

**Approved Minutes
Town of Stratford Public Meeting
Wednesday, April 7, 2010 at 7:00 P.M.
Stratford Town Centre
234 Shakespeare Drive**

Present: Mayor Kevin Jenkins; Councillor Gary Clow; Councillor Sandy McMillan; Councillor Steve MacDonald; Councillor Emile Gallant; Councillor Patrick Ross; Robert Hughes, CAO; Vahid Ghomoschi, Director of Planning; Kevin Reynolds, Development Officer; and Joshua Collins, Planning Technician.

Developer: Terry Ferrier

Residents: 50

Call to Order

Councillor Clow called the meeting to order at 6:59 p.m.

Councillor Clow introduced Mayor Kevin Jenkins who welcomed the public to the meeting. Mayor Jenkins explained the process and procedures that would take place during the meeting. The Mayor explained that any application or decision of Council can be appealed to IRAC, and we are very sensitive about an appeal to IRAC possibly on both sides. If we decide to approve a rezoning, it can be appealed and at the same token, if we decide to deny a rezoning it can be appealed. An IRAC process is not a pleasant process to go through, it is expensive, costs all of us taxpayers money so we like to avoid IRAC whenever we can. One of the best ways to avoid an IRAC appeal is to have a proper process in place. That is one of the things that IRAC looks for - if Council is following the proper process when considering a rezoning application. I've been told over the years, why do you bother having public meetings, why don't you just make a ruling and let them go to IRAC, but since the Town's inception back in 1975 public meetings have been part of the rezoning process. I think that the public meeting is a good part in the rezoning process. It's an opportunity for the applicant to come and present their side of the story - why they want the rezoning. It is also an opportunity for us as residents, to come and hear about the rezoning and offer our opinions on the rezoning. The process tonight will be a presentation by the Developer to explain the proposed rezoning. Feedback from tonight will go to planning board. Staff and planning board will make a recommendation to Council and then Council will make a decision on the rezoning.

The Mayor noted that a good number of Councillors and staff are present and will be happy to answer questions after the meeting. If you do not feel like making a public comment you are welcome to comment privately after the meeting.

The Mayor then turned the meeting over to Councillor Clow, Chair of the Planning & Heritage Committee.

Councillor Clow welcomed everyone in attendance. Councillor Clow also noted that there is a great turn out of Councillors. This certainly shows that we are concerned and want to hear from you tonight.

The public meeting this evening will be in two parts. The first part will be related to the rezoning. The proposed parcel of land from Single Family Residential (R1) to Two-Family Residential (R2) and the second part of the public meeting will be the proposal of the Heritage Policy & Bylaw. We will start with a

presentation by the Town's development officer, Kevin Reynolds, followed by the applicant Terry Ferrier. The floor will then be opened up for residents to provide their input and concerns. If you have a comment please address the mike, state your name and address for the minutes. Your comments will be brought back to the planning meeting.

Councillor Clow then read the following information on the Agenda Items:

1. An application has been received from Terry and Audrey Ferrier to rezone parcel number 399725 (6.07 acres) located on Aintree Drive, from the Single Family Residential Zone (R1) to the Two-Family Residential Zone (R2), for the purpose of being able to construct semi-detached dwelling (duplex) units.
2. Pursuant to the Provincial Planning Act and Section 24 of the Town of Stratford Zoning and Subdivision (Control) Development Bylaw. The Stratford Town Council is holding a public meeting in order to received comments from the Public on the Proposed application.

Councillor Clow turned the meeting over to development officer Kevin Reynolds, to make a presentation on the Rezoning Application.

Development Officer:

You would have received a letter from the Town explaining the proposed rezoning. This letter was distributed to residents/landowners of land within 500' of the land proposed for rezoning. (*A map was displayed showing the area of land*) The block of land is approximately six acres in size. The current zone is Single Family Residential Zone (R1) and the permitted uses in the Single Family Residential (R1) Zone are as follows:

- i. Single Family Dwellings;
- ii. Parks and Playgrounds;
- iii. Accessory Buildings;
- iv. Private Garages;
- v. General Agricultural Uses.

We also have a Special Permit Use. If you want to received approval for this you would have to apply to Council and there would be a public meeting process.

Special Permit Uses are as follows:

- i. Group Homes;
- ii. Community Care Facilities;
- iii. Child Care Facilities.

The proposal this evening is to rezone the land to Two Family Residential Zone (R2).

The permitted uses in the Two Family Residential Zone (R2) are as follows:

- i. Single Family Dwellings;

- ii. Duplex or Semi Detached Dwellings (up to 20% of units in a Block);
- iii. Parks and Playgrounds;
- iv. Accessory Buildings;
- v. Private Garages;
- vi. General Agricultural Uses.

The following Conditional Uses subject to such terms and conditions as shall be imposed by Council, so by way of an application to Council these Conditional Uses could possibly be accepted.

- i. Duplex Dwellings or Semi Detached Dwellings up to 100% of units in a Block;
- ii. Town House Dwellings or Row House Dwellings having up to six (6) Dwelling Units (owned either individually or as Condominiums);
- iii. Group Homes.

There is also a Special Permit Use Clause in this section, similar to the R1 Zone, where someone could apply for the following:

- i. Community Care Facilities;
- ii. Child Care Facilities.

