

PUBLIC MEETING
September 17, 2008
Approved Minutes

DATE: September 17, 2008
TIME: 7:00 p.m. - 7:55 p.m.
PLACE: Stratford Town Centre, 234 Shakespeare Drive

COUNCIL: Mayor Kevin Jenkins, Deputy Mayor Steve MacDonald, Councillor Diane Griffin, Councillor Emile Gallant, Councillor Gary Clow, Councillor Patrick Ross

STAFF: Robert Hughes, C.A.O., Kevin Reynolds, Development Officer, Adele Gillis, Recording Clerk

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS: Rob DeBlois, Brenda Goodine

RESIDENTS: Eight (8)

DEVELOPER: Marshall MacPherson

VICE-CHAIR: Councillor Emile Gallant

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Jenkins called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and welcomed those in attendance. He stated that the purpose of the meeting this evening is to consider an application from Marshall MacPherson to construct two apartment buildings on a lot located on the Kinlock Road. The "Use" is a permitted use in the Planned Unit Residential Development Zone (PURD). There is a requirement in this Zone to hold a public meeting to hear public input before making a decision. We are not here to promote the project or to tear down the project. We have an application from an applicant and we are here to receive public input. There has been no decision on the project. We are here so that the applicant can bring the proposal to the public. The Developer will tell us what it is, and Council can consider it, as well as public input before any approval is given to the proposed project.

Mayor Jenkins then turned the meeting over to the Councillor Emile Gallant, Vice-Chair of the Planning & Heritage Committee.

Councillor Gallant made the following comments on the process that will be followed during and after the public meeting.

There are members in attendance from the Planning & Heritage Committee, as well as Council Members. Planning Board receives the application and then reviews it before making a recommendation to Council. Council will then make the final decision. Kevin Reynolds, Development Officer will give you an overview of the proposal, and Marshall MacPherson will then give a presentation on the proposed project. After the presentation the floor will be open for any question or comments that you may want to make.

Development Officer: I will give a quick overview on the Town's perspective on what the application is, and what the permitted uses are in the area. (*A presentation showing the location, satellite imagery, zoning map, zoning regulations, concept plan of the proposal drawn by Linus Gallant and site diagram by Island Drafting was displayed for the public.*) The apartments are proposed to be located on a portion of parcel number 865550, (approx. 2.35 Acres) which is located within the Planned Unit Residential Development Zone (PURD). This property is located close to the corner of the Kinlock Road and Stratford Road, between the two - four Unit Townhouse that face the Stratford Road and the Fox Meadow Subdivision.

Section 12. 2 of the Planned Unit Residential Development Zone (PURD) was read into the minutes as follows by the Development Officer.

12.2 PERMITTED USES

- a. No Building or part thereof and no land shall be used for purposes other than:
 - i. Single Family Dwellings;
 - ii. Duplex Dwellings and Semi Detached Dwellings;
 - iii. Town House Dwellings or Row House Dwellings up to six (6) units (owned either individually, or as Condominiums);
 - iv. Parks and Playgrounds;
 - v. Accessory Buildings;
 - vi. Private Garages.
- b. The following Conditional Uses subject to such terms and conditions shall be imposed by Council:
 - i. Community Care Facilities;
 - ii. Public and/or Private Assisted Care Facilities.

12. 3 SPECIAL PERMIT USES

- c. Notwithstanding Section 12.2 above, Council may issue a Development Permit for the following uses subject to such terms and conditions as Council deems necessary:
 - i. Group Homes;
 - ii. Child Care Facilities;
 - iii. Apartments (owned by a single Property Owner or as a Condominium).
- d. Prior to the issuance of a Development Permit for a Special Permit Use Council shall ensure that:
 - i. the Development is deemed appropriate and complements the scale of the existing residential development;
 - ii. the Development has sufficient landscape Buffer around the periphery of the Property;

- iii. in the opinion of Council, the Development does not cause any hardship to surrounding Property Owners due to excessive noise, traffic congestion or any other potential nuisance;
- iv. property owners within 61 metres (200 feet) of the subject Property are notified in writing of details of the proposed Development and asked to provide their comments; (letters were sent to property owners on September 8, 2008)
- v. a public meeting shall be held pursuant to Section 24.2 (3) to allow the Applicant to present the development proposal to residents to obtain their input; and
- vi. all other relevant provisions of this Bylaw are met.

