



City of Kenora
Planning Advisory Committee
60 Fourteenth St. N., 2nd Floor
Kenora, Ontario P9N 4M9
807-467-2292

Meeting Minutes
City of Kenora Planning Advisory Committee
Regular Meeting held in the Operations Centre Building
60 Fourteenth St. N., 2nd Floor – Training Room
March 19, 2019
6:00pm

Present:

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| Wayne Gauld | Chair |
| Ray Pearson | Member |
| Graham Chaze | Member |
| Bev Richards | Member |
| John Barr | Member |
| Robert Kitowski | Member |
| Tanis McIntosh | Member |
| John McDougall | Member |
| Devon McCloskey | City Planner |
| Kylie Hissa | Secretary Treasurer |

Regrets:

| | |
|-------------|--------|
| Andrew Koch | Member |
|-------------|--------|

DELEGATION:

- (i) Wayne Gauld, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm and reviewed the meeting protocol for those in attendance.
- (ii) Additions to agenda - there were none.
- (iii) Declaration of interest by a member for this meeting or at a meeting at which a member was not present – there were none.
- (iv) Adoption of minutes of previous meeting
The Chair asked the Committee if there were any questions or corrections to the minutes as circulated.
 - Approved as written: February 26th, 2019 minutes of the regular Kenora Planning Advisory Committee meeting.
- (v) Correspondence relating to the application before the Committee
 - The Secretary Treasurer indicated that additional correspondence had been received related to all applications. The items, which were public

comments and comments from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR), had been circulated to Committee members via email as well as printed for their review.

- (vi)** Consideration of applications for minor variance
- D13-19-05, K Sports

Tara Rickaby, Agent
TMER Consulting

Tara Rickaby introduced herself as the Agent for the file. The owner of the subject property, John Derouard, was also in attendance. The Agent explained that the application is for permission to enlarge the existing marine accessory building, which is legal non-conforming to the existing R2-Residential Second Density zone. The use of the land as a marina dates back to the early 1990s, which has made the operations having been ongoing for over 50 years.

The Agent stated that the existing sea cans on the property will be removed, and that the easements won't be affected by the construction of the addition. The Agent also explained that the property includes a portion of Laurenson's Creek, which is unusual. A scoped Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was undertaken by a local biologist, Ryan Haines. It was felt that given the historical and current uses, the proposed storage building addition could reduce the impact, as storm water would be better managed. Currently, there is some impact at times with a few marsh grasses as a result of the runoff; however, this will be more controlled and a concrete floor would be graded to ensure one point of discharge for drainage.

There will also be a minimum of 5m of riparian buffer established. Plantings will be required to ensure that the storm water coming off of the roof won't go directly into the creek and cause issues such as erosion. These have been listed as conditions to the approval and would likely form part of a site plan agreement.

The Agent explained that the application is supported by the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), as the proposed addition intensifies the employment while protecting natural features. The proposed addition does not represent a major change in use and the considerations by the biologist and comments will prevent adverse effects as well as will ensure compatibility to residential uses to the east. The Agent initially stated that the sea cans will be removed but then clarified that they will not be removed, by the current owner. Parking won't be affected and the structure would provide more privacy to abutting residences.

The Planner presented the planning report, indicating that the addition will be approximately 75 ft by 89 ft for cold storage. The application provided supporting documentation that no negative impacts will occur, and noted that non-conforming uses are permitted to be expanded given that the use meets the intent of the Official Plan. The MNR also received circulation of the application and provided comments; there were no significant concerns.

It was the Planner's professional opinion that the application be given conditional approval. The suggested conditions as per her report had been included within the EIS and she would add that there is careful consideration of the construction process as identified by the MNRF.

When asked about the shipping containers, the Agent stated that they have been on the property for over 20 years, thereby proceeding the By-law.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of or against the application. There were none.

The Chair asked the Committee if they had questions pertaining to the application.

Wayne Gault, Chair, referenced the submitted EIS report and asked about the suggestions to have a drain system in the concrete floor. The Agent explained that plans changed so there will be a design to ensure that the appropriate grade is achieved. The water would drain outwards.

Tanis McIntosh wondered whether the recommendation for approval was based on the assumption that the shipping containers be removed. She asked whether there would be concerns if they are not removed, given that the EIS was undertaken on that same assumption of the removal, and if drainage would still be an issue. The Planner confirmed that the shipping containers are not close to the subject area and so drainage won't be a concern whether or not they remain.

John Barr referenced the sloping floor for the proposed addition and asked whether they will be handling petroleum products, in which case an oil separator would be needed. The owner stated that they would not be. John Barr also asked whether there will be a metal roof, to which the owner confirmed that it will be such. The owner also confirmed that they would be responsible for cleaning out the catch basin.

The Chair asked the Committee if they are okay with adding the conditions identified by Ryan Haines in an email that preceded the EIS. The Committee agreed.

Graham Chaze noted that no one has complained of the shipping containers as of yet and does not see it being a requirement for them to remove as part of this application. He believed all the issues have been addressed through the recommendations of the EIS and the biologist.

There was no further discussion.

Moved by: John Barr

Seconded by: Ray Pearson

That the Kenora Planning Advisory Committee gives conditional approval to application for permission file D13-19-05, seeking relief from section 3.21.1 (a) ii. – which requires that a situation of legal non-conformance/compliance not be increased. Approval of the application permission file D13-19-05 will allow a situation of legal non-conformance, being the existing use of the property as a Marina in a R2-Residential Second Density zone, to be increased as a result of the construction of a

cold storage addition to an existing marine accessory building with a setback of 7.16 m to the high watermark; conditional on the following:

- That the eaves troughs designed to handle a one in ten year rain event be installed and maintained for the existing and newly constructed storage buildings. These eaves troughs (downspouts) will direct water from the roof lines directly into the wetland area;
- That a minimum of 5m riparian buffer be established along the entire north facing shoreline adjacent to the newly constructed storage building;
- That the floor height of the new constructed storage building be a minimum of 3.23.9m above sea level;
- That a cement floor is to be poured so that it is sloped into the middle of the building;
- That a large, sealed (no outlet) catch basin is to be installed in the middle of the cement floor;
- That the catch basin is to be cleaned out on a regular basis to ensure it does not overflow.

Carried.

- D13-19-06, Cunningham

Matthew Good, Owner(s)
40-A Decemvir Drive, Black Sturgeon Lake

Matthew Good introduced himself as one of the owners and co-applicant of the subject property. He apologized on behalf of his wife, Alex Cunningham, who could not make it. She is the primary applicant.