This outlines the difference between the two zones that are under discussion this evening.

The development officer then turned the meeting over to Terry Ferrier, the applicant applying for the Rezoning.

Terry Ferrier:

I would like to introduce myself. My name is Terry Ferrier and I live in Stratford. I'm not from away. I plan if this goes through, to live in the area myself. I have passed out a couple of binders because I felt that there is a need for people to understand what R2 really was and what you can do with it, and how important it is to have covenants in place to protect what is being developed. It is not just the zoning. It is unfortunate that over the years a lot of semi-detached type of homes have been stereotyped as being not good. What I have passed around are homes that I would like to see developed in this area. What I thought I would do, was myself, someone from the Town Hall and someone from the Community, if there is a home to be built on the property, would have the right to look at it and say, yes we like it or no we don't. As long as it is within reason. I wanted to show you the types of homes. This will in no way, absolutely, no way devalue any property. It will, in fact, probably raise the value of the lots. It will raise the price of a lot of homes in the area. These homes are probably as nice as any homes that you will find. Again, people have the stereotype image of what an R2 or detached home is. These would be covenant protected, in other words, we would ask for garages, you would want at least 1,200 sq. ft. on each side. You would love to see brick or stone on each side. If any of you have been up to North River Road and Sydney, you would see how nice these home are and what they are selling for. One side is listed at \$236,000. This will give you an idea that these homes are not what a lot of people may have envisioned.

The reason that I started looking at this is because my wife's folks live in close proximity to us and it was difficult to find a property. I found this property, but it is more than I need but I would be willing to do this development and have a spot in there myself and live there. That is what initially drove me to develop this property. I also looked at the cost factor of trying to develop it with R1. The lots are just too small. There is an old adage, you never put a deck on a town house overlooking on a street and you never put small windows on a cottage overlooking the water and you never build large family homes on small lots. The lots that would go in there would be R1, 11,000 sq. ft vs. the R2 of 14,000 sq. ft. per lot. What are you going to have, you are going to have small R1 homes. There is nothing wrong with that, not covenant protected, not necessary having garages, as part of the home because of the cost factor. It will probably be a small house, a small garage, maybe at the back, that type of thing. That is what would go on there. If you want to buy a lot for \$50,000 or more you are going to go to Stonington. I have spoken to the agent in the area and we have people coming in who want to build a new R1 home. We would not put them in there. We would take them to Stonington. Consequently, to compete with the price in Stonington at \$50,000 you can't charge that. Forty thousand dollars or less for a small lot, that gives you an idea for the R1. I thought this was the perfect answer for housing in that area. Thirteen units all valued at approximately \$300,000 for each one of these. There are 14,000 sq. ft. lots, nice and big in size, in fact they are probably larger than lots in the area. Traffic volume is not increased in any way. In R1 there could be between 18 or 19 houses in there, with a road. I know that is an issue with the people on Greensview. You have brought that to my attention. I was around to see a bunch of people, spoke to people adjacent to the property and also spoke to people who had issue with the traffic and that type of thing. Thirteen lots with 26 units in total versus 19 R1 you are only looking at about seven cars in the difference. A road will go through eventually. It has already been there since about the late 80's. It is already an approved road. I met with the province, and the province wants the road to go through. I'm not looking at the road connecting. I'm just looking at the R2.

Councillor Clow invited residents to come to the microphone and to please state their name and address before asking questions or making comments.

Questions:

Bill Noseworthy, Greensview Drive:

I don't have any questions for you but I do have some statements that I would like to make and this is not personal to you.

I have a copy of the Official Town Plan and it came about as a result of a fairly long process in which there were a lot of meetings. As a result of the meetings there were goals and objectives created and that the goals and objectives would basically guide the decisions made by Council until the year 2012. There are certain provisions within this, to allow Council to listen to amendments and so on, and that is what we are talking about.

In part of this document there is a Plan Action and it says that there are statements indicating specific initiatives or directions which will be undertaken when you implement the Plans Policies and Objectives. It also says that it a guiding document for the people whom we elect to our Council for making decisions. It starts off with a shared vision and one part of the shared vision is that, it says, as a result of the intensive

consultation held during the preparation of this Plan, the following list of assumptions describing the type of Town our residents desire in the future has been prepared and adopted. Point number two is...while development and change is inevitable, the quality and character of our existing neighbourhoods must be protected. I don't think that a neighbourhood of duplexes helps protect the makeup of the current neighbourhood in which this is situated.

The reason that I'm referring to this is because, again, I don't want you to take anything that I'm saying to be offensive, but the reason why you want to rezoning is so that you can build duplexes. I don't know how much work that you have done in looking at the idea of Single residential families. One of the things that would concern me about that neighbourhood is that once it does get rezoned, there is really nothing preventing you, and the way you have talked about it here and again, and I'm using you as any developer, is that you are not just interested in 20% of this parcel being duplexes. You are interested in 100% being duplexes. Is that correct?

Terry Ferrier:

Are you asking a question?

Bill Noseworthy:

Terry, What percent of this are you interested in being duplexes?

Terry Ferrier:

Thirteen lots. 100%.