12.6 DENSITY

The maximum density in a PURD Zone shall be no greater than ten (10) Dwelling Units per acre, provided however that where the Developer is required to retain environmentally sensitive areas in their natural state, Council may permit the balance of a Parcel of land to be developed at a proportionately higher density per acre.

Development Officer: There is approximately 2.54 acres of land on this property and the Developer is proposing to build two (2) twelve (12) unit apartment buildings or a total of 24 units.

The Development Officer then reviewed and explained in detail the conceptual drawings prepared by Linus Gallant. It was also noted that a detailed set of drawings prepared by Island Drafting are also available for the public to review. These drawings will show a revision of the parking area from the conceptual drawing.

The meeting was then turned over to Marshall MacPherson.

Marshall MacPherson: We are proposing to construct two (2) twelve (12) unit apartment buildings. Island Drafting has drawn the plans and an architect will be hired to stamp the drawing upon receiving approval from Council. If a permit is issued to construct, we will start as soon as possible. We would like to get the paving done before winter sets in. I've owned several rental properties over the last 20 years, including 66 units at Bridlewood on Much Drive, several duplexes, and probably 200 - 300 single family homes over the years. We do a good quality job and would do a nice job on the Kinlock Rd. If you have any questions I'll try to answer them and if I can't then we will get the answers for you at a later time. We are ready to go if we get approval.

Resident: Will there be a restricted covenant for the building?

Marshall MacPherson: There will be a superintendent on site. It will not be a trashy looking site. It will be a quality built project, we will spend well over one million dollars on the project.

Resident: What type of market will you be going for?

Marshall MacPherson: In the past, we always went for the seniors market when we had elevators in the building. I would have preferred to put a 24 unit building on the site, but felt that it probably wouldn't fly. If that had been the case, we would have put an elevator in the building. We will definitely screen our clients. We don't want a bunch of young kids partying, etc. We will be looking after the buildings ourselves. My wife looks after renting them.

Resident: How long will that last?

Marshall MacPherson: We had the buildings on Mutch Drive for 10 years. I believe that we may have had three empty units in 10 years. I think that we are pretty good landlords.

Resident: So, it's your intention to keep ownership of the property?

Marshall MacPherson: When we sold the other building, I had two partners (Simon & Ralph Compton) who wanted to sell so I didn't have a choice but to sell.

Resident: Why this location and not where some of the other apartment buildings are located such as Ducks Landing or in behind the school? Why this location?

Marshall MacPherson: I think that it is a better location.

Resident: We have a lot of congestion on the corner of Kinlock Rd & Stratford Rd. I don't know the Town's plans for that intersection. Sometime down the road we may see that intersection (Kinlock Rd. & Stratford Rd.) getting wider. With young kids going to school, we have to watch it very carefully, especially in the winter. We don't have any sidewalk on our side of the road. The children are forced to cross the road and walk up the road to get the school bus. Obviously, we have some concerns about the congestion that will be created by this exit with the two apartment buildings.

Marshall MacPherson: That would be something that highways would probably look at before a permit is issued, I would imagine.

Resident: This is definitely a concern, especially the school bus situation. Is there any talk of changing the entry point to this development? To get a right of way by the other apartment buildings, to use the existing entrance to get back onto your property.

Marshall MacPherson: I really can't see that happening, Fox Meadow owns that building and land and I don't think that there would be room to put in a driveway.

Resident: Or using the existing parking lot of the apartment building.

Marshall MacPherson: Quite honestly, I couldn't see that happening. No.

