

MINUTES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Monday, October 4, 2021, 6:30 PM
Council Chambers and by Zoom
18 Centre Street, Spencerville ON
Contact the Township Office to Register
(613)658-3055

PRESENT: Deputy Mayor Tory Deschamps
Mayor Pat Sayeau
Councillor Hugh Cameron
Councillor Stephen Dillabough
Councillor John Hunter
Conor Cleary
Greg Modler

REGRETS: Cody Oatway
Chris Ward

STAFF: Dave Grant, CAO
Rebecca Williams, Clerk
Wendy VanKeulen, Community Development Coordinator
Candise Newcombe, Deputy Clerk

1. Call to Order – Chair, Tory Deschamps

Deputy Mayor Deschamps called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

It was noted that an error occurred and the August 3, 2021 minutes were included in the agenda package. It was noted that the Committee has the Council approved September 7, 2021 meeting minutes, on their desk and the error will be corrected on the Township website.

Moved by: Councillor Cameron

Seconded by: Mayor Sayeau

That the agenda be approved as presented.

Carried

3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest & the General Nature Thereof

None.

4. Business Arising from Previous Committee Meeting Minutes (if any)

Members inquired about the status of the short-term accommodation discussion from the September Community Development meeting. It was noted that due to the extent of the current agenda, it was determined to defer the item to the November meeting for further discussion.

Committee inquired about the clean-up progress at the proposed Terpene Farm location. It was noted that the debris surrounding the exterior of the building has mostly been removed.

Members inquired if the applicants had completed all application requirements for the site plan control agreement and the building permit. It was noted that there have been additional items submitted by the applicants, however, the application is not yet complete. Committee inquired if the applicants were working with a consulting firm or planners. It was noted that they are working with various agencies, though Dicentra Cannabis Consultants appears to be the predominantly referenced firm.

5. Delegations and Presentations

None.

6. Action/Information/Discussion Items

a. Live: Land Use Planning

1. Application for Severance, Walker Street (North/McNeilly)

Committee reviewed the report for the application for severance for 3057-3065 Walker St. Members inquired about the purpose of the proposed severance. It was noted that currently two semi-detached buildings, each containing two units, are located on one parcel of land. It was noted that the proposed severance would divide the property into two lots, each parcel with its own semi-detached building. Each building currently has its own water and sewer connections.

Committee sought clarification as to why each building containing two units only requires one water and sewer connection. Members referred to recent development in the area, consisting of four units, which was required to obtain single connections for each unit. It was noted that the 2013 Cardinal Water Meter bylaw outlines the requirements for a building with multiple units. It was noted that the referenced scenario referred to a new build, while the dwellings in the application in question existed prior to the implementation of the meters, therefore pre-dating the current requirements.

Members noted their concerns of future merging of the parcels if the intention is to retain both parcels under the same owner. It was noted that the applicant has been represented by a realtor, making it a safe assumption that the intent is to sever and sell. The concern of future severance was noted to be a non-issue as the Planning

Act mechanism for granting consents indicated; once a severance, always a severance. It was noted that a lot created by severance cannot be merged in the future, however, retained lots can.

Members inquired if the sold parcel would require auxiliary water and sewer connection. It was noted that there would not be another connection required unless the retained parcel is severed and under the ownership of separate owners.

Committee inquired if the severance application was in compliance with the Township's Official Plan and Zoning bylaw. It was noted that there were no contradictions in this application with either the Township's Official Plan or Zoning bylaw.

Members noted an opportunity for a future walking path project in the unopened portion of First St., highlighting a chance to connect the community by providing a convenient commute area to recreational facilities and future residential development.

Moved by: G. Modler

Seconded by: Councillor Dillabough

That Committee recommend that Council recommend in favour of severance B-113-21.

Carried

2. Development Agreement, South Street (1504107 Ontario Inc)

Committee reviewed the report and inquired if the Counties requirements listed in schedule D had been met. It was noted that the reason for the development agreement is to ensure schedule D is registered on the title of the property.

Moved by: Mayor Sayeau

Seconded by: Councillor Hunter

That Committee recommend that Council adopt a bylaw to enter into a development agreement, as attached, with the owner of the subject lands of severance B-80-21.