Bill Noseworthy:

Thank you Terry. I appreciate that answer. So the next part of the Official Plan talks about the residential part. It says...that while the character of the established neighbourhoods must be protected, it says current development costs dictate that new fully serviced residential subdivisions must become more efficient and it goes on to say, as pressures grow for new more innovative and somewhat higher density residential development forms, the Town must seek to carefully direct such development to areas which will not adversely affect our established neighbourhood. Now the established neighbourhood that is there is single family dwelling.

The established neighbourhood there is single family dwelling. Here is another objective. It's to ensure that the character or the appearance of the existing neighbourhood is maintained and enhanced.

This is a policy about residential development standards and it says, it shall be the policy of Council to ensure that the predominately low density single family residential character the Town's maintained. This part of their Action Plan-while increased opportunities for higher density will be identified. The predominant land use in the Town of Stratford will remain low density residential.

The next Plan Action says, the integrity of existing low density residential areas will be protected. So, in other words, what it is saying here is that the people whom you have elected for Council for making decisions, this is the document that they had created for them to guide them in their decision making. To me, we shouldn't be talking about your pictures, of what can be built there. What we should be talking about is

the reason why you want this land to go from R1 to R2 is because it's feeding the objective and the Action Plan in the Official Plan. That's what I think you should be talking about.

The other part of residential deals with what is called infilling. It says that Council should ensure that infilling, which occurs with existing developed residential neighbourhoods, conforms to the established development when character and street scape even if the result in standards exceeds the minimum provisions of the Bylaw. It says that the Development Bylaw shall require that residential infilling must conform to the Development Standards of which the subdivision was originally approved. I don't know what the original subdivision was for that area, but it has single family dwellings.

This has to do with residential development. It has to do with medium and high density development. It says, the Policy of Council to provide for expanded opportunity for medium and high density residential development, but in a form and scale which will not conflict with the predominately low density character of the Town. I guess I could go on but there is very strong language in this document that basically says any rezoning should take place based on the document that has been prepared to guide Council in making decisions. I think that when you are making your presentation, you should be addressing those items in the Official Plan and I think that there should be some measures. Like what are the measures that have been undertaken, to say, that the reasons for the rezoning are these reasons and that they should be measured objectively against this Plan. Thank You.

Terry Ferrier, Developer:

I agree with everything you said and read and that is exactly why I met with the province and the Town at least ten times. It has been over a year since I've been looking at this development. That's why you see these homes and that is why I brought the pictures along to show you that they would conform. So I would conform. I live in the Community also, just as much as you do. I would not build and live there if I thought that it was going to degrade the area. Honestly, I wouldn't. I am only talking 13 lots. I'm not talking about high density apartment buildings. I'm talking about 13- R2 good looking contemporary modern homes that I think anyone would be proud of. If you look at the pictures it says enhanced development concept and covenant protected.

You will not build expensive homes on a low expensive lot. You just don't do it.

You asked me if I did any preparation. Yes I have.

Bill Noseworthy:

Have ruled out Single Family Dwellings?

Terry Ferrier:

For me, yes. I don't think you would put it there either.

Bill Noseworthy:

No, I don't own the land.

Terry Ferrier:

It is not economically feasible. It is \$350,000 to put the road in. You can't sell the lot and make enough money.

Bill Noseworthy:

I don't want to make this personal.

Terry Ferrier:

It's not personal.

Bill Noseworthy:

You bought the land and you knew what it was. It was R1. You knew then and if you had this plan in mind and now you are coming back and saying that in order for me to make it feasible it has to be R2.

Terry Ferrier:

You are assuming a lot of things.

Bill Noseworthy:

I'm not twisting your words. You just said it.

Terry Ferrier:

I said what. Say it again just so I understand.

Bill Noseworthy:

When you bought the land it was R1. So you knew according to what you just said it wasn't feasible to develop it in R1 lots.

Terry Ferrier:

Yes, you know what I said earlier. I started off by looking for a piece of R2 property. So I could live on one side, and my wife's folks could live on the other.

Bill Noseworthy:

That's fine. You don't have to build 13 units to have someone live on the other side to achieve that.

David Panton, 13 Aintree Drive:

Could I have something clarified. One gentleman is saying that it is approved for R1 between 18 - 19 and we have another gentleman saying it is 13- R1.

Adam Affleck, Realtor:

I am the Realtor for the Changs, who are the current owners of the property. Terry is trying to rezone the property. When the Changs bought the property 20 years ago, it was approved by the province for 13 lots. The Town of Stratford has never approved that plan. In talking with Vahid, as far as he is concerned it is a single piece of land and any rezoning, whether it is 11 lots or 13 lots or 20 lots or whatever has got to go through them. You don't even get to this stage until the Town has approved it. Vahid and Kevin have

changed this diagram eight to ten times to make this suitable. Something they thought that the residents would like. Terry is trying to go back and say, whether it is, being the cost of putting the road in, the cost of putting the sewer in, whatever, there are going to be 13 structures. As far as the amount of square footage is allowed, whether it be a single family home or the same size of a house which happens to be a semi-detached. You are right. There will be more people. It will be duplexes instead of single family. I don't live in a \$500,000 house or a \$400,000 house. I live in a fairly cheap house, but in driving down Aintree Drive, it's not Kinlock Creek, it's not Stonington, so these brand new homes whether they be \$275,000, or \$350,000, he is not picking the design. You are coming in and you want to buy a lot. You pick out what you and your mom and dad what to build for a duplex. It goes to Terry and if he says yes we like it, and the Town and someone in the community and they like it. They say you know what that is going to look good back there. If it doesn't go, in talking with Town Council, when you look at your map, anyone who is living on Aintree has to look at R2 to the left and PURD Zone, which is five unit Town houses. To use the excuse that there is never going to be, you are devaluing the area. You are making it worse. Take a look at the construction going on around you and that is the zoning that was there before.