The Applicant explained that the main purpose of the application is to generate some kind of operational income during the period of his wife's maternity leave. She comes from the tourism industry in Saskatchewan and has a strong passion for this type of business. They had been looking at the ability to have a home occupation and their intention was never to disturb surrounding neighbours.

The Applicant stated that the proposed home occupation would be a "glamping" business, which in simpler terms, is glamorous camping. He further explained the business proposal, which had been submitted as part of the application. Notably, the tents would resemble a hotel room and there would be a proposed shared bathroom facility on site. To alleviate concerns from the public, there would be an established quiet time, no pets allowed, no smoking in and directly around the tents, and there would be a limit on the number of visitors. An extra fee would be required if there are additional guests to disincentive numerous patrons staying overnight at once.

The variance is seeking relief from the zoning provisions for Bed and Breakfasts. The Applicant explained that instead of having up to four (4) units, they are only planning on having three units, which will be detached from the dwelling. The choice to have less was because of concerns regarding limited space on the property and to be

respectful of their neighbours' privacy and those in the vicinity. It would be sustainable development with limited tree clearing. Due to financial abilities to undertake their proposal, they need to have at least three units to make it viable. The Applicant stressed that they do not want to adversely affect the neighbours or the environment. They have also had preliminary discussions with the Northwestern Health Unit and there was the understanding that this development would require improvements and permit approval. Development is all within their property and they will also be approaching a third party surveyor to confirm the setbacks to lot lines.

The Applicants further explained that neighbours are approximately 11m lower in elevation than where their dwelling is situated. This is evident by the tree growth and sound attenuation. The neighbours to the south are approximately 75m away with tree growth and given these factors, they do not believe that the proposed glamping sites will obstruct any views. There will be locations for the disposal of garbage, which they would then bring to the transfer station. The Applicant highlighted that this is their home too and there are no plans to make it a garbage dump. To address concerns over property values, local realtors indicated that it is solely based on opinion. It is a matter of perception and with the improvements to the lot, they saw it as being a more positive outlook.

When they did a quick calculation, the total area of all structures would make up approximately 3.5% of the total lot area. They also plan on having the Fire Marshall visit the site to ensure that they meet code and that the structures have fire retardant material. The Applicant recognized that this is their first time doing local business and are willing to work with those in the area to make sure it is as low impact as possible. The Applicant stated that for full transparency, he does work in the Engineering Department at the City of Kenora; however, in no way did he participate in any part of the approval or providing of comments. He had attended the meeting to represent his wife, Alex, and the business.

The Applicant described how their proposal meets the four tests. They would be contributing to the local economy and they expect that some of their clientele may wish to fly to this location out of the local airport. If approved, they would comply with all other general provisions listed. Currently there is no permitted use that would apply to this business, and since they are living onsite, it would qualify as a home based business. The proposal would not impact property owners any more than what a Bed and Breakfast would. To specify, the Applicant noted that some comments had been received about the lack of boat launches. In the future, if there is a need, there may be paddle boards used but their current proposal is solely the glamping units.

The Planner presented the Planning Report for file D13-19-06. The proposal would be similar to those with short term accommodation and in this case, there would be luxury camping units with access to plumbing. The planning rationale gave a detailed description of how concerns will be mitigated. Neighbouring uses are both seasonal and full-time.

The Planner explained that a number of policies within the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) apply to support development in the Rural Area. Small-scale commercial uses

are encouraged with home occupations as well as tourist uses. The property is zoned RR-Rural Residential in the Zoning By-law. A Bed and Breakfast is a permitted use; however, they are generally required to be part of a single-detached dwelling. She noted that this is a rather groundbreaking proposal. During the pre-consultation meeting, the BnB concept was used as the scale would be similar to the proposed use and to ensure that the commercial operation would not overrun the residential character of the dwelling.

The Building Department did comment that a Zoning By-law Amendment may be a better tool and Kenora Fire commented on access with tents and structures built to be in conformance with the building code. There should also be smoking alarms and no smoking. The application was circulated to property owners within 60 m and as of the date of the meeting, the Planning Department received nine written comments. Generally, concerns were over a loss of privacy, that it would be precedent setting, that the property won't be desirable, over the lot size, and that it would not be offering a remote type of attraction.

The Planner described how the application meets the four tests. It was her professional opinion that the Committee takes into consideration the comments that had not been received as of the writing of the report. She noted that the proposal would not be able to proceed if not all three units were included. She believed that the neighbourhood should be able to comment on compatibility and that this information should be considered for the rendering of the decision.

The Applicant wished to clarify that photo three in the report is the entrance to the proposed glamping sites, despite being identified as "site three".

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of the application. There were none.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak against the application.

John Donetz
33 Decemvir Drive

Mr. Donetz wished to speak against the application. He explained that he has academic (post graduate degree) background in fisheries and resource management. When they bought the cottage, the area was very undeveloped; however, they were not naive to think things would remain that way. They anticipated more cottages and boats, considering it is a beautiful area. He stated that when he looks at this proposal, he believes it would fundamentally change the intent of having a seasonal cottage use. They see it as being a major change. He also wished to comment that in his own experience with notification periods, they have always been required to incorporate the views by those most affected by a development. His lot is right next door and while he had briefly met one of the Applicants, he was not informed that this development would be taking place. He believed that these types of proposals should not be done in the dead of winter when seasonal residents are not around; not unless

the Applicants have gone to the extreme to reach out to them. Mr. Donetz noted that he did speak with Kylie, who had sent him a copy of the notice via email. He believes that a Bed and Breakfast should be part of the dwelling. He does not see this as being similar and believes the definition is being misused.

He stated that definitions are established in the first place for a reason, and he objects for this term to be used under this proposal. Mr. Donetz further stated that whenever he worked on projects within Ontario, two things stop things from proceeding: 1) public comments; and 2) Northwestern Health Unit approval. He was surprised to hear that they were so willing to support this project. He explained that he and his wife are opposed, partially because they do not know much about it, that they were not well informed about it, and that also he believes that it will change the character of the area. If it is approved, he recommended that the parking is moved off the property line and towards the other side. He mentioned that there was a dock proposed and doesn't see if working with the drop in elevation. Lastly, he wanted to suggest that the City consider servicing the rural areas. If this proposal came with sewer, water, and natural gas, they might rethink it.

Grant Nelin
28 Decemvir Drive

Grant introduced himself as one of the neighbours in the area, and noted that his neighbours are also Audrey and Bruce Hosegood. He stated that they had not been contacted about the proposal. Audrey requested that Grant present to the Committee on their behalf.