Resident: Are you going to be building the apartment for the higher end rental.

Marshall MacPherson: These apartments will rent at approximately \$900 per month.

Resident: There will be no low income housing?

Marshall MacPherson: Definitely not. I've had some good and bad tenants over the years. And I'd rather have an empty unit than on that's going to be trouble.

Resident: I normally deal with your not so popular clientele. I'm a police officer. Some apartment buildings always want to have the best clientele. Everyone wants that, but the economics are sometimes you can't get them full. Clientele starts moving down. I live at 94 Kinlock Rd., and when looking out I'm looking at the eighth tee right now. I will be looking right square into your buildings. Nothing to do with your building designs whatsoever. When I moved here is 2002, the house that I bought was on the market for quite awhile. I did my research and the reason that it wasn't selling there was a rumour that there was going to be a 16 unit apartment building go on that corner. I came up to the Town Council office and inquired what the zoning was. I was told at that time that the biggest units they could build was four units. Basically, what is there now. That's fine. They build them, but some of the clientele has changes two or three times. Being in the occupation that I am in, I know that some of the clientele previously were not the most popular for various other reasons. My concern is that everybody wants ideal clients in there and I have no problems with that if that is what you want. But economics dictate that you can't

always fill them. If you can't fill them, your rents come down a little bit and then you get less desirables in them. When that happens the noise goes up. In the morning between 7:10 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. the only way that I can get out of my driveway is to back in. There is no way that I can back onto the Kinlock Rd in the morning. Outside of that, with this amount of vehicles, and adding 24 units you are probably averaging 35 vehicles. Put that into the equation and I'm never going to get out of my driveway. I have four kids and they are all in school. When the proposal went out (these questions are more for Council so I apologize for that) for the crosswalk and sidewalk to be installed all the residents wanted the sidewalk on the side of the road where the houses are. It wasn't economically feasible to that, so they put the sidewalks on the opposite side of the road. My kids, as well as others, have to walk out the driveway, mine specifically, walk across the road, through a ditch, to the sidewalk, up the road and then cross back across the road to get onto the bus. In the winter time, you can't get on those sidewalks. You are walking up the side of the road with all the traffic going by, so congestion is one of my big concerns. The potential clientele is also another one of my concerns. The Council didn't listen to us last time. We wanted the sidewalks on our side. I have already heard several stories, through rumours, that this is already a done deal. If it is, this is a waste of time.

Marshall MacPherson:

I can assure you that it's not a done deal in my mind.

Resident:

This is why I'm here - to satisfy rumours and facts. The intersection of the Stratford Road was very busy before they put in the other stop signs. Being an RCMP Officer my car is in the yard very frequently, and people know who I am and what I do. I went to approximately 12 collisions at that intersection. That's how busy that intersection is. A proposal went out to put the rumble strips in. That didn't work. Since they put the four way stops in it's better, but I can sit in my driveway and watch car after car go through the stop sign. I could write 50 tickets there in the run of an hour. Traffic volume in that intersection is too high now. You put another 30 vehicles going there every day. I know your buildings and I know that they are good. My concern is the traffic flow and potential clientele. The Sweenies have two kids, I have four, and there are four in behind us that go to the bus stop. The traffic is far too busy as it is, and you add another 25 - 30 vehicles coming out of there between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.

I'm in the process now of getting transferred to Kings County to Traffic Services, and part of our transfer policy is that my house gets appraised. My house was appraised last Friday. One of the sections is