Dave Panton:

The inventory of R2 land to be developed in the Town. Is there an inventory?

Director of Planning:

Yes.

Dave Panton:

Yes there is. Thank You.

Wayne Sanderson, 21 Kinlock Road:

I'm one of the four houses on the Kinlock Road that is a single family home. If you change that all around us then we are stuck in the middle of multi-family units. So, that is really going to affect our property by changing that piece of land in behind us, as opposed to keeping the whole neighbourhood all the same. That is what we want.

Aerial Whitlaw, 6 MacLaughlin Drive:

I'm just in the process of looking for land in the near future. I'm young and looking to reside on my own in Stratford. You are saying that you want single family homes. What's to stop me from getting a single family home and then renting out those rooms to other single people to live with me, to help pay for my house. You are then having six or eight people living in that home. It would be the same as having a semi-detached home. Whereas, if you were building semi-detached homes to start with, you might not necessarily have more people, depending on who you have move into those semi-detached homes. To me, I'm excited to hear that it would be a possibility to zone it to R2. I'd like to live in a higher end more modernized home, but I can't afford for my first home to go to Stonington or the new development all around there. The prices that I've heard and from looking at the homes the semi-detached are going to be more modernized, more available to people like myself who are looking for a first home. I hear what you are saying, but there is nothing that will stop anyone from filling a regular single family home.

Wayne Sanderson:

You said that a person might build a single family home and rent out all the rooms. What's going to happen and we get a duplex and both people do that. Which is a possibility, and from what I gather you are buying that as a starter home. We want people to move into the neighbourhood with their single family homes and be proud of it and stay there.

Adam Affleck:

If I am correct, you live on Kinlock. There is a duplex across the street from you and you are two lots down from five unit townhouses. So, I can't see how a high end duplex is going to devalue your property, and you are on Kinlock Road.

Wayne Sanderson:

What happens if the one in behind me is the one that rents out six rooms and the other person rents out six rooms.

Adam Affleck:

She is talking that can happen, but you have to go through the covenants.

Wayne Sanderson:

Our single family home has been there for 35 years.

Adam Affleck:

Any realtor will tell you that in Stratford there is a shortage of R2 lots. If they are any hidden in someone's back pocket I'd love to see them. There might be two or three lots that are available for sale. Two at a fair price and the rest are gone through the roof.

Dave Panton:

I believe that my question was is there or was there R2 areas to be developed in the Town of Stratford.

Councillor Clow:

I believe the answer is yes.

Adam Affleck:

I said available for sale.

Councillor Clow:

There is R2 available, but we do not have a number to give you at this time.

Gary Demeulenaere, 108 Greensview Dr.:

I just have two quick preliminary questions before I get into a brief submission.

Is the intention if this is developed to connect Campbell Avenue?

Terry Ferrier:

I appreciate that you ask me that question. The Town knows how many different plans that I have brought to them. They involved cul-de-sacs not connected to that road. I hired a person that is retired from the province to design the land. We tried to make it as nice as we could. I had to live within the rules. The road is already there and that is what the province wanted. I understand that over in Greensview there are two issues here. One is the R2 and that is what I'm about. I'm just talking about 13-R2 units. That's all I'm going to talk about. It is pretty straight forward. I'm not trying to hide anything. The road is a separate issue. I don't have any control over the road. I would end the road where the land butts up against another gentleman's property (Doug Molyneau.) I did go around and speak to the people who were located adjacent to and beside the property. Looking at the map I can see that the property cuts off at the end of the road to the next community. I am not connecting the road.

Gary Demeulenaere:

I don't mean to suggest that you do have anything to do with it. For my own understanding, I would like to know what the concept is.

Adam Affleck:

Nothing will happen until they get that little triangle, which the landowner may never give up.

Gary Demeulenaere:

Point of clarity. You don't actually own that property right now.

Terry Ferrier:

No, it's conditional.

Gary Demeulenaere:

Have you looked into whether this proposal, because I know that you were discussing some of the economics, is still cost efficient in your opinion, if this is zoned simply R2, with a 20% content of duplexes.

Terry Ferrier:

I wouldn't do it.

Gary Demeulenaere:

Has that been something that you have examined?

Terry Ferrier:

Yes I have. The first thing that I did was to meet with three different banks to go over this proposal. I have appraisals from Island Coastal, and other reputable companies - they gave me the price. I went to an engineering company and talked to them about the engineering. I have looked at the numbers a whole bunch of ways and I know I wouldn't, and I don't think that you would. I can't speak for everyone here, but I would say that most people would not do it. It's not economical.