Mr. Nelin read the comments that were provided by Ms. Hosegood, as emailed to the Planning Department and provided to the Committee prior to the meeting. Listed concerns were: parking, boat launching, light pollution, septic load, existing status of Decemvir Drive, garbage, jumping cliffs, house/lot size, seasonal use, timing, buffer, property values, property enjoyment, water use/boat traffic, frontage, precedent setting, business plan, fire safety, newbies, and setting. The comments concluded by stating that they believe the application should be denied and that a true B&B would be an acceptable business in their opinion, with the proper infrastructure (i.e. addition to the home & parking).

Mr. Nelin then read his own comments, which had also been provided to the Planning Department and Committee prior to the meeting. Generally, his concerns were: that the definition for campground is more suitable than B&B; that the application is major in scope; noise pollution; sanitation/waste disposal; location danger; safety & security; clearing of vegetation; unfair competition to hotels etc.; precedence setting; short notice/winter timing of the application; possible conflict of interest. It was summarized that the application is a major stress in the neighbourhood and that it should not be approved.

Steve Garrett
Vice President, Black Sturgeon Lake

Property Owners Association (BSLPOA)

Steve Garrett introduced himself as the Vice President of the BSLPOA. He noted that Phil Burns, the President, had submitted a letter outlining concerns on behalf of the Association. In summary, he indicated that he was confused with the difference of this being a campground versus a Bed and Breakfast. Another concern was regarding the lot size. It was noted that for a home industry, the minimum lot size is 2 ha, which the subject property is well below. Lastly, the comments raised concern over Northwestern Health Unit approval. In summary, they wished that the application be declined for approval.

Janet Hyslop
364 East Melick Road

Janet Hyslop introduced herself as another neighbour in the area. She noted that they live outside the 60m for public notice, but do have comments and concerns; most of which, have been addressed already. She believed that the City has been remissed with proceeding with the application and that there should be more opportunities to speak. She explained that this application can be considered life changing to seasonal residents and that there needs to be more discussion on the lake and the small bay; it has already been impacted by the subdivision applications. She asked that the City takes that into consideration and that there may be ways to have these kinds of ideas in other locations.

Margot Nelin
28 Decemvir Drive

Margot Nelin wished to speak on behalf of another resident, Tino Brambilla. She read the comments that had been provided to the Planning Department and the Committee prior to the meeting started. Generally, concerns were over the impact of the business on the character of the surrounding area, and that an Environmental Impact Assessment should be performed. The comments concluded by saying that in a truly rural and isolation location, this proposal would be reasonable. However, in this case, the location is surrounded by unsupported neighbours and will lead to conflict and detrimental relationships.

The Chair asked the Committee if they had questions pertaining to the application.

Graham Chaze asked the Planner if there was consideration for the application to be a Zoning By-law Amendment. The Planner stated that no, there wasn't. She explained that the application came forward as a minor variance to existing provisions. As submitted, there is some interpretation and the Committee evaluates an application on the four tests. The notification period was met by statutory requirements and the application was submitted without knowing public comments. She noted that it is good that residents were there.

John Barr stated that he does not think that the request for a variance to the rules for a BnB is not valid since, without the provision of meals, the proposal does not fit

the definition of a Bed and Breakfast. Also, he explained that the addition of three units would likely require an expansion of the current septic system. In addition, if they are using lake water for consumption the system would fall within the definition of a small drinking water system under the *Health Protection and Promotion Act* and require disinfection and filtration for the removal of cryptosporidium. The Health Unit would need to identify any additional requirements. Lastly, he noted that the access road is steep and narrow and that he is unsure about fire protection. He asked the Applicant whether they had looked into these items.

The Applicant noted that he could understand why people would relate the proposal more so to camping than "glamping". When they were originally looking at policies, the Bed and Breakfast with the exception of it being within the dwelling unit, seemed to fit. If there was a glamping by-law, they would have gone that route. He explained that it is not an excuse and perhaps that it was their ignorance in the process. His wife, Alex, would not be providing meals per se. Rather, more so what a hotel would provide such as coffee and water. He also explained that there are a number of infrastructure improvements that they would need to make. One, being capacity, and these costs have been built into the business plan. The Applicant agreed that they would need to abide by everything the Health Unit stipulates and that they don't plan on skipping any requirements. They do not want to infect people with poor drinking water.

Wayne Gauld indicated that the property keeps being referred to as Rural. The Applicant clarified that it is zoned RR-Rural Residential, but is designated Rural Area under the Official Plan. Wayne then asked the Planner if they are trying to define this use as a B&B. The Planner explained that the Committee has the ability to approve relief for use or for setbacks. In this case, it is a review of the use. A Zoning By-law Amendment application would come up with a definition and there would be a site specific provision. The Applicants opted to apply through a minor variance and demonstrate that there would be no negative impacts.

John McDougall asked to clarify the difference between glamping and regular camping. The Applicant explained that this application is truly his partner's "baby" and that given her background in tourism, she would probably be able to explain it better. Unfortunately, she was unable to make it today. He referenced the photos that had been submitted in the application, and noted that they sort of define it visually. They would be providing furniture, beds, sheets, etc. It is similar to a hotel room.

John McDougall asked how many beds there will be. The Applicant stated he believes it would be a single queen sized bed. To deter additional people, there would be an extra fee per person. John asked whether there could be potentially twelve people on site with all the traffic etc. He asked if they would be able to show up with an atv or boat trailer. The Applicant indicated that they are not advertising it and that he does not believe there are any plans to advertise boating. There will be spots for a fire pit but no trails. It's like a hotel – they are there to sleep and will have to leave to do those activities.

John McDougall asked when they talked to the Health Unit, if they understand that there may be up to four residences on site. The Applicant explained that there is a process when an application to them is submitted. There are load requirements and capacity; all of those things have been taken into account. It was clarified that there will not be kitchenettes, only bathrooms and beds. In order to offset the costs, they need all three "glamping" units. The Health Unit would need to approve that and they recognize that they can't move forward without their support.

Tanis McIntosh asked why it was decided that the requested use did not meet the definition of a campground. The Planner explained that it could have but it would imply the use of trailers and numerous tents. In her opinion, there were a number of things about this proposal that would be different than a campground. It was felt that relief could be given to something that was already a provision and it was an attempt to review a permitted use. The bed and breakfast was chosen because it could be argued that it would have a similar size and scale of use. There is no criteria for the scale of use for a campground, which would mean that there could have been the option to bring in RVs. She believed the relationship is different. She also had been under the impression that meals would be provided.

The Chair asked the Committee for discussion prior to making a decision.

Robert Kitowski indicated that there may be value in adding a definition for glamping in the Zoning By-law. He noted that perhaps it should have been added prior to this application but he understands that it doesn't change this one.