defined - comments include any positive or negative features such as, conforming to zoning, effects of known easements, anything that will affect the value of the residence. The Real Estate Agent marked in...steady growth in the area in the past five to six years, several new homes under construction, there is a notice publicised in the local newspaper, dated 09/09/2008, asking for comments on the application to build two, twelve unit apartment buildings. If this apartment building is not going to adversely affect the property values of our houses why would the property assessment appraiser put this on my assessment form? My property assessment when I moved in here in 2002 was \$1,500 now is \$2,400. My taxes have gone up, my appraisal has gone up, and according to the Real Estate Board the value is going down. In your own Bylaw zoning section 12.3.2. *Prior to the issuance of a Development Permit for a Special Permit Use Council shall ensure that of the Development is deemed appropriate and complements the scale of the existing residential development.* You have the Fox Meadow Subdivision where there are houses from \$250 - \$300,000. Our houses along the road range from approximately \$180 up to \$250,000 in a five house range. Putting these two 12 unit apartments is not going to compliment the residential zone. Apartment buildings are great if they are put in the right place, but not in the middle of a residential area. This has no bearing on your building whatsoever. I've seen your buildings and it is not that. It is the location of the building in a residential area.

Marshall MacPherson: I believe that it has a lot to do with how the buildings are taken care of.

Resident: That may be so, but this is not the place for two twelve unit apartment buildings. That's my opinion.

Marshall MacPherson: I can understand that, but when I applied to build the buildings there I was told that it was zoned for apartments, so that what I'm doing.

Resident: I understand that and if it goes through then that's Councils decision. They haven't listened to us in the past, I hope that they do this time. Again, nothing personal.

Roma Cooper: Is there an easement on the back of that property?

Development Officer: The easement is part of the Fox Meadow Subdivision.

Roma Cooper: How far is the easement from the parking lot?

Marshall MacPherson: We have pulled the parking lot back a lot further, in order to make more green space. There is probably 40' to 50'.

Roma Cooper: What about where the garbage containers would be stored.

Marshall MacPherson: They are shown on the site plan, but that is not to say they have to stay there. I would look at getting them hidden more than outlines in this plan. This drawing just came out yesterday afternoon and we were a bit rushed getting it ready.

Roma Cooper: This is not the final drawing.

Marshall MacPherson: To get a stamped drawing it will cost me approximately \$10,000 to \$15,000. If I am not able to get a permit then I didn't want to spend that kind of money. I may try to make it a little more condensed than what you see. They have made the parking lot smaller but I want to make it as small as possible. The parking has to be one and half spots per unit so I'll need 36 parking spots.

Roma Cooper: Will the buildings be half way back?

Marshall MacPherson: A little bit more towards the front. I wanted to give it a little curb appeal from the Kinlock Rd. You can look at that both ways and maybe we should have put the parking closer to the Kinlock Rd. and that is still a possibility.

Resident: According to the drawing that I have it is roughly 106' from the right of way to the front of the building and roughly 52' to the side.

Roma Cooper: The noise that we receive now from the eight units is phenomenal. I know that something has to go there.

Marshall MacPherson: Once again, I hate to revert back to Bridlewood where we had 66 units, but if on the way home tonight you pull into that parking lot where there are 66 units you can hear a pin drop. Once again it depends. We didn't have any children down there, it just worked out that way. You cannot *not* rent to someone who has children. If someone calls me up they don't have to tell me that they have a child, it against the law, but once you get so many units filled then you can start screening your clients. I can't guarantee that there won't be a child in these apartment. That would be impossible.

Roma Cooper: There is definitely an issue with the traffic.

Marshall MacPherson: Something will have to happen some day.

Roma Cooper: I don't know if they realize how bad the traffic is there.

Marshall MacPherson: The price that they are asking for the land, for duplex lots, it's not going to work.

Roma Cooper: I would love to see something along the line of a seniors complex, especially with the golf course so handy. Something has to go there but when you start adding 35 more vehicles it really can become an issue.

Resident: I have a lot of friends who live in apartment buildings and they have a lot of complaints that they don't have any room to store their garbage. Will this end up with there being a lot of garbage around?

Marshall MacPherson: Like I said before, we are going to have a superintendent on site and I can assure that I'm not going to spend this kind of money, my retirement money, to have a dump place. That's not going to happen if it takes place.

Resident: When you look at the drawing that is displayed and I look at my drawing it doesn't quite look the same.