Carried

3. Proposed Revision to Plan of Subdivision, Meadowlands North (Zander/2057876 Ontario Inc.)

Committee reviewed the report and noted concerns about the parkland lots on blocks 74 and 75 south of the proposed

development, referred to commonly as the buffer zone. Members noted concerns that the diagram provided of the proposed development appears to encompass the outlined parkland lots. Members inquired about the following items: if there was the intention to implement a form of privacy barrier, if lots 74 and 75 had been surveyed and indicated with stakes, and on the intent for placement of the stormwater pond. Ms. Zander noted that the draft plan from 2017 was prepared by a surveyor. It was noted that survey stakes were confirmed to be present on the south side of the proposed development. Ms. Zander noted that the developer is responsible for providing privacy barriers as a requirement, and made it clear that the Township could detail the preferred type of barrier (tree planting, fencing etc.) in the subdivision agreement. Ms. Zander noted the intent to place the stormwater pond on the abutting lands north of the proposed subdivision, which also belongs to the Lockwood Brothers. Ms. Zander highlighted the future need of a maintenance agreement for the continued upkeep of the stormwater pond.

Members inquired about the proposed use of lots 55-58, and whether that parcel of land was owned by the Township or developers. It was noted that two pathways and two park blocks were planned for the area, and are owned by the developer but are required to be conveyed to the Township as per the 2017 draft plan conditions.

Members inquired if the developer intended to meet the Provincial guidelines of 25% of the development being dedicated as affordable housing. Ms. Zander noted that the initial application did not require these conditions, however, the developer has expressed his commitment to addressing affordable housing. It was noted that most of the units will range from 1000-1500 sq/ft to assist in making the homes more affordable.

Committee inquired if the sewer and water servicing has been confirmed. Members noted their interest in having curbs and gutters implemented, noting that it would coincide with the Township's recent drainage project suggestions to construct curbs and gutters in Johnstown. Committee reached a consensus to request the implementation of curbs and gutters be outlined in the subdivision agreement. It was noted that the initial application requested capacity for 106 water and sewer connections, noting the need to factor in only 40 more connections. Ms. Zander noted that she would supply the servicing capacity report as soon as it is available.

Committee inquired if the supplied renderings of the proposed units were the intended builds for the proposed subdivision. It was noted

that the designs supplied were units previously built by Lockwood Brothers Construction, noting that no specific designs have been determined for this particular subdivision.

Members noted that through the intensification of the subdivision, many of the affordable housing issues are being addressed. It was noted that many of the design discussions regarding the subdivision could be addressed later in the design and finalization stages. It was noted that added development costs, such as incorporating curbs and gutters and sidewalks, will add to the overall cost of each individual unit, which highlight Members concern with the affordability of the proposed dwellings.

Moved by: Councillor Dillabough

Seconded by: Councillor Hunter

That Committee recommends that Council recommend in favour of the proposed revisions and that the Township conditions of draft approval remain generally consistent with the conditions issued in 2017 subject to confirmation of sufficient servicing capacity.

Amendment:Moved by: Mayor Sayeau

Seconded by: G. Modler

That Committee amend the original motion to include the addition of curbs and gutters.

Carried

Moved by: Councillor Dillabough

Seconded by: Councillor Hunter

That Committee recommends that Council recommend in favour of the proposed revisions, with the addition of curb and gutters and that the Township conditions of draft approval remain generally consistent with the conditions issued in 2017 subject to confirmation of sufficient servicing capacity.

Carried

4. Proposed Revision to Plan of Subdivision, Lockmaster's Meadow (Edwardsburgh Developments)

Committee reviewed the report and requested clarification on the location of the proposed additional lots. It was noted that the United Counties described the proposed lots as south internal lots. It was

also noted that staff would require more information in regards to noise attenuation before making a recommendation.

Members noted their concern for the existing tree line including the existing wildlife that depends on that habitat. Committee inquired if there were any provisions for privacy barriers and if the proposed amendment to the lot sizes conform to the current zoning bylaw. It was noted that compliance with proposed lot sizes would have to be confirmed.