Tanis McIntosh stated that given the comments from the public, she questioned whether or not it can be considered minor in nature.

John McDougall echoed those comments. Without a clearer definition, he believed that they owe it to the residents that we clearly define the use to ensure that it is compatible or not, given the location.

Ray Pearson expressed that he is interested in the concept; however, in his opinion, he doesn't think the concept meets the definition for B&B and unfortunately, there is no definition for glamping. In his opinion, a tent is a tent and an amendment to the By-law would have been more appropriate. He was also concerned about the precedence that it would set in the RR zone.

Bev Richards stated she agreed with everything said so far.

Graham Chaze also agreed, noting the concerns over the septic and the environment. He believed it is still camping and that it is not minor. It is not a compatible use, which had been demonstrated by all the comments received by the public.

Robert Kitowski believed that a lot of the concerns can be mitigated and part of the recommendation is that NWHU approval is given. If they can't get clearance by the Health Unit, then they cannot proceed. He noted that it would be nice to have a definition for glamping and that this application is sort of a hybrid. He stated that at

the last meeting they were discussing smaller homes and that we are not set-up for smaller homes. Obviously, the City is not yet set up for this type of use. Anyone else interested in a similar proposal would also have to go through this process and have their application evaluated by the Committee. He indicated that visitors can bring RVs and stuff to his own property, noting that it is not that big of an issue in this case. He was not convinced that this is a horrible idea and that it can't proceed.

Graham Chaze explained that in his opinion, the proposal is not conducive to the size of the property. If there was an additional buffer area to address light and noise and safety concerns, it would be different. Looking at all of these factors, together, it is evident that it is not ideal for this specific property. He would be open to looking at a re-zoning application for a different RR lot to accommodate this use.

Tanis McIntosh noted that after reading the definitions for campground and campsite, she doesn't see anything that does not meet that definition in this proposed use. The structures are still tents and showers will be put on site. It doesn't need to have all of the potential options and so it still meets the definition.

There was no further discussion.

Moved by: Graham Chaze

Seconded by: Ray Pearson

That the Kenora Planning Advisory Committee does not approve application for minor variance file no. D13-19-06, seeking relief from Section 3.4 (a) – which requires that a Bed and Breakfast form part of a single-detached dwelling. That the application does not meet the definition of a Bed and Breakfast and potentially not minor in nature.

Carried.

The Committee took a break from the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

The Meeting commenced again at 8:04 p.m.

(vii) Consideration of applications for consent

(viii) Consideration of applications for Draft Plan of Subdivision

- D07-19-01, Green

Patti McLaughlin & Owen Green (Owner)
1337 River Drive, Kenora ON

Owen Green introduced the application, explaining that it is to approve four (4) building lots at 1337 River Drive, which is behind Tim Hortons on the East Highway. He noted that there is a lane allowance between his property and the business. Mr. Green referenced the draft sketch prepared for the application that showed the proposed lots and their measurements. He indicated that there is an existing home now on proposed lot 4.

The Planner presented the Planning Report for file D07-19-01. The purpose of the application is to receive draft plan approval of subdivision in accordance with the R2-Residential Second Density zone provisions. Initially, the proposed frontages for each of the lots was going to be 15.24m but now they will have 16m of frontage, per the draft sketch provided. The Planner explained that there is part of a land and numerous lots that had been part of an old subdivision, Plan M63. Lots would be municipally serviced and servicing them would be the responsibility of future purchasers. The density of the area is similar to this proposal, which residences being single detached dwellings. The application will contribute to the overall housing supply in the City and it is centrally located in Kenora, being approximately 2 km of downtown.

The Engineering Department commented that it would be a requirement that the front lots are filled and sloped towards River Drive to control surface water. There would be some benefit to have the driveway and roof drainage go out towards River Drive and it is not suggested that development should fully surface drain to the south side as there is only one small storm pipe, which is private. The lot to the west will have to account for the existing fire hydrant, which will hinder access. The Building Department didn't have concerns with the application but did note that there was a storm drain provided on the private property and that it is there to service the land. Joint utility easements would typically be required by Synergy North.

The Planner explained that the Engineering Department did request a drainage plan to support their comments so that prior to signing off on the subdivision, there is a "build-to" plan in place. New owners would be aware of this and would be required to build to those standards. As of today's date, there is not a process for this under the building permit process.

No written comments had been received by the public as of the date of the meeting. It was the Planner's professional opinion that the application is given draft approval. She read the listed conditions are per the amended planning report and those noted in the decision.

The Applicant referenced the concern over drainage and explained that the property does slope from the north to the south. He didn't think any development will worsen any drainage as it has never been a problem on the lower end of the lot. With the development, it will slope to the street and any homes build would be at grade to the street.

The Planner explained that the area at the back of the property is quite wet and the concern is that if it were to get more water, the land would reach capacity and water would get pushed towards private land. She further explained that the condition only requests a plan for drainage, which would be a "build-to" requirement.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of or against the application. There were none.

The Chair asked the Committee if they had questions pertaining to the application.

John Barr noted that the three new lots appear to be pretty low in relation to the street elevation. He asked if they would need to pump sewage to sewer. The Applicant explained that the elevation is at a level high enough that wastewater flows to the street sewer would be by gravity.

The Chair asked the Committee for discussion prior to making a decision.

Ray Pearson requested clarification from the Planner as to why the condition for easements was removed. The Planner explained that they could have left the condition as an "if required" statement; however, the Applicant was worried that there may be confusion later on whether or not it would actually be required.

Bev Richards asked about the PINS, and noted that one PIN had been excluded in the planning report. The Planner confirmed that it has been added to the approval and that the Applicant is in the process of consolidating the PINs now.

Graham Chaze asked whether the application could have been done through consent, if they are separate PINs. The Planner explained that it could have gone through that process. In earlier meetings it was explained the process, which includes that the transfers need to have taken place within a year. A draft plan of subdivision allows them to maintain ownership. In this situation, there is no extension of services required or an agreement.

There was no further discussion.

Moved by: John Barr

Seconded by: Bev Richards

That application D07-19-01 for proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision, being PIN #'s 42168-0176, 42168-0175, 42168-0174, 42168-0173, 42168-0181, 42168-0655, described as Lots 53 to 55, 60 to 64 of Plan M63, Part of Lane and Part 1 of Reference Plan 23R-14558, be given Draft Approval by the Corporation of the City of Kenora Planning Advisory Committee, subject to the amended conditions as outlined in the planning report. That the application meets the criteria set out in Section 51 (24) of the Planning Act and will increase the supply of housing for the City of Kenora.