Marshall MacPherson: We shortened up the parking lot at the back, trying to condense the asphalt a little bit.

Resident: The parking lot doesn't actually border on the property line.

Development Officer: (displayed on map) The drainage swale, Fox Meadow Subdivision, the parking lot boundary on this drawing doesn't push right to the back.

Leo Shea: My lot is the corner lot and the parking lot looks like it is right up to the property line. How close will the parking lot be?

Development Officer: A parking lot can be as close as three feet to the property line. It doesn't have the same set back as the building does.

Marshall MacPherson: I want to condense the asphalt as much as I can for obvious reasons. You don't have pay for as much asphalt and we'll try to keep it away from the properties as much as we can.

Roma Cooper: There is a hill there.

Marshall MacPherson: There is about 12' of elevation from one side of the property to the other. We will take some from one side and put it on the other. A drainage plan will be prepared by John Manthas. There will not be any run off from our property. There will be a gradual drop from the existing home. If parking is an issue then maybe we can move the parking to the front - if that is better for everyone involved.

Resident: I don't think that Council realized that the subdivisions are building up so quickly and they are not complementing our roads, safety, or congestion. We have lived there six years and four subdivisions have already been built. I think that the Town needs more planning to get the congestion out of the way and have better lights, stop signs, because everything seems to be coming onto Kinlock Rd and hitting Stratford Road and then going to the highway. We are a main street and putting something like that in, to me, it is not feasible until the Town starts planning better.

Marshall MacPherson: So, the subdivision that went in on the lower part of the Kinlock Rd, 50 or 60 lots and they probably have two cars that would make approximately 120 cars coming on the Kinlock Rd. That would be a highway/Council problem.

Resident: Yes, but they are going to approve something that is not logical at this time. The same with our sidewalk. By putting a sidewalk on a street that has no bearing on safety for children where the houses were. There are no crosswalks on our street to get to the sidewalk.

Marshall MacPherson: I've lived in Stratford for twenty years and in our subdivision there are no sidewalks.

Resident: Stratford has built up in the last six years since I've been here. I think that they are making a big mistake.

Roma Cooper: Will this be a three storey building with the first floor as a walk out?

Marshall MacPherson: All floors are above ground. This building will be 38' high.

Roma Cooper: Both buildings will be the same.

Marshall MacPherson: One building will be approximately five feet lower than the other.

Leo Shea: How will the land be sloped towards our property?

Development Officer: You will notice the contour lines on the map. These line show the slop of the land.

Marshall MacPherson: You will not have water run off from our buildings onto your property.

Resident: How will you handle snow removal?

Marshall MacPherson: We will certainly not blow snow on anyone else's property.

Resident: Given the amount of snow that we have had over the last few years, you learn really quick that there is no room to put snow anywhere or you are on other peoples property and you have snowploughs blocking the roads. Your side of the road is especially bad because of the sidewalk. There is very little room, so you end up with very high sides. Visibility for seeing cars becomes very poor. I'm wonder if it is your plan to keep the snow on your property?

Marshall MacPherson: We usually blow the snow and periodically we have to haul it away.

Councillor Gallant: Are they two unit or three bedroom apartments?

Marshall MacPherson: There will be eleven two bedroom apartments and one wheel chair accessible apartment in each building.

I would just like to say that I know no one wants an apartment building in the back of their property, I probably wouldn't myself, but at the same time we will take care of the place. It will not be an eyesore. I can see why you would be concerned, as there are some places built around that are not that appealing to the eye, but if we do it, it will be done right.

Resident: I'm not doubting that one bit. I have heard lots of good things and you have a great reputation. We are property owners and we don't want to see the value of our properties go down. I bought there for the reason that it may increase in value and that it would be my retirement place. From what I can see I'll have no privacy now because if you build a fence someone will be able to see over it from the top floor. This is my concern. Nothing against you at all.

Marshall MacPherson: I'm not taking it personal, but at the same time when you people bought those lots, and don't' take this the wrong way, but you must have known that it was zoned PURD and that someday something would be built on that property.