Gary Demeulenaere:

In terms of submission to Council. Really all I wanted to say to the gentleman that spoke first Bill Noseworthy, I agree with everything that you said. I had actually come here with some of the similar notes

from what is in our Bylaws and Official Plan. Really, that is the essence of what consideration is supposed to be. I haven't heard a lot from the developer side of things that would really encourage or cause me to out way a lot of the concerns that have been raised with respect to what the integrity of the community is. Certainly, I have only been living in Stratford on Greensview Dr. for three years. I think that the character of the community including the surrounding community, is not something to be taken lightly and obviously when the Bylaws and Official Plan were developed the authors of that agreed with me. I don't take any comfort, unfortunately, in the suggestion that covenants are going to dictate the development that goes on here. The reality is that a covenant is only as good as it is in terms of its enforcement. I'm not even sure that I could write you something that would protect what he has been talking about. When you make statements to the effect that these things are going to increase my property value, I understand, that you are the developer, and you are not going to come here and tell a crowd of angry onlookers that this is going to decrease the value.

Terry Ferrier:

Contrary, I wouldn't come here. You are bringing your story, and obviously a lot of people here have the same issue. But I don't know what I can do to convince you, other than tell you, show you, what I'm going to do. I've lived here fourteen years, not as long as a lot of people here and I've raised three boys here. I still live here, work here, trust me, I want to live in that community.

Gary Demeulenaere:

And I would be happy to let you live there but my concern is....

Terry Ferrier:

Is it the road that you are concerned about? Because I have a sense from a lot of people that I talked to over in that area if the truth be known, and it was told to me that a petition would be taken around because he didn't want the road to go through. I'm sorry, but I get the sense that it has nothing to do with the looks of those homes. I defy you, I don't know what kind of home that you live in, but those will be every bit as nice, I can assure you they will be as nice as home as you live in.

Gary Demeulenaere:

That is the point where you and I disagree. Because what I'm telling you is that you have not provided any indication to me, other than the idea that there is going to be a covenant there, that allows you and two other people perhaps to judge what kind of home goes in there. My primary concern there is what happens, no offence, something happens to you, that you don't make that decision anymore and then the person who acts in your stead decides that I just really want to liquidate these properties now, because I want to sell these lots and that safe net is not there. Certainly, the properties that you have displayed on the screen are nice looking houses, but if you have a minimum square footage requirement and someone wants to build a rather ratty looking duplex to rent out what happens. What I'm telling you is that you can't build the mechanism to protect that, you can't put something in there...

Terry Ferrier:

I disagree, with you sir, because I would put something in place because I'm the developer. The one who would be selling the lots.

Banter was held between residents and the real estate agent...no one addressed the microphone.

Chair requested that anyone wanting to speak to please address the microphone.

Gary Demeulenaere:

To be fair to Adam, I understand that you obviously have an interest in the property. I don't have any issue with the things that you are saying, the banter going on between us. I am a lawyer, and I'm not holding myself out here that I've investigated title to this property or anything. What I am saying is that I have an issue in terms of enforce ability and those kinds of things. I am content just to have that on the record and I can move onto my next point.

On a bare assessment of this I really have no issue with the R1 residential development going on there and I would go so far as to say that I have no issue with a generic R2 residential development which would say that duplexes could be up to a maximum of 20%. I understand that the character of that neighbourhood that there is some surrounding R2 there. I'm not speaking for anyone else that is here, but I don't have any problem with that. The problem is simply with a blanket 100% development. I recognize this is not something that you have control over but when you are talking about 13 units that is essentially 26 new properties in there. I live on Greensview and this is going to result in somewhere in the range of an extra 50 cars travelling by your house each day, if you are talking about two vehicles per unit. There are lots of children on that street between Greensview and Campbell Ave.

Terry Ferrier:

There is 19 R-1. Nineteen versus twenty-six. You are talking about seven more vehicles.

Adam Affleck:

On the corner of Kinlock and Stratford there are now 50 units.

Gary Demeulenaere:

The vehicles from the 50 units don't drive by my house. A number of people live here, their children play on that street.

Mike Cochrane:

I have an eight year old and a three year old and I have other neighbours with young children. We are located adjacent to the property, so parking and traffic flow whether it is seven more or seven less is an issue for us.

Terry Ferrier:

Gary, I can appreciate what you are saying because, honestly, those are valid points. I really tried to stress that I don't have, it's not me that is putting in the road that connects the communities, and as I showed you there are 19 lots. Let's say that R2 wasn't there and I was putting it in. I don't have to do anything. I just have to go along and put it in. Done - 19 homes there. You do not have a say on what I have, no covenant protection on R1. R1 is small 11,000 sq. ft. lots Watch out what you wish for, you may get the road and on the other end of it a lot of R1's, but that's not what you want. You certainly won't get that type of development in the individual type of a building of \$300,000. You won't get it!

Gary Demeulenaere:

Certainly, and I understand that. The difficulty...

Terry Ferrier:

You're talking about traffic and kids.

Gary Demeulenaere:

It's among these issues, obviously the property values is a significant concern and it does kind of go back to the covenants. The problem that everyone has is a reaction to living behind the duplexes, is precisely the issue where the properties are sold and are rented. The problem and the vast majority of duplex properties is not what they look like for the first ten years it's what they look like when they are rented. If you are owning the building and you don't live there, you don't have the same incentive as the property owner to keep up your property.