Carried.

(ix) New Business

- Recommendation(s), Application for an Amendment to the Zoning By-law:
 - i. D14-19-03, KDSB

Tara Rickaby, Agent
TMER Consulting Kenora Inc.

Tara Rickaby introduced herself as the acting Agent for the file. She has been retained by the KDSB and the property owner has granted them agency. The Agent was joined by Ben Reynolds (KDSB), Henry Wall (KDSB), Meghan McCarville (OAHs), and Sara

Stevenson (KDSB). She explained that the application is proposing to add a definition for supportive housing, which is a residential use and that is becoming more and more prevalent in Canada. She highlighted that it is not an Institutional use and that the use does not include a correctional facility. In this application, they are requesting to add the definition in the Zoning By-law as well as include it as a permitted use to the R3-Residential Third Density and I-Institutional zones. The application would also be removing the hold symbol and a concurrent application for consent has been applied for. And Environmental Impact Statement was also undertaken and the report was included in the application.

The Agent described how the application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) and that the development would be a type of supervised residential housing build. She explained that the subject land is part of the former mill site and although not official part of the Community Improvement Plan for the site, Council has indicated that providing affordable housing in this location is one of the key goals. The land itself is within the settlement area and designated as "Residential Area". This is a housing type that will meet current and future needs, as well as represents mixed uses in neighbourhoods. Site plan will apply and will consider urban planning guidelines.

There is also a proposed amendment to the parking requirement. A decision was made to change the requirements in general by including this new definition of supportive housing and to have a consequential parking requirement. It would be less than what is required for an apartment. The Agent noted that Council did adopt a resolution the week prior at the Committee of the Whole meeting for the extension of watermain and for a portion of the unopened road allowance.

Henry Wall (KDSB) thanked the public for attending the meeting to hear more about the proposal. He noted that it has been an opportunity that has come fairly quickly. The City of Kenora is in a housing crisis and that includes those who cannot afford housing as well as find housing. The Kenora District Services Board (KDSB) has been lobbying both provincial and federal governments for funding. The process for this development began only in January and it shows that the government is interested in supporting the City.

Henry also clarified that the partnership is between the Ontario Aboriginal Housing Services (OAHS) and the projects they do are inclusive. This project will also be inclusive and will not exclude any race or culture thereof. In terms of other projects, any build is of top quality; it does not look like a stereotypical affordable housing build. They strive to add value to this neighbourhood.

Meghan McCarville spoke on behalf of the OAHS, indicating that they serve over 10,000 people daily in both urban and rural areas. They focus on indigenous peoples finding housing but they also help those that are not; they believe all people deserve safe accessible housing. They have also received excellent feedback from the build in Sioux Lookout and are hoping to help address a need in Kenora.

Sarah Stevenson introduced herself as the Director of Integrated Social Services with the KDSB and explained that they have a list of community partners, including schoolboards, the OPP, women's programs, health programs, indigenous programs, etc. In partnership with the OAHS, they developed Homeward Bound in Dryden, which was designed for single mothers. The intent of this particular project is to meet the local needs in Kenora. The details on criteria, application process, and demographics are being determined through consultation with community partners. Ultimately, the project is to support people to have a better and healthier life. They examine the driving force of homelessness and come up with new solutions. They've learned about the justice system, health system and other organizations and how they drive housing needs. They have read the comments received from the public so far. She noted that this an opportunity to hear from the community and it will inform how they make decisions for this specific program.

The Planner presented the planning report for file D14-19-03. She noted that there was a lot of general misunderstanding or wanting more information from the public. She thanked the representatives for clarifying some details. She explained that development would be in accordance to Official Plan policy as it is located in an area designated for growth. Services and utilities are able to be provided.

The Planner further explained that the R2-Residential Second Density zone does not currently allow for higher density development. There is also a holding zone, as it was not known how the property would be accessed. Details have now been brought forward that alleviate those uncertainties and so now the hold zone is able to be removed. The proposed main entrance connecting off of Ninth Street has raised some concern; although, there is the option to have a second and alternative access off of City property.

Land drainage is suggested to be directed towards Ninth Street North, which would also be a construction priority. Synergy North commented that they have an interest in hydro poles off of Ninth Street. The driveway over the proposed municipal service easement shall also be maintained. Kenora Fire commented that private hydrants should be constructed to support large trucks. The Planner highlighted that the statutory public meeting is held on April 9th, 2019 and that the KDSB has conducted community consultation door-to-door with information. There will also be an information and open house scheduled on Thursday, held by the KDSB.

As of the date of the meeting, the Planning Department had received eight written comments by the public. Statements were generally made with concerns with the occupants and assumptions over the character of the persons as well as concern with it being located near the community club and the schools. There were also concerns with increased crime, requests for buffering and fencing.

Servicing and access will be further evaluated with the severance and site plan control. In 2015 the location was identified as being idea for future housing development. Provisions to support individuals and families is also needed. Reduced costs in emergency services are significant, which follows a cost analysis that had been done for the development in Sioux Lookout.

It was the Planner's professional opinion that the Committee makes recommendation to approve the application in consideration of public comments. She read the listed amendments to the By-law.

The Agent wished to highlight the open house that will be held at the Ukrainian Hall on Fourth Street North. She stated that there will be the opportunity for additional questions and other presentations. Henry Wall (KDSB) explained that they will have community organizations presenting and a delegation from Sioux Lookout. They want to make sure that this development adds to the community in an inclusive and healthy way. The Open House will take place from 6 to 8 p.m. on Thursday March 21st, 2019.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak in favour of the application. There were none.

The Chair asked if there was anyone in the public whom wished to speak against the application.

Jana Lasso
1030 Ninth Street North

Jana Lasso wished to speak against the application. She asked whether the Sioux Lookout facility is across the street from the school. Henry Wall stated that it is not. Ms. Lasso explained that she does not believe this proposal is conducive to the school environment. She explained that she works at the school and her daughter goes there. She believed it would be different if families would be living in this development and if children were going to be at Evergreen School. She stated that low income families do come to the school and are given services. She asked whether families will be housed in this build. Henry Wall clarified that for this particular build, they would not be.

Stan Zroback
1022 Ninth Street North

Stan Zroback asked for clarification whether the build was for 20 units or 30. The Agent clarified that it is a 20 unit build. Mr. Zroback then asked how much it will cost and stated that there are hundreds of people homeless in the area. He asked how this would solve the issue. Henry Wall explained that this is a starting point.