Resident: On that note, when I bought my property the Town office told me that the biggest thing that could be built was a double storey four unit building. When the house was for sale, it was on the market for quite awhile and I did inquire, occupational by product, to do investigation to find out why because there were rumours out there that they were going to build a 16 unit building there. I went and did my research. Council at that time told me the biggest that they could build would be four unit buildings.

Marshall MacPherson: Can anyone comment if that statement would have been made?

Development Officer: I can simply comment that, the bylaws that have been in place in 1997 in the Town, the PURD Zone itself has not changed. There were three different concept plans presented for this particular property in the eight years that I've worked for the Town. One was a 36 unit apartment building. This was prior to the four unit town houses being built on the Stratford Road. There was a 36 unit apartment proposed and given preliminary approval back in approximately 2002, to the APM Group. After that the APM Group came back and applied to rezone the property from PURD to Multiple Family Residential (R3) which would have doubled the density and allowed them to build a 72 unit apartment building. That application was denied. After that the Developers who developed the two, four unit townhouses on the Stratford Road had a concept plan for the overall parcel of land. It was with the two four units and at that time they could build a maximum of five units in on building before they had to detach it and have a separate building. In the upper portion, the concept plan showed a mixture of three and four unit buildings attached to each other around a private cul de sac area. There was no apartment building concept, at that time, that was under approval, so the bylaw hasn't changed but it would have allowed for an apartment at that time, it wasn't an application that was on the table at that time.

Resident: So, whoever I was talking to didn't know what they were talking about?

Development Officer: I can't comment on that.

Resident: My only issue is that, and again it doesn't come back to the building per say, is the property value. Apartment buildings are great in the apartment building areas, but not in the residential areas. Residential sales people tell me that my value is going down already. This is just because the proposal is in the area. My assessment has gone up \$40,000.

C.A.O. Just to help Council with their decision, if someone comes in

tomorrow with a concept for four six unit townhouses, or six four unit townhouses, and I don't know if they can physically fit on the site or not, whatever number they could fit, we couldn't say no to them. The zoning allows that without a public meeting, as long as they meet the bylaw requirements. So when it comes to planning board and council, would that be preferable if that does happen, or is what Marshall is trying to do with two twelve units. If this gets turned down, it is possible that someone at some point in time will come in with a proposal and you will not have any say in it.

Resident: The four unit buildings that are there now are more aesthetic, and again it's not the building, the four units look more residential than a big, three level apartment building. It matches the decor and the houses that are already there. All our side of the street are single family houses all the way up the road. My lot is nice and private, which is part of the reason that I bought it. It's a big lot, great neighbours, nice yard. The density that you are putting in there is crazy. For me, traffic flow is a big issue. Call it an occupational by product. I've gone to accident after accident at that intersection and it is getting worse. The perfect example of a traffic flow problem was when they had the Tour de PEI. and how much of a traffic hazard was created on the Kinlock Rd. It shows you how much traffic runs down that street.

Roma Cooper: Why put the building there?

Marshall MacPherson: There are not many vacant lots in Stratford where you can put an apartment building. Fay MacKinnon has some lots and she is working on putting streets in. I was approached by Simon to buy this property and was told that I could put apartment building on it. I think that it's a great location to maybe attract seniors and it is a nice piece of property. I hear your concerns. If the zoning is there I will probably do it if I'm allowed. I guess that's up to Council and we'll see how it goes from there.

Leo Shea: Would it be possible or feasible to put one level of seniors units there?

Marshall MacPherson: I didn't price that out.

Leo Shea: At least then it wouldn't be such a big, high apartment building and seniors are a lot nicer people. Like the lady said earlier it would be great if they were golfers. I would probably welcome that, with not knowing what clientele might be in there.

Marshall MacPherson: The problem is it is cheaper to go up than out.

Resident: The structures themselves don't match the neighbours.

