres.

At the request of the applicant, the application was withdrawn.

**Item 7: Edgar Young**  
**47-49 Cranston Avenue**

---

Proposal: To rezone the subject site to reflect the existing use as a six-unit building

Type of Application: Rezone the subject site to "RM-1" Three Storey Multiple Residential and Variances to:

- a) Reduce the minimum lot area from 690 square metres to approximately 630 square metres;
- b) Reduce the minimum lot width from 22 metres to approximately 18.5 metres;
- c) Reduce the minimum drive-aisle width from 7.5 metres to approximately 5.5 metres for the parking spaces at the rear of the site that are at 90 degrees to the building; and
- d) Reduce the minimum required landscaping between the parking area and the adjacent residential properties to the south and west of the subject property from 2 metres to approximately 0.5 metres.

Mark Reade advised the application is to rezone the property to recognize the existing use as a six-unit building. Staff is recommending approval subject to conditions and variances.

Edgar Young appeared before the Committee and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report, however questioned why the variances were necessary, to which staff briefly explained why the variances were necessary to legalize the use on the property.

No one appeared before the Committee opposed to the application.

After considering the report, the presentations and discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED*

1. *That Common Council rezone a parcel of land having an area of approximately 630 square metres, located at 47-49 Cranston Avenue, also identified as being PID No. 00026120 and 55068621, from “R-4” Four Family Residential to “RM-1” Three Storey Multiple Residential.*
2. *That, pursuant to the provisions of Section 39 of the Community Planning Act, the proposed development of the parcel of land with an area of approximately 630 square metres, located at 47-49 Cranston Avenue, also identified as being PID No. 00026120 and 55068621, be subject to the following conditions:*
  - a. *That a board-on-board fence of at least 1 metre in height be installed between the proposed parking area and the residential property to the south at 39-41 Cranston Avenue (PID No. 55043517) and to the west at 42 Somerset Street (PID No. 00031179) within one year of the issuance of a Building Permit; and*
  - b. *That any development of the site be in accordance with a detailed site plan, to be prepared by the proponent and subject to the approval of the Development Officer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, indicating the location of all buildings, structures, parking areas, driveways, outdoor storage areas for waste, and landscaped areas including required fencing.*
3. *That the Planning Advisory Committee grant the requested variances to:*
  - a. *Reduce the minimum lot area from 690 square metres to approximately 630 square metres;*
  - b. *Reduce the minimum lot width from 22 metres to approximately 18.5 metres;*

- c. *Reduce the minimum drive-aisle width from 7.5 metres to approximately 5.5 metres for the parking spaces at the rear of the site that are at 90 degrees to the building; and*
- d. *Reduce the minimum required landscaping between the parking area and the adjacent residential property's to the south and west of the subject property from 2 metres to approximately 0.5 metres on condition that a board-on-board fence be installed with a minimum height of 1 metre to prevent vehicle headlights from shining across the property line.*

**CARRIED**

**AMcS/ML**

**Item 8: City of Saint John  
411 Rothesay Avenue**

---

Proposal: To vest small portions of two commercial properties in order to facilitate the construction of a new signalized intersection.

Type of Application: Subdivision and Variance that would increase the maximum access width standard of 11 metres to approximately 11.5 metres.

Mark Reade advised the application is for a subdivision and variance to vest a portion of lands along Rothesay Avenue as part of the public street and to increase the maximum driveway width. Staff is recommending approval.

David Russell of Municipal Operations appeared before the Committee and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendation as contained in the staff report and responded to questions from the Committee with respect to location of the traffic signals and pedestrian crossing.

Paul Wilson of Real Estate Services appeared before the Committee and indicated he also was in agreement with the recommendation and was involved with the acquisition of the land.

No one appeared before the Committee opposed to the application.