Ed Titley
917 Minto Street

Ed Titley stated that the area is a school zone with young children, noting that increased traffic is a concern. He explained that there is already heavy traffic and the community club has functions. He has lived in the area for a long time and when

school is in, it becomes a very congested area as kids are going and leaving school. He understood that housing is a need but was uncertain with it being at this location.

Samantha Atchison
1124 Valley Drive

Samantha Atchison stated that she is a mother and her daughter goes to Evergreen School. She was also worried that families would not be housed there, as her daughter is blind and will need to learn to walk home from school. She believed other buildings in town are more suitable and asked why they couldn't buy something already built and gut it to do this. She asked about policing, noting that they already have enough break and enters. She realized that there is a housing crisis and highlighted that her mom had been homeless as well. She asked if all apartments were full.

Benoit Duhaime
1009 Guernsey Street

Benoit Duhaime also commented on the proximity to the school. He explained that in twelve years of being a teacher at Thomas Aquinas, they have gone through many lock downs and it is going on the increase. He didn't have an idea who the residents are that will be housed in this development. His concern was the transitory aspect of the building and stated that if it were families, it would be fine. He asked who would be doing the check up and if people are suffering from addictions or mental illness, they will be further from downtown. He asked who is responsible for the maintenance of the building.

Henry Wall (KDSB) explained that they are well aware of the proximity to the school and that they have personally reached out to the principal. It is hoped that the principal would be part of the intake process for those going into the building. He recognized that there are a lot of unknowns and misperceptions. They want to be as transparent as they can. Maintenance would be done by the KDSB and the OAHS.

Benoit Duhaime noted that there is a lot of unknowns and that he doesn't do unknowns when it comes to children. His concern is not related to the taxes, it is the children. He asked if they are saying that the community center will be infringed on, and stated that the purpose of a community is to build up community centers like this. He asked if they are removing the evergreen community center.

Henry Wall explained that over the past winter, he has received numerous calls from a teacher in Sioux Lookout. A tenant they have is a student and also is a tenant in the supportive housing program.

Derek Rieu
1003 Guernsey Street

Derek Rieu explained that he received a flyer about the development in his mailbox and noted that he did not speak to anyone from KDSB. He stated that if this goes

through, he will not put a kid anywhere close to a supportive housing build. He stated that he is a young upcoming person and news travels quick. He recognized that the City does need it but that there are other areas.

Tammy Higen
904 North Campbell Street

Tammy Higen spoke that she is against where the build is going but that she is supportive of the development. She did not believe it should be by a school.

Mark Splett
922 Ninth Street North

Mark Splett explained that his concerns were over the proximity to the community club, where kids play. He noted that mental health illness and substance abuse is a concern and believed there were better locations, such as downtown where there are services available. He commented on water runoff, explaining that an additional street off of the hill onto North Campbell Street would worsen drainage issues. He asked if they extend sewer services for an additional 20 units and use an old drain system that needs to be fixed, where the additional sewage would go. He was also concerned over property values, as he lives directly across from the proposed build. He was also unhappy with the notification period and thought this was happening last minute. He commented that when the City approached the community club about moving the rink, they did not advise them what the access road would be for. He raised concern about density and noted that he supports the two level housing types rather than one big building. He also commented on the crime rates going up, noting that the affordable housing in Minto creates an abundance of crime in their area. He explained he is supportive of this but doesn't think it is in the right area. He explained that there is some inconsistencies with the information being shared, such as telling people the build won't be for elderly people but now it's being said that elderly people can be there. He was concerned that the use will change to support additions and asked why we are moving people farther away from having access to jobs like in downtown. He also asked why they are having an Open House after this one and believed that the Open House should have been held prior. He stated that he has started a petition against this and it has 200 signatures opposed to the location.

Blair Dolinski
9171 Valley Drive

Blair Dolinski expressed that he is concerned that the project is going way too fast. He noted that he just got back from holidays and thinks more research needs to be done. He also stated that he needs his own time to go over the little information he can get.

Barry Skinner
941 Ninth Street North

Barry Skinner commented that they've all had their properties broken into in the area, explaining that he had someone enter his garage, smoke a joint, while going through his things. He explained that it has been a constant struggle and that he took care of the community rink for years, picking up garbage in the summer. He stated that there are needles and empty alcohol containers around and he has witnessed people passed out on his street in the winter. He agreed that the development is needed but not close to their personal properties. He had a lot of concern about it and the children playing at the rink. He also commented that snow needs to be removed from the parking lot at the community rink, but that's where the access road will be. He expressed that it may not be high on the list of priorities but it is a concern. The snow has to go somewhere.

Debra Kasprick
1022 Ninth Street North

Debra Kasprick commented on the different information being made public about the development. She referenced that in the news, it said that it would be a 30 unit build and strictly indigenous people but now they are being told it is a 20 unit build. She stated that if it is for indigenous people and for supportive housing, she had concern that there should be certified physicians, professionals, elders and healers. They should also have the facility provide traditional healing methods like sharing circles and smudging rooms. She claimed that there is an area by Rocky Heights Road and that it probably is zoned appropriately because of the hotel converted into apartments. She thought that would be a better location.

Carol Petrocovich
1114 Ninth Street North

Carol Petrocovich stated that she understood Kenora has a need for the development but also was concerned with the location. She explained that the mill property is very large and asked whether it would make more sense to have it located closer to town for supportive services.

Jenn Skene
1000 Guernsey Street

Jenn Skene explained that she also has two young kids that attend Evergreen and who use the trails in the forested area, which high school students also do. There is a lot of traffic and depending on who is living there, she didn't think it is appropriate. She explained that some of the kids are already high risk to begin with and don't need to be walking near that. Most of their kids play at the community rink and her husband volunteers there. She explained that it is a safe place to play and be active. She also expressed concern with the transparency, noting that at first it was said to be a 6 unit and then it was a 30 unit in the paper and now it is a 20 unit. She was concerned that they could not give a definite response as to who will be living there. She believed that it would be different if it were for families but if it is for mental health and addictions, it's an issue.

Benoit Durhaime, from the public, stated that he heard the word future development and asked if this means there will be additional builds. The Agent clarified that it was a comment made by the property owner with respect to himself development the land (not KDSB), and noting that this particular build won't affect future development of the former mill site.

The Chair asked the Committee if they had questions pertaining to the application.

Tanis McIntosh asked why this property was selected over others, given the concerns raised over property values. She wondered what else was available. The Agent explained that planning-wise, this property is designated for residential development and permitted uses are similar to this proposed use. She also explained that the subject area has not yet been developed and there is ample size to accommodate the building with parking and amenity space. She stated that there has been a massive search for suitable properties.

