



Village of Point Edward
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
Zoning Amendment Application No. 1 of 2007

Owner: Dorothy Moore.

Re: Change the Zoning from One Family Residential 1.1 (R1.1) Zone to a Site Specific Residential zone which would permit the construction of a six unit freehold townhouse development.

Plan 2, Block F, Lots 2 and 3, Plan 25R-8448 – Livingston Street

Tuesday, June 12, 2007 at 6:00 p.m.

Point Edward Council Chambers, 135 Kendall Street, Point Edward, Ontario

All persons present were asked to sign attendance sheet with name and address.

1. Introduction by Mayor Kirkland

Mayor Kirkland advised that the Village of Point Edward is considering a Zoning By-law Amendment application submitted by Dorothy Moore to change the zoning from a One Family Residential 1.1 (R1.1) Zone to a Site Specific Residential zone which would permit the construction of a six unit freehold townhouse development.

The Planning Act requires that a public meeting be held in order to allow the Council to receive input from the general public about the proposed Zoning Amendment. A notice of this meeting was placed in the Sarnia Observer on May 22, 2007 and notices were sent to owners in the area of the proposed rezoning.

Mayor Kirkland asked the applicant or agent to give an explanation of the Zoning Amendment.

2. Applicant Comments

Moved by Deputy Mayor Robson
Seconded by Councillor Churchill

THAT Dorothy Moore and Ted Loxton be invited within the Bar.

CARRIED.

Mr. Loxton advised that the applicant would like to create six freehold residences that would be connected on the existing two lots. The parking would be contained in the back of the houses with two spaces for each unit. Therefore, Livingston Street parking will not be impacted. He has developed a staggered design of the units to ensure that neighbours will not lose their view of the Bridge or the Waterfront. There are two old buildings on the existing lots but they are not designated as historical. They plan to bring brick from the old houses into the design as architectural features. They will each have private patios with roof-top gardens. There will be no trees in the gardens except possibly in small pots.

Ms. Moore advised that each townhouse would be owned separately. It is not a condominium. Each unit is two storeys. Other items will be added to the site plan with an agreement being entered into with the Village. It will be nicely landscaped. They will include high-end units with the best of appliances and layouts. Each will have their own view.

3. Lambton County Planning Department Comments

Dave Posliff presented his planning report, a copy of which is attached.

4. Comments by General Public

Peggy Cramp read four letters from the following persons: Gerry Spanton, Doug and Mary Vance, Linda Braichet, and Clayton and Marlene Boyd, copies of which are attached.

Mayor Kirkland asked for any comments from the audience on the proposed Zoning amendment.

Gerry Spanton commented that it is an attractive artist conception but he would like Council to consider that this is a concept and may not end up looking like that. The Bluewater Anglers came out with a lovely concept plan but it did not turn out that way. What we see may not be what we get. The units could be sold or rented. Townhouses are not normally kept as well.

John Philbin commented that there will be congestion on Holder's Lane if parking at the back end is allowed. Some will park in front as well. If the park is full of people, there is no extra room for parking adding more congestion. These are multiple family dwellings. Cantaleigh is proposing 450 units similar to this. Why would the Village need more on Livingston where they are surrounded by single family dwellings. These are two prime lots for single residential dwellings. He is not trying to be negative but he opposes this proposal.

Lee Toole objected to the proposals based on all of the reasons previously mentioned. They should go to Venetian Blvd. for this type of development. There will be continued parking issues. She cannot get into her own property at times without the additional development. There are also the health issues with air quality from the Blue Water Bridges. This will allow more people to be affected by it.

Barb Horner echoed all the comments made. The concept is offensive. This is being proposed on 132 ft. Six units on 132 ft. is too great a density. She agreed with Mr. Spanton that it is not in character with the Village. The Village is enjoying the wonders of well-planned growth.

Natalie Gilroy echoed the comments of Gerry Spanton. She objects to the proposal.

Bryan Brown applauded the four letters. This will place more vehicles on Holder's Lane. He measured from the hydro pole to the property fence on Holder's Lane and it was 13 ft. It is very narrow. There is one streetlight. The alley could have dramatic changes affecting neighbours. Kids use the path for walking. He agreed with the safety hazards mentioned from other Departments. When you drive down the alley, you go in but it is difficult to leave. He does not like the proposal. The concept is great but not in this location.

Rick Moyer commented that the proposal does not match anything in Point Edward. The width of the garage door is questionable. With the units having flat roofs, they will want shade and could put gazebos, tents, etc. on it. It will be a campground on the roof. It does not match the rest of Point Edward. There should be a maximum of four units. These would fit fine on the other side of the Bridges but it doesn't match here.

Hazel Brown advised that this property backs on to her property. She asked if there are any plans to change Holder's Lane. It is a busy lane and this will bring 12 cars to the back. She first heard that there would be four units but now it has increased to six. Two cars cannot meet on Holder's Lane. For snow removal, they need four feet on either side. She measured between the two 'No Parking' signs and it was 16 ft. If you meet a car on Holder's Lane, someone has to go on to private property. This will lose the Village identity. It was single family dwellings. She commended others who have commented and the points that they have made. They have beautiful homes and this proposal should not be considered.

Jean Marie Graves is not an owner but has lived here for 25 years. She has a feel of the entire area and is proud of each unit. She does not want the Village to lose its identity. There could be parties on top of the roofs. It is emotional and it will affect the feel of the entire Point.

5. Conclusion by Mayor Kirkland

Mayor Kirkland advised that Council may deal with this Zoning By-law amendment tonight immediately following the public meeting or they will deal with it at a future Council meeting.

He asked that any person who wants further notice of the passage of the by-law should give their name, address and postal code to the Clerk prior to leaving the meeting.

All persons who have given the Clerk a request to be notified of the decision will be notified within 15 days of the date of the decision. There is a 20 day appeal period following the sending of the notice.

Resolution #1

Moved by Councillor MacKenzie

Seconded by Councillor Hand

THAT the Application for the Zoning By-law Amendment be deferred until a future meeting to provide an opportunity to consider the Application and to obtain final recommendations from Dave Posliff; and further that everyone who signed the Public Meeting list be notified prior to the application being brought forward to Council for decision.

CARRIED.

6. Meeting Adjournment

Resolution #2

Moved by Councillor MacKenzie

Seconded by Deputy Mayor Robson

THAT the public meeting for the Application for Zoning By-law Amendment by Dorothy Moore, be adjourned.

CARRIED.

Mayor Dick Kirkland

CAO Peggy Cramp