After considering the report, the presentations and discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED*

1. *That Common Council assent to the attached Coyle Real Estate Holdings Inc. Subdivision that would vest an approximate 9 square metre portion of the property at 411 Rothesay Avenue as part of the Rothesay Avenue public street right of way, and to any necessary municipal services and public utility easements concerning the construction of a signalized intersection at this location.*
2. *That Common Council assent to the attached DKB Enterprises Inc. Subdivision that would vest an approximate 17 square metre portion of the property at 418-424 Rothesay Avenue as part of the Rothesay Avenue public street right of way, and to any necessary municipal services and public utility easements concerning the construction of a signalized intersection at this location.*
3. *That the Planning Advisory Committee grant a variance from the requirements of the Zoning By-law that would allow for the reconstruction of the commercial access at 418-424 Rothesay Avenue with an approximate width of 11.5 metres.*

**CARRIED**

**ML/EK**

**Item 9: City of Saint John  
54 Loch Lomond Road**

---

Proposal: To vest a portion of the subject property as part of a public street right-of-way in conjunction with the construction of the One-Mile Interchange.

Type of Application: Subdivision and variance to reduce the minimum required lot depth from 30 metres to an average depth of approximately 29 metres.

Mark Reade advised the application is for a subdivision and variance to permit a street vesting due to additional right-of-way acquisition required for work associated with the One-Mile House Interchange. Staff is recommending approval.

Curtis Langille of Real Estate Services appeared before the Committee and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report.

No one appeared before the Committee opposed to the application.

After considering the report, the presentations and discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED that Common Council assent to one or more subdivision plans, in one or more phases, in general accordance with the submitted Bayview Credit Union Society, Ltd. Tentative Plan of Subdivision, located at 54 Loch Lomond Road (PID 00315945), with respect to the vesting of the proposed public streets and any required municipal services easements and public utility easements.*

**CARRIED**

**DG/ML**

**Item 10: City of Saint John  
60 Gilbert Street**

---

Proposal: To construct a sanitary lift station.

Type of Application: Variance that would reduce the minimum front yard requirement of 7.5 metres to approximately 1.3 metres with no landscaping.

Mark Reade advised the application is for a variance to construct a wastewater pumping station and is a permitted use in the "I-2" Heavy Industrial zone however there is a variance required to reduce the front yard requirement. Staff is recommending approval.

Paul Wilson of Real Estate Services appeared before the Committee and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report.

In response to a question if there should be a protective barrier, John Campbell of Municipal Operations responded if they were concerned that the station might be hit by a vehicle that a barrier could be easily installed.

After considering the report, the presentations and discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

No one appeared before the Committee opposed to the application.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED That the Planning Advisory Committee grant variances from the requirements of the Zoning By-law that would reduce the minimum front yard requirement of 7.5 metres to approximately 1.3 metres with no landscaping for the proposed lift station at 60 Gilbert Street (Marsh Street) as generally illustrated on the attached site plan.*

**CARRIED**

**ML/AMcS**

**Item 11: Comeau MacKenzie Architecture (for FIC Holdings Inc.)  
20 Technology Drive**

---

Proposal: To construct a four-storey, fifty-nine unit apartment building.

Type of Application: Variances to:

- a) reduce the minimum required lot area from 7,875 square metres to 6,379 square metres;
- b) increase the maximum permitted height of a main building from 3 storeys (11 metres) to four storeys (12.35 metres);
- c) further reduce the minimum required depth of landscaping along Technology Drive from 6.7 metres to approximately 6.6 metres; and
- d) reduce the minimum required width of four additional off-street parking spaces from 2.7 metres to 2.44 metres.

One letter opposed to the application was received.

Mark Reade advised the application is for variances to permit the construction of a four-storey, fifty-nine apartment building in the "RM-1" Three Storey Multiple Residential zone. Staff is recommending approval.

Peter MacKenzie of Comeau MacKenzie Architecture appeared before the Committee on behalf of his client and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report. He indicated originally the application was for a three-storey building which occupied a significant portion of the site. Upon further review they reworked the proposal for a four-storey building which would result in retention of a great deal more of the existing landscaping and trees while at the same time occupying a smaller footprint.