Henry Wall further explained by saying that in terms of criteria, they were limited for lot size. He highlighted that this development is for 20 units and not 30. The other ten will be developed elsewhere. He also commented that the development needs to be about this size for it to work financially. Choosing single detached dwellings will lose money, especially with the cost of development. Location to services was also a factor and that individuals being housed in this build feel as though they are part of the community. Isolating them won't meet those objectives and he stressed that the status quo does not work.

Robert Kitowski asked if there will be a bathroom in each unit. Henry Wall (KDSB) explained that each unit will be a standalone apartment with bathrooms. It is multi-residential but will have supports on site. Robert then asked what their target clientele is, as they had mentioned families but in the pamphlets it was talking about mental health issues. Henry clarified that they still have to go through the process to determine the criteria, nothing that this type of housing looks different in each community. They didn't want to come to the Committee with the final solution and stated that there is no point in having these discussions without first finding a location and a building.

Ray Pearson stated that it seems as though the KDSB is going off of what the community wants. That they have a 20 unit build but don't have the demographic established. Henry Wall (KDSB) explained that the development should not be confused with the bail aftercare program and that it is still supportive housing with an intake criteria. They are still in the process of working with community partners, learning from other projects, to determine which individuals will be a good fit. It is a massive undertaking and they want to make sure that they are supporting what other community organizations are accomplishing in Kenora. He explained that the opportunity came arise only in January and so the window is quite small. Henry also explained that they will continue with community engagement even after the build is finished to ensure that the program is working for everyone. If there are issues, they want to hear about it from the neighbours so they can address the programming. He

highlighted that it is a fluid and “out-of-the-box” program. They are not asked for an institutional re-zoning as it is a residential type of use.

Ray Pearson asked whether the support services will be on site or if they will be downtown. Henry Wall (KDSB) explained that services will be offered on site and that the fundamentals of the program will help individuals with their life skills, to cook, budget, etc. They are also potentially looking at physical outreach services instead of them having to go to the hospital. They want to have staff available 24/7 to make sure the program works.

Ray Pearson then asked whether the intent is to provide temporary housing or if it is permanent. Henry Wall explained that they want to have each individual feel and believe that this is their home; however, if they want to transition out, they would help them through that process. He stated that there would be lease agreements.

Ray Pearson also asked why this site was selected over locations downtown.

Henry Wall clarified that because there are many people downtown in units there is the assumption that it needs to be there, but it doesn't. They were reviewing the size of the land, the cost of development, and whether the site was conducive to being residential dwellings. He highlighted that they are not trying to hide people; rather, assist those that have been failed by the system. He explained that Kenora does have a challenge but it will take the entire community.

Bev Richards asked whether a disabled or elderly person would not meet their criteria. Henry Wall explained that a long-term care facility is a whole separate definition; however, there is not an age restriction for this development. The intake criteria has to be a community discussion and mentioned that high school students may even qualify.

Bev Richards then asked how they will ensure that drugs won't be taken. Henry Wall explained that there will be two staff on-site at any time. There will be amenity areas and laundry facilities and that the development is not a lockdown situation with no conditions. Bev asked what would happen if drugs are found. Henry stated that possession of illicit drugs would be a crime and that they will go to jail.

John Barr asked how many units are in the Sioux Lookout build and whether it is the same type of building. Henry Wall stated that it is also in a residential area, same type of building and also for 20 unit. He noted that it is in fairly close walking distance to grocery stores and not too far from elementary schools.

John Barr asked how long it has been open to which Henry stated about six months.

John Barr then asked whether the principal of Evergreen seemed positive about the project when they had been approached by KDSB. Henry Wall explained that they have their own decision-making process to go through. The KDSB wants to make sure that there is an open process.

John Barr mentioned that many neighbouring residents have been talking about risk and risk mitigation. He asked how they will ensure that any risk is minimized. Henry Wall explained that there are already issues with crime and needle use in the area; the risk is already there. He explained that having programs like this does help curb the risk. John Barr noted that there may be a current risk level but that there may be an increased risk. He agreed that having it staffed 24/7 will help. He also suggested that it appeared that this project came up very quickly with time-lines on government funding which affected the ability to do site selection within specified criteria.

Wayne Gauld, Chair, described that it sounds like the neighbourhood felt that this project snuck up on them. He suggested that the Committee puts the discussion on hold to allow people to attend the KDSB Open House on Thursday to have their questions answered.

The Committee discussed the option. It was noted that a Special Meeting could potentially take place between the 9th and 19th of April for a recommendation. It was agreed that they should refocus on their role, which is to make a recommendation to Council on a land use planning application. It was noted that there were concerns over programming, which is outside of the scope of their role.

Gene Grant
348 Gould Road

Gene Grant asked whether each unit will have to pay property tax and have individual water meters if the zone changes from R2 to R3.

Karen Brown (CAO), in the audience, clarified that the building will be subject to property tax. She explained that Council has not made a final decision on the water meters, noting that it could change or it may not.

The Planner clarified that the recommendation by PAC is whether or not to include supportive housing overall in the Zoning By-law and to allow it in all R3 or Institutional zones. She noted that the committee has the option to review and decide whether it should be site specific.

Henry Wall also clarified that each tenant pays part of their rent. The tenants would pay what they can afford.

Robert Kitowski asked the Chair if they can vote whether to stay beyond 10 pm, per the Terms of Reference. The Committee was in favour.

The Committee took a break at 9:57 p.m.

The meeting commenced at 10:01 p.m.

The Chair asked the Committee for discussion prior to making a decision.

Robert Kitowski explained that his only concern is with the driveway and the adding of the waterline, because open space would be removed and there is nothing to show in the plans that it would be given back. He indicated that he would like to see part of that addressed. Second, he stated he was not supportive of the condition to add supportive housing as a permitted use in all R3 zones. He noted that there are a lot of R3 zoned properties and that he was not sure that this use could be accommodated in all of them.

John McDougall noted the opposition of the public, mentioning that there seems to be a lack of clarity. He believed it would be helpful for them to get more information on similar projects. He asked whether the Sioux Lookout development houses people that face mental illness. He also noted that it had been mentioned earlier about a high school student being housed and he was not sure if they face those issues. He wondered if the KDSB can do something not supportive housing, explaining that he drives the area often and that he realizes how difficult it is to make turns onto Ninth Street near the armories. He expressed concern over the increase in density and potential traffic issues.

Tanis McIntosh also recognized the level of opposition for the project. She wondered if there were any other properties that meet the needs and the criteria for development. She expressed that she believes opposition will come wherever the building is proposed and that being close to the school is a hindrance. She highlighted that the KDSB also realizes this and are willing to accommodate compromises for the intake criteria. She noted that homelessness and mental illness issues are also on a spectrum, as it can be anything that hinders people from finding jobs to support themselves. She was hopeful that 20 out of the quoted 500 people that were identified as homeless would not be dangerous to children.