Terry Ferrier:

You are making a lot of assumptions, if you don't mind me saying so.

Gary Demeulenaere:

I certainly recognize that I am but....

Terry Ferrier:

You certainly are and I showed you pictures and I can't be any more honest than what I'm trying to show you.

Gary Demeulenaere:

Neither can I.

Terry Ferrier:

I have lived here for fourteen years and I'm going to park myself in there, live there myself. Okay I don't have anything to gain. I don't have any control over the road connecting. That is the province. The province wants that road. They are going to have it, unless the people owning the property don't want to give it to them. That has nothing to do with me. Again, I'll repeat, that R1 gives you 19 units and what I have proposed is 26 units, a difference of seven. Then it was commented that even seven is a lot of traffic. Now you are talking about an issue of connecting the road and again I'm only trying to be reasonable here. I think that I'm being very reasonable. I understand what you are saying, but I don't see the traffic volume increasing a whole heck of a lot different between 19 -R1's or 13-R2's. I don't see the difference in that. You went on to elaborate and say something about run down and shabby. Unfortunately, you are right. That's what has happened over the years. I agree with you. A lot of these R2's have had this stereotype and it is because of that and that is what I've tried to say. We can do something nicer that fits with the community. It will fit in perfectly. It will look very nice and you would be proud to say that this is at the end of the road. If I was over on Greensview and the road did connect I have got to have 13 of those units at the other end or 19 of the small R1's.

Gary Demeulenaere:

I guess we will have to agree to disagree.

Leigh Jenkins, 144 Greensview Dr.

Covenants. We have heard that word all evening. Who enforces covenants? Are they enforced by the Town?

Councillor Clow:

No

Leigh Jenkins:

Are they enforced by the developer?

Director of Planning:

The developer.

Leigh Jenkins:

And when he is gone who enforces the covenants once the developer is gone?

Director of Planning:

No one.

Leigh Jenkins:

I would like to see who at the Town Hall is going to sit down and pick out multi-family units. I don't think that the Town would want to be put in that situation. It's a nice thought.

Strawberry Hill. It is a beautiful development and that is one kilometre up the road and is built exactly for this purpose. These are really nice. They are beautiful. The price is wrong - \$180,000 per side is what I come up with at \$150. per square foot is the building cost these days. They are nice and they work and there is room for this type of development. The other word that I would use if I was on Town Council is that it would be called "Spot Zoning." I would almost consider this as "Spot Zoning." This is an R1 development on either side with PURD on one side and the PURD has been there forever. To plop R2 in the middle of this is a little bit radical.

We talked about Stonington and I heard people talking about the lots in Stonington. Well, we'd love to have some lots that we could build \$200,000 instead of \$400,000 or \$280,000 or \$290,000. Our neighbourhood is full of \$200,000 and \$250,000 houses and we like it that way. We don't need it to be Stonington. We are Stratford.

Norma Corbett. 50 Aintree Dr:

We live next to where you want to build. You say you have no say on the road. If you are going to build you will need a road. Are you coming out on Aintree? Are you going to have a street or cul-de-sac?

Terry Ferrier:

(A map was displayed showing the original subdivision) I did have a plan showing a cul-de-sac but the province would not allow that.

Norma Corbett:

When they built in behind us, they sent us a letter saying that we have to give up one lot to put the road in. I thought that we would not have a road behind us and a house, but we got both.

Terry Ferrier:

I understand what you are saying. If this is R1 the road is still going to go by you. If it's R2 the road will still go by you. There is a road allowance between 9 and 11 Aintree Dr. The design already shows that and the road will end at your home.

Norma Corbett:

Are you going to live there? Are you the builder?

Terry Ferrier:

No, I am not the builder but I will build one and live there.

Adam Affleck:

Terry will be selling the lots, and you will not be able to build on the lot until you have your architect plans approved and a lawyer will have to prepare a bullet proof set of covenants.

Norma Corbett:

Do you own the land now?

Terry Ferrier:

It's conditional.

Norma Corbett:

I think that all along Kinlock Road and Aintree Dr is all single family dwelling...

Terry Ferrier:

Displayed on the map the areas zoned PURD, Multi-Unit Residential.

Norma Corbett:

There are big \$300,000 single family dwelling homes on Golf View Drive and then came down along Stratford Road and they are semi-detached, and then a whole lot of other big things sticking up there together. You might start out looking good. I tell myself that when you don't own the land anything could happen, but you do hope that you have some say on what comes next to you. Also, behind us there is a Right of Way where there are trees growing and I don't know if that is still a ROW or you have bought that land. I wonder how close you will be coming to our house.

Adam Affleck:

The gentleman will not sell the triangle.