Mr. MacKenzie further commented the redesign of the project is in keeping with a trend towards larger and more accommodating upscale apartment units which traditionally are occupied for extended periods as opposed to transient type of individuals. Mr. MacKenzie responded to questions from the Committee pertaining to the retention of the existing tree buffer and noted staff recommendation requires the developer must provide security to ensure the required landscaping is completed.

Gordon Reid of 45 Somerset Park appeared before the Committee and expressed he did have concerns with the landscaping, however he was satisfied with the applicant's response to previous questioning from the Committee. He inquired if there would be blasting on site.

Mr. MacKenzie reappeared before the Committee and indicating there would be no blasting on site, however there would be rock breaking carried out on site but that would be done with a pneumatic hammer and backhoe from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

After considering the report, the presentations and discussions the Committee resolved to adopt the recommendation based on the reasons as outlined in the staff report.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED that the Planning Advisory Committee grant variances to:*

- 1) reduce the minimum required lot area from 7,875 square metres to 6,379 square metres;*
- 2) increase the maximum permitted height of a main building from 3 storeys (11 metres) to four storeys (12.35 metres);*
- 3) further reduce the minimum required depth of landscaping along Technology Drive from 6.7 metres to approximately 6.6 metres; and*
- 4) reduce the minimum required width of four additional off-street parking spaces from 2.7 metres to 2.44 metres;*

**CARRIED**

**EK/DG**

**Item 12: Comeau MacKenzie Architecture  
(for Salty Dog Properties Inc.)  
62-66 Kennedy Street**

---

Proposal: To replace two residential buildings with a new building and a paved parking area.

Type of Application: Variances that would:

- (a) Increase the maximum number of main residential buildings from 1 to 2;
- (b) Reduce the minimum rear yard requirement of 7.5 metres to approximately 2.4 metres;
- (c) Reduce the minimum landscaped area and amenity space requirement of 20 percent to approximately 15 percent;
- (d) Reduce the minimum onsite parking requirement of 8 spaces to 7 spaces;
- (e) Reduce the minimum parking aisle width requirement of 7.5 metres to approximately 6.7 metres; and

- (f) Reduce the minimum parking stall width and depth requirement of 2.7 metres and 5.5 metres to approximately 2.4 metres and 4.9 metres respectively.

One letter expressing concerns was received.

Peter MacKenzie of Comeau Architecture Inc. appeared before the Committee on behalf of the applicant and indicated he was in agreement with the recommendations as contained in the staff report and responded the applicant is prepared to address the concerns expressed in the above-mentioned letter.

No one appeared before the Committee opposed to the application.

*It was MOVED and SECONDED that the Planning Advisory Committee grant the following variances for the proposed development at 62-66 Kennedy Street that would:*

- (a) *Increase the maximum number of main residential buildings from 1 to 2;*
- (b) *Reduce the minimum rear yard requirement of 7.5 metres to approximately 2.4 metres for the proposed new building;*
- (c) *Reduce the minimum landscaped area and amenity space requirement of 20 percent to approximately 15 percent;*
- (d) *reduce the minimum onsite parking requirement of 8 spaces to 7 spaces;*
- (e) *Reduce the minimum parking aisle width requirement of 7.5 metres to approximately 6.7 metres;*
- (f) *Reduce the minimum parking stall width and depth requirement of 2.7 metres and 5.5 metres to approximately 2.4 metres and 4.9 metres respectively for proposed parking spaces 4(C) & 5(C);*
- (g) *That the above variances only be granted on the following conditions:*
  - (i) *That the property (PID Nos. 00377267 & 00377259) be consolidated into one parcel prior to the commencement of the proposed development;*
  - (ii) *That the property be developed and maintained in accordance with detailed site, landscaping, and building elevation plans approved by the Development Officer;*
  - (iii) *That, except for demolition or foundation work only, the above approved plans must be attached to any building permit application for proposed development; and*

- (iv) *That all necessary site work and landscaping be completed in accordance with the approved plans to the satisfaction of the Development Officer within one year from the issuance of the building permit.*

***CARRIED***

***AMcS/EK***

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

---

Eric Falkjar  
Chairman

---

Lynda Lockhart  
Recording Secretary