Resident: We live in the R1 Zone and we knew that at some point in time it would develop and we were hoping that a single family dwelling home would go up in there to match our nice neighbourhood. The last thing that we want in there is apartment buildings because that does bring down our neighbourhood.

Marshall MacPherson: I'm surprised that when they did the subdivision it wasn't made part of the subdivision when it was built.

Resident: Someone else made that mistake.

Marshall MacPherson: I believe that it was zoned PURD and it was worth more money. That's why I'm suppose to be paying more money for it.

Resident: When was that area made?

Marshall MacPherson: I think around 2000.

Development Officer: It would have been in place in 1997 when the Official Plan and Bylaws were approved for the Town of Stratford. I don't know what it was prior to the Town amalgamating.

Councillor Gallant: Anymore questions or comments.

Resident: Are you saying that with the Bylaws they took that section and cut it into pieces, where this would be an R2 and this an R1.

Development Officer: That's correct. There is logic behind how things are laid out, such as availability of services, the proximity to intersections, etc. I hear your concerns about the Kinlock Road. The Kinlock Road is classified as a collector road. It is not a local street, so yes maybe there is more work that should be done in the future and that is something that the Town will work on hopefully with the Department of Transportation and Public Works in a Transportation Master Plan, which is one of the tasks for this year. I don't mean to alarm you, but at the end of the Kinlock Road it is all single family potential development. There is a subdivision that has preliminary for 150 lots and they have developed approximately 40 lots. There is also a subdivision across the street that has preliminary approval for 110 lots. It all zoned very low density residential beyond the golf course, but it will bring a lot of

traffic to the Kinlock Road.

Resident: The buildings are matching what is in the neighbourhood. This doesn't match, it doesn't fit. I would rather see more smaller units spread out at least I know it would probably keep my value, because it seems like it fits. The apartment building doesn't fit and in your bylaws it says the Town has to look at congestion and safety and everything, and I feel that this is going against what they are saying.

Resident: What is the land currently zoned up toward Sobeys on the Kinlock Road?

Development Officer: If you are referring to the Smallwood land, it is also zoned PURD. All three sections that were vacant at the time the Bylaw was passed were zoned PURD.

Resident: If you were to take the same building and put in that PURD Zone it would blend in, but not here with all the other houses.

Marshall MacPherson: The people in that area probably wouldn't like it either.

Resident: You would have a bigger buffer area there.

Marshall MacPherson: It is also a bigger piece of land and therefore a bigger building.

Brenda Goodine: The plans that are here on the table may not be completely accurate. Are you having the plans done by an architect?

Marshall MacPherson: The elevations that you are looking at are 99% accurate. If we go ahead we will put washers and dryers in each unit. There will be a few minor changes.

Brenda Goodine: The physical structure, will it be dressed up a bit to have more of an estate look to blend in with the character of the neighbourhood?

Marshall MacPherson: Compared to a lot of buildings that building is already dressed up. There is boston headers on the windows. It is not as typical as the apartments you will see.

Resident: Will the siding be brick?

Marshall MacPherson: The siding will be vinyl.

Brenda Goodine: So, is it possible when you drive by that you might mistake it for a country estate?

Marshall MacPherson: No. I'm not going to say that you would, you wouldn't.

Brenda Goodine: Because aesthetics are part of the concerns.

Councillor Gallant: One last chance for questions or comments.

If there are no further questions I'll outline the process that will take place following this public meeting. The Planning & Heritage Committee will meet on September 29, 2008 and they will review the comments from the public meeting and then make a recommendation to Council. Council will then make their decision at their regular monthly meeting in October.

Resident: If Council approves this application then you plan on starting ASAP.

Marshall MacPherson: Yes. I would like to get the paving put in before the asphalt plant closes.

Councilor Gallant then thanked everyone for attending the public meeting and asked residents to please forward any comments to either the planning department or any Council members so that planning board can have all the comments on record.

Meeting adjourned.

Councillor Emile Gallant
Planning & Heritage Vice -Chair