

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING

MINUTES

Brant County Council Chambers
7 Broadway Street, Paris
Wednesday, January 7, 2009
7:05 p.m.

Present: Mayor Eddy, Councillors Wheat, Schmitt, Simons, Haggart, Powell, Atfield, Chambers and Hodge

Regrets: Councillors Coleman and Gatward

Staff: Johnston, Pomponi, Davidson and Lehmann

Others: Mr. John Kennedy, MMM Group Limited

Councillor Schmitt in the Chair.

Approval of Agenda

Moved by – Councillor Chambers
Seconded by – Councillor Hodge

That the agenda and addendum for the Special Planning Advisory Committee meeting of January 7, 2009, be approved.

.Carried

Official Plan Submissions:

Submission A19 - Ben and Nancy Depew

Mr. Depew provided Committee with a copy of correspondence from Mr. and Mrs. Crawford, owners of 686 Powerline Road, requesting that their property be rezoned to Highway Commercial. Mayor Eddy noted that the correspondence would be referred to Planning staff.

Submission A41 – Mr. Dave Aston – Agent for Karen and Suzan Piovaty

Mr. Aston reported that his clients are supportive of Planning staff's recommendation. Ms. Aston reviewed the current designation of the lands and noted that the purpose of the request is to facilitate the accurate reflection of the findings of the environmental and slope stability studies, such that the Official Plan designations are rationalized.

Submission B5 & E11 – Mr. Mike Collishaw – Agent for Rottar, Bairos and Robinson

Mr. Collishaw reported that the subject lands are currently zoned agricultural, but that the lands do not support that use. He reviewed the topography of the subject property and provided Committee with demographical information, noting that adult lifestyle communities are becoming

a growing trend. Mr. Collishaw reported that the average person choosing to reside in an adult lifestyle community would be affluent, revenue-generating citizens.

Submission F3 – Mr. Rob van Poorten – Agent for Mr. John Dragos

Mr. van Poorten reported that there are a variety of mixed uses that currently surround the subject lands. He noted that Grand River Street North is becoming largely commercial and that his client is requesting that his property be re-designated from Low Density Residential to Commercial. Mr. van Poorten reviewed the hierarchy of uses and noted that there are instances in which convenience plazas are contained in residential zones. Mr. van Poorten discussed Neighbourhood Commercial uses, noting that the size of the subject lands would limit any commercial use to small scale in nature. Mr. van Poorten requested that should pertinent sections of the Official Plan, as specifically related to the subject lands, change at any time, that Planning staff provide his office with written indication of same.

Submission H19 – Mr. Jay Hitchon – Agent for Walker, Nott, Dragicevic & Associates

Mr. Hitchon reported that he disagrees with the recommendation of Planning staff and noted that until such time as the Employment Lands Study has been completed and submitted for review, it is premature for Planning staff to make such a recommendation. Mr. Hitchon noted that the current designation for the subject lands provides for commercial uses and that these provisions are not included in the draft Official Plan, thereby resulting in what he perceives as a down-designation of land.

Mr. Hitchon noted that the municipality has the power to re-designate the lands from the traditional “industrial style” commercial use to an alternate use, provided that such a re-designation occurs during a time of “comprehensive review”. Mr. Hitchon further noted that now is the time of comprehensive review and requested that the recommendation of Planning staff be deferred until such time as the results of the Employment Lands Study have been received and analyzed.

Submission F40 – Mr. Charles Pickett

Mr. Pickett requested that the following comments be recorded verbatim from the handwritten material submitted to Committee:

“Our submission was submitted April 2008, over one year prior to the June 2009 deadline and followed our attendance at the St. George workshop. The six month time seemed to us the minimal period needed to allow appropriate issues to be identified. Provincial interference in the process does not cancel the validity of municipal planning. We draw your attention to the illustrated excerpt from OP&ZBA schedules. Please define Buffer. We cannot find this definition written in your planning documents. We applaud the existence of such provisions, if they really exist. The oval illustrations seemed to imply that they might exist, and therefore, protect our residential privacy”.

Reports from Staff

PA-08-66 5 Year Official Plan Update – Site Specific Requests – D. Johnston and M. Pomponi

Mayor Eddy requested that Submissions A32, B6 and F25 be reviewed separately.

Discussion focused on the employment lands study and staff recommendations that have been approved “in part”. In response to a question from Councillor Chambers, the Chief Planning Official advised that in each case, whether a submission is requesting a re-designation to “Industrial” or a re-designation from “Industrial” to something else, the submission is dealt with individually.

It was noted that Submission A23 was withdrawn by the applicant.

In response to questions from Councillor Haggart, with regard to submission A41, Mr. Aston reported that he is in agreement with the maps contained on pages three and five of the report packages and discussion focused on the potential change to the woodland area along Rest Acres Road.

Moved by – Councillor Chambers

Seconded by – Councillor Wheat

That the County of Brant APPROVE the following requests for Site Specific requests for consideration as part of the review of the 5 Year Update to the Official Plan:

A7, A18(B) A19, A32, A41, B6, B12, F25, F26, F29, F30, F32 and H4.

.Carried

Councillor Wheat requested that submissions B5(A), B5(B), B5(C), E11, F8 and H19 be reviewed separately.

Councillor Chambers requested that submissions A21, B4(A), B4(B), E13, F1(A), F1(B), F1(C), F21, F31 and H22 be reviewed separately.

Various Committee members expressed concern with respect to submissions that are categorized by a recommendation that they be refused as the development would require “future planning justification”. In response to questions, the Chief Planning Official reported that “future planning justification” includes items like environmental studies, marketing studies, traffic impact studies, etc., and to recommend a deferral of the submissions may result in a delay to the Official Plan process. He noted that a refusal at this stage in the process does not prohibit future applications for amendments to the Official Plan.

Discussion focused on requests for the expansion of urban settlement areas and the refusal of same, given current Provincial Policy Statements.

Moved by – Councillor Haggart
Seconded by – Councillor Simons

That the following submissions be referred to Planning Staff for further study and evaluation:

A31, B4(A), B4(B), B5(A), B5(B), B5(C), E11, F8, E13, F1(A), F1(B), F1(C), F21,F31, H19 and H22.

.Carried

Moved by – Councillor Wheat
Seconded by – Councillor Hodge

That the following Site Specific requests be DECLINED for consideration as part of the review of the 5 Year Update to the Official Plan:

A11, A39(A), A39(B), F3, F15, F36, H12(A), H12(B), H12(C) and H14.

.Carried

Moved by – Councillor Chambers
Seconded by – Councillor Wheat

That Submission F40 be received as information.

.Carried

Other Business

Employment Lands Study

In response to a question, the Director of Development Services reported that the draft Employment Lands Study has been circulated interdepartmentally and that comments have been received in response. The Director advised that he anticipates the study to be finalized and submitted for public review and comment in February. With regard to the submissions that have been presented and acted upon, prior to the completion of the Employment Lands Study, the Director advised that should the study have an impact on the disposition of a submission, that the submission would be resubmitted for further consideration, in conjunction with the findings of the study.

Adjournment and Next Meeting

The Committee adjourned at 8:49 p.m., on a motion of Councillors Haggart and Powell, to meet again on Monday, January 19, 2009 at 7:00 p.m., in Council Chambers, Paris.

Secretary