John Barr expressed that he supported what Tanis had said. He noted that the perception of risk is based on project site location and understood the concerns by the neighbourhood. He indicated that the role of the Committee is to make recommendations based on planning matters and not based on the people who may reside there.

Graham Chaze stated that there had been a lot of talk about risk, which makes sense, but what was not being talked about was stigma. He explained that there are issues on dignity, human rights, and community. His wife works in mental health and he knows that her clientele are in desperate need of housing. He stated that there is a lot of fear based decision-making, but that if the risks are properly managed and if there is the correct programming, those risks are low. He highlighted that those "risks" are already in the community. He also is a parent and lives nearby. He understood the concerns but this development is to make the community better. He expressed that he does not mean to devalue anyone's concerns. He asked what the benefits are to the entire community and not just the neighbourhood. He raised the question if there is a perfect neighbourhood, stating that we need to be inclusive and that the program can be very successful. He ended by saying he understands the communication restraints that have taken place but that he had to address the stigma.

Robert Kitowski explained that he also had difficulty with the recommendation to Council to amend Table 4 of the Zoning By-law, over parking. He explained that through discussion at the meeting it sounds as though the tenants will be there long-term and if they become financially stable, they may want to buy a vehicle.

The Planner clarified that part of the rationale for reduced parking was related to affordability. The parking would primarily be for visitors, as the tenants would be less likely to own a vehicle if they are struggling to pay rent or own a house. She noted that the project will be providing sixteen (16) spaces.

Henry Wall clarified that the intent is not technically to have each tenant be there long term, but that it is more so the psychological factor of the project being housing first. They will not be rushing them out but they have had tenants move out within a couple of months for their own housing. He highlighted that they don't want to be imposing time restrictions.

The Committee talked more about parking in relation to the proposed development. The Planner explained that the new amendments would also be something that could be applied for future applications.

Henry Wall explained that the team behind the development is very committed to see the project succeed. They are committed to having it be from a culturally safe perspective and not a "white man's solution". He explained that something needs to happen in the community and the current trends are not sustainable. In terms of buildings, he explained that some low-income buildings in Minto are believed to be the KDSBs' but they are privately owned.

Wayne Gauld asked for clarification whether they work with the neighbourhood, the schools and other agencies.

Henry Wall confirmed that they do. The KDSB financially supports child care centers in the community and in households in the area. They care about the neighbourhood's concerns and they care about the families that live there. They care about removing the stigma of mental health.

The Secretary Treasurer read the Planner's recommendation, per the planning report.

Robert Kitowski wished to see the definition be site specific to this location and not being permitted in all R3 and I-zones. The Planner explained that this development would be residential and clarified that the use of a bail bed program would be institutional (and not permitted in the R3 zone).

Robert Kitowski put forward a motion, noting that it amended the Planner's recommendation to have it be site-specific.

Moved by: Robert Kitowski

Seconded by: Ray Pearson

Resolved that the Kenora Planning Advisory Committee recommends that the Council of the Corporation of the City of Kenora approve application D14-19-03, subject property fronting on Ninth Street North, located west of the Kenora Armoury and north of the Evergreen Community Club, part of Roll # 6016-020-009-135-000,

- To remove the hold for development plan (h)
- To change the zoning of the subject property from Residential Second Density to a site specific form of Residential Third Density zone;

AND

- To add a definition for Supportive Housing to Section 2 of the By-law:

Supportive Housing

A residential use building containing rooming units or a combination of rooming and dwelling units, providing residence to any persons requiring supports to live, and support services on-site which may or may not include collective dining facilities, laundry facilities, counselling, educational services, and transportation. This does not include Retirement Homes, Continuum Care Facilities, Correctional Facilities, or Emergency Shelters

- To amend Table 4 of Section 3.23, to include Parking Requirements for Supportive Housing at the rate of 0.25 per rooming unit or 4 beds plus 1 per 100 m² of gross floor area used for medical, health or personal services.

That the Committee has made an evaluation of the application upon its merits against the Official Plan, Zoning By-law and the Provincial Policy, and provides a recommendation to Council purely based on these matters; whereas the Committee may not have had the opportunity to hear public comments in full.

Carried.

Mark Splett, member of the public, asked about next steps for the application process. The Chair explained that the KDSB is offering an open house on Thursday of the week and that the Committee has made a recommendation to Council. Council will hold a statutory public meeting on April 9th, 2019.

Jana Lasso, of the public, asked for the pamphlets by KDSB so that she may send to parents at Evergreen school.

(x) Old Business

- Discussion with regard to creating a new zone for reduced minimum lot area & building size

The Planner gave a brief update on the discussions around a "small home zone". It would be included in the Zoning By-law and some of the permitted uses found in other residential zones would be removed.

She explained that the zone would be able to accommodate a Mezzo home, or something similar and that the project is hopefully coming to Kenora. There is the possibility for some flexibility and that she will be meeting with the Mezzo Home builder tomorrow in Selkirk to see some existing development. The zone should be able to accommodate access to the rear of the property.

A potential setback would be the requirement of an Official Plan Amendment when a high density type of home would be proposed (i.e. 39 units per ha). The Planner explained that City Departments will also be circulated to provide comment. She clarified that the zone would need to be serviced by both municipal sewer and municipal water.

The Planner stated that a location has not been determined right now, but that this zone would establish rules around smaller lot sizes and floor areas. A future developer would be able to find this zone as an option and under a subdivision, they could propose similar requirements. Otherwise, they would have to come up with this rationale on their own. A re-zoning would still be required.

Tanis McIntosh asked about tiny homes, and the Planner explained that they could look at a new zone for that use as well. However, at this point the City is not ready to bring anything forward. Amendments would need to be made to the Official Plan and the City will also want to review the financial implications and what is affordable to the City for the provision of services. Right now, with the "Small Home Zone", there is not massive variation from what is already permitted. But there is just enough to accommodate a smaller home on a smaller lot. Secondary dwellings would not be permitted.


The Committee discussed about 1.5 sized lots being able to accommodate a smaller home, such as those in Lakeside.

(xi) Adjourn

Moved by: John Barr

That the March 19th, 2019 Planning Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned at 10:47 p.m.

Minutes of the Kenora Planning Advisory Committee meeting, Tuesday March 19, 2019, are approved this 16th day of April, 2019.



Wayne Gauld, Chair



Kylie Hissa, Secretary-Treasurer