Development Officer:

There is one item that I need to clarify. There is a lot of talk about subdivision and the two neighbourhoods connecting. Those are not the items to be discussed this evening. Tonight's agenda is about the rezoning of the land. I have spoken to a lot of people who I have sent letters to who have called me directly or they have talked with our Councillors. They do have concerns about road configuration - how things are going to look in the future. I invite you to come and talk to us after the meeting or send us your comments and we will take them into consideration when we get to a point

that we are actually discussing a subdivision. At this point, we are not discussing a subdivision. We are discussing the possibility of rezoning this piece of land from R1 to R2. Terry is trying to give you some indication of what his proposal would be based on his plan for that land in the future. How many lots. The issues of the neighbourhoods connecting are not ironed out yet. They are not finalized or set in stone, so without getting into a lot of debate, if we could focus on the rezoning portion and I invite you to talk to any of us later about the subdivision details. We would be happy to discuss it.

Bill Noseworthy:

I believe that he was talking to the Town about a cul-de-sac where Campbell Drive is.

Development Officer:

There were numerous discussions with the Town, and the Department of Transportation and Public Works regarding what a possible subdivision could look like. There were variations of R1 and R2. None of the subdivision discussions have gone beyond a very preliminary stage. However, there was a discussion about the possibility of the two neighbourhoods connecting regardless of R1 or R2. There will be comments made by the Town and by DOTPW in relation to that matter. It is not in relation to the zoning. Yes, there have been conceptual talks about subdivision, but until we determine what the zone is and if we have a developer on the table for a subdivision, there are no details to be talked about for a subdivision at this point.

Bill Noseworthy:

In the talks that you had was there a cul-de-sac that would prevent the connection of Aintree Drive and Campbell Drive.

Development Officer:

Some variations did and some did not. None of the plans were approved or rejected. They were only for discussion. These details will be dealt with in the future. Any subdivision layout has to go through planning board and Council for approval.

Bill Noseworthy:

Will that come back to a public meeting?

Development Officer:

No.

Bill Noseworthy:

Once the land is rezoned then it is basically between the Town and the developer.

Development Officer:

I am inviting people if they have comments or concerns regarding the subdivision to talk to their Councillors and talk to the staff. Put your information on record, so we will have the information when it does come time for discussion on the subdivision. We will then have your information on file. The plan you see was a plan that was approved in the early 70's. At that time it was 15 single family residential lots. That did not get developed as the second phase of the subdivision.

Wayne Sanderson:

Just one thing that I want to get absolutely clear about the covenants that this man has been saying. He is saying how great it would make everything. If it gets rezoned to R2 and it becomes a more valuable piece of land, and some other developer then comes along and says, oh well, I'm going to develop this and he doesn't have covenants. There is nothing protecting the land because there will be no covenants or nothing at all to protect us. The Town will not take what he says and transfer it to anyone else.

Development Officer:

You are correct.

Doug Molyneau:

I am the owner of the triangle piece of land and I have never been approached to sell that piece of land.

Adam Affleck:

I was told by someone that it was not for sale.

Stephen Gallant, 5 Aintree Drive:

I reside there with my wife and two children and have been there for 14 years. I'm against the rezoning from R1 to R2 for a whole bunch of different reasons. Some have been talked about here this evening. I just want to voice my opinion, which I'm here to do tonight. I am against the rezoning. I will comment that the homes that we looked at tonight are gorgeous homes, beautiful homes, and I'm sure that they would look really nice somewhere else. I really don't think that it is a fit for that parcel of land. We are not Beverly Hills Drive, but I'm sure that they will increase the property value somewhere when they get built. I'm quite happy with taking my chances on the single family dwellings and remain an R1.

Laura Sanderson, 21 Kinlock Road:

I understood that if this was to be developed, there would be a park put in that subdivision. I haven't heard anything this evening at all about land being devoted towards the park.

Development Officer:

That is an item that is dealt with at the subdivision level. What we are talking about tonight is a possible rezoning. When we get to the stage where we are talking about subdivision, whether it be under the current regulations of R1 or under a possible rezoned R2, that is when the Town has detailed discussions with the developer regarding the possibility of parkland dedication within this six acre property.

Laura Sanderson:

Will that change the number of lots.

Development Officer:

Yes, it may very well change the number of lots.

Adam Affleck:

You can also give “cash in lieu” instead of land.

Development Officer:

That is the Town’s choice. If it was cash in lieu instead of land, the cash would go toward recreation equipment.

Jim Corbett, 50 Aintree Drive.

I want to commend Mr. Ferrier. I think that he has done a lot of good homework and I was somewhat impressed by the proposal. These homes do look very nice. However, it’s my opinion, and I join with the rest of the audience, that it does not appear to be a good mix. I have lived on Aintree Drive since 1975. When we first built there it was a dirt street and wide open county. I realize that someday people are going to build up around you and we understand that. We want to see the Town grow, and you want to see progress. That’s a good thing. I’ve lived in lots of neighbourhoods, but I’ve lived there for 35 years and it is the best place on P.E.I. to live. The reason being, this man sitting beside me, my neighbour across the street and other quality neighbours. Good people that care about the community have been there and we all watch out for one another. I think probably what we are talking about here is perhaps fear of the unknown. Fear that rezoning this parcel of land will change the demographic to a point that we just can’t accept.

Recorder stopped at this point during the meeting.

Roger Doucette, Aintree Drive:

I built on Aintree five years ago and would like the community to be developed as it stands today. Reiterates the last gentleman’s points. Did not buy land there in order to have it rezoned.