Committee noted the increased use of the rail line, highlighting the possible need for further noise restrictions as opposed to the proposed reduction of the noise berm from 5 m to 2.5 m. It was noted that the peer review outlined that exterior noise levels were approaching the maximum allowable decibel level, meaning if the berm was to be reduced, alternate noise management measures should be considered.

Members noted there was little concern in regards to the proposed additional units, but inquired if the development addressed the current affordable housing guidelines and requested options to incorporate County guidelines. The report outlined by Novatech suggested that if the application were to provide a range of different housing types, this may trigger the need for a major amendment and subsequent public meeting.

It was noted that the planning report prepared by Novatech addressed an issue with access to the west end of the subdivision and that CN rail encouraged a safety berm as well as a 1.2 m high chain link fence. It was noted that the developer has suggested the extension of street D to provide future access to the lands to the west.

Mr. Simpson suggested a solution to the reduction of the noise berm by installing air conditioning units to the dwellings to reduce sound further in homes. He noted that the installation of air conditioning units into the dwellings closer to the railbed will allow people to keep their windows closed and reduce noise. He noted that only the dwellings in closest proximity to the railbed would be equipped with air conditioning units and caution of higher noise levels will be fully disclosed in the purchasing agreements. Members noted their proximity to the railbed noting they could still hear the trains. Members noted that the installation of air conditioning units is merely a method to circumvent the requirement for the 5 m noise berm.

Moved by: Councillor Hunter

Seconded by: G. Modler

That Committee recommends that Council recommend in favour of amending the draft plan conditions to increase the number of lots from 93 to 95; and that an access block to the abutting lands to the west allowing future expansion of “Steet B” or “Street D” be added to a revised draft plan and a condition of draft approval be added that this block will be conveyed to the Township; and that the standard conditions imposed in the 2013 draft approval are carried forward.

Carried

b. Work: Economic Development

1. Application for Community Improvement Plan Funding, 29 Bennett St (Spencerville Pharmasave)

Committee reviewed the report outlining a request for additional funding through the Community Improvement Plan for the Spencerville Pharmasave. It was noted that to date the applicant had only been issued \$1466.44 of the \$5000.00 maximum under the Property and Façade Improvement Program. Members commended the addition of the new business and its owners to the community.

Moved by: Councillor Dillabough
Seconded by: Councillor Cameron

That Committee approves the application S-04-21 (Spencerville Pharmasave), reimbursing 50% of the actual costs to complete the property lighting improvements to a maximum of \$3533.56.

Carried

c. Play: Recreation

1. Wayfinding Signs, Johnstown

Committee reviewed the report and commended the designs of the proposed signage. Members inquired where the placement of the sign would be. It was noted that the Township is coordinating with the UCLG to have the wayfinding sign placed on County Road 2 near Sophia St., however, the exact location with respect to if it will be placed on the north or the south side of County Road 2 is still being determined.

Members noted their interest in placing 2 signs in the area, one along the south side and one along the north side of County Road 2. Members suggested an additional sign along County Road 22 south of highway 401 indicating the location of the Cardinal

Ingredion Arena. It was noted that the Counties would likely only allow one sign in the area of County Road 2 in Johnstown. Committee inquired if the new signs could replace the green county signs. It was noted that the green signs are required and are not likely to be removed.

Committee inquired if there were quotes received from various companies for the wayfinding signs. It was noted that to maintain consistency, the signs were ordered from the same vendor that supplied the wayfinding signs in Spencerville.

7. Inquiries/Notices of Motion

Councillor Dillabough announced his intent to bring forward a motion to request the Township cover the expenses of the Cardinal Festival Committee in the amount of \$820.00 for insurance coverage for the fireworks display and proposed that the funding be drawn from the Cardinal Hydro Reserve Fund.

Councillor Hunter commended the contribution the Spencerville Pharmasave has made to the community and the commitment they have shown to the residents of Spencerville.

8. Question Period

None.

9. Closed Session

None.

10. Adjournment

Moved by: Councillor Cameron

Seconded by: Councillor Dillabough

That Committee does now adjourn at 9:02 p.m.

Carried

Chair

Clerk