Mike Cochrane:

I echo Steve and Roger’s comments and believe that the property should stay as R1.

April Driscoll, Aintree Drive:

I respectfully request that Council respect their Town Plan and leave it zoned R1.

Doug Molyneaux, 181 Stratford Road:

I’ve lived here for 60 years. and have seen a lot of changes. A number of subdivisions Golfview Drive, Greensview Drive were constructed and we were not notified. Terry did come and discuss the proposal with us. How do we stop progress. This will be developed no matter what. The roads will connect. Whether it’s Terry with R2 or R1. I think that what he is proposing is great and I can’t see denying him.

Ralph Macdonald, 25 Aintree Drive:

I’m opposed to the rezoning. I’ve raised four boys in this beautiful neighbourhood. It was R1 when I moved here and should remain R1.

Wayne MacKay, 29 Aintree Drive:

With all due respect I’ll take my chances with R1. It is not a good place for R2.

Kim Mooney, 21 Aintree Drive:

I live in a charming area and would not like to see it rezoned. Has this property ever been looked at for a park?

Development Officer:

During the subdivision application the parkland is discussed.

Kim Mooney, 21 Aintree Drive:

Loves the charming area. I think that over the years the charm of Stratford has been taken away and with R2 lots we would lose the charm. Has the land ever been considered for merely park land. Does the Town have the ability to purchase the land?

Director of Planning:

You can purchase the land and transfer the title to the Town.

Adam Affleck:

Can you explain from a planning perspective why you Terry thought that R2 could work?

Development Officer:

I'll answer that very cautiously. We are not here to sway it one way or another. There are guidelines in the Bylaw which we review once we have a rezoning application.

It was stated earlier that this might be considered "Spot-Zoning." We would not consider this as a "Spot-Zone" as it would fit with the PURD Zone to the South.

Judy Irwin, 14 Aintree Drive:

Bill and I were the first people to purchase the land in the neighbourhood. We bought it knowing it would be R1. We raised two boys who played on the streets, and now we have grandkids that do the same. We also have the walking trail which goes by our home. I agree that the homes that are proposed are beautiful but I still want to see it remain R1.

Aerial Whitlaw, 6 MacLaughlin Drive:

Recaps the list of concerns, existing land, and safety....believes it comes down to who lives there and not what type of homes are there. Thinks that duplexes would add people to the hockey games, or the children being able to have more friends.

Joanne Holden, Greensview Drive:

I'm quite upset at the Real Estate Agent. I don't feel that he did anything to help you with your proposal this evening. I lived on a large beautiful property in the Bunbury area as a teenager. That property was sold and suppose to have had a beautiful place built on it. It ended up being large apartment buildings. We are happy with the way it is.

Wayne Conrad, 104 Greensview Drive:

Asks if the plan shown is the final...asks about the lot sizes. In order to get a view ...thinks that most of the land will turn into rental properties which are not looked after over time. The R 1 lots are 11,000 sq. ft and the R2 lots are 14,000 sq. ft. My property on Greensview Avenue is a quarter of an acre.

You will have no control over rental property, and we all know what happens when the properties are rented. I am strongly opposed to the rezoning.

Judy Perry, 23 Kinlock Road:

I contacted a ReMax Real Estate Agent to ask about duplex loss. They told us that we could lose 30-35% of the value of our property.

Terry Ferrier:

Thanks the crowd. Apologizes for not being able to meet with everybody.

Terry also responds to Wayne Conrad's question about lot size.

Resident:

Man stands up against covenants.....Terry responds that the covenants control what kind of buildings will be built.

Stephen Gallant:

Will you purchase the property?

Terry Ferrier:

Yes.

Resident:

Could the land be purchased for a park?

Mayor Jenkins:

We can forward the request to the recreation department and see if it's viable.

Wayne Sanderson:

Will there be anymore meetings?

Councillor Clow:

This rezoning item will be discussed at the next Regular Council Meeting. You are all invited to attend that meeting on Wednesday, April 14, 2010 at 7:30 p.m.

This portion of the Meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Councillor Clow called the second portion of the meeting to order at 8:50 p.m.

Heritage Policy & Bylaw

A presentation was made by the Director of Planning on the Heritage Policy & Bylaw.

The Director of Planning presented the policy and bylaw via slideshow and summaries of the policy and bylaw were handed out to the residents that remained.

Public that remained - David Panton, Doug & Linda Molyneaux leave at 9:02 p.m.

Councillor Clow opened up the floor for discussion.

Question about how old a building has to be.....The Director of Planning explains that it is a process of gathering information which is to be reviewed - one of which is age.

David Panton:

Does not live on a heritage property...professional and personal interest in this policy and bylaw...explains that he has been involved in developing some of these policies. Strongly commends the Town for bringing this policy and bylaw forward in order to protect Stratford's history. Very pleased and proud to say that he lives in a community that takes a proactive stand on this.

One question on 120 days in which no solution has been found in order to approve demolition...who decides what is warranted as a solution to denying the demolition.

The Director of Planning responds that the main intention of the Heritage Policy is "encouraging" to the owners rather than a "restriction." The 120 days is there to enable a solution. The Town can not restrict a demolition.

Again reinforces congratulatory impression for the policy and bylaw.

Adjournment 9:11p.m.